

SMITH, Zane Grey Jr. FS 1951-1989
08-14-06
03__Corrected

**U.S. Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Region Five History Project**

Interview with: Zane Gray Smith Jr.
Interviewed by: Steven Dunsky
Location: Springfield, Oregon
Date: August 14, 2006
Transcribed by: Mim Eisenberg/WordCraft; August 2006
Corrections by: Linda Nunes

STEVEN DUNSKY: This is Steve Dunsky, Steven with a “v”, D-u-n-s-k-y. This is the project that we’re doing for the Region Five Oral History. Today is August 14th, 2006. We’re in Springfield, Oregon. It’s a nice bright sunny day. It’s about two o’clock in the afternoon, and I’m here with Zane Grey Smith Jr.

Zane, would you mind spelling your name for us, please?

ZANE GREY SMITH JR.: Sure. Zane, Z-a-n-e. Grey, G-r-e-y. Smith, S-m-i-t-h, and Junior.

DUNSKY: Zane, let’s start out by talking a little bit about your early life and how you got—well, it sounds like you came by the Forest Service honestly, so maybe you could tell us a little bit about how you got involved with the Forest Service to begin with.

SMITH: Right. I was born into what turns out now [to be] a three-generation Forest Service family. My granddad entered the Forest Service in the early days. He was a biological survey hunter—

[Recording interruption to let clock finish chiming.]

DUNSKY: Okay. We are back. And, Zane, you were just telling us about your early life in the Forest Service.

SMITH: Right. I was raised in a Forest Service family, me being the third-generation Forest Service career person. My granddad started with the Forest Service in the early days, transferred from the biological survey as a government hunter, and spent his career in Region Three, Arizona and New Mexico, retiring as an acting forest supervisor on the Coronado [National Forest] in Tucson. Dad was a graduate of what now is Colorado State University. His career started in Region Three (Arizona, New Mexico), and he was finally assigned to the Lewis and Clark Forest in Montana as forest supervisor and then back to the chief's office, and then returned to Albuquerque as assistant regional forester for lands and recreation.

So my early life, I was raised on a ranger station or a couple of them, and had all this Forest Service seeping all these years. I never really considered any options. I wanted to be a forest ranger, so I proceeded through high school and on to University of New Mexico for a year and then transferred to a forestry school, University of Montana, and stuck with it ever since.

DUNSKY: What year did you actually enter the Forest Service?

SMITH: Actually, I worked temporary in 1951 on the Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona, fighting fire and pruning trees, and then worked temporarily during school on the Coeur d'Alene National Forest in Idaho, and then I was first assigned as a permanent employee in 1955 to the Rogue River Forest in Region Six [in Oregon].

DUNSKY: Tell me about your name, Zane Grey Smith. Was your grandfather a fan of—I mean, I presume he was a fan, or your grandmother, or somebody was a fan of the western novel or maybe the western novelist particularly.

SMITH: Right. My granddad and grandmother were friends of his. Grandfather met him in dental school.

DUNSKY: Could you say who it was?

SMITH: They met Zane Grey, the author, and Zane Grey and my granddad were in dental school, and both kind of dropped out. Zane Grey went on to be an author, and my granddad escaped to California and was a cowboy for a while.

DUNSKY: Where was this that they were growing up together?

SMITH: This was in the Kentucky area, but I'm not sure where they met going to school, probably somewhere in that vicinity. Then Granddad connected with him again when he was with the biological survey as a hunter-trapper in Arizona, and did some guiding for him. And they maintained this close relationship all through the years. They were so taken with him that they named my dad Zane Grey Smith, and I became Junior.

DUNSKY: So did your dad have any contact with the author as well?

SMITH: I don't think Dad really did, other than discussions. Granddad, when he was acting forest supervisor on the Coronado in Tucson, still had some correspondence with him, and they wrote back and forth, but to my knowledge, after his early days in Arizona, they didn't have any personal contact.

DUNSKY: How much relationship did you have with your granddad? I mean, did you see him at work in the field and so on?

SMITH: I usually spent summers with him as I was growing up in Tucson, a bad place to be in the summertime, but it didn't bother young kids. Anyway, I'd go there and spend a month or two with them. He often took me out in some of his wanderings about the Coronado. Basically, in the early days, horseback was their primary mode of transportation, but in Tucson he had a car, a Forest Service car, and I recall vividly how he would almost use that car like a horse. He'd take it anywhere it would go. It didn't have to be a road. [Chuckles.] I don't think he ever fully transitioned to automobiles.

DUNSKY: Your experience with the Forest Service spans probably three-quarters if not eight-tenths of the history of the agency, in a way.

SMITH: Oh, probably a little bit more than that. Granddad I think came in about 1912, and here we are in 2006. I retired in 1989, so we ended up with over 100 man-years, as my dad would describe it, of Forest Service service.

DUNSKY: I just want to ask you another—touching on brushes with people that are sort of celebrities, in a way: Did your dad work with Aldo Leopold at all?

SMITH: I don't think my dad worked with Aldo Leopold. He actually served as a landscape architect. In the early days, as you know, foresters could do everything. At that time, he was a forester but served as a regional landscape architect. I'm sure that Aldo Leopold's work was a prominent thing. I doubt that Dad ever met him.

DUNSKY: What was the year that you really sort of became aware of—your earliest memories of the Forest Service. Approximately what year was that?

SMITH: Oh, I would say it would be about 1936. I was three years old. We were living on the Prescott National Forest at a ranger station, and I have very vivid memories of that, then throughout the rest of my life.

DUNSKY: Just while we're on that topic, what would you say characterizes the difference between the Forest Service today in 2006 versus in that year, the prewar Forest Service?

SMITH: After I was well along in my career, my grandmother and my dad both used to remark about how different it was. My grandmother, in the pre-1920s, said she knew everybody in the region, had had some contact with them, knew who they were and often had talked to them. And she was remarking how different that was in the 1970s, when I was forest supervisor of the

Willamette National Forest in Eugene, Oregon, that we had about 1,000 employees during the peak of the seasonal period, and she couldn't get over that.

Dad had somewhat the same feelings in that when he was forest supervisor of the Lewis and Clark, he had a couple of hundred employees, probably, and it was a low degree of development in terms of timber production and that sort of thing. His era kind of transitioned between the custodial period and the emergence of the development period. Of course, when I entered the Forest Service in 1955, the prewar development period had begun, and the staffing had gone up a lot. People were still around who had memory of the past times, even the custodial times, so it was an interesting period of transition. And, of course, that's rapidly changed in the past fifteen, twenty years.

DUNSKY: So you come into work basically in 1951, I think you said? Is that basically when you started your career? Where was it that you started?

SMITH: Nineteen fifty-one was my first year out of high school, and I worked as a seasonal employee on the Sitgreaves in Arizona and then worked during college out of University of Montana, which was a requirement there, to have some sort of forestry experience. I worked on the Coeur d'Alene then, until I got my permanent appointment in 1955, on the Rogue River Forest in Region Six, Oregon.

DUNSKY: How would you characterize the type of forestry education at that time? What were the things that were being taught in forestry school in your year?

SMITH: This varied a little bit in terms of what schools we're focusing on, but University of Montana was basically preparing people for Forest Service careers. I would say it resembled more training than it did education. The Society of American Foresters had such rigid requirements for graduating that you had very little opportunity to move around the university,

so it was a disadvantage in many ways not having more liberalized education, which I fortunately was able to catch up through my ROTC program there, and then the Air Force and then eventually some graduate work at Cornell University in public administration. But it was basically training, and in the case of the University of Montana, training for forest services careers—most people either went to the BLM [Bureau of Land Management] or the Forest Service.

DUNSKY: I've heard some of these schools referred to as ranger schools. Is that a term that you've heard, or is that the way you would characterize it?

SMITH: I've heard that term. In fact, in New York some of the institutions there have ranger schools. I think they would be more akin to technician type training. To my knowledge, the western schools do not carry that term, but in fact you had a four-year program that was technical in nature, and mostly training in that respect.

DUNSKY: But my understanding—and, again, I've delved into the history just a little bit—but there was a real premium placed on being a professional forester, especially in the Forest Service. It was kind of almost like a two-tier system of technical employees and professional employees. Is that a fair statement?

SMITH: That's my assessment too, is that there were technicians and then there were professional foresters. Both were viewed with quite a lot of great value. Technicians, including those that were generally called district assistants or fire control officers, were the technicians who stayed on a district for an entire career or for many years and were the backbone, really, of the operational aspects of the ranger district, whereas foresters tended to come and go pretty fast. There was a little bit of resentment about that. Often a young, kind of wet-behind-the-ears forester would come in and be the boss. It would work out fine if they realized they had a

partnership and a team approach to it, but those foresters who came in and tried to run everything in a very detailed manner—they usually were not too successful.

DUNSKY: What was the role of women on the district or in the office in those days? Were there any minorities in any of those offices [unintelligible]?

SMITH: The role of women was effectively zero for many, many years. It was confined to wives and children who were supporting rangers like my granddad way out in the boondocks. Even my mother—she was heavily involved, as the ranger's wife in the thirties, forties and that era, helping with Christmas tree sales and helping issue permits for wood and this and that. In some of the early literature in California—the California Region, it was called then—was that women didn't really have a place. They were clerks in offices and occasionally a lookout. That really went all the way through part of the fifties. Then, of course, women began to get into the pipeline through forestry education and other disciplines that the Forest Service needed, and it finally has ended up where it is today, where women are equally qualified and in many cases are occupying jobs that were never occupied by women in the past.

Minorities. You asked about that. It kind of depends on where you were. The Forest Service in Southern California I'm sure had a lot of minorities in the seasonal workforce; Northern California, not very many; Oregon and Washington, hardly any. And I think Region Three, Arizona and New Mexico, had quite a few minorities. You go into Region One and Two and Four, not very many. And the rest of the Forest Service, pretty much the same.

DUNSKY: What was your degree? Was it a BS, BA?

SMITH: My degree was a BS in forestry. The major was timber, timber management. You could have got a degree in range management, timber management or wildlife management at the University of Montana. And this varied somewhat school by school. My final education was

I was a National Institute of Public Affairs Fellow at Cornell University for a public administration (this was not a degree program). The Forest Service sent me back to school for that, which was very valuable in coming to be a forest supervisor, a regional forester or a director in the chief's office.

DUNSKY: What year was that?

SMITH: I went to Cornell in 1966, fresh out of the Job Corps program. I'd been a Job Corps center director in the state of Washington on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, went back and was on the staff, in the Job Corps division, in Washington; then went to Vice President [Hubert H.] Humphrey's President's Council on Youth Opportunity for a detail, from Agriculture, and then to Cornell.

DUNSKY: I'm jumping ahead a little too far here, but why was it that the Forest Service and you wanted to go into this—why was it important for you to go into that kind of training at that time?

SMITH: I don't think it was really planned that carefully. It was an opportunity [that] came along for Agriculture to put somebody in this program for a particular year, and my boss, Vern Hamey, was the Job Corps division chief in Washington, DC, and he just felt that people who had been in the Job Corps program were well equipped to move into that little additional education, particularly expanding their horizons from a technical forestry end, and I'm sure that I can thank him for promoting the idea, and I was able to get the secretary's approval.

DUNSKY: I want to get back to the Job Corps thing a little bit later on, as we continue to talk about the changing workforce in the Forest Service, but let's go back to when you started out with your first permanent job with the Forest Service, and if you could tell me where that was, what the job was, and what was your ambition at the time? When you think back to what you

really wanted to do in your career and where you wanted to end up, what were you thinking at that time?

SMITH: I guess I never fully appreciated where I might end up, but I had an interim goal, at least, of being a ranger. I'd have been satisfied to be a district ranger. Betty and I went from Missoula, Montana, to Union Creek, Oregon, which is on the Rogue River, just outside the boundaries of Crater Lake National Park. This is a beautiful spot, with old-growth sugar pine, Douglas fir and large western red cedar, a ranger station that was truly a compound, without electricity, but we did have a diesel power plant that each of us took turns turning on and off during the day. And I was assigned to the timber management staff there. It was a large timber district. I worked with my associates there laying out timber sales. I only stayed there a short time and was called into the Air Force.

DUNSKY: When you use the term "laying out timber sales," for somebody who doesn't know much about that, what do you mean "laying out a timber sale"?

SMITH: In other words, providing the groundwork that led to a timber sale. That would be to identify timber stands that were ready for harvest, actually laying out the road system and marking the timber, or the clear-cuts in that case, and appraising the value and advertising them, selling them and then actually administering a timber sale into contract.

DUNSKY: What was the volume, if you will? Do you remember what amounts of timber were coming off of the district at that time when you were first starting?

SMITH: Probably that Union Creek District would cut probably just under 100 million [board feet] a year. It's a very, very large timber and very fast growing, one of the better timber sites in the system. For example, when I was on the Willamette National Forest as forest supervisor in the seventies, we actually scaled, two years in a row, over one billion board feet, which included

everything, including what they call “Older Dead,” but it was scaled timber that was paid for by somebody.

DUNSKY: There was a phrase, wasn’t there: a billion or bust”—

SMITH: [Laughs softly.]

DUNSKY: —that was used sometimes? Did you ever hear that phrase?

SMITH: I haven’t heard that, but that’s a lot of timber, yes.

DUNSKY: Because the national timber cut was only at that time maybe, what, 9, 10 billion.

SMITH: That’s right, yes. Region Six was the big timber region, about 4 to 6 billion a year, and Region Five was next with about 2.5 billion.

DUNSKY: So you maybe had 10 percent of the national forest cut coming off of one forest.

SMITH: Well, not off one forest. Well, yes, pretty close. The Willamette was by far the largest timber-producing forest in the system.

DUNSKY: I think we’re jumping ahead in the timber program. Let’s go back to the 1950s. So now you were actually called into service. You were in the ROTC, and you’re called into service. Tell me about that, how that comes out, and how long were you gone?

SMITH: I was on a fire, the Haystack (or Sterling Mountain) Fire, it’s called, in Northern California, and had been there for two or three weeks, it seemed like, and I got my call to the Air Force. I thought, *Well, you know, this might not be a bad idea. Get a clean pair of socks and a rest.* [Laughs.] So we left, and went to San Antonio, Texas, for orientation at Lackland Air Force Base and then on down to Moore Air Base near McAllen, Texas, for pilot training. I went through T-28s and T-34s there. Then went to Lubbock, Texas, and got my wings in a B-25 and stayed on as an instructor-pilot for a three-year tour. Came back, stayed in the Reserve, but came back to the Rogue River National Forest at that time.

I might say, Steve, that the Air Force taught me a lot that I needed to know about managing people, developing teamwork and communications, that sort of thing, teaching, so a forester's education, particularly in those days, required some different experiences to really get rounded out.

DUNSKY: It seemed like at that time a lot of the people that came back into the Forest Service on the G.I. Bill were vets and stuff too, so there was kind of a military culture at that time.

Would you say that's a fair assessment?

SMITH: I think that's pretty accurate. My graduating class at the University of Montana was probably at least half veterans, and those folks came in into the Forest Service and other agencies. There have been quite a few people. My dad was still in the Forest Service at that point. He was a World War II veteran. So, yes, I think there was a good deal of that, but at the same time, many people described the Forest Service, you know, as pretty structured like the military, anyway. Maybe not so much anymore, but they used to call it the marine corps of the civilian service. There was a lot of discipline, autonomy but following regulations. There's been a lot written about that. Yes, there's some similarity.

DUNSKY: How would you characterize the management style at that time in terms of the way in which people were moved around or ordered to do things? Was it pretty much a top-down type of hierarchy?

SMITH: I think it was top down in terms of the employee. Probably most people working on ranger districts or on a forest, the forest supervisor made those kind of decisions, and usually made them for you. I never did apply for a job all the time I was in the Forest Service. It was always—I had my performance rating and the assessment of my supervisor, and then when the time came to get a job, they told me I was offered a job, so I never once made application.

That's a major change, whereas today, if you want a job, you have to apply for it. It's advertised. It was not advertised in the past.

DUNSKY: Were there consequences if you turned down a job? I mean, if they offered you a job, were you pretty much obligated to take it?

SMITH: I think you understood that if you didn't take it, you probably were truncating your career. My theory was that I should take whatever came to me, and I did. I only turned down one job, and I didn't get penalized for that one.

DUNSKY: So how did that work? Your supervisor would come in and say, "Zane, have we got a deal for you!"? Or what did that look like and sound like when that happened?

SMITH: I'm sure that the hiring officer, the supervisor, whoever it might be, was presented a list of names, and depending on what the grade was, the chief's office probably got involved in that too, and the region and the forest and so forth. And they would look at this list and make the top selection or top three, and then they'd pass that by their supervisor and he'd say, "That's all right," and then your supervisor would come and offer you the job and say, "You've been selected for this job. Do you accept?"

DUNSKY: As you moved up in the organization, you probably had the opportunity to make some of those selections too.

SMITH: Lots of them. Absolutely. And by the time I was in those positions, it was a fairly structured system providing qualified names, even to the point of advertising. I was involved, in that area, as a supervisor and selecting officer. I just was never subjected to it myself.

[Chuckles.]

DUNSKY: What years were you in the military?

SMITH: Nineteen fifty-five through '58.

DUNSKY: To '58. Okay, so you come back to the Forest Service, I presume, in '58, '59?

SMITH: Fifty-eight.

DUNSKY: Had the organization changed at all in the time you were gone? Did you perceive any differences in the time you were gone?

SMITH: I don't think I saw too much change. I think the changes began to come in the sixties, and particularly after Earth Day [April 22, 1970]. Lots of changes started occurring then.

There's suddenly an environment awareness in the whole country, and it really altered the Forest Service, and I think luckily the Forest Service responded to it, with certain constraints. I think we were boxed in, in many respects, so that we might have responded a little bit faster had it not been for the straight-line structure that we had.

DUNSKY: Let's take you through the sixties a little bit, late fifties and into the sixties. How long are you working in timber? What's your next move? Take me through that, going up to the Job Corps.

SMITH: Okay. When I returned to the Rogue River on a different ranger district, I was again assigned to timber sales and did a lot of timber sale contract administration, which by the way is a good training ground for line officers as well. And then along came the fire re-planning in 1958, and I was assigned to lead that project for the Rogue River National Forest, which I did, still living at the ranger district. From there, in 1959, we were transferred to John Day, Oregon, and I was the assistant timber staff at the forest level there, and stayed there about thirteen months, working strictly in timber, mainly in the office, checking appraisals and providing leadership for the timber people on the districts.

Then I was assigned to the assistant ranger position in Klamath Falls, Oregon, on the new Winema National Forest, a national forest that had been created out of the purchase of the

Klamath Indian tribal lands. There, I spent about five months as assistant ranger and was selected as the district ranger for the Conconully District of the Okanagan National Forest in Washington. That was kind of an interesting situation. The ranger there, Don, had been there quite a while, but he got caught up in the John Birch Society, which is an extremist group, anti-Communist extremist group. And he got to where that was kind of driving him in the community. He was splitting the community, and the forest supervisor counseled him, and finally the regional forester and the forest supervisor said, “Don, if you can’t separate this from your job, then you’re going to have to leave.”

DUNSKY: What town was this?

SMITH: This was Okanagan, Washington, which is in north-central Washington, right next to the Canadian border.

DUNSKY: What kinds of things was he doing with this John Birch activity?

SMITH: In these smaller towns, the district ranger is a fairly prominent person, so he was actively involved in promoting membership to the John Birch Society, preaching the gospel to people and even apparently on the job, taking advantage of those contacts, so it was kind of a matter of saying, “You either have to stop that or you’re going to have to leave.” And he chose to leave, and he went to Spokane and became a staffer for the John Birch Society.

DUNSKY: So he chose to leave, then.

SMITH: He chose to leave, right. So I was selected for that job. I’m just speculating, but I think they thought I could smooth the community situation over, which, as I look back on it, one of my strengths—there’s not too many of them [chuckles], but one is to kind of collaborate and facilitate agreements and be sensitive enough to know when you’re stepping on people’s toes in a negative way.

DUNSKY: This touches on another of our other key [unintelligible] here. We're [unintelligible] changing workforce, timber, also the image of the Forest Service and their communications with the public.

SMITH: Right.

DUNSKY: I'm interested in your perception of the ranger's role at that time in dealing with the public. Obviously it depends on the person and the situation, but I'd be curious to know what your feelings were about what needed to be done in that particular job.

SMITH: Certainly the ranger, particularly in that era, in those smaller communities, was the face of the Forest Service and was expected to get involved, and that's when I first joined the Rotary Club. All those kinds of things kind of went with the territory. You became an important part of the community. People listened to you, and you were asked to be involved in various kinds of things.

DUNSKY: Did you get any training in that, in, like, public relations or public speaking? Was there any training at that time?

SMITH: I think basically the answer is no. You kind of either learned it yourself and were successful, or didn't learn it and would find yourself leaving the ranger job. So it wasn't until probably the late sixties, early seventies that we really got involved in that kind of development, at least in my experience. I think probably that's one of the things I could have had or was kind of deficient [in], was enough training in that sort of thing. I don't think that's a particular problem right now. I see Forest Service being developed in a more broadened sense, but at that time, it was more like getting your Class One fire boss credentials or getting your range transect training or timber training, whatever it happened to be.

DUNSKY: One of the raps that you hear about the Forest Service in that era is that we had a tendency to sort of tell people, "This is what we're going to do. We're the experts. We know what we want to do, and we're going to do it. We're just going to explain it to you so that you understand why this is the best way to go." And it wasn't until the seventies or maybe later that we started to do more of this collaborative type of thing and public involvement and scoping and all the other terms that will come up later, but is that a fair assessment, do you think?

SMITH: I think that, to a large degree, is probably fair. I think you had an apathetic public, though, that kind of accepted it. They trusted the Forest Service, and if the forest ranger said that, it's probably right. There was an occasional dispute about that sort of thing, but by and large I think the Forest Service was able to get by with it. There didn't seem to be any great necessity for it. But, as you say, in the late sixties and seventies, people began to push back on it, and it was difficult for field people to do much with it because we were still getting pretty hard-line direction from the top, and that to some degree is true today. It doesn't give local people a whole lot of room. That's one reason that this thing called community-based forestry is beginning to be talked about a lot more, and that it's good, that we need to get back to our roots on that.

At the same time, rangers and others were out talking to the public a lot in those early days too. I had all kinds of times that I did multiple-use features, promoting the good. It's like the ranger who went to a funeral and asked if anybody wanted to say something, and nobody did. He said, "Well, if nobody has anything to say, I'll tell you a little bit about multiple use."

[Chuckles.] That's about where we were. [Laughs.]

DUNSKY: For somebody that doesn't know or the younger generation, describe what was multiple use? What was that concept, for the public?

SMITH: The public was told that national forests were created for a variety of uses, and it would be wrong to exclude uses. That didn't mean that every use had to be used on every acre but that you could develop plans that sort of gave a focus to timber or range or wildlife or recreation, and you managed these properties in that kind of a matrix of uses.

DUNSKY: Kind of a zoning idea? There was, like, a timber area, a recreation area? And sometimes they overlapped.

SMITH: Yes, that's right. For example, a road might be built to accommodate both timber sales and recreation. That would be multiple use, too. You didn't just build a road for timber, you tried to accommodate other kinds of uses. In a sense, it was like zoning. You'd have zoning where you'd try to maximize timber production, not at the absolute exclusion of other uses, and always underlying that supposedly was the protection of the water and soil, the basic ingredient for all the resources.

DUNSKY: I'm sorry to cut you off.

SMITH: That's all right.

DUNSKY: So when you're giving your A-list speech on multiple use, what would you say? If you were trying to convince me that multiple use was the best thing, what would you say to me?

SMITH: You could optimize all the benefits. I guess the antithesis of that would be that you would have a wildlife area and a timber area and a recreation area and a minerals area, at the exclusion of all other uses. The idea of multiple use is that you can accommodate combinations of these things, perhaps not providing priority emphasis on one or the other but allowing it to occur, anyway, always with the mind that you would protect the water and the soil so that you could change that at any one time. Some people wanted to see all the wildlife lands go to the Fish and Wildlife agency; others wanted all the recreation lands to go to the National Park

Service; and the Forest Service pushback on that was multiple use multiple use: “You don’t have to do that; you can have them both, see?” Wilderness is probably the most exclusive. The Forest Service agreed to that, in fact kind of invented it, I guess.

DUNSKY: I wanted to test a little hypothesis on you here. In thinking about the difference politically between the prewar years, pre-World War II, and the postwar years—I mean, during the Depression you have some pretty progressive ideas coming out, with all the New Deal programs or at least big-government programs. In the postwar years you get a swing to the right. I mean, you’re talking about the John Birchers and so on, who has a real fear of Communism and so on. I’m just wondering how—and people like Pinchot and Bob Marshall and Raphael Zon and these people—these were pretty left-wing people, if you get right down to it. Was there a sense of, in some ways, trying to move away from the prewar Forest Service to a postwar Forest Service? Did you have any sense of the politics or, like, who was in and who was out, or what parts of Pinchot were being used, as opposed to some messages from Pinchot in the prewar years versus the way Pinchot might have been used to justify the timber program in the postwar years? I’m sort of maybe letting my own pet theories come in here, but I’m just wondering if you had any perception of the politics that were going on inside the Forest Service?

SMITH: When you first mentioned it, my answer was no, but as you look back on it, I think there was such a preoccupation with development after the war. It was to develop these lands, to maximize value and jobs and opportunities. I think the Congress and the administrations tended to agree with that, with the funding that went with it, and the targets. I don’t think there was particularly a move away from some of the New Deal, Depression-day things, like the CCC [Civilian Conservation Corps] program, one of the best things that ever happened to the Forest Service.

After the war, we began to develop the work programs, culminating in the _____ Job Corps Conservation Center program, so we always had those things. In the fifties and sixties and seventies, we had those programs coming along, and the Forest Service used them. But there was this thrust for developing the land. Get the roads in, get the timber under “management” (quote, “management”), and that kind of altered the way we looked. It altered their budgets so that in the fifties we began to hire a lot of engineers to build roads, and we built a lot of roads, and we hired more foresters to see that timber was cut. I always say you kind of are what you eat, and we were eating a lot of appropriated money for roads and timber, and that’s what we became. And we had experts doing that job, and they began to overwhelm the old custodial mentality of, you know, “We’re taking care of this land. We’re protecting it, and we’re gentle with it” and so forth. It became a lot different at that time.

Then the environmental movement began to take effect and, again, push back from that whole notion, and we began to respond to it to some degree, but never as fast as the general public perceived it.

DUNSKY: What about Gifford Pinchot? When I came to the Forest Service in 1988, 1989, I had never heard of Gifford Pinchot, to be honest with you, and here I see these maxims—some of them were kind of old, but there were these maxims up on the wall and people were talking about this guy, Gifford Pinchot, and I didn’t know anything about him. But you obviously grew up hearing about Gifford Pinchot, and your granddad might have even met him. I don’t know. But was Pinchot sort of a guiding light throughout this entire period, or how was Pinchot perceived, in your mind and in the mind of your colleagues?

SMITH: I think he was a guiding light, or at least perceived that way. The quotation, “The greatest good for the greatest number in the long run,” you know? And you really can’t argue

with that. But the application of it can vary quite greatly. What are the public's priorities here? What kind of balance do you need or want? That's where it began to move, and probably people would use fragments of his preachings to achieve what they wanted. You still hear a lot of that. You know, "We should be cutting timber," and we should, but it doesn't have to be clear-cut and burn everything, you know? [Chuckles.] And there are those that feel pretty strongly—in fact, Forest Service retirees are kind of on the edge of that, at least the organized retirees. I think it's not very productive in this day and age, when the chief of the Forest Service and all of you working in the Forest Service now are trying to keep that balance somehow. It's never perfect, but you can't go back to the old days when production was the king. There's a lot more to it.

And then you get involved with the administrations bouncing off both walls here and the Forest Service trying to find a way through the middle of it. It's difficult. I think the Forest Service people have a much more difficult time today than we ever did in the past, because the country is so divisive on this matter. It's not just forestry or land, it's just everything. It's much more divisive, so it's hard to maintain a balance that's endorsed by the majority of people.

DUNSKY: So now we're up to the middle sixties. Tell me, what was the transition from—you said you never applied for a job, so I assume that somebody said, "Hey, Zane, we're going to put you in charge of the Job Corps Center." How did this Job Corps thing come about, and what was that like for you? What kind of experience was that?

SMITH: It came about when the Forest Service agreed to manage about fifty-some Job Corps conservation centers. We still had a residual of the old CCC program. The memory was there. I'm sure the Forest Service saw it as an opportunity to not only respond to the president and the administration, as we usually try to do, but that it would be good for the Forest Service to become involved in that and that there would be some products as a result. We'd built a lot more

campgrounds, we'd have more fire crews, we'd have more cultural work in timber. Just a lot of things that can happen. And we thought we were pretty good at supervising young people and *training*. So the chief apparently said, "We're going to get behind this." This was [Edward P.] "Ed" Cliff. He says, "We're going to make this work, and we're going to have the best."

DUNSKY: About what year was this?

SMITH: This would be 1965. [R.] Sargent Shriver, a very dynamic guy, was the head of the OEO [Office of Economic Opportunity] and got personally interested in the Job Corps in the Office of Economic Opportunity, that whole set of President [Lyndon B.] Johnson's—I think it was Johnson's Great Society, yes. So Sargent Shriver went to the Forest Service and all the land management agencies, Park Service and BLM and so forth, and convinced the directors that we ought to do this, and the Forest Service really got behind it, got some of its best people to get into the leadership positions.

Jack Dienema, for example, who was Regional Forester in Five at one time—he was selected to be the chief honcho there for the Forest Service, then went over to OEO, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and was director of the Job Corps program.

DUNSKY: Could you get a sense whether something was like a dead-end thing or whether this was like a good career move? In other words, you could tell by who was being picked and how it was being done whether this was a good place to be in the agency?

SMITH: I think the immediate perception was "this could be a dead end." But then Chief Cliff just was very forthright about it. He says, "The people that get in this program are going to have good experience, and we're going to take care of them if they're successful." And he was really serious. That word got right down to the last guy. I don't know exactly how they decided to contact certain people, but for center directors they were looking primarily at district rangers,

somebody who demonstrated leadership, ability to manage organizations and train people and this and that. I know Fritz Moisie, the forest supervisor of the Okanagan, called me over to his office one day, and he said, “How about being a Job Corps center director?” And he explained to me.

You know, I never really hesitated on it, but after I did that and became known, several people came up to me and said, “Big mistake, big mistake. You’ll be sorry. It’s a dead end.” Then I looked around and noticed the people that had been selected, and they were not dead-end kind of people, so I accepted, and by that time—I don’t know if Vern Hamre was then the director at Washington level, but anyway, all of us went through Managerial Grid. The Forest Service has a history of taking a lot of people through that program.

DUNSKY: Describe it to me. What is Managerial Grid?

SMITH: Managerial Grid was an employee and organizational development program. It was based on a grid of nine attributes on the vertical axis and nine attributes on the horizontal axis. I think the vertical axis was the ability to work with people, sensitivity and that sort of thing, all the way to being a dictator. [Chuckles.] And the other one was something kind of similar to that but on a different scale. The idea was that a nine-nine was the best position to be in. And a one-one would be the worst. I guess the horizontal axis was the ability to take initiative, a self-starting sort of thing, one being very low and nine being really aggressive. So if you were a nine-nine person—

DUNSKY: Self-starting collaborator.

SMITH: Yes, exactly. That was the best to be. Or you could be a nine-one or a one-nine or whatever it was. Anyway, you go through a whole series of exercises. As I recall, it took about a week to go through this program.

DUNSKY: Was this in the Washington office?

SMITH: The initial program was in the Washington, DC, area. They pulled in all the Job Corps center director candidates or appointees, and they all went through that. And then it eventually became a hallmark of Forest Service employee and organizational development. A lot of people went through this program, and they were still going through this program as recently as five years ago. This region was still using it.

DUNSKY: Was this put on by a contractor or by the Forest Service?

SMITH: It was initially put on by contractors, and then people were certified within the Forest Service to conduct these training sessions. And it was a good one. It was really the forerunner of a lot of the things that we later did.

DUNSKY: It strikes me as odd because it seems like those are, what, personality traits? And so it seems like trying to train people to be more collaborative or have more initiative, and it's kind of hard when you're an adult.

SMITH: I think personality has a lot to do with it. On the other hand, the organization that you're in tends to force you into that. If your rewards are all in the area of being nine-one, you're a dictator and you don't have any collaboration [chuckles], then you're not going to be very successful.

DUNSKY: So it's more of a weeding-out process.

SMITH: To some degree, but I think people can be trained in that, too. I think the organization was maybe limiting people in the wrong place. Our history was—you know, district rangers and other people were out there having to make decisions quickly and had to be authoritative, so a lot of background is in that direction. But working with these kids and working with other kinds of disciplines, you've got to be a little more collaborative. That program did a lot for the Forest

Service and resulted in a good deal more outreach to people in our decision making and planning and that sort of thing.

DUNSKY: Where did you fall out on the grid?

SMITH: I was not too bad. I learned as a district ranger that you—I don't remember if I was nine-nine or not, but I was probably a little more on the authoritative side. I remember Vern Hamre—he defended me a little bit. He says, "Well, you gotta remember, these guys are out there in the field, and they gotta make decisions, they gotta fight fire and this and that," and he said, "That's the way they operate." So you'd be better to be a little bit more decisive than to be wimpy. [Chuckles.]

But I also learned some skills, on how to be a better collaborative person, and that carried with me right through the rest of my career as a forest supervisor, regional forester and what have you, and even on the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission, where you do a lot of things without having the authority of command, which is important. If you need command, that's fine, but—

DUNSKY: So where was this Job Corps center that you went to, and how did that work out?

SMITH: This one was in Cispus, which is on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, about twelve miles from Randle, Washington, on a dirt road. We actually built the center. It was a contract building, but it was a 225-enrollee center, all men, sixteen to twenty-one years old. And we built a program of work, and half-day education. So we hired, oh, people like principals of high schools, teachers from school systems. We hired a lot of Forest Service work supervisors. We hired a few journeyman type carpenters from the private sector. We hired a Navy corpsman to run the dispensary. Just a variety of people. And resident assistants that would live in a sixteen-person dormitory with people. Their duty came on in the evening, and they stayed through the

next morning with them. So that program was likened to the Three Cs except the Forest Service ran the whole thing; the Army wasn't involved at all. It was a great program. It developed a lot of us so that we could go on and be successful.

DUNSKY: So you're managing a lot of non-Forest Service people, it sounds like.

SMITH: Right. You're managing people like a deputy for work programs and a deputy for education and a deputy for administration, all coming from different backgrounds. The only one that came from the same background was my deputy for work. He'd been a district ranger. So, you know, it thrust you into an environment in which you could practice these things, and it worked out quite well.

DUNSKY: Where did the young people come from? What was their background, and what was the ethnic or racial mix involved?

SMITH: Early in the program, it was basically poor minorities, economically deprived minorities. And in our case, of all things, most of ours came from the South, mostly black and a few Hispanics from Los Angeles, into a place where there was probably not a black person within half a day's drive. Of all things, this Job Corps center was built on the Niggerhead Road, at the confluence of Niggerhead Creek and the Cispus River, and in the background was Niggerhead Rock, all those things right there. All the Forest Service-routed signs. The staff and I—we started our early collaboration, what to do.

The community did not want this Job Corps center, Randle, a little town of about 400 maybe. They were opposed. They said, "These black people are just going to come in and destroy our whole town." We decided, well, we're not going to change the names. We're just going to include that in the orientation of these young people. And, you know, we never had any trouble with that. We explained the origin of the name, Niggerhead, that it was a common term,

that there were no black people around here. It was not anything particularly against them. But within six months, the community came to us and said, “We think we ought to change the name of these places,” and we did. So it worked out, but it was tricky.

DUNSKY: That’s a great story. Any other stories about individual kids that were there or other things that you can remember that were particularly memorable?

SMITH: Oh, it was quite an experience for those kids to be in a place that—it was frightening to them. They came from the inner cities, and here they are, in this wilderness, practically, as far as they were concerned. It was too far to walk anywhere to get away from there. A lot of people—not a lot, but several people just couldn’t hack it, and we had to send them home.

It was interesting working with them. I don’t know how the other Job Corps centers worked, but we had this big cafeteria and a full commercial kitchen, and the Job Corpsmen, themselves, did a lot of the work. We had a chief cook and a deputy cook, but everything else was done by corpsmen. We had a student enrollee government, and I sat down with them once a week for lunch, and we had a council meeting. We raised the flag every morning, with appropriate music. Everybody gathered around the flagpole.

DUNSKY: What time of morning was it?

SMITH: It was about seven thirty, I think. Up with the flag, and that started the day. They’d already eaten, and then they would go on their ways.

The Navy corpsman did a wonderful job as our medical person. Had a fully equipped dispensary. But with these kinds of kids, working with axes and this and that, we had one kid cut his finger off, and I just watched this corpsman take care of that. I heard about it and went to see this kid right away, and he was just in excruciating pain. He was lying on the gurney there, and he was gripping my hand, and the old corpsman came in and looked at it. He says, “Where’s the

finger?” and grabbed a splint, one of these inflatable splints, and put it on his arm, pumped it up, and the pain went away. The kid just relaxed. They took him to a doctor in a nearby town—not nearby, forty-five or fifty miles, and they sewed the finger back on.

A lot of things happened like that. We learned an awful lot about sixteen-year-old to twenty-one-year-old people. We worked with the Boeing Company, got a lot of them jobs in Seattle. So it was a good experience. And most of those folks that were in the Job Corps program did well. The staff, particularly the Forest Service people went on with their Forest Service careers, and some of the educators stayed on with the Forest Service and took up careers in administration for things that they were trained in.

DUNSKY: Tell me, did any of the kids end up in the Forest Service, the enrollees?

SMITH: They did. Several enrollees went to the Forest Service as seasonal people and then finally got permanent jobs. There was a Job Corps enrollee who was in the regional office in Portland for a full career, working in the mailroom and this and that. These kids—all we were trying to do was get them to up to a sixth grade education in math and English, and then work skills. In the world of work, you get cleaned up every morning and be on time and give a day’s work. And that was our whole issue.

We actually built a field house, a huge field house, and the old carpenter there, the old union carpenter—he put his hands in his pockets, and he never took them out. [Laughs.] He just worked with them. He told them everything to do. And they did it, and the pride that came out of those kids, who had been basically abused by the culture, their environments in the past.. Many of them, we heard later, were ordered by the court, “Join Job Corps or go to jail.” But they were just unruly kids; they weren’t hardened criminals.

DUNSKY: One last question about Job Corps and then we'll take a little break. We've been at this just about an hour here. I've heard people say that were involved in the Forest Service Job Corps that it changed the Forest Service as much as it affected the kids. Did it have an impact on you and the way you looked at the world?

SMITH: I think it definitely did, particularly those who worked within the Job Corps program. It gave them a cultural awareness and a social feeling about our country that I'm sure they never had. It also gave them a lot of confidence in the ability to invest in young people, that it's a good investment because you can see the change. It was remarkable, the changes that occurred in these young people. So yes, it exposed me for the first time to minorities. I was raised among Mexican-Americans, but in my career I had no close colleagues or associates that were minorities. We got thrust into the middle of it. We were 80 percent minority in the Job Corps center. So yes, I think it was a great benefit. Chief Cliff was right: It benefited the Forest Service a lot, and not just production of widgets but for tuning us in to society and how important it was.

DUNSKY: Okay, I'm going to stop this and take a little break.

SMITH: Sure. Would you like a cold drink?

[End CD File 1. Begin CD File 2.]

DUNSKY: Okay, we're back.

SMITH: From Job Corps I of course went to Washington, DC, on the Job Corps division staff there, and spent about thirteen months, including a detail to Vice President Humphrey's office for the President's Council on Youth Opportunity. I was assigned St. Louis, Missouri, East St. Louis, Illinois, and Omaha, Nebraska. That was very interesting, to go out and talk to those people and try to figure out ways that the administration could better respond to the youth of

America, particularly minority youths. It was a good education for me. Those kinds of experiences tend to broaden your perspective a lot, and prepare you for being a forest supervisor or a regional forester.

And then from there I went up to Cornell University for some public administration graduate work.

DUNSKY: What was it like working with the vice president? Did you interact directly with former Senator Humphrey?

SMITH: Yes, he was vice president then, and yes, he met with us every week. He wanted a report. There were half a dozen of us that had these assigned cities, and he'd ask questions. He was a very dynamic, energetic guy. I remember riding in the elevator with him. His office there for this particular activity was in a building off of K Street. We were in the elevator, and this woman got on, and she looked at him. She says, "You're the vice president." He just put his arm on her. [Laughs.] He was a very friendly guy, just a real nice fellow.

DUNSKY: He was quite a conservationist, too. I mean, he was very interested in wilderness issues and so on. Did he talk to you about Forest Service things?

SMITH: He really didn't. His time there was focused on the youth opportunity thing. He knew where each of us worked, but he concentrated on what was going on in East St. Louis or Omaha, Nebraska.

So then up to Cornell for an academic year. That really rounded out my education pretty well.

DUNSKY: Going to Washington—was that pretty critical to your career in those days? You had to at least spend at least a little bit of time in the headquarters?

SMITH: It was thought that that would be a real advantage. People who hesitated to do that, because they were afraid they'd get stuck back there—you know, so many people didn't like it, and the ones that disliked it the most were the ones that never got out. So I decided, *I'm going to be happy with this*. And we were happy. It was a great experience to be close to the top of your leadership at the Forest Service and to experience the Washington area, so it was never a problem. We were only there thirteen months, so it was not bad.

The second time I was there was for four years, but that was a good assignment too, so I don't regret that. If you work hard, you'll be out of there. Somebody will want you, unless you get too high up.

So then we went to Fresno. I was Walt Puhn's deputy on the Sierra National Forest. He was about ready to retire, and I think it was kind of a planned thing. They didn't tell me that, but I was okay with being a deputy forest supervisor. I had not had too much experience at the forest level, so it was good.

DUNSKY: Who was the regional forester?

SMITH: The regional forester was Jack Deinema. Jack had been at the Job Corps too. All these Job Corps people were looking out for people to be committed to the Job Corps program.

So then I became the forest supervisor. [Douglas] "Doug" Leisz came in there about the time when I left. I was on the Sierra only a couple of years, and they offered me the job on the Willamette in Eugene, Oregon. And there—it's a little bit on the order of the Okanogan district ranger situation. The forest supervisor here had really kind of done about all he could. You know, the half-life of somebody in a forest like this is not too long, and he was right in that transition where the environmentalists were very upset about this forest's timber program—

DUNSKY: What year is this?

SMITH: This was 1970.

DUNSKY: So right around Earth Day.

SMITH: Yes, right. The forest supervisor here was the old school, and—I'm trying to think of his name right now. Oh, [David] "Dave" Gibney. Dave Gibney was close to retirement. In fact, he already was. He retired from here. He had just done all he could. He really, seriously felt it was wrong to not fully produce timber on this forest, and he could see that it was going gunny sack.

DUNSKY: Wasn't there a—I'm reaching into my memory—wasn't there a big wilderness issue here and then there was a group in Eugene—I can't remember the name of it, but there was an organized group, and I think [Michael] "Mike" McCloskey [head of the Sierra Club] might have been involved in that.

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: Can you tell me about that?

SMITH: Well, French Pete was the big issue. French Pete is a 17,000-acre drainage just outside the Three Sisters Wilderness, or it was outside. It was an undeveloped, unroaded area that was scheduled, right on the five-year action plans, for timber sales. It was a huge issue. The Forest Service here did not want to give that up to wilderness, and Dave Gibney was right on the firing line. The Sierra Club—Mike McCloskey was involved in that, and the local Sierra Club people, Brock Evans was another one, Doug Scott. A lot of top officials in the Wilderness Society and Sierra Club were helping with that issue.

DUNSKY: There was also, like, a name for a local group. It wasn't the Sierra Club. It was, like, a local—I think it was, like, an outdoor organization or something. I'm stretching myself here, but—

SMITH: There were several groups, all right. There was the Obsidians.

DUNSKY: Maybe that's it.

SMITH: Yes. Basically it was the Sierra Club who were the main leaders in this, but they had a lot of allies, so you probably have heard of some other folks. I always wondered why they selected me, but they probably were looking for somebody that had a lot of recreation background in the forest, and some timber too, because I'd been up here and had been involved in some social programs, both down there and in the Job Corps. So I came up here. That was a promotion for me, so that was pretty nice. This was one of the first Grade Fifteen forests. And so we came up.

DUNSKY: What do you mean by that?

SMITH: GS-15. Yes, yes, yes. Paul Stathem had got on the Shasta-Trinity [National Forest], was about the first one, I think.

Anyway, I came up, and there was a very strong, professional group of people working on this forest, and it was well financed, had a lot of people. I think we had about 1,200 people working on this forest at the high season. Seven ranger district. A really going concern. Big timber program.

Well, French Pete was still an issue. I tried to develop some communications with them, and we did. It's always easier when you come in. You have kind of a clean slate, and they were looking for somebody new, and I was willing to listen to them. So we did. We did a lot of talking, and we initiated what we called Sales and Trails Breakfasts. We had one a month. We went through our entire five-year action plan. One of the biggest issues was trails. We just kept wiping out trails with our road system, ignoring any semblance of saving them.

So we went through the whole program. I would go to these meetings with the timber staff and the recreation staff and a couple of members of the timber industry and the key people in these environmental groups, and we'd go through sale by sale on the five-year action plan, and we would modify or replace until we reached agreement. It took us about a year to get through the whole action plan, but that was a very useful thing.

The other thing I did is we started what we called the Almaden Associates. The Almaden Associates was a jug wine and Sunday afternoon at my house. [Chuckles.] We invited the environmentalists over, and we'd sip wine, eat cheese and crackers, and talk about wilderness and about French Pete.

DUNSKY: When you say the environmentalists, was it anybody that I've heard of?

SMITH: [Richard] "Dick" [Noyes?]. Oh, Holly Jones. The Doug Scotts and Mike McCloskeys. Mike wasn't living here at that time, but he joined us a time or two. It was that group of people. Many with the University of Oregon. They were professors, and they were quite active in it. [Richard] "Dick" Gayle was another one, Meridel Gayle. So those folks—we just talked it out, you know? I think they had a lot more give to them than what they had indicated to Dave Gibney, because they'd just come to loggerheads. It's kind of like the Israelis and the Lebanese. So anyway, we kind of got that off of dead center. We deferred anything in French Pete and just tried to come up with some new plans. We took Senator [Bob] Packwood and Senator [Mark O.] Hatfield up there with them, and we talked about that.

DUNSKY: What were their positions on this thing, for those who don't remember?

SMITH: They were pretty cautious on it. Basically they were sympathetic to the Forest Service. They wanted to see us work something out and still be able to cut some timber in there, but scale

it back, not to be the usual clear-cut and burn and fully roaded. We did come up with an alternative plan, but about that time, I left and went back to the chief's office.

DUNSKY: Just to close the loop on it, what did happen with the French Pete?

SMITH: It finally came into wilderness, yes. You know, I think, Steve, that sometimes we hang onto these things too long, the Forest Service. Maybe not anymore, but in my career towards the end, we lost all opportunity to have any national forest in Alaska because we would not give any. You know, the regional forester up there said he didn't want wilderness up there, and that just about sealed it off, and the Park Service and BLM retained it all. We didn't get anything.

And Mineral King. I was director of recreation and management nationally when Mineral King was a hot issue, and Doug—you know, he'd worked with the Disney Corporation, and they had a really good plan, but they wouldn't give. That resulted in Mineral King being transferred to the Park Service.

And the North Cascades, same thing. North Cascades became a national park. Eventually the people are going to prevail. Sometimes the best decision doesn't come out of that, but we could have had a decision that probably would have been as good or better and still under Forest Service jurisdiction.

I guess my point there is I think we dragged these things on too long, and the public was really out ahead of us on it, and eventually politically they're going to get us directed into a position that's more compatible with them.

DUNSKY: It seems like one of the changes, too, with these new environmental laws and so on [was] that the court system all of a sudden became a venue where a lot of this stuff was happening.

SMITH: Absolutely, and the courts for a majority of issues has been sympathetic with the public. You can argue about whether it's the letter of the law or not. There's probably enough latitude to go either way. The courts have not supported the Forest Service too well on these issues. Again, I think we've learned quite a bit. I don't detect that being such an issue right now, but when you get administrations that change radically, from [President William J. "Bill"] Clinton to [George W.] Bush, you get whiplash. [Laughs.] And the Forest Service has a tough road right now. Plus the kind of the history of almost semi-appointed chiefs instead of career chiefs. All of the big career people. But it's changed quite a bit, the chief not having the respect and trust of Congress like the earlier chiefs did. It's all part of the culture. It's not any one person's fault, but we can't prevail.

It used to be a chief could say, "I'm not going to do that." Jack Ward Thomas came closest. He was an elk biologist up at Enterprise. He became chief, which was a big surprise to him and everybody else, but when he was asked about making all the forest supervisor positions political appointees, he says, "Over my dead body." And he prevailed. But there's a whole series of little things that happened in between that just happened. So we've lost a lot of our credibility, trust and so forth.

DUNSKY: While we're back just on the Willamette for a second, talk about the reward system in terms of the ASQ [available sale quantity]. What is the ASQ and the whole idea of timber targets? When I first came into the Forest Service, that was kind of like right at the very tail end of the big timber program in the Forest Service, and I heard a lot of rumblings about ASQ and timber targets and rewards systems and so on. What did that mean in terms of your career in the Forest Service? How did that work?

SMITH: It had a major truncating effect on my career. [Laughs.] I'm not upset about it.

DUNSKY: Tell me about that.

SMITH: It'll be kind of the culmination of ASQs as far as my career personally.

DUNSKY: When you were on the Willamette—

SMITH: On the Willamette I tried very hard to make it.

DUNSKY: What's an ASQ?

SMITH: Allowable sale quantity. ASQs actually is supposedly the sustainable allowable cut.

But you get targets against that, and, while we were getting targets, we were tying up land into RARE I, RARE II [Roadless Area Review and Evaluation], and all kinds of controversies and backing out of them, so that instead of, on the Willamette, having 1.75 million acres of forest land to divide up, we kept shaving away from that, so we're still cutting the same amount for a lot less land base. It was not working well at all. In fact, when I was here, I looked at a satellite picture for the first time in the wintertime, and [chuckles] I saw those white squares all over this place, and I said, *This is not going to work*. It didn't take a rocket scientist to figure that one out. And that's when I began to really get concerned about over-cutting, because I didn't see our ability to restore these lands back into the allowable sell.

DUNSKY: What year was this?

SMITH: This was 1970 to '74, but we were still going, and we made our cut every year I was here, and it was important.

DUNSKY: Who gave you the cut? Who said, "This will be your number"? Who was that, the regional forester? Was that the chief? Was that Congress? Who gave that to you?

SMITH: It was a two-way street. We would develop what we thought at the ground level. We knew our objective was to reach our ASQ, so we tried our very best. And we'd follow up and go up to the chief and to the Congress, as part of the administration's package. They'd come back

to us with dollars and targets. And so it eventually got back to us through the chief and regional forest and the forest supervisor to a district ranger with these targets.

And there was a lot of consternation about that because on one side of our mouth we were saying, "If you can't make the cut, you can't make it. Do your best." On the other side of the mouth, you said, "You better make it." [Chuckles] You know, "We don't have much choice, so we gotta do that." So it was a driving force. Most field people recognized that we were on the margin, that we couldn't really sustain that kind of thing. The hope was always there that we'd get those lands back into the base that had been temporarily removed, pending final decision. RARE I and RARE II really emphasized that, because it became very formal. You couldn't cut timber in those places. But there were a lot of other little places, too, that became so controversial you couldn't do it.

So that continued on, and I went back to Washington in recreation, wilderness and so forth and then regional forester. Well, when I got to the region, Region Five, I think our cut was about 2 billion board feet.

DUNSKY: And that was mostly where, mostly which forests?

SMITH: It was central and northern forests, primarily the northern forests. The Shasta-Trinity, the Klamath were big; the Plumas was big; the Modoc, a little less; the Tahoe; the Sierra and the Sequoia had modest timber programs; Mendocino had a modest timber program. The Southern California forests had basically none. But we were cutting about 2 billion and selling 2 billion board feet a year. It just kept getting worse and worse. We didn't have any place to go. We got this dialogue with the chief. [Raymond] "Ray" Housley was deputy chief.

DUNSKY: Who was chief?

SMITH: It was [John] McGuire first and then Max [Peterson] and then Dale [Robertson]. They were between a rock and a hard place, too. But they always said, "If you can't make it and protect the resource, you don't have to. Raise your hand." Well, raising your hand didn't get you permission. [Laughs.] And so finally, with the forest supervisors, I said, "I'll defend you as well as I can, but don't let me down. If you can get it out, just get it out." And they did probably more than they should. And finally we got to the point—just before I left, I met with the timber industry. The California Timber Association, I think it's called; all the industry people belong to it.

DUNSKY: What year was this?

SMITH: This was 1988. And I said to them—I said, "You know, the handwriting's on the wall." We were doing our planning at that time. And I said, "Get ready for something around 1.5 billion board feet." Bill Dennison, the executive of that, said, "No, that was a shot that was heard around the world." That happened on a Thursday.

DUNSKY: And who's Bill Dennison?

SMITH: Bill Dennison was the executive officer for this timber association. I don't know who's down there now.

Anyway, the next Monday I was informed by the chief, Dale Robertson, that the secretary of agriculture was coming out to discuss this issue with the industry, and I was not invited, nor were any Forest Service people. He did come out. That was [Richard E.] Lyng.

DUNSKY: Dick Lyng?

SMITH: Dick Lyng, yes, and he met with the industry and sometime later that week, the chief called me and said, "The secretary thinks we need a change in Region Five." And I said, "Okay." He said, "We'll offer you a job in the chief's office." I says, "Let me know what it is."

He offered the associate deputy chief for National Forest System. It was a fine job. I mean, that's the same grade, and everything is the same. Lots of responsibility. But I had been back there twice, and I just said, "I really don't want to do that." I was fifty-three years old, and I had plenty of time, but I didn't have age to fully retire, so I said, "Dale, let's do this: Give me something here that will carry me over past my fifty-fourth birthday, and I think I'll just deny it."

In the meantime, he offered me some other regions, Region Two. At that time, my mother and father were alive, and neither one could go to anything that high. Denver is too high. They didn't have any other place for me to go, so I said, "I'll just take a directed reassignment, and I'll retire." I was in Senior Executive Service, so there was no appeal to that. You got to do what they tell you to do. So Dale came and visited the region, and we had a family meeting in the theater down there in downtown San Francisco, and he announced it, and [chuckles] it was really kind of interesting. People were really taken by the fact that he'd go to that extent. But, you know, he couldn't back off of that.

And so I retired at age fifty-four. I ran the recreation strategy for the chief, and that was interesting. It was fun, a fun job. And then retired in March of 1988. I would have stayed through my fifty-fifth birthday at least, but as I look back on it, I was regional forester for ten years during a period of lots of turmoil—consent decree, this and that, and all this timber stuff—so I don't have any problem with it. My agreement was with the Senior Executive Service. I knew what was going to happen.

And I don't think, under the circumstances, Dale was in any position or strength to do anything about it, and so I just took my way out, and I've never tried to badmouth the Forest Service or anybody else. It was a just a circumstance that if you're going to get into those

positions, then it's going to happen. I admire chiefs who have said, "I'm not going to do that."
That's what I tried to do, too.

DUNSKY: I've heard it said that the chief has to go to work every day prepared to be fired.

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: It has to be something that you're willing to—some hill you're willing to die on.

SMITH: Yes. You got to be willing to accept that. That's part of the cost of being in those jobs.

DUNSKY: Okay. Well, somehow we skipped all the way to the end.

SMITH: Yes, right. That was ASQ, right? [Laughs.]

DUNSKY: That does explain it well. So really you were looking at, like, a 25 percent reduction in timber harvest in that one year, just because you saw that it wasn't sustainable.

SMITH: Yes, yes. I figured that the best we could do was 1.5 billion when our plans came out, and as it turned out, that's way more than the region is cutting. I don't know what you're cutting, but it's probably 300 million or something like that. Some of the people in the industry have talked to me and said, "You know, you were right." It's again a little bit like the Mineral King thing. If we'd have backed off a little bit more, into some reasonable ground, we probably wouldn't have had a political thing that just—you know, it just eliminated the timber program in this region and Region Five. It basically is not there any more. Very minimal.

DUNSKY: Was your staff right with you on that, or did you have a division between, say, the biologist types and the timber manager types, or did you feel like your staff was pretty much all with you on that?

SMITH: I think my staff was okay with where we were. In fact, they suspected we couldn't even make that in the long run. They were pretty quiet about it. Some of my immediate staff says, "Aw, that's not right. We're gonna fight that." And I said, "No, I wouldn't fight it,

because there's nothing you can do about it." And Lyng was—he was not very happy with the region because of the consent decree. He never liked the consent decree. [Laughs.] It was too bad because it wasn't his to like or dislike. [Laughs.] But he just expected us to take care of that, get rid of it, and we couldn't get rid of that.

DUNSKY: We're going to get into that.

SMITH: We'll get into that later.

DUNSKY: Yes. So let's go back. You were director of recreation and you inherited wilderness—

SMITH: I was Director of Recreation, Wilderness, Cultural Resources and Trails to be accurate.

DUNSKY: —from the Washington office, and then I guess Max was the chief when you became regional forester? Is that right, or was McGuire still chief?

SMITH: McGuire was still chief.

DUNSKY: Okay, so this is what, seventy—

SMITH: This was '74 through '78 when I was back there.

DUNSKY: Back there. That's the McGuire [unintelligible]. But then when you become regional forester, what year was that?

SMITH: Nineteen seventy-eight.

DUNSKY: Seventy-eight. I'm trying to think. So McGuire—

SMITH: McGuire was still chief, and then Max succeeded him. I think McGuire gave me one performance rating, and then Max gave me some, and then Dale Robertson.

DUNSKY: How would you characterize McGuire's style and Max's style of leadership?

SMITH: McGuire was a very intellectual man, very quiet, very deliberate, not excitable, very well respected, was willing to put his life on the line. Max was a very energetic chief, and he

was throughout his career. He was an engineer for Region Five, too, so I knew him here when I was supervisor. He's a little bit like spit on a hot skillet. He's everywhere at once.

DUNSKY: [Chuckles.]

SMITH: He had a huge capacity. He was very effective in the programs and legislation deputy job, working with the Congress and a lot of people. But I think he was the beginning of the end in terms of our relationship with Congress and the administration. It had become so extreme that I think even McGuire and Cliff had a half-life pretty short. So they were quite different personalities, and I enjoyed working for them both because I really respected both men, and they were good friends. In fact, Max is probably a better friend. He's a little more gregarious. He was just a fun guy to work for. McGuire was very rewarding to work for. He was often called the most intellectual chief we ever had. He was miles above his deputies, in most people's view. A wonderful man.

But circumstances at the time really began to come to play on the Forest Service, and unlike BLM, who's had a political director for all these years—they know how to get around that, and they figured that out. In fact, I think BLM is doing much better today than the Forest Service. Not better people or anything like that, just they know how to manage the situation better. You know, their people are just doing great guns out there. They're doing things that used to fall to us to do, and they're getting out there in front with the river management, wetlands management, all kinds of really spectacular things. They've never been too troubled by multiple use [chuckles] and all the baggage it carries, so they can really fall into these niche things that really please people a lot. They're good in their outreach, too. They're more accessible, in my limited zone here, than the Forest Service is. So the Forest Service needs to be concerned about

rebuilding. They will. The people are wonderful. The field people—you'll see as you go out here—they're just topnotch professionals, but they're limited in what they can do.

So both Max and McGuire are very fine people.

DUNSKY: Now, from what I understand about this, your predecessor in Region Five, Doug Leisz, came within an eyelash of becoming chief. That's the story that I've heard, anyway, that it was sort of between Max and Doug, and Max got the job and, of course, Doug became the associate chief. But Doug was very highly regarded in Region Five and the agency and so on. What was that like, coming into Region Five after Doug Leisz, who was a very—

SMITH: He was a dominant figure. I understand what you're talking about with Doug. He was a different personality than me, a different style of management, but it's very effective, too. He's very decisive and very tenacious; i.e., Mineral King. He did his homework, he got it done right, and he wasn't about to back off anything.

I think the region had probably some mixed feelings about me that maybe it was more comfortable to work for Doug because you knew exactly where he was and you could predict where he would be next, and they didn't always know that about me because I didn't always know, myself, until I did a lot of collaboration both in and out of the service. I never had any trouble in Region Five, but I'm sure that some people liked me and some people didn't, but they wouldn't necessarily reveal that to me.

I got a recent communication from an ex-forest supervisor that worked for me that kind of shocked me, he was so critical of me, on a current issue. But I figure that probably grew out of some dissatisfaction while I was there, too. When you change that much, particularly the old school would have I think really liked Doug. He was a very decisive man. He knew exactly where he was going and what he was going to do. You can predict what he's going to do.

DUNSKY: How did you perceive your role coming into the region? And, of course, Region Five always has had this reputation of being one of the more, if not *the* most complex and on the leading edge of change in the Forest Service. How did that feel coming into that job at that time?

SMITH: I was very privileged and honored to be there. I didn't know where I might go. I was hoping I'd get one of those regions. Albuquerque came open. I would have gone to Albuquerque, but my father and grandfather were down there, and I'd just as soon go someplace else. Region Six, I would have gone to, or Region One. I would have gone to any region but preferred not the East, but any Western region.

So I really was delighted to go there. I felt that I had some special qualities in that I'd been the director of recreation, which was a big issue in California and one in which I think California was somewhat dragging behind in terms of fair share of budget and recognition, and all these recreation pressures. It's kind of like everything else in the Forest Service: lowest common denominator—everybody gets the same. [Laughs.] It was unfair to them. And yet I had quite a lot of timber experience in this region, so I didn't feel uncomfortable with it at all.

I probably initiated a lot of different style in terms of working with my immediate staff. We had a daily sit-down session.

DUNSKY: Was this in the Black Oak Conference Room?

SMITH: In the White Oak, I think.

DUNSKY: White Oak.

SMITH: The small one. I don't know if that's still—

DUNSKY: [cross-talk; unintelligible]. Right off the regional forester's suite, that suite there?

SMITH: I don't know if it's still there or not. You wouldn't know now.

DUNSKY: The last time I went in there, that building—you know, it's a federal building—was being used as the offices of a bakery, strangely enough.

SMITH: [Laughs.]

DUNSKY: It's a federal building, but they're leasing the space, I guess. [unintelligible]. The Black Oak and the White Oak conferences rooms are still there.

SMITH: Yes, yes. The White Oak Conference Room was just about the right size. I had the three deputies and the personnel officer and the chief of planning and my executive assistant and myself, so it would be about seven of us. It might have been one more.

DUNSKY: What time in the morning was it?

SMITH: It seems to me it was—it was first thing, like seven thirty or eight, yes.

DUNSKY: Not at six o'clock.

SMITH: No, no, no. In the morning or afternoon?

DUNSKY: [unintelligible] these six a.m. meetings.

SMITH: Oh, no.

DUNSKY: [unintelligible] meetings.

SMITH: No. I usually was at my desk at six thirty. It would be seven thirty or eight that we would meet.

DUNSKY: And where were you living? Were you commuting into San Francisco?

SMITH: Petaluma.

DUNSKY: Did you take the bus down?

SMITH: Bus, yes, yes.

DUNSKY: Across the Golden Gate Bridge?

SMITH: Yes, right. In the morning it was a straight shot, at that time of day. I'd leave about five forty-five, and I'd be sitting at my desk at six thirty. Going home at night, I'd leave between four thirty and five and get home at seven sometimes, so it was not that good going back.

DUNSKY: How did you like that downtown office in San Francisco?

SMITH: Oh, I loved it. I didn't mind that at all. In fact, I really dug in my heels about the idea of going to Sacramento or anywhere else, although Sacramento, I had to agree, was the right place to move to. You know, the governor's office and other agencies—BLM is there, and if you're going to move out of San Francisco, you might as well move to Sacramento. I probably would have really been unhappy with Mares Island. But you're there, so.

DUNSKY: Because that [unintelligible] [in the sixties] [unintelligible] moving to San Francisco.

SMITH: Yes, yes.

DUNSKY: As far as I know, for four decades we talked about leaving San Francisco.

SMITH: Yes. You know, I had a little different philosophy about what a regional office ought to do. I liked being in the Region Ten federal regional headquarters, because you had all the federal agencies there and you had several congressional offices, both senators and several representatives. We had the federal executive board there, which I thought was useful. EPA [Environmental Protection Administration], Park Service was there. I just didn't see any reason for us to move, that there were great advantages in being there. And it was also a place that—most of our clients at that level had access to us there.

DUNSKY: Plus the major environmental groups were there.

SMITH: Yes, they're all right there, just down the street. You walked to most of them. And the financial district was perfect, in that respect. And then I'd been the forest supervisor there when

[Charles A.] “Charlie” Connaughton was the regional forester, and others. That was a great thing.

DUNSKY: We’ll digress. What was the culture or the social life of the Forest Service on Sansome Street at that time? Did people get together after work? I heard some stories about Christmas parties and things like that.

SMITH: There were, yes. I don’t know that there was a regular after-work sort of thing, unless it was Friday night and maybe they’d all go down to the Hilton or Hyatt Regency and that kind of thing. There was a lot of socialization among the various regions of housing. Like, the East Bay—they did a lot of things together. Petaluma—we had, at one time, the regional forester, three deputies and a bunch of staff directors who lived in Petaluma. They all lived there, so we were together all the time, and we did a lot of socialization: Christmas parties, bicycle rides, skiing, just lots and lots of activity. I don’t think that lasted that long. I’m sure the East Bay people did a lot of things together too. You know, it’s not like being on a forest or a ranger district, by any means, but it was okay. We had several parties at our house in Petaluma for staff, all the principal staff. We’d have an incredible number of people, with forest supervisors and staff at that time.

That sort of reminds me that I felt that regional office was way too big. Of course, we reduced it to one deputy. I proposed to Max Peterson a regional office of 100 people, because we were up around 700, 750 when I got there, yes.

DUNSKY: There was, like, a shop over on Fort Mason, wasn’t there?

SMITH: There was a unit over there. There was an engineering unit over in the East Bay.

DUNSKY: Pleasant Hill?

SMITH: Pleasant Hill, yes. I guess those are the two major ones. But what my idea was is to have basically a chief's representative for each *Region*, with a small staff, because the chief's span of control would be just unreasonable, to go directly to forest supervisors, but I didn't think he needed a formalized level at the regional office. It was more a matter of forest supervisors collaborating and negotiating on budgets and targets and that kind of thing, and the regional representative of the chief there to help facilitate that.

Max was interested in that, but the Washington staff—boy, they went ballistic. [Laughs.] Because, you know, despite our line staff organization, they saw the line from engineer to engineer to engineer, or recreation, recreation; timber, timber; right on down the line. And that's not to say it's not right. I still think the regional offices are too big, and they need to alter their purpose and role in Forest Service. I think we can do better.

DUNSKY: You had a couple of real power centers there. You had the timber engineering folks, and then you had the fire people, especially in Southern California.

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: For the agency as a whole, those represented some pretty big dollars.

SMITH: Oh, absolutely, yes. Fire was a driving force for years in California, and then timber and engineering got big. I expect fire still is pretty big. One of the things I've noticed, maybe not so evident there, but these organizations drifted back to sort of self-contained. Law enforcement [and] fire are specific examples. We had our trouble with law enforcement in having a few forest supervisors being unruly or exhibiting bad behavior or whatever. Instead of taking care of those issues, we just pulled law enforcement out. To me, that's a big mistake because every ranger and every forest supervisor needs to have on his team law enforcement. It's good to have them on the team instead of sort of a subcontractor.

DUNSKY: Could you clarify that for me? You said something about the supervisors were not behaving well? What was the story?

SMITH: There were a couple of instances where apparently supervisors intervened with law enforcement officers and told them—

DUNSKY: Directed them not to do something.

SMITH: Not to do something, yes. There was a timber scaling discrepancy somehow, and I think something else, and the supervisors just said, “You’re not going to do that.” Well, if that was wrong, we should have taken care of that forest supervisor and take *him* to task; don’t just move the law enforcement officer out from under him. I always felt law enforcement officers were part of our major team, particularly in California, where so much depended on them, and they could go off on various tangents that you may or may not appreciate. If they were on the team, then the team would make sure we all were moving “West” together instead of opposite directions.

So anyway, that idea died, but I still think it’s worth considering. The regions were located and organized around a completely different time, and now I don’t think we need that. It’s probably changed even since I was there. Maybe there’s a whole totally different way of organizing.

What I don’t like is seeing ranger districts consolidated to the extent they are, and forests diminished in staffing. I think that’s the wrong direction. This forest is a good example. We got ranger districts that are bigger than a lot of national forests.

DUNSKY: This forest being the Willamette.

SMITH: Willamette, yes, yes.

DUNSKY: Let's take you back to the kinds of challenges you were facing as you come into this job. This is probably one of the real tumultuous periods in the history of—well, there's been a lot of them, but this period that you were there, and especially in California, was a period of real change and real turmoil, to some extent. Let's talk a little bit about the changing workforce. What was it like when you got to California? Let's talk a little bit about how we got into the consent decree and what was driving these controversies around, I'd say, women in the Forest Service.

SMITH: Right, right. Well, this was all staged before I got there, of course, but apparently the Pacific Southwest [Research] Station had the grievance, and the settlement ended up wrapping its arms around the region as well. I don't think the region was ever really accused of anything that was wrong except that we were not balanced in terms of workforce. We didn't have any grievances that were triggering this, but the region then became the primary affected unit.

DUNSKY: Why was that? Why did the region get hooked into something that was basically a station issue, just because we're all Forest Service and we're all in California?

SMITH: That's part of it, but I think the options that were beginning to emerge out of the courts and so forth was worse, and, in fact, this was going to be applied to the entire Forest Service.

Doug and his negotiating powers—Doug Leisz was pretty much responsible for probably minimizing that effect, and the region got embraced in it. It really impacted Region Five.

DUNSKY: What was it? What was the agreement? What did we agree to do? This was a court settlement, right? In the case of Bernardi, right?

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: Bernardi v. the Secretary of Agriculture [sic; *Bernardi v. Yeutter*, 945 F.2d 408 (9th Cir. 1991)] or something?

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: And then what did we agree to do? I guess it was our attorneys in conjunction with the regional forester? Who were the parties that agreed to this agreement?

SMITH: Again, this was before my time there, but as I understand it, the Department of Justice was involved, and our OGC, Office of General Counsel, was involved, and the line officers of the Forest Service—Doug Leisz as regional forester and the station director and the chief—

DUNSKY: Was that Callahan at the time?

SMITH: Yes, it must have been Callahan at the time. Just exactly how all that happened, I don't know. I just kind of accepted it as a given. "Quack, quack, don't look back. We gotta deal with it now." Probably the most difficult entity for me to manage was the Department of Justice because they took the hard line. They took the line that we shouldn't be in this; we gave the ranch away, and they wouldn't let us really collaborate with the consent decree monitor or the class. It all had to be formalized into the legal stuff. I expect DOJ is used to that in working with various agencies, but the Forest Service didn't operate that way. We have a lot of delegations and a lot of autonomy, a lot of competence at the lower levels. I think they just wanted to fight this thing every inch of the way.

DUNSKY: When you say "they"?

SMITH: The Department of Justice. Their attorneys intervened a lot.

DUNSKY: Was the attorney general directly involved in this at all? Was it [Edwin] "Ed" Meese III at the time, or did Meese come in later?

SMITH: I don't ever recall the attorney himself or herself being involved, but obviously some of the other lead attorneys were.

DUNSKY: Where was this coming from? Was this just the attitude of the administration at the time that this was, quote unquote, “targets”—I mean, this was quotas. What was it, a it a policy sort of view?

SMITH: Yes, I think the principle targets really turned them off. They never got into it deep enough to know what we were trying to do, trying to avoid setting targets that were arbitrary but trying our best to build a pipeline of qualified minorities and women, and we sort of wrapped the minorities into it as we went and having them come out the other end legitimately. The consent decree monitor got into a lot of confrontations with Justice, which didn’t help us a bit.

DUNSKY: Who was the monitor?

SMITH: I can’t remember her name now. There’s a couple of them that I dealt with. They were decent people, but they were trying to back off and look at it and hold the Forest Service’s feet to the fire, and probably a little more responsive to the class because, after all, by having a consent decree, we sort of indicated that we need to do something. But Justice turned out to be the problem, in my view, and every time we’d get going on something, well, they would push us back a bit. And that’s what got Lyng mad, too. He says, “Why can’t you take care of this?” He’d sit there at his desk and he told me, “Why can’t you take care of this? You’re the regional forester.”

DUNSKY: This is in Washington?

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: So you were called back there to explain why we’re not making progress?

SMITH: Yes, “Why’s all this difficulty?” He says, “You’re the regional forester. You do it!”

[Chuckles.] And there’s nothing you can say to a man like that if it’s not possible. He just got

involved when things began to pinch him a little bit. He just didn't understand the situation, or was unwilling to understand it.

So consent decree turned out to be, I think, a very divisive thing, but despite that, you know, we made progress. We got a lot of women going, and we started filling the pipeline. It seems to me, as I recall, there was a kind of a guiding group of women that were dealing with it at our level. I met with them constantly.

DUNSKY: Do you remember who some of those players were?

SMITH: Oh, yes, I probably could look back somehow and figure it out. One of them was kind of leader, ended up with BLM up here in Eugene. Nice lady, yes. And when I left, they gave me a nice leather workout bag. We had a pretty good relationship, but it was difficult. As a result of that, there was a lot of men in the region who felt that they were being discriminated against. I don't think they fully appreciated the lengths that we went to try to avoid that, because we didn't want to end up in that place, nor did most of the women. They wanted to be able to demonstrate that they had the credentials and qualifications and they earned it rightfully so, but I know it must have given the appearance that we were favoring women. Of course, that's what the consent decree people wanted. The courts tended to look at it that way as well. Justice was completely the opposite.

DUNSKY: What were some of the things that the region was trying to do to either recruit or retain or train women to fill this pipeline you talk about?

SMITH: We did a lot of recruiting from the universities and the private sector, other agencies, a lot of interviews, that sort of thing. I don't know how effective that was. On the other hand, working with forest supervisors and then with their rangers, we tried to identify women in the workforce that we could accelerate. I think we put quite a few resources, investments in time

and money, into those folks and got them in a position where they could, on paper, compete favorably with the men. That was kind of the general arena of activity. As it turned out, we made quite a bit of progress on it. We ended up with some forest supervisors, in the short time I was there and left, and people that moved up the line on the staff. We had a couple of staff directors in the regional office, at least two, maybe more—I don't know—several rangers.

DUNSKY: Did you feel in any way that—again, it gets back to everybody was on the same page with this. I mean, were there people that were actively working to undermine the progress that you were trying to make with the consent decree?

SMITH: Oh, I think there were, from the secretary on down. I think there was a lack of appreciation in the rest of the Forest Service about what we were going through, and there sort of wasn't a whole lot of sympathy. That was another thing. As we were tending to try to find people in other regions, we could get in there, to meet our expectations. I think as time went by, they could appreciate that, boy, we were under a lot of stress and pressure there. But at first there was not a whole lot of sympathy for it. "That's your problem" kind of thing. And there were people in the region that were resentful of it. There were quite a few men, I'm sure, who were really pretty ticked off because they figured their career was being affected. But the women had already been affected. I don't know how much real discrimination was ever going on. I think there was probably—you know, the Forest Service had always been a man's organization, and there's probably some lingering on, thinking that, "women can't really do that." But most of the women we put in those jobs did well. It turned out they were pretty darned effective, and they worked hard at it, too.

DUNSKY: It seems like—I mean, we've got two settlement agreements that we're still working on, a women's settlement agreement and an Hispanic settlement agreement. It seems like this has been going on for a quarter of a century now.

SMITH: Yes, yes.

DUNSKY: And we still haven't gotten out of court, if you will. Why do you think that is?

SMITH: That's a pretty tough question. There's that inertia to overcome, and then the courts are involved. They tend to push a little hard sometimes in an imbalanced way, it seems to us. I really don't know the answer to that, but it's discouraging that we're still under that. I'm sure Region Five is ahead of anybody else on this thing, although the chief has been making a lot of key appointments with women, and I think, as far as I know, they're doing fine. I don't know how that affects other people that were competing for those jobs.

DUNSKY: My sense is that there are whole regions now where the regional forester and both her deputies are women. We've got a pretty good balance at the upper level of management now, in terms of at least the gender equality.

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: I wouldn't say it's 50-50, but it's darn close, and I think our forest supervisors in the region are pretty close to 50-50.

SMITH: Are they?

DUNSKY: Nine out of ten people on the management team on the Angeles are women.

SMITH: So you question why are we still in these consent decrees? Why can't we say victory and go celebrate? I don't know. It must be more than Forest Service performance that's driving that. It must be some anxiety or dissatisfaction with the whole system of government

employment, and “as long as we’ve got you on the hook, we’re just going to keep you there.” I really can’t explain it.

DUNSKY: Let’s talk about another aspect of the changing workforce, which I think was a big part of that period when you were regional forester, which is the whole idea of organizational development and some of the things that were going on there in terms of—we talked about futuring. What was your philosophy or your idea about that and about organizational development and where you wanted to take the Forest Service?

SMITH: My thoughts initiated with the Managerial Grid in Job Corps. I saw such great return from that, getting people to work together. The other thing that happened is when we moved from basically all foresters to engineers, landscape architects and cultural anthropologists—you know, the whole thing. We had a great need for interdisciplinary planning and decision making, and schools don’t teach that, and you don’t get a whole lot of experience in it, and so that drove us as much as anything in Region Five when I was there, at least from my perspective, as to improve our ability to plan and decide in an interdisciplinary way. Otherwise you get biologists who are trying to sub-optimize biology, and they will continue to argue that point despite being in an interdisciplinary team and having maybe the regional forester or the forest supervisor set a vision or an objective. They still want to sub-optimize.

DUNSKY: When you say “sub-optimize,” you mean that they have their own agenda.

SMITH: Yes, yes.

DUNSKY: And their own objectives.

SMITH: Maximize wildlife biology or maximize landscape architecture or whatever it might be. I think that really hampered our ability to come up with the best decisions. None of us had all that much skill in it. So that’s what provided me the incentive to engage in these programs. I

finally decided, with Lou Romero, that it didn't have to be the best in the world, as long as everybody did it. It could be sort of just an average system and process, but if everybody did it, it probably would make a huge, leaping jump towards success. We tried to select the best stuff, but I don't think we always did. This vision thing was kind of useful. It allowed us to sort of get our sights recalibrated when we were getting reduced in budget and staffing. You know, "What's important here? What's not so important?"

I'm talking right now to the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission during budget cuts, drawing back on our visioning in Region Five, and saying, "You got to get everybody working on this. You can't just start cutting positions or eliminating projects. You got to get the people, everybody doing their fair share and coming up with their ideas. I told them: Down in Region Five we had a big old button that said "BAU" with a round circle around it and a slash through it: No more business as usual. Everything we do—and that means the district clerk to the firefighter to regional forester—make sure you—no more business as usual. Look at everything you do and how can you cut back. No more, no less. Max Peterson coined that term during this period. Just "no more, no less." Don't do 125 percent, because if you do that, you're going to drop out something that's really important. Don't do any percent either; just do what is necessary to do an adequate job. And that way you can make your dollars and your resources go further.

Some of these exercises allowed us to accomplish that. I started way back when I was a forest supervisor in Fresno and then up here. We took I think it was 1,100 people through a program up here with a man named Sterling Ellsworth. He was a clinical psychologist who had developed these organizational development programs. Took everybody through it, including families. When we got through with that, everybody was going the same direction. They were

just really enthused about it. I don't know if it was the best program in the world, but by having everybody going through it, it worked, whereas in the early days, with Managerial Grid, we had certain key people from the forest that would take Managerial Grid, come home and—you know, everybody else said, "You're crazy. What are you talkin' about?" You had to get everybody in the same frame of mind, in the same skill level. So that's kind of the way we approached it there.

DUNSKY: Can you give me some other examples of specific types of programs that you did, specific exercises or training sessions or things that Lou might have introduced, or some of those other folks that were there?

SMITH: He would remember all of these, I'm sure. He got us involved in several things. Some of them were longer term. What were the two guys who wrote this book? I want to say Woodward and something. It was a textbook on how to develop your organization. They had a structured program, and we went through the whole thing.

DUNSKY: It's not *In Search of Excellence*.

SMITH: *In Search of Excellence*, yes.

DUNSKY: Tom Peters. [Transcriber's note: Tom Peters wrote *In Search of Excellence*, on which the process "Towards Excellence" was based.]

SMITH: Yes, Tom Peters, yes. We went through that whole business with the staff and forest supervisors, and then they brought it down to the forest level. I can't really measure too much on that because it was not too long before I left, but that's the kind of thing we were using.

And then we'd engage people at every forest supervisors and staff directors meeting. We'd engage somebody for a little tune-up of some sort, a shared experience that would tend to build a team. One time we went up north of San Francisco, and we met in a wine barrel

[chuckles], if you can imagine! A huge thing. It was about four times the size of this room, a redwood wine barrel that was about a story and a half high. Had carpet on the floor. [Laughs.] It was kind of humorous, but we all went through some interesting things, besides having our regular kind of decision-making sessions.

DUNSKY: I can almost hear some of these engineers and [Mr. Smith laughs; [unintelligible] people going, “This is touchy-feely,” that “this is not something that we are comfortable with.” Did you get some of that as well?

SMITH: Early on we did, but we were pretty careful. Lou Romero was pretty sensitive to that, and we didn’t have what I’d say real touchy-feely stuff. We honored privacy. We didn’t want everybody to spill their life out in front of them. And there was some of that early in Region Five that was not good at all.

DUNSKY: There was that thing called the Pajaro Dunes, I recall.

SMITH: I don’t remember that, but I remember when I was in Fresno, one or two people came back with stories that really were offensive. That was too bad. But I think we outgrew that pretty fast. It got more directed. You just didn’t have to cut people right down to their souls and then try to build them back up; you could do that without getting into their personal stuff.

DUNSKY: What about the other side, the communications with the public? Can you take us through—this is the whole RARE period, the RARE process?

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: Scoping and [unintelligible] making the public a partner and so on?

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: Was our relationship with the public changing at that time, and how was it changing, and how were you trying to address that issue?

SMITH: I think it was. Land-use planning got us into that. That occurred at every level, practically: rangers and forest supervisors and the regional office staff and so forth. We had a pretty elaborate system of analysis. We sent it off to wherever it was, Salt Lake City or something, to develop all these data. It was useful. And RARE II had a big public involvement program.

DUNSKY: Was that Fort Collins [unintelligible]?

SMITH: It might have been Fort Collins.

DUNSKY: [unintelligible]?

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: They had a big computer there.

SMITH: I think maybe RARE II did go to Fort Collins. RARE I, not quite as much, I think. But land-use planning really brought us into that world. I don't know, we learned a lot, I guess. We weren't too skilled. We triggered a lot of canned responses. You get these campaigns that are anti-this or for that, and you get a lot of postcards that are all saying the same thing. We tried to point out that that's not as useful as giving us some reasons, but you're going to have to put up with that, I think. Volume does affect people politically. [Laughs.]

So I don't know. I'm a big believer in it. When I was regional forester, I used to go out and meet with local people with the forest supervisor. I remember going up and meeting with forest supervisor [Joseph] "Joe" Harn on the Six Rivers [National Forest]. We had a little timber sale that involved some old-growth redwood up there, and a lot of the public were really opposed to that. We took them out on the ground, and we talked about it, and as a result, I pulled the sale. I don't think that was very popular with the forest, but I think it was the right thing to do.

DUNSKY: Did Joe Harn support that decision?

SMITH: Well, you know, Joe is a good soldier. He supported it, but I think his people had trouble with it. They invested a lot of time in it. They thought they were doing the right thing, and to have the regional forester come up and meet with the public and them. You got to be sympathetic with that, because they thought they were doing the right thing.

DUNSKY: I want to take another quick break here. We're over an hour again here. Tell me a little bit about some people that I'm familiar with, the folks on the Public Affairs staff, and how did you use Public Affairs? How did they work with you? Specifically Jane Westenberger was there, I think, at that time.

SMITH: She was, right.

DUNSKY: A pretty big staff, a pretty active staff. And the guy that brought me into the Forest Service, [Robert] "Bob" Tribble, who you mentioned earlier, was a very active component of that staff, so tell me a little bit about Public Affairs in that era.

SMITH: Yes. Jane Westenberger was another one that met with us early in the morning, because Public Affairs—we need to make sure they know what's going on and the context of some of the things that we're talking about, so when regional forester, deputies and staff agree on kind of a direction, she would know, so she could understand and explain it, and warn us. [Chuckles.] And she's good at that. She was a remarkable lady, much older than what her performance would indicate, so I really appreciated her. She was a good counselor for me. I talked to her regularly. Her office was right down the hall, just a few doors away.

She had a little problem working with her own staff, Bob Tribble, for one. Now, Bob—you see, I really appreciate people like Bob Tribble. There were two or three of these kind of people in the region. One was Williams, the land staff. I can't remember his first name now. But he was the kind of guy—you just want to have an early-morning meeting with him about

seven thirty and say, “You know, So-and-so, I’d really like to see us do this.” Or he’d come in and say, “This is what we can do in lands. And lands is really tricky business. We’d agree on where we wanted to go. I would say, “Now, don’t get me in jail.” And I’d let him alone, because he was a freewheeling, open-field runner. And he’d get there. And he would keep you out of jail. But you didn’t want to follow him too closely, because it would be scary.

“Rocky” Solas. I don’t know if you ever heard of Rocky. Rocky was a guy in the manpower program somehow. He would come in and talk to me almost every day. He’d get there about quarter till seven or something, and we’d talk. And he was an open-field runner. Bob Tribble was an open-field runner. And all of those guys—their staff directors did not appreciate them because they appeared to be undermining them, because they’d come in and talk to the regional forester. They’d make a decision and go on. I would try to keep Jane and others informed, but it’s hard. I think she had a little trouble with that.

But as far as I’m concerned, she was a good staff director for me. She had a good staff, and she had some good people in there. Some of those young women were outstanding people: publications and ideas on how to present things to the public, getting people, staff and myself, involved with the university in Berkeley or a radio station or a TV station or wherever it was, and she’d work with the public affairs officers on the forest and get things all lined up. And she was effective, herself.

So I always felt I was pretty privileged to have those folks. It’s a difficult job, and it’s one that they got to be careful with the personality of the regional forester. There’s egos that get in the way, and there’s biases that get in the way. It’s not an easy job.

DUNSKY: Did you feel like at that time the Forest Service over all was a little gun shy about being too far out in the public? You were taking some artillery. Did you feel that way from where you were sitting, or did you feel pretty comfortable?

SMITH: I felt pretty comfortable with it. I never really worried too much about it. We never reacted immediately to a bad press. You know, "That'll be history tomorrow. Just don't worry about it. We can aggravate that, and it'll go on forever." I think some people had trouble with that. They said, "We ought to set the record straight here. We can't let that out there." But most people read the headlines and go on; they don't pay that much attention to it, anyway. It bothers us more than anybody else. So there's that tendency, and I think maybe some of the staff and employees wished we'd have been a little more defensive on things, but, I don't know, Jane was pretty much in the same camp as I was on that. "Don't worry about it. Get over it." [Laughs.] And usually it worked out pretty well.

DUNSKY: That was also the era, I know—this will be the last thing, and then we'll take a little break here, but that was also the era, it seems to me, of a lot of these large however you call them, campaigns or initiatives or whatever taking wing: Rise to the Future and America's Great Outdoors. The Forest Service was, in a way, packaging its message in certain ways. I don't know if you got involved in that process.

SMITH: We did. I think Lou Romero had some influence on me there. He said, "It's okay to have a motto or a slogan," and we used it quite a bit. Max Peterson used it quite a bit, too. In any of these particular nationwide programs, I don't know that we got overwhelmed by that, but we did kind of try to pull together the entire workforce with a slogan or two. Every time I'd go out or the deputies would go out, we'd talk to them about it, say, "What are you doing on so-and-

so? How ‘about this ‘No more, no less’”? I had a great discussion with Trini Juarez one time—you know Trini?

DUNSKY: Oh, yes, sure.

SMITH: He was a ranger on the Los Padres. Where was that? Something—Lake Frasier?

DUNSKY: I know what you’re talking about.

SMITH: Had kind of desert unit down there. Well, anyway, he was very proud of a wilderness sign that he had built. It was all routed and very rusty. He said the sign—it was only about that big [demonstrates]—it cost three hundred dollars. And I challenged him on it. I said, “No more, no less.” [Laughs.] He still kids me about that. He says, “Boy, you really hit us hard on that one. We were so proud of that.” [Laughs.] But that’s what gets people involved, if you can find an example and say, “You know, it’s wonderful what you’ve done here, but not at this time. You can’t do it. You’re wasting resources.”

So I liked those kind of visions and that sort of thing that you can tie people to, allowing them to implement it themselves, ask them, “How are *you* implementing this? Because you’re important.” And, “How are the people that report to you implementing it? They’re important, too.” You add them all up, if they’re all going the same direction, then you got something significant; otherwise, it’s so fragmented that people tend to just go back and do what they were always doing.

DUNSKY: Let’s take another little quick break here.

[End CD File 2. Begin CD File 3.]

DUNSKY: Okay, and we are back in action. Do you want to talk about Snowbird or do you want to talk about—

SMITH: Snowbird was the first national meeting of forest supervisors. Of course, all the regional foresters attended, and chief and staff.

DUNSKY: What year was that?

SMITH: That would have been about 1988 or so. I'm not sure of that date. Max Peterson was the chief, so it was before that, maybe 1985, '86, along in there.

DUNSKY: Why was it called Snowbird?

SMITH: Snowbird is the name of the ski area that it's at, and it's in Little Cottonwood Canyon, outside of Salt Lake City. This, of course, was in the summertime, but it's a beautiful spot.

From Region Five, we went in there, and we had a lot of spirit. Lou Romero got us all ginned up, and we had T-shirts that said, "Pacific Southwest Region," green T-shirts. We sort of were harassed a little bit by the other regions—you know, "All these rich people from California and Oregon and Washington," taking all the budget. Anyway, it was a good meeting.

DUNSKY: Did all the forest supervisors come?

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: From Region Five.

SMITH: Yes. As far as I know, either they came or their acting came. Supposedly every one of them was there. It was maybe an early winter because I do recall that there was some snow on the ground, I think. The chief had a little remark about these forest supervisors coming up there, and they weren't used to front-wheel-drive vehicles, so when they got into the snow, they put the chains on and turned around and backed up. [Laughs.] The driver's on the back. [Laughs.] He was always coming up with some very interesting things.

Anyway, it was a good meeting. It built a lot of esprit de corps among forest supervisors. He managed to recognize them as a critical part of the Forest Service, and eliminate some of the top-down anxiety some of them had. It was interesting:

When we took our picture, we had a professional photographer, and we all stood on the steps of the large Snowbird resort there, the rock steps. He says, "Get a little closer. Get a little closer." You back up, and he says, "You got to get a little closer." He finally says, "Stand sideways." He looked through his camera lens, and he said, "Now, that's the first time that's ever happened. You got wider." [Laughter.] So the chief had a remark about that, too, about getting rid of those pot bellies. [Laughter.]

DUNSKY: What was the point of bringing those supervisors together?

SMITH: I think it was just team building and the chief's way of getting everybody together and say [sic; saying], "We're all part of a big team." They had issues and talk [sic; talked] and so forth, but I think basically it was just to pull everybody together.

DUNSKY: Tell me about your involvement with FIREScope [**F**irefighting **R**ESources of California **O**rganized for **P**otential **E**mergencies] and the things that it evolved into.

SMITH: Okay. When I arrived in the region, FIREScope was already well under way. Doug Leisz and [Robert L.] "Bob" Irwin and a few other people really got that things started. It was an RD&A [research development and application project specifically to improve fire management in the Southern California area, but it didn't take long to realize that this was a good way to organize and develop a command system that was applicable everywhere in fire, particularly when you had more than one agency involved, and we certainly did in fire. But as we all know now, it's been adopted world wide.

I can't take any credit for it except to be a real supporter of it. The incident command system and the MACS—I forget what that stands for, Management of Fire [Multi-Agency Coordination System]. Anyway, it turned out it was really a good program, and we had some terrific sales persons for it: Bob Irwin, for example. He really was marketing that to me every time he had a chance. I agreed with him that it had a lot of potential.

Subsequent to that, following that, it's had application in a number of instances, in disasters and crises. I think it was used the time the airliner crashed into the Washington 14th Street Bridge. It shows up every time that we get involved in something, like picking up the pieces after the astronauts' space ship went to pieces. [Transcriber's note: He refers to the disintegration during re-entry of the space shuttle Columbia on February 1, 2003.]

Katrina, the hurricane [August 2005]. We needed it down there desperately. That's one reason the Forest Service and the Coast Guard did so well. Although the Coast Guard probably doesn't have a complete application of that, they're organized much that way. We saw on television them interviewing people about the Forest Service down there, and this one individual said, "If you want to get something done, go ask the green pants. They get it done." And it's because of the incident command system.

It's worked at all kinds of things. When California had the big poultry issue and had to slaughter a lot of poultry, they called on retired Forest Service people who were familiar the incident command system to come down with APHIS [Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service] and help them. It really worked. So it's a great program, and we need to get it installed in, I think you mentioned earlier, Homeland Security and other places.

DUNSKY: Was there resistance to it in the old fire boss model? Were there people that said, "Nah, I don't want to deal with this"?

SMITH: I didn't detect that, although my enthusiasm might have depressed people talking around me because I really was supportive of it. I think probably more than anything, people were leery that it wouldn't work and that we were investing a lot of resources into it that might not pay off. But I don't think you can talk to fire people anymore that wouldn't agree that it has really helped us.

DUNSKY: Was there anything else in the fire area that came up on your watch? I think the '87 fires were really significant. That was a really significant fire season.

SMITH: They were. You know, I've always admired the Region Five fire services and their partners, the CDF [California Division of Forestry] and so forth. Been kind of awed by them in many respects. I never tried to intervene too much except to keep them on the team.

One thing that's bothered me is that Forest Service people—their first job is not is no longer fire when it occurs, and I think that's too bad because now we're so specialized that the landscape architect, when a big fire bust hits and he's going to Disneyland, he still goes, instead of their getting involved in the fire. I wish there were some way that we could incorporate every employee into the fire situation, even if it's backup at home on something else. I don't see that happening. I see us drifting away from that.

Fire wise, in California there was some concern about the fire being a separate and even unequal (better) organization than the rest of the Forest Service, but we had fire staff people in the regional office that really dealt with that, and I didn't feel that that was a problem. They were on the team, and I still think they are. Their resources are limited because of the lack of skilled people that they can pick up outside the fire organization.

DUNSKY: We started out talking about the end of your Forest Service career. We started talking about it around the timber program and ASQ and everything. Maybe we could just get

back to that for a second and talk a little about the role of the under secretary's office, John Crowl; Douglas McCleery a particularly active role in setting timber harvest levels, or what was the role of the under secretary at that particular time, or assistant secretary?

SMITH: Right, right. The under secretary, or before that, the assistant secretaries—they always had a fairly positive—well, significant influence on what we did, the priorities. It depended on the administration. [Dr. M.] Rupert Cutler was—you know, he's very interested in wilderness, and he was sensitive to improper timber harvest. I think he had a good relationship with the chief. The chief, McGuire, knew where they were coming from. The Forest Service always tried to respond within the framework of sustainability. John Crowl kind an opposite, really interested in maximizing production off the national forest. Again, I think the chief was able to moderate that to get back into line, pretty well.

But it was not only the under secretary but the administration, itself, and the Congress that established some of these things, sometimes inconsistently. The Congress might be passing very strong environmental legislation at the same time insisting that the Forest Service proceed with higher than achievable timber targets. But the assistant secretaries and actually the secretaries of agriculture have always been pretty supportive of the Forest Service. We've enjoyed an autonomy that other agriculture agencies don't have. And that's been up until very recently, when the administration, itself, has taken a greater interest in the environmental aspects of it, or production aspects of it. Part of that goes with just having been bouncing back and forth from one extreme to the other, feeling that they must intervene with the Forest Service lest they forget who they're working for.

DUNSKY: Another slightly different subject: What was the role of technology in this whole thing? In other words, this was the beginning of what we call the DG or the Data General system, also known as the FLIP, the Forest Level Information Processing System.

SMITH: Could be.

DUNSKY: How did that impact the Forest Service and other sorts of computer models like Foreplan and things like that? What was happening with technology at the time that you were there?

SMITH: You're very right. The age of computers came along in I guess mostly eighties. The land-use planning triggered a lot of reliance on computers, and it helped us a lot, except that it tended to obscure some of the judgmental decision making. I think forest supervisors in particular were concerned about what Foreplan, being unable to argue effectively against various levels. I suppose we're still learning how to deal with that. It's a wonderful tool, but it also accumulates massive amounts of data, which sometimes leads us down the wrong road. You have to be careful with it. You still have to use your judgment and humanized decision making. Getting that done sometimes is difficult because of just the massive aspect of the work.

The DG came in. That was quite a revolution. Here, you had the ability to talk to everybody. The chain of command began to break down, and it took an inordinate amount of time to deal with all this. Some folks could spend the entire day on the DG, just communicating back and forth, and others refused to get involved with it. Max Paterson said, "You know, you ought to really learn how to type. It's not very inspiring to see somebody using two fingers on the DG." Others spent way too much time on it.

I had a practice: I never allowed myself to get beyond what was it? Nine lines? In a message. And you didn't have to do quite so much that way, either. [Chuckles.] Sometimes I

had to send two messages because I couldn't quite finish it, but I never learned how to use the full message system. But it did give me an appreciation for a lot more on-the-ground sentiment and feeling. I tried to read all of my DG messages. People were willing to provide some feedback on those. It caused all of us to get into the computer age and the e-mail age, which is good, but it had to be managed.

DUNSKY: I may have a story around that. I think Max told me that he actually had the first DG terminals put on his regional foresters' desks and that he would send messages to you. Is that true? To see if you were actually using it? Is that a true story?

SMITH: It might be. I hadn't heard that, but I wouldn't put it past Max, because he seemed to know what was going on. [Laughs.]

DUNSKY: He wanted to make sure that you adopted it because then he knew that if you adopted it, all the other people would?

SMITH: Yes, yes. But I think that was probably a good move on his part, good strategy. We adopted it in Region Five pretty fast. We had some excellent computer people. The staff director for that unit was good.

DUNSKY: Okay. Now, let's see. I'm kind of running out of topics here. I think I asked you this when I saw you at the reunion, but you became involved with the AFSEEE group? Is that true, after you retired? Tell me about AFSEEE and what your role or relationship with them is.

SMITH: I never was a member of AFSEEE.

DUNSKY: Which is, for the record, that's the Association of Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics.

SMITH: That's right.

DUNSKY: Started by Jeff DeBonis.

SMITH: Yes.

DUNSKY: Still exists. I think it's based in Eugene, isn't it?

SMITH: It still exists, still in Eugene. Jeff DeBonis has gone to a kind of government-wide kind organization similar to that, and [Andrew] "Andy" Stahl is the executive director of AFSEEE now. AFSEEE was a kind of irritant to the Willamette Forest when it started, because Jeff DeBonis was on the Blue River District, I believe, and he was a little bit of a problem, but [Michael] "Mike" Kerrick was the forest supervisor here, and he tried his very best to see the positive side of that and work with him. And he had good communications with him.

I didn't get involved or really know about them until I retired and moved up here, and Andy Stahl contacted me and asked for advice on some things. I said, "Sure, I'll give you some advice." In fact, at one point we traveled to Washington together and met with the chief and at that time a fellow named Woods—

DUNSKY: That would have been [Michael P.] "Mike" Dombeck and Chris Woods?

SMITH: Yes, met with Woods. Talked about—it seems to me it was more about the K-V, the Knudsen-Vandenberg [Act, of June 30, 1930] funds and the funds for brush disposal, and how that was working. I never belonged to that group, nor did I try to support them in any way other than just advice and some guidance in getting at the issues. So I think several retirees, maybe some of the Forest Service people thought I was getting in with them and was going to be a problem, but I don't think that ever came about.

DUNSKY: Tell me, since you've retired, what things have piqued your interest and what have you been working on? It sounds like you're involved in a lot of different things. Maybe you can just give me a brief summary of some of those activities.

SMITH: Right. The primary activity—two. I've been volunteering for American Forests as their Pacific field representative ever since I retired.

DUNSKY: What is American Forests?

SMITH: American Forests is the old American Forestry Association. It's the organization that Rex Resler, a former associate chief, headed up for a while. Deborah Gangloff now is the executive director, and it's the oldest citizens' conservation group in America. I'm going to give you an American Forests magazine.

DUNSKY: [unintelligible].

SMITH: It's a moderate conservation group founded in 1875. It takes credit for helping create the Forest Service and the Park Service. They're not an extremist group at all, just simply advocates for forests and forest trees. So that takes a little bit of time. And Trees for Tigers project in Russia is something I created with them and it's overseeing that and some other—

DUNSKY: What does that do?

SMITH: It plants trees for tiger habitat.

DUNSKY: Siberian tiger?

SMITH: The Siberian tigers, yes. One of their programs is called Global ReLeaf, R-e-capital L-e-a-f. I do quite a bit of work internationally for them. We've had projects in the Russian Far East, Southeast Asia and so forth.

But the biggest job I had was ten years as, first, director of policy, then vice president for programs for a nonprofit group called Ecologically Sustainable Development. That was created by a former Forest Service employee, who received one of these MacArthur Foundation grants, several hundred thousand dollars, and was able to do something he'd always wanted to accomplish, and that was do land-use planning in an emerging country.

DUNSKY: Who was this?

SMITH: George Davis. He started with the Forest Service and went to the Adirondack group in New York, and then he came back to the Forest Service. He helped us with RARE II and then went to the Panhandle National Forest in Idaho as deputy forest supervisor, and then he left and went back to the Adirondacks. So he created this nonprofit specifically to do land-use planning. Our first project was in Russia, for the Lake Baikal Basin, 30 million hectares within the watershed within Russia. We worked with the Russian Academy of Sciences and the three regional governments there, with the blessing of the central government, when [Boris] Yelstin was there.

And we produced a land management plan which included a book of standards and guidelines, and a zoning map. And then we extended that to Mongolia, the other half of that watershed, another 30 million hectares, so in those two projects we covered an area the size of California and Oregon combined. Basically gave the Russians and Mongolians the process by which we can land use plan: interdisciplinary planning and just the approach of zoning and that sort of thing. Then we moved to the Ussuri drainage in northeast China and southeast Russia, another 30 million hectares, and completed that, and then over to the Altai Republic, an autonomous republic in the Russian Federation, in southwest Siberia, and completed those. So that brought me to Russia, Mongolia and China several times, overseeing our core teams that interacted with the Russians, seeing that we got a product out of it.

Then I also did work under the umbrella of ESD, the Ecologically Sustainable Development [organization], for OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which is a U.S. agency that underwrites loans for American investors overseas and provides political risk insurance. Before they do that, they have to have an environmental assessment of the project, so

I was doing their forestry work. It involved several people, like retired forest supervisors and BLM district managers and so forth. That lasted through about 1997, and after that I continued a little bit of that work, and then the Trees for Tigers thing came along.

And then, oh, about five years ago, that work was pretty much done. ESD had dissolved. And I became a member of the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission, a seven-person commission that oversees the work of the Department of Fish and Wildlife in Oregon. And that's basically where I am today, working on that and a few other things.

DUNSKY: Do you want to add anything, any significant things? We've touched on a lot of things. I'm sure that we could talk for another eight hours, but I was just wondering if there's some big chunk of this that I haven't asked you about.

SMITH: I don't think there's any major issue. I've had such a great career. I'm very thankful for it. Fortune has been awfully good to me.

Well, you know, the thing that Roger Bay, the director of Pacific Southwest Station, and I had was overseeing Forest Service programs in Micronesia, and that was pretty interesting. During my tenure, we appointed a new Pacific Islands forester, who spent ten or fifteen years out there, really developing great relationships with—

DUNSKY: [Leonard A.] Len Newell?

SMITH: Len Newell, right. And Len did a wonderful job. He had a lot of autonomy. He knew where we wanted to go, working with those folks. The Forest Service built a very good reputation out there. We came in partnering with Peace Corps volunteers, did a lot of hands-on work with those folks. They had sort of drifted towards welfare and discarding their kind of, oh, reliance on natural resources there, and got them started again on the fisheries and good land stewardship and so forth. Research had some people out there doing a good job. We had some

intergovernmental personnel, people that we've placed in kind of state forester positions, and that was a good program. It's still going, I guess. That was probably the only other major thing that was really missing outside of just a very satisfying career.

DUNSKY: Looking from the outside now, if you will, or having worked with a lot of other agencies, what is it that makes the Forest Service different from other government agencies?

SMITH: I think our history of professionalism. Rules and regulations, but the authority given to local people has built a competence that is pretty much unmatched. The professionalism and dedication of Forest Service remains the same. I can go out and you'll go out to the field, and you see the same kind of people out there. They're working under a significantly larger burden of scrutiny from the public, mistrust, and what really is kind of a politicalization of some of our top policy and target setting. I have a lot of confidence in them overcoming that. Some retirees are very upset about this, you maybe have encountered, but I have a lot more optimistic view of it than probably some, at least. Just give them a little time. I think the national forests are too important.

Lane County here in Oregon, for example, in the seventies was getting about \$30 million a year in shared revenues; now they're getting practically zero except what Congress appropriates annually. I think eventually that's all going to come to the surface, and people will realize that these lands are too important just to lock up and not do anything, that we ought to turn the Forest Service loose again in terms of all the technology and understanding we have of good ecosystem-based forestry and get on with it. We got a big wilderness system now to manage, and we got a lot of high-growth timber ground to use, and we know how to do it. I think the old marine corps has not died yet. I think there's still that spirit.

DUNSKY: What a great place to end. Well, thank you, Zane. This has been a real delight, and I really appreciate your time today.

SMITH: Well, thank you. You're a great interviewer.

[End of interview.]