Oral History Center
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

Greg Moore

Greg Moore: Executive Director of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

Interviews conducted by
Shanna Farrell
in 2022

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Since 1953, the Oral History Center of The Bancroft Library, formerly the Regional Oral History Office, has been interviewing participants in or witnesses to major events in the history of California, the United States, and our interconnected world. In oral history, we refer to these interviewees as narrators. The Oral History Center produces first-person narrative topical and life histories that explore the narrator's understanding of events through a recorded interview. In oral history practice, the interviewer records the narrator's responses to questions. The recording results in a lightly edited transcript of the interview that the narrator reviews, which is then published. Some sensitive or controversial material in oral histories may be upsetting to some readers. An oral history document does not present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. The views expressed in the oral history are those of the narrator and do not necessarily reflect those of the interviewer, the Oral History Center, the University of California, or any project sponsor. Through oral history, the subjective recollections of the experiences of the narrator add to the historical record for subsequent analysis and interpretation.

In this interview, text that appears in [square brackets] indicates additions, revisions, or commentary by the narrator, interviewer, or transcriptionist that are not part of the original audiovisual recording. Text that appears in {curly brackets} indicates portions of the interview with unverified spelling or information.

****

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between The Regents of the University of California and Greg Moore dated April 10, 2023. The manuscript is thereby made available for research purposes. All literary rights in the manuscript, including the right to publish, are reserved to The Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley.

For information regarding quoting, republishing, or otherwise using this transcript, please consult http://ucblib.link/OHC-rights.

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Greg Moore, "Greg Moore: Executive Director of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy" conducted by Shanna Farrell in 2022, Oral History Center, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2024.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Greg Moore in 2018
Photograph by Paul Myers, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Abstract

Greg Moore was born in Dayton, Ohio in 1952. His father was in the Air Force. He and his family moved to several places during his early life, including Redondo Beach, California, Montgomery, Alabama, and Washington, DC. His family settled in Orange, California after his father retired from the Air Force. Moore earned his undergraduate degree from the University of California, Berkeley, where he studied in the newly formed Conservation of Natural Resources school and College of Environmental Design. He interned at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and then transitioned to a full-time position with the National Park Service. He later rejoined the Golden Gate National Recreation Area as chief of interpretation before moving to Seattle, Washington to attend the University of Washington for his graduate studies. After earning his master's degree, he moved back to the San Francisco Bay Area and resumed working for the National Park Service. He played a role in the creation of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, where he served as the executive director from 1986 until his retirement in 2019. In this interview, Moore discusses his family; his siblings; his interest in music; his grade school education; experience at UC Berkeley; meeting his wife Nancy; working for the National Park Service and the Golden Gate National Recreation Area; his graduate studies at the University of Washington; returning to the Bay Area; the birth of his son; work at the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy, including the various projects, successes, and challenges that he experienced; as well as work with various staff and board members; his decision to retire; and his hopes for the future of the Conservancy.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Table of Contents

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Interview 1: January 12, 2022

01-00:00:09
Farrell: Okay, this is Shanna Farrell with Greg Moore on Wednesday, January 12, 2022, and this is our first session, and we are speaking over Zoom. Greg, can you start by telling me where and when you were born and a little bit about your early life?

01-00:00:28
Moore: Sure, I was born in Dayton, Ohio in 1952. My father was stationed there as an Air Force pilot at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and we lived in a very modest, little home in Dayton. I lived there for just about three years. I have memories of it but not as strong as later portions of my life of course.

01-00:00:58
Farrell: What are some of the memories that you have of Dayton?

01-00:01:03
Moore: My memories of Dayton are really simply of the house and the neighborhood, not much more than that, a little bit about experiences including when I fell down the stairs and ended up going to the emergency room for stitches, the things that are somewhat traumatic but also things that were fun, playing with my older brother in backyard. It was a warm Midwest climate where you had inflatable swimming pools for toddlers in the backyard and a lot of neighborhood discoveries and a few even friendships at that very early, early age. Also, a milestone that I didn't realize at the time was a milestone, is my mom's mother, my grandmother, came to visit us after her husband's death and it turned out she never left. She stayed with my family until her death at age eighty-six. That was, I think, unexpected for everyone that my grandmother would travel around the country with us as an Air Force family and be part of our household.

01-00:02:23
Farrell: That's great. After you moved from Dayton, where did you move to?

01-00:02:30
Moore: The next move was to Redondo Beach, California. I don't think my mother could ever have been happier because growing up in Wisconsin, her mother would take her to California to visit her uncle Charles in Southern California virtually every year. My mom fell in love with Southern California as a child and always dreamed about someday getting back there so when my dad was stationed to the LA area, she was super happy, and we packed everybody up. I don't have good memory of that. Of the other journeys, I remember. I don't remember the cross-country journey to Southern California, but I do remember that the house was larger, the setting was sunny. There was this amazing thing called the beach that was new to me and became a big part of our life. It was a very happy time of my childhood.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:03:39
Farrell: Can you tell me your mother's name and some of your early memories of her?

01-00:03:44
Moore: Sure, her first name is Elinor spelled with an *i*, E-L-I-N-O-R, middle name Gene, G-E-N-E, last name Eberle. My mom was a combination of fun and funny and zany with incredibly high standards, and strong values. You did your best, you thought well of other people, and you were kind. You wrote thank-you notes. She just had this amazing combination of being a real energy of fun as well as being very clear about her standards and values and a disciplinarian. It was the era when—not that we're completely beyond that now—but the mom ran the household, and that's what she did, she ran the house and most aspects of her kids' life well.

01-00:05:02
Farrell: How about your father—what's his name and some of your early memories of him?

01-00:05:07
Moore: First name is Robert; middle name is Edward like my middle name. My early memories of my dad are not that strong because his career was demanding at that age, and so he was the kind of dad that came home for dinner and left the next morning for work. Of course, he did interact with his kids, but mainly that was a weekend sort of thing. It might be a trip to the beach, it might be learning to throw a baseball, or batting practice, or later on going to a Cub Scout group. My mom could be very mercurial, she could go from completely calm to completely ballistic, and my dad always, always have a sense of humor even when it wasn't appreciated. He found everything funny even things that my mother did not. He was definitely a calming influence in our family, which I didn't realize really until later in my life. At a young age, I wasn't putting all that together.

01-00:06:38
Farrell: What did he do for the Air Force?

01-00:06:42
Moore: He enlisted in World War II with the idea of becoming a pilot and he ended up being a B-17 pilot. He was the guy flying the plane. He did twenty-five missions from England and then re-upped for twenty-five missions from Italy, very challenging, traumatic time in his life that again we learned about much, much later. But the Air Force saw his potential and put him through Harvard Business School where he got his master's in business administration and then began using his talents for a variety of programs that involved the combination of pilots and what the Air Force was doing with advances in military aircraft and his knowledge of both flying a plane and his business knowledge is what was put to use.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:07:54

He came to Southern California to work in the test pilot era, if you happen to know about the book *The Right Stuff*. That was a little bit my story. Chuck Yeager, the guy who broke the sound barrier, was a family friend. We were out at Edwards Air Force Base, that is a memory of my dad going out to see the planes, and he got our first dog at Edwards Air Force Base, and of course the dog was named Jet. We hung out with test pilots, that was pretty cool.

01-00:08:33

Farrell: Yeah, I was going to ask if you grew up around planes and the base a lot.

01-00:08:39

Moore: Yeah, I did grow up around planes. I never flew with my dad. There is a story, that I imagine is true, but you never know sometimes, that he took my mom up in a plane and with the idea of maybe teaching her to fly, and all that resulted was she developed a lifelong fear of flying.

01-00:09:10

Farrell: Did you ever hear the story of how your parents met each other?

01-00:09:17

Moore: Yes. They grew up in two small southern Wisconsin towns, my dad Lake Mills and my mom in Watertown, that were about fifteen miles apart. Lake Mills had a beautiful swimming lake and Watertown people would come there, and my mom and her family would rent a cottage in the lake. They met early on in their lives maybe when they were teenagers or maybe even younger. I think my dad may have dated my mom once or twice in high school, but later events intervened, and he went off to the war effort in World War II. He came back and my mom was working as an accountant in Chicago, and he looked her up and reacquainted himself with her around October. They were married January 13 the following year. It was one of those after-the-war courtships. It was quick, but they did have connections before them.

01-00:10:26

Farrell: So their anniversary is tomorrow?

01-00:10:28

Moore: You got it, that's right, yeah.

01-00:10:30

Farrell: How about your grandmother who you grew up with her in the house? What's her name and what are your memories of her and her being around and part of your childhood?

01-00:10:46

Moore: Yeah, her name was Letitia Marie Eberle, quite a pretty name Gosh, describing my grandmother! As a youngster, she was just one more person in the house to interact with. She had a teasing personality and was a bit of a prankster. It was only later through a number of events that I could understand the challenge for my mom as a newlywed woman with a family having her

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

mother live with her for all her life and a challenge for my dad as well, so it was not without times of difficulty. But as a youngster, she was just fun and another person around the house. It was only later on, I realized that she did almost nothing to contribute to the running of the household except cut the stems off strawberries. She was kind of an invalid and actually went in and out of what were called asylums and mental institutions, even had electroshock therapy and all that stuff and a whole period of her life when she believed she couldn't walk and there was nothing wrong with her. She brought a certain element to our family that was different for sure.

01-00:12:25
Farrell: Thanks for sharing all of that. I also know that you have a few siblings as well. You're the middle child and you have an older brother named Terry. Can you me about some of your early memories of Terry?

01-00:12:41
Moore: Sure, we're three years apart so that that's close enough to do things together and close enough that sometimes I think he felt I was crowding his space. My early memories of him was as a playmate really; we just did stuff together, particularly when we were under six maybe. I tagged along and he was out there in front of me making friends, and I hung out with his friends as long as it was tolerable and then eventually went out on my own, developing my own friendships. He's an intense individual and certainly he's mellowed with age but kind of had the common first child syndrome of being in charge of his life and in charge of the people around him. We have a deep and loving relationship even though there were times of—not really conflict—we worked our way around one another as kids, I would say. The other influence he had and that came later is—this was a benefit and also not a benefit–what he achieved, I decided I needed to achieve as well. I find in my life that some of the milestones I set for myself were, for example, because my brother was senior high school class president and I was freshman high school class president, as one example.

01-00:14:32
Farrell: He helped with your ambition?

01-00:14:35
Moore: Yeah. That was a positive influence. I don't think we were ever really directly competitive with one another, but it could be without his influence, maybe I would've discovered some of my own interests sooner than I did.

01-00:14:54
Farrell: Yeah, that makes sense. You also have a younger brother Rick and a younger sister Lisa. Can you tell me about some of your early memories about your younger siblings?

01-00:15:07
Moore: My brother Rick is six years younger, and my earliest memory of this—again probably just this foggy, crazy memory—is walking into my parents' room in

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Redondo Beach. It was a Sunday morning, and my dad was asleep in the bed, and I said, "Where's mom?" He said, "She just had a baby." That was my memory of when I first knew I was going to have a little brother. Maybe they told me earlier. My mom didn't show pregnancy at all, so I could've missed it. But then I was just fascinated. I mean, you go to the hospital, and you see your little brother behind the glass in a crib and the whole bit. Rick became a thing in my life, just a whole different relationship than with my older brother because our ages were different enough that at some points in my life, I was actually babysitting my younger brother and sister. In that era anyway, parents considered a twelve-year-old capable of babysitting. So that's Rick, and of course, there are many stories about Rick that I could go into but maybe a little later.

01-00:16:29

My younger sister Lisa, I got more advanced warning. We were walking down the street in Montgomery, Alabama, and my mother told me that she was going to have a baby. Lisa was born on Thanksgiving Day in the deep South, and she was named after my grandmother; Lisa Marie Moore was her name, after Leticia Marie Eberly. We were all thrilled to have a sister and my dad and my mom to have a daughter.

01-00:17:04

Farrell: After Redondo Beach, did you move to Montgomery, Alabama?

01-00:17:08

Moore: Yes, we did.

01-00:17:09

Farrell: Okay, and how long did you live in Redondo Beach for?

01-00:17:17

Moore: That was a longer stay, about four years.

01-00:17:19

Farrell: Four years, okay. So you were around seven when you moved to Montgomery?

01-00:17:24

Moore: I think that's about right. I entered third grade in Montgomery, so whatever age that is.

01-00:17:31

Farrell: Okay. What was it like for you to move from Southern California to now the deep South and to go to elementary school there?

01-00:17:43

Moore: I was completely unprepared for it. Of course, I knew that there were people of different races in the United States but barely, and here I was in the deep South not only amongst the African American community as well as the white community, but amongst incredible prejudice. It was near the beginning of the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Civil Rights Movement. [I had never been exposed to prejudice and intolerance since I was too young, and we lived in somewhat suburban settings.] So I was completely unprepared to the extent that we went into a grocery store, there were two drinking fountains, one said "white" and one said "colored." I asked my brother what is about, and he said, "Well, I think that one gives you colored water to drink." Perhaps, he was teasing me, but I accepted that as truth. That seemed like okay, I guess that's weird, but that's what that's about. It was not the most fun part of my life [due to the many adjustments and exposures to racism], but I learned a lot, a lot, and my parents had to guide us through it. I was on buses where white people sat in front and Black people in the back and taking them to a Catholic school in downtown Montgomery, Alabama. My brother and I—I don't know whether we were standing up for principles or what we were doing, but we decided that we were going to sit in the back of the bus one day, which we did. The bus driver pulled over to the side and threw us off the bus. Yeah, it was a time of learning about the bad side of human character.

01-00:19:44
Farrell: What were some of the lessons or things that you took with you from that period of time that you carried with you for the rest of your life?

01-00:19:55
Moore: Well, a few things. I can't say my parents were without prejudice, but they did believe in fundamental human rights, and they taught us that what was going on was not right, that segregation was wrong, and that we should learn from it. We should be compassionate and speak to our values, so they did go that far. That was in the middle of the Freedom Riders if you remember that protest, all that, and so I just observed all these civic events. These events were never brought into the classroom at all, never, it's like they didn't even exist. My Catholic grammar school was not integrated at all, so these lessons were just things I picked up because of news, because of my parents telling me about them, or my own direct experience.

01-00:21:05
Farrell: Were you are aware that the Freedom Riders—that that movement was happening?

01-00:21:10
Moore: Yes.

01-00:21:11
Farrell: Okay, but that's another thing. It wasn't discussed in your classroom at all, it was kind of like the classroom was treating that as a bit of a vacuum, and all the stuff is going around outside, it sounds like?

01-00:21:23
Moore: Yeah, and in my class, we learned English, arithmetic, and God. It was a Catholic school, so it was not a place [for conversations about current events]. Today, I think the Catholic Church would be more progressive—well, parts of

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

it would be more progressive, but back then, no, we were in our own little vacuum. But my parents knew, we were on public buses getting to and from school, and they had to give us a certain amount of reference points maybe even for our own mental and psychological and personal safety perhaps.

01-00:22:03

The other bubble was the military base because my parents decided that we would never live on a military base. That was always an option, but they didn't want us to grow up that way, but we did spend a lot of our life there. That's where the swimming pool was and recreational activities, so we were in two isolated settings. Our house was just in a normal [modest] neighborhood, but of course not in an integrated neighborhood at all.

01-00:22:40

Farrell: That's interesting. Why did your family decide they didn't want to live on an air force base?

01-00:22:48I

Moore: I don't know the answer in depth. What I was told is that my parents believed that our experience would be richer if we just lived in a community that was more varied, and in in a way I think it was. There were economic consequences because if you live on the base, my dad was an officer, you get a big house and all that stuff, but they just decided that that wasn't the way they wanted to bring us up.

01-00:23:22

Farrell: How long did you live in Montgomery for?

01-00:23:26

Moore: I think it was about a year and a half. Yeah, it was a short stint but one with lots of memories.

01-00:23:35

Farrell: Where did you move to after that?

01-00:23:37

Moore: By the way, [in my school in Montgomery], I was so far ahead [in the classroom].

01-00:23:42

Farrell: Oh, that's interesting.

01-00:23:44

Moore: I was in a Catholic school in the Redondo Beach as well [and it was teaching at a different level than my school in Montgomery].

01-00:23:55

Farrell: Yeah, yeah. After Montgomery, where did you move?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:24:01
Moore: Then we moved to Washington, DC, and another wonderful posting because it was really an introduction for me to government, what government is and what the White House is and what the FBI is. My parents had various [connections to Congressional members] that they got us into Senate chambers and into the Capitol building and into Congress [offices]. My dad was working at the Pentagon, so I toured the Pentagon. Racial prejudice was still very much a part of the story in Virginia at that time, not as visible as in Montgomery, but I knew how to recognize it. There, you'd go into restaurants, and they'd have that classic sign, "We reserve the right to refuse service to anyone," and that was obvious what that message was about. John F. Kennedy was president, and it was the Camelot days—government was idealistic, the mood of the country was positive.

01-00:25:21
Farrell: Another place where you can't really ignore the politics and government that's going on around you as well.

01-00:25:30
Moore: No, one thing I didn't mention about my mom is she took advantage of where there were learning opportunities for her kids. Whenever we traveled between our homes, part of the journey was what we could learn along the way and what we could see. That's in some way was how I was introduced to national parks as a child because on the way to Alabama, we stopped at the Grand Canyon or on our way to California, we saw Yosemite. It was that era when you had the station wagon and up into that point, our station wagon always had diapers in it. My dad went ahead, so my mom had to do the travel alone with between three and four children—well at first two, then three, then four, and my invalid grandmother.

01-00:26:27
Farrell: Yeah, that's a lot.

01-00:26:29
Moore: Yeah, that's a lot, [laughter] that's a lot.

01-00:26:32
Farrell: Yeah. What was it like for to be introduced to the national parks as a kid? Especially as you're moving from place to place and you're seeing these what can be quite majestic places on the way?

01-00:26:46
Moore: Yeah, well, the one that was most memorable for me, I think when we were in Southern California, was a vacation to see national parks because my memory is pretty strong about our visit to Yosemite. We went to both Sequoia and Kings Canyon and Yosemite and even at my young age, a true inspiration to see that beauty all around. I brought back a number of mementos, posters, and other things of Yosemite. In fact, one that I still have today, so it clearly had an impact on me.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:27:28
Farrell: Did your parents have an appreciation for nature or the outdoors?

01-00:27:33
Moore: I think more in a sightseeing way. My mom's parents were fairly adventurous and so there are pictures of my mom as a young child at Zion National Park and Bryce National Park. They even, as an American family, drove all the way to Mexico City, if you can believe it, like in 1935 or something. My mom had a sense of adventure that she applied, but outdoors to them was scenery, not nature.

01-00:28:17
Farrell: How long did you live in Washington, DC for?

01-00:28:22
Moore: A little over two years.

01-00:28:23
Farrell: Okay, so you're right around ten at this point if I'm tracking this correctly?

01-00:28:30
Moore: No, we moved back to Southern California when I was in about [sixth] grade.

01-00:28:39
Farrell: Okay, and when you moved to Southern California, where in Southern California?

01-00:28:44
Moore: Yeah, at that point, my dad had retired [from the Air Force]. He had put his twenty years in, and maybe twenty-two or so, and so he picked up a job in the aerospace industry. My mom had always made it clear that Southern California had been her favorite [Air Force] posting of them all and there were plenty of aerospace companies in Southern California, so we moved to Orange County to the town of Orange to the biggest house we've ever had, which my mom thought was a wonderful house, but more expensive than my dad should have spent. My dad bought these houses without my mom ever seeing them.

01-00:29:24
Farrell: Oh, okay.

01-00:29:25
Moore: Yeah, I mean what a risky thing to do, you know? [laughter]

01-00:29:31
Farrell: Let's go.

01-00:29:33
Moore: Yeah, and my mom was never completely pleased with the outcome for one reason or another, but she clearly loved this house. She was happy to be back in Southern California.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:29:46
Farrell: Yeah, and you stayed in Orange through high school, is that right?

01-00:29:51
Moore: That's exactly right. At that point, my brother was entering high school and I was entering [middle] school and so my parents really wanted us, if they could do it, to have our high school years be stable. My brother went all the way through high school from freshman to senior and then I followed.

01-00:30:15
Farrell: What was it like for you after going from Ohio to Southern California to the South, then to DC back to Orange County and settling there? What was that like for you to have all these experiences and then you're coming back to Southern California?

01-00:30:37
Moore: It was great. I was accustomed to knowing that I would be leaving where I was living. Even though I really enjoyed Washington, DC, and one thing was particularly formative for me there is my parents were in the new suburb in Alexandria, Virginia, but behind our house were acres of forest, just behind our backyard. That's where I spent my time with my friends. We build tepees and climbed trees and we just have the run of this huge forest. It's probably only fifty acres, but it seemed like Sequoia National Park to me, and it was when the outdoors were completely accessible to me. It wasn't like a yard that needed to be mowed, it was nature. So, moving back to Southern California, I missed that because we moved into the suburban development. I got my own bedroom, I think for the first time. That was pretty cool. I lived in a place where 30 percent or maybe 50 percent of the neighbors had swimming pools, so that wasn't bad. My dad loved his work, my mom was happy. Yeah, it was it easy to slide back into that.

01-00:32:17
Farrell: When we had talked originally, you had mentioned that you served as a lot like the family glue. Can you tell me a little bit about what you mean by that and give me an example of how you served as the family glue?

01-00:32:34
Moore: Sure, in a few ways. As I mentioned, my older brother had a pretty independent streak, and as a result, he and my mom kind of banged heads a lot because they were both strong-minded people and that produced that dynamic. As I watched my older brother struggle with his way of doing things, it was like, well, maybe there's a different approach than banging heads. I really developed—I think to the extent that word fits—a friendship with my mom and a conversational ability and an interest in what she had to say and what I could learn from her rather than a person I had to push up against. There's one part of it.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:33:35

My younger brother is a middle child too, so I was kind of the glue between the older generation of kids in the family and the younger generation because of that, that difference in age. My younger brother and sister were much more present in my life as people who I enjoyed and fooled around with and played than my older brother who was clearly older and moving on with his life. He wasn't going to hang out with Rick and Lisa as a high school freshman, whereas I was still up for it. And as I said, at times, I was like the babysitter, so I developed that.

01-00:34:21

I also figured out my grandmother. I figured out the conflicts between my mom and my grandmother; I mediated a lot of those conflicts when they got super serious and scary. When there were family moments to celebrate, I was the one behind trying to make it memorable. I don't know why this all happened, it just happened. Some of it was—I think it gave me a little bit of a creative outlet, too. That's happened throughout my adult life. I'm the organizer of family reunions, I'm the person who made a whole the history of family masquerades, but that's another story, and I was the inventor of that.

01-00:35:17

Farrell: Did you say history of masquerades?

01-00:35:19

Moore: Yes.

01-00:35:20

Farrell: Can you tell me a little more about that?

01-00:35:24

Moore: Yeah. It's always hard for people to believe, but we have a history of disguising ourselves adequately enough and in an unexpected setting enough that we have taken one another on long, confusing rides.

01-00:35:52

Farrell: Do you mean in your family?

01-00:35:53

Moore: Yes, exactly.

01-00:35:54

Farrell: How would you do that? I'm curious to how that worked. Did you dress up as characters?

01-00:36:05

Moore: Yeah, I'm trying to think of a good example because I started this tradition when my sister came home from Notre Dame College, and we were meeting her at the airport. I realized that my dad had all these weird leisure suits and my younger brother, Ric, and I completely dressed ourselves up in these unusual clothes and put scarfs around our faces and everything else and kind

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

of harassed my sister at baggage claim. She didn't know who we were. As it went on, longer than we thought because we thought she would discover us right away, but she got frightened. That's when it ended, is when she ran to my parents and said, "These two guys are really bothering me." But that just started this crazy tradition usually around milestone birthdays and other things. Before airlines were restricted, I was flying to Eugene for my brother's birthday, and I got on a flight in San Francisco, my seat had been changed. I was seated next to a nurse, and next to the nurse was a child completely head-bandaged and with an oxygen tank. I decided I should give them their own space, but the oxygen tank mask kept being tossed into my lap, and I'd return it and return it, and eventually it turns out, that was my sister and her son. [laughter]

01-00:37:47
Farrell: I appreciate the examples because now I have an understanding, so it just was kind of ongoing like family pranking.

01-00:37:55
Moore: Yes, and really elaborate disguises.

01-00:37:59
Farrell: It sounds like it.

01-00:38:01
Moore: Yeah, no, they have to be really good because otherwise, you get discovered; some of them haven't worked.

01-00:38:09
Farrell: Do you still do these masquerades?

01-00:38:13
Moore: What's the last one? Yes, oh my gosh, for my older brother. My brother retired about three years ago, and it was also around his birthday, his seventieth birthday, and his company gave him a retirement party. We devised this masquerade where my younger brother built this box, and it was all wrapped up as a gift, retirement present. But my brother's three siblings were all inside this large, gift-wrapped box in disguise [laughter] with wigs on and all sorts of stuff. My brother is getting presents and a friend says, "Well, we really got you something cool, it's a little big." They made up a good story, and my brother went to open the box, and we popped out the top, and there's a video of this, and my brother went airborne. We so scared and surprised him, and he was like six inches off the ground. [laughs] Anyway, that's the last one, I think.

01-00:39:29
Farrell: What a fun tradition. That feels very special.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:39:33
Moore: It's pretty cuckoo. I finally made a list of them all because there became so many. Some of them were incredibly spontaneous like just thought about almost on the spot and some were elaborately planned out.

01-00:39:48
Farrell: Yeah, like being in a box.

01-00:39:52
Moore: Yeah.

01-00:39:54
Farrell: That's great. I'm also, on that note, wondering a little bit about when you were growing up, whether you're in grade school or you're in high school, if you had any favorite subjects or there were hobbies or things that you found yourself most interested in?

01-00:40:13
Moore: Yeah, a few things. I've always liked building things, I like the process of creation, making things and so a lot of my childhood toys [reflected that interest]. Whether I was building a teepee in a forest or a fort in the backyard or working with Lincoln Logs or building toys, that was where I gravitated in terms of hobbies. I always had an interest in music that my parents had trouble fulfilling. They liked music and there was always pop music on in our house, but I wanted to learn to play music, to play piano. I think because we moved so much, they just couldn't figure that [large musical instrument was a practical choice], until my dad retired. I wanted a piano and instead my dad leased an accordion, that was his answer. So I learned to play the accordion of all things. I was barely four feet tall and when I put it on, I practically fell on the floor. He wanted to learn to play polka songs. But eventually, I got like a compact electronic organ [with two keyboards]. I never had lessons, I taught myself to play music and I still play today. But I do wish that with this interest of mine, they would've been able to support earlier on, but that didn't happen.

01-00:41:57
Farrell: What kind of music were you listening to? You mentioned you had pop in the house, but were there other types of music that you found yourself drawn to, other genres or types of music that you wanted to play?

01-00:42:13
Moore: Yeah, there were two primary influences. The main influence was pop music, and my parents listened to it a lot. My mom and my dad, but more my mom was a big fan of musical theater, so we got taken to *Camelot* or whatever musicals were happening, we got introduced to that kind of music. But also, there was church music, right, because I went to church all the time. Most of that music wasn't terribly interesting to me, but I remember when we moved to Washington, DC, the choir actually was singing the tradition Latin Catholic music in vocal harmony, in incredible harmony, and I'd never really heard [musical harmony] before. It was like, what's that? Then I was in the choir, I

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

learned a little bit about what it meant just to sing in harmony at different places, with an alto and a soprano and other voices. But my musical tastes stayed fairly narrow until I got out my own. In college and beyond, I discovered classical music, which I love, discovered country music, which I also loved. I like all kinds of music actually.

Farrell: What was it like for you to teach yourself how to both play and read music? Reading music is not so easy.

01-00:43:54

Moore: I just did it because I wanted to, and it was in front of me. The result now is that often when you self-teach yourself something, you build in some bad habits. They're like shortcuts, so it did kind of put a limit on how far I could go. I now have to go back backwards to come forward. On the other hand, I loved reading music, and I can play pretty well by ear. I had to learn where an organ is different than a piano as you tend to learn chord structure and so I learned chord structure really well, and that helped me in advance. I had a friend who played the church organ, which is phenomenal—that's why I played some Bach fugues and then I dabbled with it, but I never played publicly. When he practiced, I was able to practice. But music is, it's very important. All my other brothers, my two brothers both play guitar, and my sister took up piano for a while.

01-00:45:13

Farrell: So you're a musical family?

01-00:45:15

Moore: Kind of. I love the stories of those families and I know a few families that grew up singing together, and they had instruments all over their house, a lot of them. I didn't have any of that, but we all found music in one way or another.

01-00:45:33

Farrell: Yeah, it's really interesting that you all gravitated towards music.

01-00:45:36

Moore: Well, and a part of it was I imagine it's probably still the same, but the music was so much part of that era of Civil Rights and the Vietnam protest and whatever you want to call that era, the flower power era. It was really defining to our upbringing with a lot of the musical artists [singing about social change].

01-00:46:03

Farrell: Yeah, I mean it's part of the culture.

01-00:46:06

Moore: Yeah.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:46:07
Farrell: Aside from music where there any subjects in school or things that you were particularly drawn to?

01-00:46:16
Moore: It's funny with me in school, my brother has a stronger math mind than I do. But when I took the SATs for college applications, my math score and [English score], the other score, were one point apart. [I was a middle child that was right in the middle of the SAT test.] I really enjoyed math, I particularly liked math that was geometry because it was visual. I think I am a bit of a visual learner, so geometry was my high point in math, and calculus, I made my way through, but it was harder. My sister just whipped through calculus like it was the multiplication tables. I loved writing, I loved reading and writing in English class and was an idiot savant at sentence diagramming, if you ever have been introduced to sentence diagramming, because it was like the geometry of words and it's the visualization of the English language. In high school, the big influence was my English teacher because in his mind, there was nothing written good enough that it couldn't be rewritten and be better. He would just make us rewrite something, a whole essay like two or three times and then coach us all the way through it.

01-00:47:50
Farrell: So you were really learning how to edit something?

01-00:47:53
Moore: Yes, and I joined the high school yearbook staff because it was both design and editing, which I liked, and it was communications, which I like too. If my life had turned out differently, I might have been a graphic designer because yes, that's part of what pushed me to architecture was that combination of math and creativity. In my spare time, I would design on paper, homes and floor plans and buildings. I have no architectural classes at the time, but I was just interested in how buildings came together.

01-00:48:40
Farrell: When did that start for you? Do you remember how old you were?

01-00:48:44
Moore: I think it started as early as sixth grade.

01-00:48:47
Farrell: Oh wow, okay.

01-00:48:49
Moore: Yeah.

01-00:48:49
Farrell: Yeah, and then at what point did you realize that you could pursue a career or were interested in pursuing a career in architecture?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:49:00
Moore: Probably about the time you have to begin thinking about that stuff. It was probably my junior year in high school when I was trying to figure out what colleges to apply to and then actually what do I wanted to learn and what occupations interested me. My brother went to Stanford as an engineering major, so he again had that stronger math mind than I did, so he went that route in his college studies.

01-00:49:29
Farrell: Yeah, and I know that you attended a Catholic school for high school as well. Did you have any teachers or people who served as mentors during your high school period?

01-00:49:43
Moore: My high school was sort of a mixed bag. At times, I was very frustrated going to a Catholic high school. It was a big school, and I could perform in things where the school wanted me to excel. I was good academically, I was elected every single year to class president or a student body officer, so I accepted leadership positions. But I was also rebellious and contrary. [laughs]

01-00:50:21
Farrell: What do you mean by that? How were you rebellious?

01-00:50:27
Moore: There's a little bit of prankster in me, so that's part of it, just like doing stupid things in class that the nuns or the priests just did not like, basically class pranks. [laughs] Those were the things that were popular in the Catholic school. But beyond that, it was the era of the Vietnam War protests and I wore a black arm band to school signifying this protest. I was the student body officer, and for the high school faculty, that was the worst possible thing. When I ran for student body office, I told the joke that the teachers really didn't like. I was a bit too irreverent. Anyway, I had lots of trips to the monsignor's office. At one point, he said, "Greg, you came to high school walking in the sidewalk, you stepped onto the curb, you fell into the gutter, and now you are washing into the sewer." Now that is a good metaphor.

01-00:51:43
Farrell: That's quite intense for a high schooler to hear.

01-00:51:47
Moore: I mean the Catholic schools were sometimes a crazy thing, you know, [especially in that era of change].

01-00:51:59
Farrell: Yeah, and were you at a coed school?

01-00:52:02
Moore: Yeah, it was coed.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:52:03
Farrell: Okay, okay. Wearing a black arm to school, can you tell me a little bit about how your political consciousness was developing in high school?

01-00:52:18
Moore: It's hard for me to know whether that was a deeply set in my own thinking or whether I was to some degree being part of the times. My older brother was in Stanford so that was an influence in me. He had gone to Stanford and all that Catholic upbringing was kind of changed within one year. I don't think I really understood the Vietnam War in the depth that would make sense for me to take that action, but at some conceptual level, I thought it was wrong. I don't know how, but I think my parents were not informed about [my actions and thinking] because they would've gone nuts, particularly my dad with this Air Force [career].

01-00:53:22
Farrell: Were you having political conversations at home at all?

01-00:53:28
Moore: No, not too much. My high school years were ones of making my parents believe I was doing everything they wanted me to do but really having a life they never fully knew about. I'd sneak out of my bedroom at night, I was a typical rebellious teenager pushing against everything but not confronting them. I think my older brother actually was more compliant, but I just wasn't that out there in my lack of compliance.

01-00:54:13
Farrell: I can relate to both of those things.

01-00:54:17
Moore: Yeah. [laughter]

01-00:54:20
Farrell: And just for context as well, what years were you in high school?

01-00:54:27
Moore: 1966 to 1970.

01-00:54:29
Farrell: Okay. Well, your brother was in college, but was the threat of the draft ever present for you? Did you ever feel that?

01-00:54:40
Moore: Yes, it was. It was a little bit more present for my brother, and it was the time of the lottery system for the draft that came into place, and my brother's number was 365 and I was 356. Once the lottery happened, we were both out of any danger of being drafted given those numbers, but we knew people who were drafted and then we knew people who resisted the draft.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:55:34
Farrell: I'd love to hear more about your college application process. When you had visited your brother at Stanford, it seemed like that was that pretty influential visit for you and coming to the Bay Area and things like that influenced your decision to apply to Cal [UC Berkeley]. Can you tell me a little bit about where you wanted to go to school and why you wanted to go to school there?

01-00:56:07
Moore: Yeah, there are few dimensions to it. With my brother, we grew exceptionally close when he went off to college. I was in high school and then when I went to college, it was like we reunited as young adults and saw each other as peers rather than older brother, younger brother. So, yeah, I was introduced to the Bay Area by going to Stanford and seeing that campus and traveling to San Francisco with my brother.

01-00:56:49
Then there was an economic slump, and my dad lost his job. Paying for my brother's education at Stanford was a financial stretch for them even though in today's dollars it was rather modest then, but it was pretty clear that I would probably have to go to a public institution, that they could not afford another private school. I was clear that architecture was what I wanted to study, and I didn't really have ambitions to move out of California. So I applied to USC [University of Southern California], which had a good architecture school, Cal Poly, and to Berkeley. I think Berkeley was my first choice—not my parents' first choice or my school's first choice because Berkeley had, at that point, a reputation for protests and riots and [counterculture]. I was told by my high school counselors that going to Berkeley was one of the worst things that I could do, but I got accepted and I got a scholarship and so that was the clear best choice in my mind. I was really thrilled about that opportunity and the architecture school.

01-00:58:06
Farrell: Did it take your parents any convincing for you to go to Berkeley, or was the scholarship a pretty influential part of the puzzle?

01-00:58:19
Moore: I don't remember having to convince them. It was clear to me, given what was going on at Berkeley and knowing what their political beliefs were, that this would not be their first choice. There were comments made about it, but I don't remember them ever saying we don't want you to do this, to their credit. My mom had already been dealt with a blow [with my brother going to Stanford instead of Notre Dame]. I mean, my dad used to say his two worst investments were my brother's education at Stanford and my education in Berkeley [laughs] because we went from Catholic Republican conservative values to the opposite end.

01-00:59:07
Farrell: Was the political climate something that drew you to the Bay Area at that point, or was that not something you were really thinking about?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-00:59:16
Moore: Yes, I think [the political climate was a draw for me]. I mean, when you go through your entire life in parochial schools, which are very strict and dogma-driven, and particularly in my era, authoritarian–and if you're a certain type of person, you want to burst out of that bubble. You want to get in the place that just lets you find yourself in your own way. There was a part of it that was not necessarily a political choice so that may have been in there, but the choices were just what I wanted. From the nuns and the priests and the other high school teachers telling me that I was rebellious or being told that the fact I worked in Fantasyland at Disneyland was appropriate because I was just always in a fantasy. [College felt like a self-fulfilled prophecy.]

01-01:00:15
Farrell: Were you working at Disneyland when you were in high school?

01-01:00:18
Moore: Yes, I was.

01-01:00:18
Farrell: Okay, what were you doing there?

01-01:00:21
Moore: Well, I was a streetsweeper of all things so, yeah, it was fun, I liked it. That [working environment] was strict too though, you had to have the right haircut and all that sort of stuff, but anyway I had the right haircut for school anyway. In school, my little minor protest was I always grew my sideburns longer than allowed and I would be sent to the men's room with a cold razor, so I have to shave the sideburns off at school.

01-01:00:55
Farrell: Yeah.

01-01:00:57
Moore: By way, my high school, it's one of the leading sports high schools in America. Their football team has won the state championship time and time again and the national championship, so the school was academically driven, but very much a sports culture. We would actually pray to God for our team to win, and even at my age I thought, God had more important things to think about—

01-01:01:28
Farrell: Than high school football?

01-01:01:30
Moore: Yeah, yeah. I thought God must be very busy if this is what people pray to him for. [laughter]

01-01:01:38
Farrell: Before we get to Berkeley, real quick with working at Disneyland and Fantasyland, was that a summer job for you or did you work there year-round?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:01:48
Moore: Yeah, I worked year-round. I started working year-round as soon as I turned sixteen. My first job was at McDonald's, so I had all name brands [in my early employment], and then something called Stouffer's, which also was a name brand, and then eventually to Disneyland. My older brother worked at Disneyland as well, so that helps with your application if someone in your family worked there.

01-01:02:18
Farrell: Okay, and so you did that through high school?

01-01:02:21
Moore: It wasn't full time obviously.

01-01:02:26
Farrell: Sure, yeah.

01-01:02:27
Moore: It's like weekends during the school year or during the summer, it was full time. I liked being in the Disneyland shift that went from about 4:00 pm to midnight because then I could go to the beach the next day.

01-01:02:44
Farrell: That's true, you can go, yeah. And okay, so then you start at UC Berkeley in 1970 and you began in the architecture school.

01-01:02:57
Moore: That's right.

01-01:02:57
Farrell: Can you tell me a little bit about what it was like for you to move to Berkeley? Were you living in the dorms? What as your experience of immersing yourself in the campus culture then?

01-01:03:10
Moore: Yeah, I lived in the dorm, and I remember being thoroughly embarrassed that my parents accompanied me up to the sixth floor of the dorm—it was one of the high-rise dorms in Berkeley—with our family's little toy poodle named Cocoa on a fluorescent orange leash. That was not how I wanted to be introduced to the sixth floor students in my dorm, but anyway that had to happen. And then the journey just began. My brother was at Stanford at that time, so we saw each other frequently. Friendships developed and classes happened and, yeah, I loved it, it was great. My dorm was right across the street from the Catholic Church I actually tried [to keep attending church, but after a while I had moved on. After all those years of Catholic religion and education, I am grateful for many aspects of that upbringing.]

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:04:22
Farrell: You also began as a Regents' scholar as well. Do you feel like high school had prepared you well for having a scholarship and being in the academic rigor of Cal?

01-01:04:40
Moore: Yes, I did. A few points in my life, I had things given to me that I didn't really understand what they really meant and how I could take advantage of them. For the Regents' scholar, there was the financial reward in the scholarship, but also it was about access, and that piece I didn't understand, and I didn't take advantage of. There would be special coffees [with the University Chancellor] and meet this [visiting scholar or faculty member]. I just kind of blew all that off when really there was probably an opportunity for me there that I should have been a little bit more cognizant of. But I went to a big high school, so I was somewhat prepared for a big school, but Berkeley was huge, and I did struggle with that a bit. Just to share, I loved the university in the fact that I could take classes in so many different things, it's like a candy store of learning, but I found navigating it not beyond my administrative abilities, but a little bit psychologically overwhelming, just a school that big and where and how to find friendships and to make them last.

01-01:05:59
Farrell: Did you end up finding a community of people that you spent time with while you were there?

01-01:06:07
Moore: I did, yeah. My journey through Berkeley was long and winding because I started in architecture and then in an unconfident mood because advanced calculus seemed really hard for me, I felt like, well, maybe I wasn't cut out for becoming an architect. So I began to wander, and I was a psychology major for a while, I was an art major for a while, I was always taking classes in the College of Environmental Design, [mainly in landscape architecture]. Eventually a brand-new school was created called the Conservation of Natural Resources and I was in its second class, [at the very beginnings of the environmental movement, planning and law]. It was only about like 300 students, that was it. At that point, I had a love of the outdoors and nature and so I graduated [with a Bachelor of Sciences degree] in Conservation of Natural Resources, but I had so many credits in the landscape architecture that my first job I got out of college was as a landscape architect [for the National Park Service]. My advisor in Conservation of Natural Resources program was a professor in the landscape architecture department.

01-01:07:22
Farrell: Yeah, I'd love to hear a little more about the types of classes that you were taking, either ones you got to landscape architecture or even in the College of Environmental Design, some of the classes that you took that you feel like were particularly important to you.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:07:45
Moore: I had to take the fundamentals of course, but I tended to gravitate toward [faculty members] that weren't necessarily the most sought-after professors, maybe because they were doing things that were new and maybe younger in their career. I gravitated to a lot of courses that were in architecture and landscape architecture with two professors, one named Clare Cooper-Marcus and the other Robin Moore. These courses emphasized community engagement in the design process. That if you're designing a park, if you're designing a building, if you're designing a housing project, if you're designing a town, if you're city manager, how do you actually do it in a way that is respectful and engaging the community that you ultimately want your work to be serving? I loved that work. I did tons of interesting work, on tangible projects actually. That work included involvement with the first school that transformed the playground into a nature play area in Berkeley, as well as the first edible schoolyard in Berkeley [with its organic vegetable beds].

01-01:09:03
Farrell: Oh, so you worked on the first Edible Schoolyard?

01-01:09:06
Moore: Yes.

01-01:09:07
Farrell: I was wondering if maybe that was one of your projects.

01-01:09:10
Moore: Yeah.

01-01:09:11
Farrell: Were you working with Alice Waters at that point?

01-01:09:15
Moore: We knew of her, who was the originator of the concept in many ways, but the schoolyard I was involved with was at Washington Elementary School [in Berkeley]. It was both a nature play area and a plant-growing area, so it was a combination of two. It's also built on [the model of] the English adventure playground. My professor Robin Moore was of English descent and so he had seen what it meant to have [a play area] more interesting than just swing sets and slides. Of course, I gravitated to any playground where kids could build things or grow things or have nature around them. I worked in that project and a lot of my coursework was there.

01-01:10:12
Farrell: So a lot of hands-on work at that point?

01-01:10:15
Moore: Yeah.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:10:15
Farrell: I'm also curious about the class design or the curriculum design. It was Robin Moore who was working on these within the local schools?

01-01:10:29
Moore: Yes, that's right.

01-01:10:30
Farrell: Okay. Had he already established those relationships with the schools and designed what it would look like or was that part of your classwork?

01-01:10:38
Moore: That was part of the classwork was to work with the teachers in the school to really determine what should be created and then how to get it done. It was a little bit of both.

01-01:10:57
Farrell: Did you have to go in and speak with the teachers about what their needs were and what their resources were and what was possible or what your limitations were for the design?

01-01:11:10
Moore: Yeah, and at that point Robin was taking the lead in those conversations, but I was present, and in some cases, I would do the follow-up work or the research. And then with Clare Cooper-Marcus, she really believed in what's called post-design evaluation. The theory was that when something is built, it's not completely done. [The design team needs] to dedicate time to evaluating its effectiveness with the people that are using it. Robin taught me how to build something effectively that meets [community] needs and Clare taught me how to look at it afterward and make certain it was successful and modify things that maybe didn't work.

01-01:11:59
Farrell: And Clare came at things from a social justice lens, is that correct?

01-01:12:04
Moore: Very much, yeah, very much.

01-01:12:05
Farrell: What kind of impact did that lens have on how you were thinking about these projects?

01-01:12:17
Moore: Well, I think it had a big impact because many things lead towards my career with national parks, part of it, of course, was the outdoors and the scenery and the beauty and the inspiration of the places. But I was equally fascinated by what does it mean to have a part of our country that everybody owns? National parks belong to all Americans. And I was also very interested in the urban interface. How do you really design and develop a national park in a way that is responsive to community needs and how do people in cities get

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

introduced to nature without having to travel to a remote national park? That was a bit of a social equity lens because national parks, they were available to the middle class, but that was still a privilege, these parks weren't available to everyone.

01-01:13:22
Farrell: Yeah, I think the idea of access, usership, and then also marketing, like who are you marketing these things for, is a big part of it.

01-01:13:29
Moore: Yes, right.

01-01:13:30
Farrell: I know that these are parts of the conversations that are happening currently, but were you finding that that was part of the conversation when you were in school or even working with Clare?

01-01:13:44
Moore: Yeah, very much and even the origins of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. There was a sense that there was a "green belt" worth preserving, but to the people in the ground floor of creating the park, including Congressman Phillip Burton, there was more to it. It wasn't called social justice at the time, but the call to action to getting that park legislated was "parks for the people, parks where the people," in some ways contrasting it with Yosemite, which is not where many of the people are living nearby. Phil Burton's interest was driven a lot by believing that everyday people should have access to parks. He wasn't an outdoor person in the least, but he believed in equity and opportunity.

01-01:14:39
Farrell: And then probably, too, where having some green space does make a difference. If you're seeing that in your neighborhood, you're more comfortable with parks and parkland.

01-01:14:50
Moore: That's right.

01-01:14:51
Farrell: Yeah, and then when you were working with Robin and coming up with the designs, and as part of your landscape architecture component of your coursework, were you having to learn about like native grasses or local flora or that kind of thing? What you could grow where and what would be useful to the local ecosystem?

01-01:15:12
Moore: Yeah, definitely. That coursework at the time was given to some degree in landscape architecture, but also the College of Forestry. It was the birth of ecosystem science at that time and all the Clean Air Act and all these major [environmental laws]—such as the National Environmental Policy Act—all these things were happening or about to happen. I took plenty of coursework

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

in California ecology, that was really the focus, and the UC system has [nature] reserves around California that represented California ecology, so we would travel as a class to those different ecosystems.

01-01:16:04
Farrell: Yeah, one thing I was interested in, you're at Cal during the first half of the environmental decade, which is from 1969 to 1980—so eleven years—but we still call it the environmental decade.

01-01:16:17
Moore: We do.

01-01:16:18
Farrell: These laws, all these regulatory laws are being written while you're in college, were those coming up in your class conversations? Or was that sort of happening and then you'd figure it out, it was something that happened later?

01-01:16:34
Moore: No, no, they came up [in classwork]. They came up and depending on the class, they were a focus because within the curriculum was environmental policy and legislation. I even took an environmental law course out of the College of Environmental Design, so that was part of it. Of course, there was Earth Day and other stuff that was happening, so it was newsworthy as well.

01-01:17:01
Farrell: Yeah, I think the first Earth Day happened while you were there.

01-01:17:04
Moore: I think it did, I am pretty sure the first Earth Day was in 1970.

01-01:17:09
Farrell: Yeah, I think it was 1970, I could be wrong. Did you participate in any of the Earth Day activities?

01-01:17:15
Moore: Yeah.

01-01:17:16
Farrell: What was that like for you and what kind of things did you do?

01-01:17:21
Moore: Well, what I liked about [this era was the social and environmental activism]. I participated in the Vietnam War protests as well—so Earth Day was a chance to be gathering for something as opposed to gathering against something. Because in Vietnam, it was gathering to oppose the war, and with Earth Day, it was gathering to create a new agenda for the planet, so it was more celebratory for sure–and I wasn't going to be tear-gassed. [laughs]

01-01:17:58
Farrell: It's a little bit of a safer activity.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:18:01
Moore: Yeah, yeah. [laughter]

01-01:18:03
Farrell: One other professor that you mentioned when we had our pre-interview is Joe McBride, who was your advisor. You mentioned he was a classic environmentalist. What were some of the things that you were learning from him especially as your advisor?

01-01:18:18
Moore: Yeah, what I really liked about Joe is he clearly had his landscape architecture credentials, but he also had his forestry and natural ecosystem credentials. And I even was working with him during my career at Golden Gate National Recreation Area in evaluating the Presidio Forest; he was that renowned in his knowledge [of forest management. At Berkeley, my advisors had to understand, or at least tolerate,] my interest in integrating things. I didn't want to "fit in a box," and the College of Natural Resources was [more supportive of] that as a newer school [that actually promoted inter-disciplinary work]. With this new college, I would've had to create my own interdisciplinary degree, would've been my other path. Joe understood that and respected it and supported my path as opposed to seeing it through the lens of "why can't you be a real landscape architect or a real scientist?" He was a cheerleader for me and an advocate for the work that I wanted to do and clearly an advisor, someone who could help me find my way and have good recommendations for me.

01-01:19:45
Farrell: I do want to talk a little bit about the culture at Cal then and then also some of the things you were doing for fun. You're there during Vietnam, but it's post-Free Speech Movement; what was the culture on campus like when you were there?

01-01:20:06
Moore: Well, it's such a combination of things. Part of the culture was the antiwar movement, right? Part of the culture was an academic culture; it was a prestigious school with a lot of things that you could learn and activities you could enjoy. And part of the culture was actually counterculture—[various movements such as the women's movement; and lifestyles involving] marijuana and psychedelics and big concerts with Janis Joplin and all that. So it a really interesting blend of things, some that were fairly conventional and others that were just different and charting new territory.

01-01:21:02
Farrell: As your politics started to diverge from those that you were brought up with, were there any major turning points? What did the impact of the antiwar movement have on your political beliefs?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:21:24
Moore: Well that, yeah, clearly an impact was the opportunity to be visible and vocal about a belief system and to take a stand. I suppose I could say that existed in Catholicism as well, but in a different kind of way. Even going back to my time in Montgomery where I saw the Civil Rights Movement, it was my chance to be part of something that was working for change. I think that probably introduced me to grassroots activity, to having convictions and making them visible, to even going up against things that you were taught. I don't know what would've happened if I maybe had gone to Notre Dame or a college like that; I'm not sure what my course would've ended up being.

01-01:22:43
Farrell: Yeah, were you having conversations about these kind of things with your parents or with your siblings?

01-01:22:51
Moore: Yes, with my elder brother, of course, because we were near one another. With my siblings, a little bit because they actually came and visited me when my parents let them come stay with me at Berkeley. The whole thing, that was really crazy. With my parents, yes, but I was careful. I didn't want them to feel like they had failed, I didn't want to hurt them, but I wasn't going to change. My grandmother came to visit me of all things. She in her eighties at that point, and she bought beer at the liquor store for me [since I was underage], and she even had to sleep in a mattress on the floor in my apartment. When she got back home—my parents had moved to Seattle at that point—she said to my parents, "Oh, Greg is so patriotic." They said, "What do you mean he's patriotic?" She said, "He's always marching, he was always out marching." [laughs] She completely missed [that I was marching in protest, not in patriotic parades]. [laughs]

01-01:24:06
Farrell: That's funny, her association with patriotism is marching.

01-01:24:11
Moore: Exactly, [laughter] yes, and of all things. My parents had enough to think about just because my hair was halfway down my back, and I had a beard that was very long, and I wore pants with [an American] flag on the back of them. But at that point, I had inherited my dad's Volkswagen convertible, and because I was a military family dependent and because he had officer stickers on his car, I was eligible to shop on the military base. I would go out to Alameda air station to the commissary and the PX in his Volkswagen with my beard and my long hair and the [guards] would have to salute me as I entered the post because I was in an officer's car. [laughs]

01-01:24:59
Farrell: Oh, that's funny.

01-01:25:00
Moore: That really gave me a chuckle.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:25:02
Farrell: Yeah. Did you ever go to the Presidio, to the post?

01-01:25:08
Moore: I did because when my parents came to see me, my mom, she loved a bargain—and military bases were bargains—so we ate at Burger King at the Presidio when it was there. They would go to the Officer's Club, and she would go shopping at Treasure Island at the military base for Alameda [Air Station]. Then they'd buy gas there because it was like five cents cheaper.

01-01:25:37
Farrell: Yeah. Before we move on to a different topic, one thing I did want to ask, because I keep asking you questions about how your politics were diverging, but you had also mentioned the first time that we talked about how your core beliefs were not changing but maybe your pathway was. Can you tell me a little about what the core beliefs you grew up with, what remained, what didn't change?

01-01:26:07
Moore: Yeah, I mean these are conversations that eventually you have with your parents to see if you can find common ground. I can make fun about my Catholic upbringing and the crazy things I had to put up with in Catholic schools, but at the core of things was a belief in kindness, a belief in honesty. There were the Ten Commandments, yeah, they're not perfect, but they're at least something. There were some good core beliefs in terms of the values of compassion and honesty and integrity. As I said, my mom, she was a very values-driven parent, and she wasn't really that devoted a Catholic actually. She was perhaps a Catholic more out of upbringing and duty than a core belief in the whole system. She made us understand that just because we could perform academically in school that we were no better than anybody else. She really taught humility, she taught looking out for the kid that's the underdog or that's not being treated fairly. She's taught us to do your best, and she taught honesty. Now those were really clear things.

01-01:27:50
With my dad, we grew up with General MacArthur's values of "duty, honor, country," and so he believed in public service. In his case, it was in patriotic wrapping, but it still was a form of public service and certain military principles are similar—you stand by your team. I think in all of that, I tried to communicate with him, and I think my dad said that he eventually got it, when I said, "Look, my career is really similar to yours. Like you, I began in the government sector serving my country, not in a war, but in something else very meaningful to the American people." Yeah, so I don't really regret any of those influences.

01-01:28:52
Farrell: Thank you for sharing all that. I just wanted to make sure that we acknowledged that because I kept asking you questions about the changing elements of things, but I think those core values are really important, and I

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

think they're also something that unite people across whatever politics they have.

01-01:29:09
Moore: Yes–and because of that example when our son was born, I had learned to believe in the power of three. I had three things I wanted for him and like I just stuck with them. I didn't communicate them to him; that wasn't the point. The point was to remind myself as a parent how I could help my child be a good person [and a happy person], essentially.

01-01:29:39
Farrell: What were those three things?

01-01:29:43
Moore: They [came from my own life experience]. The first thing was confidence because it took me a long time to have confidence in myself. I was the person who would be very quiet in class and then someone would say like, "Why didn't tell me that you could do that?" I ended up in places that I didn't anticipate, it wasn't a plan—I just ended up there—and I think it was a little bit of a lack of confidence and so I wanted that for my son. The second thing I learned—these are all my own reflections—is that getting through life is easier if you have a sense of humor. That when times are fun, when times are tough, when things get tense, when you're stressed, that a sense of humor can be a gift to yourself and others, and the third was kindness. Eventually, when my son was twenty-one, he asked about my parenting, and I revealed these things to him. [Of course, I also had to acknowledge that I was not a perfect parent, but always a loving dad.]

01-01:31:07
Farrell: Well, yeah, I like that, I like the power of three idea, and I'm sure that we will revisit that theme in our later interviews, too. We've talked about some serious topics, but I'm also wondering while you were at Cal, some of the things you did for fun. I know when you were a kid, you went to Yosemite, but you also went in college with some friends and that was formative. Can you tell me a little bit more about that experience?

01-01:31:35
Moore: Yeah, sure. Well, the one experience that I remember the most vividly—once I began doing that, it became a regular part of my life—was my first visit back to Yosemite since my visit as a child. I went with a small group of about six friends. I think it was possibly my first backpacking trip, it probably was, and we went through the Yosemite backcountry near Tuolumne Meadows on about a four-day trip. I just loved it and I loved everything about it. I loved the companionship of my friends. I loved the beauty of the environment. I loved the time to reflect, sit on a rock. So that experience just became something that I did: to go hiking, go backpacking, to get outdoors. That was a regular part of my recreational life. There was also concert going of course. Music was a big thing, and there was an incredibly vibrant musical scene in San

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Francisco at that time. What else? I loved to read; I always did that. And somehow managed to—not in my dorm room, but once I rented an apartment—I bought a piano. Talk about the most ridiculous instrument to have when you're moving. Piano was not the best choice, but somehow, I managed to keep that in my life.

01-01:33:20
Farrell: That's great. Do you remember some of the bands you saw play or even some of the books you were reading at that point?

01-01:33:28
Moore: Yeah, well the bands, I saw the Grateful Dead, Janis Joplin, Jefferson Airplane. Those are a few just amazing. And then books, let's see. I took a course in existential literature at Berkeley so that introduced me to a whole range of people from Kierkegaard to Camus and others, and that was super illuminating. But then also Ken Kesey's books, *Sometimes a Great Notion*, *One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest.* There would be much more if I looked at my bookshelf; I've probably got some of them up there. These were more academic, but there was a like a breakthrough book called *Design with Nature* by Ian McHarg. There were a number of environmental books that were first-timers like *The Population Bomb,* just a whole host of them that were part of what I was learning.

01-01:34:38
Farrell: Towards the end of your college career, what were some of your career aspirations?

01-01:34:51
Moore: Well, I knew I wanted a professional position in the environmental field, and actually if I allowed myself to be really specific, I wanted to work with the National Park Service. And it happened. [laughs]

01-01:35:12
Farrell: Good goal setting.

01-01:35:13
Moore: Yeah, yeah.

01-01:35:14
Farrell: Effective.

01-01:35:14
Moore: I'm still kind of surprised but it did.

01-01:35:18
Farrell: I do want to ask you a couple of reflective question before we wrap up but how do you feel like this period of your life shaped you?

01-01:35:29
Moore: The period at Berkeley or—?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:35:31
Farrell: Or any of what we discussed today.

01-01:35:35
Moore: Oh wow, well, this interview started from when I was born until college.

01-01:35:39
Farrell: I know it's a long period of time, but I want to leave it open for you to be able to take the question however you want to.

01-01:35:45
Moore: Well, let me see how I might pull that apart. I think the fact that we moved around a lot taught me adaptability and resilience. It made me realize that I had to have the wherewithal and the confidence to meet new people and to learn new things and to exist in different environments. With my family upbringing, it's what we've talked about, just the middle child, but not only the positive parts about that, but the difficult parts. In my case, and I didn't get into it the detail, but my mom's relationship with her mother was a really dramatic part of our family life, and either I was drawn into it, or I gravitated to it as a problem solver and peace maker. The exposure to the outdoors and then finally Berkeley pulled it all together between my longtime interest in building things and my interest in creativity and innovation.

01-01:37:07
In high school, I won a bunch of leadership awards and so that gave me the sense that maybe I could be in charge of something. But I usually thought leadership would get in the way of creativity. That if I had the responsibility of leading other people, it would take time away from my own creative impulses, and I learned that was not necessarily the case. And just the era I was in with Earth Day and the Vietnam War and all that stuff, but again Earth Day, going all the way back to my discovery of a forest in Washington, DC, and the Vietnam War going back to my introduction to the Civil Rights Movement, it all seems to in some weird way tied together. The things I was introduced to as a child got confirmed as a young adult. That's a bit rambling.

01-01:38:06
Farrell: No, that's great, that's great. What are some of the things that you're most proud of from your time at Cal?

01-01:38:19
Moore: One thing is that it was a big school, and I made it work on my terms. I could've stuck with the architecture school, that's what I intended to do, but I just found a way to take advantage of it in a manner that really worked for me and set my life on a better path for me than if I had pursued and worked in architecture practice. It gave me many more opportunities to follow my passions. Secondly, I think I was able to find in this big school with the thousands of people who could be your mentors or your colleagues, both friends and teachers that were influential in my development. Actually, people who saw my creative spirit and supported it even if it didn't fit with the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

cookie-cutter way. Finally, some of my deepest relationships are from Berkeley. They're not a lot, but there some that are lifelong including that I met my wife at Berkeley in the Conservation Natural Resources program. We were friends, but we weren't romantically involved really until after college. She got had hired by the National Park Service, too. She was a park ranger, I was a park ranger; she was an environmental planner, so was I, so kind of crazy. We have two ranger uniforms tucked away in our closets. [laughs]

01-01:40:17
Farrell: Yeah, we'll definitely talk about that next time, but that's a great kind of seed for the next one. Is there anything else about this period of your life that you want to add that we didn't talk about?

01-01:40:33
Moore: The only other piece and I don't know whether it adds anything new, it's just a chapter that occurred. When I was at Berkeley, I mentioned to you that my dad had lost his job. Well, he got a job offer at Boeing in Seattle, so my parents moved with my younger brother and sister from Southern California to Seattle, which my mom hated because it meant rain, but my dad really didn't have a choice. But it introduced me to the Northwest, which was really wonderful. I loved visiting them up there and exploring the national parks of the northwest. The northwest also gave my younger brother and sister a really great upbringing that was I think good for them at the time and different than if they stayed in Southern California. And my wife actually is a dual citizen, Canadian and American, but she was born in Canada but grew up mostly in Seattle. When we got married, both of our parents lived in the Seattle area, and that's why I went to the University of Washington for graduate school and lived in Seattle.

01-01:41:50
Farrell: Great, okay, that's great. We'll talk about more of that all next time. I think that's a great place to leave it.

01-01:41:55
Moore: Yeah.

01-01:41:56
Farrell: Yeah, that's great. Well, thank you so much, Greg. This was a really fantastic discussion and I really appreciate all of your thoroughness in answering all the questions. Thank you so much, I really appreciate it.

01-01:42:11
Moore: Well, thank you for making it so easy. I feel embarrassed by the self-absorption of it all but—

01-01:42:19
Farrell: That's the point of these.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

01-01:42:21
Moore: I guess that's the purpose. I find myself wanting to now have like an hour and a half with you learning all about your [laughter] upbringing and everything else.

01-01:42:32
Farrell: I understand the impulse; that's why I like asking the questions, so but I appreciate it.

01-01:42:35
Moore: You, too.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Interview 2: February 3, 2022

02-00:00:06
Farrell: Okay, this is Shanna Farrell back with Greg Moore on Thursday, February 3, 2022. This is our second interview, and we are talking over Zoom. Greg, welcome back.

02-00:00:18
Moore: Glad to be back, Shanna.

02-00:00:21
Farrell: We left off talking about your college and your education, and I wanted to start today by talking a little bit about your early career. After you graduated, you started working for the National Park Service as a landscape architect, environmental planner, and park ranger. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about your interest in working for the Park Service and what application process was like for you?

02-00:00:54
Moore: Sure. I mentioned in the earlier interview my visit to Yosemite and how transformative that was in my early awareness of our national parks and that they were an American system of special places. Coming out of Berkeley, I was very focused on that, being where I had hoped I could begin my career, not knowing much about the process. But I had a little bit of a leg up because in my final year at Berkeley, I was an intern at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area when they set up their very first office and hired their first superintendent and had a staff of about eight people. That put me in contact with national park people that were here at the inception of this new kind of national park in an urban setting. They were beginning to set up a planning team to determine what this park should be, how you take a park that's legislated on paper and make it a park for the people.

02-00:02:09
I was really intrigued by that work, and when working on it, I began developing and figuring out how to apply to the National Park System for work. And because I was an environmental planner and because the National Park Service Denver Service Center was where environmental planners and landscape architects were hired, that was the logical place for me to put in a job application. The application was complicated. I was new to the civil service system, so I had to take various tests in terms of proving my credentials. And eventually I was contacted by the person who was the director of the team for [planning and design in western] national parks. The Service Center divided its planning and construction activities into regional teams. And, my gosh, the Service Center hired me with this ridiculously long title, "environmental planner/landscape architect/park ranger." They hired me in a category called "intake," which was a funny word, but intake was a term to indicate that they wanted you to hang around in the organization [and that they saw professional promise in you]. They would provide you money for

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

training and career development and then as long as you pass certain thresholds, your career would advance in a timely way by calendar.

02-00:03:45

In government, the salary levels are called GS and so I said was a GS-5/7/9, meaning I'd go from [level] five, to seven, to nine–provided I did my work effectively, of course. So that's how it will began. When offered the job, I stated my preference to remain in San Francisco, which I thought was just something I could do. At the time, it was unheard of to request something like that. [laughs] They were very reticent, but luckily for me, the folks at Golden Gate went to bat on my behalf. They said, "We'd like Greg to stay in San Francisco." Golden Gate was about to create its first plan, Point Reyes was about to create its plan, and they wanted me to be part of that mix. I don't know if anyone had ever done it before as far as I know, but I stayed in the Bay Area and then was given a number of other park assignments in the West Coast and one in East Coast.

02-00:04:53

Farrell: Before we talk a little bit more about your assignments, I've got a couple more questions. When you were an intern at the beginning of that GGNRA, can you tell me a little bit about—because I don't know if we talked about that—can you tell me a little bit about your experience doing that and what your proximity to some of the planning was in those early stages?

02-00:05:19

Moore: Yeah, just to set the context, which I think you've already understood, I was coming right out of Berkeley in the early 1970s. It was Earth Day, important environmental legislation, National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act –everything was happening in terms of the beginning of the environmental movement. I arrived at Golden Gate at an agency, the National Park Service, which was, by and large, a conservative agency. They almost ran like a military system, and having grown up in a military family, I got it, but I had hair halfway down my back and looked like your standard Berkeley student at the time. But I had come out of Berkeley—and we talked about this earlier—with a strong conviction about how planning should occur, what it meant to engage the beneficiaries of your planning in the design of the overall end product, how that could happen, what it meant to develop public open space, so it wasn't just for the rich and wealthy, but for everyone. At the time, the Park Service was rather unaccustomed to urban settings and to this new environmental way of thinking. Fortunately for me, they were able to see me as bringing something new and important rather than someone that they felt was not representing their institutional culture or was unaware of their institutional culture. They did hire other people from the Bay Area as part of other re-planning team, which brought that kind of ethos to the whole effort as well. The first superintendent of the park was one of the more progressive National Park Service superintendents and hadn't risen up through the standard ranger

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

ranks, because usually superintendents came up as park rangers through the law enforcement track and not through a public policy or planning track at all.

02-00:07:34
Farrell: It also sounds like at this period of time, there's a lot of reconceptualizing what these things mean, and at the beginning of the organization, it's something that's just getting started, a real opportunity to set the foundation up for the future. Is that what you were experiencing or was it something different?

02-00:07:56
Moore: In this limited bubble at Golden Gate, the National Park Service team there was very contemporary in their thinking given the full organization. They were brought into that park because they had that way of thinking and also brought into that park because not many National Park Service people wanted to live and work in an urban area. [Many Park Service staff considered a] new urban park as "less than" a "real" national park. There was a bias about it even whether Golden Gate was even worthy of being in the same system as Yosemite or Yellowstone. For many, it was not considered a good assignment, but for people who were innovators and liked doing things new ways, that weren't totally loyal to how things have been done in the past, it was an opportunity.

02-00:08:56
Farrell: That makes sense. How long were you interning for?

02-00:09:03
Moore: It was the last two academic quarters of my time at Berkeley, so I think that would be about six months. That would be my guess.

02-00:09:13
Farrell: Okay, that makes sense. After you graduated, did you move to San Francisco or were you still living in the East Bay?

02-00:09:21
Moore: Initially, I was living in the East Bay and then eventually through a colleague I met at Golden Gate who is still one of my dearest friends–in fact she attended my birthday party the other day. She through a friend, found an apartment in North Beach on Russian Hill that we rented for the great price of $175 a month, so you can tell it was a long, long time ago.

02-00:09:52
Farrell: Oh, I see.

02-00:09:52
Moore: Which put me within walking distance of Fort Mason and also within walking distance—the Park Service had a regional office in San Francisco and so I could work in between the regional office and the park office. I could walk to either and then I could fly to Denver or fly to whatever park assignment that I was taking on.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:10:16
Farrell: Okay. Knowing that civil service tests are quite involved—and correct me if I'm wrong—but my understanding of this is that you take the test and then you're put on a list and then you get a call if you're selected to be interviewed off the list. How long did that period take from when you got onto the list? Do you remember what the time period was between getting on the list and then getting the call?

02-00:10:46
Moore: Not exactly. I do remember I was initially on a temporary appointment. I just remembered my first hire was a temporary and they wanted me permanent, but the civil service system works its own way and on its own pace. The challenge for me becoming permanent at the time was through the general civil service test. There were so many Vietnam veterans returning, and the veterans' preference was part of the civil service equation that on standard test, there would be ten vets ahead of me because they were given preference, and the qualifications for a veteran were more open than the qualifications for someone like me. But eventually, I found out there was a specific federal certification for landscape architecture, and once I found that out, once I took the relevant test to get on that certification, there weren't many veterans who were trained as landscape architects and that put me in reach of a selection.

02-00:12:00
Farrell: Okay, got you. When you were working as a landscape architect, environmental planner, and park ranger, what were some of your roles in that position, some of the things you were responsible for?

02-00:12:14
Moore: My main role given all those titles—the park ranger title came somewhat because of that intake program that I mentioned and the possibility that I might rise up in responsibility in the system and move into the management ranks. But really the bulk of my job was environmental planning and landscape architecture. I was put on a variety of different planning assignments throughout the system. At Golden Gate [and Point Reyes, my work was a] planning assignment [for the overall "master plan" for the park]—and also at Yosemite which came later—it was a planning assignment [with an emphasis on public involvement]. You almost had to be somewhat of a communications professional because so much of the work was building partnerships, meeting with constituents, meeting with elected officials, interacting with the public about what they wanted their national park to be. Communications was a big part, and I liked that, that was fun for me. I was a competent and creative writer, and I found people who actually felt that was an asset.

02-00:13:29
Farrell: Did you have someone giving you guidance in terms of communication or building relationship with community partners or talking to elected officials? Somebody who's guiding you into how to do these things?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:13:44
Moore: I did, I had a number of people. The one I mentioned is my good friend Judy Walsh. Judy joined the early Golden Gate staff in a somewhat unconventional way. She was a political staffer in Congress and then for, Mayor Alioto [of San Francisco]. She knew the political realm very well and became the first [National Park Service] public information officer at Golden Gate [National Recreation Area], so I learned tons from her with that background. [I also worked directly with a dear friend from college, Rolf Diamant, who was also pursuing a National Park Service career and had joined the Golden Gate planning team with me. Our common vision, values, teamwork, friendship and humor made such a profound and positive difference in this early part of my career. Rolf was a constant colleague and dear friend throughout my life and career, which we each devoted to national parks. Even after Rolf left Golden Gate, we collaborated on so many things.] In terms of the planning and design work, not only was my boss at the Denver [Service Center] pretty interesting and curious and a learning individual, but he also had a lot of experience to impart to me. I had two bosses at Golden Gate, [Ron Treabess and Doug Nadeau], who also brought the same interest in doing things a different way combined with their substantive experience of having been with the Park Service for at least a decade each. They gave me tons of running room, which was like "just go do what you do." They saw that I had something new I was bringing to the table, and they embraced it. I think because I was young, they thought it was, "Wow, this guy is young, and he's bringing all these ideas and has the creativity and confidence to put them forward." They were terrific, really, really amazing [in helping shape my young career].

02-00:15:33
Farrell: Can you tell me a little bit more about that, how you were bringing something new to the table, what that looked like?

02-00:15:43
Moore: Mainly, it was about how to get out of the very rigorous and formulaic planning process that the Park Service had developed after all these years, which was formal, agency centric, and full of documents that were long-winded that no one could ever understand. Actually, I think to some degree, with the fundamental bias that the National Park Service knew best what national parks should be. They, after all, were the ones taking care of the parks, they have the training and expertise, and, yes, you had to engage the public, but it was like a necessary evil almost. The National Environmental Policy Act, which is part of the reason I was hired and so many new people were hired, this law actually required public involvement and planning for all federal agencies, required environmental assessments and environmental impact statements, had requirements for public input and review and approval, and the agencies weren't accustomed [to this level of public engagement and transparency]. It hadn't been a legal imperative before. Even if they didn't like it, they had to do it, it was legally required. If they did it poorly, they could end up at court. Someone could file a lawsuit. Oh, and it required the consideration of planning alternatives and assessing impacts. Yeah, it was

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

different. I think because I knew the law, because I wasn't wedded to how things were done but was interested in how things could be done, that made the difference.

02-00:17:42

Farrell: What were some of the assignments that you were working on? You had mentioned Golden Gate, Yosemite, there was one on the East Coast.

02-00:17:51

Moore: In terms of my time, the Golden Gate plan and the Point Reyes National Seashore plan were done as a combined planning effort because the parks were adjacent to one another. That took a lot of my effort because it was a brand-new park in the middle of an urban setting with lots of people who cared, lots of people had opinions, and lots of opportunity and even conflict to work through. Then the other planning projects I was assigned to were often completely different from Golden Gate. For example, I worked on the plan for Crater Lake [National Park in Oregon]. Here's a park that's only open like four or five months of the year and so the need for public involvement up there was pretty limited; it was still required by the National Environmental Policy Act. But I worked on that park for maybe a year or so, getting its overall plan in order. Then I was put on the Yosemite National Park planning team, that was a big effort because the prior planning effort had ended in a meltdown. That plan never got over the finish line, [to some degree because it was done in the old way without adequate public involvement. The proposed plan] was highly controversial and it was eventually tossed out. The Park Service had to wait a while before it could even reinitiate that effort. But because of my work at Golden Gate had shown a new way of doing things, the person in charge of the planning team asked that I be put in that team because of that experience.

02-00:19:39

[That person, John Reynolds, became a very important mentor and friend in my life. He was a landscape architect and believed in my potential in working on significant and complicated planning assignments. He invited me to join] the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area planning team at the very beginning of this national park. Again, because of my urban park experience, they put me on that team at the beginning to help get it up and going. Then, in the northeast region of the National Park Service, which is in Boston, [the Chief Planner] there who I had worked with in my Denver Service Center had an interest in me taking a planning position in his region. So to give me a taste of what it might be like to live and work in Boston, he gave me an assignment to work on the Nantucket Island feasibility study for a national park. That was a terrific assignment. The island is an incredibly beautiful place, really interesting politics. In the end, the locals decided that they did not want federal involvement in that park [and their conservation efforts], which made sense, since they already had plenty of conservation controls. But I decided not to pursue the professional opportunity in Boston.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:20:58
Farrell: Yeah, I was going to say I've been to Nantucket a few times, and I don't remember a national park there so it's interesting that was part of the conversation a while ago.

02-00:21:06
Moore: Yeah, I mean it was not just Nantucket because there's a whole set of islands—I think they're called the Elizabeth Islands—that are adjacent, which are pretty pristine. I wasn't that far into that project when I was thinking that this is probably not going to be a new national park site. But I think Senator Kennedy's office actually put the [request for the feasibility study]—senators can ask the Park Service—members of Congress can ask the Park Service to do feasibility studies for national park status, and I think that's where that came from.

02-00:21:40
Farrell: Yeah. I went to college and Boston, so it's interesting—

02-00:21:46
Moore: Oh yeah, there you go.

02-00:21:47
Farrell: —being a bit familiar with some of the regional politics there, especially this is at the time when public input is part of the process. I could see those things going hand-in-hand and specific politics in one area on an island that is still pretty pristine. Nantucket is not overrun with the public input, so was that one of the reasons that the park didn't go through because of the public input period?

02-00:22:22
Moore: Yeah. Absolutely. There probably are some times when you can get a national park established [with public support], and sure there are times when local communities may object. But in that environment where the local community is so small, [you have to be thoughtful of their perspective] and to some degree, the benefit of that planning assignment is that it was requested by a State Senator. When an assignment is requested by the senator of the state, you have to do it in a way that responds to the senator's request, but not really inadvertently upsetting or angering people along the way. You want to keep the senator's constituents happy with the process and believing that they can honestly give you their viewpoint.

02-00:23:22
Farrell: Yeah, because I feel like this is something that will come up later because you did work with elected officials. How did you learn how to dance that dance?

02-00:23:37
Moore: Oh, I've had some good mentors, which we'll probably get to later. But part of it was there are simple things in human nature, like to listen before you speak and to try to understand what are the motivations of the person that you're interacting with, what's their personal style, and what would they consider

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

success. Many times, with my experience with elected officials, I had to bring things that I was proposing that they could help me with, but from the standpoint of why it was valuable to them and then why it was valuable to the country and why they, if they chose to, could be a leader in making something happen. In fact, a lifelong supporter of our national parks was the Republican Congressman Ralph Regula from Ohio; one of proudest accomplishment was his role in the conversion of the Presidio and Fort Baker to national park sites. He would call me every year and see how it was going. It was a different era, of course, but to consider that he would think of the National Park System and actually be proud of his legacy with national parks in Nancy Pelosi's Congressional district was amazing.

02-00:25:06
Farrell: And I think emblematic that the times were different.

02-00:25:08
Moore: Exactly, that would not happen now.

02-00:25:12
Farrell: Before, you had mentioned that there was a little bit of a bias in the National Park Service with parks in an urban setting. Because you have had experience working with parks in urban areas, you were put on some of those assignments like in Santa Monica. What were some of the unique challenges that urban parks were facing during the planning process that were different from something like Yosemite?

02-00:25:44
Moore: The challenges mainly were about just the complexity of the urban interface. With the national parks in an urban setting, yes, they can be places that people go to see from around the world, and Golden Gate certainly is such a place. People come to see the Golden Gate Bridge and the beauty of the Marin Headlands and Muir Woods, but they're also day-to-day parks for people that live nearby or within the region. There's a whole different relationship people have if they're hiking once a week or walking their dog on a beach daily or looking at the parks out their window. That just entails a more complex set of opinions, potentially more conflict between federal standards and sometimes the rigidity of federal standards with people believing that local control is important, finding a balance between knowing that an urban park belongs to everyone in America, but if you can keep people nearby happy and content with it, that's not going to work. It was just a lot more balancing I would say.

02-00:27:05
Farrell: Yeah, I'm curious about how you keep people who live nearby and might use the urban parks on a daily basis, how do you keep them happy? How do you balance that with tourists and their interests and the Park Service with federal oversight?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:27:27
Moore: Yeah, you try to get to the bigger picture and to help local people understand that although, yes, the parks will be at some level be shared with others, it's far better that it is a park and protected and giving them the daily benefits that it is than not being protected at all. And to remind them that federal dollars, like every single American paying taxes across the country, are helping bring the funds to take care of a place that they get to use every day. Those messages have to be delivered delicately, so they're not considered a lecture or politically motivated. Also building pride in the care and stewardship of the place, giving people opportunities to be volunteers, to be the part of making something better or caring for it over the long term. Ultimately—Muir Woods was an example and then that can come later—you need to help solve community problems, like when the visitor traffic gets too overwhelming for local neighborhoods, by being open to figure out if and how they can be solved.

02-00:28:49
Farrell: Yeah, that's a good example, we'll definitely talk about that later. We talked about how at that point, a lot of this was pretty formal, was agency-centric, but I am curious about the culture of the National Park Service at the time. What was the work culture like at that period of time?

02-00:29:18
Moore: Yeah, I have a number of insights into that because my wife was working for the National Park Service at the same time, so how her career evolved as a woman as opposed to my career as a man, that tells a story in itself. But the agency clearly was very male-dominated, all the positions and authority and power were with men. Even in ranger ranks, very few women were park rangers, that was just beginning to happen. Like me, my wife was hired by the Denver Service Center, and I think she may have been one of the first woman planners ever hired by the Denver Service Center. She had to face issues in her career that I did not, and she eventually left the National Park Service because she found it just too patriarchal, I guess would be the word. The culture was very hierarchical, it revered tradition, it revered certain experience such as the frontline ranger experience and a certain pathway for working your way up. It was politically capable but a little bit stodgy and somewhat in a time warp. I mean that transition into the 1970s from all the influences of the 1960s was probably an impact everywhere in society and professional life, I would think. A lot of corporations, businesses, and government agencies, and nonprofits had to update their way of thinking. I can only look back at this now and see it, part of the reason I was reluctant to go to Denver is I was with people that were giving me creative opportunity in San Francisco, and I wasn't at all sure that if I went elsewhere, I would be given that same opportunity. In fact, I was somewhat convinced that it wouldn't happen.

02-00:31:43
Farrell: Yeah, that's really interesting. Are you comfortable sharing maybe an example of how your wife's career and your career trajectories differed and maybe

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

some of the obstacles she dealt with? It's okay if you're not comfortable with that; that's totally fine.

02-00:32:03

Moore: No, I'm okay. There are a few that are tangible and so crazy to think that they existed. Obviously if you work at the National Park Service and you work for the Denver Service Center, to do your work you need to travel. You have to get to the national parks. The agency was very reluctant of putting my wife in a travel assignment because they had all these crazy ideas of what might happen if she travelled alone, what might happen if she traveled with someone who was married, what might happen if she travelled with someone that was unmarried. She found herself not getting to do her work in the way that men could because of this prejudice about women and what might happen if they travelled to their assignments.

02-00:32:56

The other thing was I was able to get into the National Park Service as a landscape architect, and she was not—she did not have the landscape architecture training, she had the natural resources training. She had worked her way through college as a typist and they tried to convince her that her only way to advance in the Park Service was for her to become a clerk typist because she could qualify as a typist and then eventually try to work her way back into a professional career of her training and experience after already having a temporary professional job in that arena, In essence, she would need to go backward to move forward. And then just classic sexual harassment, things that would not be tolerated in the workplace today. In an office environment that was almost completely men, so there were very few people she could turn to, no HR department that she could really go to. She did work, she did really good work, despite those obstacles. She still found her work fulfilling and got things done. But eventually when she couldn't land a permanent assignment and the agency couldn't figure out how to support her—ironically, you'd think that they would have been supporting a female professional coming in through the ranks—but they couldn't figure that out, and she was hired by the regional planning organization, ABAG, and went there in a professional capacity as a regional planner.

02-00:34:36

Farrell: How long did she last at the National Park Service? How many years did she work there for?

02-00:34:42

Moore: Well, I'm thinking it's somewhere between three to five years, something like that.

02-00:34:47

Farrell: Okay. Can you tell me how you met—her name is Nancy, we should also say—your wife Nancy?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:34:53
Moore: Yes, her name is Nancy, and her full name is Nancy Peterson. Even though we're married, she kept her original name. We met in Berkeley in a common friend group, and so we were friends before we became involved as a couple. That happened, and it was beginning to happen around my senior year at Berkeley. In that era, nobody really thought about getting married right away, and we didn't either, so we got married in 1981.

02-00:35:40
Farrell: Did you have classes with her at all, because it sounds like there were some overlap there?

02-00:35:50
Moore: I don't know if we ever had a class together, but I met her through a common friend, I think, at the dormitories in Berkeley before I had moved out of the dorms and into my own apartment. As I said, we were just in a common friend group. What solidified our friendship and then later moved us into a relationship beyond friendship was she was in the Conservation of Natural Resources department at Berkeley, which was a brand-new department at the time; she was maybe in its first graduating class. I had been in landscape architecture, but when I learned about Conservation of Natural Resources program and degree, I gravitated that direction and got my degree in natural resource conservation with a minor in landscape architecture.

02-00:36:47
Farrell: Okay, thank you for sharing all of that and a little bit about her experience, too. I think that is a good example of how things were at the Park Service then. And I'm also wondering about the racial demographics of people who work there. Was it mostly people who were white who were in those positions?

02-00:37:07
Moore: Yeah, very much so. On the Golden Gate staff—this is the park staff, not the planning staff—that staff became more diverse because of the local hiring ability. I think it was more just the diversity of the hiring pool more, rather than intentionality at that time.

02-00:37:32
Farrell: Okay, so you were seeing a difference based on the region?

02-00:37:37
Moore: Yeah.

02-00:37:38
Farrell: Okay, that's interesting.

02-00:37:40
Moore: At that point, I don't believe there was a conscious effort to create a diverse staff. It was just, "Okay, well, this person has the talent for that job."

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:37:50
Farrell: Did you start to see any of that change whether it was intentionality around hiring or being more supportive of women in their careers during your period there? You worked for the National Park Service for quite a few years, and I'm wondering if you saw that evolve or change over time?

02-00:38:08
Moore: I did see a change. Yes, I did, not at this transformative pace, but with time, particularly in some of the professional fields—in the planning field—it changed maybe more rapidly than in other fields. I think with park superintendents, that took a while longer. It's commonplace now and there have been of women serving as the Director of the National Park Service, but that took a while too.

02-00:38:45
Farrell: This is also in the '70s too, so this before the women's movement and things like that in the '80s.

02-00:38:52
Moore: Mm-hmm.

02-00:38:54
Farrell: I'm also curious a little bit about the leadership that you had, whether that's in Denver—I know you were in San Francisco—but where the job was based, whether it's the leadership there or with some of the assignments you had and whether that's at Point Reyes or elsewhere. If you could tell me a little bit about some of the leadership styles you saw, what you learned from them, if there was anyone that—I know you mentioned a couple of people—but if there was any supervisors or anyone who were formative for you?

02-00:39:35
Moore: Sure, a number. One of the individuals that I think you interviewed or maybe we were planning to interview was John Reynolds. Have you talked to him yet?

02-00:39:46
Farrell: I'm having a hard time getting in touch with him, but he's on the list, yeah.

02-00:39:49
Moore: Yeah, well, John was at the very beginnings of my career both in the Denver Service Center and then later on the Yosemite planning team. He again was a curious, foresighted individual, with tons of experience. At the time that I had met him, he was probably ten years ahead of me in his career and really was a lifelong mentor to me just starting very early and then through a whole set of circumstances, which I hadn't anticipated. He eventually was put on the board of the Presidio Trust, so he became full circle from the beginning of my career and actually about at the close of my career. In all that, he also worked with my wife Nancy when she was in the Park Service, so we're lifelong friends. I think for the most part, it was having someone—because I was doing things in different ways, against conventional ways of doing things—it was important

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

for me to have someone who was willing to embrace that [entrepreneurial spirit] and be part of that. [As a National Park Service leader, he valued the national parks in urban settings for their ability to innovate and for trying new ways of achieving success. He admired and appreciated the advances being made in many arenas whether conservation, partnerships, philanthropy or community engagement. Coming from a very well-respected National Park Service leader, that support meant a lot.]

02-00:41:20
Farrell: Is there anyone else that you wanted to highlight from that period of time?

02-00:41:27
Moore: The superintendent of Golden Gate whose name was William Whalen, he was very good, politically savvy; he really understood. The park had a formal advisory commission. Congressman Phil Burton considered it his park. Phil Burton was powerful in Congress at the time, and Bill Whalen had to navigate that political world. He had really good sensibilities of how to do that because your political world in an urban park is city, a regional, state, and federal. I mean you're interacting with elected officials up and down the chain of government, and you're interacting with stakeholder groups from the Sierra Club to whatever the opposite of that would be. [laughter]

02-00:42:29
Farrell: I guess a development company.

02-00:42:32
Moore: Yeah, exactly.

02-00:42:33
Farrell: Yeah?

02-00:42:33
Moore: Yeah, yeah.

02-00:42:35
Farrell: I'm also curious what it was like for you to commute? To fly to Denver every once in a while, to travel to Nantucket or to Boston, to different parts of the state. What it was like, what that experience was like for you to travel?

02-00:42:57
Moore: Well, I love traveling, so it was never a hardship. The only part of my devotion of Golden Gate that has not really been a downside, but by being so devoted to one park throughout my life, there were opportunities see a lot of America's national parks that I didn't take advantage of because my career could've gone a very different way even traveling around the system and living and working in national parks. The early travel, I liked it. It was a new opportunity to get involved with a different place, new problems to solve, new people to meet, and I embraced it; it was good for me.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:43:45
Farrell: Was it helpful for you to see how styles are or workplace culture or even solutions to some of these planning issues, how they were being handled differently in different parts of the country across the agency?

02-00:44:02
Moore: Yeah, very helpful, and I continue to work on it today actually. I have another meeting later today trying to the work with the National Park Service at the federal level to solve various policy impediments to innovation and success. I did learn the National Park Service kind of inside and out as an organization, both its most innovative side and its most conservative leanings, and I'm not saying that in a political way, just how to be effective within that system and how to draw people out and gain their trust and move ahead.

02-00:44:54
Farrell: From there, you moved up into being an interpretive specialist and chief of interpretation starting in 1979. Can you tell me a little bit about how that came about and what it was like for you to move into that position?

02-00:45:13
Moore: Yeah, eventually, I had to make a choice because the Denver Service Center had been lenient with me and my arrangement. Eventually my career was advancing and I either had to commit to a career that brought me to Denver or moved me around the system or if I wanted to stay in the Bay Area, find a way to do that. At that point, Nancy and I were a dual working couple. At the time, the Park Service had limited concept of what that meant. They do now, they actually pay attention to that and help move professional couples jointly that both work for the Park Service around the country. But at that point, if Nancy's career was here and mine was elsewhere, we had to come with grips with that. I was deeply in love with Golden Gate as a park and the people that I worked with there, so I made, really an unconventional, move from planning work into interpretive work, which really was about communications and telling the park story essentially and getting people engaged in the park story. I was open to that move and people worked hard to make that move happen for me because it was not conventional. The people in Denver were not really happy with it. Again, there were various civil service hurdles that had to be worked through.

02-00:46:51
Farrell: How long did that process take?

02-00:46:55
Moore: Probably six months or so.

02-00:46:58
Farrell: Okay. During that six-month period, was there some uncertainty about whether you would stay here, or if this would work out and you would be able to stay or if you'd have to go?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:47:08
Moore: There was uncertainty whether it would work out, and it if it hadn't worked out, I'm not sure whether—I never had to face what Nancy and I would've decided, well, for example, I continue with the Park Service and Nancy would move with you. But for Nancy, the prospect wasn't a good one because there still weren't great opportunities for women in the National Park Service. If I got moved to Yosemite National Park, there was no way she was going to find a job there or Alaska or elsewhere, maybe at the Denver Service Center that would've been possible, but that career path was unclear to me. My career was motivated by opportunity and creativity, so I didn't view myself as someone who necessarily wanted to go up the ranks and had high ambition for leadership or responsibility. I just wanted to do things that I thought took advantage of my talents and I could get the job done.

02-00:48:14
Farrell: Yeah, that makes sense. After that, did your relationship with the Denver office change at all since they weren't happy?

02-00:48:21
Moore: No, I mean it was fine.

02-00:48:23
Farrell: Okay, okay.

02-00:48:24
Moore: We were just working our way through something that was kind of sticky, and once we got our way through that, that was over, and actually the new job didn't really require me to work with the Denver Service Center much at all. I don't think it would've been a problem, but then it didn't require that.

02-00:48:39
Farrell: Okay. Yeah, and it's also interesting because you were doing that for, let's see, five years. It's also interesting, I'm thinking about the culture of—especially governmental positions or if they're state or federal, people have a tendency to stay in the same positions for their entire careers.

02-00:49:01
Moore: Right.

02-00:49:01
Farrell: And now there's much more movement, I think.

02-00:49:04
Moore: Sure.

02-00:49:04
Farrell: But at that period of time, people stayed for a long time, so five years for some people is a really long time, but it's interesting that there was some friction around moving into a different position after five years.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:49:21
Moore: Yeah.

02-00:49:22
Farrell: I don't think there's a question in any of that.

02-00:49:24
Moore: I think what helped me a bit is that I did have a good reputation, a good track record, so I think it was almost a compliment that they wanted to keep me at Denver. But part of what a lot of people don't realize, that you're maybe putting together already, is that I began at Golden Gate as an student intern and I ended my career at Golden Gate. I mean I really gave much of my life to this park. Even though I had different positions, and I was kind in and out of it in different ways, I was much more in it than out of it.

02-00:50:08
Farrell: That's really, really special too.

02-00:50:14
Moore: Yes, but most people believe that my time at Golden Gate began when I became the first full-time director of the Parks Conservancy because they don't have window back into that earlier time. I moved to Seattle and did other things.

02-00:50:29
Farrell: Yeah, that's really interesting. Yeah, I definitely want to talk about Seattle today. But with the interpretive specialist and chief interpretation position, you were doing things like public tours, creating environmental education programs, doing some interpretive media, and working with advisory groups and councils. Can you tell me a little bit about some of the projects you worked on, some of the things you're most proud of from that period of time?

02-00:51:03
Moore: Yeah, some of them are relatively straightforward and expected and some of them aren't. Again, because Golden Gate was a new park and it had very little in place in terms of informational materials, interpretive booklets, tours, films, videos, et cetera, I was where I like to be, on the ground floor of creating something new. I know that I gravitate toward building something from scratch. I always believed with national parks, because these are considered the best places in America –that means our work should be of the highest caliber of excellence, so I was really stuck on that. I just couldn't stand work that wasn't of the quality that it needed to be to be in the company of Muir Woods or other park sites. I had a lot of fun doing that standard of work, setting up the whole outdoor exhibit program for Golden Gate, something called wayside exhibits, getting the early park publications in place at the quality I believed that they should be, getting some initial tours up and running.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:52:26

Some of the work that I enjoyed the most was interacting with other nonprofit partners that could help carry the park message and equally importantly, help occupy park buildings because we had so many of them. I was on the ground floor of getting the YMCA into buildings that were in Marin Headlands as an outdoor center, one of the National Park Service founders of the Headlands Center for the Arts, which at its premise was how can artists help interpret nature and culture, with the beginning of the Fort Mason Center and getting it up and running and getting the agreements in place, and a number of others. The Discovery Museum at Fort Baker came a little bit later. But just having this amazing opportunity to reach out to people with ideas and help locate them in a national park setting. I also worked actively with the park's Citizens Advisory Commission, which was appointed by the Secretary of Interior and was responsible for ongoing public meetings and public hearings about park planning and park policy, anything from the new plan for a park site to off-leash dog-walking policy. I was one of the key liaisons to that group.

02-00:53:53

Farrell: What was the process like in showing the value in some of these things like having the Fort Mason Center or having an artist in residency at the Marin Headland Center for the Arts, that kind of thing? I think these are things that make the Bay Area unique and especially with the urban interface there with the national park, and I'm just wondering if it took a lot of convincing to sign off on this? You did mention that this part of the park was more progressive—the supervisor was more progressive, so yeah, just how those things played together.

02-00:54:41

Moore: I was fortunate in a few ways. First of all, it was very optimistic era. It was a time when people still believed in possibilities and took on ridiculous challenges and did it almost in a naïve kind of way. There was lots of belief that good things could happen if people work together. Secondly, these sites have really nice curb appeal. I mean they were all in beautiful settings, and it wasn't until you went inside or looked under the hood that you realize you really were getting a big fixer-upper, and that was the challenge. I think that thirdly, I found that for the organizations that moved into a national park, they felt a pride that they were in a place that was designated as national in stature and available to all, that it was a pride and maybe a little bit of an uptick in their brand. On the other hand, we really needed those local organizations to infuse the park with community ownership, to make the park connected to the community, to reach the audiences we have the capacity to serve with other people at our side, and to give these buildings the tenants that would take care of them. For the most part, despite the financial and logistical difficulties, it was a win-win for both sides.

02-00:56:28

Farrell: What was the process like in implementing some of these programs?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-00:56:36
Moore: I think the overall process in some ways was similar and there were some similarities with each nonprofit tenant, but there are many differences, too. The similarities were simply the meeting with people, the understanding your vision, the building of the trust, and getting to the point where the Park Service believed that people were bringing a benefit to the park and the people moving into the park believed that the park was bringing a benefit to them, just getting through that phase, that was common to all. But individually depending on the resources of the group moving in, depending on their familiarity with governmental processes, depending on their patience and perseverance, and depending on their flexibility, there was a lot that had to be handled. I've often said a vision without resources is a hallucination, so you have to get to a point where the resources fill in the vision.

02-00:57:51
Some of them, like for example the Fort Mason Center and the Headlands Center for the Arts, these are people with artistic backgrounds for the most part and not familiar with government processes and maybe even a little bit dismissive of them. That took a little more handholding to make that work. Where with an organization like the YMCA, they've been around forever, the Y, they understand what it means to manage buildings and to be an effective partner. Or the other one was—it's now called NatureBridge, at the time it was called Yosemite Institutes—the environmental education group that moved into the Marin Headlands, they already had a campus in Yosemite National Park, so that wasn't a big stretch for them. From a resource standpoint, it was just determining who could put in what, not only in terms of time and talent but in terms of money. Because some of these buildings really needed a lot of work and that not every organization could immediately fundraise to make the buildings habitable.

02-00:59:11
Farrell: Were you responsible for working on any fund-raising or development campaigns then?

02-00:59:19
Moore: No. The federal officials have significant constraints in terms of what they can do in terms of fund-raising activity, so not so much. Because I was working with nonprofits that were doing that work, it was an education for me to be at the side of that. I got to understand what a nonprofit board was like because each of those organizations had nonprofit boards and they work with them a lot. I got to understand a little bit about nonprofit finances because we had to figure out how the federal dollars and the nonprofits would work. It wasn't an in-depth education, but it was kind of an awareness education.

02-01:00:04
Farrell: You had also mentioned that you helped get some of the parks' publications off the ground. Which ones were you working on? I'm curious about what the experience was like working on—it's a print publication, right?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-01:00:20
Moore: Yeah, I mean some of the publications were as simple as park brochures and getting those in place. Leave it to the Park Service, they have a center for publications and design for not only physical assets but interpretive assets, which is located in Harpers Ferry, West Virginia. I was interacting with the design team at Harpers Ferry to develop the initial park brochures and to develop initial books about the park, initial videos, and other things, and the outdoor exhibits as well. The Park Service, I think in a good way, wanted a certain standardization to that work not only for quality but also so if you went into a national park, you would see things that had a similar look and feel so that the whole system would be reinforced. In general, I was messing around with that standard approach a bit just because there were things that I felt weren't quite working as they should in the local area. I took a much more active art direction role in the process that I think Harpers Ferry was accustomed to.

02-01:01:45
Farrell: Were you doing any writing for this, for any of these?

02-01:01:47
Moore: Yeah, I did a lot of writing. In fact, in my planning work, I did a lot of writing too. One thing that was a wonderful gift to me was that the Denver Service Center had a team of professional editors. I worked with them a lot and I love writing and I love people who could look at my writing and make it better than it might've been. I really love the architecture in writing and so that this editorial team was really just a hoot to work with, really fun.

02-01:02:25
Farrell: Yes, the value of editors is important. I'm not sure everyone shares that opinion but—[laughs]

02-01:02:31
Moore: I completely believe that, and I still love it when I can write a draft and I just have my wife review a draft of something I was writing to offer her editorial advice.

02-01:02:41
Farrell: I completely agree. Were there any topics or issues that you were trying to highlight in any of these materials?

02-01:02:57
Moore: One thing I remember that I did—and it didn't seem that ahead of the times, rather it just seemed like this is something that should be done, and parks developed this—we developed our own library of materials to understand the park's story. Because we had many military bases, the first historian to write about Golden Gate and provide all these background materials was a military historian. He did an amazing job, but it tilted the interpretation toward the historic military story because that was what was in the reference library, and this had happened before I came into my position. I commissioned other

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

stories. With my own budget, a historian—an African American historian—to look at the Black history of the park, a Native American historian to look at Native American history, a Hispanic American historian to look at Spanish history, and an Asian American historian to look at Asian history so that we could actually get the broader story into the reference material so that the ranger staff could begin telling stories that were actually hidden. I was really proud of getting that work done, and that was about the time I was leaving the position. I don't think it had quite the impact that it should have, but at least it had some impact.

02-01:04:35
Farrell: Was there their support for that when you were doing that since and it's including multiple perspectives?

02-01:04:42
Moore: There were support at the local level. In general, when you advanced studies like that, they were farmed out somewhere else like at the regional office or elsewhere. I was, I think, a little unwilling to test whether that would be the best route—I didn't want to get to "no," so the best way not to get a no was to complete the work with the resources I had. There was completely agreement at the park level that this was a good thing to do.

02-01:05:16
Farrell: Well, what were some of your biggest challenges in this role?

02-01:05:28
Moore: Yeah, I think my challenge was I believed in the importance of ranger staff, and I believed that they were valuable for visitor contact information and interpretation. But I didn't believe that rangers were the be-all and end-all of telling a story, and rangers are almost mythological, right? There is a long history of what they do and why they do it and their nobility and their honesty and their knowledge. I didn't want the interpretive story in the park to be held by such a limited group of people, and I knew that ranger staff move on to new assignments in other parks. They move to new parks, to other settings, and that if the story was going to be owned and told by all that it had to be spread. That's I think part of the reason I reached out to other organizations, again with support of the park staff, to be part of that and to be storytellers also. Eventually I was promoted to be Chief Interpreter of the park, and I wasn't the standard Chief Interpreter. The standard Chief interpreter, at that time, spent virtually all of his or her time with the park ranger staff, and I did that to an extent, but probably not at the level that the ranger staff would've liked because I was doing these other things as well.

02-01:07:08
Farrell: How about some of your biggest successes, including the initial efforts to create the Parks Conservancy, well, what would become the Parks Conservancy?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-01:07:20
Moore: Some of these successes I have spoken to. I think one of the biggest successes and successes I share with other people involved was opening the park buildings to, for the most part, nonprofit organizations that can provide programming that was at least compatible with the park mission, if not necessarily spot on. The Fort Mason Center for the Arts is comfortable with the park story, but they did so much more than that, and they make people feel comfortable and they'd give people a reason to come to this national park as well. I would put that near the top and maybe just the quality of the early communication materials for the park. Of all things I was thinking of, one example that was a breakthrough concept was a publication called *A Group Guide to Your National Park Next Door*. [The publication invited community organizations to the park and provided a helpful guidebook for supporting their visit.] I worked actively with Self-Help for the Elderly in Chinatown and with the Chinatown Improvement Society for Parks and with the Bayview-Hunters Point organizations and others. I wanted to give these organizations the agency and the information to come to the park on their own visit. They could bring their own group of seniors or their own schoolkids or their own members of the Y to this national park. But they needed a little help in understanding what's available and how to get there, what resources can help them get there. We launched a whole set of programs to actually underwrite transportation for groups with some initial help and understanding that they were welcome and that the parks were almost next door.

02-01:09:34
Farrell: As you were building those relationships with seniors in Chinatown or with Bayview Hunters Point community, how were you going about building trust with them to bring them into the parks?

02-01:09:48
Moore: I think the first piece was relatively simple—but sometimes simple things get missed—it's actually going out and being in their turf. Park rangers are so accustomed to like, "Here's a park and here's the entrance gate, and people come to us." I was reversing that and saying, "No, I am coming to you, and I want to be part of introducing you to this, and I want to understand what place it could play in your community's well-being and in your lives." There were many names I can still remember that became almost like personal friends that were leaders of those organizations.

02-01:10:36
Farrell: Yeah, I was going to ask if there were any leaders in those communities that you were building relationships as sort of like you build trust with them, and they are leaders in their communities, so then it's like a liaison almost if there were people in those communities?

02-01:10:54
Moore: Yeah, absolutely, it did work that way. I think my initial group in Chinatown—I may have the name wrong—but it was the group that was in

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

charge of improving parks within Chinatown. Doreen Der was the person in charge and then Doreen worked at the Cameron House in Chinatown, which was a community center. She introduced me to Annie Chung at Self-Help for the Elderly and then one thing led to another and the same is true in the Mission and Visitation Valley and Hunters Point that one person would lead you to other people in terms of the work you did, and it was schools as well with the teacher interface.

02-01:11:40

Farrell: The transportation piece is really important because it's also meeting people where they are. It's not the expectation they'll come to you, it's, hey, we'll provide this bridge to get there. Did you find that that was successful?

02-01:11:54

Moore: Yeah, I mean it's just the length of years I spent at the park, the one critical bus line that never really got right in the park boundary, maybe a little bit was [SF Muni] 30 Stockton bus line. I don't know if you know the 30 Stockton, but it comes through Chinatown—it goes a long way. Just a year ago, after years and years and years of trying way back when, trying to make it happen, the 30 Stockton was extended, the final six blocks to go right into the middle of the Presidio, and I was like, "Well, at last." That's going to make a difference; it really will.

02-01:12:35

We worked with Muni. We ran a whole series of pilot—and you're bringing my memory back—pilot transportation programs where we underwrote Muni to start a bus [from San Francisco] to the Marin Headlands to have buses in Golden Gate Transit that went [from the city] to Muir Woods and Point Reyes to begin to show these transit agencies that they could be other than commute entities, that there was a recreational need that could be fulfilled if they would commit to it. We weren't as successful as we wanted to be, but some of those routes that we premiered then are still in place today.

02-01:13:15

Farrell: I actually don't live super far from the Presidio and driving through, I will see the bus come through quite a bit to drive there.

02-01:13:22

Moore: Yeah. Well now, there's a transit center at the Presidio because there are like three or four Muni bus lines that have now been extended and then Presidio has its own shuttle system and that offers a free shuttle that goes downtown and back. There's a pretty good system in place now.

02-01:13:39

Farrell: Yeah, yeah, and transportation is important. It's not the sexiest topic, but it's important and I think the infrastructure makes a big difference there.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-01:13:52
Moore: Yeah. I'm jumping ahead, but one of the programs at the Conservancy that we launched much later was a community shuttle program and it had the same principles that I was working on in the area that we're now talking about.

02-01:14:05
Farrell: Mm-hmm, yeah. Were there any colleagues that you want to highlight that you were working closely with during this period of time?

02-01:14:15
Moore: Yeah. As an interpretive specialist, I had another wonderful boss who just let me do my thing, but maybe there is a trend here. He came from an urban planning background and was finishing up his career at Golden Gate, but he gave me license and freedom and a budget to get things done. As chief interpreter, I reported to the park superintendent, and again, the park went through a number of superintendents that were very committed to their job not necessarily visionary, but they didn't get in the way of vision. They weren't opposed to it, and again, that helped me as well. We were just consistently doing things in ways that national parks in remote settings were not doing.

02-01:15:23
Farrell: Around this time, you decided to go to graduate school at the University of Washington and I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what your career aspirations were at this point leading up to grad school? What was involved in your decision to leave the Park Service and continue with your studies?

02-01:15:46
Moore: Yeah, a few things. I mean one is rather whimsical. I was about to get a ten-year pin [of service for my decade with the National Park Service], and instead of it making me super proud, it was like, "Oh my gosh." It was a passage of time that meant that I had been doing something for a long time and I felt this need to shake it up, just a personal urge that I had to take a break and look at the bigger world. The other motivator was I have a deep personal affection for the ocean, for beaches, and aquatic life. I was lucky to grow up in places where I was introduced to swimming, [scuba diving,] and body surfing and all these things, so I kind of wondered whether my career might go in an ocean conservation way. Actually, one more thing I forgot was at Golden Gate as chief interpreter, I was in charge of being a liaison to a brand-new National Marine Sanctuary, the Gulf of the Farallones Marine Sanctuary that surrounded Golden Gate with its waters and working with the initial team there. It introduced me to this whole realm of ocean national parks that was just beginning to happen. [I was really fascinated by the idea of national parks of the ocean.]

02-01:17:09
Finally, and more personally in a surprising way, my wife's parents and my parents both—Nancy grew up in Seattle, but my dad moved to Seattle when I was an adult for a job at Boeing. Both of our parents were living [in the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Seattle area] and here was an opportunity, if I went to graduate school, for Nancy to spend time with her mom and for me to spend time with my parents. That all came together, and I applied to the Institute of Marine Studies at the University of Washington, and they gave me a very nice fellowship, underwriting my graduate education to a large part and off we went. What was interesting was the Park Service allowed me to take it as educational leave, so although I left filling my job, I didn't formally resign from the Park Service, so I had a way a way back in if I wanted it. Right before I left, and part of the difficulty for me in leaving is, I did have the idea with others to set up a nonprofit [support group to the Golden Gate National Parks]. We began that effort, and we conceptualized what it would be. We began the nonprofit incorporation papers, we got the approvals that we needed to put this new organization in place and so I left putting that into other people's hands to move it through the formal process. It turned out that my dear friend [and former colleague], Judy Walsh, who I mentioned, was operating as a private consultant at that point, and she offered, as a consultant, to help move that vision to the next step. [I am forever grateful to her since the Conservancy ultimately changed my life's path so positively.]

02-01:19:11
Farrell: I think we'll talk more in depth about that next time, but that's great to know, and I was furiously taking notes while you're saying that. Also, around this time that you and Nancy got married.

02-01:19:25
Moore: We did.

02-01:19:25
Farrell: Yeah. Where did you get married?

02-01:19:30
Moore: [laughs] It's so funny because my son is getting married now and he wants limited fanfare, and his wife-to-be is interested in some fanfare. Unfortunately, we set an un-fanfare example because my wife and I went to [San Francisco's] City Hall to get married before it was popular. We went there with about ten friends, and that was it. We went afterward to a crazy little café called Blanche's on Mission Creek that is no longer there. Let's see, I think we went to Tahiti, somewhere in there, I can't remember whether that was pre-marriage or after marriage as a honeymoon or what that was, maybe a little bit before in anticipation of our marriage. But yes, we were married in City Hall in San Francisco by a female judge.

02-01:20:24
Farrell: That's really cool. Was she still working for the park service at this point or had she left already?

02-01:20:32
Moore: Well, her career had gone really through a few cycles, but she had been at the regional planning agency ABAG and then [returned to the National Park

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Service as Director of the Young Adult Conservation Corps at Golden Gate. So for a time, we were both working for the National Park Service at Golden Gate. Nancy's job influenced her future career direction with youth conservation corps locally and across the United States.]

02-01:21:02
Farrell: Okay, okay. It was a pretty mutual decision for you both to move to Seattle after you had gotten into the University of Washington?

02-01:21:13
Moore: Yeah, it was. My wife was a little bit more hesitant than I because I think when you grew up in a place, you sometimes have mixed feelings about returning. For her, coming to Berkeley was just such freedom and liberation from her upbringing that going back to Seattle, which at that point was fairly conventional, not now, brought a few hesitations. But yeah, overall, we were both excited about it and made that decision together.

02-01:21:42
Farrell: Do you have a sense of what she was doing for work when you moved up there? Do you remember?

02-01:21:47
Moore: She didn't work up there. We made a crazy decision to buy a houseboat, it was our first real estate investment. We could only afford something that needed a lot of work, and my wife is a great project manager and very handy, so she spent time fixing up our houseboat and getting it functioning.

02-01:22:14
Farrell: Oh, wow. Where was your houseboat, where were you?

02-01:22:18
Moore: Do you know Seattle?

02-01:22:20
Farrell: A little bit, yeah. I was up there right before the pandemic and did go around where the channels are, where people have houseboats.

02-01:22:27
Moore: Yeah, well there are two big lakes, Lake Union, which is one, and Lake Washington, which is the other, and there's a waterway that connects those lakes, and we were on that waterway. It's called [Portage Bay], so we were right there [across the water from the University of Washington]. I can get in my little rowboat and row to my classes, so it was a pretty sweet life.

02-01:22:48
Farrell: I drove right by there because we drove through the University of Washington campus and passed that channel, so I know exactly what you are talking about.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-01:22:56
Moore: Yeah, it's called the Montlake Cut is one bridge and then there's another bridge.

02-01:23:01
Farrell: Yeah, it's really beautiful over there.

02-01:23:03
Moore: That was great.

02-01:23:04
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. What was your experience like moving to Seattle? I mean you're a little closer to your parents, you're living on this houseboat, you're going to school?

02-01:23:17
Moore: First of all, we moved up there in the summer, which was great, and before we took a little bit of a break with my older brother and his wife, we chartered and sailed a boat all the way up into Canada and to British Columbia and just saw so much beauty. We had about a three-week sailing vacation that we did together and then eventually came back to Seattle and began moving into the houseboat, and I began taking classes. Living in Seattle in the summer is the right time to move there because you don't regret it–where in the winter, you have moments when you regret it or even weeks when you regret it due to the dark days and the gray weather.

02-01:23:59
Farrell: A bit like Chicago, I think.

02-01:24:00
Moore: Yeah, probably.

02-01:24:02
Farrell: Do you remember what the cultural climate of Seattle was then, or, I don't know, maybe you weren't super immersed in that because you were living in the channel and then also going to school, but do you have a sense of the culture of the city?

02-01:24:19
Moore: I do. It was before anything, like Microsoft or Amazon or any of that influx. Seattle compared to San Francisco felt a little bit more suburban to me almost. It felt slightly safer, cleaner, smaller, less of a big stage, but with incredible natural beauty. I mean just a beautiful setting and beautiful things to get to, so it wasn't hard for me to fit in. When my parents first moved to Seattle from Southern California, I was excited that they were getting into a different place, and when the houseboat came through, it was like, "Yeah, what's not to like about this?" Everything seemed really good.

02-01:25:16
Farrell: What sort of classes were you taking at the University of Washington?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

02-01:25:23
Moore: The Institute for Marine Studies, which was part of the larger College of [the Environment], I think. The Institute courses included environmental planning and had many different tracks. The track I ended in, some of it because my [past professional] experience, was a coastal zone management track, involving how do you effectively plan for the coastal interface. But I took classes in international marine law, classes in economics, classes in waterfront development. I kind of rounded out my work beyond the environmental credentials I already had to get more classic city planning and economics and legal background. This was with the thought that professionally I might either go the coastal zone route or maybe even move into coastal and ocean national parks and marine [sanctuaries], just not knowing where I would ultimately go.

02-01:26:28
Farrell: Were you discussing any issues related to climate change at that point?

02-01:26:33
Moore: No, not at all.

02-01:26:35
Farrell: So no discussion about sea level rise or anything?

02-01:26:38
Moore: No, [climate change and sea level rise was not a well-known situation then]. But another factor was relevant since international law had changed with something that was called the Law of the Sea, which had recently been passed. That law created a whole set of new standards of sovereignty over the oceans and care over the oceans that [had been negotiated and now] were internationally in place. There was a lot of emphasis on this new law–how it would be implemented and whether it would be effective.

02-01:27:10
Farrell: So the focus was more on that?

02-01:27:13
Moore: Yeah, [my coursework had some emphasis] there because that law was tied to the College of Fisheries since many of its components were about fishery resources. I learned about that, I didn't really make that a focus of mine, but I did gain some knowledge there.

02-01:27:27
Farrell: Okay. Were there any professors that you had that you found to be pretty influential or significant?

02-01:27:37
Moore: Yes, there were two. My lead advisor was Marc Hershman, and he was in the Institute and was the head of the coastal zone management program. He may have been the person that really was a proponent of admitting me to the Institute because I had a lot of coastal zone experience at that point with national parks. Another person I worked with was Robert Goodwin, and he

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

interacted with the Sea Grant Program, which is how I got involved with the Seattle waterfront study work. That was part of my graduate schoolwork, working as a Sea Grant intern on that project.

02-01:28:24
Farrell: Do you remember the demographics of the people you were going to school with, who the people were? Because you had gotten a midcareer fellowship, right?

02-01:28:34
Moore: It was, yeah.

02-01:28:35
Farrell: Okay.

02-01:28:35
Moore: That's right.

02-01:28:36
Farrell: So if they were midcareer, if they were coming from other parts of the country, what perspectives they were coming from?

02-01:28:43
Moore: Yeah, it was a small group of people formally in the Institute, fifty or less [including students and faculty]. For the most part, people were midcareer. I was probably a little bit more into my career than most, but not all. There were a handful that just went from undergraduate to graduate but not many. They were international, they were people from—not a lot but maybe [20] percent of the [students] were from other countries. For the variety of background, the person that, once I met her, we knew we would be lifelong friends, was from California, had worked at the environmental education center in Golden Gate, and had the owned the same kind of sailboat I owned in San Francisco. Amy [Margerum] and I hit it off really quickly, and we're still friends to this day.

02-01:29:51
Farrell: You were there from 1981 to 1983 and during period of time, you were organizing the Seattle Shoreline Vision Symposium which happened in 1982.

02-01:30:06
Moore: Yes, that's right.

02-01:30:06
Farrell: What was the goal of that symposium?

02-01:30:11
Moore: At the time, urban waterfronts were facing an existential dilemma because the urban waterfronts have been working waterfronts traditionally with either cargo industries or fishing industries or cruise ship tourism being the predominant tenants of waterfront locations. The waterfront's opportunity for

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

urban revitalization and tourism was growing while the fundamental physical infrastructure was declining, so there needed to be new capital investment. The question was whether maritime industry could continue to be the economic driver for urban waterfronts, or is it a mixed urban waterfront with maritime industry and recreation and travel and tourism, or is maritime industry antiquated on the urban waterfronts and it needs to be relocated away from this premium real estate into other locations? Those forces were at play and because they were at play, things were getting stalled out. As long as people were undecided about which way it would go, because the maritime industry felt very threatened and was very vocal about their need to be, in essence, subsidized, so there were political forces too. That was the main thing we worked through.

02-01:31:48
Farrell: What was your role in organizing this symposium?

02-01:31:52
Moore: It was a little bit of the public role but not as much because I was an intern and Robert Goodwin, who I mentioned, played the more public role. But because I had experience in this kind of work, in public planning and public meetings, I helped write the materials for the symposium and helped organize the speakers. I think there were one or two cases where I actually spoke and was part of the symposium myself, but it was a little bit more of a behind-the-scenes role than I am accustomed to in my professional work simply because I was a student, right? That was actually difficult for me in graduate school that I hadn't realized is I'm a person that loves getting things done, I like the tangible, and I really found returning to academic work not as great as I thought it was going to be. I learned things and it filled a place in my life, but I struggled with it.

02-01:33:05
Farrell: Yeah, I mean you're used to planning, executing, implementing things, and in academia, you're just talking about ideas.

02-01:33:13
Moore: Yeah, and in academia, there's a faculty-student hierarchy, and at times, you can feel like you're just doing what a faculty member needs some handy intern to do, and it's maybe not your passion, but that's what you've been given. Like anything, there are power dynamics.

02-01:33:35
Farrell: Yeah, yeah, that's for sure. Do you remember some of the speakers that you were working on getting to participate in the symposium or what topics? Maybe even if it's not anyone specifically, what topics you were hoping to cover?

02-01:33:50
Moore: [The speakers included leaders in various areas–from the maritime industries, the tourism sector, the real estate sector, city planners, elected officials and

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

more.] Seattle had its own visionaries about what their waterfront could be and why it should transition and why that transition was positive. On the one hand, I think I was mainly involved with those folks, but we also had to bring in the fishing community. I worked with the Port of Seattle because they were the big landowner on the Seattle waterfront and then trying to determine where they should be building out their future. And then classic neighborhood groups, environmental groups, the array of people who saw it as a civic question, not just the waterfront, but what does the city of Seattle want to become.

02-01:35:01
Farrell: Were you happy with the outcome of the symposium?

02-01:35:05
Moore: Yeah, I was, I was. It wasn't that the outcome was completely definitive, but it got the dialogue going, and it reached certain conclusions. I'm sure after I left Seattle, those conclusions had many more chapters to go through. But interesting today—and I'm in touch with this project—is that Seattle has torn down its [waterfront highway] viaduct along the shoreline and it's akin to the [Presidio] Tunnel Tops, actually, because [Seattle] built a transit tunnel and are building all these parklands right down from the city heights down to the waterfront, which had been interrupted by a freeway. It's being designed by the same landscape designer that designed the Tunnel Tops, [James Corner Field Operations].

02-01:35:59
Farrell: Oh, so yeah, there's a lot of parallels there.

02-01:36:01
Moore: Yeah, exactly, yeah.

02-01:36:02
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. Towards the end of your time at University of Washington, you completed your coursework but didn't get your degree?

02-01:36:15
Moore: My father—rest his soul—there are parts of me he had trouble understanding, [such as not completing my thesis and getting my graduate degree–] and I understand why. I had my thesis drafted because the degree required a thesis, I had my thesis committee assembled, but I guess I was just burned out on it. The idea that I had to write a piece of paper and go through a committee—it wasn't arrogance, I just wasn't up for it [at the level of effort required]. Meanwhile, one of my closest friends in life and his wife invited Nancy and me to go to Europe for two months, and I'd never been to Europe, and I thought, "Thesis, Europe, thesis, Europe?" [laughs] Guess what, Europe had a bigger draw to me than my thesis. My full intention was to complete my thesis [when I returned from Europe]. When I returned to the Bay Area, I brought [all the thesis materials] back with me to the Bay Area to complete it, and I just never did. I did all the coursework, the thesis was 80 percent of the way

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

finished, and then [I just could not motivate myself to complete] the final 20 percent, [especially after returning to professional work].

02-01:37:33
Farrell: Where did you travel to in Europe?

02-01:37:35
Moore: Ah, great places. We started in the Belgium and worked our way to Holland and then to Germany and then down the French coast and then to Corsica and then to Italy and then back up through Italy through the Alps in Italy, Switzerland, France, and eventually flying home out of Belgium again.

02-01:38:11
Farrell: Well, it sounds like an amazing trip.

02-01:38:13
Moore: It was great, yeah, and eventually I went back to Italy on a National Park assignment so that was kind of cool.

02-01:38:21
Farrell: Doesn't get better than that.

02-01:38:22
Moore: Oh, it doesn't, yeah.

02-01:38:25
Farrell: Around in 1983 when you're done with your coursework, you're thinking about your thesis, what were your career aspirations at this point?

02-01:38:35
Moore: Well, something happened to me where I had to make a choice. I was looking for work in Seattle, but I was still holding on to the opportunity to get back to Golden Gate. My wife and I were trying to figure whether Seattle was a temporary location to get to know our parents and to do other things and the Bay Area is really our home, or are we going to relocate our lives to Seattle. I was offered a job as head of public affairs for the Seattle Aquarium, and it was an exciting opportunity, but I wasn't going to take a new job and not be committed to it. For a bunch of reasons, we decided to return the Bay Area. I would say maybe my wife was a little bit more instrumental in helping make that decision —she hadn't found [professional] work in Seattle and went there for me and her work opportunities were going to be much better in the Bay Area, whereas I built a bit of a network in Seattle where I was offered a job. We chose between these two amazing and wonderful, vital, urban, waterfront cities and came home.

02-01:39:53
Farrell: Yeah. Maybe it's a good place to start with your return to the Bay Area at the beginning of that the next session, but I'm wondering—I do have some reflective questions for you unless before we get there—if there's anything

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

that I didn't ask about during this period of your life that you want to make sure to talk about?

02-01:40:21
Moore: No, I can't think of anything that we missed, but if I think about it, like even in your questioning I remembered things that I didn't have in my notes.

02-01:40:33
Farrell: Okay.

02-01:40:34
Moore: Yeah, so that was helpful.

02-01:40:35
Farrell: Okay, if anything comes up that you remember too, we can always revisit in the next session or you can always add it into the transcript, but I just wanted to make sure to leave that door open for you if there was anything glaring.

02-01:40:47
Moore: One of the reflections is a personal one. The opportunity of me to spend that time with my parents was really meaningful. Their excitement about coming to see me in the houseboat, like who had a houseboat, and Nancy's mom as well. It turns out, which we could never forecast, that both my mom and Nancy's mom did not live a long time after that, so we really felt that that decision had proven itself in so many ways.

02-01:41:20
Farrell: It's amazing the timing of how significant that was.

02-01:41:25
Moore: Yeah.

02-01:41:25
Farrell: Yeah. Did you spend a lot of time with them when you were living there with your parents?

02-01:41:33
Moore: Yeah, yeah, because we didn't have a big friendship network up there and then we had intentionally gone there with the purpose of spending more time with them, so that allowed us to do that.

02-01:41:45
Farrell: Yeah, that's fantastic. I'm glad you had that experience. Also, thinking about significance, what did it mean to you to start your career with the National Park Service, a place where you had wanted to work, and then at the start of your career spend ten years with them?

02-01:42:07
Moore: Well, it was an incredible gift, as I said. It was my first choice of where I wanted to work graduating from Berkeley, and to be able to have that happen and to be given the opportunities I was given to apply my talents in the ways

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

that I wanted to, well, I think that was really rare. Not only to get the job, but to have the job fulfill how you wanted to be fulfilled and to actually let me use my talents in a way that was for the public good and do it consistently.

02-01:42:48
Farrell: I know you weren't specifically a ranger for the Park Service, that was part of your job, but what it meant to you to be in the parks and to visit different areas and to interact with the public and see how all these pieces fit together?

02-01:43:11
Moore: Yeah, I was very proud of what America's national parks were, what they stood for, the history of them, what the ranger uniform meant. Maybe I was on a slightly different path [in my national park career], but I never felt disrespect. There were practices that I did have disrespect for in terms of women in the workforce and other things, but in terms of the basic mission and purpose and the legacy [of the Park Service], I could fully embrace that. The opportunity to serve that mission and to bring that mission into a new era in a more modern way is the gift I was given.

02-01:43:56
Farrell: Are there any lessons or things that you learned during this part of your life before you returned to the Bay Area that you carried with you for the rest of your career or life?

02-01:44:12
Moore: I don't know that I knew that I was learning it, but the first lesson was that for many things in life, it is all about people, the relationships you form, the trust you have, the common vision you have, the shared experiences you develop, and the commitments you shared to moving something forward. I learned that in terms of public sector work, patience and perseverance are critical. Big ideas don't happen overnight, and maybe they shouldn't and certainly there are some that are urgent, but you don't give up. Because I was in one place for a long time, I could start at the very idea and then see it brought to conclusion. For the really big, big stuff, it's five to ten years before you get to where you want to get to so that was the second [lesson: stay committed to your results]. Maybe the last lesson was just trying to consistently relook at things through different lenses so that there's always the opportunity to bring in new ideas—and not all, but some solutions begin to outdate themselves and if you're not open and curious about new ways of solving things, then you can get stuck. At Golden Gate, I was constantly given projects that required new ways of looking at the opportunity and solving the problem.

02-01:45:53
Farrell: That's great, and I think these are fantastic seeds to plant for our subsequent session. [laughter] Is there anything else you want to add to this part?

02-01:46:04
Moore: Oh, no, just once again just thanking you for being so amazing in how you do this. You can tell I don't have trouble responding to your excellent questions

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

or being drawn out more when you think that there's a bigger story that needs to be listened to, so thank you for your patience and perseverance and graciousness.

02-01:46:24
Farrell: Well, thank you for being so being so forthcoming and sharing all of this. It's really, really fantastic to hear about how all these things came together, the formative experiences, some of the background to these things, so I really appreciate you sharing your perspective on this.

02-01:46:42
Moore: Yeah, well, my pleasure.

02-01:46:43
Farrell: Thank you.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Interview 3: February 17, 2022

03-00:00:06
Farrell: Okay, this is Shanna Farrell back with Greg Moore on Thursday, February 17, 2022. This is our third interview, and we are speaking over Zoom. Greg, welcome back. When we last left off, we were talking about you are wrapping up your time in Seattle, and you ended up moving back to the Bay Area in 1983. I'm wondering if you could start by telling me what it was like for you to return to the Bay Area and San Francisco?

03-00:00:40
Moore: It was a happy reunion to come back to the Bay Area. It's a special place with so much beauty and energy, innovation, and really more like home than anywhere in my life since I grew up moving all over the place. It turns out by the time I left the Bay Area, I had lived here longer than anywhere else in my entire life, so coming back to San Francisco had the feeling of a homecoming.

03-00:01:08
Farrell: What part of the area did you move to or what neighborhood were you living in when you returned?

03-00:01:14
Moore: We came back to San Francisco, and since my job was in the Marina District at Fort Mason, we got an apartment in the Marina District as the first place we grabbed back hold of the Bay Area.

03-00:01:28
Farrell: It's fitting, because you see what it becomes.

03-00:01:33
Moore: That's right, [laughter] right, I could walk to the parklands I was working on.

03-00:01:40
Farrell: How often would go visit those parklands?

03-00:01:42
Moore: Oh, constantly. I realized through life that because the place I was working for was so present and so much of a part of my personal enjoyment as well as my professional enjoyment, that that had many wonderful benefits for me. However, it was hard to get away from the job even in personal time because I was enjoying the very places I was helping preserve and improve during my work life.

03-00:02:14
Farrell: Yeah, and in the early '80s, can you describe what the parklands looked like or maybe some of the sights, the sounds, the smells that you remember?

03-00:02:26
Moore: Yeah. At that point, this new national park, this new concept of a national park area in the urban area, was on the map, and not only on the map

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

legislatively but on the map in terms of people's minds of a place that had opened and they could visit, that military lands were becoming national parks and with much the mood of what you would expect a park to have, beauty and history and people enjoying themselves. At the same time, it was clear that a lot of the lands still were kind of a leftover from their former role, and as a result, they still needed reinvention to achieve their full national park purpose.

03-00:03:15
Farrell: When you came back, you returned to the National Park Service and were there from 1983 to 1985. Can you tell me a little bit about why you were interested in returning to the National Park Service?

03-00:03:36
Moore: Maybe without even verbalizing it to myself at the time, I had formed a pretty deep bond with this park and its potential. It was a homecoming as I described, but it was also continuing to get the job done and seeing the promise of the park and knowing the creative opportunities that would be there and wanting to be part of that. The park was still unfolding and to continue to be a part of that was really fulfilling for me. Not that I didn't think of other ways my career would maybe go or that other offers weren't in front of me, but the tangible quality of my work was hard to replace.

03-00:04:32
Farrell: Yeah, did you feel like there were lots of opportunities, like you saw the potential in things, and you weren't done with your work there yet? You felt like you had more to do?

03-00:04:45
Moore: Yes, I did. The only part of it that moves into my transition to the Conservancy is I did feel—and I've talked about this before—slightly confined in the governmental sector. Even at Golden Gate, it was a part of the system of national parks, there were ways things had been done for a long time, there were policies and procedures and expectations that were just part of the organizational culture. [That tradition was] acceptable but confining if you were trying to break the mold and find new pathways.

03-00:05:29
Farrell: When you came back, did you find that anything had changed? Or did it feel the same? I'm talking about, organizationally, the culture of the Park Service.

03-00:05:44
Moore: The main change was that the park had moved from a park that was being planned to a park that was open and had visitors and had to be managed, preserved, and operated. It had moved from something on a piece of paper where Congress drew lines and boundaries into something that needed attention just because of the day-to-day visitation of the park. At the same time, the park still needed continued planning and design work, as I said before, to fulfill its full potential.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:06:22
Farrell: On that note, one of your roles was to do planning and management studies for how you might use a number of different historic buildings—I think that was around 800—converting them from the military use to a protected-area status. Can you tell me a little bit more about that project, what some of the buildings were like, and how you were thinking about adapting them?

03-00:06:54
Moore: Sure, the buildings, by and large, were not in prime condition. Once it was clear to the Army that they were leaving, they really didn't have an incentive to continue to invest. A lot of the buildings were in need of infrastructure upgrades, seismic upgrades, all the fundamental basics, which had never occurred. So with the magnitude of the buildings that were in the park and because they were all historic and needed to be kept [and preserved], it really was essential to find uses for the buildings that would occupy them, hopefully improve them, and ideally be consistent with the mission of the park. Our job was to find organizations who, at some level, either fit the park mission or at least were compatible with the park mission. It wasn't so much looking at the buildings for revenue potential; it was mainly looking at the buildings like who can take these over, so they're occupied and eventually improved.

03-00:08:10
Farrell: Were there any particular challenges that you were facing in adapting the buildings?

03-00:08:21
Moore: Yes, some of the challenges, particularly where buildings were close to neighborhoods—Fort Mason for example—was that local neighborhoods have gotten accustomed of the buildings being either vacant or very lightly used. When you begin to think about how they could be used for greater visitation and to serve the public, there were times when local neighborhoods were either concerned or oppositional to some of those plans, and that was mainly on the city side of the park. Over in the Marin Headlands, the buildings were pretty remote from nearby neighborhoods out at Fort Cronkhite and other areas where that wasn't as much of an issue.

03-00:09:08
But there was an issue too finding organizations that many of them in their incipient era, of course, they had to have the vision and they had to have a solid proposal. But eventually, they needed to have the financial resources to take on these buildings and repair them. Many of the early park partners were a little bit slim in that regard.

03-00:09:42
Farrell: Who were some of the partners you were finding to take that on?

03-00:09:45
Moore: There were a variety; it was really a fun variety. Some were environmental in purpose like the Yosemite Institutes, that was their name at the time, out in

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Fort Cronkhite. Some had a community and the outdoor orientation like the YMCA that took on a set of buildings at the Nike site in the Marin Headlands. Some were cultural arts like the Headlands Center for the Arts, which was a new organization formed specifically to take on those buildings, or the Fort Mason Center, which was a cultural organization again formed specifically to create Fort Mason as a hub of cultural activities, so a mix. Out at Fort Funston, the San Francisco School District took on military buildings as an environmental education center. You can see that those purposes certainly get the mission of the park as a side-by-side. Much later on, the Bay Area Discovery Museum moved into the buildings at Fort Baker.

03-00:10:49

Farrell: Yeah, and it's really interesting to see them now. I'm thinking about Fort Mason, it's thriving over there.

03-00:10:55

Moore: Absolutely, yeah. It was tough going, and we were very empathetic with the partners. The Park Service really didn't have many financial resources coming their way, so in general, the tenants were responsible for everything inside the buildings, and the Park Service was responsible for all the exterior of the buildings and the big fixes. But even over time, once seismic codes became more stringent, there was a lot of unexpected capital work that needed to happen, and actually, even today it's still happening.

03-00:11:37

Farrell: Mm-hmm, yeah, that's interesting. What was the process like of getting these buildings to be under protected status?

03-00:11:48

Moore: Well, they were protected once the park boundary was set, so that protected them. Some of them were already identified as National Historic Landmarks and then the Park Service when they came in, they evaluated every building for its historic significance and many of them were nominated to the National Register of Historic Sites and then became additionally protected as historic buildings. For buildings that the Park Service inherited that were not historic, they had the option to remove them if they wanted. Even with historic buildings, you can remove them [if they're severely derelict], but for the Park Service, as a preservation agency, that's a step of last resort.

03-00:12:35

Farrell: Were any buildings removed?

03-00:12:39

Moore: Yes, actually, there was. At Fort Mason where the Great Meadow is now, there was a whole set of temporary buildings that the Army had built that were not on the historic register, so they were removed. There were buildings removed ultimately along Crissy Field, quite a few when the Crissy Field was restored. I think that's mainly it.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:13:03
Farrell: Okay, great, and this may dovetail with that work, but another thing that you were responsible for was developing master plans and program plans for an environmental education center and conference centers and artists-in-residence programs, cultural centers, that kind of thing. How much did that work overlap between adapting these buildings and then also working on these plans?

03-00:13:28
Moore: They were pretty much one and the same. It was a codesign effort because the Park Service had to advance its mission and its vision, and the tenant of course had to advance its vision and mission. It was finding how those two could be super symbiotic in what was the end result.

03-00:14:01
Farrell: Did you see the Park Service be willing to expand their vision? I know that we had talked about before that San Francisco, that wing was more progressive than other parts of the Park Service. I'm just wondering what it was like to get people to expand their vision, to think outside the box to start incorporating things like cultural centers?

03-00:14:27
Moore: To some degree because that was a necessity in this as well as a visionary part. People embraced it pretty quickly because these buildings needed people to occupy them, and empty, they would continue to deteriorate and even be a public hazard, so we had to move there quickly. But it was an interesting creative opportunity. It wasn't something that the Park Service had done across the system in any way or maybe in very modest ways. Just as one example at the Headland Center for the Arts, their initial vision was pretty much for artists' studios, and in discussion with them, we helped them see that they could incorporate the idea that artists can interpret nature and history and that the parklands surrounding these artists would be their own outdoor canvas to consider how art could be a storytelling device or a provocative device looking at history and culture.

03-00:15:37
Farrell: Kind of taking a page from the Hudson River School.

03-00:15:41
Moore: Yes, there we go. In fact, at the time, I was sent on assignment to the Delaware Water Gap [National Recreation Area] to [explore a similar program there and] help them develop an artist-in-residence program.

03-00:15:51
Farrell: Oh, cool, that's really cool. Thinking about accessibility and usership, when you were designing these plans, how were you thinking about attracting artists to come use these studios or getting people to come visit these cultural centers or enroll people in the environmental education programs?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:16:15
Moore: Yeah, because the initial advocacy for the park was a phrase, "Parks to the People, Parks Where the People Are," we took the legislative history of the national parks seriously and believed that a national park in an urban area had a special opportunity and even an obligation to serve people that live nearby. In the selection of the tenants, that was incorporated into our thinking. For example, the YMCA is very community connected, their intention was to create an outdoor camp for city kids to come out to the Marin Headlands, similarly with the Yosemite Institute. The Environmental Education Center out at Fort Funston as well, and even Fort Mason really, really making these places attractive and relevant to a broad spectrum of the community.

03-00:17:11
Farrell: Was that also something that the partners that you were working with, that they were focused on as well, a big part of their job was to bring people in?

03-00:17:21
Moore: Yes. Part of what made the relationship mutually beneficial is, for the Park Service, we found important uses for buildings that serve people, and for the nonprofit partners, to be in a national park, to have their purpose and their programs merit being in a national park setting built their brand too. They were in some of the most beautiful places on earth and had been selected to be there, so many of them embraced that identity as an asset.

03-00:18:02
Farrell: Yeah. I will say those views do not hurt either.

03-00:18:06
Moore: No, not at all, [laughter] not at all.

03-00:18:10
Farrell: From either side of the bay. Another thing that you had to think about was how to make these places financially self-sufficient. How did that get folded into the planning process?

03-00:18:27
Moore: In retrospect, not as much as it should have, but things have worked out fine, so I guess it's okay. But the initial piece of the historic building re-use was really a fairly modest expectation—can you make these buildings occupiable, and can you offer programs that benefit the public? Those were the initial standards of what financial resources were needed to achieve those two goals. We weren't asking the initial tenants to do complete capital rehabs, to get buildings into premiere condition, but we knew that would have to probably come later and likely be a combination of federal investment and nonprofit philanthropy, which has been the case. Even, for example, the Headlands for the Arts has not yet completed their full build out. The Discovery Museum just recently completed their full campus. The Fort Mason Center is still working on two pier buildings that need tons of money to make them seismically sufficient, so it's ongoing work.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:19:47
Farrell: Long-term projects.

03-00:19:49
Moore: Yes, exactly. But the good part is that the fundamental vision and mission and the programs are being delivered and re bringing good things to the visiting public.

03-00:20:04
Farrell: Yeah, it's certainly a huge benefit. During your time with the National Park Service, because you start working for the Parks Conservancy in '85, what are some of your biggest successes, the things that you're most proud of from your time with the Park Service?

03-00:20:30
Moore: I would say, yeah, maybe a handful of things. The first is completion of the general [management] plan for the Golden Gate [National Recreation Area] and for Point Reyes National Seashore, not just as a physical product that outlined what the park could become, but as a product that entailed extensive community consultation in its development. The plan not only brought in great ideas and visions of what the park should be from a community perspective, but made people feel an ownership in the evolution of the park in their backyards. That would be the first part. The second piece, we were just speaking about, and that is opening up the park for community-based organizations to be residents, to be partners, to be part of the operations of the park, and to add to the mission of the National Park Service, and to add to the creativity and resourcing of public programs. And the third success was meeting and greeting community-based organizations to orient them to the park, and to facilitate their access to the park with transportation programs that provided community shuttles, with publications that showed these organizations how they could visit the park on their own, with meetings in communities to encourage people to come see these new national parklands thirty minutes away from where they lived.

03-00:22:19
Farrell: With thinking about the community consultation that you were doing, maybe particularly with Point Reyes, how much were you involved with the community in getting some of their feedback?

03-00:22:33
Moore: Oh, intensely. I think that was to some degree the piece I brought to the equation because the Park Service in the era before me did not really have that requirement legislatively, and the National Environmental Policy Act required that you look at planning alternatives, that there is community consultation. There began to be an important, formulaic way of doing it because of the legislative and policy requirements, but we took that to a different standard with ongoing consultation and engagement of community leaders and organizations.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:23:17
Farrell: Hmm. How were you approaching the community feedback? I'm thinking about, and this could be different, but some of the things [like] community meetings and things like that, so you can voice your opinion. But I guess I'm wondering how you approached working with the community and listening to them, hearing their feedback, and then incorporating it into the planning process.

03-00:23:45
Moore: Yeah, there were a few vehicles. One that I forgot to mention is the legislation for Golden Gate created a Citizen's Advisory Commission, and that Commission was appointed to represent community leaders as well as conservation advocates and others. They had the more formal job of hosting public meetings, of listening to formal testimony, and of eventually giving their advice to the National Park Service about park plans and policies. Very few parks have a vehicle like that in their legislation, but added to that was the more ongoing communication and community consultation, going to neighborhood meetings, going to community meetings, getting to know leaders in various neighborhoods, and building relationships, and actually holding meetings at community locations about the parklands and how they should be improved and what their future should be. And then bringing people to the park, so they could actually experience first-hand what we were talking to them about. I think in the Golden Gate plan, I have to look it up, there were maybe over 200 community meetings in San Francisco and Marin County that were held through the full extent of that planning effort. And then various feedback systems, such as we produced a publication, *Your Guide to the Future of the National Parks Next Door*, which allowed people to fill in forms and send them—it wasn't the day of emails and social media—so they actually had write to us about what they felt was relevant and what the future should be.

03-00:25:45
Farrell: What were some of the things you learned from that experience that you took with you throughout the rest of your career? I'm going to leave it open; it could be pertaining to working with the community or anything else that you learned during that period of time?

03-00:26:03
Moore: One thing I learned is that when you have nature, history, culture, and beauty, that's for everybody. People may have different ways that they enjoy those settings or ways that they feel welcome or ways that these places can be relevant, but the joy that parks bring is universal–it crosses cultures, it crosses ages, it crosses economic levels. The interesting point is if that's the case, how do you create ownership and how do you create welcomeness and inclusiveness? Because you could appreciate something, but if you don't feel welcome and if the programs aren't relevant or you don't know how to get there, you're not going to take advantage of what's your right as much as

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

anybody else's right. That was the place where, even today, the details need to be worked to make that all come together.

03-00:27:04
Farrell: How did you start thinking about that and then making sure that people felt welcome, and there was ownership?

03-00:27:17
Moore: Yes, I would say we worked on it, but it's not that the job is done, right? It's an ongoing conversation in our society about how we solve issues of inclusiveness and racial injustice and the other things that we face. The best thing we did is establish that goal as a principle, that was important, and then to put our effort behind the principle. As I said, it's still being worked on. I'm really proud of Golden Gate and how the [Park Service, Trust and] Conservancy continue to dedicate time to this even today. Recently in Alcatraz, a truly amazing exhibit was opened on mass incarceration and what that means for our society and why is it that America has more people in prison than any other country in the world. These parks are platforms not only for joy, but for public dialogue and learning.

03-00:28:25
Farrell: I guess transitioning into the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy where you started in 1985, I want to back up a few years in time.

03-00:28:37
Moore: Sure.

03-00:28:37
Farrell: Because you were are really involved in the founding of the nonprofit wing, which I think officially was founded and got its status in 1981. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about your—I think we talked about it briefly last time—but a little bit more about your involvement with the nonprofit and what your role was and maybe some of the people you were working with?

03-00:29:00
Moore: Yeah, before I took a break to move to Seattle, the idea of a nonprofit support group to this national park made tremendous sense to me. As I said in the prior interview, national parks, Yosemite and others, had nonprofit organizations that served that supporting purpose. At the time, these organizations served this purpose in a fairly narrow way, and we believed that that narrow way was part of what the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy would deliver, but only a part. Our bigger goal was to use this nonprofit arm as a method of community engagement and bringing public benefits for the entire park and also, too, for volunteerism and philanthropy. The concept developed, the Park Service came on board with the concept, we began looking at other models around the system especially those in urban areas including the Friends of Independence Hall [in Philadelphia]. We interacted with them about their work and how they did it. [Through conversation and written materials,] we began forming the concept and what

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

we needed to do to incorporate [the new nonprofit organization], what the bylaws would be, and what the board might be.

03-00:30:26

That's at the point that I took off [to Seattle]. Others were standing ready to give this idea life–to move it to formal incorporation. That's when my [friend and] colleague Judy Walsh was hired as a consultant to work with the Park Service team and some early volunteers to move to incorporation papers forward and to get the Conservancy, [then called the Association,] at some minimal level up and running, so Judy did that. To incorporate, you need three volunteer [board members] to sign the papers, and there's a period when you're reviewed, the period where you become eligible, and then a period when the incorporation is final, so you had to wait through all of that.

03-00:31:23

When I came back, the Conservancy had been incorporated, Judy was still involved as a consultant, her title was association coordinator as a consultant. [Judy had the Conservancy up and running and fulfilling parts of its overall mission, especially around interpretive services and products. The Conservancy had] some shelves in Alcatraz [and in other park areas] selling our first sets of [books and] postcards. The first year of the Conservancy, the point was, to some degree, if the Conservancy had an income source, to dedicate whatever we could back to the park. I believe in that first year, the Conservancy was able to dedicate about $9,000 back to the park, in terms of either grants or direct services to the national park area.

03-00:32:10

Farrell: During those planning years, how were you developing the mission and the vision for the Conservancy?

03-00:32:20

Moore: We developed it to some degree by our own experience at Golden Gate, understanding the level of community reaction and support as well as the iconic nature of these parks. They weren't backdoor and hidden, they were front yard, I mean you can't get more iconic than the land surrounding the Golden Gate Bridge. We believed we had a good product, and we saw the public response, and it was to some degree how we could take to scale. Separately, how we could be supporting the National Park Service but also retain the innovation, the vision, the advocacy that a nonprofit organization can carry? It's different than what a federal agency can carry. We could not only add resources but be advocates and innovators [as a partner organization].

03-00:33:30

Farrell: Where was your office?

03-00:33:34

Moore: I was back at Fort Mason.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:33:35
Farrell: Okay, okay. You mentioned starting with those three bookshelves in Alcatraz selling the postcards. What was on those postcards?

03-00:33:44
Moore: One of the first board meetings I went to, the board members were trying to determine which photos to put on the postcard, so you could see board was at a level of detail that they eventually had to move beyond. For the most part because the prison history of Alcatraz was the prime attraction in Alcatraz, the postcards reflected that prison history, whether they were pictures of historic buildings, pictures of individual inmates, the basic stuff that people were coming to Alcatraz for.

03-00:34:21
Farrell: Can you tell me a little bit about what it was like for you to leave the Park Service and start with the Conservancy and also be their first employee?

03-00:34:32
Moore: Yes, with a little context. Eventually the Conservancy had the revenue where it could hire its first full-time director, and at that point, by the way, it was called the Golden Gate National Parks Association, not the Conservancy. When it got to that point, Judy Walsh was clear that she had a consulting business and didn't want the full-time job, and Judy and the board turned to me and asked me if I'd be interested. I did have to think that through. I had a good federal job with a splendid retirement program and all the things you could imagine and the opportunity, if I had so chosen it, to move up the ranks in the National Park Service and to have a very fulfilling career. I was restless, and the opportunity gave me the ability to start something from scratch—I mean how often do you get that opportunity—and to be in charge of something and to chart its vision and to move it forward, so I said yes.

03-00:35:58
Farrell: Was your wife supportive of the transition to the new job?

03-00:36:03
Moore: Very much so. If ever I was going back and forth, she would be the one that would remind me of why this was a good idea and remind me that if for some reason that it only worked for three years, no problem, I'd find something else. The way the federal government works, once you're a civil servant, you can always come back into the family. You have to find a job that somebody wants you to do, but I did have the option of ultimately returning to the Park Service if I had so chosen, but it didn't turn out that way. I'd say to people I thought I'd do the job for three to five years, and I had the two numbers right, it just turned out to be thirty-five, not three or five. [laughs]

03-00:36:49
Farrell: Oh, that's funny. [laughter] Can you tell me a little about what those early days were like having a small staff, what you were responsible for, and what those early days were like for you?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:37:06
Moore: Yeah, they were super fun, very invigorating, and very challenging because although I knew the parks really well and the mission and purpose of the parks, although I had a vision for what Conservancy could become, I had no experience with nonprofit management. I was handed the Conservancy's financial statements with the balance sheet and profit-and-loss statements, and there were auditors, and there were board committees, and there weren't systems behind me like the federal government. In the federal government, everything you want to do, there is a procurement officer, an HR officer—it's all standardized. But I had to create that organizational infrastructure and create it in the nonprofit sector, which was new to me. But I loved the challenge. It was super fun to wrap my mind around understanding nonprofit financial statements and understanding what it felt like when I can barely make payroll from January through March or could not make payroll and watching how we would tick our income up a little bit each year and what we could do to make that happen.

03-00:38:31
Farrell: How were you learning how to create those systems?

03-00:38:37
Moore: Pretty much in a very hands-on way I have say. There is some minimal coursework I took, but that coursework I think was primarily around philanthropy and fundraising. Fortunately, the Conservancy was small enough that it wasn't complex [–and I could learn in stages]. It was new too but not overly complex and the math was basic addition and subtraction and multiplication not high algebra, so I could handle that piece of it.

03-00:39:15
Farrell: Aside from the postcards that you were selling, what were some of your other revenue streams?

03-00:39:23
Moore: Eventually, the three bookshelves became more than three, and eventually, we began to develop a product line. One of the first things that was produced was a replica of the official prison rule book that the Alcatraz inmates were given when they came to Alcatraz. [The Conservancy] simply republished that rule book as a replica item, and it sold really well. All we did is republished a part of history and put it out in front of the public. We made improvements to the stores, we made them more visible, we began working on Muir Woods and eventually the Marin Headlands and other sites. The Park Service term for this work is "interpretive retail." In other words, it's merchandise that tells a story of the park. Where we eventually became really different and innovative was we developed our own very extensive product line. We published our own books, we had copyrights, we trademarked our own items, we had posters and a full array of merchandising that hit the quality that it should in national parks. We were proud of that. At the time, in contrast, there was a [private] concessionaire at Muir Woods that was selling logging trucks as a memento in

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

a national monument that preserved redwood trees, [laughs] so we really wanted to move the dial in a direction of the story of these parks.

03-00:41:11
Farrell: Yeah, I feel like retail and thinking about products is a very specific thing and different from what you had been doing before, so how were you thinking about that? How were you getting those ideas and learning what would work and getting the idea for the rule book and that kind of thing?

03-00:41:31
Moore: What I hadn't put together about myself, but I studied architecture and landscape architecture in college so I [did have design training and instincts]. Also, I'm a really visual person, and I have, along with others, a good eye for what will be attractive and compelling. Of course, I knew the [park] story because I had worked at the park by then for [more than] a decade. So it really was pulling those two things together [–the park story and compelling design]. I was very comfortable with the world of graphic design, with the world of printing and publication. I've done quite a bit of that when I was in the Park Service actually, so I just moved right over into that scene. Eventually, the Conservancy reached the point where we could actually hire professional specialists in this area, but for a while that was the CEO's role.

03-00:42:29
Farrell: How many years was it before you were able to grow the revenue stream and hire more people?

03-00:42:38
Moore: The breakthrough on that was another incredibly risky and challenging innovation, which was the audio tour on Alcatraz. Because that tour succeeded in the way that we never imagined frankly and developed an income source that not only was good at the beginning of the audio tour, but continued to grow and grow. That revenue helped underwrite [other things and it] provided working capital to not only invest into our purpose of preserving and restoring and serving park visitors, but also into our own revenue infrastructure. We could imagine a new [revenue] venture that had possibilities and invested in getting it up and running.

03-00:43:30
Farrell: As an oral historian in grad school and after, that audio tour is something we talk a lot about and how that can be a model for things you can do with oral history.

03-00:43:42
Moore: How interesting.

03-00:43:41
Farrell: It's really interesting, and I think public historians too probably think about that too, but even when I was in grad school in the mid-aughts we were

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

talking about how revolutionary that was then. So, yeah, just very forward thinking and I've been to Alcatraz a few times.

03-00:44:01
Moore: Yeah, we were way out of over our skis in so many ways on that one, but we can decide how much we want to give to that story or not.

03-00:44:12
Farrell: Well, as much or as little as you want to. I've taken the tour a few times and always have the audio as a big part of it. Yeah, it's become I think synonymous with visiting Alcatraz; it's hard to do without that audio tour.

03-00:44:28
Moore: Yeah, well a little bit about the origin story, if you feel there's room for it. What the Park Service realized on Alcatraz, was that the visitor demand to see the site was beyond what [they] could fulfill. The ferries were full constantly, people were unable to get tickets, and that wasn't a great situation to have a national landmark that people could see once in their life and to be turning two-thirds of the people away that wanted to see it. We had to find a way to deal with this fundamental capacity issue, and the audio tour was the idea that we decided can not only interpret the island well but could fundamentally pace people through the experience in a way that was [high quality and] driven by [a general time allotment to the visitor's time in the cellhouse]. On the ranger tours, the ranger could only handle at most fifty people and if there were three ranger tours in the cellhouse at the same time, nobody could hear anybody because they'd all be interfering with one another. Although that concept was straightforward, many of the National Park Service rangers saw the proposal as threatening. They believed that it might eliminate their jobs. Actually, some of them started a national call among the rangers to stop the audio tour, that this would be the beginning of headsets replacing rangers, so we had to work our way through that obviously.

03-00:46:03
Farrell: How did you work your way through that?

03-00:46:06
Moore: We were lucky to have leaders in the Park Service who were willing to stand up for why the audio tour made sense and were willing to be in dialogue with their staff about it and were eager to say, "Look, we have a huge national park, there's plenty of room for rangers in this park, that's not a question. We're just figuring out a way to make this portion of the park more accessible to the general public, and you will still have a role," which they do. But then we had to figure out, forecast what we could invest and what it would take to get the audio tour up and running. We had a very short time frame. We advertised the opportunity to develop the audio tour [with vendors that served museums and historic sites] and we had three bidders: one vendor that was the world's standard for audio tours; one vendor that was second in the running; and then one vendor that was a local theater company with a [financial]

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

balance sheet that honestly had almost nothing on it and had never done an audio tour in their life. We chose the theater company, which caused an uproar, including the other vendors threatening to sue us for that selection, and that got complicated.

03-00:47:31

But this vendor's concept was the most original because they brought a theatrical attitude toward it, not in a way that was phony but in a way that was extremely authentic. They wanted the tour to reflect the actual voices and sounds of Alcatraz. At that point, we were aware that people who had lived the Alcatraz experience [as prison inmates or guards] were still out there [and alive], but they wouldn't be in ten or twenty years. We developed the principle that the best people to tell the Alcatraz story is not like conventional audio tours that have celebrities mainly. We could've chosen Clint Eastwood, right, that would've been the logical choice because of his movie filmed in Alcatraz, but better than Clint Eastwood were people who had lived in Alcatraz and had the real experience. So we went about finding them [with the selected audio tour vendor–the local theater company called Antenna Theater]. It was just incredible. I was getting calls from Leavenworth [prison] and different prisons around the country getting permission for Antenna Theater to interview people and get a huge amount of oral history that then could be cut—you know what this is about—cut into the story line [for the audio tour]. They did a spectacular job, truly spectacular. The day we opened, we knew that we needed to get at least 35 percent of the visitors taking the tour to break even—it was an optional experience at that time. I think we hit like 45 percent, and then within the first months, we were a couple over 50 percent. We knew we were going to be okay financially, and it turned out, we ended up being better than okay. The tour was celebrated; it won awards all over the place because the story was told in such compelling way.

03-00:49:35

Farrell: Do you know what the percentage of people who take a tour, the audio tour is now?

03-00:49:42

Moore: Yes, well, here's how it developed. When it was still optional, we got all the way up to like 90–93 percent as an optional experience and then the Park Service, and we, decided well, let's just make this part of the ticket price, and if people want to opt out, they can. We moved to all-inclusive ticket, and at this point, pretty much everybody that goes to Alcatraz takes the tour. If people are coming to Alcatraz for a second time, they also have the ability to opt out, but the tour is pretty much at 100 percent most of the time.

03-00:50:22

Farrell: It's what it seemed to me, but it's interesting, having it folded into the ticket price does make sense especially if you're getting in the 90 percent of people.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:50:32
Moore: Yeah.

03-00:50:32
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. Well, so one thing I want to talk a little bit about today is the different people that you worked with because you're not operating in a vacuum. You're working with the GGNRA, you're working with different partners, different people like that. Who were some of the people that you found you were working most closely with, Brian O'Neill included?

03-00:51:02
Moore: When I came back to Golden Gate, [there was changing National Park Service leadership at the park]. The first superintendent of Golden Gate, Bill Whalen, had become the Director of the entire National Park Service and when that position ended, he came back to Golden Gate as superintendent for a brief time. For a while, I was working directly with Bill, and the good part about that was we knew one another. Bill was an innovative and visionary person and was very supportive of the idea of the Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy and actually helped facilitate it and opened doors to the other areas in the National Park Service that had organizations like that. Bill selected Brian O'Neill as the deputy superintendent. Brian had come not from the Park Service but for another Interior Department bureau called the Heritage Recreation and Conservation Service, which no longer exists. He was an out-of-the-box selection because he wasn't a Park Service veteran and because the federal agency he worked for was more about working with state and local governments for conservation [and park] purposes. Brian brought a more open feeling about partnerships and less of attitude that the Park Service knows all and can do all, et cetera.

03-00:52:37
When Bill left, Brian became [park] superintendent, and that changed everything because Brian was an incredible visionary and super charismatic. For Brian, no idea was too big, and the more he could be promoting public engagement in the park, the more partnerships, the better. The more he could convince the entire National Park Service that partnerships were the way to the future, the happier he was. Of course, being at his side as a partner organization, he was an incredible blessing and an inspiration for the Conservancy and actually for all the park partners, not just the Conservancy but the other tenant, nonprofit park partners like the Headlands Center for the Arts and others. Brian was one-of-a-kind and really put Golden Gate on its continuing path and supported its positive evolution, but also actually changed how the Park Service looked at partnerships.

03-00:53:53
Farrell: Yeah, and so when mentioned that everything changed from the transition of leadership from Bill Whalen to Brian O'Neill, do you mean the partnerships was a major thing that had changed or was there something else too?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:54:07
Moore: Yeah, well but Bill was a fan of partnerships as well so that the mood was still there. What was different about Brian is he made partnerships his central purpose and cause. Brian wasn't a person for details. His idea was if the vision is big enough, the resources will follow, and my response to him was that a vision without resources is a hallucination–so we were [laughs] a good team. Because I was visionary too, but I really focused on, okay, how do we land the vision, how do we get it done? Brian liked, that was a good separation of duties. The other people, of course, that were influential to me were the [Conservancy] board members. Judy, of course, who went on to other things, but I have such a debt of gratitude for her vision and leadership in getting things set up, and she continued to consult for a while after I became the executive director. But then the early board members, for it takes a certain amount of courage and commitment to join a nonprofit that's just starting. It's not like you're getting social credit, nobody has heard of who you are, and so you really have to be committed at an early stage to the organization's growth and well-being. It was a good, early board and the board continued to grow and evolve. My first boss was someone named Virgil Caselli who had been [the general] manager of Ghirardelli Square and my second chair was Roy Eisenhardt who at the time was president—I think at the time was president of the Oakland A's baseball team—and Roy was just an incredible strategist and supporter and pretty much a behind-the-scenes, open-the-door person for the Parks Conservancy.

03-00:56:23
Farrell: Yeah, and at that period of time, what were some of the board members bringing to the table in terms of a vision and also providing those resources for you, so you can dream big?

03-00:56:36
Moore: Yeah, some of them were bringing just the skills you need, whether it's financial management skills for the finance committee or legal skills for the inevitable need for that, but other [skills and connections as well]. Particularly Roy had a strong sense of the opportunity, and in fact with the audio tour, we actually had a formal study by McKinsey & Company, the management consultants, of how we should do that, and their recommendation was that the Conservancy should outsource the entire thing and take a royalty. Roy looked at that and turned that out on its head and said, "No, we should [operate the audio tour ourselves and pay a royalty to the vendor who helped produce the tour.]" I don't know that I would've had the confidence to take a formal management study and [go against its recommendations and] say, "No, let's do it still ourselves." Roy was willing to take strategic risk and see where they would go [–and saw that the mission and revenue opportunity for the Conservancy was far more substantial with this approach].

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-00:57:46
Farrell: Thinking about Roy's vision with that and turning the study on its head, did it take a lot of convincing for you to do that or did you trust your board members' instincts?

03-00:57:58
Moore: I trusted them, it didn't take a lot of convincing. I'm a bit of a risk taker myself—I mean not a silly risk taker—but if someone else confirms it that it's worth pursuing. He had quite a bit of professional experience that I didn't. Running a baseball team is pretty big deal.

03-00:58:23
Farrell: That's true, yes. [laughter] Those original board members, Judy and Virgil and Roy, I know how Judy came to the project, but how did you go about bringing people like Virgil and Roy into the fold and getting them to be board members?

03-00:58:42
Moore: Yeah, Virgil came in for two reasons. One is he had been in charge of the "Save the Cable Cars" philanthropic campaign, so he was on our radar screen [as a civic volunteer who knew philanthropy]. Ghirardelli was a park neighbor, so he was someone that we knew, and he was very active in the civic scene of San Francisco, so he is someone that we knew. With Roy, it was another board member who introduced us to him. I remember the first meeting with Roy, and I wasn't giving it a lot of possibility that it would happen given all that was on his plate, but, yeah, after the first meeting he said, "Yeah, I'll [join the board if approved by the full board]." He became the board chair after Virgil.

03-00:59:41
Farrell: How often were you interacting with the board members?

03-00:59:47
Moore: Oh, a lot. Roy and I had a meeting every Wednesday morning, and other board officers were invited to attend and the Park Service [superintendent] was invited to attend. There was like maybe six of us and that really helped just build the trust because of that regular connection. None of us was anticipating what was to come with the Presidio closing, how important that trust would be to face the opportunities and challenges at that scale.

03-01:00:22
Farrell: Yeah, I'm also thinking about having done many background interviews at this point with board members over the years, one thing that a lot of people have mentioned is how good at establishing relationships you are with board members. I'm wondering if your experience with those early board members or I guess how you learned how to develop good relationships starting with Virgil and Roy? You had already known Judy, but how you started to think about board relationships?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:01:02
Moore: I think I'm fundamentally curious about people. I like to understand where they come from, what they know, what they believe in, what their life experience has been and so that's just one way of just getting to know someone. Secondly, I really value and respect expertise and I felt that the board members, each in their own way, were my mentors and giving me a hands-on education to things, and I respected that and took advantage of that. And thirdly, I really believed that as a nonprofit organization, we should have a culture of gratitude. I was always prompt in recognizing how people had helped the Conservancy and doing it in ways that were not formulaic but personal. I think the curiosity, the value of what they brought, and the generosity were the three things that I put together.

03-01:02:25
Roy was challenging [in a positive way]. He had a mind that was so incredibly capable.

03-01:02:36
Farrell: I also really relate to being naturally curious about people and asking people questions and I'm wondering how you went about getting to know the board members?

03-01:02:55
Moore: In a variety of ways, none of it was complicated, [and the Board members were there to serve]. Of course, I had my regular interaction with them because we had meetings that we attended and work that needed to be done. But I tried to make time to get to know them personally and to get to know their life beyond the Conservancy. What other things were they involved with, how were their kids, who was their family, how did their vacation go, what made them happy, how could the Conservancy make them happy? The Conservancy formed the feeling of a family in the love and support we gave one another.

03-01:03:9
Farrell: Yeah, and it sounds like by getting to know them in that way and asking those questions, you were willing to meet them where they were.

03-01:03:50
Moore: Yes. We had to find the appropriate boundary between me being the staff leader of the Conservancy and the board being the governing body. But I was willing to have that boundary and so were they to be not a straight line but a crooked line. Because I wasn't, as the leader of the Conservancy at the staff level, threatened by their involvement. Yeah, there were times probably when they got into things in a more detailed way than might be the normal, but I always saw the benefit of that as evidence of how much they cared really. I didn't see it as a push for control as much as the desire to help.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:04:49
Farrell: Yeah, you know that's a really interesting thing, not feeling threatened by them, but if you all are understanding that you all have a similar goal, might come at it from different perspectives, but it does sounds like that might be something in practice. I think in theory, a lot of people will say those things, but in practice, not feeling threatened, that will allow you to hear what they're saying and take that feedback in an open way.

03-01:05:17
Moore: I think [human relationships, trust and collegiality] requires a lot from everybody to practice it well because it is a bit of an art form, and trust must be there, of course, or you could feel threatened or insecure. But, gosh, it sure worked out well for the Conservancy, I would say.

03-01:05:37
Farrell: Yeah. Were they responsible for helping you come up with different fund-raising ideas or income streams?

03-01:05:45
Moore: Yeah, very much. Well, one that I'll mention now because it relates to an important chapter of the Conservancy. Roy was by marriage part of the Haas family of Levi Strauss and the family has private foundations that manage their philanthropic giving and gave grants to organizations. He was instrumental in introducing me to not only Walter and Ellen Haas Jr., his wife's parents, but also to the president of the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund. Roy was instrumental in introducing his father-in-law Walter to the concept of what Crissy Field could be. He opened up a big vision for everyone to be part of and I think it's clear how fundamental the Haas, Jr. Fund was to the realization of the restoration of Crissy Field. The biggest grant in National Park Service history came from there. Their first grant [to Crissy Field's restoration] was $35,000 and I was thrilled at that, but I had no idea how we would jointly move forward and had much bigger ideas and visions.

03-01:07:19
Farrell: Yeah, we'll get into that in depth, I think if not today in some of our future sessions. But knowing how just how instrumental they were in helping you realize that vision is important.

03-01:07:32
Moore: Yeah. Other board members were there as well, Rosemary Young, who was very active in the foundation world and philanthropic world was great with her contacts and her support; everybody along the way. Eventually, I don't remember exactly when this occurred, but we hired a private consulting firm named Bridgespan—they do nonprofit consulting—to do a complete review of all of our revenue-based opportunities that were mission related throughout the Golden Gate National Parks, so that really gave us a complete portfolio of business opportunities to consider.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:08:20
Farrell: I want to talk a little bit more about Brian O'Neill because I know you worked with him quite a bit and then also had developed a friendship. I'm wondering if you could tell me what some of your first impressions of Brian were?

03-01:08:37
Moore: Yeah, pretty much universally it was hard not to like Brian at the get-go. He was just so welcoming and charming and the classic twinkle in the eye, and a person that made you think that you were the most important individual he had ever met up to that point. He had a great sense of humor [and could be very playful, but also very engaging and] persuasive—not in a way that was pushy, just in way that was compelling—and we had a lot of fun. There was a lot of behind-the-scenes work that we got to do, and we had a natural affinity for one another. We each had a sense of humor that carried us through both the positive stuff and the hard stuff.

03-01:09:33
Farrell: When he came on as superintendent of the GGNRA in 1986, how did you see him take on leadership and how would you describe his leadership style then?

03-01:09:50
Moore: Brian was so different from the normal park superintendents because at that time—it's changed now—most park superintendents focused on what was inside their boundaries. That's where their attention went. "Okay, I've got this park and it's got all this stuff, and I have to take care of it and operate it." But Brian turned that on its head. He focused on what was outside his boundaries and left the inside to others [on his team]. He joined organizations like SPUR [San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research], he lived in [Marin County], but was working the park it seemed like every night and every day and the weekend. Building the park's identity, its friends. He said it's not fundraising, it's "friend raising," that was one of his lines and just building the identity of the park through his own leadership position as something that was up there with the museums, the symphony, and the other assets that the community cared about.

03-01:11:01
Farrell: You had mentioned that he had a lot of big ideas, no idea was too big, and that if the vision was big enough, the resources would follow. What were some of his big visions?

03-01:11:20
Moore: Well, many of them were common. For example, he gravitated toward Crissy Field really easily. Of course, when the Presidio came up [with its conversion from post to park], that was an obvious one [for him]. That was put in our hands, but you needed a visionary attitude about the Presidio, and Brian brought that so much. It was era of possibilities when people believed the Presidio could become like a world-class, solve-every-problem think tank. That every square inch of it would be of a public purpose, which is not eventually how it turned out. Another initiative that Brian brought to the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Conservancy was this idea "trails [forever,]" which was that the trails of the park were like its circulation system for public enjoyment and so how do we take a long-term view of enhancing, improving, and taking care of that trail system. He was formative in the concept of the Bay Area Ridge Trail, connecting all the ridges of the Bay Area by trails. Actually, for a while, we were hosting a "partnership academy" at Golden Gate for national park employees from around the country who would come to Golden Gate to learn how is this done. Brian and Golden Gate and to lesser extent myself got profiled in a book called *Governing by Network*, which the opening chapter talks about Golden Gate as this new way of governing by network rather than just on your own.

03-01:13:09
Farrell: You had mentioned some of the visions that were successful. Were there any that were not successful?

03-01:13:16
Moore: There were some. I wouldn't call it a vision, but there was a problem with a sewage treatment plant in the Marin Headlands and so all the park partners were having trouble delivering their programs as that was breaking down. He'd convinced me that I should try to raise money for that vision, and I did try, but that was unsuccessful.

03-01:13:40
Farrell: Were there any times where he dreamed a little too big and you had to rein him in?

03-01:13:48
Moore: I think he dreamed a little bigger about the Presidio than was feasible but it's always good to have a push for the highest possibility even if you have to deliver it at a way that eventually is more practical and realistic. I don't fault him for that, but yeah, we couldn't occupy six million square feet of buildings entirely with charitable causes, that just wasn't possible. But I think because of Brian's vision, the very first campus that was developed at the Presidio was a nonprofit campus, the Thoreau Center for Sustainability, so he definitely was able to put a stake in the ground and an important one.

03-01:14:44
Farrell: How often were working with him? How often would you meet with him, how often would you talk to him on the phone about these things?

03-01:14:55
Moore: Well, I saw him every day. [His office was on] one floor of the building, and I was in another, so we were up and down the stairs all the time. If we weren't up and down either early in the morning or in the afternoon, we often just caught up at the end of the day [when other staff had gone home]. Particularly when Crissy Field began happening and obviously when Presidio began happening, we had a lot to do together, so we were always in consultation.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:15:26
Farrell: Did it help that you were coming from two different organizations, two different perspectives?

03-01:15:32
Moore: Yeah. I think it did help because for Brian, as I said, he was a visionary and he needed other people to be sure that the visions could be implemented. The federal government did not have the flexibility, procedures, [the resources], or policies, or culture to deliver [on all that] he wanted done. He needed [a partner] that was willing to take risks and be innovative and do things in ways that were not conventional. In the early years, from the Park Service point of view, Golden Gate was seen as this out-of-control maverick. Brian was not popular up the ranks with a lot of people because he just resisted doing things the way they were normally done, and he was seen as a superintendent that no one could get control of. Eventually that transitioned for Golden Gate being looked at as [a positive] innovation engine for the Park Service. [The attitude changed from seeing Golden Gate as an] out-of-control child to [an innovative standard bearer], that people actually emulated for breaking new ground. So [this evolution in Park Service perspective] ran its course.

03-01:16:55
Farrell: Yeah. From going to the black sheep to the model child.

03-01:17:01
Moore: Yeah, it's like maybe we were the reckless teenager and eventually grew up to be the successful adult, I'm not sure. [laughs]

03-01:17:09
Farrell: Yeah. [laughs] You also cultivated a friendship with Brian. Did that happen immediately or did that happen slowly over time?

03-01:17:40
Moore: Yeah, it happened pretty quickly. Yeah, there wasn't any difficulty there at all. I will say most everybody felt like Brian's best friend, so I had to always put in check a little bit how close we were. But we've spent tons of time together and really enjoyed one another [–and developed a deep friendship].

03-01:17:47
Farrell: As we talk more about these other projects too, we'll talk more about Brian and his involvement with these, but were there other national park superintendents that you were also working with?

03-01:18:01
Moore: Not for long. Either [before or] after Bill [Whalen] left, there were few interim superintendents, but they were there at most a year. Of course, I've worked with them but not in the way that was producing any long-term results.

03-01:18:20
Farrell: Okay, got it, okay. Yeah, and I do want to talk a little bit about some of the projects that you were working on particularly in the mid-'80s leading up to

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

the early '90s. I was looking at the timeline of the association, now the Conservancy, and one of the first things that I saw that you were able to do was to build the Golden Gate Raptor Observatory. That was a partnership with the National Park Service and included citizen science. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about the impetus for that idea, how it came to fruition?

03-01:19:02

Moore: Sure. The Raptor Observatory had been formed by a National Park Service biologist to track this incredible migration of birds of prey [in the park], and it was completely volunteer run other than the limited attention that the Park Service person could give it. It grew to a point that it deserved more formal staff members and resources to really hit its full potential. The Park Service asked the Conservancy if we would be willing to take the program under our wing, which is a perfect expression for a bird-related program. We were asked to see if we could find the money to fund its first director, [to be hired by the Conservancy]. So we took that on. We were successful in getting a grant that to me, at the time, was just like super huge. It was a three-year $95,000 grant from the San Francisco Foundation. Not only was it instrumental in what it allowed the Raptor Observatory to do, but I think it really signaled our emergence into the philanthropic world to get a grant from the San Francisco Foundation, to get a grant of that scale, and to get some program experience under our wing, and to advance the concept of citizen science, which was pretty new at the time. Now everybody uses that word, but back then I didn't even know if it was called citizen science yet. With those funds, I hired an amazing young man recently graduated from UC Davis, a zoologist named Allen Fish, and he's still there, all these years later and the Raptor Observatory is world renowned for its observation and research and educational programs.

03-01:21:13

Farrell: How did the role of citizen science work in the observatory? Also, what was the significance because as you mentioned this was a newer thing that was happening?

03-01:21:26

Moore: Yeah, at the time, I was willing to take on the program, but even then, the program occurred to me as rather specialized. For one of the first things the Conservancy does that's [philanthropically supported and] visible [and public facing], it was kind of a specialized, focused niche. But it turned out, it got us importantly into the area of the care and stewardship of the natural habitats and resources of the national park, and that was fundamental to our mission. From there, we went on to support and help found the Habitat Restoration Team, the Site Stewardship program, and native plant nurseries. It really got us into the fundamental ecosystem and the habitat restoration work in the national parks.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:22:19
Farrell: When it had originally opened and people were able to use it, what was the response from the public like?

03-01:22:27
Moore: Oh, incredible. I still think it's a little bit [unknown], but not really sleepy anymore. I don't know how many people realize that you can drive fifteen minutes out of the city, maybe even ten and go up on a hill, you can see hundreds of birds of prey passing overhead and see a hawk released, an eagle, a falcon, a hawk or whatever, as part of the banding program–literally being ten feet from a bird of prey as it's sent back up into the sky on its migration. It is an experience that is unforgettable.

03-01:23:06
Farrell: We talked a little bit about revenue streams and income, but one thing we didn't talk very much about was growing the membership. I know that in the first three years, the membership grew to about 5000 people and I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about who audience was and how you were thinking about bringing members in?

03-01:23:45
Moore: Membership, of course, was brand-new to me. I had never run a membership program before, so I had to turn to people that had experience and understood the fundamentals of how you create an invitation for membership and how you grow a membership. I remember realizing—still the convention, it's changing, but most membership is still a direct-mail process. There are more online memberships that are happening, but at the time I was doing it, that was how members were found was by mailing stuff to people. If you were lucky, anywhere from 1 to 10 percent of those people would decide to join. I remember coming into our office one morning, and there were like fifty envelopes on the desk, and it was like, "Whoa." We opened the first envelope, and it was a membership from a woman whose name was Happy Joe. I thought what a great name for our first member, Happy Joe. From there we just continued to stay in the mix of sending out invitations and getting responses and renewing members and building that membership.

03-01:25:05
Farrell: Who's your ideal audience?

03-01:25:11
Moore: You know what, I don't know at that point whether we had an ideal audience. It was for anyone who cared about nature or kids and families and history or scenery—we were hoping they were thinking of supporting us. In the same way that people gravitate toward the California Academy of Sciences or the Museum of Modern Art, we believed we had something that people could care about and care about over time. We also believed that if people joined us as members, which at the time was as low as fifteen dollars to twenty-five dollars, that if they stuck with us, that perhaps they'd be able to volunteer or maybe they'd be able to give more. That's turned out to the be the case.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:25:57
Farrell: What about neighbors, were you trying to appeal to people who lived nearby?

03-01:26:02
Moore: We did. There was a bit of a zip code analysis that you go through in terms of it, and we could see that the further we got from locations proximate to the park, the more our membership numbers dropped off. We did pretty well in the East Bay just because a lot of people in the East Bay gravitate toward the ocean, and we're one of the first places [to get to the ocean]. We did well in San Francisco, we did well in Marin, and eventually, I think we almost had a member in every state, but I called that the "staff parents club."

03-01:26:43
Farrell: Yes, those are real things. [laughter]

03-01:26:46
Moore: Yeah.

03-01:26:48
Farrell: That's funny.

03-01:26:49
Moore: I know, my dad was all the way [up in] Washington State. [laughs]

03-01:26:52
Farrell: Yeah, that's funny. [laughs] You did also work on some restoration projects including different habitat restorations and I think one of the earliest ones was that Crissy Field Shoreline and those plans were announced in 1986. What was the impetus for wanting to restore the Crissy Fields Shoreline habitat?

03-01:27:21
Moore: Yeah, you have to take people back in time for this one. I think what most people are unaware of it now, but when you walked in Crissy Field before its restoration, you were facing a hundred acres of asphalt and concrete, chain-link fences, rubble, and [old] tires and debris on the shore, fallen-down buildings, and underneath all that, environmental contaminants. Actually, people were almost okay with it because there was a shoreline strip that you can walk where the views were really beautiful. If just kept your gaze looking out to the [San Francisco Bay] instead of at what was behind you, it was a really nice walk. A few people even liked all that asphalt because they taught their kids to ride bikes or dog owners felt that they had a certain place at Crissy Field because few people had found it yet.

03-01:28:20
But my point is all you had to was look at Crissy Field and see this does not look anything like a national park. The scenery is marred, the ecology has been lost or is threatened, the history is not evident, and the opportunities for the public to walk and enjoy a hundred acres of the scale that they should is completely missing. We took on a visioning process to determine how Crissy Field could be improved. At the time by the way, the Army was still there, so

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

the Park Service only had about forty-five acres of Crissy Field to work with, not the full hundred and twenty that eventually became part of it. That's where the initial Haas, Jr. Fund grant was instrumental because they gave us some early seed funding to begin getting that vision developed and to consult with the community about that vision.

03-01:29:25
Farrell: Yeah, and so that initial seed funding was to plan for how the habitat would be restored?

03-01:29:33
Moore: Yes, and the only the point I would make is habitat restoration was part of it, but I think in a bigger-picture way, the theme was park making, how do we take this public place and create a park, and that park of course had habitat, it had scenery, it had history, and it had picnic areas and places for recreation, so it was a mix.

03-01:30:01
Farrell: Was the vision for what Crissy Field eventually became and is now, was that all part of that original planning that went that went into that announcement in 1986?

03-01:30:12
Moore: Yes, the vision was contained in a very big-picture way in that plan. Clearly even then, we could see that the future state of Crissy Field shouldn't be what its current state is, but there was nothing, there weren't words to describe it. There was no formal design in any way, no site plan and no schematics for what that might look like.

03-01:30:38
Farrell: Were you required to do an environmental impact review?

03-01:30:42
Moore: No, we hired an outside landscape architecture firm to bring their talents to the effort and then later complete the environmental review. It didn't go all the way to EIS—environmental impact statement—but an environmental assessment was needed.

03-01:31:02
Farrell: Yeah, I guess if you're restoring it and not building it, it's different.

03-01:31:07
Moore: Yes, I mean, [the restoration plan] could've triggered an EIS, but because that overarching plan [for Golden Gate National Recreation Area] already had an environmental impact statement, [the Crissy plan] kind of built on that foundation. We finished that plan and got it all approved. But it was very quickly obsolete because once the full Presidio base closure was announced, we had to start over. I had worked so hard to get that plan done that by the time we got it approved, I said, "I'm taking a long time off," and I think I took maybe five or six weeks and my wife, and I travelled throughout Asia. When

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

we flew back into San Francisco and we're walking down the airport terminal, and they had a little a newspaper stand there, the headline in the paper said "Presidio Slated for Closure." That's the first time I heard about it, and I thought my life is never going to be the same. [laughter]

03-01:32:14
Farrell: This is interesting with the timeline, how such two major projects Crissy Fields and also the Presidio, the transition from post to park, they dovetail with each other.

03-01:32:29
Moore: They do.

03-01:32:30
Farrell: With that plan becoming obsolete, you feeling like you need time off. I've found that it began in 1990 but when was it announced that that was going to happen?

03-01:32:48
Moore: The Presidio closure?

03-01:32:49
Farrell: Yeah.

03-01:32:50
Moore: I think the first wind of the closure was in 1989. It was the Base Closure and Realignment Act, formerly known as BRAC, that had a special commission that would make these decisions, and they were considered nonnegotiable. The Presidio was put on the list; that was the 1989 announcement. There were efforts by Senator Boxer and Senator Feinstein and Congressman Pelosi to turn that decision around because San Francisco loved the Army as its neighbor, it had been there for 200 years, but they were unsuccessful, and eventually the closure was confirmed. We had to put our heads together. Now what we do we do?

03-01:33:42
Farrell: I think that there's a lot of details about that and so we may not get to the Presidio today.

03-01:33:49
Moore: It's a big one.

03-01:33:51
Farrell: It's a big one, yeah. Those original plans for Crissy Field that that became obsolete, so I know the plan was announced in 1986. Did you start the planning process in 1986, so for like those three years?

03-01:34:08
Moore: Yeah, we started in about 1986 and we concluded in about 1989 before I left for my vacation time off. Coming back, facing the Presidio closure, that I have

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

then two things to carry–both the Presidio closure, which was huge, but also maintaining that vision for Crissy Field and deciding when it was right to get that planning up and going again. But it had to wait until the Presidio closure had gotten far enough along in its planning that it was putting Crissy Field in the context of the conversion of the entire [military post to a national park].

03-01:34:54
Farrell: Sorry, I'm just taking notes, so I have some background on this, but, yeah, that's really interesting. Also coming up with that plan, that's three years with Crissy restoration plan, it's three years, it's a long time.

03-01:35:07
Moore: It was, yeah.

03-01:35:09
Farrell: Who were some of the partners or the stakeholders that you were working with during those three years?

03-01:35:17
Moore: Yeah, well the main partners—the Presidio Trust wasn't established yet, so the main partners were the Park Service and the Conservancy, to begin the planning effort for Crissy Field again. The National Park Service had a planning staff that we worked with, and then as I said, we hired an outside landscape architecture consultant to do the detailed work. There were lots of public hearings and public meetings and outreach. It had its controversy with standard stakeholders in that the dog walkers were feeling threatened that Crissy Field would be improved at all, with those wanting to see ecological restoration believing that dogs would be a problem for birds, with people in the neighborhood worrying whether an improved Crissy Field would be a benefit to them or actually produce traffic that made it a detriment. With other people that just approached it as something wonderful to think about but didn't feel that they weren't a traditional stakeholder, or they didn't feel like they saw the impacts as all positive. The Citizens' Advisory Commission was still in action, so we ran a lot of this through their public hearings process and did the complete environmental assessment work as well. Like many of these projects, they have their moments of complete opportunity and momentum and times when you think like you're never going to get there, but we got there.

03-01:37:04
Farrell: Yeah, I mean that's a multiyear project, that's a lot. Did you feel good about the plan that you had originally drew up for Crissy Field?

03-01:37:14
Moore: Yeah. I didn't really covet the land in the other side of the fence that Army still had because it was in no one's 's mind that it would be transferred within our generation or even the next. I mean really the Presidio closure was unexpected, and maybe the public sentimentality for the place got in the way because when you really look at the detail, it was becoming obsolete as a

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

military installation. It was designed to protect the harbor entrance, and it wasn't doing that anymore.

03-01:37:55
Farrell: Right, yeah, it's interesting.

03-01:37:58
Moore: We just felt like it was sacred. I mean it was the oldest continuously operating military post in the country. It was the Army's most—one of their most beloved locations, so we just figured it was just going to be there because it's always been, and people love it there.

03-01:38:19
Farrell: Yeah, that's interesting, and I think something that will be good to talk about, about how that feeling was preserved.

03-01:38:26
Moore: By the way, I didn't mention this, but another stakeholder was the Army because the Park Service had to interact with the Army because the law for Golden Gate gave the Park Service a certain degree of oversight about how the Army developed the post now that it was in the boundary of the national park. There was a principle of one up, one down that if the Army was going to build something new, it had to take equal square footage down, and the Park Service was in charge of monitoring that. The Army, at one point, moved ahead to provide a major portion of Crissy Field for a huge postal service facility and storage area. It even began being built, and eventually due to lawsuits and other things, the Army had to retreat, and the post office had to retreat. Otherwise, there might be a mega post office storage and delivery facility there.

03-01:39:25
Farrell: Oh, that's interesting. I feel like I've seen one of those, and they're quite large.

03-01:39:30
Moore: Yeah, yeah. A person I haven't talked about is Amy Meyer who was really one of the two key advocates for creating the GGNRA, the leader of the [People for a] Golden Gate National Recreation Area. To this day she remains in an advocacy role for the park, and she was instrumental in fighting that post office and getting it stopped.

03-01:39:54
Farrell: Do you remember what some of her arguments against the post office were?

03-01:40:00
Moore: Some of them were more from a values perspective, like this is a national park, and this facility, at this point in time, is out of scale. Also, the Sierra Legal Defense [Fund took this on and found issues with the Army's planning and review process. The Defense Fund] had statutory things behind them including the one up, one down principle and the Army had failed to do a

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

complete National Environmental Policy Act, environmental assessment. It was a combination of ideology and values and the details of the process.

03-01:40:43

Farrell: Yeah, and it's interesting because that review is a federal process, [laughs] so it's funny the federal government didn't think about that.

03-01:40:51

Moore: Yeah, yeah. [laughter]

03-01:40:52

Farrell: Another thing in the late '80s that was established was the habitat restoration team, and it's one of the longest-running volunteer programs in the park. How much did that grow out of the Crissy Field restoration planning? Was that a part of it or was it related?

03-01:41:14

Moore: I think they came from a separate place, but then one began to serve the other. The Habitat Restoration Team, again it was generated by mainly Park Service staff members involved in natural resource conservation realizing that they didn't have the staff resources to take on the full scale of the park and finding the people who were willing to volunteer their time to be supportive. It started almost in an experimental way and then once it was seen that it had potential for growth—I mean often that's what happened that things would be experiment with by the Conservancy or the Park Service and then if they were working, often it was given to the Conservancy to take it to scale. That was the case with the Habitat Restoration Team, and then that led to, as I said, the Site Stewardship Team and the native plant nurseries, and all the other things that were happening.

03-01:42:22

Farrell: Yeah, so that was the jumping off point for a lot of those things that came later?

03-01:42:25

Moore: Yeah. I mean it started with one native plant nursery early on and then eventually grew to six nurseries, and the Conservancy was producing 250,000 native plants a year. Actually, we're the most preeminent set of native plant nurseries in the entire National Park Service, and largely volunteer run.

03-01:42:47

Farrell: Yeah, and what kind of projects were the volunteer team working on? Was it cleanups, was it planting, were things a little bit more that took a little bit more scientific knowledge?

03-01:43:03

Moore: Yeah, with the Habitat Restoration Team, a good portion of it was invasive species control, and it's very straightforward to introduce volunteers to what's an invasive species and to show them ways to effectively remove it. Of

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

course, once you remove invasive species, the best approach is to replant with native species so that would follow. Where habitats have been lost down in San Mateo, Milagra Ridge, or Mori Point, or along Redwood Creek, and in Muir Woods, or at Muir Beach, where either [habitats or wetlands] had been paved over or filled or you name it, you had to bring it back. Lands End was another area, and you often dig it up, recontour it, and replant it.

03-01:44:02
Farrell: How many volunteers were you attracting to these projects especially in those early days when things were first getting started?

03-01:44:13
Moore: It would be hard for me to really recall that number. I know eventually the volunteer program grew to be about a [25,000] volunteers a year producing [about 500,000] hours of volunteer time, just huge, absolutely huge. In the early time, it was probably 10 percent of that I would guess.

03-01:44:36
Farrell: And since, have you hired staff people to manage the volunteers?

03-01:44:41
Moore: Oh yeah. Yeah, that was another thing that Brian was—actually, he had a saying to his staff, "Every job you do by yourself is denying an opportunity for a member of the community to give back." He worked hard, and with some resistance, to actually make his staff management team believe that getting volunteers was as important as hiring staff. That that part of their fundamental mission of success was allowing opportunities for people to engage.

03-01:45:22
Farrell: Yeah, I think that's really important, and also goes to the ownership part that you were talking about. If people feel an ownership, they're more likely to care.

03-01:45:33
Moore: Exactly. Eventually, the volunteer infrastructure really grew. Now, it has a complete curriculum for volunteers, training classes something called the Park Academy that any volunteer can attend to learn more about the park and everything from its native plants to its history.

03-01:45:55
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. I'm wondering after you were like, "Okay, I'm going to take a break," you mentioned that you took five or six weeks off and you went traveling. I believe you said Asia, is that right?

03-01:46:14
Moore: Yeah, my wife and I went on a trek in the Himalayas, the Annapurna Circuit, and spent three weeks in Nepal and three weeks in Thailand.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:46:26
Farrell: Wow, okay, and what inspired you to do that?

03-01:46:27
Moore: Of all things when I got in a plane to fly to the Himalayas, one of the members of the park's [Citizens] Advisory Commission was on the same flight. [laughter]

03-01:46:35
Farrell: Of course.

03-01:46:38
Moore: When we got to [Nepal], one of my former staff members, [who was living there at the time,] greeted me at the Kathmandu airport wearing a Golden Gate Raptor Observatory T-shirt. [laughs]

03-01:46:49
Farrell: You just couldn't escape it. [laughs]

03-01:46:51
Moore: I couldn't escape, yeah.

03-01:46:53
Farrell: What inspired you to go on that trip to visit those places?

03-01:47:00
Moore: Well, you reminded me of the staff member of mine who really got our initial bookstore function up and running. She left [the Conservancy] and moved to Nepal and was involved in many ways in Nepal but also had friends in the trekking world. Her name was Nancy [Welch]. She reached out and said, "When are you going to come visit me?" I said, "Uh, well, maybe soon." She actually set up the trip for me—found a company and set up [our trek in the Himalayas]—and we stayed with her in Kathmandu.

03-01:47:35
Farrell: Oh, that's really special.

03-01:47:37
Moore: Yeah.

03-01:47:38
Farrell: Yeah. Well, I think based on time, in terms of theme, like topics, this is a good place to pause for today. But I do have a couple of reflective questions before we wrap up. I'm wondering, during this period of time especially as you're starting to work on the Crissy Field plan and working with Brian, you're directing a nonprofit and it's a new thing for you. What are some of the things that you learned from this period of time, let's say, mid-to-late '80s that you really took with you that you found formative for the rest of your career?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:48:24
Moore: Well, it's not like we can ever close a chapter on Brian, but to a bring to a certain degree of close, I learned a lot of him. I saw his energy and his ability to inspire and compel people to the public good and little did I know that he would end his place in my life very unexpectedly with his sudden death. Without either of us knowing it, he had prepared me to step on a stage that was now somewhat empty because it wasn't that I wasn't out in the community as well, but he was out there a lot [and was the park's leading spokesperson]. With his death, there was a mourning for what he stood for, for his energy, for what the park stood for, and I had to step up. But I don't even know that I had recognized at the time, it's just what I did because there was a thing that needed to happen, and I was there and able to do it. That's one of my reflections, just how much you learn from people in big ways without necessarily even knowing it as it's happening, but fortunately because of oral history programs, you can reflect on that important place.

03-01:49:52
The other piece I realized again was the continued advantages of opening the door for people to be their better selves, to volunteer, to contribute, to take a stand, and to have a vision, to make the world or their neighborhood or their community a better place. There's rarely a downside to that as long as you are clear that it can't be just talk, it has to eventually result in tangible things.

03-01:50:37
Farrell: My last question for you today is we started with your return to the Bay Area, which you felt like was a homecoming and now you're living in the Marina area, you're working on these issues that are essentially in your backyard. What did it mean for you to be doing this work as you returned home?

03-01:50:57
Moore: It was an incredibly meaningful and rare opportunity to not only have the creative opportunity in the community engagement side of things, but then to see things change in dramatic ways in front of you. To see that when [places and programs] change for the positive, how quickly they're embraced and the joy they bring to many people. That it's magic, really magic. I think that's why so many people at Golden Gate, whether in the Park Service or Conservancy or the Presidio Trust, stay and continue to work on this endeavor. You know too, this is being very hopeful, but the sense is that national parks are there for all times–so you feel like with the work you've done during your chapter with these parks, to the extent that it can sustain itself, those results are there for the ages, not just for people now, but for future generations, for kids and grandkids and great-grandkids.

03-01:52:20
Farrell: Yeah, you're not doing something that exists in a vacuum.

03-01:52:23
Moore: Yeah, it's not a pop-up.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

03-01:52:26
Farrell: Right, right. It's not ephemeral, it's there even it might feel that way.

03-01:52:31
Moore: Yeah.

03-01:52:32
Farrell: Yeah. Well, thank you so much, this is great, and I think that we've planted a lot of seeds for our next session, too.

03-01:53:40
Moore: Thank you. I hope we've made the progress you wanted to today.

03-01:52:43
Farrell: Oh, definitely.

03-01:52:45
Moore: All right, all right, good.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Interview 4: March 2, 2022

04-00:00:05
Farrell: Okay, this is Shanna Farrell back with Greg Moore on Wednesday March 2, 2022. This is our fourth interview, and we are talking again over Zoom. Greg, welcome back; it's nice to see you.

04-00:00:18
Moore: Thank you. Good to be back.

04-00:00:21
Farrell: When we left off last time, we were talking about the Crissy Field Restoration and how several years of work had gone into that and then all of a sudden, the closure of the Presidio as a military base was announced in—I believe it was announced in 1988—and or no, sorry, the federal commission recommended in 1988 and then it was announced by Congress in 1989. That changed everything for the Crissy Field Restoration plan. You took a break, you went to travel to avoid burnout, but you came back. Can you tell me where things picked up when you returned from that trip?

04-00:01:06
Moore: Sure, when I returned from the trip, it was clear that the Presidio would be transferred by the Army to the National Park Service within a four-year period, and that was both an opportunity and a daunting challenge. The Presidio was a complex site, with over 6 million square feet of buildings, its own utility systems, its own neighborhoods. It's like a small, little town in itself, and it was unlike another national park in the United States in terms of how it needed to be managed. Not in terms of the beauty of its scenery or its history or what the natural qualities but the urban complexity of it and the infrastructure entailed in it, including hundreds of historic buildings that needed to be preserved for all time.

04-00:02:08
My challenge in coming back is the Conservancy as a partner to the National Park Service—this is before the Presidio Trust was created—was to be at the ready to help the National Park Service, particularly the local Superintendent face an opportunity and challenge unlike any that that agency had ever faced in the composition of the situation and the various dimensions.

04-00:02:37
Farrell: Yeah, I mean that's a huge thing to do. This was, at the time, the oldest operating military base in the United States. It's got over a 200-year history, it's part of the culture of San Francisco until then, and in many ways, still is in a different way. I'm wondering how the pause and the challenges that come up with the Crissy Field Restoration aside, how did you feel about the announcement when it was made that this was going to be converted from a post to a park?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-00:03:18
Moore: It was a breathtaking announcement in the true sense of the word. Breathtaking in that there was a lot of awe and opportunity, and breathtaking in that it was hard to wrap your mind around how to even begin. At the beginning, it was challenging to get everyone to understand that that transition had an inevitability to it. That was because of the affection for the Army, because of the history in San Francisco, because people considered them a good neighborhood who in times of earthquakes and other challenges had always been at the ready. There was a tendency to not want to accept the decision. The longer the acceptance was procrastinated, the shorter the time frame became to get the job done. Part of what we had to do was turn the mindset around to "let's get to work."

04-00:04:21
Farrell: Yeah, four years is a pretty short period of time especially for a project this big. How did you and the people that you were working with think about approaching this especially initially?

04-00:04:40
Moore: We understood at the beginning that we had to operate on a number of fronts. One front was advocacy. We needed people who could be ambassadors for this post to park conversion, could work with the local community, with the city of San Francisco, with the stakeholders in the Bay Area, the people in Congress, the people in the Department of Interior to keep everyone working for common objectives and to solve challenges and opportunities when they came up. Secondly, we knew that there was no script for this opportunity. The Presidio was contained in the early park legislation, but it was different to have the Presidio just drawn on the map to understanding you needed to actually convert [this historic military post] to a national park. So the vision had [to be about the future of this place and] what its role would be within the national park context. Finally, we understood that it was unlikely that normal ways of doing business would get the job done, that expertise of a variety of levels would be needed. That with the experience of the National Park Service and even the Conservancy, we were unprepared to take on a park with real estate components of these dimensions, so we had to beef up our level of expertise. I guess to sum up, we needed the public support, we needed a compelling vision, and we needed the know-how to implement the vision we came up with.

04-00:06:31
Farrell: This might feel like an aside, but I'm thinking about the way that you answered that question with the [power of] three and I know that one of your big things is the power of three. I'm wondering when you started to think about that idea, especially as a way of approaching something and also communicating?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-00:06:52
Moore: Yeah, well, if your question is about the power of three, I don't know how I began speaking that way, but it just comes naturally to me. I don't even know who introduced it to me. But it was funny, I was talking yesterday with someone about it. Brian O'Neill, we coauthored this little book, it ended up having the title *The [21] Principles of Partnership,* and I have tried to convince Brian to get them down the three, but he [stuck to 21]—[laughter]

04-00:07:23
Farrell: [At least] that's a multiple of three.

04-00:07:25
Moore: Yeah, that's right. There we go. We could've put [seven] things under three headings, and we would've had it taken care of.

04-00:07:34
Farrell: There you go. Okay, and we'll talk a little more about that later, but I just didn't know if there was an inkling of that happening at this time?

04-00:07:47
Moore: Because we needed to engage a lot of people, everything from philanthropists to elected officials to community stakeholders, we had to find a way to communicate [with the public] that was direct and simple because the project was complicated enough.

04-00:08:06
Farrell: Okay, yeah. Before we get more into the specifics about the transition, so the Crissy Field Restoration was put on hold. What did that look like for you, and what was the plan for when it would be off hold?

04-00:08:34
Moore: It was put on hold for a few reasons. The first reason was when the Army was still at the Presidio, Crissy Field was about forty-five acres of shoreline. With the Army departing, the entire Crissy Field area was about hundred and fifty acres. We had to recognize that the scope and scale of the opportunity was completely different. The second piece was more technical in that the plan that we had completed had lost its, for lack of a better word, legal sufficiency. Because the plan analyzed the impacts of a park with the Army being its neighbor, and now with the Army departing, the data that provided the process to approve the plan according to the National Environmental Policy Act was the wrong information. Finally, Crissy Field was now connected to the whole Presidio, so how things happened adjacent to Crissy and what changes were anticipated there affected what Crissy would become. It had to wait until the bigger vision for the Presidio was far enough along that Crissy Field could be fit in that context. It was almost like Crissy was a room in a house that was being remodeled, but you had to understand a full remodel before you could do the room.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-00:10:05
Farrell: Great analogy, yeah, that makes a lot of sense. Okay, and so I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what your role was in preparing for the conversion from the Presidio to a national park?

04-00:10:21
Moore: The role was not spelled out in advance by anybody. We were simply a support organization to the National Park Service at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. It took the [National Park Service] Superintendent Brian O'Neill and the Conservancy board, and me as the CEO, to determine if the Conservancy would take a role and what role that would be. Brian was very quick in understanding and believing and promoting that he needed almost his own external think tank and group of ambassadors to work through the challenges and advocate for the Presidio. So he really was on board right away in deciding that there was a role [the Conservancy] could play. Meanwhile, our reputation was modest, but people knew us. We did have a little bit of a philanthropic following, and the San Francisco Foundation reached out to us, and this was big news, it was a civic opportunity and a civic challenge and said, "We're willing to put some philanthropic support behind making the Presidio successful, so we're happy to accept a proposal from the Conservancy about what that might look like." There were corporate leaders who jumped in as well including Warren Hellman and Tully Friedman. Warren was on the board of the San Francisco Foundation at the time. That was clear that if we could come up with a concept, there would be some philanthropic support to that.

04-00:12:13
Farrell: How did you approach putting together that proposal and thinking through that vision?

04-00:12:20
Moore: It's a little hard for me to remember exactly how the concept of the Presidio Council came up, but in a way, it probably just came up in the same manner that our board existed for similar functions [with the entire Golden Gate National Recreation Area]. But we realized the Presidio was a unique asset now in that [larger] national park, that needed its own kind of advisory board and needed specific talents and specific connections and a diversity in the skills and demographics and background. We believed that if we could rally those advisors, we could come up with different and innovative ways to get the job done. Even at the time, the numbers told us a story. The Army's operating budget [for the Presidio], they were not really forthcoming about what that was, but it was anywhere from $45 to $90 million, just the operating budget. And the [scale of the] capital assets were clear. I mean there were hundreds of buildings, infrastructure in disrepair, and toxic contaminants; so even at first glance, as beautiful as the Presidio was, you could tell that [its conversion and care as a national park] was going to be costly.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-00:13:47
Farrell: Yeah, I feel like this is a pretty common theme, especially the contaminants to come out of former bases. It's kind of part and parcel of those stories.

04-00:13:58
Moore: Yeah.

04-00:13:59
Farrell: Yeah, so was the Presidio Council one of the things to come out of the proposal that you sent to the San Francisco Foundation?

04-00:14:07
Moore: Yes, absolutely. We had to get far enough along to understand what the Council could be, and we began thinking first off—Toby Rosenblatt was the board chair of the Conservancy at the time, and we had a small group including Roy Eisenhardt, who was on the Conservancy board, thinking through what the council would be and starting at the top, who would join us at the leadership level as chair of the Council. Through a lot of thinking and a lot of different people that we considered, we came up with James Harvey, who was the CEO of Transamerica at the time. He had a wonderful reputation as a corporate leader and as a civic leader and had served on the National Park Foundation board for many years. He was a lover of national parks and the environment, and his wife Charlene was an expert in nonprofit management. We reached out to Jim and after good consideration, he agreed to join us. We actually selected the chair before we began filling out the membership of the full council.

04-00:15:29
Farrell: As you were filling out the membership, what were some of the perspectives that you wanted represented on the council?

04-00:15:37
Moore: [We needed a variety of experience, expertise, and talent.] We needed urban planning and design expertise, and we had amazing people join us, some of the best urban planners, landscape architects, architects and designers almost on a global scale: Maya Lin, famous for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, but also an architect herself; Gyo Obata, a very famous architect of buildings all across America including the Air and Space Museum in Washington, DC; Jay Brodie who ran the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, which to some degree, became the model for the Presidio Trust. Let's see, who else have we got? Well, I think that that covers the design people. Oh, Adele Chatfield-Taylor, the head of the American Academy in Rome, which is a setting for landscape architects and architects to take a sabbatical and refresh themselves. And then we added people with environmental perspective: The head of the environmental program of the UN for North America, [Dr. Noel Brown], John Sawhill, [CEO of] the Nature Conservancy; Roy Eisenhardt was [Director] of the California Academy of Sciences; Bill Graves who is the head of the National Geographic Society; and more. And then for history, we brought in Roger Kennedy who was the head of the American History

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Museum of the Smithsonian and Robin Winks who was the preeminent historian of national parks [at Yale University]. We brought in academia with a number [university] presidents. We brought in people in the social service sector including Jewelle Taylor Gibbs, the professor of social welfare at UC Berkeley. People in health, [including from Stanford University] and California Pacific Medical Center, corporate leaders, and finally the arts, Francis Ford Coppola was a member of the board. That group was really ahead of its time in terms of its diversity. It was a wonderful combination of age and race and background and just really impressive public-serving people including one of my favorite people of all time, John Gardner of the Haas School of Public Service at Stanford University, so a great and wonderful group.

04-00:18:31

Eventually, the Council became larger than we envisioned—I think it ended up being thirty-seven people, and our original concept was probably fifteen. But once word got out, it was really easy to get people to agree to serve and so we just kept building the Council until we thought, well, this is everything we need.

04-00:18:55

Farrell: Was the diversity intentional or did that just happen?

04-00:19:00

Moore: Oh, it was intentional. The Bay Area was less diverse than it is now, but still it was a diverse community, and we really wanted to fulfill that opportunity to reflect the community well.

04-00:19:22

Farrell: Yeah, and I mean it's thirty-seven people, all the different areas that you described, the perspectives they're coming from, it sounds like a really holistic approach where you're trying to cover all the bases, which makes sense because you want to make sure this is a thoughtful, intentional transition. The forming of the council—before we started talking, you mentioned that they had been pretty fundamental with the vision, which sounds like one of the three major points. You had no script for this, so the vision setting was a big component. The thirty-some people is a lot, there's a lot of different perspectives there. How did work to make sure that their perspectives were working in concert instead of conflict?

04-00:20:21

Moore: We had a committee structure for the Council in terms of what was being handled. That included a [park] design committee, a historic preservation, a financial committee—and I won't remember them all—but anyway, a committee that took advantage of the skills that they had. I had to hire staff, with a group of that scale, to functionally staff out their expertise and their contributions. I eventually ended up hiring four people including Craig Middleton who after that assignment became [the first staff member and

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

second] CEO of the Presidio Trust. He had applied ahead, and he had left a job working with Nancy Pelosi as her press secretary at the time I hired him [to serve as a staff member to the Council]. The [staff] head of the Council, because I needed a staff member to be the head of the council, was a woman named Nan Stockholm, who was an environmental attorney living in the Bay Area, but had been chief of staff to Senator Moynihan from New York. She brought a real knowledge of the workings of Congress, of the executive branch, and a great range of her own professional contacts that really helped [build the Council's membership]. A number of people that were on the Council were people that Nan had connections to and helped bring on to the Council.

04-00:21:57

Farrell: In terms of vision, what were some of the things that they were bringing to the table on how this transition might work?

04-00:22:13

Moore: In many respects, the vision, in terms of the purposes that the Presidio could serve, was straightforward, such as recreation and preservation. But with all those buildings, what uses might the buildings fulfill in the vision of the Presidio. From a planning perspective, a design vision [was needed], how are all these spaces interconnected into one cohesive national park site, so there were a lot of sketches that were done about what the design principles should be. Finally, I think, and this was a moving target, which we can talk about later, is not just the governance, which was important, but the business plan. People like to stay at the vision level, but the Council got into the business plan. Meanwhile, I should make it clear that the fundamental responsibility for creating the official vision for the Presidio rests with the National Park Service because they were going to oversee the Presidio, and they were the federal agency responsible for what that park plan should be. We had to interact with [the National Park Service], the Council had to interact with their planning team as well.

04-00:23:41

Farrell: That was actually this perfect—that was my next question [laughs] because I know Brian O'Neill was involved in this. What was his vision for this?

04-00:23:52

Moore: Yeah, Brian's vision was [bold and sweeping]—and it was clearly a different era, we should acknowledge that. It was an era when there was such a belief that the problems and challenges of our society, or our world, were solvable by people working in concert, by good thinking, by progressive ideals, and by moving things forward in that way. Brian saw the entire Presidio as part of responding to the needs of our time whether they were environmental needs or societal needs or social justice needs. Probably in his mind, he had an idealistic view, and of course we wouldn't have disagreed, that every square inch of the Presidio be devoted to a broader, big public purpose. That was where Brian's mind went.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-00:24:51

Even the National Park Service planning team picked up on that idea. They developed something that I think was called the grand vision. It imagined that all the buildings were housing purpose-driven organizations, whether it was corporate government or nonprofit, and that all the residents would be people who were, for the most part, employed by those purpose-driven organizations. That's not how it ended up for a variety of reasons, but that was, to a degree, the starting point for the National Park Service, even the community, I think. There was a newspaper no longer around called the *Bay Guardian* that thought of itself as the Presidio watchdog, and they immediately, once the Council was formed, looked at it and created a story that it was an effort to privatize the Presidio and that there would be shopping malls and you name it. They created a future picture that was not only inappropriate for the Presidio but insinuated a conflict of interest on behalf of members of the Presidio Council.

04-00:26:13

Farrell: Does that relate to Lucasfilm at all?

04-00:26:19

Moore: Not at that time because that became later. That was really separate from the Council, although the Council didn't have a part in selecting the Lucas tenant for the Letterman Complex. That actually happened under the Presidio Trust's watch, and at that time, we had told the Presidio Council members that their service would conclude the day that the Presidio became a national park because we had to give them a sense of like, "Okay, this is not a life assignment," so that's when their role concluded–in 1994.

04-00:26:58

Farrell: Okay. In terms of what came first, it sounds like the vision setting—I mean probably these things are happening at the same time, but maybe the primary things that needed to happen was this—the Presidio Council and vision setting and that kind of thing and then you can get to advocacy. Is that right?

04-00:27:25

Moore: There was [vision and] a linear blueprint [to implement it], but it was upset by the course of events. The Presidio Council definitely had plenty of ability to look at the vision for the Presidio in a way that I've described, and I think one of their most important contributions was almost behind-the-scenes work that we did on how can this place be effectively managed. Because people, particularly people in the corporate sector, had a belief that the National Park Service has incredible expertise in areas that the public understands–such as historic [and environmental] preservation, recreation, all those things, but they're not a real estate entity, and at the bottom line, the Presidio was a real estate conundrum—how do you manage and care for all these buildings, [totaling about 6 million square feet]? The Council understood relatively quickly that they had to begin looking at what the governance could be, and they believed that the governance would require an entity to work side-by-side

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

the National Park Service that was purpose driven on the built space. People agree the Park Service could well take care of the outdoor space, but it was the scale of the built environment that we didn't believe the Park Service was equipped to handle.

04-00:29:06

Farrell: Thinking about some of the efforts that went into all of the moving parts that required that advocacy, and that because there were multiple jurisdictions that were overseeing this or involved in this, whether that's local, state, or federal, there's a lot of perspectives that go into this beyond the Presidio Council, including with elected officials because this was national news. This is a federal site, and now it's transitioning. I know that there were some issues that went along with that including Tennessee Rep. John Duncan who was a major spokesperson in house that was against the Presidio becoming a national park. Can you tell me a little bit more about his opposition and how that affected the work that you were doing?

04-00:30:18

Moore: Sure, Congressman Duncan believed that the Presidio simply was too expensive. Secondly, he believed that it was not of national stature, and it was more of a local amenity, and he put those two ideas together to argue that the Presidio status as a national park should be changed. It took a variety of forms, but the one that was perhaps the most threatening was a legislative bill that would've preserved only the shoreline areas of the Presidio and put the rest of the Presidio up for public sale. At the time, there was a lot of focus in the federal debt in Congress. During this time, there was the Newt Gingrich revolution or whatever it was called, and [the U.S. House of Representatives] switched [from Democratic to Republican] and became even more fiscally conservative.

04-00:31:18

We had to manage the changing attitude to our Congress about the Presidio, and the Council did a few things. Quickly, we produced a beautiful coffee table book about the Presidio, a hardcover book co-published with Chronicle Books press and hand delivered this book virtually to every single member of Congress just to make the case that there's national significance to the Presidio. It was already a National Historic Landmark, so that was already part of the equation. Congressman Duncan took photos of the Presidio Pet Cemetery and held them up in Congress and said, "Does this look like a national park to you?" He was taking the most whimsical component of the Presidio and presenting it as if it was what the Presidio was all about. We had to change that portrayal and then deal with the fact that the financial issues could be an Achilles' heel to our overall vision for the place.

04-00:32:37

The Council was very instrumental [in advocating with Congress] and they're people of national reputation. When you have the head of the American Museum of History at the Smithsonian saying that this is a national landmark

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

in the interest of all Americans to be a national park, you can't deny that that person doesn't have the perspective and expertise to make that point. For many of the Council members, we deployed them in that way. Even the corporate leaders, we deployed to help speak to the economic benefits of national parks and the potential to make the Presidio not a long-term drain on the federal treasury. The Council was really important, and of course, Nancy Pelosi was absolutely essential. Clearly Democrats and Republicans have their points of view, but it was still an era of bipartisan conversation and solutions. Luckily, we had that atmosphere and some of our strongest proponents were Republicans and actually [became] lifelong friends of the Presidio. Congressman [Ralph] Regula from Ohio, the chair of the Interior Appropriations Committee called it his proudest accomplishment as a chair of that committee.

04-00:34:12
Farrell: How much did you see the reductive nature of that rhetoric where Duncan is just holding up the pet cemetery? I mean that's just such a small component of the Presidio. How much did you see that working, convincing people that maybe this wasn't in the best interest of the country?

04-00:34:40
Moore: We worked every single way, and we were lucky again with either Nancy Pelosi's contacts or Nan Stockholm's contacts and the Council's contacts. We reached out to all of our friends, and we met with them in Washington, DC, if we needed to, and we invited them to the Presidio. I toured Congressman Duncan through the Presidio because we believed that if people came and saw the Presidio and heard the story, that that could be persuasive. We didn't hide from our opposition; we engaged them in a conversation in the Senate and in the House.

04-00:35:27
Farrell: How successful was that? After Duncan came and toured the site, did his opinion change at all?

04-00:35:35
Moore: I think it was successful. Well, with some people, it was successful because they simply didn't know what the Presidio was, and when they saw it, they could tell it was different than what they thought. But for people that the predominant concern was more about the money than the place, we had to listen to their concerns and find a way to be responsive. That's part of why when we wrote the legislation for the Presidio Trust. Through the council, we had completed a comprehensive real estate assessment of the Presidio through a preeminent real estate firm, Keyser Marston. We had worked with [the management consulting firm], McKinsey & Company, to analyze the governance and to look at case studies around the country and around the world about how the Presidio could be managed as a national park. We had the best experts at our side doing the homework we needed to do to show that

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

[our plans for the Presidio] weren't pie in the sky. Not only could we deliver, but we could deliver in a way that was fiscally responsible.

04-00:36:52
Farrell: How much do you think that the fact that this is to be a national park in an urban setting had to do with the pushback? Because it's not something that people are necessarily—it's not like Yosemite or something.

04-00:37:08
Moore: There was pushback in that way because the Presidio is within the city itself, it's a big part of San Francisco, it's part of the city's identity. It was easy for people to think about the Presidio as Congressman Duncan suggested, as a local amenity for the local population, not a nationally significant site for all the American public. Why should the taxpayer in Maine be paying money that would go into the Presidio's restoration? That was even a challenge locally because for the [San Francisco] board of supervisors, for the mayor, for the city planning commission, the military had been there forever so that they had accepted [that status quo]. But when that status quo was changing, and the change was managed by a federal agency where the reporting structure was back to the Secretary of the Interior [in Washington DC], it was confusing and threatening to local elected officials that something that big and important in the city of San Francisco wasn't under their control. The Park Service actually agreed to completely fund a staff representative from San Francisco planning to be embedded into the Presidio planning team. There were a number of things that were done to keep the city comfortable. [If the Presidio's plans and conversion had needed] to go through the city board of supervisors for approval, I had no idea where we would've ended up and in what timeline.

04-00:38:46
Farrell: One of the components of this, too, is that you were taking into consideration the neighbors and speaking with them about how they felt about this, what they thought might be the best use of this. What were those conversations like with the public in San Francisco?

04-00:39:08
Moore: All in all, it was good. The neighbors formed a coalition group, called Neighborhood Associations for the Presidio, acronym was NAP, and that was Cow Hollow and Pacific Heights and Richmond district and others. It was a challenge for them because the Presidio had been a relatively sleepy neighbor. It was a neighbor that if there were raccoons running around in the neighborhood, they could call the Army, and the Army would come out and catch the raccoons. It was a neighbor where kids could go on to the Presidio from local neighborhoods and be accepted and there were city playgrounds in the Presidio. For the neighbors, the Army association was super positive, and the national park idea was a positive idea, but of course, there were concerns about, well, what did mean when the Presidio was a place that was there for the entire American public to enjoy and visit? That had to be carefully worked through. The neighbors were, in general, concerned about plans that they

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

thought were high density, created new traffic, or had spillover effects that were negative into neighborhoods.

04-00:40:39
Farrell: At that point, was it just listening to what they were saying and then going to take to the vision setting?

04-00:40:48
Moore: Yeah, in general, their ideas for the vision were sought, but at the same time, it was listening to their concerns about the transition itself and trying to make the plan to be as sensitive as it could be where parking was put and where the density of uses were so as to not overwhelm the neighborhoods in a way that they would consider a problem. But also, not to surrender the fact that this was a place for everyone, and to keep that at the forefront. We needed to be clear that this is now a national park. There will be people coming here to walk the trails and to recreate and to see Crissy Field when that's restored and to visit restaurants if they're put in, or lodges or whatever happened. It wasn't going to be freeze-dried [to the Army era].

04-00:41:45
Farrell: Mm-hmm, yeah, and that makes sense. One of the roles, so on this note, of the Presidio Council was solving some of those challenges including how it might be governed and legislated. How did that work or how did the council go about thinking through those ideas?

04-00:42:09
Moore: In terms of the governance, there were two main influences. One was the work by McKinsey & Company, which I have mentioned, and their review of what [management options were] out there. The other was Jay Brodie, the head of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, who was on the Presidio Council. The Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation was a federal corporation legislated by Congress with the goal of reinvigorating, from a real estate and civic perspective, the entire Pennsylvania Avenue corridor in Washington, DC. It had—much like the Council [envisioned for the Presidio Trust]—an independent board, its own CEO, and its own specific federal authorities to get the job done. Jay was an amazing urban planner and a great resource in saying that here's one model within the federal system that may be applicable to the Presidio. Brian [O'Neill] believed of that necessity. The Park Service, that has the central planning headquarters in Denver, had selected a Denver team to do the planning work for the Presidio. That team was more accustomed to believing that the National Park Service could get the job done on its own, so it took a bit of persuasion to get this concept incorporated into the National Park Service plan [for the Presidio], which it ultimately was.

04-00:43:52
But in the Park Service plan, what I think [this new management entity] was called the Presidio Partner. It didn't have the name of the Presidio Trust, it was

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

viewed that the Presidio [Partner] would be fairly small, and that it would only manage building space that the Park Service didn't need, and it would manage any outdoor space. That the Park Service would remain the overall manager of the Presidio almost with a real estate arm to handle that portion of it.

04-00:44:27
Farrell: That makes sense where you know where your strengths are in different departments.

04-00:44:31
Moore: Exactly, and that point, there was no requirement for [financial] self-sufficiency. But part of what would push the self-sufficiency eventually is when the Park Service completed its grand vision for the Presidio, the cost of their overall plan had to be estimated. When they costed the plan out, all of the work that had to be done in the Presidio with buildings and grounds and everything else as a capital investment, that capital investment [and funding requirement] was $1 billion. It gave Congressman Duncan a new sound bite, "the billion-dollar national park," and this was in the Newt Gingrich era. The fact that Park Service had a plan that now said it was going to be a billion dollars to get the job done, and we had with [House Speaker] Newt Gingrich and a fiscally conservative Congress beyond what we were dealing with before, then everything was thrown up in the air again, to reconsider how we could make our way.

04-00:45:35
Farrell: Yeah, and so the financially independent part of this came a little bit later then?

04-00:45:41
Moore: It did. At the time, the ultimate way to get the Congress to accept the Presidio as a national park was to say, "Yes, there will be a federal investment, here's the scale of that federal investment." After—I think it was fifteen years—there's no more federal investment. The federal funding started at I think around $25 million a year and then it worked its way down to zero [over a 15-year period]. Congress could, at that point, say, "Well, hey, this is not a bad deal for the American public and it has a whole different sound than a billion-dollar park." Because there was not only the capital investment but then the operating cost, and we knew from the Army that their annual operating cost for the Presidio was between $45 and $90 million. That is a cost you have to pay every year. All these numbers were being reworked and reworked and reworked to create a path towards self-sufficiency that we could explain.

04-00:46:48
Farrell: So many moving parts, it just sounds like constant evolution.

04-00:46:52
Moore: It was. [laughter] We came up with ideas, and Jay [Brodie] was helpful. For example, the [Trust] legislation authorized borrowing from the federal treasury for the initial investments because we knew that once we got the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

income engines working, almost like a mortgage, we could repay the mortgage. We also—and this was [Congresswoman] Pelosi—held the Defense Department accountable to a certain level of infrastructure repair. I think maybe $75 million of it, and the Army accountable, and here it was Senator Boxer, Feinstein, and [Congresswoman] Pelosi [who pushed this forward], for the environmental cleanup. We pushed [the majority] of these expenses on the departing entity, the Army, and we worked quite a bit with the Chair of the Defense Appropriations Committee to write legislation within the big, huge Defense [appropriations] bill giving money to the Presidio.

04-00:47:59
Farrell: Yeah, I definitely want to talk about the environmental side in a second, but in terms of the becoming financially independent component, which I think had to be by 2013 or something.

04-00:48:14
Moore: Yeah.

04-00:48:16
Farrell: With that being added on top of this, how did you feel about that, or was that just sort of like part and parcel?

04-00:48:25
Moore: No, I think they were realistic. Well, I'll speak for myself, we would've preferred not to have that [self-sufficiency requirement] hanging over us, at least at the time, and we felt like the National Park Service was a little ambivalent about the legislation. When you're ambivalent, you're not advancing it. We felt that with that ambivalence, we had missed the opportunity to pass [the Presidio Trust legislation] in a Congress that was more on the side of the Presidio. But that we had to get over that and just pick up the pieces and go from there. [We realized that financial self-sufficiency] was a challenging requirement, but one that was doable and one that would require us to change our concept about who were the tenants of the Presidio. The [Trust wasn't] going to hit that goal with simply nonprofit tenants or with their employees living in Presidio buildings, so the vision took a big, a major shift. It never moved away from preserving the scenery, the history, and natural environment of the Presidio. That was the bottom-line vision requirement.

04-00:49:50
Farrell: Yeah, that makes sense. When the financial independent component came up thinking about the business plan, how did the Presidio Council think through what some revenue streams might be? I mean you mentioned tenants, were they thinking that would be all the buildings or a portion of them and what were some of the other revenue streams that would help support that, that kind of thing?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-00:50:16
Moore: Yeah, that analysis was done at a fairly macro level through that firm I mentioned, Keyser Marston, just to get [a preliminary financial forecast]. Some of the [revenue] numbers were pretty straightforward because the buildings, so many of them were residential, and if they were going to remain residential, then you could anticipate what that residential income would be. A certain number of buildings had office reuse purposes; some had venues for hospitality whether restaurants or events or meeting spaces. The building and its architecture indicated the adaptive reuse and, by the way, from a historic preservation standpoint, the closer the new use is to the historic use, generally, the less you have to alter a building. It's not only cost-effective, but it's respecting the history of the building as well. At a macro level, that analysis could be done. Once the Trust was established, they had to turn that [financial forecasting] into a leasing program, and for the Letterman Complex, a formal request for proposals and a selection process that ultimately chose the Lucasfilm project.

04-00:51:30
Farrell: I think, too, choosing which sites are highest priority and which you can think through later—I'm thinking Fort Scott and how some of that stuff happened much later far after the financial independence was established.

04-00:51:47
Moore: Yeah, and this is maybe jumping ahead in the timeline, but part of the reason that the Trust began with the Letterman Complex is it really was an ugly [and dilapidated] site. It had a high-rise hospital that we looked at it a million ways [in terms of the ability to re-use it]. There was almost no way to seismically retrofit that hospital. It had a windowless research center where animals were battle tested through [laboratories] with a rather sad history in this big concrete building. It was right at the edge of the park and close to transit and close to major roads and had a small neighborhood adjacent to it. Not only was it a good opportunity because of its scale and because it didn't really have historic buildings that posed real limitations, but it was clear that it could look a lot better. We had that going for us that we could put something on that site that was better than what was there from a park perspective as well as from an income-generating perspective.

04-00:53:02
Farrell: That makes sense, yeah.

04-00:53:05
Moore: That [conversion project] actually was not the Conservancy's job. That was the Presidio Trust that really worked that through.

04-00:53:11
Farrell: Right, that was in their jurisdiction then?

04-00:53:13
Moore: Yeah.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-00:53:13
Farrell: Yeah. Thinking about the environmental side of this, we had mentioned earlier that there were contaminants on the site. At this point, you've established the Presidio Council, you're thinking through some of those advocacy issues, having ambassadors for the conversion, you're starting to set the vision, and now, it's time to start working things through in a practical application, like an environmental impact review or doing those reports. Who was responsible for the EIRs, was that the Army Corps of Engineers? I know that happens now, but was it a different group?

04-00:54:07
Moore: It was a mix, and just to set that table a little bit, when the Presidio formally transferred, the Presidio Trust was not in existence. For the first few years, the Park Service managed the entire Presidio, and actually, the first major lease was a Park Service lease for the Thoreau Center for Sustainability in the Presidio, and the Park Service was doing all landscape care and all that. When the Presidio Trust was legislated and began staffing up, the Park Service had to transfer that responsibility to the Trust, and it was a hard time for the Park Service. They had grown to love the place, they had staffed up for it, and now they had to give it over, not the entire thing, but at least 80 percent of it, to this new management entity that was being created. The Trust, I think it was in the legislation, did everything they could to pick up the Park Service employees that were relevant to the Presidio's future so that there weren't major job losses on the federal side.

04-00:55:18
Getting back to the cleanup, the Park Service only began a little bit of that, and where it became the most present was at Crissy Field because we had now advanced the Crissy Field project along, and the Trust jurisdiction only extended to a limited part of Crissy Field, not the park that we were fixing up. We had to work with the Park Service and Congresswoman Pelosi to get the Army to handle the toxic contaminants in Crissy Field so that we could restore it; so that was on its own timeline and under Park Service jurisdiction.

04-00:56:02
Moore: Meanwhile, the Trust had the rest of the Presidio. Here, the Army [was reluctant and resistant to being responsible for] all this cleanup. They were out of there and why should they pay the bills? It took a lot of not only political muscle but really intelligent agreements to get the Army to clean it up. Here, the Trust really showed its innovation because not only did they work to hold the Army to the task, but they took out a major insurance policy, which the Park Service never could have, to back up any potential unforeseen [contaminated] sites. That insurance policy ended up being incredibly beneficial financially to the Trust because there were unforeseen munitions and contaminants that the Army had never identified in their remediation plan. There was a whole citizens' advisory board guiding the remediation plan. In the early stages of that, the Conservancy brought probably $350,000 of pro bono legal effort to work with Park Service and Trust on the on the cleanup

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

side of it from a legal and enforcement perspective. Eventually over time, it took many years maybe even a decade before all the sites in the Presidio were finally remediated.

04-00:57:30
Farrell: Was that one of the strengths? We talked about Duncan and his opposition, but was that one of the strengths at this point of working with elected officials considering it was Pelosi, Boxer, Feinstein who were in your corner trying to get the Army to clean this up?

04-00:57:51
Moore: Yeah, it was, and we would make the case like, "Hey, look, this is federal property." It was Army property and now it's Department of Interior property. You're not going to get away from somebody's [federal government] pocketbook taking care of this. It can't be delegated to a state budget or a local budget, so we just have to figure out, know which party is going to pay for what. We felt we had a better chance given the scale of the military budget to hold the military accountable for that. I think the way it worked is that the military was accountable for the money, but the Trust was responsible for the work. Because the Trust believed that if it was under their control and stewardship, that they would always be working for the best cleanup approach where if just outsourced that to the Army, that maybe the Army would possibly take shortcuts or not clean it up to a standard that a national park required.

04-00:59:01
Farrell: Did that end up working out in a way that you feel good about?

04-00:59:06
Moore: Yes. It was a huge challenge and a political challenge, a technical challenge, a timeline challenge, and an expertise challenge, but it ended up working really well. I think [the Conservancy's] role was relatively minor with that pro bono help that we provided in the early stages, but then the Trust hired people with the skills to manage that well both from a legal perspective and a technical perspective.

04-00:59:35
Farrell: Especially because that cleanup far exceeded those four years of the transition.

04-00:59:39
Moore: Yeah, yeah, and there were so many issues, like lead paint that had come off buildings and was in the ground too–and at Crissy, there were old gas stations and asbestos, you name it. There was nothing like super bad [contaminants], and it was I think never designated a Superfund Site. It was just the scope and scale of it because the Army had had major dumping grounds in the Presidio where they just took bad stuff and buried it. That all had to be dealt with, especially at Crissy because we were recreating a tidal marsh, which meant we had to go subsurface [to create the tidal prism]. We realized that anytime in the Presidio that you have to dig, it's a challenge. You can find

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

archaeological sites or historic fabric that was unknown, you can find environmental contaminants that were unknown, and you can find utility systems that were unknown.

04-01:00:47
Farrell: I think that's true across a lot of sites, anytime you have to dig, it's a whole other thing.

04-01:00:53
Moore: Yeah.

04-01:00:53
Farrell: And often you do when there's environmental pollution.

04-01:00:57
Moore: Yeah, and the Army records were okay, but it's not like you had full utility records for where every single sewer line or electric line went.

04-01:01:12
Farrell: Yeah, and they were dumping these things and putting those utilities in before the environmental decade, so it's before the Clean Air Act, before the Clean Water Act, they don't have to record any of this. They're allowed to do all of that before that decade.

04-01:01:30
Moore: Absolutely, that's an important point to be fair to the Army. It's not necessarily that they were bad stewards; they just were doing what everybody did at that time. But also, I think with the military, there's a sense of purpose and of mission that maybe they'd get a little bit of an allowance that other agencies wouldn't. Certainly, for the National Park Service, they can't take a pass on environmental cleanup. Their whole mission is in environmental and preservation missions, so they have to do it at a standard that reflects the mission of their organization.

04-01:02:09
Farrell: Right, exactly. They may have even have better records than other polluters that were corporate and private.

04-01:02:17
Moore: Yeah, and there were some who believed that the Park Service was cleaning up at a level that was excessive because there are human health standards, which are one thing, and there is biological standards. Human health standard would say, "If you stick your hands in the ground, here's your level of exposure," but an environmental standard would say, "If there's an earthworm in that ground, here's that exposure." There's a lot to work through it. Actually, I've forgotten, with certain aspects of environmental cleanup, there's a state regulatory role as well, and with historic preservation, there's a state regulatory role also, so it becomes a bit of the jurisdictional soup. So that if you can get it done, you need to be applauded.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-01:03:07
Farrell: Right, it's the federal and the state working together at that point. Most states have their own environmental department where some of that cleanup is overseen depends on the state.

04-01:03:21
Moore: Yeah, the state has a toxic substance review agency as well as about water—regional water quality board and others, and all those boxes have to be checked in terms of the environmental cleanup effort.

04-01:03:38
Farrell: Right, and yeah, it's comprehensive.

04-01:03:40
Moore: Yeah.

04-01:03:44
Farrell: In terms of Crissy Field, you've gotten to the house and the remodel at this point where Crissy Field is that you can now start to address again. Can you tell me a little bit about re-approaching that or coming back to Crissy Field? I'll leave it open, and you can tell me.

04-01:04:12
Moore: Sure. Yeah, well, the Park Service's plan for the Presidio was approved in 1994. Once that plan was approved, it put Crissy Field in the context it needed, and that [overall Presidio] plan had a complete environmental impact statement so that had completed a certain level of public review and environmental review. We "tiered off" that and ended up restarting the effort [with that foundation]. We turned to the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund who had given a small grant to the first effort and the California State Coastal Conservancy and each of them provided about a hundred thousand dollars to get the planning effort underway again. The Haas Jr., Fund was so instrumental here because they really encouraged us to dream big. They said something like, "Look, we want to invest in you because we believe this is a great opportunity, but we don't want you to limit your imagination, and we want you to see that what are all the ways that you could serve the community effectively in this place. By the way, as a Fund, we really believe that there are people who don't have access to national parks, so this is a unique opportunity to reach people with this system of American national parks within their backyard."

04-01:05:39
We began that effort working again in concert with the National Park Service as our planning partner, and the Park Service was responsible for the formal review and adoption of the plan, and we were the engine behind it. With the philanthropic funds, we hired a landscape architecture firm named Hargreaves Associates who have a wonderful reputation for recycling landscapes that had served other purposes including shoreline landscapes, and we began the public process and the design process to begin to create this new blueprint. It's never

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

easy and it's always, in a way, an interesting and fun ride even though it is never simple. People have many different ideas about how parks should be developed, and for example, if you're coming at it from an environmental perspective, you would like almost all of Crissy Field dedicated to the [tidal] marsh that was once there. If you're coming it from a historical perspective, you're going to believe that the shape of the historic airfield is more critical to preserve than restoring a bigger marsh. If you're coming it from a user perspective, you might believe that this is the best board sailing site in the world, and everything should be done to preserve that use, and other uses that might intrude in that use shouldn't be allowed. Or if you're a dog walker, you might believe that if a tidal marsh is created, it will limit your ability to walk your dog on Crissy Field. If they're people that have never been to Crissy Field, you have to offer the question "Well, what can these parklands do for you that would be valuable?"

04-01:07:32

You have to put all that public opinion together and read your way through it and listen really hard, every so often get screamed at and just keep working the tapestry into something that that you believe is good and that you believe you could secure the environmental review and that you believe you can get approved without someone filing a lawsuit at the end of it. With all that introduction, sometimes it's good to have all those different forces at play because it makes you more thoughtful about how you integrate things. We really deliberated about whether the tidal marsh inclusion was a bridge too far, because it was clear that to restore Crissy Field, the Conservancy would be the ones having to fundraise for the restoration effort. We were cautious about getting too far in the scope and scale of our vision where it would be philanthropically [infeasible]. But eventually, members of the Conservancy board, to their credit, really rose to the higher vision and the bigger purpose of the tidal marsh restoration. At that point, very few portions of the San Francisco Bay had been restored, and people saw Crissy Field because of its [highly visible] location as really symbolic of this idea of bringing nature back it had been lost. [At the time], the whole beach was covered with rubble, just completely covered, just like a mess of tires and chain-link fence.

04-01:09:18

Farrell: How did you ultimately decide that the tidal marsh was worth restoring?

04-01:09:28

Moore: There were a few different ingredients to it. One was, to some degree, the mission of our national parks, not only to care for nature as you inherit it, but to restore nature where lost. We felt a certain, almost like philosophical association with that possibility, and we also believed—and this is where the landscape architecture perspective came in—that it would be a thing of beauty. That it would make the site more interesting for people that came to have the wildness of San Francisco Bay on one side and a [restored] tidal marsh on the other. If wildlife returned, and it did much quicker than we ever, ever imagined, there would be a beauty to see a white egret or a brown pelican

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

or birds in the bushes in the marsh. We committed to restoring the coastal dunes that were lost, we committed to restoring the tidal marsh, and committed to the preserving shape of the historic airfield, and committed to East Beach area being an active zone with access for everyone including board sailors by putting parking at the shoreline edge in that area.

04-01:11:00
Farrell: I'm wondering with the tidal marsh conversation, how much climate change—what we now refer to as climate change—was a part of that decision considering how ecologically important tidal marshes are with rising sea level and riparian species? I'm wondering if that was a factor in the decision?

04-01:11:27
Moore: It was not a factor actually. Climate change wasn't really in people's minds in the way that it is today. I'm wondering now when the word "climate change" was originally developed.

04-01:11:42
Farrell: I think it was much later.

04-01:11:44
Moore: It was.

04-01:11:44
Farrell: I think it's in the past twenty, maybe fifteen, twenty years where that's the phrase. But before, it was like the greenhouse gases, that was a big thing, the ozone was a big thing I think in the '90s. Yeah, the [environmental challenge and the] language has definitely shifted.

04-01:12:03
Moore: Honestly, I don't know where we'd end up now, if we were planning Crissy Field in a climate change environment because the [sea level rise] forecasts are very threatening to Crissy Field. I mean it's a low area, and over time, something will have to be done with that space. If you're planning it now, maybe it would be a different concept, I'm not sure, but at the time, it was more from a biodiversity lens and a habitat recovery lens.

04-01:12:42
Farrell: Which does happen to be important later with climate change because if you're already thinking about these things, it's not like it's a built environment that you then have to figure out how you're going to save the sea level rise or whatever, that's part of the natural landscape.

04-01:13:00
Moore: What the Haas Jr. Fund brought to the planning effort, again, was this commitment to determining how to reach people that didn't have easy access to parks. That was a whole community consultation process that ended up with the concept of the Crissy Field Center, which was in essence a community center for programming primarily focused on youth, and that has grown incredibly. [That commitment to youth and community is] a central

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

part of what the Tunnel Tops now is, the level and degree of community partnerships and programming and the number of young people along the community shuttles and everything else. I really have to credit Ira Hirschfield at the Haas Jr. Fund, who was the president and CEO at the time, for really encouraging and holding that vision in front of us.

04-01:13:59
Farrell: Yeah, and I'm wondering because I think the fundraising and the philanthropy with Crissy Field is a big topic, and I do so want to come back to the Presidio before we get there. But I'm wondering how much of your time at this point was being spent thinking about Crissy Field and then thinking about the Presidio transition?

04-01:14:23
Moore: It was a mixture. Fortunately, at a certain point, the military base was transferred, and the Presidio Trust was in place and doing its work and that allowed the Conservancy really to return our bandwidth more toward Crissy Field. We needed the bandwidth for Crissy Field, so the timing worked out well for us. The most money we had raised before Crissy Field was around $2 million for the Presidio Council, and in Crissy Field we ultimately raised over $34 million, so it was a huge leap [for the Conservancy]. Because we were responsive to the community and responsive to the idea of parks for all, the Haas Jr., Fund and the Robert and Colleen Haas Fund made grants that totaled $18 million. It was the largest philanthropic cash gift in the history of the entire National Park Service at that time, and it turned out to be over half of our campaign goal. It was huge not just its magnitude but what it symbolized about the value of the project, about the reputation of the Conservancy, and about the confidence that we could get the job done.

04-01:15:54
Farrell: I think about your vision too, and what you can do. We'll definitely talk about that more in depth, but just backing up a little bit, I guess, to the early '90s, a couple things that we haven't yet talked about in terms of the Presidio was there was some trust legislation that Nancy Pelosi introduced in November of '93. Can you tell me a little bit more about that and how that affected the planning? Because it's so close now, it's almost '94.

04-01:16:24
Moore: Yeah, sure. For people that don't know the legislative process, they might think like you just write legislation, and you get people to pass it. But when you write legislation, you begin a process that almost always involves changes, right? Because you have to get the legislation through various [Congressional] committees, you have to get it through two political parties, and you have to be adaptive. If the Trust was going to be a reality, we needed to begin that process as soon as we possibly could because it was unlikely that we would get legislation passed in one year, maybe it would be two, it turned out to be [about three years]. I don't believe that the first [drafted bill] had the [financial] self-sufficiency requirement in it, but that requirement was later

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

put into the mix. [The first bill] was a little bit more modeled on the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation legislation.

04-01:17:32
Farrell: There were some congressional hearings on that legislation, do you remember? Were you involved in all those at all? Do you remember?

04-01:17:41
Moore: Yes, we were involved because the Presidio Council had a role not only in meeting with members of Congress but in testifying before the committees on behalf of the Presidio. We employed our ambassadors who could speak to the issues at hand and who can effectively make the case for the legislation itself.

04-01:18:08
Farrell: One of the outcomes of a lot of this aside from the actual transition that happened when it became a park was the National Park Service put together a general management plan, and I believe that was from 1992 to 1994 that it was being written. Can you tell me a little bit about if you were involved in that or a little bit more about the general management plan in general?

04-01:18:42
Moore: We were involved in the development of the general management plan for the Presidio. It was a public process of community input and reviews, so the Council had to be careful not to give any impression that we had, in any way, a special seat at the table. But we were involved to the extent that we wanted to inform the plan enough that it could be [viable] given what we knew to be the challenges of the Presidio. Our main objective was to ensure that the Park Service was comfortable enough with an entity that, at that point, was called the Presidio Partner. Later it was called the Presidio Corporation and eventually Presidio Trust. We wanted this governance concept in the plan as essential to the longer-term management of the Presidio, and it did.

04-01:19:39
Farrell: Okay, so a lot of the vision setting is what ended up in the general management plan?

04-01:19:44
Moore: Yeah, and the general management plan, I think as I've said before, the Park Service plan was based on the premise that virtually all of the Presidio could be public serving and serve big [societal] needs of the time–anything from international peace to environmental restoration to community well-being. When the Trust legislation eventually was passed, it was clear that the Park Service plan for the Presidio was not practical and so the Trust then—this was later—had to launch what was called an implementation plan, which tiered-off the National Park Service work but made it consistent with the Presidio Trust and the resources that were going to be available to preserve and make the Presidio a national park.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-01:20:47
Farrell: Yeah, and so this was adopted in the fall of '94, but there's also something about the problem of the grand vision. Can you tell me a little bit more about that?

04-01:21:01
Moore: The grand vision was, again, the idea that the Presidio, virtually every square foot of it could be dedicated to a public purpose, but then the price tag associated with that approach came up to be a billion-dollar park. Honestly, I think because we did something called the "Call for Interest," the Conservancy helped the planning effort with that, and that was actually putting the word out, and we even went national, for entities that believed that they might find a home at the Presidio that would serve a public purpose mission. Would tenants like the National Geographic want a satellite office, would The Aspen Institute want a think tank, would the [San Francisco Planning and Urban Research] want their offices in the Presidio, just to get an idea of how we could populate the place. Even at that, there were a lot of people that wanted to be there, but a very small number of those people have the ability to capitalize their presence in the Presidio.

04-01:22:22
Farrell: Yeah, that was actually a question I had about SPUR, which I believe it stand for the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research. How involved were they with your work?

04-01:22:45
Moore: They were involved as a key organization. It was important to hear their voice and to give them a place to actually they would hold workshops with their members about the future of the Presidio, so they were a collaborative partner. Because the Presidio is federal jurisdiction, and by the way they're a nonprofit entity anyway, they're an advice-giving organization. Where they really had a role, but that's a separate story, is when they formed a task force around the rebuilding of Doyle Drive, and that task force ended up, through a variety of ways, with coming up with the Presidio Parkway.

04-01:23:34
Farrell: Yes, that's right. Yes, so the drive.

04-01:23:38
Moore: I might add just going backwards a bit to the congressional [effort], we were really lucky that the Conservancy had [staff member] Craig Middleton working with the Presidio Council. Craig had been Nancy Pelosi's press secretary and knew how Congress worked intimately. He really was the staff leader of that effort to get the Trust legislation passed working with the Council and others and with the staff in Nancy Pelosi's office and staff across the [Congressional] committees. For a while, Craig actually moved to Washington, DC, to shepherd that effort because it needed that type of on-the-ground presence. Ultimately, he became the very first Trust employee when it

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

was set up and then the Trust hired an executive director and when that person left, Craig applied for and was selected to be the next executive director.

04-01:24:36
Farrell: Just for a sense of timeline, do you remember how long he lived in DC for—was it a few months, was it a year?

04-01:24:44
Moore: About a year. It was pretty much toward that final push because the Trust bill, it was the very, very last bill of the congressional session of that year. It passed at like midnight—I was watching it in C-SPAN. The bill had missed being passed for two or three years, but it finally got over the finish line.

04-01:25:10
Farrell: And was that in '96?

04-01:25:14
Moore: [Yes, it was late 1996.]

04-01:25:15
Farrell: Okay, okay. Backing up a little bit, so in 1994, the post did transition to the park, and there was a celebration. Can you tell me a little bit about what you remember with that? You had a note about a logo there, if you can tell me a little bit about that?

04-01:25:36
Moore: Yeah, well, it was a big deal. I mean how often does a military post become a national park? At that point, a lot of hard work had happened to get to a place where that future was secure, so we believed it should be celebrated. [The Conservancy], with the Park Service, hosted about a week of activities including the formal, ribbon cutting on the new park with "Taps" being played and the U.S. flag coming down and a lot of ceremony. [Vice President] Al Gore was in attendance representing the federal government, and Rich Silverstein with the Conservancy board did that incredible logo of the American flag being handed from an Army soldier to a National Park Service ranger, and that symbolized the transition. It was in that era when swords to ploughshares was something that people believed in, that we were moving toward a world that was preoccupied with nuclear arms and arms races and military activity into a time of peace.

04-01:26:47
We actually hosted [Mikhail] Gorbachev, [former President of the Soviet Union], at the Presidio. In fact, I toured with him around the Presidio. He was, at the time, leading up something called the Green Cross, which was the environmental equivalent of the Red Cross. We had lots of noteworthy people that have come through. We celebrated the conversion, and the Conservancy decided that we should thank all the philanthropists and community members who had been part of it. We hosted our very first gala on the Main Post, called Post to Park, and it was on September thirtieth, [the eve of the transfer from

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

post to park]. So at midnight, many of us celebrated when the Presidio officially became a national park. It was amazing.

04-01:27:48
Farrell: You were there at the midnight transition?

04-01:27:51
Moore: Yeah, yeah.

04-01:27:51
Farrell: Was there anything that happened at midnight, like streamers or fireworks or whatever?

04-01:27:58
Moore: We didn't have a ball drop, but [laughter] I think there were like something, streamers and other stuff. We actually hosted the event it in a large tent and the designer for the event had filled the tent with trees representing the Presidio forest and had pumped in fog and had wood chips on the ground, so when you walked into the tent, you felt you were in the Presidio forest in the fog, and eventually the fog cleared. We had a lot of fun, big band music from different eras of the military history, remembering that Bob Hope performed for the troops at the Presidio one time–and all this amazing history.

04-01:28:41
Farrell: It's funny that you pumped fog in because I feel like it was probably pretty naturally foggy in that place.

04-01:28:46
Moore: That's true, [laughter] that's true, we just enhanced it a bit.

04-01:28:50
Farrell: Yeah, well I guess so you could clear it, that makes sense. There was also a park identity campaign—can you tell me a little bit more about what the impetus for that was and what some of the components of the campaign were?

04-01:29:05
Moore: Sure, the Conservancy at a fundamental level was an arm of public engagement in the parks as volunteers, as supporters, as beneficiaries of what these national parks had to offer. What we realized—and Rich Silverstein of the Conservancy board was part of a committee, the marketing committee that looked at this—that although we had this national park site, it was not a traditional one. It didn't have a brand like Yosemite. It was a collection of lands that were quite different, an old prison like Alcatraz and a redwood grove like Muir Woods. It was a collection of lands that some were former state parks and city parks and private property, and it was a collection of lands where the identity of the individual sites surpassed the identity of the overall park–as if people would know Half Dome without knowing it was Yosemite.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-01:30:17

Rich [Silverstein] believed that the only way or the best way to unify these parks and make it clear they were national parks was to take the site identities and marry them in a portfolio that made them all part of an extended family with the family being the Golden Gate National Parks. He believed that the word "recreation area" was confusing and didn't convey that these sites were of national park quality. The campaign was a campaign for the Golden Gate National Parks with the site logos that are still immensely popular and actually became an important part of our revenue engine. A corresponding public service announcement campaign on TV and radio that actually promoted the national park with those images in bus shelters all over the city and a direct mail campaign to build our membership associated with it all. It was a big deal, one that won design awards one right after another. It was because the caliber of the artist, Michael Schwab. His ability to take almost a CCC/WPA art form and convert it to a contemporary look was brilliant. It was a real breakthrough for us in terms of getting the park identity understood, and we actually did marketing surveys in advance and marketing surveys after, and we demonstrably moved the needle in terms of the awareness of the national park sites.

04-01:32:01

Farrell: Yeah, those images are so iconic.

04-01:32:04

Moore: They are, yeah.

04-01:32:05

Farrell: Yeah, and even before I lived in California, I was familiar with them. They have national recognition. I think people recognize them who don't live in the Bay Area.

04-01:32:15

Moore: You're right. Sometimes I'll open a magazine, and there would be some of these homes with one of those posters in it. Of course, we delivered them to everyone in Congress who would hang them in their offices because why not get your subject matter in front of elected officials, right?

04-01:32:34

Farrell: Right.

04-01:32:34

Moore: And then we developed the retail products as well. But, yeah, it was really just one more example of how the Bay Area is such a talent pool and a talent pool with incredible pride and generosity. We were the vehicle for accessing that talent pool and letting them put their talents to public purpose. The amount of work that Rich did as a volunteer is hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars because time after time, he make his firm available to us to do work on campaigns including the Help Grow Crissy Field image for Crissy Field's restoration that became so iconic.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-01:33:25
Farrell: Because I know as you put it before, we started recording, is that there's a couple of overlapping stories, which is the Presidio conversion and Crissy Field, but there's also some parallel stories, things that the Conservancy were working on. Do you want to continue with the overlapping stories, or do you want to bring in some of the parallel stories just because there were other things going on with the Conservancy at this point in time?

04-01:33:50
Moore: I think I'd like to make sure we finish Crissy Field.

04-01:33:52
Farrell: Okay, okay.

04-01:33:55
Moore: With Crissy Field, of course, there was the planning work and getting the plan approved but then the philanthropic work, which we've spoken about, of raising the funds. Because of the scale and commitment of the Haas Jr. Fund, they had such an amazing reputation as standing for the highest values in the community, we had access to other generous people. Charlene Harvey, who was on the Conservancy board and was a pro at nonprofit work and fundraising, chaired the [fundraising] campaign for Crissy Field. We were able to secure major grants and gifts, some anonymous, some not, and eventually, we closed the campaign with the public piece where people could give a gift of any size to help underwrite school groups and volunteers to come to Crissy Field and personally plant the plants for the native plant nursery that were needed to restore the dunes in tidal marsh. We had a beautiful array of people creating their own park by putting a native plant in the ground. Some people still go back to Crissy Field and believe they are pointing to their plant.

04-01:35:17
But the tidal marsh was an amazing event because of the power of it when we broke through to the San Francisco Bay. At that point, we had a deep relationship with the Ohlone community because two weeks into Crissy Field, very unexpectedly, we had an unknown archaeological site, a [Native American] midden site at the Presidio. We had to redesign the tidal marsh to preserve the midden site and be in consultation with five or six tribal chairs of different branches of the Ohlone tribe and engage Ohlone tribe members as paid archaeological monitors for the site. Although it added a fairly significant expense to our budget, it built this relationship that is still there. In fact, one of the young women who was about three years old in the Ohlone ceremony—when we opened the tidal marsh there was an Ohlone blessing—became a national park ranger at the Presidio, a Native American national park ranger of the Ohlone tribe at the Presidio.

04-01:36:28
From there, we just marched our way down Crissy Field and improving it from the east moving to the west because as soon as the Army cleaned

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

something up, we were right behind them. What was unusual was the Conservancy was in charge of the big construction effort. [The Conservancy] didn't give the money to the National Park Service to do the job but relied heavily on the [Conservancy board Project Committee] and its amazing [chair], David Grubb, who was the CEO of Swinerton, one of the city's largest construction contractors and management builders. Dave was at my side helping me make my way through a $30-million restoration effort and just guiding that with such expertise and skill and humility. Eventually, the money was raised, and it was time to open Crissy [Field]. People were able watch Crissy being restored as it happened because we had completely allowed public access. But we did a weeklong series of events that were really magical including the ribbon cutting ceremony, the Ohlone blessings, the historic air show, a kite festival, an event for what we called our community heroes, all the people in our community who had supported us, another event for all the major donors, another event for all of our youth. It was a very, very busy, wonderful week.

04-01:38:06

Farrell: Thinking about the fundraising and the philanthropy, and also the planning, some of that, from what I understand, worked hand in hand. I believe that when I spoke to Ira Hirschfeld, he mentioned that there was a seed grant that they had given you, kind of a planning grant that was the first step in some of this. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what that was like for you to put that together but also first approach fundraising in this way where you mentioned that the jump in fundraising went from a few million to 34 million, right? Thinking about your approach to just dreaming bigger and thinking about scope of a project.

04-01:39:02

Moore: Yeah, honestly, I was accustomed to wanting to think big about things but also of being reasonably pragmatic about the vision, and Ira really gave us permission to think big. What we didn't know at the time though—the Haas Jr., Fund is such an effective grant maker—is that they were prepared, if the vision was better, to support it. They didn't tell us think big, and the money will follow. Rather, they in some ways wanted to be certain that our values were synchronous with what they believed at some level because they didn't want to really unauthentically take us to a place that we only went to because there was a financial reward. We needed to show that we had belief systems that would be with us not only when Crissy opened but moving forward. Some of the original grant levels we talked about from them were $5 million, some were $10 million, and ultimately as I said, beyond what we had ever expected. Within that, the Haas, Jr. Fund was foresightful enough to actually put money into that grant that we reserved for the celebration to the thank people, to commemorate the civic accomplishment, to invite people to the new park, so they were just amazingly thoughtful. Also, the grant included a program fund, because they knew the Crissy Field Center would be an annual operating expense, and we would need a certain ability to get that up and

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

running, and then we would make it philanthropically sustainable or more sustainable through our earned income.

04-01:40:59
Moore: Jennie Watson who was the program officer of the fund, I just can't say enough about [her role in all this]. Roy Eisenhardt had been in our board, and then Wally Haas was on our board, and then Betsy Eisenhardt on our board, so we had a long relationship with that family.

04-01:41:17
Farrell: I've heard a little bit about the meeting that you went into where you made that ask, the biggest philanthropic gift that was made to the National Park Service. I'm wondering what you remember about going in to make that ask?

04-01:41:42
Moore: I remember first of all, in a way, the comfort I had with the Haas, Jr. Fund team. It would be easy for a philanthropic partnership to feel that someone had power, and someone was seeking, that there was a power dynamic for those giving money to the people that needed the money. But the Haas, Jr. Fund was so deeply collaborative that that was not part of the equation, and it allowed for honest and genuine conversation. Ira was clear that the Conservancy had a choice of what level of vision we wanted, and that the choice was ours. We could take a smaller vision and have a certain investment, a moderate vision and have a certain investment, or a bigger vision and have a bigger investment. That was really the Conservancy's choice to make, which was really a wonderful thing to think about that a philanthropist was willing to invest in you at whatever level you felt matched your values and you felt that you could deliver upon.

04-01:43:11
Farrell: I'm wondering when you went into that meeting to pitch your idea, your proposal, what you were feeling like the odds of it being successful were? Did you feel confident they were going to say yes?

04-01:43:26
Moore: I don't know if Ira understood this or not, I'm just thinking about it now, but from my early days working on the park plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the theme of the parks was "Parks to the People, Parks where the People Are." Baked into the legislative rationale for the park was this idea that national parks in urban areas could reach people that may not have the money to get to Yosemite or to visit Yellowstone or to see the Statue of Liberty. In a way, what he was allowing me to dream about was something that I had a complete philosophical connection to as being a central purpose of this national park, and what gave this national park distinction. While the park's resources gave it a distinction, the purpose gave it an added and unique distinction. To have the opportunity to have someone improve the resources and back up the purpose distinction was really extraordinary.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-01:44:38
Farrell: Yeah, I mean it feels, I don't know if obvious is the right word, but the impact that raising $34 million had. But I don't know if you want to say anything about what you feel the impact had, how it allowed you to realize a lot of the visions that you had or maybe the benefits that came out of that?

04-01:45:09
Moore: Well, yeah, by the way just backing up a little bit, I think my memory is with the choices that Ira outlined for the Conservancy is he didn't ask me to make that decision on the spot. He understood that it was a big decision, and I think he understood that I had to bring that back to our campaign committee, to our board, to the Park Service to understand what we were all committed to because it was a partnership of people and institutions that had to fulfill that vision.

04-01:45:43
Then moving to Crissy Field—the Crissy Field was the first major restoration effort in this new national park at the Presidio—it was dramatic because Crissy Field was covered with asphalt and chain-link fence and environmental contaminants, and the physical transformation was dramatic. It was emotional because the swords to ploughshares idea, the environmental restoration, the community piece, and the moment it was opened, it was celebrated. [The restoration was also] was an infrastructure repair or infrastructure reinvention project that won environmental awards, won historic awards, won design awards, was profiled in the Museum of Modern Art in New York as a keynote project of the new century of landscape architecture. We were just doing our job, but in the process, the reputational lift [the Conservancy] got was huge, and the Conservancy now was on the screen of so many people who had maybe known about us or not known about us at all. But regardless of the case, we with our National Park Service partner had done something really noteworthy and visible and significant. It really pivoted us into a civic visibility, into a following, into philanthropic realm that was different. We were up there with other important things that are supported philanthropically like the [California Academy of Sciences] and the Exploratorium, or the Museum of Modern Art. We had emerged into that level of showing that parks are part of the civic fabric in the same way that libraries are, as we've talked about before.

04-01:47:49
Farrell: Yeah, very true. They add to quality of life and so many components.

04-01:47:57
Moore: I think again because of the obvious, tangible visibility of the transformation, most people understood that this wasn't just like planting grass or building a swing set–that this had a complexity and a boldness of vision that was different.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

04-01:48:26
Farrell: Another thing, another campaign that happened was, you had mentioned this, that it was chaired by Charlene Harvey Help Grow Crissy Field. Can you tell me little bit about that campaign and Charlene's work on that?

04-01:48:43
Moore: Sure. Well, the overall campaign was a fundraising campaign for Crissy Field, and the first part of that campaign was leadership gifts, and that's where the Haas, Jr. Fund gift came in. The second part of that campaign was major gifts, which is a different level, and the final part of that campaign was called the public campaign, and the title of that public campaign was "Help Grow Crissy Field." Charlene was the chair of the [campaign] committee that oversaw all of those chapters including the final public chapter, the Help Grow Crissy Field chapter. That chapter first was super fun because of what I said of the ability of people to feel that they were with their own hands making a park for all time.

04-01:49:32
Farrell: Yeah, and that was one of my next questions was given that $34 million, those campaigns that were going into it, how did that affect the public's perception or their engagement in Crissy Field?

04-01:49:51
Moore: A lot because people could feel that either as a volunteer or as a donor or as a philanthropic foundation or as a corporate supporter, that everybody felt some ownership in that end result. I mean when I say everybody, I'm using that a little bit loosely, but there was a broad spectrum of people engaged [including many community partners]. We had a whole youth leaders advisory board for example, and many people that donated pro bono expertise to the Crissy Field effort including the environmental cleanup part of it because we really had to struggle with that too.

04-01:50:44
Farrell: You had mentioned the Ohlone community when you're doing the environmental restoration and finding the artifacts there and having to hire some tribal chairs to monitor that restoration. Was that at the first point in the whole process that you were interacting with the Ohlone community or were they involved prior?

04-01:51:08
Moore: No, they weren't really involved that much prior because there wasn't the awareness that there were archaeological sites on Crissy Field. In fact, the feeling was that there weren't even when we consulted with archeologists. I think the consultation [with the Ohlone] really began at that time, and actually, we reached out to a Native American lawyer, Mike Barr, who knew this area [of law and policy] really well for his help. He donated that help and then he joined our board, and he really was great at guiding us through the federal law and state law regarding Native American rights, the archaeological sites, and what standards applied. For example, a shell midden has one level

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

of consultation, but obviously, if you hit a Native American burial site, then there's another level of consultation.

04-01:52:13

But a lot of the day-to-day interaction with the monitoring group was held by the Conservancy's project manager, a man named Glen Angell who I hired to manage the construction effort. He was magnificent in that role and a lot of the community work was done by my deputy director, Carol Prince, who had lived in San Francisco all her life and really understood the community well. We had a really good staff and board team along with our National Park Service partners doing the work.

04-01:52:49

Farrell: You had mentioned a lot of the events, the exciting week that happened in May of 2001. Yeah, what was it like for you, now all this work had come together and it's the opening and the Crissy Field Center is opening?

04-01:53:10

Moore: We had another creative exercise in how do we provide opening events that are memorable and signify what the Presidio and what the Crissy Field means. What we landed on was terrific, but it took a while to get there, and we hired an outside firm to help us with it. They were very creative. We worried a little bit that people might forget just how bad Crissy Field had looked, so for the ribbon cutting event, we had a tent, a big tent on Crissy Field, and approaching that tent was an audio and visual timeline of the Crissy Field's history beginning at the Ohlone phase all the way up becoming a park where as you walked down a long pathway in the airfield to the tent, you were being introduced audially and visually to artifacts of the Presidio's history.

04-01:54:07

When you walked into the tent with its flaps rolled down, you couldn't see anything outside, and on every flap was printed what Crissy Field had looked like [before the restoration], if you had looked in that direction. If you looked out to the shore, you saw rubble; if you looked toward the city, you saw the concrete; if you looked to the left, you saw the old, dilapidated Army buildings, so it was almost as if you were back at Crissy Field as it was. We had, of course, wonderful speakers Congresswoman Pelosi, Anna Deavere Smith—if you know Anna Deavere Smith, who does really, really emotional, historical interpretations, actually interviewed key people about the Presidio history and reenacted their oral history on stage. It was amazing.

04-01:54:56

When the moment came, we lifted up the tent flaps, and Crissy Field was revealed in all of its glory, a very simple, real concept but one that really worked. There was a time in Crissy Field's history after Armistice's Day when a plane flew overhead and dropped daffodils on Crissy Field as a sign of peace and the end of war. At the beginning, as we came out of the tent, this military plane flew and dropped daffodils down in Crissy Field. We had the air show

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

and the kite show, I think those were in subsequent days and then all the other events. We had music; the Crissy Field Center became our musical spot. By the way, there was a whole a poster series that Rich Silverstein art directed for the opening day. Getting the Michael Schwab art for the Crissy Field image correct, we went through [many] versions until we finally landed on the right one, and we put a great egret on it, not knowing whether a great egret would ever show up at Crissy Field, and actually in the first week, a great egret showed up, so [our image became reality].

04-01:56:15
Farrell: If you build it, they will come.

04-01:56:17
Moore: Yeah, that was true. The marsh I think within the first three months, we had seventy species of birds that have been counted.

04-01:56:24
Farrell: Wow.

04-01:56:24
Moore: That's before even all the plants had grown in. The plants were a little nubs; they weren't providing that much habitat at that point.

04-01:56:33
Farrell: It's incredible, yeah. What a memorable week of events and air shows and daffodils and music. It's really special.

04-01:56:44
Moore: Yeah, my wife surprised me; she took my son out of school. I was in the tent, and I looked out the door, and there is my son and my wife walking down that long pathway, so that was an emotional moment for me.

04-01:56:59
Farrell: Yeah, and a great reason to miss school.

04-01:57:03
Moore: Yes, and he had been at my side [through the restoration effort] and he was a very mechanical kid. In fact, he's in construction management now and so he was of that age where bulldozers and tractors and construction equipment were completely enthralling, so we had many visits to Crissy Field. I think he was maybe one of the first people in a little boat going out on the Crissy Field Marsh with Glen Angell, who was our project manager.

04-01:57:33
Farrell: Oh wow. That's a great memory for both you and him and your wife.

04-01:57:39
Moore: Right, and the one thing I forgot to mention is that my dad who had served in the Air Force, it turned out when he came to Crissy Field, he had a memory, and the next time he visited, he brought his flight log in. It showed that he

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

landed at Crissy Field three different times and was one of the last planes to land at that airfield that as he flew up from an Air Force base in Southern California escorting a general to the Presidio.

04-01:58:10
Farrell: Oh, wow.

04-01:58:11
Moore: So my life came completely full circle.

04-01:58:14
Farrell: That's just so special. I mean, this is your work, but there's that personal family connection, too.

04-01:58:22
Moore: Yeah, my dad had a little bit of trouble understanding my career. Specifically, the nonprofit part didn't make sense to him, and the Air Force had put him through Harvard Business School, so he had a good business sense. But I think he could see that as his career had been dedicated to the service in the military, my career had been dedicated to service with our national parks, so that was a wonderful connection. Doug McConnell who does [the television series] *OpenRoad*—it used to be called *Bay Area Backroads*—he interviewed me at Crissy Field with my son and my dad, and that's one of my favorite videos of all my years at the Conservancy.

04-01:59:19
Farrell: Yeah. And on that note, what did it mean for you to have such two major projects, like the transition, like Crissy Field, come to fruition?

04-01:59:32
Moore: Wow, it meant a lot. In fact, at that the time, I wondered whether I could ever replicate this in terms of personal challenge, personal opportunity, or professional challenge, opportunity, and fulfillment. Just the caliber of people that I was working with, the generosity of spirit, the teamwork, the perseverance, the results. It still seems like a bit of magic must've been at play at some level.

04-02:00:17
Farrell: Yeah, yeah.

04-02:00:18
Moore: As I said, there was no guidebook for this and maybe that was one of our biggest assets that we had to be adaptive enough to invent the formula. Fortunately, we weren't stuck in feeling that it had to be done this way or maybe we wouldn't have succeeded if we had too rigorous an idea of how this was going to get done.

04-02:00:43
Farrell: Yeah, definitely an asset, yeah. Well, I think that's a great place to leave it for today. Of course, there'll be more questions related to these things in our next

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

session, but, yeah, I think this is a good place to leave it for today. Thank you for going into such detail about how these projects worked together or separately, that kind of thing.

04-02:01:04

Moore: Yeah, my pleasure, and I think we'll pick up where we left off, but today we covered one of the most significant and one of the most complicated chapters of the Conservancy in its evolution and the national park. It feels good that we got a lot of that down.

04-02:01:24

Farrell: Yeah, we made it through. [laughter]

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Interview 5: March 9, 2022

05-00:00:07
Farrell: Okay, this is Shanna Farrell back with Greg Moore on Wednesday, March 9, 2022. This is our fifth session, and we are speaking again over Zoom. Greg, thanks for joining me again. It's nice to see you.

05-00:00:22
Moore: My pleasure.

05-00:00:24
Farrell: Last time we talked, we mentioned the concept of parks for all, and I get the sense that this concept weaves through a lot of your work. I wanted to talk a little bit about when the seeds of this idea were starting to percolate or grow or germinate, and how you started to incorporate that idea into some of the planning around projects that you did?

05-00:00:55
Moore: Sure, well, the "Parks For All" came when the Conservancy was trying to think through how to how simply and straightforwardly describe our mission. The Conservancy had a mission statement, but like many it was probably twenty-five to thirty words long, and I began thinking about how to put that in simple words that were very direct and, in some way, have the power-of-three impact. That's when I began thinking, well, of course, we're about "parks," these are the physical places that we need to transform and enhance. Then we're about "for all" because these places are owned by every person in the United States as national parks, and then our final responsibility is "forever,"– to pass them from one generation to the next. It not only summarized our mission but almost described a theory of change that first you have the places and to make them for all youth to improve and enhance them. You have an opportunity to engage people in their enjoyment, in their stewardship, in their contributions under for all, and then finally all the restoration work that cares for these places that you've enhanced and taken care of.

05-00:02:19
Farrell: I feel like this reminds me of some of what we were talking about when you were in undergrad and some of the work you were doing through the social justice lens as well. Do you feel like those are related, that maybe some of this grew out of that or it was maybe more when you started working?

05-00:02:41
Moore: I think they are related as well as related to my work as an undergrad, related to the very reason that the Golden Gate National Parks were created by Congress, and related to the dynamic situation of the Bay Area where people do treasure open space and parks, but not everybody has equal access and availability. I believe that a park within ten minutes of your doorstep was a wonderful asset, your own neighborhood or community park, and that national parks offered something that added to that in the terms of their history, their scale, their variety, and even their stature. Not many people can have Muir

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Woods as neighborhood park, but it can be a transformative destination. Over time, we heard stories of people that actually only got to the beach every so often or only visited Muir Woods maybe once every five years, but those experiences were really memorable, really memorable. We took kids out to the parks that had never seen the Pacific Ocean before, one case of a young girl said, "Look at the big lake." There's a certain sense of discovery and invitation and inclusiveness that comes with bringing people out to the parks.

05-00:04:19
Farrell: In connection with that, how were you thinking about making parks accessible to the most amount of people possible?

05-00:04:31
Moore: Boy, there are so many components of that. The first part, of course, is making people aware that the parks exist, the second part is making them feel comfortable, that they're welcome, and the third part is making the parks relevant to their life experience. Not everybody's a mountain biker or jogger or even a hiker, so you try to program the parks with a variety of possibilities, while speaking to the community about their own needs. That's why the Conservancy started a program [called Summer Stride] with the San Francisco public libraries to help kids continue to learn over the summer, but to make it interesting by giving them a visit to the park as part of that learning experience. It's why we have the Park Prescriptions program to help people with their fundamental health. It's why we work with schools in their curriculum-based programs, and it's why we have Art in the Parks to create the different cultures, so there's the place but then there's the program.

05-00:05:39
Farrell: Thinking about it a little bit more holistically and trying to meet people where they are, it sounds like?

05-00:05:46
Moore: Exactly, and to come to people not saying "here's what I have for you" but saying "what do you need? What are your community needs and aspirations that the parks can be a part of?"

05-00:06:02
Farrell: Yeah, and I think we'll get into this a little bit more especially when we talk about the Crissy Field Center and things like that. I know we've spent some time talking about what makes these parks unique because they are in the urban setting, but I guess I'm wondering how that influences the idea of parks for all because there are so many different constituencies that are around these parks?

05-00:06:30
Moore: When you have an urban population of six million people or more [in the Bay Area], obviously you can't touch everyone, so you have to determine what your scope and scale can be and the Conservancy, of course, began modestly and then grew programs. Right now, with the Tunnel Tops about to open, the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

goal of the Tunnel Tops, with this expansion [of parklands and facilities], is to reach every kid in San Francisco during the course of a year, I think it's about 60,000 kids. You have to be realistic about your audiences, how to serve them, and to provide a quality experience as well. Also, to recognize that the work that you do with the people that you help engage has spillover effects, particularly with our youth programs. Many of those young people now have chosen environmental careers and are working throughout the National Park System. The effect was life-changing for them and for their families and for their future direction.

05-00:07:41
Farrell: When you've worked these ideas into the planning process, how receptive are your colleagues or partners that you're working with to these ideas? Is everyone on the same page, or did it ever take convincing for someone to get there?

05-00:08:01
Moore: No, I think the Conservancy was really fortunate that not only did the board and the staff believe in this vision and these ideals, but our Park Service colleagues and our Presidio Trust colleagues did as well, so we were all aligned. What the Conservancy had however was more ability, given our financial model, to initiate, to test, and to fund early programs in any of these areas. As I mentioned before, the Trust had its financial mandates that really focused on capital upkeep and self-sufficiency. The Park Service had to operate an 80,000-acre park, so they were they were funding lifeguards and rangers and park maintenance people, so [the Conservancy] could be a little bit more of the program innovation engine.

05-00:09:02
Farrell: Yeah, that makes sense, and I appreciate you going into some about that because I do feel like that's such a big concept for a lot of these things that we're talking about, so it's helpful to know.

05-00:09:13
Moore: Yeah, and I might just add, the [Conservancy] board members are really a part of this because of how they were selected. In the early days of our program, there was a board member Carlota del Portillo who is the dean of Mission Community College, and she was a lifetime educator and a lifetime outdoors lover, and so she brought a lot of her convictions and her experience to the table. Later Dr. Milton Chen joined our board, and not only became a leader at the Conservancy, but went on to be the chair of the entire National Park System's education advisory board and influenced the entire National Park System, eventually so that Congress added the word "education" to the [National Park Service] "organic act," adding education to its mission.

05-00:10:05
Farrell: That's a big deal, that's a big deal.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-00:10:07
Moore: It was a big deal. We found out when [Milton] was at KQED running their lifelong learning program and then later he ran The George Lucas Educational Fund, but he's still active with the Conservancy and someone that we all admire.

05-00:10:23
Farrell: Hmm, yeah. We'll talk about the board a little bit more in a few minutes, but last time we were talking a lot about the Presidio transition from post to the park, and we got through a lot of that. But there was one thing we didn't talk about so much, and that's the Presidio Trust implementation plan, which happened around 2000. I know that the Conservancy wasn't majorly involved in that, but I'm wondering if you could tell me about where the Conservancy fit in to the plan or the concept of the plan?

05-00:11:00
Moore: Yeah, and with your permission, I'll back up just to put a little bit more context around that. When the Presidio Trust was established, the entity had to be put in place, and to do that, the Conservancy made available Craig Middleton who was on our staff to be the first staff member of the Trust. He went over and set up the Trust offices and began the process of having a board appointed, getting office furniture in, and supporting the Trust's search for their first executive director. We stayed in the mix in a helpful way in making certain that the Trust could be launched and then once they were launched, they were their own governing entity, so our role was supportive. When it came to the plan, the Trust really was relying on the work of the Presidio Council as well as the prior National Park Service plan that had been written for the Presidio, and within that context, bringing in the need for financial self-sufficiency that the Trust act required. Now we have the vision, but we knew fundamentally the dollars and cents of that vision, and that had to be applied to the Presidio Trust's implementation plan, that the word "implementation" is key there, so that they had a roadmap going forward.

05-00:12:34
Farrell: I guess, too, we should mention that the Presidio Trust was formed in 1996 and then I think with it was—and correct me if I'm wrong—but it was created by Congress. It mandated that 80 percent of the land would be managed by the Presidio Trust and 20 percent by the National Park Service, and part of that was it was supposed to be financially independent by 2013. So that was a big part of the implementation plan.

05-00:13:07
Moore: Yeah.

05-00:13:09
Farrell: I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about how the idea that the Presidio Trust needed to be financially independent impacted the Conservancy?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-00:13:20
Moore: Yes, the fundamental way it impacted the Conservancy is that the Trust had to, with the financial self-sufficiency mandate, ensure that they were putting revenues that they earned back into the capital upkeep of revenue-producing properties and ensure that they had money to continue to renovate part of the six million square feet of building space that was at the Presidio so that it could be leased and it produce future revenue. That meant that the Trust resources for the park-making [projects and programs] of the Presidio, the reinvention of the outdoor spaces in the Presidio as a national park and even some of the public-serving spaces like the visitor center were incredibly limited. They could devote staff time and support, which they did, they could devote some money, which they did, but it resulted in the Conservancy, after finishing the Crissy Field campaign, moving from one [philanthropic] campaign to another to help the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service and our community fulfill the full vision of the Presidio.

05-00:14:36
Farrell: Yeah, and before we started recording, you had mentioned that for a lot of the big projects, the Conservancy actually was the person who provided a lot of the funding for that.

05-00:14:49
Moore: That's right, and of course obviously in consultation with the Presidio Trust and the Park Service about what their priorities were and in consultation with all of us about what we believed had enough public benefit and impact that it was worthy of people donating [their ideas], funds and time.

05-00:15:10
Farrell: Yeah, and just for people who may be listening or reading this in the future, in terms of the implementation plan, the Trust worked with a group of consultants, and I believe it was Sasaki that they worked with. They were working with them to establish policies and strategies for land use and circulation for the buildings, but also open space and the natural resources and some programming for the park, and that had to do with getting them to be financially self-sufficient in 2013. That was a big project and that helped prepare for generating the management plan. From what I understand, you weren't—

05-00:15:54
Moore: And just to jump in here, I don't want to mischaracterize the Presidio Trust implementation plan. While it had to respond to the dollars that would be available, it was a comprehensive plan, and it dealt with appropriate development, open space improvements, trails and landscape design, natural resource protection. [The landscape architecture consulting firm] Sasaki had a role in helping the Trust make it a comprehensive park plan.

05-00:16:27
Farrell: That also sounds like this plan, too, is formalizing a lot of what had been discussed and taking it to the next step as like okay, how is this going to work

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

practically, what's the process for this since there was no guidebook before this?

05-00:16:41
Moore: Exactly, and the Trust was fully aware of the challenge ahead of it with the needs of the Presidio and need for a certain degree of community consensus about what the future would look like, how the Presidio would change, why it would change, and when it would change. They couldn't necessarily go to the public every time they decided to lease a building, they needed an overall plan and concept that they were working with.

05-00:17:18
Farrell: That's a good point because there's a lot of buildings there. [laughter]

05-00:17:20
Moore: There are a lot. Now with some of them if the development project was big enough, say for example the Letterman complex, then [the project] had its own complete environmental review process because of the scale and scope of it. But for example, once buildings were zoned for residential housing in the overall Presidio plan, the Trust could move ahead with how to manage [these neighborhoods] and lease those buildings for housing purposes.

05-00:17:46
Farrell: Yeah, and that's a good point with some of the revenue-producing properties that you had mentioned. There is housing that's offered for rent to civilians in the Presidio too. When you drive around the Presidio, you don't think there's a lot there, but there are a lot of homes there, so I can see how that is.

05-00:18:05
Moore: Yeah, and one thing that brings up is the—I'm talking about building use as a source of revenue, which they are, but a bigger purpose that often gets forgotten, including by me—is these are historic buildings that have to be improved and cared for. The Trust really, I think at this point, successfully managed one of the biggest historic [building rehabilitation] projects in the United States. Over [450 historic] buildings were restored to impeccable condition, for the most part according to LEED environmental standards. I sometimes think that the Trust's legacy doesn't quite get the credit that it should for that huge gift and responsibility.

05-00:18:54
Farrell: That also makes me think about the change in the culture to San Francisco because that was military housing, and now, the public can rent it. It's just making me think about after this—and it's not something we talked about in detail last time—was after the Presidio transitioned from a post and then became a park, how did you see the culture in San Francisco change?

05-00:19:19
Moore: Related to the Presidio?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-00:19:22
Farrell: Yeah, related to the Presidio.

05-00:19:24
Moore: Yeah, well, it was an evolution. I would say the fundamental principle that held through most of it, it came and went, was pride. I mean San Franciscans were proud of Presidio, they were proud of its history, they had pride about what it could become as a national park, and that was a good asset that people cared about the place and believed in it and understood that preserving it was a good idea, that it made sense. With that said, of course, there are lots of details, and particularly people that live nearby are people that have been using the Presidio before it became a national park. But there was a worry about change, what would it be, would there be traffic, what were the neighborhood impacts? Could I take my dog where I used to take my dog? I used to know it all by myself and now other people will know it too. You had to be conscientious about that, but not overly threatened by it, it just had to be worked through and so that made its way. I mean there were some projects that were more controversial than others, but in the end, things happened and got done. In the end, some of the projects that were controversial, the public had an appropriate role of pushing back in terms of scale and degree of impact and the Trust or the Park Service and the Conservancy made changes in plans and projects as a result.

05-00:21:03
I think in the latest chapter [of the Presidio], maybe the last decade, people have seen the Presidio Trust as a San Francisco success story. The Trust won an award for "Good Governance" one year as the most trusted [government] entity in San Francisco. People comment positively about the Presidio, they comment on its upkeep, and particularly as the city struggles with the upkeep of neighborhoods and the homelessness crisis that San Francisco faces, that the Presidio has the benefit of being very well cared for. That's where the self-sufficiency requirement really was a bit of a blessing in that you always had to be conscientious about stewardship, and by that, I mean the care of the facilities themselves. Governments usually have an annual cycle of appropriations and end up with huge, deferred maintenance problems. The trust has that issue, but not at the level that like California State Parks or the National Park System does.

05-00:22:28
Farrell: Did you see a shift in the culture of San Francisco when the post was demilitarized and there's less of a military presence in the city or the Bay Area?

05-00:22:40
Moore: You mean a notice of a deficit without that presence?

05-00:22:43
Farrell: Yeah, like without the Army being there, did the culture shift at all, did you see that?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-00:22:52
Moore: Well, I think it did in some ways because there was a feeling that the Army was there when needed in emergencies, and of course, there are things that people can point to about that, but fortunately, you don't have an emergency every year. There have been a few earthquakes and other things where the Army has had to step in. I think there was that worry, but over time, other entities, if there is a void, I think those voids have been filled in, and that worry is not current. The other shift perhaps is that I sometimes wonder whether people coming to the Presidio today would even know that it was a former military post. I mean it's obvious to all of us. Many people don't even know that Crissy Field was an old airfield. They just think, well, that's how it always was. As time goes on, this sense of history may disappear except for great work like the oral history project in keeping it intact.

05-00:24:01
Farrell: I remember when I first visited San Francisco when I was in high school driving through the Presidio, and I had no idea, and it wasn't that long after it had transitioned. Somebody had to explain that to me, and I was like, "Wow, this is really interesting." When you start to learn it, you can see where it is, but you may not necessarily know that. It's a good point that as time goes on, there's definitely that connection there as soon as you engage with it, but it's maybe not immediately obvious, which may not be a bad thing.

05-00:24:34
Moore: No, and the other thing that I think has changed, and this goes all the way back to the beginning of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, is when you're in a city the scale of San Francisco, forty-nine square miles, with about two-thirds of the shoreline [as national park, and with the Presidio being] a bigger open space than Golden Gate Park. The Presidio is managed by the federal government, so there was worry about your own community's sense of effect and jurisdiction and what are the feds doing taking care of such a major portion of your city. I think the National Park Service and the Presidio Trust have now totally proven themselves as not only stewards for this national treasure for all Americans, but government entities that are very much in touch with local officials, with the local community, and it brought tremendous amounts of capital dollars and operational dollars to care for the city. The Presidio, when you think of all the private and public and philanthropic dollars that have gone into it, it's over a billion dollars by far. Much of that money, other than a conservancy, it's through federal government entities [–the National Park Service and Presidio Trust and other federal funding sources].

05-00:25:56
Farrell: Yeah. Yeah, it's a good point. I do want to talk a little bit about some of the challenges along the way too. We talked a little bit about them, we touched on the Army departure and the cleanup last time, is there anything else? We talked about how it took a little while and it took a little bit of convincing for the Army to agree to be in charge of the cleanup or at least financially

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

responsible for it. Is there anything else you want to add about the challenges that [you faced]? I think that was all we really talked about last time.

05-00:26:37

Moore: Yeah, well, I think that there were a few challenges in the transition, one was just the timeline, when would the Army leaves and when would the properties be transferred. As I think I mentioned before, the last property to transfer was the Presidio Golf Course, so it happened bit by bit. The second part was what condition would the Army leave the Presidio in, and as you suggested, the Trust arranged that they would be in charge of [early infrastructure rehabilitation and environmental clean-up and] the Army would provide the bulk of the [initial] funding. That was how that one was settled. The other challenges in the post Army era were about the details of getting a plan approved or something at the scale of the Letterman project that the Trust launched into. That was in the news, there were people that liked it and didn't like it, of course, there were different contenders, and eventually the Lucas proposal was accepted, which was actually, I think, the proposal with the least square footage impact of any that the Trust was considering and also contributed to the beautiful park design by Lawrence Halprin as part of it. But some people felt that even that project was built too high or too big.

05-00:28:00

Farrell: Yeah, that's one of the things that I did want to talk about is with that. That was the Letterman Hospital site and George Lucas was pursuing twenty-three acres out of that area for the Lucas [Letterman Digital Arts Center] campus. I'm curious to hear a little bit more about why people were maybe opposed. You said it might be too big or too much; what were some of the reasons they were getting for that?

05-00:28:32

Moore: I think one of the reasons was this was the first time that the Trust's need for more revenue and revitalization dollars using private and corporate partners was evident in a significant way. It was clearly allowed in the Trust Act, but being allowed and actually happening is a different thing. The public had to now get used to the fact that Trust lands would be improved in public-private partnerships and that the Trust would not have the ability to do that on their own, [without some private capital]. People just had to get accustomed to that concept and this [Letterman project] was the biggest piece by far; it wasn't just renovating a house and putting tenants in it. It was more about the fit, the scale, the architectural look, the impact on neighborhoods, the transportation concerns, and the historic preservation fit. Fortunately, with the Lucas proposal, it was at the edge of the Presidio, it was well served by Muni and Golden Gate Transit. They built a huge underground garage, so all of their parking needs were accommodated in a way that was completely invisible, and they could get to the parking lot without going through any neighborhood at all; it was one off-ramp. The design had a lot going for it in terms of the compatibility of the architecture, the beautiful park it was developing, and George Lucas had a very positive reputation as California's own inventive

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

filmmaker and visionary. If you were interviewing the Trust, you'd find a lot more details about the challenges and the difficulties, but the project made its way.

05-00:30:39
Farrell: Was the Conservancy supportive of Lucasfilm taking over that site?

05-00:30:44
Moore: There were some exceptions, but we generally believed that the Conservancy's role was not to weigh in on planning and public policy decisions. That our role began when the planning was done and once the policies were made–and then we would be the people that would help get the job done. Of course, in the Lucas case, we had no responsibility there, so we were supportive, but I don't think we ever wrote letter of comment to my memory.

05-00:31:18
Farrell: Okay, that makes sense. That site opened in June 2005, so it went forward and went forth.

05-00:31:27
Moore: Yeah. I was there on opening day, and it was incredibly celebratory. I think the San Francisco community, for those who had been watching it, who attended, were pretty blown away by the scale and the fittingness of it.

05-00:31:44
Farrell: Yeah. There were a couple other tenant choices that I think became a little bit more rocky, like the Fisher Museum and then the Lucas Museum. How involved was the Conservancy in those issues?

05-00:32:04
Moore: Well, not so much with the Fisher Museum but more involved with the Lucas Museum. With the Fisher Museum, the public concern was not as much about the concept but the location. The Fisher Museum was proposed to be located on the Presidio Main Post, which many considered the core of the historic landmark. The Fisher Museum was a beautifully designed building, but an incredibly modern-looking building. The public, by and large, wasn't able to support a building of that scale [and contemporary design] in the one of the most historic districts of [the Presidio]. My memory is that there were other site choices offered, but that [Donald] Fisher, who was the proponent and funder of that museum, really believed that it belonged on the Main Post, and that eventually that project was halted. I [believe the project proponent withdrew the museum proposal once its impact on the historic landmark was verified by the relevant regulatory authorities].

05-00:33:22

Interestingly enough after one museum making its way, another museum popped up later, and this one, the Conservancy had to pay attention to, and I'll explain why. This was for the Lucas [Cultural Arts] Museum. It was at the Sports Basement site in Crissy Field and given the Conservancy's role in

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

restoring Crissy Field, given our conviction about that space, given the volunteers and donors who had made Crissy Field what it was, we believed that there could be a better proposal for that site [–and one more in keeping with the site architecturally and more complementary to the mission of national parks]. We didn't directly oppose the Lucas Museum, but when the Trust went through its process to ask for a call for proposals, because they didn't want to give away that site without any sense of competition or public input, we developed a proposal that we submitted. There were about five to ten different proposals submitted, and we were one of the final three being reviewed. Our proposal was called the Presidio Exchange, and it modified the Sports Basement building into a multidisciplinary program [facility that blended the themes of nature and culture] with supporters all over the country from National Geographic to many local supporters as well. We thought our best course of action was to come up with a proposal that we felt was more suited rather than opposing the Lucas proposal. People had different reactions to the Conservancy stepping up in that way, some positive and some not positive because the Lucas proposal was supported by the mayor, the governor, the two state senators and Congresswoman Pelosi. The [Lucas proposal had] lined up their support by elected officials very, very completely.

05-00:35:30

Farrell: How did you navigate that? That's a strong group of people who want the Lucas Museum to go forward.

05-00:35:40

Moore: Yeah, it was honestly one of the hardest decisions and hardest things I ever had to do because all of the individuals I mentioned, I have high respect for, and they all had pivotal rules in making the Presidio what it was. So to counter that with another proposal, even though the process allowed for it and I wasn't doing anything that the process didn't allow, it was a bold decision. I made certain that [the Conservancy's] board believed it was a good idea and the Park Service believed that it was a good idea, and the Trust was open to us submitting. But I just felt it was required, that the vision for the park needed a proposal that responded to that vision. As much as I respected George Lucas and his personal and professional legacy, I just couldn't see why that [museum's program focus and large-scale architecture] belonged in a national park. The Lucas Museum proposal really, in my mind, had not much to do with the mission of the park, and it was at a key site. In addition, if developed as proposed, it would've blocked the views from the Main Post of the Golden Gate Bridge, so the Presidio Tunnel Tops, which we were beginning to think about, would've looked at the back of the museum [blocking most of the view of the Golden Gate Bridge]. The Trust actually simulated what those views would look like.

05-00:37:19

On the other hand, the process was incredibly creative and fun. We had so many partners that came to our side, so many people that donated time, so many wonderful organizations that said they wanted to be a part of its future.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

We had endorsements from The Aspen Institute, from the Stanford University arts program, I mean the endorsements just wouldn't stop. We had a beautifully designed [building], park and concept, so I think we showed that something different could work, and in the end, the Trust decided to close down the whole process. That there had been enough dialogue and enough consideration and enough controversy that maybe the time just wasn't right to move this forward, and the Sports Basement wasn't a bad tenant, so they'll stick with that until a future time. So that's how it ended.

05-00:38:24
Farrell: Yeah, so kind of put on indefinite pause?

05-00:38:27
Moore: Yeah. Yeah, but I mean clearly there were lots of relationships to handle and to manage. For an organization like the Haas, Jr. Fund that had invested a lot into Crissy Field, they were in a similar position as what we were thinking. That the [Lucas] idea wasn't the best, and if there was so much controversy about what to put in the national park in a place this important, maybe the best idea was just to take a pause, so a long pause.

05-00:39:03
Farrell: Yeah. Was your board in support of this?

05-00:39:09
Moore: Yes, they were. It's something we had never done, so, yeah, we had to reach deep to our mission statement, to our convictions, to our history. I had to reach deep in myself and say, "Well, the worst thing that'll happen to me about this is,"—I mean personally, well, and professionally is—"I could lose my job." I just had to face any demons I have and just put them aside, so I could approach this with enthusiasm and conviction and vision and creativity. As I said, for all the complications of it, it was one of my fondest memories of the Presidio in terms of creativity and growth. I was really proud that we responded to the challenge, and we had very limited time to do it. I'm proud of my staff, proud of the board, proud of our team and the supporters.

05-00:40:05
Farrell: Yeah, was there a point that you were worried about losing your job?

05-00:40:11
Moore: No, it's a personal habit. If I reach a fear point, I will go to what would be the worst conclusion, and then I try to dismiss it so that I can jump over that, and that project was one of [those times]. The other one I worried about less was would the Conservancy's reputation be hurt? I worried about, of course, with our long-standing relationship with elected officials, would we lose those relationships. I worried about even if our proposal was supported, would we have the wherewithal to find the philanthropic dollars to deliver it? There was a big basket of worries that I had to just put aside to do the best I could, to have the Conservancy deliver something that we [and the community could] all believe in.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-00:41:07
Farrell: Yeah. Did that change your relationships with the mayor, the governor, Pelosi, elected officials?

05-00:41:17
Moore: It did. I think the further people were away, the less. I mean with the governor although he supported it, he's not involved in the day-to-day life of the Presidio. What was hardest for me [was with Congresswoman Pelosi] because of my incredible admiration and gratitude for what she's done for the Presidio. The Presidio would not be here today with her work, without her tireless working, ingenuity, persuasion and dollars [that Congresswoman, then Leader, then Speaker of the House] Nancy Pelosi brought to the Presidio. [It was hard to compete with the project she supported for the site, the Lucas Cultural Arts Museum.] In fact, it was very difficult. I had very good relationships with the Congresswoman and her staff. It was hard for her as well to see that the Conservancy that have worked side-by-side with her for so long and always had a similar point of view, in this occasion and with something important to her, the Conservancy had a different point of view.

05-00:42:25
Farrell: Do you feel like that relationship was restored to where it was before this?

05-00:42:34
Moore: Yeah, I think so. I mean it's been an ongoing thing because when any valued relationship is fractured, you work to rebuild it, right?

05-00:42:43
Farrell: Yeah.

05-00:42:44
Moore: And then you don't rebuild something that was fractured instantly. I think that with the board and with me and with the Trust, we worked on that because the Trust, of course, they were even closer because [Congresswoman] Pelosi had championed the legislation that created the Trust, and the Trust turned the [Lucas Museum] proposal down, [along with all the proposals for the site]. The Trust was in a situation that was even closer to her for what she had done for the Presidio than the Conservancy was. But, yeah, I think Presidio continues to blossom, the Tunnel Tops will be glorious. I think that opening of the Tunnel Tops will proudly honor everyone's dedication to the Presidio including Speaker Pelosi because she was so responsible for getting the funding for the Presidio Parkway. We wouldn't have the Tunnel Tops if she hadn't been in there helping fund the parkway, so we have a big thing to celebrate that I think will continue to bring everybody together.

05-00:43:59
Farrell: Mm-hmm, yeah. Well, my last question on this is where did the National Park Service stand on the Lucas Museum?

05-00:44:11
Moore: They did not think the museum was a good idea either.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-00:44:16
Farrell: Okay.

05-00:44:17
Moore: They were a formal commenter. As a federal agency, they're pretty much required to write in when their proposals were being considered, and they were clear with their point of view.

05-00:44:33
Farrell: Okay. One thing I did want to talk about was the Conservancy's relationship with the Presidio Trust board and leadership. We've mentioned a couple of times that Craig Middleton was very instrumental in those early days in helping find an executive director, and Toby Rosenblatt was part of that. But I'm wondering how much you were working with the Presidio Trust board and what your relationship with them was like?

05-00:45:05
Moore: We worked with them constantly and particularly at the beginning because the Conservancy board was a ready source of nominees for the Presidio Trust board because the Conservancy board members were completely familiar with the Presidio, had shown their volunteer [leadership and] service, and had been selected for their talents and abilities. On the very first Trust board, former Conservancy board chair Toby Rosenblatt was put on the Trust board. [Toby] became the chair of the Trust board. Later on, Dave Grubb moved from that Conservancy board to the Trust, Charlene Harvey from the Conservancy board to the Trust. Mark Buell, [former board Chair of the Conservancy], is now Trust board and will likely be the next chairman. So part of it is that if you had been on the Conservancy board and worked with the Park Service and Trust, [the subject matter knowledge and] the relationships were there to be effective on the Trust board. Of course, many other people were added, as they should be—that shouldn't be just Conservancy board members on the Presidio Trust, and we got to know them as well. Nancy Bechtle had been on the National Park Foundation board, so I knew her from that work. My primary relationship, of course, was at the staff level, for much of the time was with Craig Middleton as the Trust's executive director.

05-00:46:39
Farrell: How did the National Park Service get along with the Presidio Trust leadership and board?

05-00:46:46
Moore: It evolved. In the beginning, I think it was hard for the Park Service because they had been managing the Presidio in its entirety. Well, they endorsed the concept of the Trust, but it all ended up in a way a bit different than they had envisioned it, giving 80 percent of the Presidio to the Presidio Trust. They had always thought that the Trust would be almost a real estate subsidiary, and they would be the holders of most of the property so that was an adjustment as they let [National Park Service] staff go and downsized. The early days of the Presidio Trust were a little bit rocky because the executive director coming

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

in—this was before Craig—wanted very much to assert the Trust's independence from the Park Service and now that seemed a little ungracious to the Park Service given how they had done. The good thing about people in the public service, by and large, is you have a mission to do, and if you want to get the mission done and you need other people at your side to do it, then you reach out and do it. I think the relationships and the track record, because of the partnerships, was always on the upswing. It's like many of your relationships, sometimes they're better and sometimes they're worse.

05-00:48:29
Farrell: It also seems like maybe because all this is so new, there are some growing pains and then you get over them and you work together.

05-00:48:38
Moore: Yeah, absolutely. I would say growing pains also applied to the relationship of the National Park Service and the Conservancy, which the Park Service helped create. As we grew and prospered, most people greeted growth with enthusiasm, but some people [in the Park Service] thought like, well gee, the Conservancy is getting bigger than we are, and what's going on here, we were supposed to be the ones in charge. It could be that the Park Service or even the Conservancy could've felt the same way about Trust, like, "Gee, we were in there at the beginning and helping give birth to the Trust and now they're their own big, major thing."

05-00:49:18
Farrell: When the student becomes the master.

05-00:49:20
Moore: Exactly, but the other way of looking at it, which you have to go to, is being proud of their success and saying, "I'm really glad I was there to make this happen at the early stages because it's now thriving, and I'll just be happy that I was part of getting it to this point."

05-00:49:37
Farrell: Right, my last metaphor is when rising tides lift all boats kind of thing.

05-00:49:43
Moore: Yes, there we go.

05-00:49:44
Farrell: Was there ever a time where you felt like you needed to step in to help them figure things out or felt responsible for being a mediator or intermediary?

05-00:49:57
Moore: Yeah, definitely, because I think [the Conservancy] was a bit like the middle child when we got deployed because my older sibling was the National Park Service, and my younger sibling was the Presidio Trust. [laughs] We were often in the mix there, helping those two entities work together, working behind the scenes to build trust and collegiality, and working to help reconcile the Park Service vision, which is clear, with the Trust vision, which was also

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

clear. Because the Park Service when you're as not responsible for the funding of something and the implementation of something [as it was with the Presidio]—and I'm not being critical here, it's just human nature—it's a little bit easier to have a very lofty opinion of how something should be done and what should happen. It was fun [helping build the partnership]. I didn't mind that, and I was glad that the Conservancy, at some level, could help with those relationships and teamwork.

05-00:51:07

Farrell: Yeah, and also the stakes are high, right, but they're maybe not necessarily as high for you, so it's easier for you to go in and take an objective look perhaps.

05-00:51:19

Moore: Yeah, and sometimes you have to find the middle ground, to find a place where everybody can agree that this is worth doing. Or sometimes it was just about resources like, why doesn't this group pay more for that than this group? You just have to find a place of shared resources like, "Okay, there's a pie chart, who's up for 10 percent, who's up for 50 percent, and who's up for the other 40 percent?"

05-00:51:47

Farrell: Yeah, that's a good point. Well, another thing I wanted to talk about was during the Presidio and the Crissy Field restoration, as we talked about, those are overlapping stories. But then there is some parallel work that you were doing while all this of was going on, including working on some visitor centers in the early '90s leading into the mid to late '90s starting with Muir Woods. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what went into opening the visitor center of Muir Woods?

05-00:52:29

Moore: Well, that project began when the [National Park Service] park manager of Muir Woods—the district ranger I think he's called—came to me with a picture that I had seen a million times, but I didn't focus on it. That picture was that the visitors at Muir Woods were greeted by someone standing in a kiosk about the size of a closet. Now, this was the National Park Service site founded by Teddy Roosevelt and with hundreds of thousands of visitors a year, and it had no place to welcome and greet visitors. [The district ranger was suggesting a portable pre-fab trailer-type building be purchased as a visitor center]. I looked at that and we all agreed that Muir Woods deserved and the visitors to Muir Woods deserved something better than that. That led us to finding the funding for the design and implementation of a new visitor center and putting it in place. We had a really wonderful ribbon cutting with a lot of the community there and people who had been part of the founding of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, so that's a fond memory.

05-00:53:39

Because a part of our function as a Conservancy was to help operate park visitor centers and provide interpretive materials for park visitors, we realized,

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

well, what about the Marin Headlands, and I think that was the next stop. When the Park Service said we have a tiny, little building at Cronkhite Beach that nobody ever gets to and we had this historic chapel that's right in the center of things, we undertook that restoration project and raised the money, designed all the exhibits, managed the restoration of the building and opened that. We went from one [visitor center project to] the next. We actually opened an interim visitor center at the Presidio when it first became a national park, later to be replaced by the current visitor center, which was a collaborative project of the Trust, the Conservancy, and National Park Service. At all these visitor centers, our staff, the Conservancy staff is involved with helping keep them running, sometimes with volunteers, sometimes with National Park Service staff on our side, or the Trust staff on our side. We also opened a welcome center at the Golden Gate Bridge. People tend to forget that Golden Gate Bridge actually is connected to a national park on each side. I always think it's part of why the national parks were created, not just the beauty of the beauty of the Golden Gate, but the beauty of that bridge.

05-00:55:20
Farrell: Yeah, and also such a functional bridge, it's not a vanity bridge—I mean that is the highly trafficked, very used bridge, so there's so many people that are traveling through those two national park sites, getting from one place to another.

05-00:55:35
Moore: Yeah, and there's a wonderful story about the bridge [and its early connection to the mission of national parks]. Many of the early proposed designs for the Golden Gate Bridge demolished Fort Point, that beautiful, historic fort now under the Golden Gate Bridge. [The eventual bridge engineer and designer,] Joseph Strauss, saw the fort's history and its beauty and created a design that saved it. That bridge really was designed for function, but it was designed for beauty and preservation as well.

05-00:56:03
Farrell: Yeah, and I think one of the most iconic bridges in—there's the Brooklyn Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge, those were the, I would say, two most iconic in the country.

05-00:56:11
Moore: Yeah, definitely.

05-00:56:12
Farrell: Yeah. There were some challenges with those along the way too, particularly with Muir Woods with the traffic. How did you think through that?

05-00:56:23
Moore: Yeah, that came later, the visitor center had been open for quite a while. But eventually Muir Woods got to a point where it was serving over a million visitors a year. It just shows how important these places are and how many

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

people are drawn to them. I think part of what happened is its visibility for tourism just grew and grew as San Francisco continued to be a magnet for local, national and international tourism. The result was that people that lived along the roads going to Muir Woods faced traffic jams at certain times of the year, felt that they couldn't get out of their driveways, felt that it was unsafe, and began to rally the National Park Service and elected officials to do something, that given where this traffic increase is heading, why can't something be created that mitigates this impact? Fortunately, the National Park Service—and we played a supportive role here—decided to look at something that may have been the first time it had ever happened in the United States–to have a national park be available by a reservation system. To have that reservation system allocate visitation in a way that leveled out the visitation at certain periods because visitation of Muir Woods was fine a lot of the time, but when it hit the peaks, there was a problem. The theory was we're just going to saw off the peaks and level it out and redistribute it and also cap it. That ended up with the program that it's in place today and I think it really did the job well. The neighbors, of course, felt it was long overdue for limiting how many visitors go to Muir Woods. It was a transition; it's hard to think ahead. I think it probably had an effect in curtailing how many local people go to Muir Woods because you can't get up on a Saturday and decide you're going to go there if you can't have a reservation and a place to park. Oh, and the Park Service also implemented a gateway shuttle system so that you could take a car, ferry or bus from San Francisco, get to the Gateway Center near Marin City, and purchase a shuttle ticket [for the ride into Muir Woods].

05-00:58:58
Farrell: Also mitigating traffic, parking.

05-00:59:01
Moore: Exactly.

05-00:59:02
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. I am wondering too about some of the value that these visitor centers added to the park system, the Conservancy, like the Muir Woods Visitor Center or the Marin Headlands Visitor Center, the Presidio Visitor Center?

05-00:59:25
Moore: I can speak two pieces: One is that the visitor centers added value in providing visitors with information that it was useful for their visit. So in some cases, the visitor centers helped people plan their visit, but often when people come the national parks, they want to bring home a memory of their visit or they want to think more about it. We developed books and posters and memorabilia to allow a visitor to continue their park visit after their visit or to plan their park visit in advance. That not only went to what we'd traditionally call visitor centers, but also to Alcatraz Island where we managed the visitor information, the bookstore, including the large one in the bottom of the Cellhouse or at the Golden Gate Bridge Welcome Center. Not only are we serving our mission,

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

but also the Conservancy, [since the bookstore sales revenue] became an income source to fuel our mission, and we became a major producer of interpretive materials for the park. In all cases, those materials are accurate, of high quality, and really well curated.

05-01:00:41
Farrell: Yeah, that makes a lot of sense, yes.

05-01:00:45
Moore: Yeah, and in some cases, too, it allows us to tell stories that are hidden. We brought the Alcatraz Gardens to life through both a book and a [volunteer-lead restoration] program. We helped to bring the Indian occupation to life through a video and a book and an exhibit. We look at the stories people are aware of and want to hear about, but we also get to the stories that have not been told that need to be told.

05-01:01:08
Farrell: When you mean the Alcatraz Gardens, are you talking about the succulent garden that goes around the periphery?

05-01:01:18
Moore: Yeah, and the gardens are actually more than just succulents. When Alcatraz was a military post and later on the prison, it was such a hard scape, it was a rock and so their goal was to beautify it. For the prison inmates actually, the best job was for the few inmates that were allowed to tend to the garden. There are ornamental [plant] species on Alcatraz that are rare. There's a rose garden with plants from like the 1870s, I think. The gardens had all become overgrown, and the diversity and texture of the gardens was being lost under blackberry, and with the restoration project, all those gardens were brought back to life, they were researched, they were documented, and they were tended and cared for by staff and volunteers.

05-01:02:14
Farrell: I think that's a great example, too, of the hidden stories that add value to the visitor center. When you go in for an hour or something, you're never going to get a full sense of the significance or the history or the connection that people had to these places without those kind of hidden stories.

05-01:02:35
Moore: Yeah, and as another example, of course, the audio tour where the former inmates and guards tell their story–and you can purchase this audio tour and take that home. If you think you've missed something, if you want to listen to it again, you can.

05-01:02:49
Farrell: Yeah, that's a good point. There were some other things too that were going on in parallel to a lot of the Presidio, Crissy Field, that kind of thing including some restoration projects. One aspect of that was with structures like Fort Cronkhite and then there were some ecosystem restoration projects. Some of

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

those effort examples include Los Lobos Creek dunes in 1998, Mountain Lake 1988 as well, and Oakwood Valley also same year, and then Crissy Field, the Redwood watershed, Mori Point, that finished up in 2008, and then Tennessee Hollow, El Polin Springs, and MacArthur Meadow. That's a big list, but are there any of those that you want to highlight?

05-01:03:49

Moore: Maybe I'll speak to bigger picture and then make an aside if we need to highlight any of them. Because this national park was put together of lands of many different histories, there were places in the park where the natural history hadn't been well tended to or the natural habitat hadn't been tended to. We tended to go with our Park Service colleagues and Presidio Trust colleagues to places where there were rare and endangered species habitat that could be recovered. With most of these examples—with Lobos Creek and with Mountain Lake and the Oakwood Valley and Redwood Creek and Mori Point—we were really looking at biodiversity hotspots. The San Francisco Garter Snake has to be one of the most beautiful snakes in the world, and that's at Mori Point, where it was the [rare plant the] Lessingia at Lobos Creek. At Mountain Lake, this freshwater lake in the Presidio had been completely contaminated. What we were able to do is help provide an engine of restoration. The restoration planning, the overall plan for why the restoration should occur and what needed to be done, was usually cowritten with our partners. But then the Conservancy jumped in to find the funding and the staff to implement the plan and to grow all the native plants because inevitably in these places what was lost was habitat, and habitat is often composed of wetland and dryland that had native species that have been lost. In some cases, actually, in Muir Woods in particular with the Big Lagoon restoration, which we haven't mentioned, actually introducing fish from the hatchery, coho salmon that were raised to a certain age and then introduced into the ecosystem.

05-01:05:52

But the result was that the beauty of the area was enhanced, and that's what people see before they see a garter snake, it's just that. We had to get people accustomed to the fact that public access was embraced, but we had to provide corridors for public access in order to preserve places that needed to be slightly off-limits, and that's where these projects interacted with the Trails Forever initiative, because we didn't want to close off these parks. Yet, we wanted to ensure that the very reason the parks were there could be protected.

05-01:06:38

Farrell: Yeah. It's interesting thinking about this. It sounds like the starting point for a lot of these restoration programs were the fact that they were biodiversity hotspots, is that right?

05-01:06:53

Moore: Yeah, and by that, I mean places where there were rare and endangered species—like the Mission Blue Butterfly is one that we worked at a lot in

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Milagra Ridge and the Wolfback Ridge and the Marin Headlands. So, yes, that was the fundamental starting point. Now, it wasn't always the only thing, but it tended to be a starting point.

05-01:07:16
Farrell: It's an organizing principle I think that makes a lot of sense.

05-01:07:22
Moore: When you have 80,000 acres, you have to begin to have a way to approach it.

05-01:07:26
Farrell: Right, right. I'm wondering what the process was of identifying what those hotspots were. Your site stewardship team or your habitat restoration team, did they evaluate that, or did you bring in consultants, how did that work?

05-01:07:48
Moore: Well, it's a mix of things. There's a process through the Fish and Wildlife Service where rare and endangered species are designated so that was a reference point. On the other hand, we had to understand what was in the park. There was an inventory part of it that was actually getting out in the field and realizing, yeah, there still are San Francisco Garter Snakes or there still are Mission Blue Butterflies. That there was a part of it that was like really detailed landscape reconnaissance just to figure out what plants and animals were there, and which ones needed extra help. From there moving to the overall restoration plan: if there were invasive species, what needed to be removed; if there was wetland that was lost, how it would be restored; if there were native species that animals depended upon, particularly like the Mission Blue Butterfly, there's one species of lupine that the butterfly lays its eggs on, you got to grow them, you got to plant them, and you got to help the butterflies find them. It's a long-term thing of course. You do reach a point where you feel when you're approaching steady state, but it takes a while.

05-01:09:11
Farrell: Who was responsible for taking that inventory?

05-01:09:16
Moore: You know what, honestly, it was a mix. In many cases, and at certain times, the Park Service to have the funds either to hire a consultant who would do that work themselves. Once the Conservancy grew, and we had our own biologist in our staff and our own site stewardship people in the field, then we had field personnel that were out there on a daily basis. We had the habitat restoration team and its volunteers and then the invasive species patrol, so we had a lot of eyes on the landscape. We did BioBlitzes at times and just did everything we can to stay up to date.

05-01:09:58
Farrell: You mentioned fish and wildlife, but were there other organizations that you were looking to with how they had done these things? I'm thinking about Save Mount Diablo because they have been doing inventory for a long time, and

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

they do BioBlitzes. Were there people tor organizations that you were taking cues from?

05-01:10:19
Moore: Yes, to a degree, and I think the one that's certain is that this was a field that its incipiency, at least in terms of how in a modern context it was implemented. At the time we were beginning, I don't think many nonprofits had the idea of community-based stewardship, had native plant nurseries with volunteers, had volunteers out in the field. And, of course, there was staff, but the staff was multiplied like at the Golden Gate Raptor Observatory, with three [staff] and 300 volunteers. We were trending things in a new direction without really knowing it, not knowing what citizen science would become, that there would be books written on it, which we are profiled in, the Conservancy. We did look at others but as I said that there was not a lot of turn to because so much of [this science and restoration] had been done only by government entities.

05-01:11:32
Farrell: Okay, okay.

05-01:11:33
Moore: I'm trying to remember really when the endangered species list was even implemented. I don't know exactly the date of that law, but it could be that we were hitting a point where people [wanted a lot more evidence the range of plant and animal species out in the world].

05-01:11:49
Farrell: That's true. Well, let's see, I can actually look that up.

05-01:11:54
Moore: I remember it was in the early 1970s—the Endangered Species Act.

05-01:11:57
Farrell: It makes sense, I mean during the environmental decade, and I did just see something. It might have been 1973, but, yeah, so that all makes sense too where it's part of that effort. In terms of the structures like Fort Cronkhite, was the Presidio Trust responsible for that and you helped, you filled in or helped provide some of the funding for that?

05-01:12:26
Moore: Well, the Presidio Trust was responsible for 80 percent of the Presidio and Fort Cronkhite is across the [Golden Gate] Bridge [and in Marin County].

05-01:12:32
Farrell: Okay, oh sorry. Yeah, you're right.

05-01:12:37
Moore: Outside of the Presidio, we were involved in historic restoration projects with individual buildings at Cronkhite, at a relatively small scale. But when we hit the big scale, and this may be in another part of the interview, is when we

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

undertook with the Park Service, the complete renovation of Fort Baker, which was the last military post to close [within the Golden Gate National Parks boundary]. Fort Baker is across the Golden Gate Bridge [from San Francisco], and that was a very challenging, controversial project that ended up turning out beautifully like many of them do. It was a complete campus of [military] buildings mostly all in disrepair, the home of the Discovery Museum and other things. In Alcatraz, we had to jump in, in big ways to support the preservation of the Cellhouse and the preservation of many buildings in Alcatraz Island so that those rehabilitation projects hit multimillion dollars. There are individual buildings, like the Presidio Visitor Center, the historic chapel in the Marin Headlands, the Point Bonita Lighthouse, we had to a role there, a whole scattering of individual [historic preservation] projects.

05-01:13:55

Farrell: You did mention before that you were responsible for a lot of the funding, that you had to pay for these restoration programs, and so I'm wondering how you approached that? How you were thinking about where the funding might come from if that was from donors, if that was from grants. Before we started recording, we talked about mitigation funds, but the financial aspect of this is a big portion, so I'm wondering how you approached and managed that?

05-01:14:28

Moore: It was a challenge because in terms of philanthropic funding, the funds available for historic preservation are not the same as the funds available for environmental restoration. The grant funds available for environmental [restoration] are higher. Historic restoration projects often fall into people's minds as maintenance with the belief that, hey, if the government should take care of anything, it should be the fundamental maintenance of the buildings and that philanthropy should be the thing that enhances something, not that fundamentally is needed to care for it. To your question, philanthropy wasn't at the scale we needed to operate, philanthropy wasn't really strong avenue for [operational or deferred maintenance] funding. We had to do it either through earned income that we could put aside and dedicate or through public-private partnerships. On Alcatraz and at Fort Baker, we did put aside earned income, but we also had very robust public-private partnerships in each case that helped take care of—I mentioned the pie chart for—helped take care of that whole pie chart of needs. At Fort Baker, we played a very major role by meeting with members of Congress over the course of five different years to get military funds directed for the basic environmental cleanup and the infrastructure repair of Fort Baker. That that was over $25 million, and without that being part of a pie, that project [could not have secured the full] $125 to $150 million, [much of it private capital, needed for the complete renovation of the many historic buildings and the overall site]. Without the infrastructure work being done at the beginning that it couldn't have happened.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-01:16:31
Farrell: One thing that you mentioned before was the Trails Forever initiative, and that was modeled after a program from Acadia National Park. Brian O'Neill was involved in that, and it's a lot building and maintaining trails. I think it's like 125 miles of trails including restoring acres of habitat and structures and things like that. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about the genesis of Trails Forever, working with Brian O'Neill on that, and we'll start there.

05-01:17:13
Moore: Yeah, I'm happy to. As I mentioned before, Brian was a man of one vision after another, and on a visit to Acadia National Park, he was impressed, and it was really impressive by their Trails Forever program and how they had, in a certain sense, endowed the trails and the old carriage roads to improve them and to keep them taken care of. He brought the idea back to the Conservancy, and I will honestly say as much as I saw the value in the idea and thought it was a vision, I felt like the Conservancy had too much going on at the time to take it on. That's when I first coined the phrase that "a vision without resources is a hallucination." I thought [laughs] that we were already resource-tapped, and we weren't going to be able to succeed. Brian did prevail and to his credit, we launched [the Trails Forever initiative], and we decided like, okay, this has to be multi-year. You can't run to the finish line on this one, we have to pace it with other things we're doing, and that's what we did and eventually began working on building a brand through fundraising event, the first Trails Forever dinner or our first gala dinner at Baker Beach. Having that provide the fuel for the initiative, getting grants, and just beginning to look at the scope and scale of the trail system within the national park and taking on trails that seemed important to us in terms of what they offered the public and doable in terms of the resources we could develop. That had a major campaign when we launched the Presidio Trails and Overlooks campaign because that campaign has, I believe, a $25 million goal.

05-01:19:25
Farrell: When Brian initially had this idea, was that one of those moments where you were like, "This is a great idea, but let's talk about how practically—using the power of three—what can accomplish?" Was that one of the compromises once again where you had to bring down him down to earth a little bit?

05-01:19:44
Moore: Yeah, I have to look at the date of the Trails Forever launch–it's 2003. Well, wow, [the Conservancy] was in the middle of a lot of stuff then. I mean this happens when you take on something as big as Crissy Field, you need a little bit of time to recharge your engines, and you can't go right back out to those volunteers and donors who have been so generous and say, "Wow, now here's another one." You have to give everybody a little bit of breathing space to get their bearings about the future and decide what's next. We were in the middle of the Lands End restoration and a lot of things so that we were approaching the community and donors about, so, yeah, I was reluctant about another big

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

undertaking [laughs] Brian was persuasive. He brought [the Trails Forever vision] to our board and he was never dismissive of my point of view, but he was going to proselytize for it, and as I said, I'm glad he did. We started, and it's been a really effective organizing tool. When you think about it, I think of the trails as being the circulatory system of the parks. How can you enjoy the parks without access to them and a lot of their beauty. You see on your feet, on a bike, or on a horse. It's been a proud accomplishment of trails including like, I think, eight different overlooks in the Presidio and twenty-three miles of walking trails and seventeen miles of biking trails, it was a complete transformation for the Presidio.

05-01:21:29
Farrell: The first Trails Forever Dinner happened in 2003, and that's something that continues today.

05-01:21:38
Moore: Yes, and our keynote speaker was Robert Redford, how about that?

05-01:21:42
Farrell: In 2003?

05-01:21:43
Moore: Yeah, and it happened at Baker Beach and the evening was so warm and calm that it was like we were on Waikiki Beach. It was so uncharacteristically warm and lovely, and it was a great start, it was a really magical event.

05-01:21:58
Farrell: Were there a lot of people there?

05-01:22:01
Moore: Well, at the time, we felt like it was a lot because it was our first, and I think there were maybe a hundred and fifty guests. Eventually we grew this event to about 400 in the tent, and the event, I think, the first year raised $250,000, and now it's been about—I mean it hasn't happened because of COVID but it was bringing in $1.5 million in a single evening event. At the beginning, that money really helped. We had to staff up for Trails Forever program, we had to hire a director of that initiative, we had to hire staff, we [had to build and improve] the trails, so the dinner helped the initiative get its legs in terms of resources.

05-01:22:50
Farrell: Do you remember whose idea the dinner was?

05-01:22:56
Moore: You know that's a really good question. [A fundraising gala event] has a certain inevitability because of our growth and visibility. For many organizations, the dinner is not only a point of rallying to raise funds but more importantly to cultivate people who have been generous, to show them what you've done with their generosity, and to build a team of people who all believe in what we're commonly and collectively getting accomplished for the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

public benefit. But I'm really lost whether it was a board member or a staff member; I don't think it was a me.

05-01:23:39
Farrell: Okay.

05-01:23:40
Moore: Yeah, I'll try to track that one down.

05-01:23:45
Farrell: I'm thinking about another opening—I think it was in '94 with the Presidio transition, the opening when they brought in a fog machine. Did they have a fog machine for the first Trails Forever Dinner?

05-01:23:57
Moore: No, we didn't. Well, we could've because it was uncharacteristically no fog, so we maybe we should have. Now that you mentioned that, maybe there is a connection between having done that event and remembering it and eventually thinking that, well, maybe this is something we should try is an annual event. But that was '94, and this was almost ten years later that this one happened.

05-01:24:20
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. Well, that's fantastic, it's interesting. I do want to ask about your growing staff, but in terms of the Trails Forever initiative, is there any component of that that you want to highlight, like the Lands End restoration or the Presidio Trials and Overlook?

05-01:24:41
Moore: I think there are a few projects that are of a scale that they're noteworthy like Lands End and the Presidio and maybe even more in some of our work at Muir Woods. But equally important are a lot of trails just get into disrepair, and often when they get in disrepair, the impacts are not just the access for hikers or bikers, but the erosion and the spill off and the dangers to nearby habitat because people will start creating social trails. If there's a big rut, then someone will walk somewhere else and begin creating what's called a "social trail." Some of the work was just getting all that planning organized and knowing that if we could provide quality trails, we could also protect critical habitats. Every year, we had a list of like fifty to seventy-five different trail-related improvements that we were working on, some may be a quarter mile long and some were [larger trail systems].

05-01:25:52
Farrell: That does sound like it dovetails with the ecosystem restoration program. It's because if you're trying to protect biodiversity hotspots and people are walking around—let's say the garter snake is there—you don't want somebody to step on the garter snake or something or go into their habitat, so it makes sense to maintain those trails where it's like a delineation of what's safe and what's wild.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-01:26:19
Moore: You've given a really tangible example because at Mori Point, the wetland area is really important for the critical species, the garter snake and I think it's the red-legged frog—I may have the name of the frog a little off—but the trail went right through the wetlands, and the wetland was disconnected because of the trail, so we created a long [pedestrian] bridge over the wetlands. It connected the wetland areas and then put up low, appropriate fencing that is almost invisible to the eye to just be sure that people can look right at into the wetland, they just can't get in, and if they happen to have a dog, the dog can't get in either or whatever else might want to get in.

05-01:27:05
Farrell: With the Lands End and restoration, what were some of the major things that went into that?

05-01:27:14
Moore: Yeah, well, the motivation for Lands End was realizing that this kind of timeless jewel of a location, that had an era of public access in the late 1800s and early 1920s that was super significant, had really just been let go [in terms of its care and maintenance]. The trails were terrible, the forest was completely dying out, and the area, to many people, felt threatening. But the site, the inherent characteristics of the site, its history whether the Sutro Baths or with the archaeological sites from Native Americans or the endangered species or the planted forest, just really a tremendous potential for enhancement. We began approaching it as mainly a trails project for the main trail that goes along the coast there, but we took on the urban forest and completely thinned out [dead and dying branches]. We planted native habitat, and eventually we built what I think is one of [the Conservancy's] best architectural achievements, the Lands End Lookout, which won many awards for its architectural design. It was comprehensive project, it happened in stages, but during about a five-year period and maybe a little bit more, most of that work happened.

05-01:28:38
Farrell: Now incredibly highly traffic too.

05-01:28:40
Moore: Yeah, definitely. Yeah, that's the thing, some people had mixed feelings about when you improve something. I've always said to everyone, "The moment we cut the ribbon, we don't have to worry. People will come." When we did that at Crissy Field, people said, "Well, will anybody come?" It's like, "Are you kidding me?" [laughs]

05-01:28:58
Farrell: It's beautiful.

05-01:29:00
Moore: Yeah, let's cut the ribbon and see.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-01:29:02
Farrell: Yeah. [laughter] How about the Presidio Trails and Overlooks, that was around 1995 with Immigrant Point opening?

05-01:29:12
Moore: That was a such a beautiful ceremony because it was funded by a gentleman, George Sarlo, who was an immigrant I think from Hungary to America. Here, we have a lookout that looks on this major [historical] point of immigration at the Golden Gate, and so it came to be named Immigrant Point. When we opened it, we had a naturalization ceremony there for new American citizens, and it was just really truly wonderful. Like many things, once you complete a project that exemplifies what the listed project would be, you can bring other funders and donors, so that helped get that campaign underway along with a very important, almost 50 percent [leadership] gift by the Haas, Jr. Fund toward the campaign.

05-01:30:10
Farrell: I think that's a great example of thinking about parks for all as well, you know?

05-01:30:15
Moore: Yes.

05-01:30:16
Farrell: You're bringing in the physical landscape, the history, the social aspect of it, and you're also creating—for the people who had their naturalization ceremonies there—they're never going to forget that that's there. You're creating a connection to the park if it wasn't already there, certainly after that. I mean that's a really special thing to have happen.

05-01:30:40
Moore: Yeah, you hit a good point, and another example of that—it's a little bit tucked away—but the Veterans Overlook at the Presidio is just amazing, a beautiful poem etched in rock at that site and an incredible view over the cemetery toward the Golden Gate Bridge. Each overlook has its own special character and meaning; they're not cookie cutter. What's similar about them all is that they speak to the location and they're of high quality and durable design.

05-01:31:18
Farrell: Did you want to mention anything about Mori Point in connection with this?

05-01:31:25
Moore: Well, I think just again maybe following up on the Trails Forever, Mori Point became a combination of natural restoration and public access. There were a few little difficult points in that because the local community, of course, had loved it as it was, but, by and large, we were supported. The way that we tended to gain support is just spending time with people and not being impatient—making certain that we had some level of trust and support to whatever we did. With One Tam, which we're going to talk about later, the leader of that effort said, she's American but of English descent, she had sixty-

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

five cups of tea before she felt that One Tam was ready to be launched with the people understanding and supporting what we were trying to do.

05-01:32:32
Farrell: Why sixty-five?

05-01:32:35
Moore: It's just the number of meetings that she had. I mean this [Conservancy staff leader] is Sharon Farrell who is not at the Conservancy anymore but was just the most amazing ecologist and leader you could ever imagine. She just decided that she was going to talk to the people that were obvious, the people that would support us and like what we were doing, the people that were neutral, and most importantly to meet with all the people that were suspicious of what One Tam was and had developed hard notions about what its intentions were. We were in an environment at the time where the Park Service had a very controversial plan for off-leash dogs, they had some controversies with the privately run stables in the parks, so there was a lot of stuff going on, and we had to make our way through that environment.

05-01:33:39
Farrell: That's a great transition to thinking about—you've got a ton going on, it's a lot—so in order to accomplish that and make sure that all those moving parts keep moving, you had to grow the staff.

05-01:33:54
Moore: Yeah.

05-01:33:53
Farrell: I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about how do you assess the needs of who you have to hire? But I'm guessing that it probably corresponds with what projects are you working on. Maybe if there's anything you want to say about how you were thinking about what positions to hire and the kind of people that you were looking for to fill those positions?

05-01:34:23
Moore: Yeah, well it's where the Parks For All Forever vision was again my friend because I turned to it—and I saw an organizational structure within it. First with the "Parks" part of the Conservancy's mission, I had two absolutely phenomenal Directors of Park Projects. First, Michael Boland, who later moved over to the Presidio Trust, he was a landscape architect, and then Catherine Barner, who is an architect who took over after Michael. That part of the Conservancy was in charge of planning, design, and construction of park improvements. Each of them brought incredible leadership and enthusiasm and vision and creativity to those roles. Then we had our "For All" mission, and that was about how to make these places relevant and of service to people. Again, I have wonderful people that stepped up for [that including the Director of the Crissy Field Center, Crissy Rocca and various Executive Vice Presidents] including [Doug Overman], Chris Spence, and finally [Katherine Toy], who has now moved on and is now directing the entire

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

access and equity program for the State of California related to parks. Finally, the "Forever" piece with Trails Forever hiring a staff member from the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Kate Bickert, and I think eventually Sharon Farrell took over that whole portfolio [and did amazing, groundbreaking things with it and advanced new models of community stewardship. Sharon Farrell has also moved on to big and broad impacts projects at the State and national levels]. Yeah, we had Parks For All Forever all staffed up, with a leader of each area, truly phenomenal leaders.

05-01:36:14

To support all that, there was also a communications [and public affairs] department, wonderful people like Nancy Miljanich in the early years, Carol Prince later on, David Shaw and now Angela Leung. Really brilliant people in the communications and community engagement sector. Of course, you need resources, so we have phenomenal Development Directors [to guide our philanthropic programs] from my very first with Crissy Field, Nancy Lamont to Dick Bunce [who worked with Doug Overman of that campaign], to eventually Kathryn Morelli and Tracy Eckels for the Tunnel Tops campaign. People were also in charge of earning the money with a COO and a CFO and brilliant revenue producers, like Nicki Phelps at the audio tour and Robert Lieber with our publications [and products], and [COO] Nicholas Elsishans leading that shop and so much more—I could go on. I have been so blessed with conviction and talent and vision and creativity of Conservancy staff members, just I can't say enough about the Conservancy team. I could probably talk about all 425 of them if I had enough time.

05-01:37:32

Farrell: Yeah, so the 425, that is a far cry from, what, the two or three of you that had started when you were all like a one-stop shop, you did everything.

05-01:37:39

Moore: Yeah.

05-01:37:40

Farrell: And now you're expanding into different departments, there are teams of people that are working on things. During this period of time, the early 2000s, do you remember how big the staff grew? 425 is probably around today, right?

05-01:38:04

Moore: No, actually because of COVID, the staff has had to reduce a bit because a lot of [the Conservancy's] earned income dropped off when the park sites were closed, and tourism declined.

05-01:38:12

Farrell: Okay.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-01:38:11
Moore: With Alcatraz closed, the Conservancy kept the staff on as long as it could, but it couldn't be indefinitely. I don't know what the staff number is now but it's probably about 250 people or somewhere like that.

05-01:38:25
Farrell: Okay.

05-01:38:26
Moore: I left when [staff levels] were at our peak, and maybe when COVID is over, the Conservancy will return some of that. As I said at the beginning, I never took the job at the Conservancy believing I would be there as long I was obviously. I thought, as I said, three to five years seemed about right. But every time I thought about leaving, one wonderful vision and opportunity arose and excited me. We tended to work on five-year strategic plans, so we just had to constantly reconfigure ourselves for growth. That was part of my job. I had great mentors on the board to help me with that who had grown companies and grown organizations and helped me understand when I needed a human resources director, a CFO–or if I had missed something, noticing it and then just acquiring the talent over time. It was a big jump probably. When we concluded Crissy Field, when the Presidio was underway, and when we began to understand how to really maximize our philanthropic and earned income, we intentionally took big steps to grow [our revenue] and fortunately have the resources to invest in growth, then it filled in the resources we needed to bring the staff on.

05-01:40:16
Farrell: Yeah. How did you go about recruiting staff?

05-01:40:22
Moore: A variety of ways, sometimes word-of-mouth, and often, particularly with some of our entry-level positions, with our very active role in youth programming, with interns both high school and college interns we could turn to. That was almost like a work development force for us. We had people that we followed through high school until their college graduation and then had an internship and then converted those talents, so we have some people that are almost lifers. Eventually, when we grew large and our time and networks were at a premium, we would work with a search firm to help us find the executive staff. But I never remember a time when there weren't always good candidates in front of us. We were lucky in that way.

05-01:41:26
Farrell: Growing to such a big staff, how were you thinking differently about management, or maybe how would you describe your management style, your leadership style in working with all these various people and teams?

05-01:41:46
Moore: One illustration I can remember is for a while, like maybe when we were up to eighty or a hundred people, I could remember everybody's name. I knew

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

everyone, I knew what they did, and if I saw them, I could talk to them. I remember over a course of time going out to a few of our facilities and not knowing the people, and it bothered me. I asked our HR department that every time a new staff member came on to take a polaroid and to give me a flash card and so I had staff flashcards for me to learn the staff. And then I realized that I would be honored to meet with every new staff member as a class, so three or four times a year, staff would have an orientation session with me, and we would gather. There were usually fifteen of us or maybe twenty-five. We'd talk about where everyone had come from, why they applied to the job, what their aspirations were, what they knew of the Conservancy. I would go to the Conservancy's values and track record and where their job fit in. The person who was hired from the audio tour in Alcatraz would meet the vice president of our fundraising department, so it had this role of teamwork and letting everyone know that whatever their job was, whether they were in the executive team or whether they were handing out a brochure at the Presidio Visitor Center, we were all equally important to the mission. I kept that up all the way through until I eventually left the Conservancy.

05-01:43:39
Farrell: It also sounds like the feel of a smaller organization and trying to make that a big organization feel intimate like small organization where, as you mentioned, the person doing the audio tour could meet the vice president of whatever department or something.

05-01:43:58
Moore: Yeah. We really wanted to cultivate that and we always at the beginning of the year, I would meet with them. We had full-staff team meetings, and on those, I would either be presenting annual goals or presenting annual accomplishments. We had something called Park Day, and that was four times year where any staff member who could be let off of their normal duties for a day, we would gather on restoration project out in the park. That had that same mixing quality where you're there all day with someone, removing invasive plants or planting something, painting a building, eating lunch together, and usually, we would have like between fifty to seventy people in each one of those.

05-01:44:45
Farrell: That's a great team building thing and also looking at how even just painting a building, that makes a really big difference and that's all significant.

05-01:44:53
Moore: Yeah.

05-01:44:53
Farrell: It sounds like if there are people from the different parts of the hierarchy coming together, and again, illustrates everybody is important and equal.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-01:45:03
Moore: Yeah, and so much in life depends on just this trust, just knowing people and believing them and believing they're honest and believing that you're in something together. I just felt like if parks are for all and we see them as platforms of connection and conviviality and community, then the Conservancy needed to bring that same DNA to the staff.

05-01:45:36
Farrell: Yeah. We'll talk a little bit more about staff too in later conversations and maybe a different area. I'm thinking about like the Crissy Field Visitor Center and a lot of the youth programs that we'll talk about. But one thing we haven't talked about yet was when you became a father in 1993 with the birth of your son Zachary. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what it was like for you to become a father—and you're so busy—so also balancing parenthood with your career?

05-01:46:13
Moore: Yeah, well my wife and I were late-to-life parents. Once we decided to have children, it took a long time before we eventually had Zack, and that pregnancy was a very challenging one. It's just like any new parent will say, life changed in so many ways. For me, of course as you mentioned, I had the Conservancy to take care of with its large number of staff and then my son and my wife. It wasn't a time when paternity leave even existed, so I was back to work within days, and my wife went back to work fairly quickly. But she had decided to leave a staff career and work at home [as a consultant], so she was able to be present and we brought in help when we needed it. But honestly, it was a hard balance for me because there were things with Zack I just couldn't be there, times when there were evening meetings or weekend responsibilities, events that I had to attend that conflicted with events in his life.

05-01:47:48
I had to reconcile that and find my own ways of being with him when I could and becoming a dad and a friend and hopefully somewhat of a guide for him getting through life. In the long haul, the parks—I can see it now and he can see it now—there were times when neither one of us could see it—had a really positive impact on him. It's really interesting, but I took him through Crissy Field during every stage of its construction process because he loved things mechanical. He was entranced with Crissy Field and now he's part of the management team for a $4 billion UCSF project and actually part of what he's thrilled about is that that project has a public service component.

05-01:48:41
So anyway, I've zipped ahead to my child as an adult but, yeah, I brought him to everything. He showed up at our [Conservancy holiday] party, and I was in a Santa Claus outfit. I came down the fire escape with him in my hands as like a four-month-year-old. I think it shocked all the Conservancy staff that I was being a little cavalier with this new child. His life now depends on the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

outdoors, I mean every single minute that he can be mountain biking, skiing, surfing, wind sailing, you name it. That's a passion of his.

05-01:49:34
Farrell: I think in the previous interview you did talk about how your wife brought him to one of the sites that was undergoing renovation, and he was very taken with the machinery there. It's great to hear that you were trying to show him, maybe you couldn't be there for everything, but the impact of what you're doing and then clearly, he's spending time outside so that makes a difference. I was also wondering if you were still living in the same area of San Francisco or if you had moved to a new neighborhood or new place at this point?

05-01:50:14
Moore: When Zack was born, we were living in Sausalito. We were there and then we moved out of Sausalito mainly because the house wasn't really designed for family. It had no yard, and it was not a good school district either, so we moved north, so he grew up mainly in the home that we're in now. But if I can digress to give just two examples. At one of my anniversaries at the Conservancy—I forget which year—the board threw a surprise party for me, and they brought back staff that had left the Conservancy and gone on to new things and former board members. I was completely clueless, and I was usually the master of surprises, and they pulled it off on me. Also in the room were my wife and Zack who was then probably nine or ten years old. People went up to the podium and said things, and Zack was sitting in a place on my side. I'm blind on this side, so I couldn't see him. I'm listening and suddenly, I hear this little voice at the podium, and it's my son up there as nine-or-ten-year-old giving a testimony to me. First, he said, "You know, you're all acting like my dad is perfect and I'm just up here to say he's not," so he had a great opening line. [laughs] And then he said, "It's really great for me to be here because my dad's been away doing a lot for this job, and at times I really wanted to be with him when he had to work. Coming here tonight, I can see in a better way what he's gotten done and why he's gotten it done and what it means." Now, I don't know if he said it exactly in those words, I'm paraphrasing. But anyhow it was just an amazing moment where this little kid of mine gets up and gives a testimonial to me while I'm feeling like I'm not being the best father that I could've been or should've been.

05-01:52:34
Farrell: What did that mean for you to have him see and recognize and start to understand the work that you were doing?

05-01:52:43
Moore: It meant so much to me. I was just an emotional wreck, and when I got home that night, I immediately used my memory to write down what he'd said because it meant so much to me that I knew I would lose it if I didn't write it down. That when had Zack had the confidence and the courage and the speaking ability to go up there because there are people in line to speak after him, and they all said, "This is it," so that was part it. He brought together my

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

two worlds in a way that made me feel good about both, and hopefully it was genuine and sincere, but if it wasn't, then it was generous. [laughs] That happened, and I won't go into other occasions, but it happened at two others where he just—I'm completely unprepared—stands up and gives something that just blows me away and everybody else around him.

05-01:53:51
Farrell: What does it mean to you now to look back at the influence, that you can see now and that he can see, that this all had on him given the fact that he is working on this huge project that has a social aspect to it?

05-01:54:14
Moore: Yeah, well both Nancy and I, our entire lives have been dedicated to public-serving careers, so he has two role models for better or for worse. I think at times when you have parents and you're an only child and your parents are so dedicated to their work and their convictions and their progress, that could be intimidating. And because Zack was dyslexic, I think it was even more intimidating because he struggled academically and had trouble finding his place. To see that now it's all worked out, that the values we had were not imposed but accepted, that the work we have done he is proud of, and that his own character is different from ours, but we're incredibly proud of him and have a very loving relationship and enjoy his company, and what could be better. He's living ten minutes from us, so you know [laughs] it all worked out. There were plenty of struggles along the way. Yeah, you're soon to be a parent, you'll have similar journeys, I'm sure.

05-01:55:28
Farrell: Yeah, I'm sure, I'm sure. But I mean you're doing something right if he wants to live so close to you that he is in the backyard. That says something.

05-01:55:38
Moore: For years, he said, "This is the last place I want to live, I'm getting out here."

05-01:55:43
Farrell: Yeah, yeah.

05-01:55:44
Moore: Not everything a child tells you can take completely seriously.

05-01:55:49
Farrell: That's true, yeah. Well, thank you for sharing all of that, I do appreciate it.

05-01:55:53
Moore: Yeah.

05-01:55:54
Farrell: I think that might be a good place to leave it for today because some of the other topic we're going to get into in the next session are pretty big. So if this feels like a good stopping place for you today?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

05-01:56:06
Moore: It does, and thank you for giving me a chance to talk about my family because I think I haven't talked about Nancy—not only Zack but for Nancy. She had to be very understanding of the demands of the Conservancy and she was totally generous, never a bit of jealousy, such as why aren't you home or why are you working seventy hours a week this week. Yeah, I was very lucky that the two people that are around me and that I love deeply and were really supportive of me all the way.

05-01:56:46
Farrell: I think that makes a big difference, the support there and we can definitely talk more about Nancy and her career and how that overlapped with yours.

05-01:56:56
Moore: Right.

05-01:56:57
Farrell: Great. Well, thank you so much.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Interview 6: March 15, 2022

06-00:00:07
Farrell: Okay, this is Shanna Farrell with Greg Moore on Tuesday, March 15, 2022. This is our sixth interview, and we are talking via Zoom. Greg, welcome back.

06-00:00:24
Moore: Thank you, Shanna.

06-00:00:25
Farrell: When we left off last time, well, we had been talking about Crissy Field and the opening, what went into that project—it's a massive project. But I wanted to talk a little bit more today about some of the programs particularly associated with the youth center that the Conservancy was responsible for and fell under the umbrella. The Crissy Field Youth Center opened in 2001 and I'm wondering if you could start by telling me what the vision was for the youth center?

06-00:01:05
Moore: Sure, the youth center opened simultaneously with Crissy Field itself. The vision for the youth center really was to acknowledge that if we could connect with young people about what these national parks had to offer and make them feel welcome at an early age and advance their education and leadership in their own lives, that we would be building a connection between the park and the community not just through this generation but through future generations. It was also a way for us to acknowledge that young people are the future of our national parks and that our national parks not only need people to visit them but need people to be aware of them, to care for them, and to advocate for them. All those factors were in the early vision including reaching youth particularly who may not have had a national park experience before or may live in a community that didn't have ready access to parks and open space.

06-00:02:13
Farrell: Can you tell me a little bit more about how you were thinking about that group of youth, the ones that didn't necessarily have access? Maybe if you can just tell me a little bit more about how you were thinking about who they might be and how you might approach them and get them involved?

06-00:02:32
Moore: Sure, our basic thought was that if we believe that national parks have something to offer and wanted young people to take advantage of what the national park benefits could be to them, that we needed to listen to their needs and aspirations and put those two pieces together. Before the center opened, the Conservancy formed a youth advisory council with young people throughout the community to get a better perspective on where the youth were coming from, what happened in their day-to-day lives, what were their needs, were they for leadership, for jobs, for friends, for better educational opportunities. And how the center in its opening could reflect the values and

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

needs of a national park but also the values and needs of the young people that we were reaching out to.

06-00:03:33
Farrell: How did you assemble the youth advisory group or board?

06-00:03:38
Moore: We started with community-based organizations whether it might be the YMCA or the local school, Boys and Girls club, just to get ideas of who might be nominated and then went through the process from there.

06-00:03:58
Farrell: When the youth advisory board came together, what were some of the needs they were saying that were a part of the planning process? What were they expressing as their needs?

06-00:04:11
Moore: It was really an interesting mix. In some cases, of course, a very present need and opportunity for their horizons to be lifted and for someone to invest in their future whether that was through a leadership experience or an internship or even a paid position. Young people have the need to feel valued by their peers and not to be in any way stereotyped about who they are and who they should be, so providing a safe environment for young people to gather and get together. Another theme is for many of our youth, some of them very new to the American experience. Some of them were immigrants themselves, some were born here, but their parents are immigrants, and so they wanted a sense of belonging in their new country, and again, a place that would care deeply about them and their future and give them a participatory and engaging experience.

06-00:05:31
Farrell: How did their vision, the youth advisory board's vision or the needs they were expressing fit in with the National Park Service and the Presidio Trust?

06-00:05:43
Moore: It did fit in well, but we needed to be open to having our perspective be influenced also. It would be easy for people that already believe in national parks and care for their beauty and value to assume that as long as we make these parks available to someone else, they're going to see it through the same lens that we do. Of course, some of those things are cross generational and cross cultural, such as beauty and scenery and history and nature, but if it really took like stepping back from the idea that we were providing a gift, almost a patronage-type system and moving into how we do we come together in a way that's mutually beneficial and respectful and how does [the Conservancy] be a part of your community, in your neighborhood, or in your school, or in your family as much as you being part of our community in this national park. We got to know parents well, we got to know teachers well, we got to know community leaders well. All of them were part of the ongoing DNA of the youth programs at the Crissy Field Center.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-00:07:11
Farrell: Was the National Park Service and Presidio sensitive to what some of the needs of people who are first generation were?

06-00:07:19
Moore: Yes, they were, and it wasn't too far along into our work, maybe five years or so, that we realized that not only were we engaging young people but many of them were thinking about careers either with the National Park Service or the Trust or the Conservancy. Many of them were thinking about environmental careers or conservation careers so it really began to almost be a full cycle in the benefits that the agencies gain by having this young almost a workforce development program.

06-00:08:04
Farrell: Yeah, and in terms of some of the programs that were actually there, there was Inspiring Youth Emerging Leaders, Project WISE, Parks as Classrooms that was curriculum based with the National Park Service, Crissy Field Summer Camps and Community Heroes, the Urban Trailblazers, IUCN World Park Congress Youth Ambassadors, Teens on Trails, the LINC Summer High School Program, Brian O'Neill Youth Leaders Fund, Camping at the Presidio, the Park Youth Collaborative, and Migratory Stories. I just went through the whole list, but do you want to talk about of those?

06-00:08:48
Moore: Yeah, sure, and that list represents about a decade of work in building out our youth programs. One of the core programs we opened with was the [Inspiring Young] Emerging Leaders program. That program really invested in a select number of youth, I think in the beginning, maybe ten or maybe fifteen, that we committed to bringing in as a cohort generally in their freshman year of high school and staying with us for a four-year period and investing into those young people's leadership skills, their own confidence, their sense of the outdoors and nature, and really taking advantage of their growing capacity to be community investors for the parks. Many of those young people went on to college and got conservation degrees, some work for the Trust, the Park Service, and the Conservancy today, and eventually the Crissy Field Center. I think maybe there's over 500 people [from these youth now] in the conservation careers; we have a track record of all that. That was when it started at the beginning.

06-00:10:05
Another one I might acknowledge are the curriculum-based programs because the center wanted to advance academic achievement too, and experiential learning is a great way for young people to understand nature and science and even the arts. We tied in with school-based programs that were directly fulfilling curriculum requirements that teachers had at every grade level from first grade all the way through high school and then made an offering to school teachers through an annual event called Teachers Night to take advantage of these curriculum-based programs, some could be hosted or some

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

that the teacher could really independently take advantage of the curriculum and bring their students out to the parks. Eventually as the youth programs really grew in their scope and scale and reputation, the center realized that we had many aligned, youth-providing program organizations both within the park such as NatureBridge or the Bay Area Discovery Museum but outside the park in terms of the Bayview YMCA or others, and we formed the Park Youth Collaborative. The point of that was to get to a collective impact model where all the organizations in the Park Youth Collaborative agreed to a similar vision, similar values, similar metrics, and joint training in sharing resources. It really was finally a complete stemming together of all these organizations with like values and outcomes.

06-00:11:59
Farrell: The collaborative sounds like a way of looking at what the needs are of the different constituents and working with them to balance what you're trying to do, their needs and make it a program that people are using.

06-00:12:17
Moore: Yeah, and again, you're absolutely right, and it envisioned the park as almost a full campus of learning opportunities because we had the San Francisco Unified School District outdoor classroom at Fort Funston or we had NatureBridge in the Headlands, or we had Slide Ranch in Marin County or the Bay Area Discovery Museum. For young people, they could see that not only that they could take advantage of the programs at the Crissy Field Center but there were many other opportunities available for them. Depending on their age, you could start at the Discovery Museum almost as a toddler and end up at the Inspiring Young Emerging Leaders program, so we called it the ladder of learning and the ladder of engagement for young people. It just helped us also be more comprehensive in our approach and the sharing of resources among the people working with youth and among the youth themselves.

06-00:13:21
Farrell: Did you find that people—let's say people from San Francisco—were going up to the Headlands for natural bridges or people were staying to their geographic location?

06-00:13:33
Moore: People moved around, and even at the Crissy Field Center, although it was located in Crissy Field, it was the intention of the center to expose you to learning and nature opportunities, not just at Crissy Field but throughout the national parks and throughout the Bay Area and even eventually—and this ties into another program there—to be international youth ambassadors. A variety of our youth traveled to a once-a-decade National Park Congress in South Africa as youth ambassadors and then ten years later, a variety of them went to Sydney, Australia, as youth ambassadors, and in each case, they were at the top of the class. They ran the youth programs, they spoke to [young people from around the globe]—I mean this conference has maybe ten thousand people from around the world, almost every country participates,

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

and our youth leaders were there proudly participating in everything that was offered and leading the way.

06-00:14:35
Farrell: Was that the IUCN World Parks Congress Youth Ambassadors?

06-00:14:39
Moore: Yes, and IUCN is the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, and I think they are the largest international organization pulling other together people working on national parks and biodiversity and conservation. As I said, every ten years, they have a focus on national parks, as they call it the Congress, the National Parks Congress.

06-00:15:05
Farrell: Okay, 2004 was in South Africa and 2014 was in Australia?

06-00:15:10
Moore: That's correct, yeah.

06-00:15:11
Farrell: Okay, great, great. Yeah, that had to be pretty exciting for those students.

06-00:15:16
Moore: It was pretty amazing. I mean I went to South Africa with a young person, Ernesto Pepito, and we met Nelson Mandela, these pretty amazing, life-changing experiences. Ernesto had, I think, never been in an airplane until he traveled with me to South Africa, so it definitely opened up a big experience in his life.

06-00:15:44
Farrell: Yeah, and Ernesto was part of the Emerging Leaders program initially, is that right?

06-00:15:49
Moore: That's right, yeah.

06-00:15:50
Farrell: Okay, okay. I'm pretty sure he continues to work for the Conservancy today?

06-00:15:56
Moore: Yes, Ernesto is still at the center running a whole portfolio of youth programs. He's no longer a young person, he's graduated from that, in fact, he's a father in his own right.

06-00:16:13
Farrell: I think that's a great illustration of the passage of time, how long these programs have been around since he was a kid and now, he's a father. But I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what made him particularly successful in that, starting as a kid and then staying with the Conservancy?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-00:16:38
Moore: Well, Ernesto is an amazingly engaging, inquisitive, and charismatic person. He fits all the definitions of a leader in his ability to project and engage and do so in a way that's humble and authentic. He has a wonderful, big, booming voice that you can't ignore, an electric personality that people will gravitate to instantly, and a real charm with everyone and a particular ability to work with youth. He came into the center as a younger person and grew up there, so it's not surprising that he's very capable in his youth development skills as a leader and a manager of youth programs.

06-00:17:38
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. Also, I think shows how successful these programs are in accomplishing their mission too because that's what you want, right? You're creating those connection between people and parks that are lifelong and then the younger generations can then pass that on to future generations too.

06-00:17:57
Moore: Yeah, and for some of the young people, they were maybe people that found their more traditional schooling either limiting or they felt like they didn't fit in and then they were introduced sometimes very whimsically or accidentally to the idea of a place at the Crissy Field Center. It's not that everyone jumped at that because they wanted to be a leader, or they cared about the environment. Some of them jumped at it because it was something different, and they felt maybe it would be fun or maybe it would add some value to their life that was additive to what they were getting in the classroom setting.

06-00:18:42
Farrell: Yeah, and I think that we'll probably as we—because, as you mentioned, that those programs cover well over a decade, I think from 2001 to 2015 so we'll come back to a couple of those.

06-00:18:50
Moore: Yes.

06-00:18:50
Farrell: But as you're growing, I guess I'm wondering with Crissy Field, with the visitor center, with these programs, what percentage of time or work did managing these programs take and how may staff people were involved in running them?

06-00:19:24
Moore: Well, we grew pretty dramatically. Our original commitment to the Crissy Field Center—our original budget I would say was about $250,000 a year, and I think we started with three staff. At its peak that budget had grown to probably close to three million and maybe more like twenty or twenty-five staff before COVID closed everything down because we couldn't meet young people in person in the same way as we had. So it did grow a lot and the center had to develop its own leadership in terms of people running the center and running the programs and engaging with the community and keeping that

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

going. As I said, there were youth programs that developed over time that touched almost every corner of the park, right, in one way or another.

06-00:20:26
Farrell: How did the Conservancy think about outreach, how to promote these programs, how to get people involved, how to reach communities they might not otherwise?

06-00:20:37
Moore: We tended to use more of an engagement model than an outreach model. And maybe I'm just parsing words here, but outreach has the idea like well, if you just reach out and tell somebody something that they'll come your direction or that maybe people have been not aware enough, so ours was always about engagement, not just showing up at the community once with the message, but putting community members on our various advisory teams, engaging parents, engaging teachers, engaging kids, and having a very active feedback loop to be certain that our programs were relevant and having impact.

06-00:21:32
Farrell: Did you reach out to specific schools or anything to let them know that these programs were happening?

06-00:21:38
Moore: We did. As some schools, there was a certain variety because if you get one teacher to be passionate about what you have to offer, and that makes a difference in terms of engaging not only that teacher but maybe that school. We also worked with school leadership, with the superintendent of the schools, with principals of schools, with Teachers' Night just to be sure that the word was out, and the invitation was there. It was up to the individual teachers or students to determine whether we had something worthwhile for them to get involved with. As one example, at Galileo High, there was a science program there, and maybe because of its proximity to the parks, the head of the science program really saw the advantage of an experiential opportunity for science learning through the Watershed Inspiring Student Education program or Project WISE. That program still is active today with Galileo and maybe another high school now as well. It happened in a way because one teacher saw this opportunity and also felt that there were students that struggled with more conventional models of learning that would really benefit from an experiential model.

06-00:23:10
Farrell: That makes a lot of sense, that makes a lot of sense. I'm also wondering—I mean there's a lot to balance here between these programs, your staff needs, your partners here, your collaborators like the Presidio, like National Park Service—how did the needs of the community and the people you were serving, how did you manage or navigate balancing all of those perspectives?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-00:23:41
Moore: You're right, there was a lot going on, and a lot of people to interact with, a lot of partners to engage with, a growing board, community partners, and of course, people that were generous to our programs and helped fund them. I guess we just stepped up as the moment required us to work or gave us the ability to succeed. The Conservancy had to grow out its staff. We were now managing many projects, we were managing many [educational and volunteer] programs, we were managing science and stewardship programs, and we grew in the number of partners we had from one at the very beginning [with the National Park Service to] ultimately to six or seven including the Golden Gate Bridge and organizations in Marin County through One Tam. We had to grow our board, grow our board committee structure, yeah, and so a lot to take care of. Fortunately for the Conservancy, our financial model of combining earned income and contributed income continued to grow as the scale of our aspirations grew, so we were able to keep pace pretty well.

06-00:25:06
Farrell: Well, that's ideal too. So if you're growing, that your income is also growing with you, so it's not disproportionate.

06-00:25:14
Moore: Yeah, and to some degree, it began with Crissy Field being a very visible accomplishment—the more that we expanded our track record of results both programmatically and into our projects and stewardship, the more public support we had and the more philanthropic support we were able to bring in.

06-00:25:37
Farrell: I think that's a great point. It's something that I think about a lot in my own work is the more visible you are and the more you're doing these programs, I do think it is going to attract like-minded people who are wanting to support these types of programs, so it's like a positive domino effect.

06-00:25:57
Moore: Yeah.

06-00:25:57
Farrell: Yeah. And so this was also not the only thing you were working on during these years.

06-00:26:06
Moore: No.

06-00:26:06
Farrell: [laughter] There were quite a few things, so this is just a piece of the pie. There were other long-term projects. Crissy Field was certainly a long-term one. There were some restoration programs, there were other park enhancement, the trails and overlooks work. I'm wondering how you stayed motivated to work on these long-term projects, how you stayed interested, how you kept yourself caring about these things?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-00:26:40
Moore: Well, there's a lot of ways to handle that question. I'd say maybe most fundamental, the Conservancy's work was really tangible, by that I mean these physically amazing parklands that are there for all time. The ability to see people enjoying them in a variety of dimensions and ways, learning from them, growing with them, and the knowledge that the work we're doing today was work that would be lasting–because national parks, some people say, are in the perpetuity business, they're hopefully preserved forever. The basic proposition is incredibly rewarding and motivating and fulfilling, and not just to me as the CEO of the Conservancy but to the staff, to the board, to our partners to have that type of impact and to see it that visibly, to transform places dramatically. If you do it once, you want to do it again. I think my staff used to joke that every time every time I helped lead the Conservancy through one big vision and challenge, I would take a little bit of a breather, but I was looking for the next one around the corner. Luckily for me, given how I like to work, the creative challenges I enjoy, and the opportunity of all the impossibilities to make possible put in front of me, I loved it, for example, when Fort Baker was an opportunity to take a military base and make it a national park even being aware of how much work and effort that would entail. There was excitement and inspiration and motivation about being given the challenge that wonderful.

06-00:28:45
Farrell: Do you like the variety?

06-00:28:47
Moore: I love the variety, yeah. Again, it all fits together because these parklands have so much variety like an old prison [on Alcatraz] and a redwood forest [at Muir Woods] and everything in between. The work has incredible variety as well, and I do think that for me and for many others, that variety keeps you stimulated and motivated and working hard. It doesn't seem routine.

06-00:29:24
Farrell: Was there ever a time where you didn't feel motivated to keep working on a long-term project or you felt like maybe a break was necessary? I'm thinking about back in nineties when you were working on version one of the Crissy Field restoration plans and then the transition from post to park was announced, and you had a little bit of a break, and then obviously that work continued for years later. I'm wondering if there was a moment that you had where you're like, this is a little challenging for me to keep going?

06-00:30:01
Moore: Well, absolutely. It's easy to believe, and it's not entirely untrue, that the work with parks is fun work and joyful work and maybe even easy work because it's going for the positive. But within that, there can be incredible stress and tension and disappointments. It's not like everything goes beautifully all the time. Big ambitions are hard to accomplish, and people aren't always on the same page, and there are many obstacles along the way. So, yeah, there were

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

times I would fatigue, or the staff would fatigue, or even the board probably, but we managed to always pick ourselves back up. For me personally, whenever something big was done whether it was Crissy Field or whether it was Fort Baker or whether it was the Presidio Trails and overlooks or you name whatever the big thing was that just got finished, I had to reassess am I up for the next chapter or is it time for me to say, "Hey, good enough, time to move on to another opportunity beyond the Conservancy itself."

06-00:31:37
Farrell: At those moments, were you having conversations with your staff or with your wife or were they just internal dialogue that you were having?

06-00:31:48
Moore: Not so much with staff because I never wanted staff to feel that I had any ambivalence about what I was doing because I felt so privileged to have the position that I had and have the work experience that came my way. Certainly, personally with my wife given the hours that I put into the Conservancy, and then along the way people, at times came to me and said like, "We'd like you to consider applying to this job." I did have job prospects that came my way, I just don't remember ever really actively pursuing them; they would show up. I had to think that through, do I want to consider this or am I happy and ready to stay active where I am? It was actually an advantage to me that other opportunities came my way because it forced a reassessment about where I wanted my career to go and whether I could still give the Conservancy what it needed.

06-00:33:00
Farrell: I guess maybe now might be a good time to talk a little bit about how your work overlapped with Nancy's? Because that probably went into some of your decisions to stay, right? Like if she had a career here and—yeah, I guess I don't want to make any assumptions.

06-00:33:19
Moore: Well, definitely, and as we may have covered in the earlier interview, my wife's career and mine started very similarly. She started at the Denver Service Center as a National Park Service planner and so did I. She worked as a park ranger for part of her career and so did I. She founded the San Francisco Conservation Corps and ran a federal youth conservation corps, so much of her work was in the environmental and planning field. We did have to come to grips with being a dual-career couple, and if I had chosen a x career with the National Park Service that likely would be all over the country and it wasn't a time when Nancy's [National Park Service] career would've been taken care of along with mine, but now, that's more common. Eventually when our son was born, Nancy had realized before then that between my job and her job, that there was a need for someone to be in the home front more and so she moved into the consulting world where she could work from home—now it's commonplace, then it wasn't—and be more attentive to our new life as a family. Her career stayed in the concept of public service much

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

like the conservation corps but went through a variety of dimensions. Now she's working for an organization called the Encore.org, which is primarily how the baby boom generation could give back as this big bubble of a population that now is moving into some form of retirement but still has a lot to offer to society.

06-00:35:16
Farrell: Well, that's also maybe good thinking about a philanthropy or how the baby boomer generation can give back—I'm thinking about fundraising. With the programs that you're building with the Conservancy or getting off the ground, you mentioned that your earned income also comes with philanthropy—the earned and donor income.

06-00:35:43
Moore: Yeah.

06-00:35:44
Farrell: I could be mixing those words up but I'm wondering if you enjoyed the fund-raising aspect of your job?

06-00:35:56
Moore: That's a good question. I learned to enjoy it more with time, but that's not I ever disliked it, I just had to find my own framework for it, right? One of my federal jobs was as [a National Park Service] chief of interpretation and education, and the whole role there is getting the park message out, helping people understand the park, and getting them to enjoy and love the park, and so I saw philanthropy as just a continuing step in that process. It's asking people to understand, to appreciate, to enjoy, and give back. Whether that's a fifteen-dollar gift as a senior member of the Conservancy or an $18-million grant, whether that's two volunteer hours or 150 volunteer hours over the course of the year, all of those are part of giving back. I began to see philanthropy as just an extension of building friends and advocates for a public cause. I did take one fund-raising course very early when [the Conservancy] was just getting into philanthropy, and the thing I remember the most is the legendary fund-raising trainer and I remember a mentor saying, "Put your ego aside and let your cause walk in the door." Because I can be proud of my cause and I could believe in my cause, and as long as my ego wasn't so fragile that I was worried about being told, "No, I'm not going to give," I just could go in and begin a conversation. It was really inspiring to me that there are people out there who are curious about how they can make the world a better place and put resources aside to do so and then will have conversations with people that are leaders or service providers on how to improve what they do.

06-00:38:07
Farrell: What percentage of your job would you say was fundraising?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-00:38:13
Moore: Depending on how you look at that word, the small percentage was about actually asking, saying, "Would you please make a gift of this amount for this program or project?" But a lot of my time was about building and maintaining those relationships and ensuring that we put a high regard on delivering the results for people that have the confidence to be generous to our cause. I would say maybe 30 percent of my time was involved in fundraising if I use that word in a broadest way of really, the getting the ideas, the communicating with potential donors, the stewardship of those relationships, and at some level, the delivery of the final product and making them understand and experience a positive the impact of that product.

06-00:39:20
Farrell: Did you apply the power of three to your approach to fundraising?

06-00:39:26
Moore: I did in a way because it is a full-cycle thing and so you need the awareness, the engagement, and the delivery, and through all of that, you need just an ongoing culture of appreciation and generosity. We set a very high standard on how we thanked people, and I always tried to say to my staff team, "How do we create the emotional connection with our donors?" Often grants are very metric driven and that that has its necessity to show how many people we reached, what the impact has been, how many youth hours were developed or how educational advancement was increased. But there's an emotional piece to this too that's very important to anyone. One young person telling their story in a compelling way can mean more than ten grant reports to someone.

06-00:40:39
Farrell: Also, fundraising is not without its challenges, and I'm wondering if there was a time where you ever had to say no to a funder who approached you about some idea that they had?

06-00:40:52
Moore: There were. I had a very classic example of a funder who had written a check that he tore up in front of me because this individual was very passionate about something very personally important to him. But the scope of delivery he wanted for this very important thing that was personal to him was at a scale that was just beyond what we could accomplish and beyond what was reasonable given the story that this person was so engaged with. At times, you do have that difficult task of letting generous people know that either their ambition is too big, or their ambition doesn't fit, or they should take their generosity to a cause that's more in keeping with what they value and want to get done. So that happens—it doesn't happen a lot, but it does happen.

06-00:42:03
Farrell: Was there a way that you would approach those conversations? I mean it sounds like also just being honest with them and transparent about where you're coming from, about, as you mentioned, the deliverable parts you can

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

deliver. Yeah, but is there's a way that you thought about those conversations before you went into them?

06-00:42:21
Moore: Well, I always felt that the best way to approach this situation is to honor their generous intent. We all can appreciate that someone wants to give to something that they believe will have public benefit and impact. The authentic way of handling it is to say as much as, "We honor your generous intent, but we're not the best vehicle for you to fulfill what you want to have done." Sometimes I would refer people to other charities that I felt were more tied into what they wanted to do because while we were an inventive organization, we couldn't completely reinvent our mission around a donor aspiration. We would be careful not to do that and to stick to what we knew we were spokespersons for and what we believed as our mission. Generally, those conversations would go well, and they're only a small number of cases where the potential donor might have felt dismissed by us.

06-00:43:33
Farrell: I'm thinking of another type of challenge as well, like do you have the money to do something but then you have competition from other interested parties in using a parcel of land or some aspect of a project like developers. The evergreen issue in the Bay Area is developers wanting to come in and do things or businesses opening, and so I'm wondering if there might be an example of a time that it was a little bit challenging to work with a developer or how you might approach a situation like that?

06-00:44:11
Moore: In a partnership way or actually someone that had bad intentions to the national parkland?

06-00:44:19
Farrell: Or just like a competing interest because it's hard to say what their intentions are, but if they're competing for you for a particular bid or something.

06-00:44:32
Moore: Well, and I can look at that in a few ways. The Conservancy certainly wasn't the only environmental organization in the Bay Area or the only organization that cared about people in parks and public land or kids in the outdoors. You could feel that this is the irony of the nonprofit world. You could believe that the people, who actually were your soulmates, were also your competition. That we were each going after the same funding, and your goal was to win that race. But you have to carefully check yourself about not getting in that mindset. That's part of the reason that we created the Park Youth Collaborative. Let's look at people who believe in the same things we do as part of our community, not as one of our competitors–our community, not our competition. It's a reminder that you have to constantly remind yourself that if someone else gets the grant that you didn't, hooray, then they can deliver in a way that is as meaningful as well. That's with the nonprofit sector, but with

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

the private sector, for our private sector partners, I think we, one, had a good instinct to select partners that had strong public principles and also to set the table in the right way so that their expectations were appropriately established at the beginning. I'm thinking, for example, of the Fort Baker project where the private partner brought a hundred million dollars to the table, that's a lot of money, but we found a private partner who really believed in the value of nature and the benefit of historic preservation. Yes, they expected to and wanted to be economically viable and to return to their investors the money that they had garnered, but we could speak the same language. They saw the Conservancy as additive to their work, and they saw the national park brand as a very positive one for what was happening in Fort Baker.

06-00:47:08
Farrell: Oh, and I think there's one program, so the Presidio Trails and overlooks lead gift that happened around 2007.

06-00:47:17
Moore: Right.

06-00:47:18
Farrell: Can you tell me a little bit about what went into that fund-raising project?

06-00:47:26
Moore: Sure. First of all, it came from the planning of the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service with the Conservancy's support to look at how do we continue to make the Presidio become the national park we want it to be. A trail system is just fundamental to people experiencing a national park, the overlooks, the Rob Hill Campground. We had a comprehensive look at how to bring that chapter to the Presidio, and at that point, we were far enough along after Crissy Field that the Haas, Jr. Fund who had been really thrilled with the Crissy Field project and the results and public benefits achieved there, that they were signaling that they might be ready for the next chapter opportunity. Like Crissy Field, we were able to get a lead gift from the Haas, Jr. Fund, which really sent us toward a successful campaign and then implementing all those projects over the years. In a way, the Crissy Field Center of that project was the Rob Hill Campground because it was conceived of as a campground for kids who were getting their first camping experience, an idea that came through a variety of community consultations. When we asked community organizations what they want the most in our national parks, surprising to us, camping was at the top of the list because camping opportunities were far afield for many communities, you needed a car, you needed resources and time. The Presidio had a former Army campground that had become kind of derelict, and we completely reinvented it for the camping at the Presidio program, which preserved more than 50 percent of its capacity for our first-time campers and became a program of the Crissy Field Center.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-00:49:35
Farrell: Yeah, that's, again, I think looking at the needs and trying to tailor that to the people who use it.

06-00:49:41
Moore: Exactly. Yeah, and from day one, every single space was filled to the extent that we had to create more spaces for [other uses].

06-00:49:52
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. I'm going to jump around a little bit in the outline because of chronology, and it's something that's come up a couple of times since we've been talking today is Fort Baker and Cavallo Point. A little bit on the history: that's in Marin, it's across the bridge near Sausalito. That was originally inhabited by the Miwok tribe, and the United States Army took the site over in 1866, and there were about twenty-four buildings built on that site between 1901 in 1915. Like the Presidio, it was announced that Fort Baker would transition to a park, announced in 1995 so the Conservancy was responsible—and please do correct me if I'm wrong—they were responsible for raising the planning funds, and the National Park Service launched the public planning process in 1998. Does that timeline sound right?

06-00:50:56
Moore: Yes, it does, yes.

06-00:50:57
Farrell: Okay, okay, great. That's a big project, another transition from a base to a park. That's on the heels of the Presidio, so it's like going from one transition to another. Also, because the locations are a little different, you might have like a bit of a blueprint, but there's also different challenges associated with it because it's in a different place. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about how you approached raising the funds for that planning process?

06-00:51:37
Moore: Well, there were a number of great things about Fort Baker. First, it was the last base transfer within the national park boundaries [of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area]. We knew that, hey, one more time, within the park with ten former military installations, we were at the final one that needed to be reinvented. Secondly, it was in an incredibly beautiful spot right in the shadow virtually of the Golden Gate Bridge at the north end. Thirdly, because of our work at the Presidio, we were more experienced in what this took, in what the opportunities and challenges were and the need for some kind of financial viability. Once again when this military post closed, we were practically told [by federal funding officials], "Good luck, we're not giving you any extra money, federal money to take care of this, you just have to figure it out." So here's another little military village, a beautiful one but one that it was in disrepair that had to find its way in terms of its vision, its public support and its financial viability. We jumped in, and that the Conservancy's role really was raising a relatively modest level of philanthropic funding mainly through the Marin Community Foundation to invest in the future

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

planning for the fort and to some degree serve the role as an innovator and a think tank in bringing in expertise and economic analysis and other things and also serving as ambassador to the local community in assisting with the communications plan around the post. We had a very active role, but the Park Service was the lead agency in the driver's seat to implement the conversion.

06-00:53:47
Farrell: Did you already have a relationship with the Marin Community Foundation established?

06-00:53:53
Moore: We did. The Marin Community Foundation was an outgrowth of the San Francisco Foundation, so they were the grant maker to the [Golden Gate] Raptor Observatory [of the Conservancy] way back when, and maybe they had made one or two smaller grants to the Conservancy. But in [the Fort Baker project], seed money is important to get the ball rolling, and I think over the course of Fort Baker, we had two or three grants from the Marin Community Foundation.

06-00:54:27
Farrell: In terms of when the public planning process started in 1988, I know the National Park Service was responsible for that, but how did you see that unfold?

06-00:54:41
Moore: The main part of that planning process was determining what's the appropriate reuse for these buildings, and because of the National Environmental Policy Act, different alternatives had to be looked at in terms of what Fort Baker could be. In the overall park master plan that have been produced years ago, Fort Baker was looked at as a possible conference center so that earlier plan had indicated that possibility. The more we got into the site analysis, the more we looked at the buildings, the more we looked at the scale of the site, [we came to a similar conclusion]. We looked at the Fort Mason Center model, like an office park, and would that work with the site and the architecture. But Fort Baker is mainly houses and barracks that just lent itself to lodging and convening and community space. The idea of a national park lodge as a reuse is what came out of the public planning process.

06-00:55:49
Farrell: It's interesting because that was—I don't know if it happened during the public planning process or later but not without its challenges from the like local community in Sausalito. Did that happen during the public planning process or after?

06-00:56:05
Moore: It did, it happened during the planning process because the plan was challenged by the City of Sausalito, and it went to federal court [to oppose the scale of development, among other things]. What Sausalito was concerned about was the scale of the development and that our economic analysis

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

showed that to financially "pencil out," [to support the scale of the site and historic building restoration], the lodge needed to be ideally around 300 lodging rooms. That was written into the plan that that was the maximum scale that the lodge could go to. Sausalito, their city council, their mayor, and a number of community activists felt that number was too large, and they filed a lawsuit against the plan. The lawsuit was mainly about issues that weren't related to scale because the Park Service could propose any scale it wanted to, so they found traction with issues related to the environmental, Endangered Species Act, and other things as a way to gain traction. This was a little bit before the Park Service issued a formal request for proposals for a private operator to invest and to create the national park lodge and conference center. The city took a lot of liberty with the word "conference center" and proposed that the lodge was vastly overscaled to the site and far beyond what this national park site could support without traffic impacts.

06-00:58:04

Farrell: Yeah, I read through some of those legal briefs, I guess they were, or some of the decision papers. It was Sausalito saying things like they were worried about the traffic and the detriment to the community and endangered species and messing with the biodiversity hot spots. It was interesting because I think originally that courts decided that they didn't have sufficient evidence to show that these things were going to be an issue and then they appealed, and there were some things that the court found where permissible but some that they didn't. I could be wrong about that, but that's what I was gathering.

06-00:58:44

Moore: No, you're right. It went on for a long time. For us, it's hard to be in a position where a community is in such strong opposition. Now, not everybody in Sausalito was opposed because an alternative group formed in Sausalito called the Friends to Preserve Fort Baker, so they were a force of community people who actually believed in this proposed project and believed in the national park future and were supportive of the National Park Service plan. But then again, the elected officials, I mean the city spent a lot of money in legal fees, and you don't file a lawsuit in federal court without having to pay for attorneys and pay to make your case. Meanwhile, the project was being hurt because the delays are costly in terms of the people that were lined up to invest in the site and be an operator–and just the passage of time accelerates costs. We were able, with the Conservancy at the lead, to get five different federal appropriations in the defense bill to get the Army cleanup [funds for environmental contaminants] and the upgrade of utility systems. That money that the Conservancy really, really secured with Nancy Pelosi's help and Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey and Congressman Regula from Ohio and Congressman Murtha from Pennsylvania. We hosted them all on site, the [House] Interior Appropriations Committee and the Defense Appropriations Committee members and then we're able to secure that really critical $25 million of federal funding toward the viability of the overall project.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-01:00:29
Farrell: Did the elected officials in Sausalito ever propose an alternative to what was proposed, what they were fighting?

06-01:00:41
Moore: Yes, they presented that they weren't opposed to the reuse and that it was probably genuine, and of course, we couldn't leave it vacant. Part of the issue was when the military knew they were about to leave, even before the public knew those intentions, these sites kind of went to go ghost towns, and so local communities get accustomed to nothing going on. In a way, it's almost just [an unimproved] place that a local community might have without any sharing of it with anybody else. When you come back to revitalize it, we weren't proposing anything that was really any that much bigger [in scale or activity] than what the Army had there originally, but it was perceived as being an issue and a problem for the local communities. But eventually, the City maintained that they wanted the room number to be about half of what the plan proposed. I think they were shooting for about 150 rooms and the plan allowed up to 300, I believe. Eventually the court settlement was, because that the case never went to final conclusion, it was a limit of up to 225 rooms, so that was number between the high number the Park Service had proposed and the low number that the city had proposed–a number that both sides could agree was okay.

06-01:02:17
Farrell: Okay, that's interesting. It makes me think about timing too because the Presidio had just transferred and so not enough time has passed to see what would happen with that, right? This is on the heels of that, so it's like you can't really use the Presidio as too much of a model of the impact because I know that there are hotels and things and lots of different buildings in the Presidio that the public income stay there, there's conference centers that people can rent event spaces with the bowling alley and things like that. But I guess Sausalito hadn't really seen that all happen yet and realize this isn't going to impact us as much as we think.

06-01:03:03
Moore: Yeah, you're right, and part of what we tried to tell the City [of Sausalito] is that the reason that a lodge makes sense is it has the least traffic impact of any other use because people they come and stay a few days and sometimes they bring a car but sometimes they don't. An office use would've had people coming and going every single day commuting to the site. We felt we had chosen the use that was the most sensitive in terms of traffic impact and we had a commitment to shuttle systems and everything else, so people could get there without a car, at least to the lodge. A little bit what worked against us, and I think in the early RF request for qualifications for the developer, operator, Marriott [and other larger companies bid on the project], kind of name brand hotel companies. That had an effect of making people more fearful because if it wasn't locally grown, then that was going to be less control. Ultimately, the company that was selected to implement the project

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

was named Passport Resorts and their CEO lived in Sausalito [and their team was a Bay Area team]. Their proposal was for the smallest number of rooms—in fact 146—even below what the community had asked for originally. Eventually everything worked out, and when the ribbon was cut and [the revitalized Fort Baker] opened, the same people that I think who were once opposed to the project were congratulated that this was one of their biggest successes, so we somehow managed to get a win-win philosophy going at the end of the day.

06-01:04:55
Farrell: Yeah.

06-01:04:57
Moore: The work of the Passport Resorts and Community Equity Builders, which was on their team, was stunning. From the moment the project opened, it won one award after the other, the Governor's Award for the Environment combined with public-private partnerships, LEED Gold for historic buildings, one of the first historic campuses to achieve those environmental standards, a number of hospitality design awards, so it was a beautiful product.

06-01:05:38
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. I am also wondering a little bit about some of the similarities between Fort Baker, Cavallo Point, and the Presidio transition? I know there had to be an environmental impact study done or statement study that led to a statement so the EIS, and you did mention that the Army cleaned up and there was congressional advocacy from people like Nancy Pelosi and Woolsey and people like that. What were some of the other similarities between this transition and the Presidio transition?

06-01:06:12
Moore: There were quite a few. One, starting at the top, we had to get a vision that made sense for the buildings [and was fitting to a national park]. We had to create a vision that we could see the financial sustainability and secure the capital investment that was needed. We had to hold the Army accountable for a certain level of cleanup and infrastructure repair, and ultimately, we had to have the community on board. It was a fraught process when you're in a lawsuit, but ultimately by the end of the day, we got to the compromise and the [settlement of the] lawsuit and were able to move forward. Of course, it takes the power of execution of all the project facets. That's one thing to get it all approved, but the long-term lease with the operator, the bank investments, the historic preservation tax credits, it was a really complicated financial formula but one that we had gotten accustomed to at the Presidio. Because when you preserve historic buildings, you can actually sell those tax credits as a way of capitalizing the project, so everything worked. The only unfortunate thing is [when the project opened as a lodge since] that was about a month [before] one of the biggest financial crises that America has ever had. The first years for the lodge were really, really tough, really tough financially, not what their pro forma had anticipated.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-01:07:55
Farrell: Yeah, because it opened in 2008, is that right?

06-01:08:01
Moore: Yeah, I think so.

06-01:08:04
Farrell: Yeah.

06-01:08:04
Moore: Was the financial crash was in there? I have forgotten.

06-01:08:07
Farrell: Two thousand eight, yeah, so it's the same time.

06-01:08:11
Moore: Yeah, yeah.

06-01:08:12
Farrell: I know that Brian O'Neill played a pretty big role in that process as well, and actually the site, I should say, was officially transferred to the National Park Service in 2002.

06-01:08:23
Moore: Yeah.

06-01:08:23
Farrell: Can you tell me a little bit about his involvement and what he brought to the project and the process?

06-01:08:31
Moore: Yeah, sure, I mean Brian brought his amazing capacity to be a spokesperson, to seek a high vision, and to do his best to bring people together around a project and vision like this. He was very active as part of the team, very active at the community level, participated in the idea to create an [environmental] institute that was part of Fort Baker, so that we had a part of the site's mission that really was focused on using the lodging and meeting rooms as a retreat center for environmental convenings. In the overall lease, 10 percent of the room nights and meeting rooms were dedicated to the Parks Conservancy at a nonprofit rate to host environmental convenings in these revitalized buildings and to bring programmatic activity like Food for Parks and other things to the site and beyond. Brian was very much a part of all those moving parts. It was hard not to love Brian even when there was a lawsuit going on. He did his best to bring that lawsuit to a conclusion and put his trust in the people on his team who had the business principles down.

06-01:09:56
Farrell: It's a great balance—

06-01:09:57
Moore: And you—

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-01:09:58
Farrell: —oh, sorry, please go ahead.

06-01:09:59
Moore: Yeah, and as we made our way to many places in Congress making the case with Fort Baker, Brian sometimes was with us. Sometimes as a federal employee the agency doesn't want you up in Capitol Hill lobbying, so we had to decide when Brian was at our side and when he wasn't in terms of making that case.

06-01:10:23
Farrell: It also seems like a really great balance between what you just described with the 10 percent of those times or 10 percent of the nights were saved for the Conservancy and environmental conferences and sessions. Because also thinking about that lawsuit with some of what Sausalito was concerned about was destroying the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat. Thinking that like, "Well, we're actually going to be pretty environmentally minded when we're here, so we're all on the same page in the end."

06-01:11:02
Moore: Yeah, and actually all the Mission Blue Butterfly habitat had already been fenced and restored by the Park Service and the Conservancy, so we had religion about that before anybody told us we needed to have it. The other thing that happened is as a result of the lodge having a smaller number of rooms—it's all the formula, and we knew that the lodging room cost would be more expensive at a smaller facility than a bigger facility that might have more modest rooms and be more available to people of different economic capacity. We felt the need that the conversion have an important "giveback" part of the project—that if the lodge was going to be a little bit expensive for people, that there was something else there that was being offered. [That thinking help give rise to the Institute at the Golden Gate.] And, of course, also acknowledging that, as I said before, people forget that the reuse has an immediate public benefit in saving all these historic buildings and an immediate public benefit in restoring the site and then giving it some public vitality [as a park]. The development team at Passport Resorts and Community Equity Builders had just such a strong social and environmental conscience that we were a seamless team.

06-01:12:41
Farrell: Yeah, I think important to pick the right partners to help execute that so twenty-five of those buildings are now historic landmarks, and one of the results is there's about 320,000 square feet of building space and forty-four acres were restored. Something you mentioned about the Institute at the Golden Gate was established—and I think you just referred to it—but if you could tell me a little bit about what the genesis of that idea for the Institute at the Golden Gate was?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-01:13:23
Moore: Yeah, and as I said, the genesis of the idea was to have a component of the reuse that really spoke to the values and principles of our national parks as an environmental and conservation leader and [that the Park Service and Conservancy] cared about the American public in many dimensions. We had to, through a little bit of trial and experimentation, determine how the Institute best fulfilled that vision. We kind of came up with a formula, the power of three, ABC–attract, broker, and convene. This meant we worked to attract organizations to host their own environmental—and they didn't have to strictly environmental, they could be social purpose–convenings at Fort Baker at a reduced rate. A broker would mean that we would be in concert as a coproducer of an event. And convene would mean that we would sponsor our own activity, our own environmental convenings. For the first two years that is the model we used. We had our own convenings such as "Turning the Tide" or we had our own programmatic activity that came out of those convenings or the Food for the Parks initiative, the Healthy Parks, Healthy People initiative, the climate change initiative. Eventually, we grew to a point where if you created a diagram and looked at the needs of society that were pressing and you created a diagram about what our national parks stand for, and you then found the overlap between what our national park stands for and what the community aspirations and needs were, that's where we focused. For example, we realized that public health was a community need and that our national parks could play a role in public health or that climate change was an imperative that we could address. We began to actually have active programmatic activity that grew out of the Institute as well.

06-01:15:41
Farrell: Yeah, I think the Healthy Parks, Healthy People has also rippled. I think the East Bay Regional Park District has programs around that as well, so the domino effect again that way.

06-01:15:54
Moore: Absolutely. We were a national leader in this effort and sort of the backbone entity for the Park Prescriptions program and the Park RX program. We staffed out the complete national coalition on this working with the National Park Service director, working with a variety of federal agencies, even working at one point in Food for the Parks with the chef of the White House among other things [laughs] in the Obama era to advance these initiatives and give them visibility.

06-01:16:29
Farrell: Yeah, that's pretty cool. [laughter]

06-01:16:31
Moore: Yeah, that was pretty cool.

06-01:16:34
Farrell: Yeah.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-01:16:35
Moore: Alice Waters was part of our team at the very beginning. We would reach out and find the people that really stood for these things. With Healthy Parks, Healthy People, we had a wonderful corporate partnership with Kaiser Health Care who really invested into our work. We ended up forming a partnership with the public health department of San Francisco where that for every public health clinic and every doctor we developed a whole tool kit for prescribing nature. By way, that program is in Canada now, and it's growing exponentially, it's a worldwide program at this point.

06-01:17:13
Farrell: You know I think the pandemic probably plays a role in that now as well because while everybody's shut inside, they're realizing how important being outside is and really understanding the value of open space, public lands. I think that kind of been a little bit of a game changer.

06-01:17:35
Moore: Very much so, and I authored an article about maybe a little over a year ago on the effect of COVID on public parks in cities [around the world] for the [International Union for the Conservation of Nature]. It really showed the impacts of Covid 19 through case study work in countries around the world in how much more people became aware of nature, in how much more people needed nature and how visitation into urban park sites went up anywhere from 30 to 80 percent, really a big impact.

06-01:18:08
Farrell: Yeah, very big impact, yeah. As we mentioned, the transformation was complete in 2008, and I'm wondering if you remember the opening ceremony or the ribbon cutting?

06-01:18:24
Moore: I do. First of all, it was freezing cold. It was just one of those days where the fog and wind are just going to throw everything they can at you. We were gathered down near the waterfront for the ribbon cutting with Fort Baker behind us, and on the stage, we had Brian O'Neill, myself, Congressman Regula from Ohio, the head of the Interior Appropriations Committee, Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, and Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey, maybe the Marin Community Foundation, and I think the head of Passport Resorts. It was the classic day of speeches and songs. We kept it reasonably short, and the weather of course kept people moving things along, and just a beautiful ribbon cutting and celebration, and then I think people moved inside for heat– and tea and coffee.

06-01:19:31
Farrell: It does get cold. I've done actually a few interviews there outside, and like my 3:00 p.m., the fog is coming in.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-01:19:38
Moore: Yeah, it's true. At the Tunnel Tops, we recently had the groundbreaking ceremony [that was very chilly], and I felt so badly for everyone. Even Speaker Pelosi was cold. But she's always game, [has been an extraordinary champion for the Presidio and the parks], and she's always incredibly articulate and wonderful to listen to.

06-01:20:00
Farrell: Yeah, I think she knows what she signed up with the weather here.

06-01:20:03
Moore: Yeah, yeah, and then she's got the apparel needed when you're going to be in a cold spot.

06-01:20:10
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. On a little bit more of a somber note, so Brian O'Neill did pass away in 2009, and from what I understand, it was a bit unexpected. I'm wondering if you could tell me maybe what impact that had on you and what his legacy continues to be around his time at the Park Service?

06-01:20:38
Moore: This is an emotional one for me and just you bringing it up now—sorry, it's hard for me to go back to that time. Of course, much time has passed, and there was such profound sadness in Brian's death, but now there is joy in his legacy. Brian needed to go in for a heart valve replacement surgery. [Years before], I very unexpectantly as a young father discovered I had to have my heart valve replaced and had surgery really unexpectedly but made my way through it and learned a lot in the process. So when Brian came to me with this news, I could be very empathetic since I knew what was ahead of him, what his recovery might be like, where to get the best help and advice if he needed it and was convinced that he would make his way through this just as I had.

06-01:21:52
Unfortunately for Brian, the surgery went well, and he came back to work quickly. Fort Baker was part of what brought him back to be part of that, and we all were encouraging him to rest and not to overdo it, which for Brian was a pretty hard thing to accomplish. But he had a horrible lapse, which was a mystery to his doctors until they eventually determined that somehow, there was like a fungal [infection] on his new heart valve that was put in, and they went through a lot of deliberations about what to do even considering doing the surgery all over again. Eventually, they decided it could be treated with antibiotics [or anti-fungal medications], but Brian had a stroke because of some of the fungal material broke off. The stroke was significant. I visited Brian a number of times in the hospital. He was coherent but clearly, in his speech and movements, the effects of stroke were obvious. He had a long pathway to recovery ahead of him, yet we remained optimistic. It was clear the stroke might be lifechanging, that even Brian's ability to continue in his role was at stake, and then eventually, he had a more massive stroke and then

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

passed away. It was a huge, huge shock to everyone. Brian was someone that not only filled the room with his charismatic and optimistic presence, he filled the universe. He was just this big presence of a person, so you could never imagine him not being there. [And he had been such a champion for the Conservancy.] His family turned to us to prepare, design, and deliver his memorial service on Crissy Field, which I took up as a way to deal with my own grief, as a way to remember someone who I cared so deeply about.

06-01:24:33
Farrell: Thank you for sharing that.

06-01:24:35
Moore: Yeah.

06-01:24:35
Farrell: I know that's not easy. I'm wondering how his spirit lives on in your work and the way that you're thinking about your work?

06-01:24:49
Moore: Well, a few things: One, at the point we lost Brian, he had made a stamp at Golden Gate as the partnership model for national parks. It was so deeply embedded in how we thought about things and how we got the job done and how we engaged the community in our visioning as volunteers and as stewards. Brian used to say to his employees, "Every job you do by yourself is one lost opportunity to engage someone in the community to do it with you," and eventually the park ended up with 10,000 volunteers a year contributing 250,000 volunteer hours, all with Brian's encouragement and with us following him. That was embedded [in the park's DNA] and that springboarded his impact on the National Park System and its emergence as a partnership organization had deep traction and also his international influence. Golden Gate was at the cutting edge, and Brian was the chief ambassador, not only locally, but nationally and internationally and a huge champion of our youth programs. We never believed that we would lose his vision or that his impact would be lost, but we had lost a cherished friend and a colleague that we loved and in such an untimely and in an unexpected way. But as time went on, it became clear that we weren't going to lose what Brian believed in and the transformative influence that he had [on us personally, professionally and institutionally].

06-01:26:48
Farrell: He stayed present in a lot of that after?

06-01:26:53
Moore: Yeah, and with the Brian O'Neill Youth Leaders Fund, we knew Brian's commitment to young people, and many people after his death wanted to contribute to his memory, to his legacy, and we decided that that was the thing that would mean the most to Brian, would be to have a youth leaders fund. As an example, he and Ernesto [Pepito] were incredibly close because we had traveled to South Africa together and like Brian, Ernesto had a big presence.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

He was a big guy, and we were in South Africa, and someone asked Brian O'Neill if Ernesto was his bodyguard [laughs] and so we had done a lot of interesting things together. Ernesto spoke at Brian's memorial service in a very large tent on Crissy Field. There were maybe a thousand people there, just an outpouring of affection for him.

06-01:27:54
Farrell: Yeah, that's really incredible when a thousand people show up to your services.

06-01:27:58
Moore: Yeah.

06-01:27:58
Farrell: That says something in and of itself.

06-01:28:00
Moore: Yeah, yeah, certainly did. And then for me, there was a vacuum, right? Brian and I had a partnership, and there was a role he played and a role I played, and although there was overlap, we each had different ways of getting progress happening. With Brian gone, I found myself much more on a public stage because the stage was empty without him, and people wanted that connection to the parks and what they're all about.

06-01:28:42
Farrell: What was it like for you to step on to that stage and be more of a public presence?

06-01:28:51
Moore: At the time, I don't think I even really noticed what was happening. It was like something's been put in front of you and you respond. In retrospect, I can see that not only did I learn a lot from Brian about the importance of it and how to engage the public, but that also I probably had latent abilities that I hadn't really fully explored because if Brian had that base covered, then, hey, I wasn't needed as much. I followed in his example, but I think I discovered abilities in me that that hadn't been called upon before.

06-01:29:40
Farrell: What were some of those abilities?

06-01:29:47
Moore: I liked communications, I like conversations, I enjoy and appreciate being able to set a framework or set a stage or set a vision, and this gave me the opportunity to do that. I have been in leadership positions all the way back in high school and won leadership awards, but I still didn't view myself as a natural leader. I just thought, oh well, this thing happened, so I guess I should do something about it, but I somewhat discovered that I had more innate abilities than I had realized. Of course, being the CEO of the Conservancy had already required me within that realm to exercise leadership skills and to work with the board and to work with staff members [and our partner

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

organizations]. It was just the public stage where I hadn't been a regular spokesperson.

06-01:30:59
Farrell: Did your relationship with the National Park Service or even the Presidio change at all after that?

06-01:31:10
Moore: Yeah, I think a little bit in that nobody wanted Brian's death to be an end of what we believed in, of the work we had done, of the way we did work, of the challenges still ahead of us as well as the opportunities. I think I became more visible as a partner to my National Park Service friends who were [grieving Brian's loss]. The Conservancy stepping up to honor Brian and making that happen in a way that was really emotional and magical helped the Park Service staff see how much we were there for them, how much we were a common family, and how much our destinies were intertwined. I think it did bring the partners closer together. There were not a lot, but there were some people that were at times a little envious of Brian's ability to take the stage, of his personality almost being the dominant one in the mix, and any of that, if it existed, was put behind as we remembered all Brian had done and all we had done together.

06-01:32:48
Farrell: Trying to move forward with the best foot forward and with collaboration and good intentions in mind it sounds like.

06-01:32:57
Moore: Yeah, exactly, exactly.

06-01:33:00
Farrell: Yeah. Well, thank you for going into detail about all of that. I really appreciate your willingness to share that.

06-01:33:08
Moore: Yeah. It's a critical part of the story. You can't tell the story of the Golden Gate National Parks or the Parks Conservancy or the Presidio without Brian being acknowledged, appreciated, heralded and remembered.

06-01:33:27
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. It's interesting too with the Brian O'Neill Youth Leaders Fund, which you had mentioned, that was established pretty soon after in 2009. How do you see that continuing its work today, the intent of that, leaders fund?

06-01:33:49
Moore: Well, at the beginning, the youth leaders fund gave people who cared about Brian a place to acknowledge his legacy and to continue his legacy. Brian was a leader and here are young people that could be advanced as leaders of national parks and conservation. I think the fund still continues to accept donations in Brian's honor. It obviously had its biggest impact philanthropically at the time of Brian's death and then people were very

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

motivated to show their dedication to what he stood for. But it continues on, and it provides funding through the Crissy Field Center for all of our youth leader programs.

06-01:34:42

Farrell: Another aspect of programs that I did want to talk a little bit about was the volunteer programs. The volunteer programs grew to be the largest in the National Park Service, and I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit about the scope, the scale, the sources of volunteers, the array of the approach that you were taking to work with volunteers?

06-01:35:10

Moore: Sure, and everything starts at the beginning, right? At one point, there was the first volunteer—I don't know when that was exactly. But I do remember at one point, there was the first job called Volunteer Coordinator, and there were two positions, one at the National Park Service and one at the Conservancy. That showed that we believed that this was a program that needed resourcing and staffing support if we're going to grow the program and we believed that it should grow. Eventually through many stages, we had more and more staff dedicating their time to volunteer experiences whether they were docents on Alcatraz or people with the native plant nursery or the site stewardship program or corporate workdays where companies like Levi's or Genentech or Google brought their employees out to the park to complete our restoration project or volunteer internships. The scope and scale of volunteer opportunities were there for every age, every number of hours, or some people who actually volunteered so many hours a year that they were really like full-time employees.

06-01:36:35

Through Brian's example and encouragement, the federal agency, they were a little bit hesitant about this because federal employees, some of them believed that [volunteer support was] a slippery slope. If volunteers are added to our workforce, then pretty much, the [staff] workforce will be cut back because volunteers would fill their jobs. We just showed like no, that actually volunteers are job-enhancing because if volunteers are at your side, you have a more complex job, you probably would be paid better, you will get more work done, and you will be able to devote your time to higher caliber work as a result of having volunteers help you. You look at the Golden Gate Raptor Observatory, three employees to 300 volunteers and then the leveraging effect is substantial. By the time the volunteer program had grown to its scale, again before COVID hit, there were [about 350] corporate workdays a year. That's about one corporate workday for every day of the year. There were over [25,000] individuals volunteering, and they were producing about [500,000] hours of volunteer time, –or the equivalent of having [250] additional employees. It so surpassed any other national park in the country. The next one wasn't even close, right? [laughs] But it did set an example of what could be accomplished and granted, because we were in an urban area, because people can get to our parks, because there is such the sense of civic

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

responsibility, we had so many advantages in terms of taking this to scale that it went beyond what all of us could have ever imagined.

06-01:38:47

Those volunteers are dedicated advocates, many of them become members, some of them become donors, so it's all a part of building a park family of supporters. Yeah, and really that program is amazing and so many people took advantage of the opportunity that we now have a whole volunteer academy, curriculum for all our volunteers for the Park Academy, and volunteer appreciation events and awards, the whole deal.

06-01:39:21

Farrell: Yeah, I don't think the beauty of where the sites are hurts at all.

06-01:39:28

Moore: No, no.

06-01:39:29

Farrell: It's kind of an incentive. If you work for a corporation, you have to do a corporate volunteer day, there could be much worse places to be.

06-01:39:37

Moore: Absolutely, yeah, and the staff that do the volunteer work, some of them had to learn it and some of them just innately had it. You need that kind of gusto and outgoing personality and always the standard of gratitude that needs to be part of it, and it's cultivating those relationships as well.

06-01:40:05

Farrell: Yeah, and I think on the relationship part too, it's another example of an avenue for creating connection to the parks. As you mentioned, people will then start their own relationships with the Conservancy, with the Park Service, and perhaps become volunteers on their own or donors or things like that, so it's another point of connection, I think. But I think it also illustrates all the moving parts that go into maintaining such a significant national park site. There's no question in there, but I think that it just illustrates this another piece of that big puzzle and the importance of volunteers and people who want to be active and give their time.

06-01:40:58

Moore: When you think about it, if the Park Service or the Conservancy or the Trust, if anyone had decided to just do business as usual and run these national parks as national parks had always been run, where would we have gone? Then Crissy Field might still be the old airfield, Fort Baker, maybe would not be restored, who knows? This new way of looking at our work and bringing in partnerships and volunteers and community members, every big success depended on this combination of forces.

06-01:41:40

Farrell: Yeah, and I'm also thinking too as you're saying that about some sites that don't have the same amount of attention or care that did take a different path

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

like the Alameda with naval base that was decommissioned versus even in Point Richmond where the Rosie the Riveter site is another national park site. Even the differences between those two areas are pretty great in terms of the attention and care and official transition from post to park, that kind of thing?

06-01:42:14
Moore: Yeah, and now, there's a national park that was legislated the same the same time as Golden Gate called Gateway National Recreation Area in New York, and it was an identical concept of an urban park in a major city. And Gateway, it has moved ahead but at a much slower pace, and they didn't have all the same advantages we did, but some of it was perhaps not bringing that partnership mentality in it at the get-go. It shows what the alternative path might have been. In the past ten years, I think Gateway has made a lot of progress, but again, it was at a different pace.

06-01:43:02
Farrell: Yeah. This might be a good place for today to do a little reflective questions because I feel like the next section gets into some bigger, like the community connections and programs and the arts and parks.

06-01:43:12
Moore: Sure.

06-01:43:12
Farrell: Those are very big topics; we probably can't accomplish that in ten minutes. Yeah, I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what it meant to you to see these large projects from conceptualization to fruition? What that was like for you, what that meant you?

06-01:43:45
Moore: It meant everything. I don't get any satisfaction out of a vision that's not realized, right? As much as I love building a vision: the brainstorming, the setting the bar high, the believing in what you can accomplish, the delivery is important because without the delivery, then what are the public benefits? So to being time and again at the origin of an idea, a proposal, a project, a program, and then being able to be part of the planning, the design, the implementation, and the stewardship, what could be better than that being able to be part of it all and seeing that your dreams–and the dreams of the community–come true? That these national parks are reaching their highest potential for public benefit.

06-01:44:49
Farrell: As the years have passed, how do you feel that those projects have influenced the fabric of life in the Bay Area, the quality of life? What do you think those projects bring to the Bay Area?

06-01:45:10
Moore: Well, there are a few ways of looking at it. One way of looking at it is when the Park Service had its hundredth anniversary in 2016, what was the most

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

popular national park in America? No one would have thought in 1916 when our national parks system was formed, that a national park near in a major metropolitan area—the Golden Gate National Recreation Area–[would be the most popular among over 400 national park sites across the country]. This national park in an urban location had served more people than any other national park, had more volunteers than any other national park, had more partnerships and philanthropic support. I think we can see the benefit by the number of people that take advantage of what is offered, and that's before we even get into the programs that are specifically lifting people in other ways, even before we get into the economic value of these parks. There are annual reports on the economic value to the Bay Area of the Golden Gate National Parks, and I don't have the numbers in front of me but there's a huge leveraging factor. These parklands are so much a part of the Bay Area economy and the San Francisco tourism economy, of course, in contributing to the economic prosperity of the Bay Area [at around $1 billion annually]. There are the biodiversity impacts, the climate change impact that we can go on and on and on and counting blessings that at some point in time, all the way back to Muir Woods being established [as a national monument in 1908] and later on the people advocating for the establishment of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area [in the early 1970s], that they were visionaries, again, trying to take their vision and make it real by establishing a major national park in an urban setting when many people said, that's not really not what national parks are about.

06-01:47:26

I guess your question was what are about the benefits [of these parklands]. There are so many. Just the benefit of the beauty, the nature nearby, and the civic gathering. I think sadly, there are fewer and fewer places where people of all ages, walks of life, and even political beliefs can gather, and parks are one of them. You don't go into parks and ask people whether they're a Republican or Democrat or whether they're conservative or progressive. They're just these outdoor living rooms where people can gather with people they might not meet normally or see frequently. I love that part of the parks, and that national parks belong to all.

06-01:48:19

Farrell: I think that's a great place to leave it today unless there's anything else on this section that you you'd like to add?

06-01:48:27

Moore: No, I'm just probably a little bit worried maybe we didn't make all the progress that you had hoped to today on this outline.

06-01:48:36

Farrell: I still think we're in good shape. I knew that we were not going to get through everything.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

06-01:48:42
Moore: All right. Thank you for your patience, and hopefully, you're not wearing out on all this.

06-01:48:48
Farrell: No, this is great, thank you, thank you.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Interview 7: March 21, 2022

07-00:00:07
Farrell: Okay, this is Shanna Farrell back with Greg Moore on Monday, March 21, 2022. This is our seventh session, and we are speaking over Zoom. Greg, welcome back.

07-00:00:20
Moore: Thanks, Shanna. Good to be back.

07-00:00:23
Farrell: We're going to continue some of the things that we were talking about in previous sessions today and especially some of the larger projects like Crissy Field. I wanted to start with some of the programs that were happening in Crissy Field, and before we started recording today, you were talking about how it was to continue the connection between parks and the community. That's a perfect way to describe the community connections and the programs. Those span, I don't know, probably more than a decade, but I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about the Community Trailheads launch that happened in 2007, what the concept for that was and how the community was involved?

07-00:01:12
Moore: Yeah, the concept behind the Community Trailheads was the realization that for many people, a park visit doesn't begin at the entry gate of a national park. It begins at the entry gate if you're fully aware of the national park and how to get there and what to do, but if you're unaware of an open space, a park, a national park nearby, the introduction often can begin at a community level. The partner organizations, the Trust, the Conservancy, and the Park Service, looked at community-based organizations that had something in common with what parks could offer. The first one that came to mind was the YMCA because of their emphasis on fitness and health, because of their dedication to community members, and because their belief that everyone deserved good health and recreation and camaraderie at the community level.

07-00:02:12
The first Trailhead was put in the Richmond YMCA relatively close to the Presidio, but this YMCA had a fairly diverse community of people who took advantage of it. That Trailhead introduced [the nearby national parks] at the Y as if you visit began there–what the parks offered, how you got there, what public transit took you there, what you could do. With that success working, we moved to other YMCAs within the city, the Bayview, the Mission, and others, and just replicated that program. As part of the program, we brought occasional park rangers and Conservancy or Trust staff to the Y to meet with people there, to give introductions to the park, and to help welcome and make the journey there understandable.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-00:03:09
Farrell: I think this also sounds like another example of meeting people where they are. If it's starting in neighborhoods like the Richmond or in Bayview, you're making things accessible to people in their own neighborhoods.

07-00:03:22
Moore: Yeah, your language reminded me of the slogan, the motto, the call for action of creating the Golden National [Recreation Area in the early 1970s], which was "Parks to the People, Parks where the People are." Really in the DNA of the founding of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area was this belief in community connection. We're putting that vision into action.

07-00:03:49
Farrell: How did that program grow over time? Well, you mentioned the new neighborhoods, but does it still continue to expand today?

07-00:04:00
Moore: Yes, again, COVID has put a damper and an interruption to some of these things, but at its peak, it was not only the idea of the awareness at the trailhead at the community level and the programmatic piece of rangers and others in the community, but we added in the Community Shuttle Program. The Community Shuttle Program said not only do we want you to be aware of the park, but if you have a group from your community that want to get to the park as a group, whether it's Self-Help for the Elderly in Chinatown or the Bayview Boys and Girls Club or the local school, we would jump in and provide at least the initial transportation and make certain that when you got to the park, we were curating that experience for you. The ultimate goal was really to offer these services, but not have community members believe that they had to rely on all that support to come to the park. Once they felt welcome, once they knew how to get there by public transit or if they had a car, once they knew what was available, then of course, they could do that experience independently without the need for the supportive system.

07-00:05:27
Farrell: Hmm, okay, that makes sense. Another program that launched in 2012 was the Roving Ranger. Can you tell me a little bit about that one?

07-00:05:35
Moore: Yeah, some of these ideas are just so simple, but the Roving Ranger, the concept has now traveled internationally. In fact, I was just meeting with a colleague yesterday who was replicating it in the Sacramento Delta for the Wetlands Wagon it's called, so the Roving Ranger has many different names depending on where it goes. But again, the concept was when you think of a park visitor center, it's a place that people go to learn about the park and kind of a tradition in our National Park System. This was a visitor center on wheels that could go out to any community, hence the school, a Y, a library, and bring park [staff and] materials. The Roving Ranger van was all dressed up in park images driven often by a park ranger, and it could simply open [at any location]. It was a converted bread truck actually and it had enough space for

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

people, a limited number to come inside, but to greet people on the outside as well and to provide materials, provide orientation, and just to get to know people. Because it was colorful and unique, it had its own kind of magnetic appeal once it arrived at its destination.

07-00:07:07
Farrell: When did you first get approached by another place to replicate that model somewhere else?

07-00:07:14
Moore: Two that I think of, but I don't know which was first: One was Santa Monica Mountains National Park down in Los Angeles, they had heard of the concept, and the other was my park colleagues in New Zealand who gravitated toward the idea. The person in charge of that program, Kate Bickert, was sending all our blueprints around, so they could physically see how the [renovated bread truck] worked. But we'd also done some case study work about how was it perceived, what made it successful, what were the additional components besides the Roving Ranger that gave cohesion and impact to the effort.

07-00:07:59
Farrell: Was there any advising that you or Kate did when you were working with, let's say, Santa Monica or in New Zealand saying like, these were the needs that we were thinking about, this is how you might think about the needs that your constituents would have?

07-00:08:17
Moore: Yes, I think in general, we're all slightly cautious about replication because each situation is different and just because it worked for us, you don't want to assume that there's a cookie-cutter solution to everyone. But this concept was simple enough that I think people could test it out and decide whether to try it. The initial investment was relatively modest. Of course, you have to be committed to providing someone to drive it to the community setting. The other piece I forgot is that Roving Ranger also often greeted people in the park, so if we had a volunteer day for example with our program called One Tam, we had a Tam Roving Ranger, we could bring the Roving Ranger there and sign up volunteers and just give their participation a little bit more celebratory and welcoming spirit.

07-00:09:17
Farrell: Another program that launched a couple of years after that was the Park Prescriptions with the city of San Francisco. Can you tell me a little bit about that one?

07-00:09:27
Moore: Yeah, that was an outgrowth really of an international recognition strongly led in Australia called Healthy Parks, Healthy People–that parks could be made healthier themselves by people helping restore them, their basic ecosystems and their biodiversity. People could be made healthier by taking advantage of what parks had to offer mentally healthier, you're physically healthier, and just

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

the civic connection and the not being socially isolated. That was the big concept, and many programs grew out of that, but one of them that grew out of it that we took a leadership role with was Park Prescriptions—the idea that people showing up at a doctor's office could learn that a park was a pathway to health. There was plenty of research evidence that had developed including evidence that visits to the outdoors were more effective in treating depression than prescription drugs, that fitness didn't require having a gym membership. We took that data that had continued to grow and used it to persuade San Francisco's public health system to embrace Park Prescriptions.

07-00:10:53

The park people trained the doctors and nurses and healthcare providers, and the healthcare providers oriented the park people to how to stitch that program together. And pretty soon, in all the public health facilities actual prescription pads, giving time to nature.

07-00:11:15

Farrell: There were different healthcare organization—like Kaiser—was involved in that one, right?

07-00:11:22

Moore: Yes. Yeah, we knew that healthcare was provided in a lot of different ways, so we had support by Kaiser. Kaiser was particularly interested in reaching communities with poor health outcomes that maybe didn't have readily available, high quality healthcare facilities, and so we focused on a few communities that Kaiser helped felt maybe this could make a difference. We took the effort to the regional level convening every Bay Area park and open space provider to get that collective impact regionally and then to the national level.

07-00:12:03

Farrell: Yeah, actually, in some of my work with the East Bay Regional Park District, this actually comes up quite a bit. In some of the parks over time, there have been like celebrations or parades or things that happened on the day of celebration for Healthy Parks, Healthy People. I think with that kind of thing when you have celebrations or people there, it is a great example of community building but also preventative healthcare measures as well.

07-00:12:32

Moore: Exactly, and then who would have ever imagined that perhaps one of the healthiest places to be during an international pandemic was in the outdoors?

07-00:12:44

Farrell: It's hard to argue with that. [laughter]

07-00:12:45

Moore: Yeah.

07-00:12:46

Farrell: Yeah, yeah, park usership just skyrocketed.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-00:12:50
Moore: It did.

07-00:12:51
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. Another one, I know we've talked about this a little bit but not very in depth, is the partnership with the San Francisco Library, and I know that became also important during COVID. I'm wondering if you could tell me how that partnership, the genesis of how that worked?

07-00:13:14
Moore: Yeah, the specific details I may not get entirely, but I do know the conceptual framework. Part of it was just looking at what are highly valued community places, where do people in communities go for services, for community events, and for learning. Today's libraries clearly have embraced a changing role of public library systems as community centers as well as their traditional function. Reaching out for a conversation realizing that parks are kind of outdoor living rooms and libraries were becoming indoor living rooms of community and working really with the head of San Francisco Public Library—what would be a collaborative thing that would help the libraries with their goals and the parks with our goals moving forward as well.

07-00:14:18
The concept came up, what's called the summer learning gap. Kids are out of school, they're not reading as much, and they can go backwards in primarily their reading abilities. We developed a program, Summer Stride—I think there may have been a park connections part of that name as well—to keep kids reading during the summer but to do it in a way that was more fun or maybe viewed as more fun than in a traditional classroom. That was around a park visit and choosing books to read appropriate to different ages that connected to the biodiversity, the heritage, the values, the recreation that parks had to offer. In the park setting, actually, [creating a "story walk" of a book], so there would be a series of outdoor exhibits where you could walk from exhibit to exhibit on your own or with your parents or with your friends and read a book on about a mile walk and finish that book.

07-00:15:34
We had an amazing book called [*Her Right Foot*], which was about the Statue of Liberty, and we put that story walk exhibit along Crissy Field at the immigration gateway to the Bay Area, the traditional immigration gateway of the Golden Gate.

07-00:15:54
Farrell: Were there other ones? That's a great example I think of connecting the themes together. Are there other examples you can think of a book that you used in a particular place?

07-00:16:04
Moore: Yeah, I think I've got the title of another one is [*Where's Rodney?*]. This book is the story of a young boy, an African American young boy, whose parents

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

introduced him to the beauty and wildness of Yosemite. That story walk was placed in the Marin Headlands in a more natural setting.

07-00:16:27
Farrell: Oh, that's great, yeah, that's really great. Again, another thing that kids can do during the pandemic to be outside but also to enrich learning and reading.

07-00:16:38
Moore: Yeah. I forgot about other part of the program that was really a fun part to watch. We had what we called Reading Rangers, and the Reading Rangers would go into the library and read to kids in the library or later out in the park. There are just amazing videos of the rangers, some of them telling their own life stories, how they got into the outdoors. In some of their life stories, they were people who never believed they would ever be a park ranger, that someone introduced them [to nature] as teenagers, maybe some of them as young adults to that opportunity, and there they were.

07-00:17:20
Farrell: Yeah, yeah, that's fantastic. We had talked a little bit about or we mentioned the community shuttle program with the Trailheads launch. Is there anything else you want to say about the shuttles program?

07-00:17:37
Moore: Well, the other component that was really terrific is the Presidio Trust to help with transportation needs to and from the Presidio. [The Trust] had a complete [fleet of buses for] a shuttle program that ran [from the Presidio to] downtown and back and forth. Some of those buses were converted to community shuttles, while most often they operated in the commute cycle during the week. But in a weekend then we could pick up that or even during the week and off times. We could take advantage of that infrastructure, those buses, those drivers. Also tell people in the community, look if you can get to where these buses intersect your life, these shuttles, you can get to the park free on weekdays and on weekends. We were always trying to move people to the ability to feel welcome enough and the parks being accessible enough and the destination being fun enough that people could enjoy the park in their own, more than just through a program.

07-00:18:46
Farrell: Was it hard to work with transit partners to get them to change the route on the weekends because that also requires more staff on their part to drive the buses and that kind of thing?

07-00:18:58
Moore: Well, it was very hard, and it's surprisingly hard. As one example, the San Francisco's Muni [buses] had routes to the Presidio that were derived when the Presidio was an Army base, right? Those routes had a different purpose and a way of operating than as a national park. It's really hard just to make simple route changes to move a bus [line]. In some cases, we were asking for a bus to be moved four blocks to provide the connectivity that we needed.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Those [existing] routes get so embedded, and I think there's a whole process of changing them. I think the transit agencies are a bit adverse to being told [about new or changing services] or maybe stuck in their [inability] to [respond proactively]. But eventually you just keep working at it, and the Trust did keep working at it, and little by little, there are great successes including now the biggest one, one we had hoped for, for probably two decades is connecting the 30 Stockton bus line directly into the Presidio. It was like a five-block extension, maybe seven I'm not sure, but now it goes right to the bottom of what will be the new Presidio Tunnel Tops.

07-00:20:26
Farrell: I see that one all the time.

07-00:20:28
Moore: Yeah, yeah.

07-00:20:29
Farrell: Moving a little bit to the Arts in the Parks program, I mean you were just mentioning you want to make sure that there are attractions. You can provide transportation, but what's the reason for people to visit. I think that the Arts in the Parks definitely incentivizes people to go to the parks and see what's there. There have been a number of different exhibitions that you've done or that have been around over the past fifteen-plus years. One in 2010 called *Habitats* that was in the Presidio, di Suvero in Crissy Field in 2013. There was Ai Weiwei on Alcatraz in 2014, which was a pretty big one. *Home Land Security* in 2016, the *Blue Whale* in Crissy Field in 2018, *Immigrant Yarn* in Fort Point in 2019, and *Future IDs, Alcatraz* in 2019. Any of those you want to highlight in particular or maybe talk about the value of having these programs associated with the park?

07-00:21:43
Moore: Yeah, I think I'll start there. First of all, the park is a beautiful platform for art. There's something magnificent when you create a beautiful human creation against the beauty that nature provides as a platform for displaying that art or the beauty of a historic building to give it texture and content. There's a certain magic that happens with art [in the parks] and with the imagination of artists. Secondly, art can tell difficult stories in a way that's meaningful, emotional, and memorable without necessarily having to take a strong political stand. It's a way of illustrating content, kind of getting at both the brain and emotions in a different way than a standard ranger tour would. We give artists a certain license to express themselves. The park ranger may feel more constrained, but an artist by definition, they're supposed to explore things in a different way. Finally, often artists had their own community connections or their own civic connections or their own audiences and so they can help bring new audiences to the park and *Future IDs* certainly did that [at Alcatraz], many of them did, but each one had its own place.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-00:23:20

With di Suvero really, it was more of an aesthetic [experience], because the artist di Suvero had emigrated from China underneath the Golden Gate Bridge as a young person. He loved the beauty of the Golden Gate Bridge, and his artworks were steel compositions, massive, often mimicking the color of the Golden Gate Bridge. That was a partnership with SFMOMA to bring the di Suvero sculptures from around the country and gather them in Crissy Field for a certain length of time. [The art installation] *Habitats* was really managed more by the Presidio Trust, and it brought the fairly renowned artist Andy Goldsworthy and others to have artwork that featured different habitats of the Presidio, the animal habitats that is. And to make that an interesting journey, it was a walk through the Presidio from one place to the next.

07-00:24:25

A number of the installations were about social justice issues. For the artist Ai Weiwei, [his installation on Alcatraz called *Ai Weiwei @Large* was about] political imprisonment and human rights, an amazing exhibition, all prepared when he was under house arrest in Beijing, all having to be transferred across the ocean, and arrived in Alcatraz—one part of the art installation had one million Lego blocks that needed to be assembled by a team of volunteers. Amazing amounts of complexity, a very short time frame, but a completely powerful exhibit that—not just visually but more than that in its emotional content. The final part of that installation was called *Yours Truly* where people could write letters to people who were politically imprisoned around the world and that component ended up being a [documentary] film. *Homeland Security*, boy certainly relevant today, the idea of refugees, what happens when you lose your fundamental securities in a country, an international group of artists each telling that story near the Golden Gate. *International Orange*, that was part of the Golden Gate Bridge anniversary; *Blue Whale,* telling a story of climate change; and *Future IDs*, really looking at the transition of people who are released from prison, who for years had their identity be a number [as an inmate] and who have lost past identities that were so important to them. One was a mother who wanted to recapture her identity as a mom because prison had completely interrupted that part of her life. That really brought a whole community of people to Alcatraz who had been in prison, who could tell their stories, who could tell their post-prison story, some very uplifting, some very tragic, combined with anti-recidivism groups and a number of partners that were part of that program. With each of these art installations, each of these could be important in themselves, chronicling that artwork and what the goals were and the vision and how it was delivered.

07-00:27:05

Farrell: This also makes me think about art and representation. Going back to what you were saying before, artists have license, they have to say things that maybe rangers might not feel free enough to say or opinions that they can share but also artists come with their own audience. Thinking about the different perspectives that these artists or these different exhibits bring to the park—I mean Ai Weiwei couldn't attend the opening because he was under

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

house arrest—this happened in the Presidio, but the *Exclusion* exhibit about Japanese American incarceration during World War II. A lot of people I've talked to, that meant so much to them and they came to the park for that and then created a connection to the park after that. Thinking about how important representation is and being able to include perspectives perhaps outside of the parks' wheelhouse too, I think.

07-00:28:07
Moore: Yeah, that's an excellent point, and the *Exclusion* exhibit is a real good example. I mean such a powerful story and just the realization that at the time, the exclusion orders were issued from the Presidio; you can go into that office today. A few blocks away, Japanese Americans were serving the war effort by helping interpret, working as interpreters to help break Japanese code among other things. There are these tragic ironies in stories that should not be lost.

07-00:28:48
Another exhibit that the trust took on was about the Vietnam—what was called the *Babylift*—when so many people fled Vietnam, and their first place that they found themselves in America were in temporary barracks in the Presidio and in the Marin Headlands, and that was the beginning of their American journey. For some people these memories are painful, maybe inspirational, but a reconnection with people that they had lost track of that are coming back to the Presidio to recall as part of their past, and just, yeah, it's very emotional and memorable.

07-00:29:34
Farrell: Yeah, I also had heard the reception of *Operation Babylift,* that exhibition, a lot of people coming together, and it started a lot of conversations.

07-00:29:46
Moore: Yeah.

07-00:29:46.
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. There had to be staff who were involved and working with the sites and working on the installation. You mentioned one of the partnerships with SFMOMA and so what were the different moving parts that you remember that were involved in having one of these exhibitions come to fruition? I mean the Lego piece, that takes a lot of work.

07-00:30:20
Moore: Yeah. I think at times we—when I say we, I mean the partners, the Park Service, Trust, and the Conservancy—would generate a concept then go find if there was someone out there that believed in the concept that we were thinking about. But more often, once artists realized that the park was open to this type of collaboration, ideas would come to us, and we had sources of ideas. One was the FOR-SITE Foundation, which fundamentally is a nonprofit dedicated to using sites to advance social and environmental ideas. They now have an exhibit on climate change out at the Lands End. We needed to rely on people that had connections [with ideas and artists] that we didn't to bring

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

these things to fruition. The same with *Future IDs* and *Immigrant Yarn*, they were partner institutions that were part of it.

07-00:31:25

At the Conservancy, we had a very creative leader of all of these efforts named Kate Bickert who had to deal with everything from the big vision to how you actually get an installation safely to Alcatraz for its assembly and then just getting through all the—of course, there's bureaucracy with everything—getting through all the requirements, the environmental review, how to host something without interrupting other visitors. It was an intriguing and tangled challenge, but one that once the final result was there, you washed away whatever had been difficult in getting there and celebrated that success.

07-00:32:17

Farrell: I think lots of volunteers help with those kind of things. I actually know someone who is a docent for the Ai Weiwei exhibits.

07-00:32:22

Moore: Yeah?

07-00:32:24

Farrell: Yeah, and well, this is actually a great segue into bringing in some younger people to help with things whether they're volunteering or they're involved in art programs in a different way. I'm thinking about some of the work with students, thinking about like there was a video that was produced about 9/11, or there was a *Not in My Backyard* play, giving them the freedom and the voice to be able to express themselves as another component to the Arts in the Park.

07-00:32:58

Moore: Yeah, definitely. With Ai Weiwei, there were volunteers, but I think we also teamed up with the SF Art Institute, which is very close to where the Alcatraz dock is, and hired students to be the installation's guides. They learned all about Ai Weiwei and all about the exhibit and all about Alcatraz, so they could provide connectivity between stories that happened in Alcatraz of political imprisonment. In fact, one of Weiwei's exhibits chronicles the story of the incarceration of Native Americans in Alcatraz so that there were those opportunities for young people to get involved in the park.

07-00:33:47

Farrell: I'm thinking a little bit about well Michele Gee and some of her work with students, youth leadership, and then working as Crissy Field Center deputy director being part of the youth advisory council. The idea to bring in students and to let them create things themselves, what is the value of having that in your perspective in conjunction with the parks?

07-00:34:25

Moore: Well, using Michele as an example, she came to the park as a young AmeriCorps intern. I think she was in high school as far as I can remember

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

and eventually became part of the Crissy Field Center as a young person, eventually became a staff member in Crissy Field Center, eventually was deputy director of the Crissy Field Center, and then further along, transferred to the National Park Service to be the Chief of Interpretation [and Education] in the park. The Chief of Interpretation for the National Park Service is responsible for the fundamental storytelling of that park, the meaning of it, the community connections, the public awareness, the volunteer program, everything about the park that is living and breathing beneath those places that have been preserved for all time. Michele just brought such great respect and then talent. Her own story, part of her family was interred, put in camps during World War II, the experience as a Chinese American and a Japanese American and really being dedicated to having this park serve a variety of youth and [a diversity of audiences] and creating really tangible, thoughtful, and creative pathways for youth to put themselves in a pathway to National Park Service careers, youth of all backgrounds. Michele's work with the Crissy Field Center transformed the composition of frontline rangers in the park because I go back a long way, and there was a time when the frontline rangers were pretty much relatively young, white men and then eventually white women, but still pretty homogenous. Michele, in the course of five to ten years, completely transformed that ranger staff probably to be the most diverse frontline ranger staff in the country.

07-00:36:48
Farrell: Yeah, and with some of the creative expression like with the 9/11 video, with the *Not in My Backyard*, was there ever pushback about some of the themes that the students or the teams were exploring through some of those projects?

07-00:37:09
Moore: Yeah, I don't know if there was pushback as much as perhaps worry. I mean when you allow the topic where there are differences in public opinion to be put out in the public arena, people could potentially complain like, what, this is not what I expected out of a national park. That didn't happen very much, I think maybe because the Bay Area is where the Free Speech Movement began in a lot of ways, so we're our own context, it was workable and accepted and valuable. We, to some degree, treated young people like the artist. It's like we had to respect the topics that they believe are important and how they learned those topics and how they expressed their reaction to those topics. And, of course, we encouraged an approach of looking at both sides and taking information in and not being overly prejudiced in one way or another in terms of how you viewed an issue at the get-go.

07-00:38:29
Farrell: Yeah, yeah, and I know that that out of those programs grew some lasting relationships with some youth who ended up like Michele who stayed with the Conservancy.

07-00:38:39
Moore: Yeah.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-00:38:40
Farrell: And just a couple of examples are Nessa Ramos and Jessica Chen, and Ernesto—I think we've talked about Ernesto before.

07-00:38:51
Moore: Ernesto came in early and so did Nessa and Jessica. I believe they were all in the IYEL program. They all went on to get college degrees and came back to serve the park in very meaningful ways. Ernesto is still there, Jessica ran the Park Youth Collaborative, and she may still be doing that. She was actually the youth ambassador to Australia for the International Parks Congress. Nessa's story is, in fact she just told it at a board meeting two weeks ago that I attended, her story of coming into [the United States] as a teenager from the Philippines in a brand-new country, not knowing how to get her bearings, hearing about the Crissy Field Center, applying, getting accepted, being embraced by the Center, and how that completely transformed her trajectory. She went to college, got a degree, and was determined to get back to the Conservancy, and she did, and she's still working there today.

07-00:39:56
Farrell: Yeah, and I think another example of why representation matters. That's an important story for people to know that this is possible.

07-00:40:05
Moore: Exactly, exactly, because I think a network begins to develop, and they're now really apparent, having watched this change over time. There are affinity groups for people that are people of color within the environmental arena or for young people or for others. There's a lot of momentum around our country.

07-00:40:34
Farrell: Yeah, definitely. Another facet of some of the programs are more environmental conservation related. This leads to the One Tam, the Tamalpais Land Collaborative, and that got off the ground in 2012. I know we've mentioned it a little bit, but I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about the vision for One Tam before it got off the ground?

07-00:41:09
Moore: Well, the vision stems from the concept that's pretty obvious, but often forgotten, is that plants and animals do not know jurisdictional boundaries, they know their habitat, right. Each place, for example a thriving forest is only as successful as the place next door and whether that place is also ecologically healthy and so you have to look at ecosystem, health, and restoration through a bigger lens. We called it Rangers Without Borders, is kind of our name for it. But the genesis didn't really come from this vision. It came in a more slightly serendipitous way. The Marin Municipal Water District, which manages a significant and beautiful open space in Marin County for recreation and for water supply, was thinking of setting up what's called the friends group, a nonprofit group to support their efforts. They asked me to come talk to them about what it would take to put together friends group, which I did, but in the process they were realizing and I was realizing just how hard it is to

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

build a nonprofit organization from scratch, how hard it is to finance it, to have a business model, to bring it to scale, to have it be effective, and how hard those early years are, and the uncertainty of it all in forming a new nonprofit. I rather quietly suggested, because I didn't want to intrude on their ideas, "Well what would you think about the Conservancy serving that role? Because our national park, [the Golden Gate National Recreation Area], encompasses state park, it encompasses federal park, it's adjacent to watershed lands. We have the same values and aspirations that you do for preservation, recreation, and we already have a volunteer and donor following that we could bring in, and we have a staff that could help raise the money for these early efforts and get it underway."

07-00:43:28

I think at the staff level, the idea was embraced pretty quickly as worth considering and then as worth recommending, but we had a number of different agencies, the Park Service, the [California State Parks], the [Marin] Water District, [Marin County Parks and Open Space], and the Conservancy. Each one had to get to a place that they believed that by allowing the Conservancy to help glue them all together, that it was lifting everybody's boat and because we had only served the Park Service, maybe their fear would be that if we took on another partner, they would get less or state parks might believe that, gee, well we kind of have a state parks foundation, so we had to come to grips with that and then we had to deal with some members of the community who felt that the Conservancy was fundamentally a San Francisco-based organization, even some that felt we might commercialize the parks because we ran tours on Alcatraz. There were some fears out there that had to be dealt with, but eventually an agreement was signed, and [funds were] raised and off we went.

07-00:44:51

Farrell: How did you respond to people who were making comments like that or had these beliefs that the Conservancy was San Francisco based or was commercializing different things?

07-00:45:05

Moore: The way we'd respond—and the credit here goes to Sharon Farrell of the Conservancy who was leading up the initiative—was to do everything we could to meet with our [supporters and our skeptics in] person. Because we realized that through social media or an email, you can create any story line you want, and there's not someone to inquire about why you have that story line or what the context of that story line is or what the true mission of One Tam was. Fundamentally, at that point, the Conservancy had a very effective but very quiet reputation in Marin County. We had done tons of conservation work that many people were unaware of it. And there was a controversy about off-leash dog walking with the National Park Service that made people additionally skeptical of the Conservancy as a partner in Marin. We didn't win everybody over, but we could say that we met with everybody, and we were completely transparent too. Everything was put online [on the One Tam

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

website], every agreement, every plan, every program, every budget, so there was no hiding as one other effort to build the trust.

07-00:46:34
Farrell: Did you find that the transparency was really useful?

07-00:46:38
Moore: It was really useful not only because it symbolized their values right, but it also answered questions. A big question for all of our government partners was, and for the community, would One Tam actually trump the [public review] processes that the community was accustomed to that each of the agencies went through for [community input]. We had to say, "No, no, no," that all stays in place, that infrastructure of community consultation is not touched. What we touched are the things that eventually get approved and are moving to implementation and need volunteers or philanthropy or expertise and where we can share our expertise across agencies. Because one agency may have a botanist and the other agency may have a zoologist, and they can just share that expertise and knowledge.

07-00:47:38
Farrell: So it's like taking the existing model and building off of it?

07-00:47:42
Moore: Yes and as our first step, we decided to do something that was necessary, but also really safe and showed our intentions as we did a complete inventory of the health of Mount Tam with probably thirty-five different scientists: Looking at all the research papers, actually looking at every aspect of habitat and species; rating the condition of individual species of ecosystems; holding public symposiums; and really doing a completely transparent report card on how ecologically healthy is Mount Tam and where should we dedicate our efforts.

07-00:48:22
Farrell: That sounds like a huge undertaking.

07-00:48:25
Moore: Well, it was huge. Well, we were going to do, and people were like, "That's impossible." [laughter] My belief is that people working in the public sector are fundamentally generous, they want to share, they want to get the mission completed. If they see people that are enthusiastic about their work and enthusiastic about their work having meaning, that helps. Actually, another part of the story is that [One] Tam was part of a four-year case study to evaluate whether it was accomplishing its goals and what those goals were and what were the outcomes. One of the goals that we hadn't anticipated is staff morale of all four agencies grew by like 35 to 40 percent because of One Tam [with 98% of the staff enjoying being part of this collaboration].

07-00:49:19
Farrell: Wow.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-00:49:20
Moore: I think it was just the nature of people–having others helping them, expanding their sense of what's possible, endorsing their work, and getting it done, and, in some ways, busting through impediments. That's always part of it.

07-00:49:42
Farrell: Yeah. To do the inventory—or I don't know if "inventory" is a good word—but the comprehensive study of Mount Tam, did you ever do a BioBlitz where people were coming in and exploring what was in certain areas?

07-00:49:54
Moore: Yeah, yeah, not only the BioBlitz but we—and they're still in place—set up a whole series of wildlife cameras, so we really could get a wildlife monitoring program going on at a big scale and that helped us. We had to come up with metrics and I think one of them was wildlife density within a certain zone. How many bobcats per acre are here, recognizing of course that those animals move, so it's a metric but not a perfect metric but a representational metric.

07-00:50:30
Farrell: Yeah. In the notes that we have on the outline, I think you put in ten-to-one leveraging. Can you tell me what you mean by that?

07-00:50:39
Moore: Yeah, that was one of our maximum effects is once people saw that One Tam could be successful, their willingness to contribute grew. Back to the inventory work, one of the things that we knew would be useful would to be to do—it's a flyover with Lidar, a [light detection] radar system that can do a complete landscape mapping. We began small saying, "Let's do that for the watershed lands," and we brought in the donor gift to help kick it off. I think it was a million-dollar donor gift. Well, by the time we got done, the Water District was in with the piece [of funding], then the State Parks wanted to get a piece, so they came in with funding, then the Park Service wanted in, while we are up there, let's get the entire Golden Gate National Parks, all 80,000 acres of it. The Gulf of the Farallones said, "Hey, if you're going to be doing this, maybe we can contribute a piece." Eventually that project got about ten times bigger in its scope and results than we originally envisioned just because people saw the opportunity to collaborate in the economies of scale in getting it done all at once. It was a massive change because now all agencies across all these locations, marine and terrestrial habitat, had a common dataset. It was uniform in time and place and so it just was a new springboard for conservation.

07-00:52:30
Farrell: We've talked about working with the National Park Service, we've talked a little bit about regional, about working with the city and the state. How was it working with the state parks? What was your relationship like with them?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-00:52:48
Moore: Oh, and actually, a whole bunch of things were going on at—not maybe exactly the same time but close to the same time. The State Parks went through an incredible fiscal crisis, so bad that the parks in Marin, Mount Tam [State], [Samuel] P. Taylor State Park, and others were thinking about closing. They couldn't even keep themselves open. Again, in a collaborative fashion, particularly because Mount Tam State Park was the source of Redwood Creek that came through Muir Woods, and we saw the difficulty of like what do you do? Someone's hiking from Muir Woods to the top of Mount Tam and then it says closed. We could see how difficult that would be to manage.

07-00:53:38
To the Park Service's credit, we came up with the idea of raising the entrance fee to Muir Woods by two dollars and being transparent with the public that those two dollars were to support the Mount Tam Watershed that Muir Woods depended upon. For the time that was needed, the Park Service again with some Conservancy help too it, was underwriting the State Park operations of Mount Tam to keep it functioning. For the State Park system, they were amazed that some [other entity] would dedicate their own revenue-producing ability to help the place that was not under their direct jurisdiction. When One Tam came up, I think State Parks already had a very favorable impression of what the Park Service and Conservancy had done to help them in a time of crisis. So that really helped me in moving that relationship along quickly [for a larger vision of collaboration].

07-00:54:46
Farrell: How was the relationship dynamics between the Conservancy and the State Parks? I know there was a lot of changes happening with the State Parks over time, right?

07-00:54:56
Moore: It was good. It was complicated in the fact of the dynamics because the State Parks were under stress. They were changing their structure; there were quite a few staff changes. When you're building a collaborative team and people are moving in and out of positions, that makes it harder for the sheer continuity of it. By the way, I might add that [a similar collaborative] program was already somewhat in place [elsewhere], but One Tam gave it new energy and inspiration and fuel as the partnership of the federal and state parks and the nonprofit organizations up in the Redwood National and State Parks. They took the One Tam model and revisited how they worked and raised their ambitions and vision.

07-00:55:52
Farrell: Okay, and probably gave them a project to work towards to make things a little more cohesive?

07-00:55:58
Moore: Yeah. Ultimately, because the One Tam had a four-year case study of independent reviewers really analyzing it, confirming its success, and

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

confirming the ingredients to its success, and eventually, we produced a tool kit about conservation collaboration. That study and that tool kit was going around the country and even overseas as a case study that people look at about how to preserve large landscapes [through broader collaboration].

07-00:56:32
Farrell: Okay. Another conservation initiative that was focused on—instead of the community, but this is more environmental conservation—was the Alcatraz stewardship initiative. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what the vision and plan for that initiative was?

07-00:56:53
Moore: Yeah, here we moved from the natural treasures of the park to the cultural and historical treasures because Alcatraz is a collection of historic buildings and historical and cultural stories. The buildings were built by the military, built by the Army, and, wow, the [federal] prison closed because it was too expensive to operate. That was one of the primary reasons. These historic buildings were deteriorating and not at the proper seismic code [for visitor safety]. It was a completely scary price tag to rehabilitate these buildings because—look, if you added it all up, it would be over $100 million—so we just had to take it one big one chunk at a time. But we formed the Alcatraz stewardship team, which included the Park Service and the Conservancy and the [private ferry] concessionaire. We looked at all of our talents and revenue sources, we looked at the needs of the island in terms of historic preservation, and we set a blueprint for bit by bit tackling the most critical needs and then the next most critical by combining those resources and opportunities. We really made our way. Huge investments, the Cellhouse, the old guard house, a variety of buildings that only could have been accomplished through that collaborative system. No one entity had the budget [or expertise] to do it alone.

07-00:58:31
Farrell: Can you tell me a little bit about how that was implemented?

07-00:58:40
Moore: It was implemented in a tri-partner way. I would say the Conservancy was probably the main engine behind the idea, right, and maybe some of the initial funding came through the Conservancy. But the Park Service was in very quickly because it was a huge challenge for them. With the concessionaire, those were private, contracted agreements where certain monies were set aside and so it was working with the concessionaire to get that money dedicated and, in some cases—well, this is a good case. It's not just the vision, it's not just the resources, it's how to get the job done. In the past, the concessionaire, for the capital improvements in Alcatraz, had contracted it out themselves and managed the effort. We, however, knew better what the Park Service required like the back of our hand. We knew the Park Service's processes and environmental review and their historic architects and the State Historic Preservation Officer. We knew how to implement this type of work, and we

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

could do it in a way as a nonprofit to make it more cost effective. The concessionaire, instead of doing it on their own, put the money in our account to deliver on those financial obligations and those historic preservation results.

07-01:00:15
Farrell: Yeah, so it sounds like there was an acknowledgement of what the Conservancy can accomplish, the concessionaires can't accomplish, so common goal there working together.

07-01:00:26
Moore: Yeah, and part of it—that's a good point—as in any partnership, you're at some level figuring out what lane can each person perform in a way that is not redundant but additive and make that work for the efficiencies [in implementation and securing the resources] and the talent.

07-01:00:48
Farrell: And often that is the hardest part of the sauce to get right, I think.

07-01:00:55
Moore: It is, particularly because there are human dynamics, people are proud of what they do and can do, and I think maybe sometimes resist being put in the lane, but there's always overlap in those lanes, too. We actually installed the system of [collaboration for] the three partners, three leads of each partner that met regularly, so there was a Conservancy lead, a Park Service lead, and a ferry concessionaire lead to manage the program.

07-01:01:38
Farrell: Also in our notes, you have new embarkation. Does that mean that there was a new place people were leaving and arriving from?

07-01:01:48
Moore: Yeah, the other things that we knew were that (*a*), not everybody can get to Alcatraz that wants to, there are capacity constraints, and (*b*) the Alcatraz experience begins at the dock, that's the dock on the city side, not once you step your foot on the island. The concessionaire contract [with the National Park Service] was up, and the [San Francisco Port Authority] leases were up because [the piers are] San Francisco [Port] property, and it was a time to like, "Let's reenvision what the embarkation experience is in getting people to Alcatraz." Let's imagine what can be performed on the city side, what infrastructure we can put there, what visitor services we can put there, and then what the island itself can accommodate. That developed a very exciting vision for the new gateway to Alcatraz, which included a welcoming plaza with standard benches and places to sit, decent restroom facilities, a welcome center with interpretation and the gift store, so even people that maybe couldn't get to Alcatraz could at least get a touch of the Alcatraz story, and if they wanted to, something to read about Alcatraz or a memento from the island's history. Also, a café [at the San Francisco embarkation] because when you're on Alcatraz, there's no food available. People either eat beforehand, so they're not hungry there, or they don't eat and when they get back [to San

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Francisco], they're hungry and they want a place to eat. We developed the Alcatraz café, the Alcatraz welcome center, the Alcatraz plaza, and worked through really extensive negotiations with the Park Service support and the Conservancy to not only to get it approved in the public arena, but all the behind-the-scenes lease negotiations and financial negotiations that were part of putting our plan in place.

07-01:03:59
Farrell: That's a lot of work to get all those pieces to work together.

07-01:04:02
Moore: It was a lot of work. At some point, you realize that you just have to keep the goal in mind because it's going to seem unreachable at times when you're working on it, but my experience is eventually you get there.

07-01:04:19
Farrell: Yeah, and I'm actually thinking about because there's so many pieces to that, Mount or the One Tam, that's a huge thing. How did you approach projects that were so massive like that in order to not be overwhelmed and put one foot in front of the other?

07-01:04:39
Moore: Yeah, that was definitely a challenge; there was a lot going on. We really had to just look at the scale of talent that we had, the commitments that staff had, and the ability, if we needed to, could we scale up not only for the vision piece and maybe that was enough, or was it a permanent scale-up that was needed. We, early on in our collaboration, developed the concept of what we called the "core team." Those were the people that were responsible for a project, an extended team, those were the people that might have input to the project—and I forget what the tier was—but it's the keep-informed team, those people who aren't providing impact and aren't responsible but it's just good business to keep them informed. For example, it's good for every park ranger to know about an exciting project in the park even if they have nothing to do with it. It's part of them being aware of what's going on within the park landscape. We developed a pretty solid project management system. Often, we had a person that was called the tracker and that the tracker's job was to make sure that everybody was getting the thing done that they needed to get done at the time that it needed to be delivered. We just honed in on sharpening out execution and team work.

07-01:06:16
Farrell: I like the use of that term tracker; it reminds me of like sci-fi or books or something.

07-01:06:22
Moore: Right, yeah, yeah. [laughter]

07-01:06:24
Farrell: There's like a sense of adventure with that.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:06:27
Moore: Yeah.

07-01:06:29
Farrell: Well, speaking of another project that was big, but this is more of a one-off, was the Golden Gate Bridge seventy-fifth anniversary that happened in 2012. Leading up to the anniversary in 2012, there was the bridge walk that happened [in 2011] I'm just wondering if you could tell me a little bit about your involvement with the anniversary? We'll start there.

07-01:07:01
Moore: Yeah, I would say what was interesting about the Conservancy is sometimes an opportunity came up and we weren't responsible for making it show up, and it showed up in a way that was very unexpected. The Presidio closure is a classic example, but the Golden Gate Bridge opportunity is another classic example. Just as background, as someone who cared about the park's story, I had been bothered for a while that the Golden Gate Bridge, that story was not really told. That it wasn't the [Golden Gate] Bridge District's responsibility really to be an educational entity or an interpretive entity nor was it its responsibility to be a visitor-serving entity. The Golden Gate Bridge, [the architectural] centerpiece of the park really was missing something I believe it needed, and the [existing modest] gift store that the Bridge [District] operated, in my view, had incredibly, low-quality souvenirs that weren't up to the caliber of the architectural beauty of the Golden Gate Bridge, so that was just something that bothered me.

07-01:08:08
But one day minding our own business, the Bridge District issued the request for proposals for an entity that would develop and run a public bridge walk at the Golden Gate Bridge. They were modeling it after the bridge tour in Sydney Harbour Australia, [called Bridge Climb], which was an incredible success, a world-class experience, and a powerful financial engine for that bridge. The Bridge District had visited Sydney and believed that a similar tour could happen here and put out an RFP. We decided, of all things, we'd go in for it. We knew that the Sydney Harbour Bridge [concessionaire of Bridge Climb] was going to enter. We knew once again it was kind of a David-and-Goliath competition, and I think the Bridge District got maybe initially five proposals and then they moved it down to three. This took, by the way, incredible effort on our part to design and envision how we would implement a bridge walk on the Golden Gate Bridge, what infrastructure is needed, how we would pay for that infrastructure, what the business plan would be, what all the components would be, and we produced I think a really stellar proposal, but we didn't have the direct experience that the [Bridge Climb] folks [in Sydney, Australia] did.

07-01:09:45
But I remember this really well because it was on Good Friday, and I was in my office, and I got the call from the Bridge District that they had cancelled

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

the competition. There wasn't a lot of explanation, but they said, "Well, you'll be hearing from us, but it's cancelled." All of us heard that it was canceled. It turns out it was canceled because as various stakeholders considered the vulnerability of the Golden Gate Bridge, particularly after 9/11 [in New York] and everything else, it was determined by a number of people—elected officials and others—that it wasn't the right time for this idea, so they put a halt to it.

07-01:10:42

The following week, we were called by the Bridge District, and they said, "We are really impressed by your proposal, and we have another idea." We said, "Well, what's that?" They said, "We wondered if you'd be willing to take on being our partner the seventy-fifth anniversary of the bridge?" We thought that through, and it was like I think less than a year away, we didn't have a lot of runway. [laughs] I said, "We'd be interested, but we'd only be interested if—we like the idea of a celebration, but it has no [tangible] legacy. We would want our legacy to be that we had improved the fundamental visitor infrastructure around the bridge and the visitor-serving experience, and that we were offering valued visitor services that would be ongoing. That we would not be just [the Bridge District's] partner for the anniversary, but we would be its partner for serving the visitors to both the Bridge and the surrounding national park." Eventually that proposal was accepted. That took a lot of development, a lot of back and forth–and then, off we moved. In that short period of time, I think we pooled together between $10 or $15 million.

07-01:12:06

For the event itself to celebrate the anniversary, we did it the way we always done these things. We decided we would have seventy-five community partners of all kinds of different backgrounds. Each of them would develop their own commemorative program to the Golden Gate Bridge as a coalition. That those seventy-five events would lead up to the anniversary date, that the anniversary date would be over the weekend with community and exhibits and other installations at the bridge. The Bridge [District] very much wanted the traditional fireworks display, and honestly, I was a little bit mixed on that, but I decided, well, if we're going to do it, we're going to do it in a way that's different than it's been done before, which we did. We had to put a campaign together, a volunteer campaign for the anniversary chaired by Nancy Bechtle and by Larry Baer who was CEO of the San Francisco Giants at the time. We put that campaign volunteers together, got all the corporate sponsors in place that we needed to raise the money, built new trails entirely around the bridge, built three new overlooks around the bridge, built a new [Golden Gate Bridge] welcome center, renovated the [historic] Roundhouse, built a new entry plaza, and got that all done by the [anniversary] date. We had a fixed date, it was not going to move, May 27th, 2012–it was either done or it wasn't. It was a wild ride.

07-01:13:45

Farrell: It sounds like operation warp speed.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:13:48
Moore: It was operation warp speed, yes.

07-01:13:52
Farrell: Did you want seventy-five community partners because it was the seventy-fifth anniversary?

07-01:13:56
Moore: Exactly, yeah.

07-01:13:57
Farrell: Okay, okay.

07-01:13:57
Moore: Yeah, that just gave us a construct about how to approach something.

07-01:14:02
Farrell: Yeah. Was it hard to find that many community partners, or there were people who were super ready and willing?

07-01:14:09
Moore: It really wasn't hard to find partners. I thought it might be a little bit daunting, but some really wonderful ones emerged. The California Historical Society did a whole amazing exhibit about the bridge in their [downtown] location. The San Francisco Giants had International Orange Day where the logo of the [75th] anniversary was on the diamond and all the team members wore the logo on their shirt. We had an event with people who had walked across the bridge when it opened, a whole event commemorating that piece of history. The FOR-SITE Foundation took on an installation at Fort Point of an art exhibit that was amazing about the history of the Golden Gate Bridge, so one by one they fell in place.

07-01:14:59
Farrell: Yeah, and it helps having that many community partners to establish something on that timeline.

07-01:15:04
Moore: It does, yeah, and again I think of the fun little role of the Conservancy was just being the motivator, the glue, the coordinator of that effort. At times, if there was extra help or dollars needed, we would chip in, but that really it was seldom that that was required.

07-01:15:29
Farrell: Yeah, and why were you torn about the fireworks display?

07-01:15:36
Moore: For one idea, it seemed a little bit old-fashioned to me, and I guess in the other point that it's an expensive half hour and the environmental effects of it are kind of mixed. I at least wanted to think those issues through and, yeah, see where I ended up. But the [Bridge District really wanted that traditional celebration for its proven appeal and impact], and it turned out to be one of the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

most memorable parts of that weekend. Because we had an amazing event choreographer, and we developed the idea of not just the fireworks but bringing in seventy-five klieg lights. I don't know if you know what they are, but klieg lights are really powerful [beams of light], and it was based on an event during the Panama Exposition [in 1915] where lights were brought in for a nighttime light display. These lights shoot hundreds of feet into the air and so we had seventh-five lights of all different colors on a barge in San Francisco Bay doing a light show in the sky at the same time the fireworks were going, choreographed to music where every song had a San Francisco connection. including "I Left My Heart in San Francisco" where at the moment the word "heart" was sung, there were seven firework hearts that showed up in the sky.

07-01:17:11
Farrell: That's incredible.

07-01:17:12
Moore: Yeah, it was really something.

07-01:17:15
Farrell: That's incredible.

07-01:17:17
Moore: When the fireworks were about to start, I was aware that not everything works as expected and I was with my wife and son with the big crowd at the tent in Crissy Field. I said, "Let's go sit somewhere else in case this goes bad." [laughter]

07-01:17:35
Farrell: That's funny.

07-01:17:35
Moore: Yeah, and you know what, two weeks later, there was a story in San Diego where they had this huge fireworks display, and someone pushed the button wrong and what was supposed to be like twenty minutes of fireworks ended in just twenty seconds, everything went off, up, and lit.

07-01:17:51
Farrell: Oh.

07-01:17:54
Moore: We are an example of what could've happened but didn't fortunately.

07-01:17:59
Farrell: I'm glad that was a success story.

07-01:18:01
Moore: Yeah, yeah. [laughter]

07-01:18:03
Farrell: Was it a foggy night?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:18:06
Moore: Not too much. I mean, of course, we worried about that, and, by and large, it was clear. There were wisps of fog, but the fireworks were, I think, really visible. There are, of course, many videos of that that were taken and are available for people who want to watch that show again.

07-01:18:30
Farrell: Yeah, yeah, that's great.

07-01:18:32
Moore: By the way, we had at the opening of the fireworks show was seven [youth] leaders from the Crissy Field Center all speaking in a different language welcoming people to the celebration of the anniversary.

07-01:18:47
Farrell: Oh, that's fantastic.

07-01:18:48
Moore: Yeah, that was the opening.

07-01:18:51
Farrell: Do you remember which languages?

07-01:18:54
Moore: I probably won't remember all of them, but of course, there was Spanish and probably Vietnamese, probably the Philippine language—Tagalog I think—and Chinese, maybe both Mandarin and Cantonese, the mix that reflected the composition of San Francisco in our audiences that might be sitting out there.

07-01:19:19
Farrell: That makes sense. Well, yeah, this actually is a great transition into some of the national and international work that you've done. We've touched on this here and there, but I wanted to give you an opportunity to talk about some of your work on a broader scale. We talked about the exchange and conference in Australia and also the bridge walk that also ties to Australia as well and New Zealand with the Roving Ranger. But you've also done work with Italy, China, Chile, and South Africa, and so I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what it's been like for you to work with international groups?

07-01:20:04
Moore: It was a total honor and a privilege, first of all, to be able to see these different places that different countries think are in their national interest to preserve for all time and to make available for visitors now and forever. It's incredible because there's such universality to the idea that places of outstanding history, culture, and nature are important to a country in its fundamental well-being or maybe even its brand identity, and then to meet with people who are dedicated to that work. And of course, what always happens is you're being called in to explain your experience, but it's so reciprocal. Even if you come in as the expert, you leave as a person that learns from another expert in a way that was a true exchange.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:21:04

With Italy, the job there was because Italy had [recently] joined the European Union, and as a member of the EU, they were required to put 15 percent of their country in protected status. Well, they were below that percentage, and they wanted to build out their national park system. The work there was looking at that, looking at some of their relatively new national parks in Cinque Terra, the Dolomites and [elsewhere and] really helping set a vision for what a system could be, the system of national parks, and that was just incredible.

07-01:21:38

With South Africa, the work came because of Table Mountain National Park, an incredible national park at the edge of the city, Cape Town, with urban communities that they wanted to serve with their biodiversity, with history, and stories they wanted to tell from Robben Island, somewhat equivalent to Alcatraz, to one of the rarest floristic provinces in the world. In an urban context looking at how to build native plant nurseries and a lot of the things that we did [at Golden Gate]. In Australia, the journey began with Sydney Harbour Federation Trust, modelled exactly after the Presidio Trust, to convert historic properties at the entrance to Sydney Harbour. Many of them military and open spaces as part of the Sydney Harbour National Park, and we simply were ahead of them by five years, and they were very grateful that we were ahead. With New Zealand it was again, a little bit more about their regional parks as well as their national parks and just the idea of community engagement and involvement in national park settings. With China, the issue of carrying capacity. They had new parks, and they were getting overwhelmed by visitors and how did we manage to get people in and out of Alcatraz in a way that we kept the experience a good experience? We had done tons of crowd capacity work mainly actually with a company that was an offshoot of Disney that we brought in as our consultant for—I had worked at Disney way back when, so I knew what crowd management was all about from that experience. And then Chile, really the establishment of a [nonprofit] friends group for the national parks of Patagonia.

07-01:23:38

Each had its own specific genesis, but what I found is once I came to the country and once people considered our experience relevant, there were often repeat visits. I was back at South Africa again, back at Chile twice, New Zealand maybe two or three times, Australia probably three times, but China only once, and Italy only once. It was just an incredible experience, as I said, joy, honor of my job. It was completely unanticipated.

07-01:24:17

Farrell: I mean maybe with the exception of Patagonia, but it seems like a lot of those examples are looking at urban parks. Is that true, or were there people who were trying to learn about more rural places or more kind of remote areas?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:24:33
Moore: There tended to be an urban focus if you look at them in total. With China, they had an incredible historic and cultural site called the Mogao Caves, which had a different origin than Alcatraz, but had similar infrastructure. Limits on how you could get people through and limits if you took people through these [historic and cultural places] that even the [negative] effects of [human-produced] carbon dioxide inside the building, on the murals inside the building itself. They had to understand how to manage that experience and what part of that experience could be handled almost in an offsite way. You're right—with Patagonia, it was a conservation mission, but important to Patagonia where many communities that had traditionally used the land for farming and other purposes that these gateway communities that had to be part of a new economic model. I had quite a bit of evidence on the economic benefits of national parks. The National Park Service does an annual study on [the economic benefits of all its parks], and you could really see that [this new system of national parks in Patagonia could] ultimately [serve local communities with economic activity].

07-01:26:00
Farrell: What were some of the things that you learned from them that you brought back to the Conservancy with you?

07-01:26:07
Moore: Well, looking at Australia, they were definitely ahead of us with Healthy Parks, Healthy People. It began with Parks Victoria in Australia, so there was a lot of [program development we could learn from]. Looking at New Zealand, they were really, really and still are aggressive about biodiversity and how to deal with invasive plants and animals. They just have a conviction that is very different than our country. We're rather timid in comparison. Looking at the Cape Town, too, what a cultural mix and what a story of people who had divided their heritage, divided access to nature. Sometimes what I bring was just the emotional more than intellectual, like what cause means and how important the cause is and getting to know their leaders, getting to know their youth leaders exactly. So each had its own case.

07-01:27:11
In Italy, [we learned about the interweaving of nature and culture in national park settings including agricultural and cuisine]. I also learned that getting the job done [in a linear way] wasn't as important as I thought. That every day still involved a lot of fun and wine and food, and eventually, we would get to the outcomes, but I would get up in the morning and like I'm really outcome driven, and that wasn't how things proceeded. The days went more informally, but we did get good work done for sure.

07-01:27:41
Farrell: Yeah, I guess that's different cultural differences in different places.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:27:46
Moore: Yeah, very much, and Italy again, they had a community infrastructure that was really pretty impressive too that I learned from and some really, really dynamic leadership.

07-01:28:01
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. I'm also wondering what you found the value of sharing, being transparent about the projects you were doing, all of the components, what went into it? The value of sharing your model and being transparent, what did you find that to be? Sometimes I find that people are proprietary and see the value in keeping things a little bit more close to the vest, but it sounds like you had a different approach than that.

07-01:28:34
Moore: Yeah, you know what, I think in my own work and the people that have mentored me and the things that have made me effective and eager to get the job done, I always viewed it three pieces. First, try to inspire people. You would think that people that work with national parks, that work with beautiful spaces would just be inspired by the very nature of the work, but often they're in the thick of things. They don't have people coming in regularly and telling them how valuable their work is, how inspirational it is to others, and how they're on a world stage, people who know what they're doing. My first job was really to identify with the audience and bring that inspiration and then to motivate, to use the inspiration to again get their engines motivated, and finally to add, to bring them tools that would take advantage of their inspiration, motivation to get things done. Of course, to be careful that the tools were put in context because I've always said it's not necessarily this exact tool will work in your situation, but that the principle behind this tool will, and I wanted to build people's toolbox to get things done. I never had any hesitation about sharing our work because our work was collective work. It wasn't something that I owned; it was something that the Conservancy and our partners, and our community owned as a collective accomplishment. If our story had value to others, that was incredible.

07-01:30:31
Farrell: That makes sense. Another collective project.

07-01:30:34
Moore: The other final piece is [about being part of something larger]. I was at Golden Gate a long time, and many people are at Yosemite or in Australia a long time. To see that you are part of national and international community, it just lifts your spirits to know that you've got colleagues around the world, some of them working in some under really extreme situations like the park rangers in Africa that put their lives on the line to deal with wildlife poachers. I mean there's a lot going on around the world in conserving nature.

07-01:31:11
Farrell: And many different perspectives about what conserving nature means.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:31:15
Moore: Yeah, yeah, of course. In Italy, nature and culture are intermixed. You accept their national parks with full villages within them. The Cinque Terre is one exactly. Yeah, those five [coastal] towns are all part of a national park.

07-01:31:31
Farrell: Yeah, yeah, that's interesting. Well, I'm thinking about another highly collaborative project, which is in the process of coming to fruition now, which is the Tunnel Tops.

07-01:31:45
Moore: Yeah.

07-01:31:47
Farrell: Big, big undertaking. Correct me if I'm wrong in my understanding of the Tunnel Tops, but basically, it's a park that's connected to what the Presidio Parkway was and there are different areas that are on the Tunnel Tops that are attractions, but they connect to different areas within the Presidio. So not quite like the High Line in New York City where that's an actual old train track where you're walking above things, but—I don't know, I don't think I'm doing a great job explaining this.

07-01:32:36
Moore: Oh, you're right on target.

07-01:32:37
Farrell: Okay. [laughter] Yeah, it's these points of connection that are connecting things, and it's on top of Tunnel Tops. I think we had talked about how the idea for this started around the time of the Lucas Museum, that proposal, so the seeds of this were planted a long time ago. If you could tell me a little bit about how this got off the ground? We'll start there.

07-01:33:09
Moore: Well, I'll start by saying the Tunnel Tops is just one more example that if you keep an open mind and value the community's input and vision, you can get to ideas that you wouldn't have gotten to by yourself. Because the vision for the Tunnel Tops was not generated—the initial vision—by the Trust, the Conservancy, or the National Park Service. It was envisioned because the roadway to the Golden Gate Bridge was seismically unsafe, it didn't meet highway safety standards and it had run its lifespan. It was dangerous, and it needed to be replaced and so it began as a highway project really, and it could've ended up as a conventional highway project. They could've just reinforced the viaduct or build another viaduct or put in another highway that split the Presidio in half, but a group of people led primarily by the landscape architect Michael Painter believed that it was no longer a highway, it was a parkway. Because the Presidio had become a national park, and therefore, a highway needed to have park-like characteristics that, for one, mitigated its disruptive effect on the national park, but better than that, actually lifted the national park to a better place than it was before.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:34:36

The idea was that traditionally, the highway had been this huge interruption between one part of the Presidio and the other. An interruption between the historic Main Post and the natural beauty of Crissy Field, and interruption that kept two of the most important parts of the military post physically separated from one another. That the [new] highway, if designed properly, could have tunnels that mitigated the traffic in the various ways [including providing for] parklands on top of [its tunnels], and fundamentally connecting one part of the Presidio to the other with beauty and safe trails and everything else. That vision was motivated by Michael Painter and a group at SPUR. Eventually, when that vision began to take hold, the Trust jumped in and took on the goal of looking at the design and seeing what it might be. On Michael Painter's plan, the Tunnel Tops were simply outlined as greenspace, like someone had put lawn on top of them, but they weren't fully designed.

07-01:35:46

Moore: Fortunately, the [parkway], that concept design was approved, the money for the [parkway] was hard fought but that came. It was an over-a-billion-dollar project. The [parkway] construction got underway, and a little bit before all of that, the Trust and then eventually with the Conservancy and the Park Service involvement began to consider, "How do we really take advantage in the best way possible this parkway, now coming through the park, and took on the detailed design of the Tunnel Tops?" That vision just kept getting bigger and bigger because the initial budget was about $47 million, and eventually, we were clocking it at over $100 million as we added many components including the youth campus and other things that became part of the overall vision and design. That sets the stage, I guess.

07-01:36:46

Farrell: Yeah. I think that the initial goal, fund-raising goal was $51 million and that included the Presidio Visitor Center, which led to a gift from the Bechtels in about 2013. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about the budget and the different components and the fundraising, all the financial parts of fundraising?

07-01:37:12

Moore: Sure. We saw the parkway as like a comprehensive project, not just the Tunnel Tops, but the nearby areas adjacent to the Tunnel Tops. That's why the visitor center was in the mix because the Presidio at that point had no visitor center, and the building we determined would be the visitor center, we could get to that project early because it wasn't so much in the constructions zone of the parkway but adjacent to it. We raised about $3 million for that project pretty early on and got that [visitor center opened]. It's closed at the moment, but maybe that's mainly due to COVID. We then turned our attention to the rest of the money that needed to be raised based on a very preliminary [landscape] design that had been completed. That's when we were able to secure the [grant from the S.D. Bechtel, Jr. Foundation], which at the time was the largest cash gift in the history of the National Park Service, really an

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

incredibly generous and foresightful gift and much interaction with the Bechtel Foundation to get to that end result.

07-01:38:25
Farrell: You knew the people from Bechtel Foundation before that, right?

07-01:38:30
Moore: That's right. They had given to the Conservancy before including one of the overlooks at the Golden Gate Bridge that we built for the anniversary. I think that was a $2-million or $2.5-million gift. This [Tunnel Tops] gift was [about 10] times bigger than that one, it was a big jump, that's for sure.

07-01:38:53
Farrell: Yeah. How similar was your approach to putting together that proposal and doing the ask? How is it similar or different from your approach to the Haas Foundation with Crissy Field?

07-01:39:11
Moore: I think it was a very similar. Fundamentally, [engaging donors is about] collaboration for a larger vision. It involves finding out what the Foundation views as their values and outcomes that they wanted to achieve and what the Conservancy and the Park Service and the Presidio Trust role is and figuring out how those can be matched together. It turned out that the Bechtel Foundation had a number of grantmaking initiatives. One was about youth and [community] service; they had initiatives about environmental education. I think to some degree because the Bechtel Foundation is an outgrowth of the Bechtel Company, which is an [international] construction company, that for about a hundred years has been building things including the Hoover Dam, is they understood the construction world and what it meant to build something that needed to last and needed to look toward the future. All those components came together, and the Foundation was in a spend-down mode. They decided that rather than holding on to all their assets to live on forever, they were going to spend out their assets, and so they were looking for big grantmaking opportunities that had a long-term impact.

07-01:40:47
Farrell: Their priorities were aligned with your mission, they also understood the cost of construction, so all those things seemed like they aligned.

07-01:40:58
Moore: They did and even so, it was a very big gift that we were asking for really. Yeah, I think it ended up being maybe the biggest gift the Foundation made in that spend-down other than there was a Boy Scout camp back east that I think also got a similar-size gifts because Mr. Bechtel really believed in young people having all the opportunities for training and service and outdoor experiences.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:41:32
Farrell: Yeah, yeah, and then the planning between the Trust and the Conservancy began in 2014. We were talking a little while ago about people staying in their lanes and knowing who's responsible for what. What was the trust responsible for and what was the Conservancy responsible for?

07-01:41:51
Moore: Sure. We identified the Trust as the lead partner because they were the jurisdiction in charge of this project. It was on their property, they were leading the planning and design effort and the public approvals needed, and they would lead the construction effort as well. We did go back and forth about whether the Conservancy would lead the construction effort because we have done construction projects before, but the Trust—because they were so involved with restoring the [Presidio's buildings and] grounds—they had really good staff [experience and expertise in this area]. The Conservancy's role, I would say, was the community piece in a big way because I considered philanthropy [and public engagement] to be part of a community piece. People in the Bay Area almost entirely, within San Francisco to a larger extent felt, this project was merited and worthy of support. Their generosity had an impact that was beneficial to people throughout the Bay Area community.

07-01:43:00
Then, of course, the community engagement, the community input. We were very active in helping ensure that the planning effort went beyond the immediate Presidio neighbors and brought in input from community organizations through focus groups, through survey work, through workshops with design experts in child's play, design people involved from communities of color that had felt not included in parks and what their experiences were and what we could learn from their experiences and what their recommendations were. We really helped play a role in enriching the design process as much as possible to get to a positive end result. The Park Service was there, too, they managed the property next door to the Tunnel Tops at Crissy Field so we had to ensure that the design was compatible with Crissy Field, and they also had to ensure, that is the program providers with the Trust and the Conservancy and the Park Service, that we were all anticipating what the youth campus would be, what the visitor center would be, and the role each of us would play in these new park facilities.

07-01:44:17
Farrell: How supportive was the community of this project and the surrounding immediate community when you were in the public comment period?

07-01:44:31
Moore: I'd say, in general, really supportive. No one was terribly affectionate about the [old highway] viaduct and what it did for things. So much like [the restoration of] Crissy Field we started with [a somewhat derelict space] that didn't have a whole host of affection behind it. I think at that point, since the Presidio was well on its way as a national park, people had gotten comfortable

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

with the enhancements and enjoyed those enhancements, so I don't remember a lot of controversy with it. There was a design competition, there were different opinions about which submitted design was most suited, opinions about traffic and parking and overuse, things like that, but we made our way through all those.

07-01:45:28
Farrell: In terms of the design, I know you just said that there was a design competition and JCFO was eventually selected in 2014, what was it about them that made them stand out in terms of design?

07-01:45:49
Moore: It seemed to us that they spent the most time listening to the community because in the design competitions, things needed to be presented to the community and then with community feedback, the designs were revised. James Corner and his team really were good with the community and responsive to the community input. Secondly, their design was lovely—they believed that the majesty of the project was its setting, the views, the historic nature of the Presidio, and the design had to be of the caliber of the setting but not overshine the setting—that it had to amplify and illuminate the setting, the views, the history, the biodiversity. In their planting choices, in how they set up views, in the community spaces that they created, they really responded [to the place and to the community], and also with the aspirations of the youth campus, they were really responsive and attentive as well and knew what it was like to reinvent infrastructure. They went on from the High Line to a lot of other projects around the world where they were reinventing something that wasn't a park originally. Finally, their design cost estimate was the closest to the money that we were intending to raise. Some of the submitted designs in the competition were like $250 million, and I forget where theirs was, it was probably like maybe at $130 million or something, I don't know, they were all beyond our budget. But all those factors affected their selection. Oh, and I might say finally, that through the community review project, it was pretty clear that their project was the one that had the most support.

07-01:48:01
Farrell: Yeah, it sounds like, so they checked all the boxes in a comprehensive way including the very important one of the budget.

07-01:48:06
Moore: Yeah, yeah, right, yeah. [laughter]

07-01:48:10
Farrell: Yeah, I mean having won five times the amounts, odds are probably pretty low. Are you happy with the way that the design has been coming to fruition?

07-01:48:22
Moore: Yes, and I have recently experienced that two weeks ago, because I was toured on the Tunnel Tops, and the lawns are in place and much of the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

gardens are in place, the pathways, the benches. I'm really seeing the final result and it's really terrific, everything that we hoped it would be.

07-01:48:45
Farrell: I know that you went on to fundraise a little bit more. I think you raised about 118, is that right, for the project?

07-01:48:55
Moore: Let's see. Yeah, I think it was more about [$102 million in total], somewhere in there. Maybe that higher number is there because the Trust paid for some of the work as well. I think they've put in about $20 million.

07-01:49:13
Farrell: Oh, okay.

07-01:49:14
Moore: When you put the two together, it's probably around $125 million as a total project.

07-01:49:21
Farrell: Okay. Did some of that final fundraising, those efforts happen after the design was announced? I'm wondering about chronologically if you had planned on the fundraising being a long-term project or if there were different time periods where you were saying like, "Okay, we're going to resume fundraising now because we have the design in place"?

07-01:49:47
Moore: It had its own momentum in a way, but again, the clock is ticking, you need to get the money raised by the time—at least close to the time construction begins. I pretty much knew that once the design competition happened, that our original budget was going to not be adequate. You don't ask a bunch of landscape designers and architects to come in and deliver a dream project without having cost escalation. I didn't anticipate the cost escalation would be require us to virtually double our campaign goal so that was a bit of a jolt. The Bechtel Foundation grant level had been raised not just on the project budget and their capacity to give, but on the idea, because this is what worked for us before, that if we'd get just half of the project budget [in a lead gift], you're really set up to succeed. Our ask to the Bechtel Foundation was about half of the original $51 million goal, so [with the increased project budget of nearly $100 million], we now had a quarter of the project budget instead of half. It just required us to really expand our sense of the gift prospect list, who are the people that might be involved, and we had to move beyond people who had given to us before, people who believed in what we're doing and had confidence in us.

07-01:51:18

We had to put a whole campaign committee in place, which is a common approach, and meet regularly to get to the job done and that the campaign committee was just amazing. Between the initial co-chairs of Mark Buell and

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Lynne Benioff, and then Randi Fisher joining in as another co-chair, they were super experienced and committed, and the project spoke for itself in many ways. Yeah, maybe people had something philanthropically that they cared about more than building a new park, people have different things that they believe our society needs their funds for, but we made [the fundraising] fun, that's always important. We thanked our campaign volunteers a lot because of their hard work. I knew from Crissy Field and other projects that once the groundbreaking occurs, it builds a momentum. There are people, who when they see it's happening, don't want to be left behind in terms of being part of it and all that helped us hit our goal. The only thing that really that got in the way was COVID because we were considering an even more ambitious fundraising goal at the time, but when COVID hit, we did an assessment and decided we could get the job done with what we had and decided to call the campaign a success, having exceeded our goal.

07-01:53:00

Farrell: Aside from COVID being a bit of a bump on the road, were there any other challenges that you faced with this project?

07-01:53:08

Moore: Yeah, there was a huge and seemingly almost intractable challenge for a while, and that was the negotiations with Caltrans that the Trust had to undertake to deal with all the jurisdictional issues related to the Tunnel Tops, the transfers in jurisdiction, and the requirements of Caltrans to finish their obligations and their project and financial obligations. We had a difficult challenge with the State Historic Preservation Officer who believed that well, the [new] architecture designed in the Crissy Field area did not meet the state standards of [historic] compatibility. These [reviews and negotiations] are critical, and we had to make our way through these challenges, or the project could not go forward. I think, all in all, it took about two years of effort [with Caltrans and the State Historic Preservation Office]. It was really hard–and then it all worked out eventually.

07-01:54:29

Farrell: That two years is a long time. How did you stay motivated or keeping progress moving forward?

07-01:54:39

Moore: It's not that we weren't transparent that there were challenges that we were facing, but we had to keep moving ahead with our fundraising work. Even though there were challenges, in a every project, we had—Fort Baker had a lawsuit and the Presidio had its bumps in the road. We were fairly confident we would get there; we just knew it was going to be complicated and the Conservancy didn't really bear the primary burden of solving these issues. The Trust was the jurisdiction in charge, and they were the ones that had to find an answer that would be the best win-win they could get to. We offered our advocacy support and our networks and other things to try to get everybody on the same page, so we played a role but more of a behind-the-scenes role.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

07-01:55:39
Farrell: What are your most proud of now that it's almost open and almost done?

07-01:55:48
Moore: I'm proud of the whole thing, so there's my first answer. But I think having been on the site recently and having our youth leaders in the Crissy Field Center speaking to the partners and the Conservancy board, some of them who were there when Crissy Field Center first opened in that building and are back in it for the first time. Hearing them explain their life story and what it had been, hearing them talk about what the Tunnel Tops and the youth campus and the outpost play area and the art and science lab, and the expanded Crissy Field Center will bring to their own dreams and aspirations and those of the community, I have to say I'm proud of that. Yeah, proud of these young people for their vision and determination and convictions and care and for people. It's going to be amazing when that all opens, and I could just hear the kids laughing, see the families gathering, and imagine the next generation of youth leaders graduating.

07-01:57:14
Farrell: Lots to be proud of with that, yeah. I do want to ask you a couple of reflective questions for today while we're winding down. I'm thinking about how a lot of these programs have become models for other parks, other places, other countries, and what has that meant to be the leader of a place that is creating models that have been used widely?

07-01:57:47
Moore: I think for all of us involved at the Conservancy and the Park Service and the Trust, we believe in the mission and values and longevity of the work that we're doing. We're committed to doing that in the areas that we were responsible for [and we stay focused on achieving our own positive impacts]. If in the process we're helping other people with similar convictions find their way and be successful in a way that's bigger than they thought, it's such a rewarding and powerful thing to see that impact being shared and expanding. You see that the results you completed here go beyond our park's boundaries, and as I said, it's permeable, many people have gone beyond their park boundaries. For me, for the staff, and the board, and again of all the partners, it means a lot to think that we're not only helping this park but helping its cause, its purpose in the larger scale. For people that have followed the Conservancy and supported the Conservancy, as donors, it's meant a lot to them [to that work has meaning beyond our boundaries]. One of our key donors to One Tam wanted One Tam to succeed, but when this donor could see that the One Tam model was now a leader in the stewardship of California's large, natural landscapes, and even have gone national in its influence, this donor just has such a sense of their gift having an impact that was beyond what would've completely satisfied them. It was many times over in terms of what it accomplished. I think part of being an innovative organization, which the Conservancy is, is always pushing the envelope in terms of what you can get done and how you get it done and how you get to

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

success. Luckily, as a park in an urban area, we were given the license to experiment and to try new ways, and we had the necessity to experiment because our old ways weren't going to get the job done.

07-02:00:33
Farrell: Looking back at all the projects, the programs, the collaborations, what do you think that has added to the value or the quality of life in the Bay Area?

07-02:00:49
Moore: Wow. [laughter]

07-02:00:50
Farrell: That's a big one.

07-02:00:51
Moore: Yeah, well, when you look at the Bay Area as a whole, on a worldwide basis, there are few cities or urban areas that have been so attentive to protecting the natural qualities surrounding it. Whether it's [city parks], big park systems, or the Golden Gate National Parks, or everything that fills it in between, or the vast marine sanctuaries offshore, [millions of] acres of marine-protected landscape right next to us. We're very blessed to be part of that and to be the world exemplar in that area, in [that mix of nature, culture and community]. The work in the Golden Gate National Parks is part of that tapestry so that's part of its [magic and global impact]. I think secondarily as part of that tapestry, we have added to the sense of innovation, of community ownership. Through volunteerism and community stewardship and community science, and community youth leaders, we show that it's not just preserving these places, it's giving them meaning and value and advocacy and inclusiveness. It's not just the place, it's what you do with the place, how you leverage with it gives you in terms of a platform for public benefit.

07-02:02:27
Getting back to the question of the park's public benefit for the Bay Area, gosh, the beauty, the nature, the health of the community, the civic meaning, I don't know where to stop and start. The beauty of these parks is that for each person, it is something different. I go to Crissy Field, and I've seen weddings there, I've seen baptisms, I've seen funerals, I've seen marriage proposals. It's like all these beautiful moments have happened in our parks as well.

07-02:03:12
Farrell: I think that's a really fantastic place to leave it today and then we'll come back next time and talk more specifically about the staff, the board, your retirement, and some more reflections.

07-02:03:28
Moore: Okay, thank you so much.

07-02:03:29
Farrell: Thank you, thank you.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Interview 8: March 28, 2022

08:00:00:06
Farrell: Okay, this is Shanna Farrell back with Greg Moore on Monday, March 28, 2022. This is our eighth session for Greg's oral history, and we are again speaking over Zoom. Greg welcome back to our final session. Today, I wanted to talk a little bit about one of the key things that made the Conservancy, the park successful, and that has a lot to do with the people who were helping make it so. I think in a way that you had conceptually thought about this as the park DNA, which I really like that concept, so the people and the park connection. I know that there's many different areas that those people fit into and what they were responsible for, but I guess maybe we should start by talking about the beginning and the starting to vision and advocate for the Conservancy's creation in 1970. I'll let you take it from there.

08:00:01:14
Moore: Sure, thank you, good to be with you again. As we've talked about a number of times, the rallying cry for creating this national park, [the Golden Gate National Recreation Area], was "Parks to the People, Parks Where the People Are." If you look into all the eras of the Golden Gate National Parks and the Conservancy, it really was people who put wind in the sails of the park's momentum, of its evolution, and of its accomplishments and of its public benefits. The public advocated for the park before it was even established, and that advocacy made it a park. People planned the future of the park with National Park Service planners and participated in that process. People then stepped up and helped transform the park with many donors [and volunteers] coming in to make our collective dreams for Crissy Field and other places come true and enhance the park through donations to restore trails and rehabilitate buildings for visitor centers and care for the park through volunteers and their stewardship programs. Every single era has an engagement of people, and now the beauty of it all is people enjoy the park each and every day. The very park that people helped to create, transform, and care for is now a place that they can enjoy all of its public benefits as well. Without that DNA, the park would not be what it is, and the Conservancy would never have been established and would never have succeeded to the extent that it has.

08:00:02:48
Farrell: When you think back on when the Conservancy was created in the [early '80s], who were some of the people? I know we've talked about this a little bit in past sessions, but some of the people who were really—as you put it greatly—putting the wind in the sails of getting that effort off the ground, and what were they bringing to the table that helped make it a successful venture?

08:00:03:16
Moore: Yeah, there was this through line maybe that we didn't even see–that the very park that people have helped create now needed another way to keep people in touch with the park and involved. The early people thinking about creating a

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Conservancy, I was part of that group, the park superintendent Bill Whalen was part of that group, a wonderful colleague and friend of mine Judy Walsh who was a [National Park Service] staff member in the early days of the park was part of that group, and then the founding [Conservancy] board. The concept was really to keep people engaged, to serve them, but to ask them to get involved and engaged. That early group, especially Judy Walsh stepping in as a consultant and as the first Association Coordinator putting the [nonprofit] incorporation papers in place [for what was then named the Golden Gate National Parks Association]. I am often called the founder of the Conservancy but really there were cofounders, and Judy would be on that list. That's Judy Walsh, one of the cofounders of this effort to create a nonprofit partner to the national park site.

08:00:04:24
Farrell: I'm also thinking about how the various founders worked together and what made that dynamic particularly successful?

08:00:04:42
Moore: The dynamic that made us successful was to keep our vision big but to realize that you have to take initial steps to get there. There was a very open idea of what the Conservancy might be, and how it could achieve this connection with people, and what the ambitions could be, and the level of public engagement. But we have to begin with what we had, which were three bookshelves in Alcatraz, and Judy Walsh, as I mentioned, helped put those early steps in place and get that going. We started with a modest set of resources but with a big vision and fortunately again because people stepped up to help, to donate, to add their advice and talents, things we never dreamed of became possible.

08:00:05:37
Farrell: Another component to the long-term success of the Conservancy is the involvement of elected officials. I know we've talked a little bit about Nancy Pelosi, but I'm wondering, thinking about it in these terms, like the park of DNA, the park and the people connection, what was the value that elected officials had in making the Conservancy successful and also balancing in times when they were supportive and they were advocates or when they were maybe giving you some pushback?

08:00:06:19
Moore: Yeah, well the elected officials—especially the federal elected officials because it is federal property—the park would not have become what it has become without their engagement, without their support, without the dollars that they brought, and without the political capital they utilized to care and expand and grow this national park. At the beginning, it was Congressman Phil Burton who was the champion of creating the park, but his legacy with the park, after he passed away and then after Sala Burton passed away, was inherited by Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, and I just can't speak enough about her impact. It was so incredibly instrumental, particularly when the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

Presidio closure happened and she stepped up to advocate for the [creation of Presidio Trust through federal legislation], to get the Trust to happen, to provide a lot of federal funding that was needed in those early days, and to be a consistent champion for the Golden Gate National Parks along with her amazing chief of staff Judy Lemons who I got to know exceptionally well as an advisor and friend. Judy went through every chapter from Crissy Field to the Presidio to Fort Baker. Yeah, there is so much to be grateful for in the leadership from Congressman Pelosi, now House Speaker Pelosi, and her staff especially Judy Lemons, who had worked for Phil Burton when the park was actually created. Such amazing and profound admiration and gratitude to them. The accomplishments in this park are theirs in so many ways.

08:00:08:07
Farrell: How much did you rely on elected officials who were advocates like Nancy Pelosi to get their fellow congresspeople on board with certain things? I'm thinking about the congressperson from Ohio who is also a big advocate. This might feel like a statewide thing, but it is federal, so you have to get people from all over the country on board. the question would be, how much would you rely on them to help spread the word and get people on board?

08:00:08:38
Moore: Oh, tremendously. We had to help represent the park and the needs of the park, and I made many trips to Washington, DC to meet with congressional staff, but the entrée in the relationship with those other congressional leaders had to occur at the congresswoman's level. She was the one who introduced Congressman Regula to the parks, Congressman Murtha, and the entire Interior Appropriations Committee. That built not only bipartisan support for the [Presidio Trust] and for the parks but incredible amounts that federal dollars coming to the park, particularly to handle the military cleanup, to handle the infrastructure repair, and to put the parks in a position to succeed. The Conservancy always had to depend on a certain level of federal investment, we couldn't ask the public [or private donors] to step up to repair an electrical system or a sewer line, that really was a federal responsibility. Without the congresswoman and her staff getting those dollars in, our work wouldn't have had the foundation to build upon at the Presidio or at Fort Baker or elsewhere.

08:00:10:00
Farrell: Conversely, how much did you rely on them when there were congresspeople that weren't necessarily on board or behind what you were doing? How much did you rely on them to help?

08:00:10:12
Moore: Sure. Well, one example is—and then I think we've talked about a little bit—is that we consistently relied on them. For example, when members of Congress thought the Presidio was too expensive to be a national park and moved to deauthorize it, we relied on them to oppose that effort and to find a way to get Congress not to take that action by building advocates and making

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

the case that this was in the national interest to preserve the Presidio. Within the federal family—using that word—we definitely relied on our elected officials, and sometimes we relied on them to communicate with the executive branch, too, to make certain that at the Park Service and the Department of Interior, we were getting the support and help that we needed, and we felt that the park deserved.

08:00:11:06
Farrell: One thing I don't think I've asked you over the course of our time together has been about what it was like for you to visit Washington when you were there on these trips?

08:00:11:16
Moore: It was amazing. Really, I loved every minute of it. I felt so incredibly honored to be in the Capitol at times or in congressional offices or even testifying in congressional hearings. It was a privilege to be there, an honor to work with congressional staff, and to see their determination, their public service, their hard work, their perseverance. I think people don't really understand what a life of public service and sacrifice it is to be a congressional staff member or to be an elected official, just how all-consuming that work is. I enjoyed it a lot, the people, learning experience, and making the case for why these parks are important.

08:00:12:19
Farrell: Another component of this, as you mentioned, at the top was the donors, the people who were helping philanthropically for the Conservancy to function. I know that there have been some big supporters over the years like the Walter and Evelyn Haas, Jr. Fund with Ira Hirschfield's, and Jennie Watson being involved with Jane Rogers at the San Francisco Foundation, the Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund, the Bechtel Foundation. But, yeah, I'm wondering if there's more on that list. I'm happy to list them but if you want to highlight anyone individually or talk about the meaning that it had to you, to the Conservancy, to have all this philanthropic support?

08:00:13:14
Moore: Yeah, I begin with just commenting that for many people when they hear about philanthropy, they think it really is about securing funding, securing money for your dreams, but it's such a bigger thing than that because in my experience working with the donor community and particularly with the [philanthropic] foundations that you mentioned and others, they transformed your thinking, they transformed your vision, they allowed you to think in creative and new ways through their encouragement. That was part of a process that eventually led to funding. But the beginning of it was a process of dreaming with them, being inspired by them, and being motivated by them. Certainly, the leadership staff at the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund with Ira [Hirschfield] and Jennie [Watson] took us places, encouraged us to go places that were beyond what we could've imagined. The San Francisco Foundation with Jane Rogers supporting the Raptor Observatory and the Presidio Council,

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

another example of a transformative gift. The Bechtel Foundation with [Laurie Dachs and] their major gift not only the Tunnel Tops but to many projects before this. The Fisher family, with Bob and Randi, so many times stepping up to support our cause. Of course, the Goldsmith Foundation [and the Goldman Fund] at our side for many different eras and then all the [Conservancy] board giving that happened as well, so many donors, really thousands when you tally them up, and then also government grants such as the California Coastal Conservancy—all people of goodwill, big vision, and profound generosity.

08:00:14:56
Farrell: I think that's a great point that you're making about the transformative nature of these gifts, allowing you to change the vision and be creative and go beyond the scope of what you might have originally been thinking. Thinking about the Haas Jr. donation with Crissy Fields, that as an example of thinking creatively that was transformative, I'm wondering if there are other examples of transformative gifts—those moments where you've gotten those gifts and those have been pivotal, transformative moments for the Conservancy? I have another follow-up question after that, but I'll let you start there.

08:00:15:42
Moore: Sure. As another example, the Richard and Rhoda Goldman Fund set the foundation for the transformation of Lands End. Often, the initial gifts are a smaller investment that propel your thinking, that propel your planning, that allow you to think big. Then if you're able to do that successfully and then show compelling projects or programs, then fortunately in many cases, larger gifts come through to implement that permission to dream. Ira Hirschfield often said dream big and that's an honor and a privilege when you're encouraged to do that, particularly when it's dreaming big for the benefit of the public.

08:00:16:39
Farrell: After those transformative gifts came through and you're thinking bigger, did you ever feel any pressure to maintain those big visions, or could you balance those big goals with the smaller ones that you would need to keep the park functioning day to day?

08:00:17:01
Moore: Yeah, I often used to say to my staff, a park bench is as important as the Presidio itself, a volunteer is as important as a major donor, a native species is as important as visitor center—everything is in the ecosystem of the park, not just in a biological way, all those things are important. But the importance of donors is that they can give at whatever level they think is meaningful to them but will get a result that they think is good for the public, and to continue to provide the invitation to think boldly, to create a legacy. I never felt it was a burden [to fundraise]. I thought it was an honor, just an incredible honor that the Conservancy and our park partners, the Trust, and the Park Service were given this incredible opportunity to make this park what we believed it could

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

be. How many public causes get that level support? More should, right? But we just had an amazing group of human beings behind us.

08:00:18:29
Farrell: I'm thinking about this quantifiably, and I'm wondering if there's maybe a percentage or what the proportion of those dreaming-big projects there were compared with the park benches? Unless you were like, "Let's think about a park bench" and then trying to apply those same principles. [laughter]

08:00:18:48
Moore: Well, I haven't tallied this up, but I would guess that maybe 40 to 50 percent of our support to the parks was in major projects if you put everything [the Conservancy supported in] the Presidio or Fort Baker or Alcatraz, not just the capital work but all the programmatic work that happened. It was central, but the Conservancy again was fortunate to have an earned income base that supported our ongoing programs. Ten thousand volunteers a year is a lot of people and an amazing testimony of individual philanthropy in its own way, people giving of their time at that scale. In the midst of the bigger projects, we were able to sustain those ongoing operating programs of the Conservancy including the Crissy Field Center and site stewardship and many other things we've talked about.

08:00:19:52
Farrell: Another component to this is the partners that you were working with, and we've spent some time talking about that throughout the different sessions that we've had but working closely with the National Park Service, with the Presidio Trust. We'll talk more about those board chairs as well and we'll talk more about the board as we go as well, but I'm wondering if you could talk a little bit, maybe if there's anyone that you'd like to highlight that, that you don't feel you have sufficiently? Yeah, let's start there with if there's anyone from the partners that you'd like to talk about more?

08:00:20:34
Moore: Sure, as we've discussed, I mean the Conservancy's ability to be effective depends upon our relationship with our federal partners with the Park Service and [Presidio] Trust. They actually have jurisdiction over the land, and anything we do, we have to do with them and benefit from their advice and vision and support. On a Park Service side, there was the amazing initial park superintendent Bill Whalen who went on to be a National Park Service director and then came back to Golden Gate and helped propel the idea of the Conservancy forward. We've talked about Brian O'Neill and his incredible and transformative impact on the partnerships of the park. Frank Dean coming in after Brian continued that legacy and was an amazing superintendent as well as Chris Lehnertz and Laura Joss, the superintendents that followed Frank. Each one of them understood that Golden Gate was a park about partnerships, and that entailed a different type of leadership than maybe a more traditional or remote national park. At the Trust, of course, just amazing people starting with Craig Middleton who was the second CEO of the Presidio Trust and had

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

a long tenure [with amazing accomplishments in advanced the Trust and the transformation of the Presidio]. Michael Boland who had worked at the Conservancy [and really was a leader at the Trust in envisioning, designing and restoring the park qualities of the Presidio]. Jean Fraser who's there now [as CEO] and is working with the Conservancy on the Tunnel Tops project and has been instrumental there [and so fundamental to the vision and results of our partnership]. And then, there are the many board members of the Trust, some that I knew because they had been in the Conservancy board and some that I didn't know. But just incredible leadership from Toby Rosenblatt as the first chair [of the Trust] all the way up to Nancy Bechtle and Dave Grubb and John [Keker to Lynne Benioff]. All of them, just amazing, amazing people. Lynne Benioff currently is the board chair.

08:00:22:36
Farrell: Correct me if I'm wrong, but the sense that I'm getting is that the Conservancy was the glue perhaps that held the Presidio Trust and the National Park Service and Golden Gate together, is that right?

08:00:22:53
Moore: Yes, there is truth in that. Everyone is a bit of the "glue" in keeping relationships working. I've always suggested that because we didn't have the day-to-day operating responsibility for the land, the need to patrol it, the need to clean it up, and the maintenance, that [the Conservancy] had a role that was relationship driven. We wanted to get along with people who cared about the park, hear their advice, benefit from that they said they needed, and help implement what we all believe was valuable. We did feel the responsibility to be part of a glue and part of the team that put us all in a common path and took advantage of all of our talents and resources.

08:00:23:56
Farrell: It also is making me think that the Conservancy was in a position of being like the diplomatic entity there as well, and I'm thinking back to our first session when we talked about you as a middle child and being the mediator, right?

08:00:24:09
Moore: That's true, right, yeah. [laughter]

08:00:24:09
Farrell: I'm wondering when you look back and you think about balancing the concert of those partnerships and making sure things stayed in balance and people were on the same page and all working towards the same goal, what are the things that you're most proud of from being the diplomatic entity in that relationship realm of the partnerships?

08:00:24:40
Moore: At a more conceptual level, I'm most proud of the effort that we all put into our relationships, and the Park Service and the Trust because we all knew that collegiality and common vision go hand in hand. Sharing resources requires trust and sharing responsibility or even sharing power if you put it in that

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

terminology, but trust is the foundation of that. In every chapter whether it was One Tam or the Presidio closure or Crissy Field, that was just part of what had to be there–[the trust in one another, the trust among the partners, the trust with the community]. Personally, I believe that parks are places of joy, and the leaders of the park should, in their relationships with one another and their comportment with the community, exemplify that joy. We should be happy about the work we're doing. As my dad said when he toured the Golden Gate National Parks once, I was in the make-people-happy business. Yeah, it was work of course that had stressful components and at times had disagreement and at times had challenges and struggles, but by and large, it was work that was joyful, and that's what the parks are—they bring joy to people.

08:00:26:17
Farrell: How do you hope that moving forward, these partnerships continue to work together positively?

08:00:26:27
Moore: Yeah, I think going forward and in the same way that these partnerships have already proven, the benefit of working together. With each chapter, and it's happening now, each partner has to effectively define what their goals and objectives are and how they align with the Park Service, and Trust, and the Conservancy, what lane each entity is in in terms of the work they do because we want to leverage our talents, not be redundant of one another. It's important that we get lift from working together, not just stumbling all over one another because we're all trying to do the same thing, so that, that's a continued project and process, I think fundamentally, for these public places to be durable, to protect the land, to ensure that it's not someday eliminated as a national park or simply not cared for, it takes that people connection. People using and benefiting for the parks and having a role in their care are the best possible protection for these parks not just physically, but legislatively and from a policy perspective and a planning perspective.

08:00:27:57
Farrell: What advice would you have for the leaders of the Conservancy, the Presidio Trust, the National Park Service who will be working together in fifteen, twenty, thirty years?

08:00:28:11
Moore: My advice would be to keep the fundamental depth of the relationships between the partners and with the public intact, and to do it in a way that is not just transactional but more meaningful than that. In a manner that touches people's emotions and ambitions and visions, that is always appreciative of people's best efforts and generosity, and that acknowledges everyone as being central to what these parks are. It's sometimes a little too easy to get in a transactional mode where you are just thinking like, okay, I'll give you this money for that, but the more durable thing is the vision and the relationships that hold that vision together.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08:00:29:16
Farrell: Another big component of the success of the Conservancy is the staff, and we've talked about how the staff grew from three people to 450 at its largest. Who were some of the visionaries, the leaders, the experts who were shaping the Conservancy staff and really leading the charge?

08:00:29:41
Moore: Yeah. I'll just start by saying that every staff member was always critical, so I want to say that I deeply admired and appreciated each and every one of them from the person at the audio tour in Alcatraz to the youth leader at the Crissy Field Center. Yet there were people that helped lead the vision and set the stage for success. So much of our work was about transforming the park, and here my friend and colleague Mike Boland is just so exceptional as a designer, as a landscape architect, as a visionary who first worked at the Conservancy and now at the Trust, and the fundamental person guiding the implementation of the Presidio Tunnel Tops. Michael, in chapter after chapter, and then followed [at the Conservancy] by Cathie Barner as a projects director brought the highest design vision you could imagine to these amazing parks and really brought the public in, in all that effort.

08:00:30:46
On the care of the park side, Sue Gardner, who was our first director of park stewardship, and Sharon Farrell, our vice president of conservation projects, they just came up with this idea before it was common of public involvement in the science of the park, the restoration of the parks, the native plants of the parks, the ecosystem of the parks, and just grew this incredible following of community scientists from the Raptor Observatory to elsewhere and really were innovators through every single step, along with Allen Fish at the Raptor Observatory. In all of our youth programs with Arlene Rodriguez staffing the Crissy Field Center on to [Christy Rooca] who is still there taking of it, Ernesto [Pepito] who we've talked about as a youth leader, that whole set of leaders and visionaries in that end. We had great people leading our development [and fundraising] work, such as Dick Bunce with the Crissy Field [Campaign] and then Kathryn Morelli with the trails projects and more and eventually Traci Eckels with the Tunnel Tops. Really top-notch development people [who taught me so much and] who understood the value of relationships as well with our donor community and their generosity. Of course, people had to maintain the financial health of the Conservancy whether it was early on with [Charles Money and later] Keith Spindle as our CFO and deputy director or Nicolas Elsishans who is COO. Our visitor services, two really brilliant people, Robert Lieber and Nicki Phelps who developed all [fee-based programs and] the [parks products and] merchandise. [Nicki pioneered the Alcatraz audio tour, an award-winning tour and perhaps the most visited audio tour in the world.] Robert really brought the parks alive through [the quality of parks books and products and the retail "museum store" experience–also award-winning].

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08:00:32:41

Also, great people in communications, [public affairs], and strategy. Nancy Miljanich was at my side through many chapters starting with the Presidio Council, David Shaw as our communications director, and Vivien Kim Thorp who was my assistant of executive communications and just such talent there. [Carol Prince, as Deputy Director, was rock solid in her knowledge of the San Francisco community, her emotional intelligence, her work with the public, and her steadfast support in moving the Crissy Field restoration forward. Besides that, she brought an irreverent sense of humor to each challenge we faced. The Conservancy had impressive, charismatic, and fun executive vice presidents in Doug Overman and later Chris Spence, supporting Crissy Field, Fort Baker and our programs.] Our events staff initially lead by Cindy Morton and later by Gwen Sobolewski, was always believing that memories were important and memorable events is what cause memories—we always talked about how do you make a magic moment, how do you touch people's emotions. And then all the support staff, [Liz] Pittinos, who was my executive assistant, Nathan Bowers, and Nessa Ramos who's still there. Nessa, who entered the Conservancy at the Crissy Field Center as an Inspiring Young Emerging Leader, and eventually became my executive assistant in the executive office. Even with that long list, there are people that I've missed, so I would say that every Conservancy staff member inspired me with their dedication, their good humor, and their public service [–and collectively had such an astonishing and positive impact].

08:00:33:59

Farrell: What do you feel the value is of having people coming from so many perspectives, different age groups, different backgrounds, various education levels, or even our areas of study? All the various perspectives that were on your staff, what's the value of that did you find?

08:00:34:23

Moore: Well, it's incredible because if you think of the fundamental mission of our national parks that they're for all, that they're places for everyone, then the more your staff reflects the community that it's intending to serve, the more you have insights to how to be effective, to the community connections you need, and to the life experiences people are bringing as they consider visiting a national park or are visiting a national park. Yeah, the range of people is critical, critical to the mission of the organization. It also makes the conversations a lot more vigorous and vital, and it makes the job more creative and interesting.

08:00:35:17

Farrell: How would you describe your management style?

08:00:35:23

Moore: Boy, [laughter] let's see. I do have high standards, not to say that others don't as well, but I fundamentally believe that because national parks really were here for all time to be passed from one generation to the next, that the work

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

we did today, especially some of the physical transformations of the park, but also the programmatic work had to be [of the quality of our parklands and] lasting over generations. These are properties that were designated by Congress to be nationally significant to the entire American public. Now that's a high standard of designation, and the work we do, I believe, should meet that standard and symbolize the national significance of the resources that we were working with. Yeah, my management style is high standards, a desire for excellence in the work we do. I do believe in the creative challenge, so I try to instill my role as a leader with creativity and being open to ideas. I do believe in acknowledging staff work, bringing a joy to their life, respecting them, and making my gratitude and concern for them as clear as I can.

08:00:37:11
Farrell: When a conflict or somebody had a grievance, when issues like that would come up, how would you handle something like that?

08:00:37:24
Moore: Well, like most people involved in management or leading an organization, you learn things over time. There are things maybe you were new to at one point or not confident about or afraid of. You have to learn to deal with those realities. I did learn that conflict should be dealt with quickly and also, it's not always a bad thing. There are reasons that people disagree, and sometimes that disagreement can produce a better result. Yet, you don't want conflict to bring down the goodwill of the organization or the teamwork or to inhibit the success of the organization. It has to be appropriately acknowledged, managed, and moved beyond so that you're getting the work done that you need to do. I do believe that humor [and humility] have their place to soften some of rough edges when it's appropriate and to break down barriers.

08:00:38:44
Farrell: Were there any people or was there anyone that you looked to their management style that really influenced yours or you really learned from?

08:00:38:55
Moore: Yeah, all the time; gosh, it would be hard to point out everyone. But I would say, each of the board chairs of the Conservancy, in their own way, was such an incredible mentor for me because all of them had leadership experience, managerial experience, [and life experience]. I learned a lot about thinking strategically, about managing resources, about being a leader and the communication skills needed for that, so I would start there. And then of course—whether it was Brian O'Neill or Jean Fraser at the Trust or the leaders that I was alongside and the partner organization—I always learn things from in how they approached their roles. Often, staff feedback is important. I had times when people would pull me aside and say you're not living up to what you should be doing here, and that was hard, but I really thank God that people were willing to let me know when I was maybe letting them down in my leadership. It's just an ongoing education, right? It's the story of life, how

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

we get along with people that we care about, and what we do with that relationship.

08:00:40:27
Farrell: Is there any advice that you would give to someone, the director of the Conservancy who will be leading in fifteen, twenty, thirty years?

08:00:40:39
Moore: I say keep the vision high. I asked the Conservancy staff to step up a lot of times, one after the other, there was a big vision in front of us, and that's a huge request. I saw the capacity of people and even the desire of people to have a big challenge, to serve the public in a way that's visionary and big, and to fill in the pieces in terms of their skills and talents and time in getting there. I would say keep that vision big, motivate people with joy and appreciation, and let them understand the gifts they're giving to the community [and beyond] through their work.

08:00:41:35
Farrell: Another huge component to the Conservancy was the board, and we've talked a little bit about the board members specifically, but I'm thinking a little bit more broadly if you could talk a little bit about the role of the board that the role that the board played with the Conservancy, and maybe what that model of participation looked like?

08:00:42:03
Moore: Yeah, well, the board as the governing board, played a role that any board member plays in a nonprofit by governing the mission, the strategy, and the financial health of an organization, and in having the responsibility for working directly with the CEO. The magic of the Conservancy for me was, although it was clear what the board's prime responsibilities were and what the staff's responsibilities were and that line between governing and execution, we'd let that line wiggle. We recognized that some of our board members would have great ideas about execution, would bring creativity to the work that we did, would bring us to a place that we couldn't get without their talents. We stayed open to a level of board engagement that may not be common with nonprofits and actually empowered board members at times. For example, I think of board member Rich Silverstein who did all of our communications, [graphic design, and advertising] for so long—to do work that was almost what you might conventionally consider to be staff work. To set the brand for the organization, [to develop an iconic set of images to represent our parks], to set a public service campaign, to come up with the term *Post to Park* or *Help Grow Crissy* Field as rallying cries for the public.

08:00:43:35
I think the board loved the sense that we would ask them not just to apply their governance but to apply their fundamental talents to what the Conservancy's ambitions were, what opportunities and challenges we were facing. But each board chair seemed absolutely perfect for the time that they

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

were there whether it [was Virgil Caselli as the first board chair], Roy Eisenhardt and his strategic sense of the early time of the Conservancy or then Toby Rosenblatt and his amazing connections and instincts for the Presidio and more, or Charlene Harvey with her nonprofit governance and fundraising experience, Mark Buell who brought such experience with elected officials [and a wide array of community and civic connections at a time when the Presidio and Fort Baker so needed that leadership. And then, Colin Lind who brought such an entrepreneurial spirit, a great problem solver and strategic thinker, and with a deep sense of design quality and lasting impact]. Each one was perfect, each one was a joy to work with, [each one generous], and each one had a huge impact on the Conservancy's accomplishments.

08:00:44:35

Farrell: Yeah, one thing that really strikes me about the makeup or the DNA of the board is how different some of their perspectives are or where they're coming from, whether it's philanthropy or marketing or education. It's not a one-size-fits-all approach, its people who are really bringing things to the table, and I think help aid with that transformative nature of thinking. What benefits did that have to the model of participation that there were people from different perspectives coming to join the board?

08:00:45:11

Moore: Again, the same benefits I suppose as having a diverse staff. When I think of board members like Milton Chen, Dr. Milton Chen who brought this incredible knowledge about childhood learning and education and education in the outdoors, really a national expert in the field of education, helping shape our education and youth programs. I mean that is an incredible gift, not only how he suggested the work is done, but the inspiration and motivation he gave us in our work, by his engagement and encouragement. [At the same time, board member David Grubb brought the professional skills and mentoring for the Conservancy to have the confidence to manage the restoration of Crissy Field. And Bob and Randi Fisher, each board members at different eras, brought so much. Bob had great analytical skills and lead our strategic planning. And later, Randi brought her skills in collaboration, in breaking down silos, and in motivating collective impact as well as her astonishing success as a fundraising ambassador. Julie Parish with the continuity of her service and the insights, dedication, and fun she always provided.] So many board members stepped up in that way [including a wonderful succession of board co-chairs] with their talents–and even in my last chapter at the Conservancy, a long one with the board chair Colin Lind, Colin had an amazing gift for design excellence and what made a good project, and here we were at the Presidio just beginning to think about the Tunnel Tops. It was a big ambition and Colin was such an incredible advocate. There were many challenges in that project, and he always stepped up to help ensure that we were moving the ball forward. Again, just an amazing relationship with him and his impact in growing the board. Actually, my succession, how they set up the search committee and Colin, because he

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

had retired and had been part of a succession plan for his own work, so we understood that really well. He could bring that right to the table.

08:00:47:02

We could write chapters of a book on each of these board chairs or board members, but those are a few examples, and then of course the ones that really taught me financial management: Mark Perry as the board treasurer, what I learned from him [about financial management and leadership]—because the Conservancy was growing. We had financial resources that were beyond the scale we ever had imagined, and he just helped me understand it all, from how to prepare for an audit to how to ensure that the Conservancy was using its investments wisely and spending their resources properly and strategically. Yeah, one mentor after another, and of course mentoring me meant that they were growing the Conservancy, right? It's not that I'm the simple focus here, it's that their help to me really made the Conservancy what it is.

08:00:48:01

Farrell: Yeah, you just mentioned that the number of members grew over time, and I think at one point, it evolved to ninety-five people, is that right, on the board?

08:00:48:11

Moore: Well, the board never grew that large, but we were very open to keeping former board members as part of the family. If you publicly add all that up, the former board members are called board associates, that it probably does go up to a number like that. Board members used to joke that you can never leave the Conservancy, even if you leave your board term, you're still part of the family, and we loved having it that way.

08:00:48:41

Farrell: Was there a length that you set for board terms?

08:00:48:44

Moore: There was. Three three-year terms were the common length. There were times when we extended beyond that, particularly if a board chair was critical to providing continuity for something. For example, with Colin, his term was extended because of the succession in [my leadership of] the organization. It didn't make sense to change the board chair at the same time you were changing the CEO, so he generously agreed to serving in the organization [– and board members Lynn Wendell and Staci Slaughter were also fundamental to managing that transition]. They carried us through and that actually has been exceedingly generous because COVID really was a challenge for the Conservancy and Colin, [Lynn and Staci] working with [the new CEO] Chris Lehnertz took the organization through the effects of COVID on the Conservancy's well-being and guided it beautifully.

08:00:49:42

Farrell: In some of the background interviews that I had done with some board members, I had heard that the board was something you had to be invited to join, it wasn't something that you could basically solicit to join. How did you

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

go about selecting board members? Was there a criteria or did you look at what the needs were in that moment, or how did you go about conceptualizing who would join the board?

08:00:50:15
Moore: There were criteria, and we kept a matrix actually that showed the professional backgrounds and skills we wanted in the board that we felt were fundamental to our mission. Some were more general like finance or accounting, and some were more specific like Milton and his role in park education and youth education. So that was one part of our approach. Another sort was where board members were connected. The park is in three counties, it serves the entire Bay Area, so we looked at just geographically where people lived, who their networks were. At times, we looked for people that were familiar with the donor community and our work in philanthropy or who were familiar with the elected officials. Just the range of connections that we knew were important to the Conservancy and the park's well-being as well as just the diversity in terms of age and gender and race, just increasingly being attentive to ensuring that the Conservancy was representing the community it was intending to serve.

08:00:51:37
Farrell: I'd be curious to hear your perspective. I think a few people had mentioned that being on the board was one of the hottest tickets in town, like it was one of the most coveted board positions in San Francisco. I'm wondering what your thoughts are on that idea?

08:00:52:00
Moore: Well, that's a nice thing to hear. I do think what [the Conservancy] had to offer is what attracted anyone to the parks as a volunteer or as a donor or as a board member, or a staff member–just these incredibly magical, tangible landscapes. The ability to do work that you can enjoy yourself and see the public benefit that was there and then the camaraderie. We really believed once again that their board service should be fun. We're working for a park, let's let board members have a good time generously donating their time and talents. I think the [Conservancy and partner] staff were attentive to not only letting them feel our gratitude but to let them have fun along the way.

08:00:53:00
Farrell: How often were board meetings or are board meetings?

08:00:53:06
Moore: Generally, we had four board meetings a year. When the Conservancy was at its peak in board involvement, I think we had even nine or ten committees, so they meet four times a year. At one point, we added up, and we had somewhere between fifty and sixty official board committee meetings or board meetings. Often, there was an annual board retreat. Then the [annual] board dinner always happened in the December, which concluded the calendar year.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08:00:53:47
Farrell: Yes, which we will talk about in a few minutes. I'm wondering if there was ever a situation that you faced when there was somebody who wanted to be on the board, but they weren't a good fit—what those conversations would look like?

08:00:54:04
Moore: Yeah, sure. I mean it didn't happen a lot, but there were people that saw our board and wanted to be part of it, and we just had to be polite and direct. If they had a skill that we already had in the board, then we would say well we've got that base covered. If they were representing the community that we already have represented, we would let them know. It really was just being straightforward, being grateful for their interest, but being straightforward that now is not the time. Now, in some cases, we would put people on a list for future board service. Sometimes we would actually seek out a board member who would say I can't do it now or my plate is full, but come back to me in three years and let's talk then. We did keep an ongoing list of people who could be considered.

08:00:55:16
Farrell: I'm also curious about considering the differences or how the founding board compared to what the current board or current iterations of the board look like. How do they compare and did the role of the board change from the founding to the present?

08:00:55:34
Moore: Yeah, the founding board was there really to help the Conservancy in its initial operational mission as well as knowing that there would be future aspirations. But the initial operational work was around the interpretive stories in the park and in serving in visitor centers and creating merchandise and books and free publications that help tell the park story. That initial board included for example, Phelps Dewey, who was in charge of Chronicle Books, the publications work, Tom Frye who was the chief historian at the Oakland Museum, Virgil Caselli who was the general manger at Ghirardelli Square and that helped run the Save the Cable Car campaign. It had people that really were hitting what the Conservancy's needs were at the time. Then you see a change with Roy Eisenhardt. The time he came on the board, he was the president of the Oakland A's Baseball team, but he was an incredible attorney and a great strategic thinker and really wanted to take on a young organization, something that wasn't completely baked, to help guide it often in the quiet and behind-the-scenes way, to take steps that were building blocks to the future and not all of those steps were that visible publicly. But it was Roy who really saw the potential of the audio tour in Alcatraz, which when that came into being, transformed our economic foundation. That transformation made so much possible. It was Roy who saw the possibility of Crissy Field and jumped in with that vision. With each chair, they each came at, gosh, just the perfect moment. I don't know whether we figured that out in advance or

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

whether we were just lucky that people showed up who wanted to help, but everyone came at the right moment.

08:00:57:52
Farrell: Yeah, either way, it's pretty pivotal.

08:00:57:54
Moore: Yeah.

08:00:57:55
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. One thing I think we may have talked about this when we weren't recording, but something you referred to as the board superpowers. Can you tell me a little bit about how you view board superpowers and the role that that played in your strategic review around 2015?

08:00:58:16
Moore: It was an interesting thing to think about because the board, in thinking about our next chapter, was reflecting on—now that the Conservancy has been around for a while—what are the things that it is known for and how do those things to propel or have impact in our public benefits. A board member came up with the term superpowers, which was kind of a fun way to describe it. The first one was really—we mentioned glue earlier—our ability to be collaborative, to work in a partnership environment, and to have the emotional intelligence and the dedication and skills to build trusting relationships that were necessary for the Conservancy's success. So that was one.

08:00:59:18
The second one was just this focus in service—that we're there to serve the parks and to serve the public, and that is a north star for us to making certain that our work translates into things that are a benefit to our community, to our region, to our country. The third I've spoken to a little bit, just the sense of design quality and excellence that the programs we invent or implement, the projects we build, whether Ai Weiwei on Alcatraz or [restored parklands at] Lands' End, have the quality that reflects the national parks that they're in. Finally, just this constant press to think about whether there is a new way to do this, an innovation that's required, just an entrepreneurial spirit about how we do our work and not to get stuck in a certain way of looking at things, but to keep reinventing, the creative part of it. Again, just because, as I've said, we weren't operating the park in a day-to-day basis, we had time to be a little bit of a think tank [and action tank] for the parks and to consider how to do things in a more powerful way.

08-01:00:42
Farrell: Speaking of cultivating meaningful relationships with board members, one thing that I heard about over and over again were those annual dinners that happened in December. They were annual parties, I think that that's where the power of appreciation really shined, and there were skits that came along with those dinners each year. I'm wondering if you could tell me, well first, a little

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

bit about these skits and how you would think about them, but also how you conceived of including skits in those annual celebrations?

08-01:01:24

Moore: Well, I come from a family that was a little bit theatrical and not that we ever went on professionally to do anything with it, but we had a silly humor in my own family growing up and so maybe that was part of it. But I also have to credit Carol Prince who was deputy director of the Conservancy and someone I'm so indebted to. She came on to help get Crissy Field done but was so critical to all of our successes and a lot of the fun that we had. Because she had a tradition of doing a few board skits at Cal Academy, which is where she had worked before coming to the Conservancy, [Carol brought that experience to the Conservancy]. When Carol came and the two of us met, there was a certain inevitability that something I was up for due to my background and something that she had done before were going to find themselves and so we really became the cocreator of this idea.

08-01:02:25

As you said, it was simply, you know what, a way to show our appreciation to our board members and our partners. To show it in a way that was fun and slightly irreverent, to show it in a way that was humble because we all tried to use our limited musical and theatrical talents in ways that would never land us at the Academy Awards Oscar's [laughs] ceremony. It showed a certain vulnerability, and board members got so excited that eventually, they were invited to be singers or actors in the skit itself. It started as something we thought maybe we just do once and then, yeah, it went on from there.

08-01:03:19

Farrell: For those who have never had the opportunity to be at a skit, how would you describe the skits?

08-01:03:27

Moore: Well, generally, we would find a theme, and actually one of the prime themes of the skit was to celebrate board members who were leaving the board. Because at each [annual] board meeting, some trustees would be "terming off" the board so often, the skits were built around the board members who were leaving the board, celebrating what they've done for the Conservancy. They were usually themed around something. Like we did one skit that was themed around *The Wizard of Oz* except instead of being OZ it was A-W-E-S like on the awe that you get when you're in the park [and see its beauty]. For the most part, that skit celebrated the Crissy Field [restoration] project with the wicked witch that was all the struggles in getting Crissy Field done, and the good witch, and of course Dorothy, but reinvented as [our Board Chair] taking us down not the yellow brick road, but the Golden Gate Promenade of Crissy Field and then all the music that came with it. We usually had anywhere from four to six songs that we performed with our own voices and with musical accompaniment. I would rewrite all the—well others and I would rewrite all

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

the lyrics of those original songs to be appropriate to the [Conservancy story being highlighted].

08-01:04:55
Farrell: Who would you cowrite those lyrics with?

08-01:05:00
Moore: At the beginning, Carol Prince and I would struggle, co-author, or fight about what those lyrics should be, and then when Liz Pittinos joined our team, she [was] really great at this, too. We had the team of the three of us working on that and working on the fundamental script for the play because you had to create lines for the people acting in the skit.

08-01:05:36
Farrell: How long would it take you to write the play and the lyrics?

08-01:05:42
Moore: Yeah, I was pretty careful to do it in weekends because I didn't want it to get in the way of my day-to-day job, but, boy, I've never added it up. Actually, most of it came pretty quickly to me, not that it didn't take a lot of time for people to get it finalized, but the fundamental themes came really fairly quickly, the plot came quickly, and I think because I played piano that the writing the lyrics came quicker to me than maybe some people would. Carol was a creative genius as well and Liz Pittinos, so we had a good team.

08-01:06:26
Farrell: I guess maybe a better way to think about this is at what point in the year did you start thinking and working with the team to write the plays? Did that happen in October or November?

08-01:06:38
Moore: I'd usually wait generally wait for the fall board meeting to be done so that we had that behind us. Maybe I would be thinking about it a little bit ahead of time just so I wasn't flatfooted once we had to create the performance. But it had come together really quickly, and we would practice afterhours and do the other things required to get ourselves ready for it all.

08-01:07:04
Farrell: You would play the piano, right?

08-01:07:08
Moore: Actually, there was someone at the Conservancy who was a much better pianist than I was, so I turned to her for that. At home I would play the piano just to make certain that the lyrics and the music were matching up.

08-01:07:24
Farrell: Okay, so did you have a role in the performances?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:07:28
Moore: I did, it varied. I think my most common role was as almost like the moderator or narrator, the person that carried it from one act to the next if there was more than one act or that set the stage at the beginning and wrapped it up at the end. I never had a singing role because [laughter] God, I couldn't do singing—I just couldn't do it. There were others, I mean some really gifted vocalists in the Conservancy staff, so we let them shine.

08-01:08:04
Farrell: How many people from the Conservancy staff would perform in the plays? I'm sure it varied.

08-01:08:13
Moore: Yeah, it varied. Usually, we had three board members leaving and so if we were celebrating those three board members, that would be three. I would say in general it was about up to ten people.

08-01:08:30
Farrell: Okay, okay.

08-01:08:32
Moore: We had board members who were incredibly talented too, and they jumped in. If people were game for it, because it took a certain type of personality to want to do something like this, we welcomed them into the cast.

08-01:08:44
Farrell: Sure.

08-01:08:45
Moore: Yeah, we rely on them for their ability to be a ham or to laugh it up or to be silly in front of people.

08-01:08:55
Farrell: Yeah, and did you ever have a favorite theme of the year?

08-01:09:03
Moore: I don't think so. For example, in the year when we talked about the Conservancy superpowers, in that year, we did a play based on superheroes that represented our superpowers. We would look at what had happened over the last year and try to be current to that cause. When Mark Buell left the board as our board chairman, he was an admirer of Frank Sinatra's music. Frank Sinatra was known as the "Chairman of the Board" with the Rat Pack, so we used that as the theme and every piece of music was a repurposed Frank song [with the Chairman of the Board as the Park Pack]. Yeah, we just did whatever seemed to fit the time and place.

08-01:09:55
Farrell: Yeah, oh, that sounds really fun.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:09:58
Moore: Oh, for the Presidio, when it was closed and we were facing it, we did not the *Age of Aquarius* but "This is the Dawning of the Age of Presidio." That was based on the play *Hair*, which we renamed "Chair" after our board chair, and then every song was a repurposed song from that play.

08-01:10:26
Farrell: Oh, that sounds really fun and very appropriate.

08-01:10:29
Moore: Yeah. [laughter]

08-01:10:32
Farrell: On a little bit more of a serious or a sentimental note, I've heard a lot about the letters that you wrote to board members over the years, and a lot of them—well everyone that I spoke to—have kept every single letter. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about what those letters are and what made you want to start writing those letters? In some of the conversations I had with past or current board members, they would refer to the letters but not really go into too much detail about what they were about.

08-01:11:10
Moore: First of all, my mother was [a mentor here]—well, thank-you letters were part of my life as growing up. That was just something that you did and something you did because you should be grateful, and you should let people know when you're grateful, so I had an amazing role model growing up. But I remember thinking at the Conservancy when I saw the hours board members were putting in, and of course we would thank them verbally, but I would look at the time and effort and dedication and goodwill that they would devote. I just said, at least once a year, I should be thoughtful about what they've done and thank them in a way that's more than, hey, thanks for showing up at the meeting, thank them in a way that was thoughtful about their impact on me and the Conservancy and the parks. That's where it began; I'm thinking it was a really small measure of thanks for all that they had done.

08-01:12:24
The reception for the first set of letters was very positive and so I continued it. What I didn't realize is what it would when it kind of went to scale with more board members to thank. Like at the time I started it, maybe there eight board members, and by the time I was continuing it, there were twenty-five, and the stories and reflections were more elaborate because so much more was being done. There was so much more to celebrate, so much more to be generous for, and I wanted the letters not only to be meaningful and thankful but funny. They were a mix of things.

08-01:13:07
Farrell: Yeah, I was wondering about the scale when you started versus as the board would grow, it's time-consuming but also, who doesn't appreciate a thank-you note?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:13:19
Moore: Yeah, these grew to be—some of them five-to-eight-pages long because there was a lot, and I would get carried away in whatever course I was taking.

08-01:13:32
Farrell: Would you hand-write them or type them?

08-01:13:34
Moore: Initially, I did hand-write them and then it just got to a point where it was just impossible, I could not do it.

08-01:13:41
Farrell: Yeah, did anyone ever write you a thank-you letter back?

08-01:13:46
Moore: Yes, yes, they did, they did.

08-01:13:48
Farrell: What did that mean to you to receive one of these letters?

08-01:13:54
Moore: Well, it meant a lot. I did put a lot of thought and effort into the letters as I wrote and to know that it's having an impact. People would of course comment on them, so I knew the fact that sometimes people would write back, that was great. For one of my farewell events for my time as CEO, the board members gathered, and each of them read from one of my letters. It was really amazing [and very emotional for me]. They each brought their letters from me, and they each found a piece that they were going to read that in some ways signified their time at the Conservancy and their relationship with me.

08-01:14:41
Farrell: Yeah, that sounds really special.

08-01:14:44
Moore: It really was, completely unexpected.

08-01:14:47
Farrell: Yeah. We'll talk about your retirement in a few minutes, but before we get there, and this is perhaps a good sort of segue, is I know that you have been involved in in board work outside of the Conservancy. You've been on the flip side of things as a board member including with the Conference of National Parks Cooperating Associations, the board and president; the Public Lands Alliance from 1995 to 1998; the Conservation Lands Foundation from 2007, and you're still on that board; the National Park Service Friends' Alliance for about nine years from 2010 to 2019; and then the Irvine Ranch Conservancy from 2010 to 2018. I'm wondering considering how busy you were with your job and also with your family, what the impetus was for you to do outside board work?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:15:50
Moore: Sure. Well, in a few cases, such as the Conference of National Park Cooperating Associations and the Friends' Alliance, it really was so directly related to my job as CEO of the Conservancy and so much about working with our partners at the Park Service on a national level that it helped the Conservancy impact National Park Service policy and planning in a way that is beneficial to our work and then helped grow the friends groups around the National Park Service that now a large number but another motivation for me—

[break in audio]

08-01:16:40
Moore: —was to better understand the people that were serving the Conservancy [board] by serving in a [similar voluntary] leadership role. I was chair of the board of the Conference of National Park Cooperating Associations and vice chair of the Friends' Alliance. When I was chair of the conference, there were two changes in executive directors. I learned what it was like as a board chair to have to find and launch a search process and find and hire a new person to lead an organization. Some of them were like the Irvine Ranch Conservancy, I went to high school in Orange County, and they heard about me and took me back to places that I grew up with in high school and had me instead of working at Disneyland, which I did in high school, I was now not working at a theme park but public parks, so that was good change for me. The Conservation Lands Foundation—I love my board work with that organization because it's building and extending the concept of public lands and relying on grassroots environmental advocacy as a way of making a difference. Friends groups in essence, which of course that's been my life at the Conservancy.

08-01:18:04
Farrell: With your board work, were there things that you learned from that perspective as a board member that you took with you to the Conservancy?

08-01:18:24
Moore: Yeah, absolutely, because it is about operating at the governing side of the equation, approving budgets, and setting the strategic direction. It's hard for me to be specific as much as to say that when you sit in a chair that someone else is sitting in, in my case now being a board member, that helps you better understand and appreciate the board member role and where they were coming from. That gave me more emotional intelligence and empathy, whatever that word is, for the work that they do and more appreciation. Because in some of those cases, I was serving as a volunteer, so this was time I was dedicating outside of my job to do this work.

08-01:19:27
Farrell: You're also a member of the—is it Friends of the High Line?

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:19:31
Moore: It's the High Line Network.

08-01:19:33
Farrell: High Line Network, okay. For those who are unfamiliar the High Line is a public park in New York City where on the West Side. It was an old, elevated train track and it was not in use for a while. It became a public park where people can walk right along—it's elevated, so it's high, so you can walk right along that line, that subway line. It's a really interesting mixture of places where you can sit. There's native grasses that are growing, you can see in the people's apartments which is always really interesting. It's a beautiful view, there are different events that happen along the High Line as well. I'm wondering what made you—since you live on the opposite coast—what made you want to become a member of the High Line Network?

08-01:20:43
Moore: The High Line Network was formed with the idea that parks in cities can be created from infrastructure that's repurposed. In the case with the High Line, a park was created from a former elevated railroad line that had been abandoned. The [High Line Network] came to the Conservancy because we had reinvented military bases, right, we had invented an old prison, and the Tunnel Tops was a reinvention of a highway project. They saw in our work a kindred spirit and wanted to create a network of public parks, mainly in cities around the country, that were taking advantage of old infrastructure that had run its course and could now be reinvented as public parkland. [Or in some cases, how new infrastructure could incorporate public places.] It's a very creative group because these projects are this reinvention idea. Many of them are big ideas around Atlanta, the entire belt line, the railroad line that circled Atlanta and converting it to a pedestrian and biking and a park destination around the entire city. It's a very fun purpose, a dynamic organization, really contemporary, and Chris Lehnertz now—as CEO—has joined that network to continue the Conservancy's involvement.

08-01:22:11
Farrell: I'm also wondering if you would like to mention any of the awards that you've receive throughout your career and what those awards, that recognition has meant to you?

08-01:22:26
Moore: I think with awards, there are maybe a few things. They provide a window into an organization's accomplishments, so that the awards can help bring visibility to an organization's work. An award could have the effect of helping you be more effective in the future because people can see that you've done something well, you've done something that's been recognized, and therefore they could be confident in helping you in whatever way they can or more confident. I do believe that anyone in public service work, whether it's the Conservancy or someone else that gets an award, should be recognized for work that is either a model for others or having strong public impact or the

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

result of rising to a challenge that that's worthy of it. The Conservancy awards, they're probably up to 100 during my time. They were really so all over the place. We won an award for the Alcatraz audio tour. We won awards for many of our publications. We won design awards, and we won awards that recognized our combination of economy, environment, and history. Some were local, like the San Francisco Beautiful [award], some were statewide like the Governor's Award for Environment and Tourism, and some were national. For individual staff members, that worked really hard on something like the audio tour, it was such a ratification of their hard work and gratitude for what they had done.

08-01:24:31
Farrell: Thank you for highlighting those. I knew there were too many to list.

08-01:24:34
Moore: Yeah. [laughter] There are, there are too many. One of the little ones that really made a difference to me, it was quite a while ago now, the San Francisco Foundation gave us their annual award for the organization doing the most for the betterment of the San Francisco Bay Area. That was really a wonderful surprise to be awarded for that range and scale of impact.

08-01:25:01
Farrell: Yeah, especially the ones where you're not submitting yourself as a nominee, right?

08-01:25:05
Moore: Exactly, yeah, yeah, and the SPUR award was a complete surprise to me. Someone had arranged a call with me, and I had a completely different idea of what it was about, only to hear that I had received the SPUR award. Those surprises are especially meaningful.

08-01:25:28
Farrell: Yeah, yeah. You retired in May 2019 and I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about your decision to retire at that point?

08-01:25:41
Moore: These decisions in some ways are—well, they're not easy, at least it wasn't for me because every chapter of the Conservancy had been so meaningful to me and I love my job. It was hard for me to imagine what life would be without the results and the friendships that I had at the Conservancy. I wanted to make certain that I didn't leave at a time that was in some way disadvantageous for the organization. I have been thinking about it, but I wanted to make certain that the Tunnel Tops was well taken care of before I left, and the way the transition plan worked, I was able to do that fortunately. As I said, I joined the Conservancy thinking that I would be there three to five years, and I was there thirty-five years, so the numbers were right, just in a different sequence.

08-01:26:39
Farrell: Well, that's true.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:26:40
Moore: Yeah, it was time for me and for the Conservancy. I'm still deeply attached to the people in the organization.

08-01:26:57
Farrell: Did you have an exit strategy? I think you just mentioned the transition plan, but I'm wondering if when you started to think about your exit and how that would work?

08-01:27:13
Moore: The one thing I wanted to do, if I could, is give the board really plenty of notice considering how long I had been there and to make certain that the organization was stable. I mentioned earlier Colin Lind stayed on [as board chair] longer to help ensure that when I left, that there was continuity in the leadership that Colin as board chair was really generous on his part and so fundamental for the transition to be effective. Staci Slaughter agreed to be chair of the Search Committee for the new CEO. I gave the board at least a year and also said look, if it takes longer, don't panic, I will stay, and within reason, I will stay until you find a person that you think is best. I said, "I will also stay if you think it's helpful in a transitional period whether you need me to continue raising money for the Tunnel Tops or to orient the CEO," and the board decided, with the new CEO, to take advantage of that offer in my part.

08-01:28:26
Farrell: What were you looking for in a successor?

08-01:28:32
Moore: I would say a fundamental piece is someone who would be comfortable working in partnership environment. It's not meant for everyone, and I can understand why it isn't. Some people like being a CEO when their world is mainly their own to make the decisions and to execute a mission; where at the Conservancy, it's just not that straightforward. You rely at the minimum on two key partners in order to be effective. When you pull it altogether in terms of donors and volunteers and board members, you rely on a lot of, a lot of people to be effective. You need a leader with the leadership style and the emotional intelligence and the personal capabilities to engage with people and to be effective with people whether it's the ability to give a presentation in front of a group and be inspiring or be very quiet at a meeting because you want your partners to say what they're thinking, and you need to be quiet to listen to what someone else has to say. That was fundamental. Of course, we wanted someone who could imagine having a passion for the work of the Conservancy either because they've done that work before or they've done other work that was similar. People who could manage a complex organization because the Conservancy was large and many divisions and moving parts. It's the leadership style, the passion about the mission, and the ability to manage probably were the three [main factors]. Now, I'm speaking for [myself, not for] the search committee who had to decide what they were looking for, and characteristics they thought were essential.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:30:36
Farrell: That's okay. I was interested in your perspective so that it doesn't feel like you're speaking for them. I'm wondering if you could tell me a little bit about your retirement party?

08-01:30:48
Moore: The people that I worked with were incredibly lavish and robust in all the different things that they did for me. It seemed like a year-long party. There were small events and big events and things in between, but I was definitely celebrated and surprised at many different occasions, and some things I did came back to me. The organization at my final board meeting did a board skit for me. It happened without me knowing it was being planned. The skit was completely developed and written by staff and board members and performed by staff and board members. So I, at this point, was in the audience watching the skit instead of on the stage.

08-01:31:47
Farrell: What was that like for you to be in the audience?

08-01:31:49
Moore: It was incredible. [The skit was] a brilliant concept and beautifully performed with music that was hilarious and humor that was over the top, and even staff members that were so exceptional in their costuming that I couldn't even figure out who they were. They really pulled out all the stops. Because I had worked at Disneyland, I would joke about Disneyland being my first park experience because it was a theme park. The skit took me in a Disneyland jungle cruise, so, yeah, it was amazing.

08-01:32:36
Farrell: That's funny to see that what we talked about with the skits kind of turned around for you.

08-01:32:41
Moore: Yeah, working at Disneyland, I did really learn customer service. They would call it the guest experience and that turned out to be relevant to my job, and we ended up hiring the Disney corporation or their consulting group on a number of times to help us plan and guide our guest experience and visitor capacity questions. It's funny how things you do as a teenager come back that are relevant to your adulthood.

08-01:33:12
Farrell: Yeah, that's very true, that's very true. I know that you've done some post-Conservancy consulting work. You were a special advisor, I think you had mentioned that with the transition from June to December of 2020, and you've been doing some other consulting since. What has it been like for you to continue working in this capacity?

08-01:33:45
Moore: It's wonderful. I knew even if I left the Conservancy and my role there, that my passion for parks and what they bring to people would still be with me. I

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

believed that my experience could be relevant to others, particularly to people that were starting up in the field or at an early stage with an organization that they were hoping would grow and prosper. My client base includes a fun group of organizations like the Appalachian Trail Conservancy, or the British Columbia Parks Foundation, [the National Park Foundation], or the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy that works on national parks ranging from Patagonia, Chile, to China to Canada to Romania. Those are different park case studies that I'm working on now as part of that work, so it keeps me in a field that I love in a different way. Of course, being a consultant is different than leading an organization and serving in that way.

08-01:34:51

Farrell: Yeah, I was just thinking about how in the early in someone's career consulting can be such a hustle where you have to constantly be chasing projects and work, but I'm wondering how much of your consulting work has come to you naturally since you were the CEO for thirty-five years?

08-01:35:10

Moore: It came to me naturally because often at the Conservancy, I would get calls for help [and advice in the parks and conservation world], and to the extent that I had time to help people, I would. But there was a limit really in how much I could settle into supporting someone else's opportunities and challenges. Some of these are people that I got to know during my time at the Parks Conservancy and then followed on from there.

08-01:35:41

Farrell: I want to ask you a few reflective questions, but before I start that, is there anything that you feel like you want to add that we haven't talked about?

08-01:35:55

Moore: Since we concluded talking about my final chapter at the Conservancy, and my transition out, I really would like to thank everybody who was at my side running up to that chapter and end of that chapter. Especially the board members who I mentioned like Colin Lind who was just the most amazing board chair anybody could ever have, and Staci Slaughter who led the search effort, and Lynn Wendell the vice chair of the board, and Randi Fisher. That team was such an amazing, amazing group of people who carried on, who give the Conservancy continuity in my departure. I'm grateful for their willingness to provide that continuity and their wisdom. And then of course, all the [Conservancy and partner staff members] that were at my side [during my concluding years as CEO]. I couldn't have had a better last chapter. The Tunnel Tops was such an amazing vision to raise the funds to implement–and to beat our campaign goal and now to see these parklands being built and anticipating its grand opening within a few months, it's just incredible and so fulfilling Just to round up with my heartfelt gratitude to all the people in that vital chapter and for their support and camaraderie and inspiration.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:37:27
Farrell: Yeah, it takes a village.

08-01:37:31
Moore: Yeah.

08-01:37:33
Farrell: What did it mean to you to be the CEO of the National Parks Conservancy for thirty-five years, to have such a long career with the organization?

08-01:37:47
Moore: The fact that I stayed there that long means that I found my work amazingly fulfilling, amazingly ever- learning, and super fun. How many people can say that about a thirty-five year career? Actually, even more years when you think of how long I've worked with national parks first as a National Park Service employee for ten years. I just was so blessed that I had that long a run, that I enjoyed it that much, that I saw the public impact right in front of my eyes and could celebrate it with others. It's just a privilege and an honor to have lived a professional life that was so meaningful to me and where people were so generous and supportive. It builds your faith in the world in a way, it certainly built mine. There are so many challenges the world is facing, so it's great to see that some of those challenges are addressed and good things happen.

08-01:39:12
Farrell: What did it mean to you to have a wife who was so supportive but also someone who you could talk to about your work, who could relate to what you were doing?

08-01:39:24
Moore: God, that meant everything too. With the amount of passion, energy, and time I was putting into my job, it was a special gift that Nancy understood what it meant to me, but in addition was never envious of the time it took, and understood that it took time and commitment, and supported me when things were going well and helped me when things weren't. She gave me confidence when I needed it and helped pick me up off the floor when I felt I had something that I didn't know what to do with or when I felt insufficient as a leader. I mean people forget that the leaders are human beings, and we have our own struggles with confidence and whether we're doing the job well and whether we're meant to do the job we're doing and whether we're even succeeding at it in some way, and Nancy was always at my side. Actually, she was the one who gave me the courage to leave my federal job and said you need to try something different; you have enough creative potential that you should be in an environment the pulls on your creative abilities. She is the one who said, "Go do it," and who knows what I would've done if she was saying, "No, why don't you stick with the Park Service? That's a steady career, it's a good job, good retirement program." But no, she didn't.

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

08-01:41:04
Farrell: Also, somebody who like philanthropic donors, right, who are giving you the opportunity to pursue your interest and dream big and be creative and not just think about okay, well, what's stable but something that will fulfill you?

08-01:41:18
Moore: Exactly, and in Nancy's case because her career was early on a conservation career for the first ten years of her life and because she ended up in a nonprofit career. She could speak from a position of expertise as well and looking at things I was facing and what I should do and could be a confidential and not just a supporter emotionally but an advisor intellectually and practically about how to proceed and how to get things done.

08-01:41:52
Farrell: It's all very important. I'm also wondering what it meant to you to build such a myriad of successful partnerships and collaborations with all the various people that you've worked with throughout your career?

08-01:42:08
Moore: Well, it meant everything. There is nothing like having groups of people that believe in what you're doing, that have the same vision and ambitions, and that work effectively as a team to get it done. I think doing public-benefit work, it would be lonely to do on your own, and I'm not even sure you could be successful doing it on your own. The point of public service and public-benefit work is to continue to build groups of people who believe in public service and believe in making the world better in whatever way they can. Those partnerships were just so reinforcing, so much fun, so inspirational, calming when they needed to be, and exhilarating when they needed to be.

08-01:43:23
Farrell: How do you hope your work inspires future generations?

08-01:43:33
Moore: I hope that it inspires people to see that if they believe in making the world better—of course that has many, many ways you could define that or do that and different scales and different areas—that they can make a difference, that the difference will transcend them. That they will be most successful if they're engaging others to be part of their efforts or they're joining others who were in those efforts already. That working together is what makes big things get done and what makes values and principles and aspirations durable, that working alone can't accomplish. There is a proverb: If you want to go quickly, go alone. If you want to go far, go with others.

08-01:44:48
Farrell: Looking back, what are some of the things that you're most proud over your life, your career, however you want to take it?

08-01:45:02
Moore: I would say in the biggest-picture way, I'm proud of the partnerships, the collaboration, and the goodwill that resulted in the Conservancy being able to

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

fulfill its mission and to accomplishes its goals. I think that principle translates to whatever endeavor some of us are pursuing. In my case, it's parks, but there are many other important public objectives and passions that have people working on them. In terms of the specific work, it's hard not to have a very special affection for [the restoration of] Crissy Field because it was so catalytic in terms of the scale of ambitions and the scope of change and the introduction of youth programs and stewardship and all things it brought with it that were called upon for future successes like the Tunnel Tops and Lands End and others. I do have a very special affection for that phase of the Conservancy's growth and that particular accomplishment.

08-01:46:21

What I would say, the other thing I've always been really proud of is our youth programs because it's really building that next generation of leaders, the person that may one day be running the Parks Conservancy or in charge of this national park or maybe director of our National Park System. I'd love to see that one of our youths ends up in any of those positions, and I know they will.

08-01:46:50

Farrell: It's entirely possible. That's actually a good lead-in to my final question for you, which is what are your hopes for the future of the National Parks Conservancy and Parks for All?

08-01:47:07

Moore: Well, my hopes are where the Conservancy is directing itself now. [During my long chapters, there was] a lot of my work dedicated to the transformation and enhancement of the national parks and the conservation of their resources and getting [these national parklands] up to a certain standard of care, [public enjoyment], and stewardship and quality. [This was central to the Conservancy's mission of "Parks For All Forever."] Of course, it involved people and programs for people, but now the Conservancy is focusing the majority of its attention on the "for all" part of the mission. A lot of my attention was on the "parks" part. Of course, I was also working on the for all and forever, but now the Conservancy I will be deeply focusing with for-all part, being attentive to parks and being attentive to forever and really taking advantage of these amazing platforms for public service and the public benefit or the Tunnel Tops or Crissy Field or Alcatraz, you name it, and really stepping into that for-all mission in a bigger and bolder way.

08-01:48:16

Farrell: Is there anything else you want to add before we wrap up?

08-01:48:21

Moore: Yes, I want to add my gratitude to you. You have been the most exceptional interviewer, so attuned to my history, so informed about it, so amazing with your questions, so engaging in getting me to talk about my story. Thank you for honoring me with your abilities and making this a fun journey, especially

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California

since I have never done this before, I have nothing to compare it to. I can't believe we're at the eighth interview, our final interview, and I feel a sadness that this is coming to a close but a happiness that with your help [and expertise], the oral history project is now mostly completed. There's a few steps ahead with transcripts and other things but the bulk of the work is done Honestly, I had no idea that it was—I knew it was a long story, so thank you for your patience in all this.

08-01:49:34

Farrell: Well, thank you, Greg. I also just want to say I really appreciate your willingness to engage with the questions, with the process, for your wiliness to be reactive, to be thorough, to bring in parts of the story you might not otherwise have, and just being a real pleasure to interview as well. This has been a really fun but also very gratifying oral history to do, so I really appreciate it.

08-01:50:03

Moore: Okay, well, thanks. As you may recall, I was a little bit reluctant to go through this because I thought like, well, what's the point? I didn't want too much of a spotlight on me because as my interviews reflect, my success was only there because of so, so, so many people who made that possible, so hopefully these interviews reflect that. [My oral history is a story of so many people who believed in a better world–a world where nature, history, scenery, culture and community would blend together in magical, transformative ways for the public good.]

08-01:50:26

Farrell: I think they absolutely do. Yeah, yeah. Well, thank you again.

[End of Interview]

Copyright © 2024 by The Regents of the University of California