

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library

University of California
Berkeley, California

Judy Hart

Rosie the Riveter WWII Home Front Oral History Project

This interview series was funded in part by a contract with the National Park Service, and with the support of individual donors.

Interview conducted by
Richard Cândida Smith
in 2005

Copyright © 2014 by The Regents of the University of California

Since 1954 the Regional Oral History Office has been interviewing leading participants in or well-placed witnesses to major events in the development of Northern California, the West, and the nation. Oral History is a method of collecting historical information through tape-recorded interviews between a narrator with firsthand knowledge of historically significant events and a well-informed interviewer, with the goal of preserving substantive additions to the historical record. The tape recording is transcribed, lightly edited for continuity and clarity, and reviewed by the interviewee. The corrected manuscript is bound with photographs and illustrative materials and placed in The Bancroft Library at the University of California, Berkeley, and in other research collections for scholarly use. Because it is primary material, oral history is not intended to present the final, verified, or complete narrative of events. It is a spoken account, offered by the interviewee in response to questioning, and as such it is reflective, partisan, deeply involved, and irreplaceable.

All uses of this manuscript are covered by a legal agreement between The Regents of the University of California and Judy Hart, dated October 8, 2014. 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. Excerpts up to 1000 words from this interview may be quoted for publication without seeking permission as long as the use is non-commercial and properly cited.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to The Bancroft Library, Head of Public Services, Mail Code 6000, University of California, Berkeley, 94720-6000, and should follow instructions available online at <http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/ROHO/collections/cite.html>

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

Judy Hart, “Rosie the Riveter, WWII Home Front Oral History Project” conducted by Richard Cándida Smith in 2005, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 2014.



Judy Sue Hart, born 1941, one week after Pearl Harbor. This picture was taken in summer 1944, in Randall, Kansas. Her father Gaylord Benson Hart had volunteered, and just been commissioned 6 June, 1944, and would drive to his Naval Communications training at Harvard in July, 1944. He returned to San Francisco February 28, 1946 and the family settled in Kansas City.

Picture credit: Gaylord Hart



Judy Hart, Superintendent, Women's Rights National Historical Park in Seneca Falls, New York. The picture was taken in the new visitor center in 1983. The ribbon to the visitor center had been cut by Alan Alda in July, 1982.

Picture credit: National Park Service



Judy Hart, retired Superintendent, Rosie the Riveter / World War II Home Front National Historical Park, with Richmond City Port Director Jim Matzorkis. They were holding their breath as the 60 ton Whirley Crane was being lowered to its “new” place at the head of an historic graving basin in historic Shipyard Number Three, where 747 ships were built for World War II. Picture taken September 28, 2007.

Picture credit: National Park Service

Table of Contents

Just Do It, and Change Everything, and Everything Changes: Introduction by Judy Hart 1

Interview 1: February 9, 2005

Audio file 1 3

Decision to leave Rosie the Riveter National Historical Park, Richmond, California — History of the development of the Park — Family background post-Pearl Harbor — Childhood memories in Kansas City — Employment after completing college at Cornell — Thoughts on marriage as a single working young woman — Travels to Europe to rethink career goals — Career path in public service — Redevelopment Agency job — Relocation of an African-American Community to new housing units in Roxbury — Role as first professional female staff with the Federal Highway Administration — Challenge of status quo related to NEPA, National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 — Development of feminist consciousness — Law school experience — Position with the Park Service developing legislation to approve national parks — Personal experience of discrimination in hiring — Proposed study on what became Women's Rights National Historical Park in Seneca Falls and Boston African-American site of first freed black community in country — Legislative maneuverings to approve and fund the Women's Rights National Historical Park in Seneca Falls — Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan champions the legislation for the Park — Coordinator for the Park.

Audio file 2 18

Process of developing and implementing Women's Rights National Historical Park Project — Role of Herb Cables, first African American to become a Regional Director in the Park Service — Process of acquiring property for the Park — Republican Congressman Frank Horton supports the Park — Federal Parks Advisory Commission Chair's opposition to the Park — Opposition to the creation of the Women's Rights National Historical Park in Seneca Falls — Efforts to keep the ERA issue, Equal Rights Amendment, separate from the legislation for the Park — Park ribbon cutting — Acquisition of Stanton House for the Park — Interpretive programs focus on right to vote — Discussion of departure as Park Superintendent — Acceptance of position writing legislation for proposed national parks — Evolution of Rosie the Riveter National Park — Plans to have the park affiliated with the National Park Service — Negotiation of Rosie the Riveter Park's affiliation with the National Park Service — Acquisition of job as Founding Superintendent in 2001 — Private funding for the Park falls through — Lack of federal money for the restoration of the Park — Working out of car for the first two years as Founding Superintendent.

Interview 2: October 16, 2005

Audio file 3

35

Starting again with new colleagues — Developing the General Management Plan — Seeking community support and connecting with the historical minority experience in Richmond — Working with developers and investors — Working with the City of Richmond — The Park coordinating committee

Audio file 4

44

The Park and its environs — The issue of child care centers — Parchester Village — The players involved in unifying the elements required for the Park — Four alternatives for structuring the Park — Ford Motor Corporation's role — National Landmark Theme Study

Interview 3: October 18, 2005

Audio file 5

53

Representative George Miller's efforts on behalf of the park — Challenges confronting a fully-conceived park — The National Park Service process and the Manzanar model — Planning for engaging the community — A particularly successful twenty minutes — Whether it's a "women's" or a "home front" park, the Rosies as an important symbol of home life during the war — Importance of acknowledging the ethnic diversity of the Rosies — Disappointing level of connection with the New Orleans museum

Audio file 6

68

Historical research on the Park elements — Budget difficulties — Development of the Park's interpretive themes — Chief of Interpretation Rick Smith — Early exhibits in City Hall — Merging the Rosie Park administratively with nearby sites — Getting the visitor center to capture the significance of Rosie — Evolution of healthcare in the Shipyard — The relevance of religion, sexuality, communism in the Shipyards — Description of the role of particular individuals and their perspectives in developing the Park — Hart's decision to retire

Audio file 7

81

Role of the property owners and community leaders in keeping the Park going — Getting the Park Service to fund the visitor center — Emotions with letting go and the outpouring of gratitude after Hart's retirement — Ford's big press conference for the Park — Rosie stories populating the website — Acquisition of artifacts — Role of *Time* magazine in showcasing the Park — Recollection of the challenges in getting the Park off the ground — Addendum: list of contributors to the Park's inception

Conclusion by Judy Hart

91

Just Do It, and Change Everything, and Everything Changes

The Rosie the Riveter World War II Home Front National Historical Park is in Richmond, California in the shipyards that Henry Kaiser built in order to build ships for World War II. The story of starting up the Park quite parallels the story of starting up the shipyards.

President Roosevelt asked Henry Kaiser to build ships, and that meant building a new Shipyard. Open mud flats in Richmond that faced San Francisco Bay were chosen and provided to him. Scarce materials were allocated to the Shipyard. Because there were not enough workers for the four new Yards, Kaiser sent trains down to the south and collected families willing to come to California for the new jobs. Richmond grew from a population of 20,000 to 120,000 in just four years, and 100,000 worked in the new shipyards. About 30 percent of the workers were women.

Henry Kaiser did not know the word impossible. He did what he set out to do. Ships were built while the shipyards were still being constructed. By the end of the war, 747 ships launched out of the graving basins where they were built into San Francisco Bay and churned off to war.

The United States Congress created the Rosie the Riveter World War II Home Front National Historical Park. But within the National Park Service there were not sufficient resources to start it up. It started up anyway. And that changed everything, and then everything changed.

The contributions of the Rosies are becoming as well known as the more familiar home front stories of living on ration stamps for food, driving on gas ration coupons, collecting scraps for recycling, sharing homes, and supporting the troops overseas. And the Rosies have taken their rightful place in history. By going to work in the shipyards, and facing and overcoming the resistance of their bosses, and their coworkers, they changed the face of equal opportunity. They showed that women could do anything. They learned that they could do anything.

The Rosie Park is a tribute to the spirit of the Rosies: *Do not tell me I can't do that. I can do anything.* And to their mighty accomplishments with their feisty spirit and will.

The story of Rosie the Riveter / World War II Home Front National Historical Park begins much like the story of the Kaiser Shipyards in Richmond. The magnificent structures still standing from World War II in the new Park are all threatened with demolition? We can change intentions and save them if we work together with community will. We don't know where the Rosies are? We can change that by working with the Ford Corporation to call nationwide for their names and their stories. The stories of the Rosies aren't recorded anywhere? We can change that working with The University of California videotaping their stories. The history of the structures isn't known? We can hire historians and change that. No one has been in the historic Shipyard Number Three for decades? We can change that. We just need a new road around the active Port of Richmond so we will build that road. The historic structures are deteriorating? We can change that with creative new uses for the buildings that will create the funding to save them. You need a community leadership organization? Start up the Rosie the Riveter Trust.

We can do it all. It just takes a vision, and a will to work together to make it happen. And

The Rosie Park has happened. Not easily. When a rocket is launched into outer space it uses 90 percent of its fuel gaining lift off and a few thousand feet of height. Then momentum takes over. Starting up a new National Park is the same: it takes a vision and lot of will and a lot of work to get it off the ground and then momentum can carry it through to its full potential.

The stories of the Rosies were once secret because of the national security concerns during the War. Shipyard Number Three was once a secret from decades being closed to the public because of security concerns for the active commercial shipping Port of Richmond. The remaining historic structures in the Park were virtually a secret because they were abandoned and a security risk. All of this is now in the public domain, for all to see and hear and be inspired by the amazing stories of what Rosies and other home front heroes did for World War II. Henry Kaiser did it. The Rosies did it. The United States Congress did it. The community of Richmond did it. The National Park Service did it.

And so what did get done in this first lift off and a few years since? Ford Motor Corporation launched a call for Rosies and their stories, and 11,000 responded. The University of California at Berkeley videotaped over two hundred Rosies and other home front heroes, and their stories will be preserved there, with many published on the Regional Oral History Office [ROHO] website. Rosies have submitted 4,000 stories and donated 2,000 artifacts to the Park from around the country.

The Park Service has opened a visitor center in the Oil House adjacent to the Ford Assembly Building. A new road carries visitors to the historic portion of Shipyard Number Three, now including a mammoth Whirley Crane hovering over a graving basin as it did during the war. Graving basins where the ships were constructed remain as built. The General Warehouse stands grandly there, and the Riggers Loft is being rehabilitated for new uses. The Maritime Child Care Center has been rehabilitated and includes Park Service interpretation in the section open to the public. The mammoth Ford Assembly Building has been rehabilitated and filled with thriving businesses and the Craneway has become a popular event site. The Bay Trail is now extended through the area for bikers and walkers.

And not least of all, a Congressional Resolution enacted in 2004 honors the work of Rosies and establishes their nationally significant role in American history. Some of the stories of how it was done are included in the interview below.

—Judy Hart

The interview begins in Emeryville, California, two days before Judy Hart's retirement move to Santa Fe, New Mexico. The interview was completed in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Interview 1: February 9, 2005

Audio file 1

1-00:00:04

Cándida Smith: Well, we shouldn't feel like we have to rush. We'll do what we do, and then we'll pick it up in New Mexico.

1-00:00:19

Hart: I'm, first of all, delighted you are doing this. I was really glad you made the extra effort to do this interview, because the last couple of weeks were so full of emotion. The first four years felt pretty flat on the whole, with spikes at events and then this rush the last couple of weeks. I don't want to get into what I want to say later, but I thought it would be really nice to do this while there was still this explosion of emotion.

1-00:00:55

Cándida Smith: I do want to start at the beginning, but maybe before we start at the beginning, maybe you should say a little bit about how you feel about leaving the Rosie the Riveter National Historical Park after spending four years getting it going.

You've been here in Richmond for four years, and you are about to leave. Maybe you could say something about how you've been feeling since you made the decision to leave and your assessment of what you've achieved.

1-00:01:53

Hart: I'll start with talking about what happened in the last month. When I was thinking about leaving and then decided to leave, I had in mind two objectives that I wanted to finish before I left. One was to come up with a plan for the development for the Park, which we call the General Management Plan. But in the case of this Park, where the properties are owned by other people and their futures are directed by other people, what was important was what they decided they wanted for the future of their property. I really hoped that would come together before I left, and it did, in a huge way that just was astounding to me. The progress, I would have to say, seemed very slow for the first four years. It felt like what happened in the last three weeks was about the equivalent of the first four years, in terms of things coming together and actual movement to get the Park happening. We had meetings with the Park Service planning team from Denver individually with the property owners two weeks ago. Then Friday they all came together in the same room for the first time ever. Every one of them showed up, two or three people from each of the properties. They shared their visions for their property so that everybody else got to hear their vision. There were some huge breakthroughs, especially with the city and Shipyard Three. Everybody got to hear the Port Director with the assembled city managers sitting there, saying that he would dedicate a part of the Port immediately for Park uses and would help work with us to find a way

to get the public in there. The *SS Red Oak Victory* is moving into historic Shipyard Number Three. A group of people are working together to move the Whirley Crane into the Shipyard.

So all of a sudden there's this new road that goes all around the Port. It goes down to the historic properties, and will be signed and interpreted. The *Red Oak Victory* will be down there; the Whirley Crane will be down there. It feels to me like instant Park, after four years of working on it. It was so exciting to everyone in the room to hear this, because they all understood that this was potentially the hugest piece of this Park. That's what would take it to one and a half million visitors, which they were very excited to hear. The excitement in the room and the conviviality and the warmth and the eagerness was almost—it's going to make me cry a little bit—almost overwhelming, because it was so different from what the first four years had felt like.

When I got there, every single building was slated for demolition or threatened by demolition, so to see the change in perspective, but most of all to see the joint change in perspective and the coming together—it was almost like everybody held hands and said, "Yeah, we're going to do it," even though it was, I think, all guys. Not that they never do that, but that was really what it felt like. Or like when the quarterback does his thing and they all clap hands, and the team goes to play. That's what it felt like. It was just incredible. The other thing that I really wanted to do was get the plans for the visitor center in the Ford Building on the funding list. So, we put on a major crunch to get cost estimates and Rick Smith did a PowerPoint. We pulled together a lot of drawings and a lot of impressive information and presented them three different times in the regional office. I believe that this week the group that's sitting to meet and set priorities, I believe they will put it on their priority list for funding. Or the Regional Director will place it on, one or the other. I hopefully will know by the end of the week.

Those were the two things that I decided last September. I could feel good about leaving this Park if those were true, and they happened in a much bigger way than I could imagine. Then the warmth and the gratitude. It's making me cry. The depth of emotion that was coming out of the last two weeks. I didn't understand when I started the Park why the City of Richmond wasn't more excited about it as a community, as a government, as a communal body. I didn't understand why they didn't celebrate their past, because it was so glorious. I didn't understand why they weren't more excited about the Park. I realized, of course, that they were distinctly unexcited about the fact that the federal government was not going to bring in the money to make it happen. I got that part. But, still it was a long time of just not feeling like I was making any traction. I kept the buildings from being demolished, and I was very proud of that in the first two years, but there didn't seem to be much excitement about it.

Then I began to understand from the Rosies that this was not a particularly happy story for African Americans. They got good jobs. They, in many cases, moved to California and had a life better than they had before, but their actual experience of the war was of prejudice and was an ugly time for them. They got the worst jobs, the worst pay. They didn't get the housing; they didn't get the child care. They did get the healthcare as far as we can tell. So it was not a time that they were necessarily instantly wanting to celebrate.

So the feeling in the last couple of months of the excitement about the Park, celebration of the story, interest, dedication and commitment to making things happen, the most meaningful part of it to me was that part of it was a kind of a farewell gift to me, but much deeper than that was embracing their story and saying that this is amazing what they did in this community; we need to tell it. We're the only place in the country that's worthy of telling this story. We have these amazing sites that are still here. We can work with them, and they will become attractions. I think saying that there was a potential of a million and a half visitors broke through a lot of hesitation, skepticism and doubt about the Park. That is, of course, dependent on the ferry coming to the Ford Assembly Building from San Francisco. It will probably be necessary to bring a million and a half visitors. That seemed to break through the nagging "Why would anybody come here?" that has so dogged the efforts to get this Park off the ground. Even if they were excited, there was always a concern of why would anybody come here and why should this money be spent.

In the early years I would talk about a busload of visitors in a sixty-seat bus. I would get this "Wow! Sixty people on a bus in Richmond?" "Yeah, more than one bus actually. You need turn-arounds; you need parking." The new startle is not a busload of visitors, but a million and a half visitors. That's based on a very extensive study that our planners did of existing sites in the Bay Area. It's perfectly plausible, as long as the attractions are there, and the ferry service comes over from San Francisco.

So, the outpouring brought all of these people working together, the county, the city, the private owners, this whole range of people coming together, and the depth of it. Not just that we're going to do it, but that the history of Richmond is huge and important, and we really need to tell it. A couple of people saying to me, "This is the most fun part of my job. The rest of it is work; this is fun." So, it seems clearly a good time to leave. I think my announcing I was leaving did cause a shock to people. Some people actually said, "You know, I never had to worry about the Park as long as you were here, and now I've got to worry about it." Yes, that was the message. That was my intention that that would be the reaction. It is, "Community, this is your turn to pick this up and make it happen. You now have a plan. Each one of you has a plan. You have a joint plan. You can make it happen now." So, the last four weeks have been beyond what I could have hoped for, really wonderful.

1-00:11:39

Cándida Smith: We're going to go into great detail how those four years led to that kind of conclusion, but right now we should probably go back, some of the personal story, who you are, where you came from. So, why don't we start with where and when you were born?

1-00:11:59

Hart: Oh my goodness. I was born seven days after Pearl Harbor. December 14, 1941. I've always wondered about the impact that had on me and my poor mother. She made it clear that it wasn't a happy time for her. My father was exempt from the war because he and his brothers owned a grain company. But he did volunteer, and I think she probably in her heart knew that that was going to happen. I was born in Kansas City. I think they stayed there about a week, and then we went back to Randall, Kansas, which is where my parents lived. It was a little town in the middle of Kansas. The Hart Grain Company had a series of what's called country elevators, including one in Randall. They bought grain from the farmers and shipped it to the big markets in Kansas City.

When father volunteered we went back east. He spent a year at Harvard, learning Navy communications. We rented a house. I have the dimmest memories, but I was told it was quite grand. It was a typical story of the war. Somebody moved out to make room for two or three military families. My first memories are really going back to Kansas City. A couple of memories from when I was maybe four years old. I grew up in Kansas City. A few years ago I went back to the Park that I remember so fondly, and was struck by the fact that it was not a huge city park. But when I went down into the ravine and then couldn't see the houses and the traffic and so forth, there was this beautiful stone bridge. There was a picnic shelter, and there were some out buildings. I thought, "This looks like CCC buildings at a national park." It looked like a vision of my future.

I went to grade school and to high school in Kansas City. I went to a very fine high school, Shawnee Mission High School, where they greeted us every morning by announcing that we were attending one of the three best high schools in the United States. I went to Cornell with a major in English, without really any intention of ever working. Or if I did, I would do the Kansas City thing; I would work until my husband got through law school or medical school, and then I would be in a nice house and manage it and the children. I did graduate. I went to the Publishing Procedures Institute at Radcliffe for three months after I graduated. I think that began to change me. I did really well. I liked it. I loved being in Boston, Cambridge actually. I loved being there. I got my first job at Little, Brown Publishing Company and learned a lot. [laughs] I quit my first job after six weeks. When I went in to quit, somebody else was walking out; they had quit. So, I took her job. It was kind of a finishing school for young ladies in Boston. You'd come and work at Little Brown for a year, and then you'd get married. So, I was on the same track, but just a slightly different version of it.

Then my second job really, really changed me. I worked for the Boston Safe Deposit and Trust Company as Editor of the two employee newspapers. I got to interview the Chairman of the Board and the President and all the senior officers. I was the roving reporter. This was 1964. Mr. Mainer, in personnel, was in charge of all the men in the bank. Mrs. Somebody was in charge of all the women in the bank. I was one of maybe a dozen professional women in the bank. But, they had me report to Mr. Mainer as my advisor. I had a boss, but Mr. Mainer was my advisor. I don't remember anything in particular that he said to me, but I took myself seriously after two years there. He opened my eyes to see that I could have a career, that I could do things.

When I talk about Mr. Mainer and the change that he helped me make while I was at that bank, it reminds me that back at Little Brown many things that I had read about publishing were true. All the editors were men, and they really would go to Lock Obers for lunch. It was very eye-opening to me. I realized, for one thing, I was very naïve still after four years at Cornell. They would come back but in the afternoon they would kind of chat and sit on the phone. The part I hated—they'd bring the secretary in, and they'd ramble on and on and on and talk at their secretary for an hour. That was the job. I quit after six weeks, because it wasn't entertaining or amusing or interesting. The second man I worked for at Little, Brown was a designer who managed production for children's books. I learned a great deal about design, what things looked like, and how to present things. It was very educational, how you present things to a six-year old.

In those twelve months that I was there it seemed to me that 80 percent of the work was done by this fleet of young women like me who'd just gotten out of one of the seven sisters or the Ivy League. So, we got paid \$5,000 a year, and they got paid hefty salaries. They did things like stand at the front door and write down what time we walked in, in case we were a minute late. It almost felt like they locked the door. There wasn't any possibility of leaving early. I did know that. The working conditions were okay. I remember they didn't have air conditioning, and the mosquitoes would just overwhelm us in the summer. It—really, for the first time—opened my eyes to this notion of who gets paid to do what, and who really does the work. Education and background and opportunity all were just sitting there in my face on a daily basis.

Then I started this job at the bank, and I got to talk to these amazing Brahmins from New England. I still have the greatest admiration for their very grand spirit. Ralph Lowell was still with the bank, and I admired that man so much. I just took in that spirit of how much one person could do. The bank was doing two things then. They were quietly meeting, I was told later, to plan the future Boston. There were five banks that were behind the urban renewal that happened, and the dramatic new architectural spine created in Boston. They were massive changes that I still think are admirable and good. They, also in 1964, hired the first woman trust officer. They hired me. They had young

African American girls as clerks when you walked in, at the counter when you walked in. They were actively promoting professional women and equal opportunity, years before anyone else in Boston was publicly doing it.

One piece of my job was to train these new young clerks how to balance a checking account, because everybody in the bank got a free checking account. So, I worked with them, and I created a training course to teach them how to run a checking account. It was a very interesting experience for me, in terms of learning how to communicate with people—the essence of this course I took at Boston University was called “Programmed Instruction.” You just rewrite it and rewrite it and rewrite it, until everybody who takes this test in the training manual gets the right answer. It was fabulous discipline in how to communicate with people. Plus working with these young women.

By the time I left the bank after two years, I really didn’t know where I was going, but I was very different. I had decided that I wanted to work for the Boston Redevelopment Authority, because they were what was happening in Boston at that point. I really admired what they were taking on. I remember thinking, that if I was going to work at all, I wanted to do something that mattered. I would sit there at my desk in the bank thinking, “I have this wonderful job in this fabulous bank. I’m the envy of many people in the world, but I don’t think it really matters all that much to me. It’s not making much of a difference in the larger world.” So, I took the summer off and then went to Europe for four months.

I remember Twiggy was the thing then. I went to England. I went to London mostly. It’s funny; I had my conservative clothes and my conservative way of thinking about things and didn’t become a part of that Twiggy culture. I really didn’t get to see much of it, but still a girl from Kansas living in London for a while was eye-opening. I had done, literally, one of those thirty-two countries in ninety days, or whatever it was when I was in college. But this was very different, being on my own. I spent a week in Paris on my own, which was even more different, because I don’t speak French. So, that was another eye-opener.

When I got back, I did all sorts of things to make a living, to get by. I used to go to Filene’s and charge clothes on my Filene’s account and then take them back the next day, because I could get cash. [laughs]. That was a thin existence. I painted friends’ apartments. I did sewing. I did some temporary jobs, which were actually quite interesting. I worked for Bolt, Beranek and Newman [now called BBN Technologies] for a while and worked for these people on a grant that were researching the French system of total control of industry, where the government tells you that you get this many trainloads of lumber and this many trucks full of this liquid, and you will make this much stuff. It was a similar to what we did in this country during World War II, which was actually quite interesting. So I went about eight months, I guess, just patching together a living and being on the other side. I was living in a

lovely apartment, but it was also eye-opening for five dollars to mean so much at that point.

I finally got a job with the Boston Redevelopment Authority doing relocation program development. They were relocating thousands of families from the hardcore African-American community in Boston. My particular piece of it—I came in after the huge, massive work had been done. Lyndon Johnson, before he got elected, his campaign promise was 1200 units of new housing in Roxbury in six weeks, Roxbury being just one inch away from the very toughest part of the African-American neighborhood. I was the Assistant to the Director, and we hired four welfare mothers to do the administrative work, two young college graduates to be the supervisors and four additional recent college graduates as field staff. We had, I think, thirty-five volunteers from a prep school way out in the suburbs and six welfare mothers that were field staff and about twenty volunteers from a church out in the suburbs.

The incredible collection of women volunteers from a suburban church, the young men from a very prestigious prep school way out in the suburbs, and a group of welfare mothers and four college graduates were the field staff that went out and interviewed these 1200 families. Usually they went in pairs, but it was an incredible project. We were blessed that no one got hurt. In hindsight, it's kind of amazing that we did it, but we did. We interviewed every family, and eventually 67 percent of them got to move back into the newly rehabbed housing; all were relocated to housing appropriate for them. It took four years, not six weeks. Six weeks would have required that they all be kicked out on the street on day one. It was eye-opening, to say the least. The developers and the Federal Housing Authority and my boss would meet once a week in these screaming matches, because the developers thought they were on a six-week track, and we had actually gone—I had actually written all the papers to get the money from HUD. HUD funded the relocation, and FHA funded the rehabilitation. So, FHA and HUD were at each other's throats. The developers were at everybody's throats. We kept saying, "You can't throw these people out on the street." I learned a very different view of the world by working on that project and was totally committed to helping those families get back in decent housing.

That was the year that Martin Luther King was shot. That was the year that Bobby Kennedy was shot. We didn't work for a few days because our boss was afraid to have white girls driving back and forth even to the office. That added a lot of extra intensity to it. It was a real gift to me to be able to do that project. It is still a highlight of my career, what I did on that project.

I went from there to working for the state; by then I was hooked. I loved public service. I loved working for the government, and the change that was able to happen by having that kind of position. I went from there to being in the Relocation Bureau of the Community Affairs Department of the State of Massachusetts. It was the same kind of job, but on a statewide scale. There

was a state relocation law that required that if public funds were used to acquire property, people could not just be thrown out on the street. There had to be a study of their needs, documenting that adequate housing was available for them, and they had to be given services. So, we went all over the state. As it turned out we went all over the state, stopping projects or slowing down projects and saying, "There's no place for these people to go. You can't throw them out." We'd work with them and figure out solutions to things, which invariably meant greatly slowing down the projects, and once in a while stopping them. I did that for two years, and then my boss left.

When my boss left, my big boss told me they were going to do a nationwide search for my Bureau Director and that they were really looking forward to me training him. [laughs] I remember my big boss, who was the Deputy Director for the Department, taking me to lunch and telling me about this and how important it was and how much he was looking forward to me working with the new person to train, who hadn't been picked yet. He was just telling me about the nationwide search. I don't know where it came from. I had no intention of saying this. I had no idea what we were going to be talking about at lunch. I said, "Well, that's very nice, but I need to tell you that I'm leaving." [laughs] I don't think he finished his lunch. I meant it. I wasn't going to walk out that minute. I said that I would stay a couple of weeks after the new person came, but I was leaving. I don't remember how long it took, and I don't remember if I competed for it. It's funny that I don't remember much about it, but they decided that I should be the Bureau Director. I said, "Okay, that's fine." I did that for two years. It was immensely satisfying.

To put this in context, our state office building had buses in the building garage almost every morning, full of police waiting to deal with the protests that were happening in front of the building. This was 1968, '69, '70. I don't remember what in particular they were demonstrating against. It was just a time when there were always hundreds of demonstrators in front of the state building and the federal building across the street.

I got sent to Cape Cod to try and develop subsidized housing, one of my favorite projects of my career. The National Welfare Rights Organization [NWRO] came to Cape Cod for their national project, and they had a few hundred college students who went to Cape Cod to picket and protest and demand better housing for the largely African Americans who got evicted from their homes every summer, because they could get more rent from the summer visitors. So I was sent down with a few hardy people on the staff to deal with it. Again it was an amazing experience. I had great admiration for the NWRO people. I thought they were honest and committed and dedicated and intelligent people who were trying to make a difference in their own way. We had lots of really good conversations and lots of happenings, like they would picket the Holiday Inn where we stayed. We stopped staying overnight. It did get to be a little bit unpleasant. We did get a few dozen families in subsidized housing, but more importantly we got an understanding of the

issues and the needs that these people deserve better treatment. They would camp in the woods the whole summer, sleep in cars and so forth. I think the biggest impact we had was saying to the town people, "These are perfectly reasonable demands. You may not like the style of the NWRO people, but the demands they are making are perfectly reasonable." I loved that assignment. I really had a good time with it and learned a lot.

I also did most of the research and writing, most of the documentation when a huge privately-funded urban renewal project was proposed for downtown Boston. Mortimer Zuckerman was on his rise. It was before he was as famous as he is now. He proposed taking over I think about twenty blocks on the not-so-nice side of the Public Garden and the Public Common and was going to build, I think, ten fifty-story high-rises, just a humongous development. Boston Public Garden with all of its flowers would have been in shade almost all day if his project had gone through. It was not well funded. The developer wasn't really putting that much money in. The city was really going to be bankrolling it. I did the research on the relocation and said, "There's no way you can say all of these businesses and very low income people would have a place to move to if you demolished this whole neighborhood that's housing them." The Governor took our side and supported us. That was Governor Frank [Francis William] Sargent, for whom I had great admiration, a classic Brahmin, just out to do good, as far as I could tell. He took our side.

We had one very dramatic meeting with the developer where he seemed to think we were going to have a chummy "this is wonderful," and instead the Commissioner said that we rejected it. It was a very tense time after that. About 20,000 union laborers demonstrated at the Statehouse one day. The Governor came out and met them. But, the rejection stuck. It didn't happen. It never went through.

After that job, I went to work for the Federal Highway Administration. I was the first professional woman in relocation and land acquisition. So far, I had been the first woman ever in two jobs.

1-00:36:13

Cándida Smith:

I'd like to ask you whether you were developing a feminist consciousness during this time. Were you part of a consciousness raising group? Did you join NOW? Were you reading [Simone] de Beauvoir or [Betty] Friedan?

1-00:36:38

Hart:

No, none of those things. At that point, as far as I remember, it was completely personal. It was like peeling off the layers of myself and saying, "Well, I can do this." [interview interruption] It was like peeling down the layers of myself and going deeper into me. I certainly wasn't doing anything organized, and I wasn't reading any of the literature. I was just looking around at the world. I think part of that is the world I grew up in was so homogenized that it was years of just noticing the world around me to make sense of it. Mission Hills was essentially a planned residential development in which I

could drive an hour and be in the same beautiful setting with lovely streets, lovely houses, flowers in the corner islands, because it had been planned by one developer. I knew the universe was not like that, and not like my high school where everybody went off to college after graduating. So it was still a Judy-gets-to-know-Judy and Judy-gets-to-know-the-world at that point.

The next job it began to change. I was hired as the first professional woman staff in relocation in the Federal Highway Administration. Until then, I had always had running buddies—people that shared my commitment. We were different; we did different pieces of it, but we shared the commitment to make something happen. I was on my own there. I was in charge of reviewing the environmental impact statements for economic impacts and relocation and social impacts. That was at a time when the agency still didn't accept that NEPA applied to them. They were building good highways. NEPA wasn't for them.

1-00:38:37

Cándida Smith: What is NEPA?

1-00:38:36

Hart: National Environmental Policy Act, that required you write environmental impact statements prior to your federal actions. It was new. The Federal Highway Administration guys seemed to me to really believe that everything they did was good. All of a sudden I was sitting there in these big meetings, saying, "This analysis isn't adequate. It doesn't say anything. It's not accurate. The studies aren't going to cut it with the public". I had been around the public enough at that point to have a pretty good idea what would cut it with the public. That was at a point in FHWA history where they had finished most of the interstate highways and all over the nation had gotten close to the major cities. And they wanted to finish their highways and bring them downtown, and they were being stopped all over the country. There I was, saying, "This isn't going to make it. You're going to go down if you publish this piece of work." It was a very unpleasant three years there, lightened only by the fact that Frank Mahady, who had come to work with me as an intern at the Community Affairs Department when he first got out of Harvard, had become the head of relocation at the state highway department. So we were working together and actually managed to make a lot of changes, but my office felt very hostile.

That's when I began to think on a more programmatic level. I was very conscious of being the first professional woman in that office and very conscious of how the agency tried to deal with that. FHWA was a very well run agency. I was very impressed with them. They had review systems and back-up systems and appeals systems, most of which came into play in my three years. The Chief Engineer was the head of the office, and he was a wonderful, wise, distinguished sort of Brahmin sort of a person, who in my opinion had a large vision. He knew that what I was doing was helpful to the agency in the long run. He was very protective of me, but it was eye-opening.

I remember sitting at my desk there one day, looking through the federal telephone book. I looked through this little federal directory, and I found a listing for the National Park Service, and it had six names under it. I read it, and I looked it for the longest time and thought, "I bet they're nicer people than the people I'm working with here."

But instead what I did was quit and get a Master's of Arts in Law at a school without walls. Goddard College in Vermont was running a Masters of Arts in Law program in Cambridge, and it was again just pushing my life out to the boundaries. We sat on the floor on pillows. There were five people in my program. The fellow who taught it was a free spirit, a brilliant lawyer who left that program to teach the philosophy of law at Harvard Law School.

1-00:43:17

Cándida Smith: So how is that different from a JD program?

1-00:43:23

Hart: [laughs] I don't think they sat on the floor on pillows. I don't think their classmates looked like mine. We did things like go down and meet with prisoners. One of the most amazing things that we did—the assignment was simple—sit in city, state and then federal court for a whole day. Just sit there and watch. It was astounding. The program core was social justice. Lee wanted us to understand that it was African Americans that you see in the court system, whites on the bench and African Americans in the chair. And then going down to a prison to meet the folks who actually end up in prison. We studied the Cuban legal system, the Russian legal system, and we learned how to do legal research, and we had passes to go to the Harvard Law Library. So, it was this experience of just stretching me and all of our minds about as far as you can, all at the same time. I wrote my thesis on a topic that I had come to feel very strongly about when I worked for the state: the three-legged stool. The idea is that if you really want to change something huge like stopping highways and changing relocation programs and changing benefit programs, you need somebody on the inside of the bureaucracy who is sympathetic, and you need a strong community protest group, and you need professionals on the outside.

While I was in this degree program, my field project was to work with a group of people from the Mission Hill district, I guess they called it, which was on a hill right next to five hospitals. Harvard had a hospital; B.U. had a hospital, I don't remember all of them. All of them were in the same neighborhood over a few blocks. They were going to build a—what did they call that? It was a heating, cooling, generating, and incinerating plant, so that all the hospitals had tubes so that they could put, as we often said, dirty diapers and body parts in the tube at the hospital. It would all come down to this one common incinerator and go up this one common stack, which happened to be right about the level of the houses in this low income neighborhood that was downwind from this project. So, I got to start demonstrating. I was out there marching with this little group in a couple of demonstrations they did. I also

organized them to go and meet with the state EPA and say that this environmental impact analysis Harvard has written is superficial, and wrong, and listed all the ways they were being misled by Harvard's impact statement. One highlight of that meeting was showing the state officials pictures I had taken the day before, with huge clouds of almost black dust in the air as their demolition of housing began. Clearly, Harvard was violating their commitment to water down the demolition and prevent dust in this residential neighborhood. The state rejected the plan. Harvard didn't get to build that cogenerating plant, which I thought was a really good thing for the world. I did not think that burning body parts and diapers to turn it into heat and then spewing that over the neighborhood was a good idea.

By this time, I was even more hooked. There was a change someplace in that year where I thought very clearly, "I'm tired of stopping things. I've spent years now stopping really, really bad things, in my opinion. That's very satisfying, but I'd rather start things." When I finished the degree program, I applied to the Park Service, got a job, was on the payroll within four weeks, and started doing land acquisition and relocation for the Park Service. I did that for about two years, did some really interesting work, relocated four or five families out of Eleanor Roosevelt's home, and stopped the eviction of the eighty-seven year old former owner from Martin Van Buren's home. I'm like, "I think we can resolve this a little better." It turned out there was a gatehouse. He moved into his gatehouse. He was happy as a clam. He lived there for another five years, and we restored the big house.

Then a job came open that was my dream job. It was legislation for the Park Service in Boston creating new national parks. So, that's what I started doing for—I had that job for four years. I found it incredibly satisfying to help in the creation of new things.

[interview interruption]

1-00:48:29

Cándida Smith: So, you wind up in an office of legislation. You're the person who's drafting the legislation that is then submitted to Congress for parks in the northeast region?

1-00:48:41

Hart: I was in the Planning Office in the Boston regional office. I often went to communities—I was sent out to meet with every community that wanted a national park. So, in many cases my job was to say, "This isn't going to work. This is not going to be what you want. It's not going to work as a national park." I basically said no to a great many places.

And then I was asked by the Washington office, "What do you want the Denver Service Center to study for new parks?" The Denver Service Center was our big formal office for planning and design. They would come in and do a study. At that point we were submitting twelve proposals for new parks a

year to Congress. It was very, very different from where we are today. We were actively looking for new nationally significant stories and sites then. I looked at what was cooking around in our region. It was a general's home. The first three or four people I asked didn't know which war he was in, and I had never heard of him. I thought, "We can do better."

I had read our Index to National Parks, which was a book we published for the bicentennial. It divided all of the national parks into categories. They included Civil War parks, Presidents' parks, natural parks. I think there were a dozen categories. The Park Service put out a nice little book, and on the very front page where it had all of these categories, there was an asterisk. It said "African-American history is incorporated into all of the above Parks". What really struck me was that there was no asterisk for women. We didn't even get an asterisk. [laughs] I thought, "This is going to change. This is ridiculous."

This was 1978, and my title was Chief Ranger for Legislation. It took a year and a half for me to get the job—including the beginning of a discrimination suit. Finally the Regional Director said that I was supremely qualified for this job, having a Master of Arts in Law, having written legislation for the state and lobbied for it, and having implemented big changes in legislation at the state. He said that since my job was to implement laws, why weren't they hiring me. It took a lot to hire a woman in 1978 for what was considered one of the plum jobs in the regional office. But I did get it. That, of course, flamed the fires in my soul quite a bit, what it took to get that job.

So I said, "I think we should have a park having to do with women." I had a brand new boss, Terry Savage, the Chief of Planning, who had just come in from San Francisco, and he had just driven across the country. He was still in a motel. I telephoned him before he even got to the office, because I had a deadline to answer Washington. He was like, "Cool." So, I went looking for one. I said, "We should have another one for African Americans, as well as one for women." I proposed we study what became the Women's Rights National Historical Park in Seneca Falls and what became the Boston African-American National Historic Site, which was the first freed black community in the country. I worked on those for the next two years. What a thrill. The African-American site was—I really went looking for it. I found it. I found a fellow who was trying to promote the idea, all of the properties. It was on the backside of Beacon Hill. He was trying to promote the idea of the park, of the history, but I actually got it turned into a Park. It's open to the public now. And Women's Rights NHP became a huge deal. Stories about that go on forever, starting with the name of it. The traditional Park Service name would have been the Seneca Falls National Historic Site. I said, "No, it should be a national historical park, because the story is so important and there are several different sites there. And if you say the Seneca Falls National Historic Site, nobody but thirty-five women will know what's there. If you don't tell people it's the women's rights site, no one will ever know." Well that argument went

on for years, including the two and half years it took the legislation to go through. It was a pretty hard fought fight.

1-00:53:39

Cándida Smith: Within the Park Service?

1-00:53:40

Hart: Oh yeah.

1-00:53:44

Cándida Smith: Was it pro forma in Congress or was there opposition there?

1-00:53:48

Hart: It was easier in Congress than it was in the Park Service because Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, for whom I have the greatest admiration, became its champion immediately. The local Congressman wouldn't sign the proposed legislation; he said that we couldn't do guns and butter at the same time. So, Congressman Jonathan Bingham from New York City signed the House bill. But, Daniel Patrick Moynihan just came in on a white horse and just blew the stuff out of the opposition. The Chief of Staff for the House Resources Committee, Dale Crane, our substantive committee, as opposed to our money committee, loved the Park and became a very good friend. So, between the two of them—no, I'm missing a very important piece of it, a very important person, as I think more about that.

I proposed we study it. I went to Washington. I went to The Park Service Denver Service Center. Denver replied that it's not big enough. It's not complicated enough. My boss, who had just come from San Francisco and by this time was really interested—we had gotten connected with the local people, and they were tremendously excited—and he said that we'd do the study there in the regional office. So I worked on the study with another woman who opposed the idea; it was her determination that there would never be a national park in this community because she said the winters were too harsh. We got the study finished. The two of us had many battles, but Terry Savage always intervened and generally agreed with me, and we got a good study done.

The regional office study was sent to Washington, and it got sent to Denver. The Denver Service Center did not recommend it being sent up to Capitol Hill for a proposed new park. In those days we were allowed to promote new parks. I had been to Washington a lot. I talked it up a lot with everybody I could find. I had been up on the Hill, giving slideshows. The Director had heard about it from our Washington liaison Peggy Lipson. And Director Bill Whalen, in the big meeting where the Denver folks presented the park proposals to be sent to the Hill, he looked at them all, and he asked what's happened to Women's Rights? I kept hearing about Women's Rights. It's not in here. Denver folks said they didn't include it. Director Whalen told them to go find the study and that it was going to the Hill. So, he sent it to Congress.

By then folks on the Hill knew about it, because I had been given a very long leash to promote this idea, because my region was really behind it. Senator Moynihan was already aware of it, and the House side Chief of Staff Dale Crane was excited about it. So, all they had to do was get it to the Hill, and Senator Moynihan and others carried it from then on. I don't even remember what our testimony was like. It was pretty lukewarm as I recall. Several folks from Seneca Falls came to Washington for the hearings, and their enthusiastic testimony was important.

I actually got to write the legislation. It got watered down in Washington by the Park Service, and there were lots of fights about it. They kept wanting to keep the costs down, was what they said. I was trying to model it after Lowell and have a Commission and two different ways to spend money and have a non-profit segment and a Park Service segment. That all got cut out. The Park Service chopped the legislation in some really significant ways.

It did survive with its name—Women's Rights National Historical Park. It got authorized. Actually Senator Moynihan had to pull it out of a hole. It went through the House lickety-split and was passed by May. It got set aside in the Senate, and in the middle of December at the end of the two-year congressional term, Senator Moynihan fished it out of the pile and said that they were going to pass this. And got it passed within a week. President Jimmy Carter, with a broken collarbone, signed it, I'm told, on his last day in office, because of course we had had a significant shift in the administration. We went from Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan. The fear was that if Jimmy Carter didn't sign it, it wasn't going to happen because the congressional session would have been over.

It did get signed. The administration had changed. I had put all of my new parks in for a \$400,000 first-year budget, and they had all pretty much gotten it. Women's Rights got funded at \$5,000 in its first year.

1:00:58:57

Cándida Smith: Does that include salaries?

1:00:59:00

Hart: [laughs] Yes. However you want to spend it. We had total freedom. I used the money to go out to Seneca Falls once a month and keep up the local excitement. I was the Park Coordinator; that title and work was added to my job as Chief Ranger for Legislation. Then at the end of that year, they decided—I decided, actually, with a lot of anguish about it; I had no intention of moving out there and starting it up. But by then the new administration was well entrenched. The lists were circulating all over the Hill, all over the country of parks to be deauthorized. At the top of the list were parks that didn't own any land. The Park Service didn't own anything yet in Seneca Falls. I thought, "With this name and no land, and we have nothing firm for the future, this Park is going to be the first one to go." So, after a lot of soul-searching, I decided to leave my much-beloved Boston and legislative job and

go out and start up Women's Rights. My first job there was to persuade the local non-profit group to purchase the Stanton House, and then the group would donate the title to the Park Service. I said, "I know this is a huge sacrifice. You all worked four years to raise the money to buy this Stanton House. This was to be your way to make your name. I understand that. But this Park isn't going to happen if you don't give the house to us, so that we can say, 'We own something. We're restoring it. This is real. There's a person out there. This is not a Park you are going to shut down.'"

So that was how I ended up at Seneca Falls. Starting on the very first day when we cut the ribbon with Alan Alda for the new visitor center, we started the rehabilitation of the Stanton House. I of course was looking to put real legs under this Park as quickly as possible, which is why Alan Alda came to cut the ribbon, and five thousand people were there to watch him. So, it was not something the administration could lightly close up.

Audio file 2

2-00:00:13

Cándida Smith: You had mentioned on the phone to me a few weeks back that unlike the Rosie Park, you never had any doubt that there would be the Women's Rights Park, once you arrived. I wonder if you could explain what your goals were as you established the Women's Rights Park, what are the key milestones you had to achieve that would allow you to say, "Now, we have a functioning Park the way I've envisioned it."

2-00:01:03

Hart: Women's Rights was so much easier than Rosie in Richmond even though the legislation was a fight, keeping substance in the legislation was quite a fight. I lost part of it, but I kept the traditional part of it, which was that the Park Service would own and restore and interpret the primary historic properties. In Seneca Falls that was the Wesleyan Chapel, where the first call for women's right to vote went public, the Elizabeth Cady Stanton house, of course, the McClintock house where they wrote the Declaration of Sentiments, and the Hunt house where they first had the tea party and decided to call the convention. So, that was a straightforward Park Service kind of thing, with these clearly nationally significant—clearly once Congress passed the law—clearly nationally significant sites. Restore them, and tell the story. That was all outlined in the legislation.

By the time I moved to Seneca Falls I had been coming to the community for two years on a regular basis, three years really. It was a small town. There were three thousand people in the village and ten thousand in the town. So, I knew all of the reigning figures, all of the significant players in town, and they were very excited about it. While it was controversial, there was never any doubt that the Park Service was eventually going to own all of those properties. It was a question of when and under what circumstances, how much money would we pay, but everybody knew we were going to own those

properties. The Park Service knew we were going to restore them and tell the story. So, I had that behind me. I had a very, very deeply committed Regional Director who was the first African-American Regional Director, and I walked on water with him, because I had created out of nothing, the Boston African-American National Historic Site and gone and found the Women's Rights site, before he was there. He could not have been more passionate about getting both of them off the ground and flourishing. He saw the potential for a breakthrough success at Seneca Falls.

2-00:03:33

Cándida Smith: What was his name?

2-00:03:34

Hart: Herb Cables. He was a fascinating guy. I learned a tremendous amount from him. For years, the whole time I was in Seneca Falls, in a really tight spot I would just stop for a minute, and I would ask myself, "What would Herb say about this? What would he do?" He was a professional athlete before he got into recreation. He loved horse racing. He said to me I bet horses, and I pick my winners, and then I give them everything they need. You're a horse that's going to win this race, so you've got my support, whatever you need, which makes all the difference in the world. There were a couple of hundred highly professional people that I had been working with already for three years in the Boston regional office, who were all excited about the Park, and with his support behind me there was no stopping me. The community was the same way. The community leaders were totally in favor of it. It certainly wasn't easy. The owner of the Wesleyan Chapel was running a laundromat in the front of the building and a parking lot and automobile repair in the back and ten apartments up top. As the laundry machines would break down, the owner would put a sign on each machine, saying that it was broken and because of the Park Service it was not going to get fixed. [laughs] So, during my tenure there, slowly, many of the washing machines had a sign that said that because of the Park Service, you couldn't use this machine anymore.

2-00:05:20

Cándida Smith: Because you were planning on buying the property? Did that mean the owner could not sell the property?

2-00:05:25

Hart: Essentially it did. It did take us probably three years to buy it. Lightening speed by today's standards. It was difficult for him.

2-00:05:37

Cándida Smith: It was a question of negotiating the price?

2-00:05:39

Hart: Unfortunately, no. It was time. The government hires a contract appraiser, and there's no negotiating ability, so that price is take it or leave it. Since he really couldn't sell it to anybody else, it was pretty much, "Take it." The real issue was how quickly could we get in there and relieve him of this place. The first

breakthrough stage was getting a congressional appropriation to fund the purchase. Congressman Horton had led that fight, but still I feared I would be fired for going against Secretary Watt's ban on acquisition, and of course I was working closely with the Congressman behind the curtain. So, that was the Wesleyan Chapel.

What became the park next to it was the only movie theater in town. It was a bright blue cinderblock box. It was right on the main street, and it was the only theater in town. That was controversial. We did buy it and tear it down. The next building was a very large, three-story building that was functioning as City Hall, very badly. The police were on the second floor. There was no elevator, no functional elevator. They complained a lot about hauling the drunks up a very long flight of stairs. They had a long running public argument for about eight months whether they should donate it to the Park Service—publicly owned property could only be donated to the Park Service—or they should better sell it to a developer. It was a very public debate in this very small village. They finally decided that they had a better bet to give it to the Park Service. So that became the visitor center, part of what is now the centerpiece of the Park.

That was all done under the Reagan administration when—their policy intentions were so clear that you really didn't say "acquisition" out loud. They were brilliant people, I have to say. In other words, that's how they would limit the Park Service. There would be no expansion whatsoever, because we could not buy property.

Everything that we did in the first half of my tenure in Seneca Falls was a donation. But still, for all of the public discussions and arguments that went on, there was a general community sense that the Park was a good thing. They were a little reluctant about the title of it, the topic of it, but on the whole, they thought it was a good thing.

2:00:08:20

Cándida Smith: Did you have allies in the Republican Party at all?

2:00:08:24

Hart: Senator Moynihan was certainly not of that party. Yes, yes, an extremely helpful Frank Horton, who was the local Congressman. Whoever it was that wouldn't sign the legislation was defeated, and Frank Horton took over the district. He had never had a national park before. He was also a Cornell grad, so that was how we got to know each other in the beginning. He decided the Park was a really good thing. He was conservative about funding, about spending money. He took kindly to the title, the topic, the substance of the Park. He became very fond of it and was a very helpful mediating influence. He wasn't going to call Secretary James Watt and say, "Back off." But he was supportive, and that helped.

James Watt appointed the running buddy of one of his principal advisors to be the Chairman of the federal commission for the Park, the Advisory Commission. She had tried her darndest to stop the development of the Cuyahoga Valley National Park. She lived in Ohio, and she would attend every public meeting there and disrupt it, scream and yell and that kind of thing to keep the meeting from happening. She was not in the end very effective. She wasn't able to stop Cuyahoga from developing, but she did get appointed head of our Commission. Phyllis Schlafly's best friend was also appointed to our commission. The chairwoman's often stated goal was to keep the Park from developing.

2-00:10:30

Cándida Smith: Your park.

2-00:10:28

Hart: My park. There was not going to be any development. A visitor center was okay. Her idea was to have a post with a book on the top, one for each state. Any woman who came to visit the Park could write her thoughts on being a woman. We would do that maybe in the Wesleyan Chapel. All this stuff about these historic buildings and the history of women's rights, was not the topic that we were going to develop and talk about. Phyllis Schlafly's friend had one mission, which was to change the name of the Park, to anything but the Women's Rights National Historical Park. The two of them really tried.

What they really did—I discovered the power of backlash—so alienated everybody in the community. They were so dismissive of everybody there, in Seneca Falls. And this Chairman just so offended everybody in this small upstate village that the backlash to her actually created a whole different level of support for the Park because every time she'd come to town, she'd stay three or four days. She'd sit in the bar at the hotel and talk very loudly about how terrible this Park was, and she wanted to stop it.

Instead, more folks in the village decided that what I was doing and what our staff was doing and what some of the leaders of the business community had put together was so attractive—for heaven's sake we brought Alan Alda to town. Who would they pick, Alan Alda or this woman? It actually created a much deeper and broader level of community support for the Park and moved it ahead faster than we would have otherwise.

2-00:13:28

Cándida Smith: It sounds like you got caught up in the battle over the Equal Rights Amendment [ERA], at this Park. It was kind of symbolic in some way.

2-00:13:42

Hart: I made a few people angry and disappointed, because I refused to discuss current issues. I said, "That's not what this Park is about." That was one of the big fights when the legislation was going through, with universal insistence that the Park would be limited by the legislation to the history of women's

rights. It was relatively clear in the legislation what that story was. So, I insisted that we not have exhibits that went beyond, say, 1920 in the Park and that we not talk about those things, that we not have programs, that we not be a focus of attention. I said, "This Park will die quicker than you can bat an eyelash if we get into that." So, we stayed out of that. But, of course, that was what a lot of the push pull was about.

When the Stanton house was finished in '84, when we were planning the ribbon cutting, I'll never know how it got on his agenda, but President Reagan seemed to be coming to cut the ribbon. It was never, "He will be there." But, we had at least three waves of Secret Service that came out and inspected everything and were talking about logistics and timing.

That was the same summer that there was a women's encampment at the Seneca Army Depot that was just south of town, which was alleged to be the place from which the Nike missiles were shipped overseas. So, there were several hundred women camping out on a farm close to the depot causing quite a ruckus over things.

I worked with the President of the nonprofit group, the Stanton Foundation. I said, "If that encampment is perceived as connected to the Park, is perceived as coming to downtown Seneca Falls because of the Park, it will be the end of this Park." So, Corinne Guntzel and her friends, many of whom were professors at the local college, spent the summer saying, "Do your thing but don't force a connection to the National Park because you'll kill it." The Park was still very fragile at that point. They stayed on their farm and demonstrated at the Depot for the most part. But when it came to Ronald Reagan coming to town, they said quite publicly--and they were in the papers all of the time, of course, it was the hottest story in town that summer--they would line the streets with their bodies and make him drive over them in tanks to get to the Stanton house. [laughs] That was really a very tense summer.

The word got out that the President was not coming, and I spent a whole day taking calls from the press and explaining that, "No, the Park Service did not tell him not to come." Of course we hadn't invited him to come either, so my tongue would be awfully busy working around the answers. It turned out Reagan didn't come, and we had a perfectly lovely ribbon cutting.

2-00:16:49

Cándida Smith: Who did you get to cut the ribbon?

2-00:16:53

Hart: Congressman Horton was our star for the day and Ralph Peters, who had been the owner of the house and lived in Seattle. [laughs] I had forgotten that. I had to persuade the nonprofit Stanton Foundation to donate the Stanton house to the Park Service, but first I had to persuade Peters to let go of it, because he had bought it, just driving through town. It was up for sale, and he wanted to protect it. I had been working with Ralph Peters for at least a year by then.

And then when Ronald Reagan won the election, Peters did not want to let go of it. I flew out to Seattle where he lived, and fortunately they were having a Park Service Regional Directors meeting, so the Director of the Park Service and all the Regional Directors were in Seattle. I met with Ralph in the lobby of my hotel that first night. They had these big flat upholstered arms on the chairs, and he was banging his fists and screaming at the top of his voice in the lobby how much he hated Ronald Reagan. That he would never give his house to Ronald Reagan. God knows what would happen if he let go of it and Ronald Reagan got hold of it. [laughs] I could see my job going down the tubes.

But, the Director at the time was Russ Dickinson, referred to as “the silver-haired, silver tongued Russ Dickinson.” He was elegant and gracious, warm and friendly, and everybody loved Russ Dickinson. Ralph and I met with Russ Dickinson the next day, and Russ did his magic. He was just so impressive as a human being. All those classic qualities: really tall, elegant looking, white hair all combed back. He looked like the Director of the National Park Service. He promised Ralph that if he gave us the house, the Park Service would immediately start restoring it. Ralph said, “Okay,” which meant the Stanton house jumped up about three hundred levels on the funding list, because the Director had made that promise. That’s how we got to start the renovation the day we cut the ribbon, the day Alan Alda was there. The Park Service crew went over and took off the old wood stairs on the house and started the construction by replacing the stairs. We also opened the Stanton house to the public for just the one day. This was just five months after I moved to Seneca Falls.

So, in its very odd backlash way—not so much the Republicans in general, not even so much Ronald Reagan, except with Ralph Peters, but the fear of—I’m blanking on the secretary.

2-00:19:39

Cándida Smith: Watt?

2-00:19:38

Hart: The fear about James Watt. In its own way, it made it hard for me, but it moved the Park ahead as a reaction against those forces.

2-00:20:04

Cándida Smith: Well, you’ve mentioned how you made a decision that you did not want the Park to go past 1920, which is a nice historical justification, but I wonder how this political situation affected the interpretive program that you developed. What did you learn about how to present an interpretation of a subject, which even though it is more than a hundred years old, is still highly political?

2-00:20:41

Hart: I found that very easy when I was working there, because most people that I talked to did not know that women did not have the right to vote until this

century. They were astonished by it. That would catch their attention immediately. The rest of it was really complicated in their minds. What do you mean they couldn't go to college? What do you mean they couldn't be a lawyer? You might be able to get into all of that, but that women couldn't vote caught everybody's attention. That was always my focus, was talking about women getting the right to vote. I didn't ever talk about the Equal Rights Amendment, which of course was announced in Seneca Falls, right after women did get the right to vote. But it was clear that, first of all, we didn't have the time or money to even tell the primary story, the right to vote story.

My great disappointment about that Park was that I left after six years out there, and we'd sponsored a national design competition; we'd had entries from every state in the country. A very prestigious jury picked the bold design of going back to the historic bricks and just saving a sense of the Wesleyan Chapel. That had all gone very well. The two young women from Harvard who'd won that design competition, Ray Kinoshita and Ann Marshall, created a team of experienced professionals and won the contract to do the A&E work, architectural and engineering study and design. We got a massive amount of funding at the time; we had a line item congressional appropriation for seven and a half million dollars to do that project.

I left with the proviso that the interpretive exhibit team had to hire an historian. That was as far as I got, and then I left. The exhibits there now barely tell the story of what happened in Seneca Falls around the convention. My least favorite exhibit was a monitor set on a post that had an interactive video with a current young man and a young woman talking about how they feel about dating. I'm like--we're spending federal money on this?

In the visitor center there was one huge wall that had a poster as part of a permanent exhibit. It showed a placard from a modern protest, something about lesbian rights. It caused a backlash. Of the sort that I envisioned from day one, and thought, "What for? Let this park get its legs under it talking about history and then take on a lecture series. Who can complain about a lecture series?" A blue ribbon committee came in to look at it and recommended taking it down, but then that caused a backlash.

My disappointment with that whole permanent visitor experience is that it doesn't, in my opinion, turn a light bulb on. To me, that's number one. Help visitors understand the history, the context, of women's rights and inspire them to think about how history is shaping today's society and their lives. You don't need to push current issues in their face with federal tax money.

2:00:25:23

Cándida Smith: What was your thinking about dealing with the issues of divorce couverture? Couverture might have been kind of technical, but divorce was certainly a central issue for the Seneca Falls group and for Stanton throughout her life.

2:00:25:48

Hart:

I always felt that all we had to do was tell the story of what the historical issues were and how they fought them. Unfortunately, it was not what happened there. It's a complicated story, but you take it one at a time and talk about property rights and divorce and who inherits the money and under what circumstances. There's a whole very rich story of the wealthy Dutch landowners in eastern New York supporting women's rights, because they saw over time their daughter would lose the family inheritance, and could be treated very badly by her husband. There was nothing they could do about it. It was a compelling story to tell and important for people to learn. To this day I don't believe that the Park, using federal tax dollars, needs to push today's issues in anybody's face. The Park should enlighten them—I've always believed that if somebody understands the larger context, and some of the highlights of what's happened, then going away and thinking about their own life, looking around them with different eyes, is more important than trying to push some button about a current issue, which is going to be different for every Superintendent. I feel very strongly about it, and I don't think the Park is very successful in that regard.

2:00:27:13

Cándida Smith: You were Park Superintendent for six years there?

2:00:27:18

Hart:

Yes.

2:00:27:18

Cándida Smith: What led you to move on?

2:00:27:21

Hart:

Most of the development of the—the Stanton house was restored; the Wesleyan Chapel was underway; the right people had been hired to do it. I thought the Park had a very straightforward future in front of it. We had acquired the McClintonck house, and I had money in the pipeline to get that restored. I've never been a person to do operations. Operations and maintenance are not my thing. I certainly might have stayed through the development of the Wesleyan Chapel, and it was a hard decision to leave when I did. I said that it was just time. "I'm burned out. I'm worn out. I need to do something different in my life."

It had been a very emotional few years for me. Somebody said to me that when you find a real passion in your life, it's often about healing a personal wound and you don't know it, but you just—to me going out and spending six years there, plus two years before that talking about issues of women's rights, when I had had this whole career when I never thought about it, but I had been in the middle of it. So it was a real acting out of a lot of stuff that had been building up inside of me and again pulling at pieces of me to change. I know it's true, and I've been told it often enough, that one of my strengths is that I can inspire people when I talk, because I'm connecting to some deeper part of me. Well, I went a whole lot deeper when I went out there, in terms of

connecting what I was publicly doing with who I was deep down inside, which was exhilarating when it worked and went well. It was very inspiring, obviously to the people around me, but it was also exhausting. I needed to be doing something different for myself.

[Narrator addendum: But before we move on to the next phase, I think it important also to mention some of the folks who put their heart and soul into getting this Park off the ground. It truly takes a dedicated army for liftoff. First and foremost are the Stanton family, including the great granddaughter Rhoda Barney Jenkins, and great grandson John Barney and great-great granddaughter Coline Jenkins. They frequently visited the Park and always brought with them significant donations, including all of the Elizabeth Cady Stanton furniture now in her restored home, her china, and many additional historic pieces. They also purchased the lot next to the Stanton home and donated it for our eventual use. Their presence and enthusiasm gave the fledgling Park a stature it could not have had without them.

Bert Fortner and Phil Prigmore were architects working for the Village of Seneca Falls and also planning the state Urban Cultural Park there with the head of the UCP, Augie Sinicropi. Our joint planning was both a great joy and a challenge. Corinne Guntzel and Lucille Povero were Presidents and leaders of the non-profit Stanton Foundation that accomplished heroic work that the Park could not. Marilyn Bero was the link to the National Women's Hall of Fame in Seneca Falls and worked tirelessly to smooth out bumps between the Park and local organizations. The Hall of Fame's independent work and programs also lent credence and substance to the development of the Park, and the Seneca Falls Historical Society was the source of invaluable information on the history of the community.

Ralph Peters purchased the Stanton home with great assistance from Audie Malone, a Seneca Falls real estate brokerage owner who also negotiated the tricky months when Peters was refusing to sell to the Stanton Foundation because of his fear of Secretary Watt. Audie Malone was also a great help to me with other Village matters, as well as my personal home! The regional office staff of the Park Service in Boston was extraordinarily helpful to the Park and to me, negotiating our first visitor center, securing a free excess furniture set for eight in our new office, writing and producing a walking tour, helping with the Alan Alda ribbon cutting July 1982, coming out to march in the Convention Days parades so we would look more substantial than we really were in the early days, and just everything that I needed. I could not have done it without their help. And their good and cheering spirits when things seemed maybe not to be possible to accomplish. Herb Cables was the Regional Director whose enthusiasm for the Park supported and affirmed the efforts of the staff to help the Park.

And underlying it all was the work of a high school student, Hanns Kuttner, who got all the Park properties listed on the National Register of Historic

Places and the Wesleyan Chapel listed as a national landmark, at the suggestion of Nancy Dubner. If these two had not engineered this accomplishment before the National Park Service arrived, I think the unimpressive appearance of the historic sites would have been an insurmountable challenge.]

2-00:32:48

Cándida Smith: So, where did you go?

2-00:32:49

Hart: Well, my parents were getting ill. They were growing older, and getting less well. They had moved to Richmond, Virginia to be closer to my sister and her family when my father retired. So it was time to get closer to them, and I had always wanted to live in Washington DC. I went on a detail, which turned out to be about four months, working for the Twenty First Century project, a Park Service, look-into-the-future big project. I did that for about four months. My parents got sicker and my mother started to have a series of strokes and was really not at all well. So, I decided it really was time to live closer. It was a good change for me to be in a bigger place. I used to describe Seneca Falls to my close friends as "There wasn't a corner I hadn't been around." There were no surprises left. And I really need that to inspire me, like, "Oh, what's next? What's next?"

I loved being in Washington. I loved the music. I loved the culture. It's a gorgeous, gorgeous city. All the flowers. I was living in the city, and I loved everything about Washington, except for the summer weather. So, I applied for a job with legislation in Washington and got that after about four months, I guess. While I was still on the detail, I got the job in legislation, so I permanently moved to Washington, working on new parks again.

2-00:34:38

Cándida Smith: So you were writing the legislation for new parks for how long a time?

2-00:34:42

Hart: I was in that job six years and *loved* it. I got to work on some parks that were really dear to my heart. Manzanar, the World War II Japanese internment camp in southern California. I did a lot of work on Manzanar. Some in the Park Service didn't want it to happen; some in this region, California, didn't want it. I did a lot of damage control. So, I was very proud of the fact that it did get to be established, and it's an amazing place now. I did a lot of work on Petroglyphs, which was the same thing.

2-00:35:26

Cándida Smith: So, you were in New Mexico?

2-00:35:26

Hart: Yeah, the volcanic cliffs on the west side of Albuquerque. There was pretty general support for the Petroglyphs, but my part in that was to say that you can't just do the Petroglyphs; you need the volcanoes. That's where the

sacred—well they are both sacred sites, but the more sacred sites are the volcanoes and the sacred land around them. I did a lot of damage control on that, a lot of promoting. It really needed to be the larger park, which got into all sorts of really complicated land ownership issues and development issues, but it did end up being the larger park. Those are the two that stand out in my mind at the moment. But I thoroughly loved expanding the Park Service.

Many in the Park Service have said to me that I was the one that started idea parks in the Park Service. I'm not sure that I started them. I think that's an overstatement. I think they are parks about values, and those are the ones that have always excited me. I always really pushed to get them in the Park Service. They've always been odd. Manzanar was very hard for the Park Service to swallow because people kept saying there aren't any buildings there anymore, what is there to preserve? I'd say, "Well, you can see the outlines of the buildings, the foundations, the ghosts of them, and it's very haunting in its own way." Women's Rights had a very hard time, because the buildings didn't look grand, they didn't look presidential. I'd have to keep saying, "You have to understand that women's history doesn't happen in palaces, and because it isn't a palace doesn't mean that the Park Service can't be there"

It's all about values for me. Values and untold stories, things that haven't been brought to light before, that the Park Service has the ability bring into the national consciousness.

[Narrator addendum: These parks raised the issue that is core to the Park Service, and that is interpreting stories through historic structures. I believe one aspect of the meaning of my starting "idea parks" is promoting two parks that did not have gorgeous, impressive, structures from which to tell the story. And for a time we weren't positive that the remains of the Wesleyan Chapel in Seneca Falls in fact included historic remains of the Chapel. So I was promoting new parks in spite of a lack of spectacular architecture. So I was promoting parks whose story, whose story about values, was more significant than the architecture available to tell the story.]

And there was a second controversy, especially regarding Manzanar. Some in the Park Service believed that the Service was in the business of celebrating American History. This point of view was described by some as telling "only happy stories" and no one could believe that the internment of Japanese for no fault but being Japanese could be considered a happy story. There was significant pushback around this concern.

2-00:37:35

Cándida Smith: So, how did the Rosie idea generate?

2-00:37:38

Hart: I came in relatively late on that, before the legislation but relatively late. The properties of the four shipyards Henry Kaiser built, somehow or another

evolved to the City of Richmond and the Redevelopment Authority. Shipyard Number Two, which was the largest one, is now covered with attractive housing on streets with names like Schooner Drive, Wind Drift, Sea Lane and Sea Breeze. One section, the most visible section, was intentionally designed to look like Cape Cod. The first city councilwoman for the City of Richmond, Donna Powers said that we were losing our history, that we were destroying it. This is where World War II happened, and now it's Sea Breeze Drive. So she first wanted to name the park that is surrounded by all that housing the "Rosie the Riveter Park," and then she decided there should be a memorial. So the city sponsored a design competition for the memorial, and that of course, is what's there now.

2-00:38:55

Cándida Smith: What year are we talking about?

2-00:38:56

Hart: I'm not sure what year it started. They dedicated it in 2000. It took them three years, so three or four years before then.

2-00:39:08

Cándida Smith: So, you got involved about when?

2-00:39:07

Hart: 1999. Once the memorial was well underway—before it was finished, but underway—the city went to Congressman Miller, George Miller, and said that we'd like to have this affiliated with the Park Service. So he shepherded a law to enactment saying the Park Service would have to do a study, to see whether or not it could be an affiliated area. He hadn't been talking to the Park Service much, because we would have said, "It can't be because it's not historic." They hadn't even built it yet, so it certainly was not historic. But Ray Murray, who is in charge of planning for the Park Service regional office in San Francisco, went over to meet with the group. He looked around and he asked what were all these historic buildings that we now know as Shipyard Number Three and the Ford Assembly Building. The group told him, and he said that this memorial couldn't be an affiliated area on its own, because it's not historic, but he noted that there were all these historic properties here and that that's what we'd need to look at to see if there is a national park here.

So he wrote a study that would include all of the properties that are now part of the Park. I guess the original concept was that the Park Service would own everything. Ray was very excited about it. The Regional Director, John Reynolds, was very excited about it. The draft study was submitted to headquarters in Washington, and I was working part of the time with the planning office there. It just went like that. [claps] Denny Galvin, Deputy Director of the Park Service, who had been a long-time standing strength in the agency, said there's no way we are going to do this park. It's a nationally significant story, but there's no way we could do this park. We can't afford it.

The Regional Director said it was the best thing that ever happened; we've got to do it. I was told there was some yelling over the phone about the study.

So the Washington office asked me to come in and edit the study and basically work through this controversy that's built up. So, I did my usual thing and got on the phone and called everybody and said, "What's your position? What's your understanding of somebody else's position? What's your idea of what a compromise might be?" I made that loop two or three times around at least, talking to everybody, and then proposed a compromise, which was that the Park Service could not own or preserve anything in Shipyard Number Three, couldn't own the Ford building, couldn't preserve it, and couldn't own or preserve the SS Red Oak Victory. At which point, they asked what makes for a park there. I said, "Well, we have the Park Service sized things that the Park Service can do. We can build a visitor center. We could own and restore"—and this was my real compromise—"we could own and restore the Kaiser hospital, the child care center, and the war working housing. Those are all perfectly manageable structures. They all tell nationally significant stories of their own, and that could be the park if all else fails and Shipyard Number Three never opens to the public and the city doesn't do anything." And everybody said that sounded good. So, everybody started talking to everybody else again.

We had another flare-up because there had not been a survey across the nation to make sure that Richmond was the best place to do this. The Park Service had become polarized over this issue.

2:00:43:04

Cándida Smith: I guess I'm not clear on what the deal is to be polarized over. Is it fiscal? Is it the story?

2:00:43:11

Hart: There were two polarizing issues. The one I was just telling you was money. It was pure-and-simple money. Denny Galvin, the Deputy Director, said that if we devoted the entire National Park Service construction budget to Rosie for ten years, we still couldn't finish it. It was just money on that first round. The second round, that we hadn't proved that this was the best place to do a Rosie / World War II home front park, was more about process, and not following procedures. In the end, some people got on the phone and did a telephone survey of the historic preservation offices around the country and confirmed that Richmond *was* by far the best place to support the park story. So that all got resolved like two weeks before the hearing, which had been scheduled because George Miller was retiring from the head of the Natural Resources Committee, and this was his going-away gift essentially.

We did all agree with this compromise I suggested and wrote a vastly different piece of legislation. I was part of the team that came up with the concepts, along with Warren Brown, head of planning in Washington, but it was actually written by the Chief of Legislation for the Park Service, Don

Hellman. And the new draft went to the Hill just in time to not embarrass anybody for the hearing. [chuckles] We testified in favor of it, and the rest is history. Well, I shouldn't say that. It was signed by President Clinton in October of 2000, again, in anticipation of an election after which it might not have been signed by the new administration. So President Clinton didn't have a broken collar bone. It wasn't December. But the legislation was up against it. [laughs] Everybody believed it was up against it to get it signed before it died with the end of that congressional session.

2-00:45:08

Cándida Smith: How did you land the job as the Founding Superintendent? Did you volunteer for it?

2-00:45:18

Hart: I was very interested. I had become really enamored of it in the course of editing the study and working on the legislation and trying to figure it all out. I had no intention of moving again, but went to lunch with friend and Departmental Solicitor Nicholas Targ. In the middle of our discussion on the park legislation he said you need to go out there and start this up. My parents and sister had all passed away while I was living in Washington. I had always wanted to live in San Francisco. I had always wanted to live in Washington, Vermont, and San Francisco, and Boston. And I had already lived in Washington and Boston, and spent enough time in Vermont. So, when the legislation passed—by this time I had been out here several times, I had gotten to know the local people and thought, "Oh this is just fabulous." So I told the Regional Director I was interested, but they were going to compete the job, of course. Actually that's not true. He had told me that he would just transfer me, that he would just reassign me. I had forgotten that part of it. The regional office decided to advertise it. And then the region decided to advertise for an Acting Superintendent.

So, I applied for the acting job with much handwringing. There's this thing in the Park Service; sometimes acting superintendents can't get selected for the permanent job, and sometimes it's a shoo-in to be selected as permanent, and you never really know which will happen. But I applied for it, because I decided it was too dangerous not to. The Regional Director called me and said—when he saw my application for the acting—he said I was it. You're the Superintendent. This was eight o'clock in the morning at home, and I said, "I'm it. Am I the acting, or am I the permanent?" He said I was the permanent; that he had decided to scrap all of that because I had decided to apply for it. So, I became the permanent Superintendent.

2-00:47:06

Cándida Smith: So, as I remember, you arrive in the Bay Area in January 2001.

2-00:47:14

Hart: Well, because I was the acting, I came two or three different times that fall for a week or two and tried to keep things going. Then I moved here January 12th, I believe it was, of 2000.

2-00:47:28

Cándida Smith: 2001.

2-00:47:28

Hart: 2001, you are right.

2-00:47:27

Cándida Smith: Can you describe the resources that you had on hand as you started your job?

2-00:47:37

Hart: When I arrived in Richmond, every historic structure was threatened with demolition, or death by neglect. I went to meet with the Director of the Port. He said that we had to tear down that building on the waterfront, that the roof was on the floor, and that there was no way the public was ever going to get in the Port. It was too dangerous. I said okay.

I met with the county officials, and they were ballistic. They were so angry. They had gotten federal money to demolish the two child care centers as part of their grant to build the new Head Start center. I got this “who the hell do you think you are?” in my face up three levels. I started with the facilities manager, Al Prince, then the head of facilities, then the Assistant Deputy County Administrator who was redder than anything on this jacket. His whole face was just beet red as he was yelling me at about who did I think I was from the federal government telling the county what they had to do. Thankfully, County Supervisor John Gioia was very enthusiastic about the Park, and his enthusiasm became shared by Al Prince and the Administrator. And they became huge supporters of the Park.

Let's see. The Kaiser hospital, the plan was to build a second floor and then on top of the second floor put domes and minarets so that it would look like a mosque. The Ford Building, they had just lost—no, I guess they still had the first developer. They still had Forest City when I got here. Forest City pulled the plug later that spring on the Ford Building.

I remember at that point I was living in Oakland, and the regional office was still in San Francisco, and I was taking the bus over the bridge in the morning. The tide happened to be out, and I could see like a half a mile of mud right there in Emeryville where the Bay Bridge ends. I remember looking out the window and thinking, “Dot-com collapsed, Forest City’s pulled out, and everything has just gone out from under Rosie.” All of the things that we thought would make it happen, which was the money of the dot-com boom, that private people would donate money to have this happen. And here the first big project was abandoned two months after I moved here. I wasn’t wrong about that and the impact on the park.

2-00:50:08

Cándida Smith: So, the funding plan for the Rosie park was to rely pretty exclusively on private investors?

2-00:50:15

Hart: Yes, for the three big pieces—the Ford building, Shipyard Number Three and the *Red Oak Victory*. We sat around and talked about it in headquarters. It was easy in Washington. We'd heard about and read about the dot-com boom. It wasn't particularly happening in Washington, so it was almost easier to imagine it happening in California. And I had been to a preservation conference that year, that November, in Los Angeles, the National Trust Convention, and I went out to see the Gamble House, a dream of mine for decades, and discovered not the Gamble House, but another prominent Greene and Greene House had been kind of adopted by Brad Pitt. He had put millions and millions of dollars into its restoration, quietly. I thought, "Yeah, we were right, that's exactly what's going to happen." [laughs] We really thought that a Brad Pitt would adopt Shipyard Number Three and just make it happen—not Brad Pitt, we actually thought it would be dot-com money. Obviously that didn't happen, and this caused a great deal of turmoil and disappointment and sense of loss in Richmond, because all of that money has disappeared.

I remember I used to have a meeting every week, a coordinating committee meeting, and the head of the library said one day after about three months, he said he finally got it, that he understood what I was saying. Because everybody thought a trainload of federal money was coming to town, and I had to explain over and over and over again, that there were all these dreams and expectations and designations as national historic sites, and no money. That's what I did year one. And, "By the way, you can't tear it down, because it's been designated as nationally significant." Which would result in the who-the-hell-do-you-think-you-are speeches, monologues. But he was of a more even temperament. I'll never forget him sitting at the other end of this conference table. He said that it was like I had brought this great big box to town, this beautiful box with this great big beautiful bow on it. They'd opened up the bow, taken the top off the box. The box was empty. I was telling them they had to do all of this work. I said, "Well, we'll do it together. But I don't have any money to bring to you."

There was first a belief that the money would come and then a tremendous sense of disappointment and anger that in fact the federal money wasn't going to come. And not only was it not going to come for the restoration, but the operating budget only supported one staff person.

2-00:53:03

Cándida Smith: You.

2-00:53:03

Hart: Me. That was it for the first two years.

2-00:53:07

Cándida Smith: And you had no office.

2-00:53:05

Hart: And I had no office. Everything I did, I begged for free. My first real office was free space in the County Supervisors' office. The space we have now in City Hall is free. The regional office even told me that when they moved from San Francisco to Oakland that first summer, they told me that I couldn't have a space in Oakland, which would have put me entirely back in my car. That's what *I* remember of the first year, was sitting in my car making phone calls, trying to write notes, making meeting arrangements, and trying to figure out where to go to the bathroom—the only public bathroom that I knew of was in City Hall. I was never so happy as when Café Teatro opened up, right there in Marina Bay. They had this beautiful, big, new women's bathroom, and all I had to do was buy a cup of coffee. I could even easily park there. They even had tables and chairs, where I could check my cell phone and write notes on their little tables.

2-00:54:31

Cándida Smith: When you say that your office was your car, you're speaking literally.

2-00:54:35

Hart: Literally. My first office was my temporary apartment here. I had two bedrooms, and I had all the room in the world, but that only lasted about four months. I operated out of my car for years, years until we actually had offices in Richmond two years ago. So, that was two years of operating out of my car. I had an office in San Francisco that I would use two days a week because I didn't have any other way of getting my e-mail. Then someone took pity on me and gave me the bid opening room in Oakland, so I actually had an office there, because, again, I couldn't get my e-mail checked from anyplace else. Then I had the office for a while in the County Supervisors' office So, I had San Francisco, my car, my home, Oakland, and the County Supervisor, and finally the offices we have now at City Hall.

2-00:55:55

Cándida Smith: I think we should end for today.

2-00:55:58

Hart: My voice is totally gone.

Interview 2: October 16, 2005

Audio file 3

03-00:01:40

Cándida Smith: As we were starting to set up, you were talking about the issue of having to start from scratch multiple times.

03-00:02:01

Hart: There were many layers and many levels that I had to keep starting all over again. Everything fell to me because the first couple of years I was the only staff person. I had to start over again with the Regional Director. John Reynolds had recruited me for the job. I had known John, worked with him for twenty-five years. I admired him enormously. He was very easy for me to work with. We understood each other; we had really helpful conversations. John had the ability to—it was almost mystical; he could cut through so many issues and just come right to the point. I'd go away thinking about something that he'd said and kind of retool the way I was approaching something. Then he decided to retire after I was there for two years. I was devastated when he left because he knew how to build not-traditional parks, working with partners, collaborating with community groups.

There were some in the region it seemed to me who somehow thought a partnership meant the community would on their own do the tasks involved in developing the Park. That was not the case, at all. Working with our partners, I had to do even more work to collaborate and inspire somebody else to do something. I had to create the dream, promote the dream, get agreement on plans, and then inspire folks to spend their money and time to make their plans happen.

03-00:04:48

Jon Jarvis became Regional Director, and we started over. His position was that I should wait until the General Management Plan got finished in a few years, and then we'd start doing something and get some funding a few years after that.

Cándida Smith:

Well, let's step back and discuss, or define at least, what a general Management Plan is, what it was that the National Park Service expected, and then what you were required to do.

03-00:06:17

Hart:

Well, it was core and spine to the challenge of Rosie, because in a traditional park the General Management Plan is an outline of the development that will happen in the park: the buildings that will be acquired, the roads that might be put in, the parking lots that might be put in—the development to be done by the Park Service. It is used in the National Park Service as the vehicle for compliance with the National Environmental Protection Act, NEPA. So it is a combined environmental impact statement and a development concept plan. That works well in a conventional park where the Park Service is going to do

the development. Except in Rosie, almost all of the significant development, the extensive, expensive development, was going to be done by the partners. It didn't make any sense to write a plan about what they would do, if they weren't willing to do it.

Particularly with Shipyard Number Three. Back when the team drafting the legislation was sitting around in Washington trying to come up with a legislative concept that would work, we fussed and fussed. I don't mean argued, but tangled and created alternatives and did everything we could think of to come up with how the National Park Service could write a plan for Shipyard Number Three, which was fifty acres, five historic structures, a number of modern structures, and the Port for Richmond. What was the National Park Service going to say that would make any sense and comply with the environmental requirements? Well, nothing. So the determination was that the City of Richmond would write an Historic Preservation Plan that would be attached to the General Management Plan. We knew that it could not be the Park Service sitting down and writing that plan.

I confess when I first started working at Rosie, I was concerned about being so dependent on the city. After I thought about it more and became familiar with the folks in the city government, I decided having the city develop the core of what would become the General Management Plan was absolutely brilliant, because it gave the freedom to the city to say what they wanted. It gave them their own power, their own determination, and it required the Park Service to work with the city. The legislative team, including the Washington Chief of Planning Warren Brown, was very clear about these legal and practical issues. But it was a major struggle in the regional office. Talk about starting over. We had three different team captains for our General Management Plan.

Cándida Smith: How were the team captains selected?

03-00:09:12

Hart: Well, the first one was a staff person in the regional office assigned by the Chief of Planning there.

[Narrators addendum: We were in this first round successful in working with the region's cultural resources staff to lay out and organize the research and studies that would be needed to preserve the structures and develop the Park. This became critical as the regional cultural resources Chief Stephanie Toothman was excited about the Park, and she funded study after study so that we were able to move ahead with the community as they found ways to fund preservation of their properties.]

Cándida Smith: The regional office is located where, in this case?

03-00:09:42

Hart:

In Oakland, California. I said after a while, "We really need to rethink how we're doing this. If the Park Service writes the standard Park Service plan for this Park, it's going to be irrelevant." And that's the road we were going down. I said, "We have got to work with the community, the City of Richmond, Contra Costa County, the owner of the hospital," which was the Northern California Muslim Association—and this was right after 9/11. The wartime housing was a co-op at this point, owned jointly by several hundred residents. I said we had no traction at this point. We were not working with the community. We needed to spend a lot more money than we'd been talking about and revise the way we were working. We needed to push this up several levels of money and expectation. Folks became convinced that we needed to do a different kind of a plan and that we could perhaps even cut some new territory here. And additional funds were directed to the Rosie planning by Warren Brown back in headquarters in Washington.

Cándida Smith:

What were the incentives for the various property owners in the elements of the park?

03-00:11:15

Hart:

That is such a good question, because there really weren't any. That's the problem; that was the challenge with Rosie. A relatively small group of community movers and shakers had worked with the Park Service in the legislative phase; they had lobbied like crazy to get the Park. It was maybe a total of twenty or thirty people that had been involved. There's no way in the world you could say it was a community effort. The Mayor knew about it—all the political figures knew about it—but did the grassroots in Richmond know anything about it or support it? No, I don't think so.

It became imperative to, frankly, inspire them that they wanted to have a Park. It was okay, when they thought we were going to come in with a whole lot of money and do it for them. That was okay, the few people that knew about it, relatively few. But there was very little federal money. There was virtually nothing coming in at the time; there was an operating budget of \$114,000, much of which paid my salary. We were not permitted by the legislation to fund the big projects, being the Ford Assembly Building, Shipyard Number Three, and the *Red Oak Victory*. What was their incentive? That was exactly my problem about a year into it. It was like, oh, now what? When I realized that this notion of dot-com money and incredibly wealthy people who retired at thirty and were looking for something interesting to do, that wasn't going to happen in Richmond. It became a challenge to work with the leaders of the community, and also to get deeper into the community itself, to try and ignite some excitement about the Park, so that they would want to do it. Richmond is a community that's struggled with a lot of challenges, in terms of income, the success of their education, in terms of the homicide rate, in terms of the deterioration of some of the structures. The longer I worked there, the more convinced I became that a lot of that was traceable directly back to World War II. They had created this whole community in two years. Richmond had

grown from a community of 20,000 people—very small, white, rural farming village—to a city of 100,000 people, in two years. Many of the people who had created that explosion were African Americans that had come up from the South who had been recruited by Henry Kaiser. They had, by their account, not been treated well. In the words of one woman we worked with, prejudice against African Americans was created during World War II, along with this influx of Southerners.

[audio interruption]

Cándida Smith: It sounds like within the City of Richmond, you were dealing with their long history of racial difficulties, then. So the black majority in the city. At least the city government, the majority was African American. You had a set of more affluent white developers and white residents, particularly where the Park is. Then you had Asians and Latinos moving in. How does that demographic mix play out in the General Plan?

03-00:16:24

Hart:

Well, it made it very challenging doing the Plan because, as I was saying before, the longer I worked in Richmond, the more I connected their current issues with their history and their World War II, their Rosie history, because about 125,000 people were employed in Henry Kaiser's shipyards and the shipyards had been built for World War II. At the end of World War II, we declared victory and shut down the shipyards. Almost overnight, over 100,000 people were unemployed. Some thought that everybody who had been recruited to move to Richmond would somehow move back to Georgia or Alabama or Texas or Oklahoma. But they didn't; they stayed. I think there's a fairly direct line of disadvantaged people, unemployed people in Richmond, going back to that occurrence, because of course, there was no way that a community of 100,000 people could create 100,000 jobs overnight. So they stayed unemployed for some time. It became a personal mission to me, to do my best to inspire some enthusiasm and community pride in what they had done during the war years. It seemed to me in the beginning of my time there that the spirit of Richmond had become the spirit of 100,000 people put out of work overnight with very few sources of income, because their biggest one was simply gone.

I wanted, to the extent that I could, to move through that and take a look at what they had accomplished during the war, and inspire pride in that. I know that that was successful, in part. That was what became the inspiration to make the Park happen, was to celebrate the glory of what that community had been able to do. Even though when I arrived in Richmond, the majority of the population was African American, and they had personally experienced deep and profound levels of prejudice against them when they came to Richmond. That wasn't an easy thing to move through. But Richmond is also a community in transition, and while I was there, the African Americans became less the majority, and it was a combination of Hispanic and Asian—

most of whom were young, and virtually all of whom had recently arrived in the country. I had a pivotal conversation one day with a woman who was a supervisor in the child care center. I was trying to explain why it was important to keep things like the children's toys from the forties, that were still up in the attic in that child care center. I quickly ran through the usual vocabulary of preservation and history, culture, society. I was not getting very far, and I tried just the basic, this is from the 1940s; it's important to keep it. I realized halfway through the conversation, she really hadn't a clue what I was talking about. She hadn't been born then. She wasn't alive when World War II happened and she wasn't living in this country. That remains a challenge. We talked a lot about it. We tried very hard to reach the community with our public meetings. But in terms of what might inspire them to get excited about the Park, beyond the fact that this is where they lived and worked and had community connections, it was very challenging.

03-00:20:31

As the years went on, our efforts to reach the community evolved substantially. We worked with the church leaders to figure out where to hold meetings, and have them encourage people to come. Our last round of public meetings, I said, "These pages and pages and pages of words, they're just not going to cut it in Richmond. We need more graphics." It's a complicated plan that showed alternatives for all the different sites in the Park. So we need pictures and drawings that explain what these concepts mean. We can't expect people to read thirty pages of English after they arrive for a meeting. So it did make it a lot more complicated. I was very pleased that I think the efforts to reach the African American community were successful. Some of that was just plain word of mouth, as some key individuals became committed to the Park and the leadership of the community became more and more committed to the Park. It began to be a critical mass of support.

Cándida Smith: I think what we're doing is identifying the context, to use NPS language. Is that correct?

03-00:21:52

Hart: Yes.

Cándida Smith: So that's the local community context. What about the context of the developers, the investors who have to provide the money that the federal government is not going to provide?

03-00:22:14

Hart: Well, it was a lot of starting over, actually. The centerpiece, in the eyes of the city, was the Ford Assembly Building. I only make that distinction because I always felt Shipyard Number Three was at least as important as the Ford building. But the city had already committed to having a private developer develop that quarter-mile-long, 500,000-square-foot Ford building into a new reuse and a new center for development in Richmond. It was interesting that the Ford building, the historic Ford building, the land was given to Mr. Paar,

that whole area, Marina Bay, was given to him to develop on the condition that he brought one big corporation into the area, and that's why the Ford plant ended up there in the first place. So they were trying to repeat history with that development.

Forest City was the developer when I first started working on Rosie. They had come up with a design for hundreds of live-work units that were really pretty funky, I thought. You had a little window way up high in your studio, and your normal windows and your front door opened onto a corridor inside the building. There was going to be a picket fence around your piece of concrete in front of your studio. The developer planned to open up the roof to provide air to these internal sidewalks, but they discovered that because it was a national landmark, they couldn't alter the roof. It seemed to me a pretty funky plan, and much keyed to young dot-com people. When the dot-com bust came along, Forest City pulled the plug on the project. The city again went through months and months and months of arguing whether or not to demolish the building or to develop it. Finally, those who wanted to develop it won out.

After a very, very intense period of competition, the city picked Ethan Silva and Gerard Howland, who had fabulous ideas for an entertainment center in the Craneway. They were going to do such wonderful things there. Their idea was to collect all of the production sorts of folks who work in the movie industry and the theater industry and have them work under the same roof. Kind of an upscale professional commune, I always thought about it. I thought, "Wow, if I was in that field, I'd love to be in that Ford building." You could just walk down the hall and talk to the people who were making the foundation for the frame that you're making, for this thing that's going to be 350 feet high. It was a fabulous idea. But unfortunately, it just didn't come together.

03-00:26:10

That resulted in another round of discussion about demolishing the building, as being incapable of coming to a new, productive use for Richmond. But the forces to revive it and make it a centerpiece rose up again, spearheaded by City Council member Tom Butt, who led the way on much of the preservation progress in Richmond. Eventually the city hired a local person, with his headquarters in Richmond, who had a whole long history of development in Richmond, Eddie Orton. The Craneway was magnificent. It looks like a greenhouse with a sixty-foot-high ceiling. A beautiful space that was literally built on stilts, piers, over the water, looking over at San Francisco. Just a stunning, stunning space. And he wanted to include the visitor center for the Park in the Craneway. Eddie Orton loved the idea, was very excited about the Park Service being in the Craneway, with a restaurant and a jazz club. Then he would fill the rest of the building with whoever wanted to rent in there. He started working on that two years ago, maybe three years ago, and is still trying to rent out the Ford building. The good news is that the Park Service has put the visitor center on its priority-funding list. So the Park Service may

be part of what sparks the renting and development in the rest of the building. That was difficult and challenging, to keep starting over with new developers for the Ford Building.

Cándida Smith: What level of investment are we talking about for the developers, just of the Ford Assembly Building?

03-00:29:13

Hart: Well, it depended from developer to developer.

Cándida Smith: So we're talking about a developer who's going to have to put in tens of millions of dollars eventually?

03-00:30:11

Hart: Oh, the Ford project was generally considered to be in the range of \$80 million. \$16 million had already been spent. That was money that FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, had granted after the Loma Prieta earthquake had damaged the building so badly. They had, I believe, spent \$4 million of HUD money. I think about \$8 million of city money did the first round of work, which was to get the shell in waterproof condition—fix the windows, replace broken glass, repair the roof, get the shell secure. So it was that money on top of an additional \$60 million to develop the building. And that did not include finish work, and this is a huge building. That would just be to create a shell, if you will, so that some individual business could come in and finish their space to their own liking and needs. The Park Service estimate to move into the shell of the Craneway and put in exhibits—I think the last estimate was in the neighborhood of \$5 million, for a relatively small piece of space; we're talking about 8,000 to 10,000 square feet. It was a massive building. Three different, very highly qualified, experienced developers have tried to make a go of it and it's not open yet, or even very close to it.

Cándida Smith: So that's the second piece of the context. You've mentioned the city. Were you primarily dealing with the City Manager's office, the City Council, the Redevelopment Agency, all of the above?

03-00:32:02

Hart: All of the above and anybody who was willing to talk to me. In the first year, really, it was a carryover of the group that had done the Rosie Memorial. That was largely supported by the Redevelopment Authority. Tom Mitchell was the head of redevelopment at that point, and Gary Hembree was the principal staff person, as well as Richard Mitchell. Virginia Rigney, of the Arts Commission, was heavily involved; the librarian, Joe Green; the head of Park and Rec, Jesse Washington; Donna Graves, who was a consultant; certainly, Donna Powers, the City Councilwoman who started it; the museum director and *Red Oak Victory* owner, Lois Boyle. They were the ones—and city councilman Tom Butt—were the ones that had promoted the memorial. The same group carried over into working with the Park Service on the legislation, and the same group carried over into lobbying for the legislation. That was the tight,

inner group. Don Hardison, of the *Red Oak Victory*, was also very much part of that. And John Gioia and Al Prince for the child care centers owned by Contra Costa County.

When I started full-time, I'd have a meeting every week with the coordinating committee. They would all come and listen to what was not really happening yet, really, was kind of what they told me after a while. There isn't any news going on here because we didn't have any money. I remember saying, about three months into it, "We could create a sense of presence here by cutting a ribbon on something. It really doesn't matter what. Pass a piece of paper; we'll make up a ceremony. Are you all up for an event?" This was the spring of 2001; they had just come off the huge opening ceremony for the Rosie Memorial, in October of 2000, so it's about six months later. I said, "I can't do it by myself. I can't put together a ceremony that's going to be worthy of a National Park Service event. Can you do it? Do you want to do it?" They looked at me and said they were tired, burned out. And they were fighting. They had turned against each other, in their frustration and work and extension over the memorial, and there were some nasty fights going on. Some weren't speaking.

Cándida Smith: I guess we could think of this as a community group, but it's a Rosie special interest group that consisted of people who lived in Richmond, but probably also other communities?

03-00:34:51

Hart:

No, they were all Richmond, except for Donna Graves, who lived in Berkeley. They were all Richmond, and all people who were deeply committed to the community, really cared about it, really wanted to see change, that was really what was motivating them. But it was a group that had no real structure and really pretty much fell apart—it turned on itself—in my opinion because it did not have a structure. Various people got upset about this or that or the other thing, and once they got through this very successful commemoration, then the fights really started, and the non-speaking and the insults. The first six months I was there, everybody wanted to tell me just exactly how badly so-and-so had behaved on something or another. I finally said, "I wasn't here for that. I can't solve that. You're going to have to untangle that."

Cándida Smith: Was this group of people primarily from the West Side, from Point Richmond and the harbor area?

03-00:35:59

Hart:

Mm-hm.

Cándida Smith: So it represented the more affluent community?

03-00:36:02

Hart:

Definitely. Definitely.

Cándida Smith: So did this, within local community politics, then mean that the whole Rosie project was viewed as some Trojan horse to bring gentrification and poor people removal? [Narrator addendum: It is important to answer that by saying that Shipyard Number Three was already the Port of Richmond, and included no housing or community facilities; it was closed to the public. The Ford Assembly Building had been vacant since the Loma Prieta earthquake and been under used since World War II but had never included housing. The smaller structures were also under used, but no housing had ever been available in the historic structures. Except the war worker housing of course, which continued on as housing.]

03:00:36:14

Hart:

I don't think the community at large even knew it was happening, because that was the first phase. The memorial group was fighting; some weren't speaking to each other; others were fighting over who owned the names of the Rosies who had come for the commemoration. The fight over who owned the names of the Rosies went to mediation, actually, with the city attorney. I said, "This is getting nowhere. I need to change what I'm doing here."

I started working more with the city structure, more with the political structure; more with John Gioia, who was the County Supervisor; more with the City Manager, Isiah Turner; more with the Mayor, Irma Anderson; and more with the Redevelopment Authority, which still was Tom Mitchell and Gary Hembree. Those individuals were becoming very excited about the project. Along with the owners of the properties, they were the ones who participated in the first General Management Plan meeting. We needed to build community participation and the city government seemed a better way to begin.

Cándida Smith: The Lowell model is not something of interest out here?

Hart:

Oh, absolutely not, not in the regional office of the Park Service here. But the community stepped up to the challenge, and the Park is taking shape. A group of people, headed up by City Councilman Tom Butt and Mark Howe, raised about \$100,000 to move the huge whirly crane up the Santa Fe shipping channel in to Shipyard Number Three. It had been donated by Gary Levine to the Park. There'll be the *Red Oak Victory*, back in the Shipyard where it was built during the war, the graving basins where the ships were assembled, one of these huge whirly cranes, and all these signs and interpretive elements. I started calling it an "instant Park." I would officially, in planning meetings, call it a critical mass of visitor attraction; but to me, it was like instant Park. Again, those first four years, just everybody thinking and telling me I was crazy and there wasn't any money and, what in the world is that woman talking about? And all of a sudden, there's going to be huge attractions going in Shipyard Number Three. Port Director Jim Matzorkis is really proud of it. The Korean auto importing company is really proud of it. They like talking about the fact that they're part of a National Park. They funded some of the

signs. Some of that was the *Red Oak Victory*. The ease of working with the *Red Oak Victory* and Lois Boyle helped to make a lot of that work successful.

Audio file 4

Cándida Smith: What about the big concrete bunker building? When is that going to be open to the public? What would be required to make it open to the public?

04-00:00:40

Hart: The good news is that the property that the Korean car importers—they have a fence around all of their property, for security reasons, because they have all those brand-new cars parked there. Their property includes the machine shop, the other gorgeous building there, the Butler building, with the corrugated metal sides, that looks like a cathedral on the inside. They actually use that building in much the same way as they did in World War II. They fix the cars that got dented or broken or need some work before they can ship them out. But their property does not include the building you're talking about, which is the General Warehouse. Nor does it include the very simple, one-story building that is between the General Warehouse and the water, the Riggers Loft, the famous building that has its roof on the ground. But it's wood-frame; it'd be easy to fix. Jim Matzorkis has said that that part of the Port could be available to the public. The museum, the Richmond History Association, is interested in either this simple building that's right on the water, or the General Warehouse, or the Ford Assembly Building. A lot depends on the location of the ferry. Whether it goes to the Ford building or Shipyard Number Three may be the determining factor on a lot of development there. There's potential room for far more parking in Shipyard Number Three. I don't actually know about water access, but I should think that they would be able to take a ferry ride into one of the graving basins and really play up on the history that way. I know the developer of the Ford building wants them to dock right there at the Ford building. So time will tell where that story goes.

Cándida Smith: As part of the Park site, you have sort of miscellaneous properties that are not on the waterfront, that are, nonetheless, important to the story. The Kaiser Hospital is an important historic site.

04-00:06:36

Hart: It's extremely important. Kaiser Permanente began there. Of all the stories of discrimination, I never heard one about healthcare. Henry Kaiser decreed that all of his workers would be eligible for pre-paid preventative healthcare. For about a quarter a week, they could go in and have everything taken care of. Not for their family, just for the worker.

I heard a very eloquent defense of the hospital structure, the saving of the hospital, by an African-American woman, in a City Council meeting. I hadn't worked with her; I didn't know who she was. Her family, she said, had lived in Georgia and worked in the cotton fields. The first healthcare they ever saw, having a doctor help them, was at this old historic building.

It was vacant for I think about five years. In '98, perhaps, the Northern California Muslim Association bought the building. After they bought the building, they discovered it was in horrendous condition. The Park Service could help with the repairs. I set up a meeting. They were very kind. My principal contact was an engineer working for the state. He was who I worked with, typically. But when we would have a meeting, there would be five or six that would come. I quickly learned that they did not shake hands with women. And they wouldn't look at me. As we kept talking, the relationship began to take a firmer shape. Finally, they started saying that what they thought they would do is keep the shell of the building, gut it, create the large worship space that they wanted on the first floor, where the people would meet, and they would not put the domes and the rest on top. They would allow the building to continue looking as it had when it was a hospital. We could use a portion of the building to tell the story of healthcare and the hospital. Certainly, we would not need to interpret the whole hospital. When it seemed like perhaps they would be selling it, they did allow us to appraise it, and we did offer a purchase price. By then, it was after 9/11. They said That's not enough money to allow us to buy anything else and they feared they would be unable to rent anyplace else. So that fell apart. John Reynolds, God bless him, he was the one that said Try and buy it; you just never know what you'll need the space for. There are fifty different scenarios for what might happen with the old hospital, but I would be very happy if just some part of it, some part of the front of the building could be reconstructed. The original welcoming counter is gone, but it's clear from the floor plan where it was, and we have pictures. We know what it looked like. If that could be reconstructed and have some space for exhibits, it would be a huge victory for the visiting public.

Cándida Smith: What were your intentions for the child care centers?

04-00:13:14

Hart:

Whoa, what a saga! The Ruth Powers Child Care Center is still being used for a Head Start program. There is a serious education program going on that the county's quite proud of. The county applied for funds to build a new model Head Start center, one of the biggest ones ever funded by Head Start, to be built in Richmond, adjacent to the Ruth Powers Child Care Center. As part of that grant application, the county requested and received funding to demolish the two historic child care buildings that the legislation authorizing the Park gave us, the Park Service, the authority to acquire. The county was not really aware of that. That's where I sensed the notion of "Who the hell do you think you are telling us we can't tear these buildings down?"

But John Gioia lived in Richmond and is very dedicated. He's County Supervisor. His wife has been very involved in after-school child care, and he became very enthusiastic about the importance of those two structures. John Gioia, bless him, said that they were both historic, that we're going to keep them both and take care of them. He said they were both going to go in the registry [National Register of Historic Properties]. And they did. But that

didn't really make it a lot easier to actually implement that part of the plan. The buildings were very flimsily built. One didn't have a foundation at all. We had to have a seismic evaluation. Massive problems. They had dealt with the settlement problems by just cutting off the doors a little more every year.

The other child care center, the Maritime Center was chockablock full of World War II toys and furniture. There were rockers and sandboxes and kitchen sets and tool chests and hundreds of big wooden blocks. It was almost spooky. It was like somebody knew there was going to be a national park. There was a piece of fence from the backyard, upstairs in the attic. We knew that because Henry Kaiser loved to promote his fine work, and well he should have. He took photographs of the child care center as it was finished, so we knew where the sandbox was, we knew where the fence was. There was a picnic bench from the backyard, up in the attic with all these toys. There was one of everything. Not two or three, but one of everything. It's like somebody knew that someday, we would want to restore that building and refurbish it. All you had to do was carry it downstairs. Absolutely priceless things up there.

I followed what was called Prop 40 for four years. It was a large appropriation of state funds for the preservation of California history. Those two child care centers, every time they'd come out with a new announcement about what they were going to do with that money, I would think this was perfect for preserving the child care centers for the Park. But there are matching grant requirements, and the Park Service would not do it. I felt very strongly that if the Park Service wasn't going to come up with much real money, at least in my lifetime, there was no point in putting together a \$5.2 million application for Park Service funding, just for the Maritime Center. I was heartbroken. Are they ever going to find a way to preserve that building?

[Narrator addendum: City Council member Tom Butt led the way for several years putting together the funding for restoration of the Maritime Child Care Center. The Park Service studies funded by Stephanie Toothman created the information necessary to apply for Prop 40 funding, and for the collection of other funding sources to match the Prop 40 funding. The restored Maritime Center opened in 2011.]

04-00:22:50

Candida Smith: Then there's the war-worker housing.

04-00:23:44

Hart: It was hard to find anybody in the Atchison Village coop that we could work with. Board members changed every year. We got a grant from the California Coastal Conservancy the first year I was there. It was supposed to go towards developing the visitor center and the Ford building. Some funds went toward studying Atchison Village, and as we found out more about the history, it became clear that Atchison Village had been more managers' housing, that

there were no African Americans that were ever living there. It remains an important resource however.

Cándida Smith: What about Parchester Village, it's post-war housing, but do you view Parchester Village as part of the Park's larger story?

04-00:28:10

Hart: It's certainly relevant, because it's so much a part of the story of what happened after the war. Parchester Village was the one place where African Americans could buy a house after the war. The man who was City Manager for much of my time there, Isiah Turner, grew up in Parchester Village and talks about the joys of being in a small community where you knew everybody, everybody loved everybody. A lot of very highly accomplished people came out of Parchester Village. It's a very important part of the story.

The Park Service has only in the last few months stepped up to the plate to fund the visitor center. It has not stepped up to the plate with any substantial money to operate the Park or to restore the Maritime Center or the hospital, which are already deemed by Congress to be nationally significant. It would take quite a leap of stretch for the Park Service to get to working on Parchester Village.

Cándida Smith: What about the process of figuring out how to unify all these elements? Is that what the four alternatives are about?

04-00:31:37

Hart: We went through three General Management Plan team captains. The second was from the Denver Service Center and had years of experience with Park Service planning. But the standard Park Service process was demanding of more time and patience than the partners were able to give.

The third team captain was the hero of Rosie Park planning. Stephan Nofield had been a planner, very successful, working for the Town of Provincetown. He was always teaching me. He understood collaboration, and he had the kind of personality and the intellect to figure out how to work with large, diverse groups of people. Support from the City of Richmond all came together in the last round of public meetings, which culminated in a magical meeting when all the property owners came together for the first time in four years. They all laid out the commitments that they'd made in the process of our preliminary planning meetings, laid out the plans for their particular properties. Everybody got to listen to everybody else and everybody got excited, and they agreed to move ahead with making it happen. Stephan was crucial to this success; it wouldn't have happened without his expertise and style.

04-00:34:26

I want to also give credit to Jay Corey, who was the Assistant City Manager for a couple of years, and was really interested in making the Park work for the City of Richmond, and he loved working on it. That was fun. It was part of

his job he enjoyed, and he was totally supportive. He moved it ahead enormously.

Another person in a very key position, who was also critical to it all coming together, was Will Travis, Executive Director of BCDC [Bay Conservation and Development Commission]. I had met him about halfway through our planning process. There was a fascinating structure in Richmond that would put a train car on a ferry to take it over to San Francisco. ABAG [Association of Bay Area Governments] had restored that as part of the Bay Trail. I met Will at the event unveiling that project. He later came over and looked at the Park plans and listened to the ideas as we toured the Park facilities. I was very nervous about that at first, because, of course, he's in charge of use and development permits for shipping facilities for the entire Bay Area. As far as I knew, the position of BCDC had always been to dedicate every inch of land that could be used for shipping, to shipping, because it might be critical someday. Richmond had been considered, in my perspective, a landmark for future shipping. No one thought it was big enough for container shipping. But in that you-never-know-what's-going-to-happen mode, let's make sure Richmond stays there for future shipping use. Will Travis could have seen it as a conflict—public use, public access, preservation of historic structures—but he fell in love with the Park, and became one of our most enthusiastic advocates.

The fact that everybody knew that Will Travis loved the Park and was totally supportive, was dead set against filling in the historic basins, dead set against changing any of the historic resources—particularly, frankly, in the absence of that kind of power from the Park Service, Will Travis' looming presence in the San Francisco Bay, supporting and promoting Rosie at every turn, was hugely important, in terms of it all coming together. If for no other reason than the Port Director could have said, well, BCDC will never approve it. Whether it was true or not, they could have been saying that for years. But they couldn't and didn't, because Will Travis, in fact, did support it.

A private planning consultant, Larry Kennings, was also key in stopping things that would have prevented Park development. He represented a firm wanting to process and store asphalt in enormous tanks in Shipyard Number Three, which would directly impact some of the historic properties. By quietly revealing the true impacts, and dangers, of the proposal, the firm and the proposed huge tanks of hot asphalt melted away.

Cándida Smith: How does this then play out in the four alternatives that were developed for how the Park might be structured?

04-00:37:38

Hart:

The full-scale one is the easiest one to describe. All of the historic structures included in the authorizing legislation would be fully restored: exterior and interior preservation, and actively interpreted by the Park Service. The new

ferry service from San Francisco would dock either at the Ford Assembly Building on in Shipyard Number Three. The historic shipyard would be the site for many community uses and events as well as visitors to the Park.

The second and third alternatives are variances and simplifications of the first alternative: there would only be exterior preservation and interpretation of some sites; or there would be exterior preservation and interior preservation of only some of the sites.

The fourth alternative involved the community more actively. More like a heritage area. It included the active interpretation of historic Macdonald Avenue, and additional World War II sites around Richmond. It was very dependent on the active support, and work, and involvement, of the community at large. We knew that it was very important to have a community-based group to work to support the Park. There was no such group. Never was, in the whole four years I worked there. The fourth alternative might help create that group, or fail from the lack of it.

Cándida Smith: Other than the Rosie Trust.

04-00:42:49

Hart:

Yes, but they were not a widely-based community group. They were community leaders, by any stretch of the imagination. They didn't have a membership behind them. That made it very difficult for me. We've already talked about the difficulty of reaching the community at large. I never could find a way to fill that hole with a group.

Isaiah Turner, the City Manager for most of my tenure there, was totally enthusiastic about the Park. Really believed in it, wanted to make it happen, was supportive. Everybody knew Isaiah supported it and his support was extremely important. In the early phases, I worked with the Redevelopment Authority, which was Tom Mitchell in charge and Gary Hembree. Totally excited about what we were doing. But Tom got caught in a meat grinder over the Ford building and retired, which was a huge loss to me because the replacement, Steve Duran, never seemed to me to be as excited about the park. His focus was Macdonald Avenue. And I didn't get to work with Gary Hembree anymore.

It became clear to me that the Planning Department focused on permits. You want to build an addition on your house, you'd have to get a permit from them, and that was their focus. The Redevelopment Authority focused on redevelopment projects, parcel by parcel. There wasn't anybody who was looking at the future of the city as a whole, and how the Park Service might fit in. That was Isaiah Turner, with limited time. That was why I was so grateful when Isaiah hired Jay Corey, who was over the Port and redevelopment and planning. No one, to my knowledge, ever previously tried to make those three departments work together. Jay was committed to having them work together

and develop a strong economic base for the future of Richmond, and he felt that the Park was one of the obvious ways of doing that. So Jay was really pivotal.

There were five City Managers, four of them Interim City Managers, during my tenure that last year. It was very hard to get anybody's attention about anything, frankly.

04-00:49:17

Cándida Smith: One of the things, in our working together, that I've found interesting, and it seemed to me that it was a difficult push-pull factor for you, was that this is a National Park about a national story, and yet you had to be so closely attuned to the local story. Were you finding yourself torn between the practical needs of connecting with the local community and your charge to create a National Park about a national story?

04-00:50:01

Hart: Oh, it was like being on the rack. I didn't retire because I was feeling better or healthier. At the end of four years I retired because I was personally a wreck from trying to hold it all together. Not that I did it all by myself, but in phases and at times, and in those places where there really was no other support, I was holding the dream together. I loved what Rosemary Corbin said, the former Mayor who was also on the Rosie Trust Board, in commiserating with some people about my leaving. She said, and I quote, "Judy got us to believe in the Park." That was my job. That's where it had to start. I went through phases of being very frustrated with the legislation, because nothing was quite locked into the future of the Park, via the legislation. But I kept coming back to thinking that this was a good piece of legislation, given these realities that survived the dot-com crash. And it's still a good piece of legislation.

We haven't talked yet about the other humongous part of the job, which was the Ford project. Which really answers a lot of your question. Ford Motor Company has had a contractual relationship with the National Park Foundation, which is a national nonprofit that works with the National Park Service. I started working on a proposal for Ford when I was still in Washington, working in planning. The two women who were the principal liaisons in the project I had worked with in other areas as well. We were good friends. So every year when they'd go through another funding cycle, I'd come up with a proposal. Ford had had hard times, and they were not really funding these efforts.

But two years ago, Ford decided to fund a call for Rosie stories. The original plan was to use a quarter of their year's advertising budget to call for Rosie stories—which, of course, had Ford's name on it, prominently. But it was a beautiful idea. It helped Ford. As someone said to me, it was the first time in years we hadn't been talking about Bridgestone tires and rollovers. We were talking about Rosie stories, and everybody loves Rosies. They were promoting the fact that Rose Monroe worked in the Ford plant in Ypsilanti and was the

star in the movie, *Rosie the Riveter*. So Ford said they created the first Rosie. It was successful beyond anybody's wildest imagination. In part, Ford did a very cute, fetching, catchy public service announcement that ran nonstop over Christmas. I saw it on the Chinese television station. I didn't find anybody who hadn't seen it on TV. I'm told that advertisers don't like to advertise over the holidays, so PSAs get big coverage. Also, there was a lot of word of mouth with families getting together over the holidays. Well, we ended up with 11,000 Rosies contacting the Park. Some of them entered entries in the Ford website; some used our website. Most of them called the Park, because they wanted to talk to somebody. We now have over 4,000 of their hand-written stories about their experiences, and over 2,000 artifacts, which just bring me to tears every time I look at them.

I was so moved that these women had kept these things so precious to them for sixty years and then were giving them up to the Park Service. Of course, it meant we would keep them in perpetuity and display them, but I was so touched every time I would see something. We had three different tests from women who had passed a welder's test. One was two pieces of metal, and there was an oblong cutout in the middle of both of them, and they had to rivet them together so that the cutouts still matched. No Rosie got hired just because it seemed like a good thing to do, to hire a woman.

The Park received over 2,000 artifacts from Rosies because of that Ford campaign. So what that did was give us, particularly the 4,000 stories, it gave us that story of what was happening around the country. Of the 11,000 women, about 500 were from the Northern California area. So that's a lot of stories from all around the country. They all talked with such pride and excitement, sixty years later, about what they'd done. Most of all, their overwhelming emotion that they were finally getting to talk about it, and that somebody cared and somebody was listening, and they were being recognized. We mailed out 12,000 newsletters on the General Management Plan, and mailed one to every one of the Rosies to make sure they knew that Congress had passed a Resolution honoring their work and that, finally, after all these years, they were taking their rightful place in American history.

So with great gratitude to Ford, although that project was overwhelming, we got just enough money to hire two people part-time, and that was the help we got. We had up to ten volunteers in there for months, answering all these phone calls and opening the packages and processing them. We had two phone-a-thons, one with community volunteers and one with National Park Service staff at Golden Gate National Park, thanks to Superintendent Brian O'Neill, answering over 2,500 phone messages that had been left on our office phones. But what came in was priceless and irreplaceable. Most of these women are eighty-five and older, and sometimes we would return a phone call, and the person on the line would say, "Well, we're really sorry, but that person's passed on." So the Ford project was a really priceless addition to the Park.

04-00:57:14

In addition to that, the Park Service had funded, for a quarter-of-a-million dollars, what's called a National Landmark Theme Study, which specifically looked at all the other Home Front sites around the country. The first question was, what's still standing? Because buildings that were built for World War II were meant to be temporary. The study did confirm that in most communities, most of the structures were gone, but it created an enormous base of information so that if somebody came to Richmond and asked what else they could go see, we could say, "Well, there's the Charlestown Navy Yard, which has been in existence since the beginning of this country. They did make ships during World War II, and you can go there. You can go to this plant in Detroit." We now know what we can tell people about the rest of the country.

Interview 3: October 18, 2005

Audio file 5

05-00:00:37

Cándida Smith: We're going to start today by discussing your relations with Congressman Miller's office, the support you got from him, and what that told you about what people were expecting from the Park.

Hart: Well, I have the highest regard for Congressman George Miller, personally, professionally. He was head of the Natural Resources Subcommittee in the House for many years and was in a very influential position for the National Park Service in that role, and was, you know, wise and thoughtful and creative and intelligent, and a wonderful person.

He tried very hard to help the Park, but was limited in key ways. When the administration changed he became identified as not only an influential and powerful Democrat but one of those passionately opposed to President [George W.] Bush and the Republican administration. That, of course, limited his ability to influence the National Park Service, because to influence the National Park Service he had to first influence the Department of the Interior, of which we are a member, and in a Republican administration the appointees to a department are Republicans, so he had his hands tied behind his back in many ways.

He wrote the Park Service, he met with the Regional Director, he requested adequate and expanded operational funding for the Park. The first letter, to John Reynolds, got a polite response in writing, but nothing happened. The Congressman wrote a second letter to the new Regional Director Jon Jarvis, but nothing came of it. So that was very disappointing, and didn't improve relations between me and assorted regional officials.

Congressman Miller was very supportive for the events we put on in Rosie. Our first big event was a thank you celebration on board the SS Red Oak Victory honoring the Congressman, and retiring Regional Director John Reynolds. Congressman Miller also cut the ribbon for the interim visitor center that we created in the lobby of City Hall. He lent his considerable stature to the fledgling Park and was greatly appreciated.

When Congressman Miller was Chairman of the Resources Subcommittee in the House, his Chief of Staff was John Lawrence, who has a PhD in history, loved Rosie, thought it was a wonderful idea, was very involved in the early stages of the legislation, the hearing, getting it off the ground. But then Congressman Miller—the whole Park was kind of a thank-you present to him, because he was leaving to go to the Education Committee, so he lost his influence in that regard as well. He was no longer our substantive subcommittee person on the Hill, and John Lawrence moved over to the Education Committee as well. But John Lawrence stayed very interested, and

he came out to visit the Park a couple of times while I was there. I'd gotten to know him during the legislative phase, liked him very much, and admired him a great deal.

I gave him a tour of the Park, and at the end of it he said something like, "We may have created something impossible here." Those weren't his words, but that was certainly the meaning. And he said—the part I remember word for word was, "You're here for the duration, right?" And I went home, and I was so angry. I thought, "You know, John, you just agreed that you've created, potentially, an impossible piece of legislation, and you, John Lawrence, are saying to me, 'Judy Hart, Judy, you're going to stay here till it works, right?'" And that was about year two, I guess, and it was one of those moments—to be honest, as much as I admired John, and I knew he meant well, and he meant it as a compliment that I would stay and somehow make it work, if it could be made to work. I know he meant it that way. But I went home and thought, "What am I doing here? Why am I—you know, everybody, or nearly everybody seems to think this Park's impossible. Why am I the only one who's trying to make it work? Maybe it *is* impossible. Why am I beating my head against a wall?" I did a lot of journaling and reflection on that. It was a pivotal moment in those four years, but John never knew it. He said it just as he got in his car and drove off.

Well, I should add that, of course, this Park was not what Congressman Miller had in mind. His legislation was to add the Rosie memorial to the Park Service as an affiliated area, a very simple project; that was his idea. The Park Service came up with the idea of the Park, and wrote the legislation, designed the whole concept, and worked with him, but handed him a very different package from what he requested. So the full Rosie Park as we know it was not what he envisioned, and I think that he, like many people, frankly, were waiting to see if it could be made to work. He understood how complicated it was and how tenuous it was to have the City of Richmond somehow find the money, millions and millions of dollars, to create a National Park. And the county to find millions of dollars to help create a National Park was a stretch of an idea, still is a stretch of an idea.

I had the sense that he and many other people were waiting for some sort of critical mass to come together to support. I always felt that—in order to really effectively work to get adequate funding for the Park—I needed to hand him a package, and that package needed to be a couple of things: a package, a plan with cost estimates and ideas in fairly firm shape for the visitor center. And that, I think, is going to work. The Park Service did put it on the priority funding list, and there is, the last I checked, \$200,000 already in this year's congressional appropriations bill as a line item, just eight months after it was put on the Park Service priority list.

The other package he needed was for the larger Park, and that was what happened in the week before I left. That was each partner saying, "I will do

this," and, "I will do this," and, "I will do this," everybody agreeing that all the pieces fit together and that they could move forward. That still needs to come into a written shape, which will be the Park's General Management Plan. He might be able to, for example—since he's in Education now—help find funding for the restoration of the Maritime Center, and the Ruth Powers Center. But he needed, in my opinion—, and I felt that way because if I were in his position that's what I would need, to get some shape to this, get some reality, get some critical mass, and get it pulled together into something that he can say, "Here. This is what we're going to do with Rosie." So that's what happened. The agreements came together in that second week before I left, and then it will be formalized in the General Management Plan.

05-00:10:10

Cándida Smith: Was a lot of the uncertainty surrounding this project having to do with it being a new model, or is there a question in various sources whether these kinds of historically, perhaps constituent-driven, parks are really what the National Park Service needs or wants, or the country needs?

Hart: I don't think Rosie is constituent driven. You know, it started as a simpler idea from Congressman Miller and was greatly expanded by the Park Service. It was not driven by the city of Richmond, nor by Rosies. It really was driven by the National Park Service, in its fuller form.

There are several issues about the Park that make it different and hard, and the first one is simply the resources. The Ford Assembly Building is a quarter-mile long, 500,000 square feet. The City spent sixteen million dollars just replacing the broken glass and stabilizing the building from the Loma Prieta earthquake. The buildings in Shipyard Number Three are in better shape, but they're equally huge, and they're designed for a use that has never really found a good adaptation in modern industrial society ever since World War II. So that's the biggest problem, and that's why the Park Service said that they would not spend money on Shipyard Number Three or the *Red Oak Victory*, or the Ford Assembly Building. So that's the biggest problem.

It is also a challenge that it's relatively recent history. And that has several subtle aspects. Some in the Park Service tend to get more excited about the Victorian architecture in Charleston, South Carolina than the very simple, functional, industrial architecture of World War II; it isn't as beautiful to some, and that's a challenge. It certainly meets our requirements. Anything that's more than fifty years old is considered historic, but it doesn't quite carry the weight of structures that are older, I think, with some folks.

Another fundamental challenge of Rosie, which relates to the funding, is the Park is kind of half way between a national park and a national heritage area. And I was very conscious of that. I felt like I had one foot on two different ice floes the whole time I was there, because the legislation demanded that the Park be a national park and meet national park standards. That has

ramifications that go from here around the block three times, anywhere from meeting the national environmental protection environmental requirements, air quality, endangered species, I mean, the number of wonderful protective pieces of legislation that apply to national parks all apply to Rosie. There aren't any endangered species in Rosie, but I would have to look and say, "That does not apply to Rosie. We don't need to worry about that."

And yet it was envisioned that the National Park Service might not ever own anything. So it is a fundamental contradiction, really, in our legal system to say that all federal laws apply to privately-owned property. And that was the essence of the screaming matches with the county, the sessions that had the flavor of "who the hell do you think you are telling the county what to do? You're the federal government. You don't tell us what to do. That was the fundamental contradiction there. And actually, most of the property is not privately owned. It's owned by the county or the city or the state, and the federal government is not allowed by our Constitution to tell any of those people what to do.

So I always had that contradiction. And the folks in the county were dead right. I mean, I just sat there and listened to them because I knew they were right. And all I could say was, "I'm not telling you what to do. I'm telling you that the federal government deems this nationally significant, and I hope we can work together to figure out some resolution here. But I know I cannot tell you what to do." Well, that's not quite true. Under the preservation laws, the national preservation laws, you can keep a building from being demolished. You can prevent a destruction, but you can't make anything happen.

There is also a deeply entrenched resistance in the Park Service against spending any Park Service funding on structures it does not own. So we were prevented from owning by the legislation and prevented from funding by the culture. So really the Park was rather more like a heritage area, which was the job I had before I went out to do Rosie, where the federal government gives a substantial amount of money to the management agencies, but the Park Service does not own any of the sites and structures. Several of those heritage areas get a million dollars a year; Rosie was getting \$114,000. The heritage areas have great freedom in how they spend that money. They can restore buildings. They can give it to some other nonprofit. They can run programs. They can do interpretation. They can really do whatever they want, and they're not required to meet all the federal regulations. That's a contradiction, and that's an ongoing controversy. What standards do the national heritage areas have to meet in order to display the arrowhead is the controversy with national heritage areas.

But I didn't have any freedom. I just was—by the legislation, everything in Rosie had to meet the standards of the National Park Service, but I didn't get the million dollars that they got. As I said, it was like one foot on two different ice floes. I would think, especially in the first couple of years, that Rosie

might better have been a heritage area. But I never really believed that. I think being a national park brings benefits that aren't available to a national heritage area, and the benefits are the standards and what that means to the American public.

But my position was very tenuous. Anybody anywhere along the line would have been perfectly appropriate in saying, "Get out of my office. You can't tell me what to do." And that didn't happen only because I didn't tell anybody what to do. I just listened to them and agreed with them, in terms of the limitations of my ability, but then would say at the end, "And this is a nationally significant story that hasn't been told, and people are really excited about it, and I'd like to work with you to make it happen."

It will be a challenge for the future of the Park if anybody comes in there as Superintendent or in any significant position, and tries to act like the National Park Service can make this Park happen. The whole thing could fall apart. Because it's very much dependent upon the partners wanting to make it happen in their own way, and the Park Service working with them to try and reassure that the way they want to do it will be comfortable with the way the Park Service would like it done, so that it can continue on as a National Park. And that will always be a very fine line for every Superintendent of the Park. It was one of the times when my Master of Arts in Law was very important to my tone and actions. I understood what they were yelling about, and respected their wisdom and respected them.

Cándida Smith: On your notes you also talk about Manzanar, people thinking of Manzanar as a good model for Rosie. Could you explain what that means, in general what the Manzanar model means, how that reflects National Park Service's practices and standards, and then what that meant in the particulars of the Rosie Park situation?

Hart: Well, there are two threads in there, and one is typical of the whole National Park Service and the relationship of Congress to the Park Service. And that is that the Park Service comes up with some early plans. It may have been initiated at the local level, it may have been initiated at the congressional level, but the Park Service has to come up with some early planning, and a concept to go to Congress for a legislative hearing. So the Park Service has to be involved in the early stages. Congress passes a piece of legislation to create every single park. There are anywhere from two to twelve pages of legal direction creating every new national park.

Then the Park Service goes in and starts shaping it with more studies and then the Park Service comes up with what they call a General Management Plan that also meets the federal environmental compliance requirements. It involves writing an environmental impact statement, so you've got the EIS, the Environmental Impact Statement, together in the same document with the

development plan, and that goes to Congress, sometimes for their information, sometimes for their approval, depending on the authorizing legislation.

05-00:20:14

Congress wants to see that GMP before they appropriate significant development money to the Park; usually the Park legislation includes a ceiling on development funding that can be provided prior to the completion of the GMP, generally \$500,000. They want to know what the big, eventual picture is going to be before they start funding visitor centers and parking lots and so forth. That's one part that applied to Rosie, except that there was the expectation of very little federal money going into Rosie, so there was a huge contradiction there.

The Manzanar role model expanded on that tradition of a GMP. It usually takes a few years to get the GMP funded, and then it takes a few years to do the GMP, and then you send it to Congress, and then you compete for development money.

But also, in the western region, it meant wait, as in eight to ten years, for any significant operation funds. Operation funds pay for staff salaries, office rent, supplies, programs, all the things that make an operating park. Development funds are construction funds, for visitor centers, large structure preservation, new roads, sewer systems, and so forth. The western region believed that operating funds should also wait till after the GMP is finished and approved, whereby the "Manzanar model", and wait eight to ten years to have any staff. So, they believed \$114,000 to pay my salary and some modest administrative costs was adequate for the Rosie Park, and I should wait the eight years to have staff or rent office space or buy supplies. Perhaps thinking since Rosie didn't own any structures, there was nothing to do.

There was also in the western region a strong culture of get in line and wait your turn. Just because Rosie's a new Park doesn't mean it's more important than anything else we've already agreed to fund. There is no need at Rosie that is more important than anything already on that list.

That was frustrating to me because of the reality that the Rosies were dying. We were losing the Park story on a daily basis as the Rosies aged and passed on. And that the City of Richmond and the County of Contra Costa, and a couple of private individuals owned the buildings in the Park. And they weren't going to wait eight years for the Park Service to develop a plan, especially since we weren't going to give them any money. And all of the structures were threatened with demolition, or neglect. And that what we really needed was money to collect the Rosie stories before the Rosies died, and money to have the staff to go meet with the partners, to listen to them, to figure out what their needs were, what their resources were, how they could match with the Park.

I tried to do all that on my own, by talking incessantly and meeting constantly, but it would have helped if we had had planners on the staff, or cultural resource people on the staff, or preservationists, and maybe even an architect to actually work with the partners and support them, give them maps, give them photographs, give them studies, develop cost estimates for their projects, things the Park Service is very, very good at. But we didn't have any of those resources. It was just me saying, "Please, wouldn't you like to make a National Park for us?" [laughs]

Cándida Smith: Well, I'm sure every park has its questions. I mean, I'm sure with Manzanar there were people dying off as well, who had important stories to tell in terms of the Japanese internment, so in a way what sounds like a rigid set of guidelines is probably designed to protect the Park Service from being yanked this way and that way in a politicizing process.

Hart: That's very true, and that certainly seemed the region's position. When you get to operating funds, breeding condors competes with law enforcement, competes with collecting Rosie stories, competes with a dock got blown away in a storm at Channel Islands and they can't dock their law-enforcement boat there anymore. All those things compete against each other, and it is—I would be the first to agree—nearly impossible to compare them because they're so different. It was time that I thought was an issue that was important. There are things that are time sensitive, and there are things that are not, and I thought the dying of the Rosies and the potential loss of the structures in Richmond both were compelling in terms of time, and I believed could have moved farther up the line against things that were not so time sensitive.

Cándida Smith: Could you talk a little bit about the charrette process and what—?

[Interview interruption.]

Cándida Smith: I was asking about the charrette process. It seemed to be one of the major tasks that you had to accomplish in your tenure. I suppose it was the basis, the groundwork for the General Plan?

Hart: Very much so, but even more fundamentally the property owners, even of the properties in Richmond, did not have a tradition of talking to each other, and I *always* had a problem having a meeting where I would try and bring the county officials to talk with the city officials. It was a lack of tradition of doing that, a lack of thinking it was necessary, and it was logistical. The county officials lived and worked in East County for the most part, and for them to drive forty minutes to go to a meeting was not what they were used to doing, and it was not an easy thing for me to persuade them to do.

I decided very early on in my career that it was much more effective to engage other people in working with the Park Service if it was fun or interesting or, ideally, both. And ideally there'd be good food and a beautiful spot, a place

they didn't get to go to very often, so the charrettes were always, insofar as possible, in the Harbormaster's Building, with glass on two sides looking out over the marina and steps and verandas all around. At break you could go out and look at the water and the boats, and people loved going to that building.

Any meeting in Richmond was a challenge. If it was too big to fit into the Harbormaster's Building it was a major challenge. Once we persuaded the private owner of the temporarily empty QRS building to give us their building for one of our big charrettes. So the place was always really important. And we'd serve good food. People could look forward to getting a lunch, and they wouldn't have to traipse out and get their own food. And from the very first one people told us they loved the charrettes. They really enjoyed getting together with people they didn't usually get to work with, and spend a day or two in a gorgeous setting.

We put an enormous amount of energy into planning them and thinking them out so they would be productive. They would pull out the inspiration of the considerable brainpower that always showed up in the room. And people like Will Travis, who have 150 things that they could go do on any particular day, would be delighted to come to the charrettes, because he would get to work with people he didn't get to see all the time.

Who doesn't like having their brains tickled and challenged, and the satisfaction of coming up with a good idea? And we were always very careful to record everything and also look like we were recording it, so you could see the person who was writing the notes, or the teams would be writing their own notes on pieces of paper that would be recorded and transcribed later on, so that everybody who participated got to see how much we valued their contributions. Every one we had became more successful than the one before, and more fun, and more interesting. More people were willing to give all day on Friday and all day on Saturday, was the way we usually did them.

05-00:30:15

It was a way of engaging the group in a way that I couldn't possibly do on my own. It was one of the really important levels of our community involvement. It was obviously not reaching into the grassroots, although we would include people that would be considered grassroots in the charrettes. But it was very fundamentally different from holding a big public meeting. But it was also reaching a level of involvement way beyond those first twenty people that had been involved when the Park first started. So every time we had one, we would say, "Wow, that really worked. That's the way we're going to do it again the next time." They were fun for us, too. They were the highlight of the job for me.

Cándida Smith: To what degree did they help resolve some of the planning, the design proposals—

Hart: Oh, my gosh. Oh, my gosh.

Cándida Smith: I remember the one I went to, there was a lot of discussion about what kind of internal transportation system should there be.

Hart: You may remind me which one that was, because we did have a number of them. But I still remember vividly about twenty minutes of what might have been the first one after I started, because Ray Murray had had, I think, three charrettes before I came on as Superintendent. This one I remember as being over in the Boathouse, because we only got the Boathouse once, and then they wouldn't rent it again. So we had a big group of people from many different perspectives that had never sat in the same room before. I believe that was the first one under my Superintendency. We were still at the point where the Port Director was saying quite intelligently and plausibly and logically that *no* public person was ever going to set foot in the Port of Richmond. It had been closed for decades, and it was his perfectly reasonable belief, from a perspective of liability, that no one was ever going to come in there. And, of course, Historic Shipyard Number Three *was* the Port of Richmond. So we were still at a point where the city was saying that this Park will not happen beyond, perhaps a visitor center somewhere else.

City Manager Isaiah Turner came, and he was quite a charismatic individual. I think that was when his attention first really lit up on the Park, when he heard all these people talking about possibilities. He saw aerial maps. He saw diagrams. I think that was when the concept of a visitor in the Shipyard really first came home to him, and he got very excited about it. He had to leave early, and he left with a flourish of his coat, you know, his tails out behind him. But he said "I'm going to make sure this happens." I'm like, "Okay, we've made a lot of progress today." We had a lot of aerial photographs, historic and current, up on the walls, great big blowups so that you could actually see Shipyard Number Three. Again, 90 percent of the people in the room had never been there because it was closed to the public.

And Jay Mancini, who was actually a financial planner I'd gotten to know when he did some heavy lifting on the Presidio legislation when I was still in Washington working on legislation, we'd gotten to be good friends over about a ten-hour working session of redoing all the financial projections for the Presidio as the legislation evolved through the hearing process. Jay Mancini came, gave up heaven knows what his billing rate would be per hour, but he came for the two-day workshop, and he looked at all those photographs and maps and diagrams, and he came over and whispered to me and said that there was a road that went around the Shipyard, and that people didn't have to go through the middle of the Shipyard. The Shipyard is like a light bulb, if you will, with a narrow opening and then the facilities spread out. To drive through to the historic part of the shipyard you would have to cross, at a ninety-degree angle, all the cars and things being unloaded and the people unloading a ship. They don't unload containers; they unload individual things,

in Richmond. So there was an inherent and obvious danger to everybody involved in having visitors come in there. So Jay's idea was, "Well, that's not necessary. Visitors could come around on that road that goes around the shipyard."

He came over and whispered in my ear, and I said, "You're absolutely right." And then I watched him go around the room whispering in the ear of the Port Director, the Redevelopment Director, all the people that were sitting in the room, saying there was another solution. Then after he had everybody's attention, he said it to the whole room. And no one disagreed. Of course. Solved the problem. Well, that twenty minutes or so has now resulted in—it turned out to be more complicated than that. The road that he was seeing on the aerial photograph was a fire road at the time. It became a full-fledged street that goes into a new housing development on the hill above the Shipyard, and we went through a couple of years of that housing development saying that would not be a public road. You cannot bring anybody, much less a few hundred thousand visitors to the National Park through our new street, through the middle of our development. So it went through many permutations, and there were a lot of alternatives about exactly where the newly extended Bay Trail would go to get around the Shipyard and open it up.

The Shipyard, of course, is totally flat. It's on fill land that Henry Kaiser created to build his Shipyard, with this significant hill right behind it. In the end, when this huge Korean car contract came to the city, the Port realized that they had to provide access to a couple of businesses that are out on the end of the Port, so they built a road on the flat part of the Port all the way around the outside of the Port, just like Jay Mancini had proposed, except it was on the flat, not up on the bluff. And by then there had been enough work and traction and planning and funding; there's now also a twelve-foot right of way for the Bay Trail. So you have your dedicated lanes for bicycle, walking, and so forth, separated from the cars, then the Bay Trail, and then the new auto road. That all opened up just about a year ago, so now the public can safely, easily, happily drive all the way around the Port, down to the now publicly available historic structures in the end of the shipyard, and appreciate a gorgeous view of San Francisco Bay as they drive around the Port.

That all came out of that charrette, and Jay Mancini buzzing in the ears of all the people that needed to hear it, who were all sitting and kind of—you know, you'd see them kind of relax as he talked, and they thought it was a good and workable idea. It was one of the highlights of the planning. There were many breakthroughs like that, but that was probably the single biggest one.

Cándida Smith: The other big topic I wanted to discuss with you today was the issue, in a sense, the historical issues, the interpretive issues, how you go about nailing down the historical story that the Park is going to tell, what are the different interests involved, what are the concerns that the National Park Service had about the particulars of this Park, and what are the issues surrounding, you

know, the question of whether this is a women's history Park, or does it speak to a broader set of issues.

Hart:

Well, there are several answers interwoven in there, and it's a fascinating question. Whether or not it was a women's Park—I'll start with that one first—was and continues to be a controversy in the Park Service. Ray Murray is the Chief of Planning for the Park Service region now in Oakland, California, and he did all the early planning. Ray deserves great credit for going over to look at the memorial and saying we might have a national park here, with the historic resources he was seeing.

05-00:39:58

He came up with the name of the Park, which is Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historical Park, but has vehemently insisted ever since that study that this is not just about Rosies. And my position was, well, Rosie is shorthand for everybody in the home front, that it is about all home front stories, there's no question. Little boys collecting aluminum cans to be recycled, the men who were 4 F and stayed home and did various things for the war effort; it's about everybody's home front story.

I did have to work pretty hard to keep it from being a battlefield story Park. You know, the Park Service is largely men to this day at the professional level, and they loved talking about how many different kinds of tanks were made for World War II, and how many of them, and how many ships, and where were they made. They love talking about that stuff.

And I would say, "That's not what this Park is about. It's important, in the sense that the Rosies were building these ships, but how many ships and what they looked like and how they evolved during the war is not what we're talking about. We're talking about the social change that happened because of this." I had to defend that over and over and over again including to the new little union of Parks with World War II stories. But to me that issue was clear cut, and I think that Rosie is on solid ground at this point.

The issue of promoting it as a women's park is still a hot-button issue. I always maintain that it is a Park about everybody in the homeland, and it focuses on Rosies, and that's not a contradiction. The Rosie story is the one that is completely untold. The other home front stories are really relatively household knowledge; they don't need the attention that the Rosie stories need. The Rosies whose stories had never really been collected before—don't think we've talked about this before—they were purposefully, in Richmond at least, and probably everyplace, they were divided from each other at work. They were not allowed to go into other parts of the Shipyard. They were not allowed to see—if they were working on rudders, they didn't get to find out how deckhouses were made, for security reasons. You couldn't take a camera into work. You couldn't take anything home with you, for security reasons.

And they often said they were so tired at the end of the day, they had no energy left to talk about their work.

When their men came home from the battlefield, it was seemingly universal that they did not talk about the war. They didn't want to think about it, and they didn't want to burden their wives, girlfriends, sisters, daughters with stories from the battlefield. So the women didn't talk about what they did. So they never got to talk about what they did, and didn't put it in the context of having changed the culture of America. They didn't see that. At least in my experience meeting them, they did not see that until the Park Service came along and said, "You changed the face of America with what you did."

And the Rosies would seem to universally say, "Well, I only did it for eighteen months. It was just a little piece of my life. I was doing what everybody else was doing," And we'd say, "Yes, and you changed this entire country. You proved that women could do whatever they chose to do. You advanced the cause of equal pay for equal work in that process." I describe it as, instead of the laws and regulations that I was interpreting as Superintendent of the Women's Rights Park, what the Rosies did was go toe to toe with their bosses.

There were six million Rosies and six million bosses, and you changed the viewpoint of six million men, and you've changed America, and it's just as simple as that. It wasn't easy. It was very hard on the Rosies, but it's very simple math. You've changed America by winning over your boss, one by one, and it doesn't matter if you're only there twelve months or two months. It doesn't matter what you did. You won over your boss, and that changed us all. And the Rosies are thrilled to hear that, and think that something they did that hugely mattered to them—they remembered the camaraderie of their work groups; they felt like they were doing something important to help win the war. So to me it became more and more obvious that that was the emotional core of the park, and everything else was important information that needed to be interpreted someday, but the core of this was what Rosies changed in our society. And I would say the same sorts of things to anybody who would raise the issue. But the issue never really went away.

The Rosie the Riveter Trust, which was really formed by a group out of that early twenty or so, included City Councilors Tom Butt and Mindell Penn, the former Mayor, Rosemary Corbin, and Diane Hedler from Kaiser and County Supervisor John Gioia. At one point—I don't know who even brought it up—but they thought about changing their name to make it more generic. And Tom Butt, I remember saying—of course he's a man—"We've got a name that anybody would die for. Why would we change it? All we have to do is make it clear that we cover other stories as well. Let's don't change our name. It's crazy." I don't remember that anybody seriously proposed changing the name of the Park, but that issue hasn't gone away, and it may never.

I envision the future visitor center, I hope it will be something like the Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C., where you immediately get immersed in many, many different stories of the holocaust survivors, or non-survivors, as that might be. I see being immersed in the stories of the Rosies. You know, you're hearing and seeing the stories all around you of what the Rosies have done. That's why I think this oral history project that you're doing is so important, Richard Cándida Smith, heading up the program at UC Berkeley. I think it's absolutely the core of what our interpretation will be. I could not, no one could make the Park be a women's park. I actually had that argument when I was Superintendent at Women's Rights, and I said that the last thing we need is reverse discrimination in any form whatsoever.

And I think it's deeply important to tell all the stories, but to focus on the Rosie stories and have the amazing eighty-five-year-old Rosies who come to Richmond, and they are already coming from all over the country, even though there isn't a visitor center or very much to see yet. They should feel welcomed and comfortable in the park. And welcome and comfort to an eighty-five-year-old woman is really not generally what we have in mind in the Park Service when we design a visitor center, anywhere from the size of the typeface on the exhibits to how many seats are there, are there chairs or are there just benches. You know, in a visitor center you often go in and there's kind of big steps with carpet on them. You're supposed to perch on the floor and watch the movie. Well, that's not the way it can be at Rosie. They need to be comfortable chairs.

But I doubt if that issue will ever really go away. The Park Service is still, to a great extent, a male agency and a male ethos. You know, the cowboy ethos is still pretty much alive and well, especially in the western region. [laughs]

Cándida Smith: Politically, given the Department of the Interior or the National Park Service, were there themes that you knew that were going to be touchy, controversial in this Park, or are there themes that you just knew, even if some people might find them interesting, you couldn't explore them?

Hart: Well, the first two big lessons I learned—and Betty Soskin was my educator in this early on. We had a public meeting. She came to it. She spoke a little bit to the issue. I went to Betty's home to hear her story. She is African American and worked in the alternate black union because they couldn't join the union in the shipyard. I learned a great deal from Betty, and she said to me that the Rosie story was not her story. It's not the African-American story. I said, "Well, it was, you know. You were a substantial percentage of the people who worked in the Shipyard. Granted, you did not get the housing, the child care. You did not get the perks that the white workers did, but you were working there."

05-00:50:05

She then said it was not a story to be celebrated because it was a story of prejudice, prejudice and mistreatment. So that was how I learned that there were two very—there were more than two, but there were two very large categories, positive experiences and not-positive experiences regarding working in Richmond.

I also learned when we got our offices in City Hall and were surrounded by a couple of hundred city employees that they did not like the poster that was so popular in the Park Service and so popular around the country, and is the number-one seller in the Smithsonian Museums in Washington, DC, the “We Can Do It” poster. It’s a drawing of Rosie with the bandana on her head, and the blue uniform, and she’s holding up her hand saying, “We can do it.” Rosie was white and didn’t well represent the staff in City Hall.

I said, “Oh. Okay.” When we first moved into our offices we couldn’t put anything on the wall. Isaiah Turner was very strict about that. But some people did love that we had lunchboxes, we had coffee cups, we had napkins, we had everything you can imagine, little bobble-head dolls with the “We Can Do It” image. So we put those away and started featuring different photographs of particularly African-American women. A huge percentage of the workers in Richmond were African American. There are plenty of photographs of women welders and riveters, and we started also featuring different photographs that reflected Asian heritage and Hispanic heritage, and men.

The photographs, for example, the formal photographs that we had of the Shipyard—Henry Kaiser documented everything he did, God bless him. And the dedication ceremonies, they would have bands. They would have movie stars. They would have famous people, often wives of famous people, come and break the bottle of champagne, and they were always white folks in those photographs. And when you’d see the managers of the various plants meeting with the military, all the kinds of standard photographs that you would see, they were all white folks, but that isn’t who worked in the Shipyard. So it was a big learning experience for all of us to become sensitive to all aspects of that story.

Cándida Smith: In New Orleans I presume the museum is still closed, but there’s the World War II—the museum that’s in New Orleans in the museum warehouse district. I didn’t go inside, but it’s an enormous structure.

Hart: And hugely popular. We had the Chief of Interpretation of that museum came to one of our charrettes, and he had lots of really creative ideas. He came to one of the later ones about the visitor center plans. His museum is popular and well-visited beyond anyone’s imagination when that idea was germinated. I did not get the chance to go there, and I don’t know how damaged it may have been by Katrina, how damaged the exhibits or the building. I don’t know, I’ve

not heard. But I have heard they've had a substantial, very fine Rosie exhibit and home front exhibit that was also very popular.

One faction was skeptical that this story would fade away when the Rosies died, that there wouldn't be any interest in it, to which I'd say, "It's a nationally significant story. It's not relevant to just one group of people who happen to be in it. And besides, look at the World War II museum in New Orleans. It has been immensely popular, and it's not just veterans who are going in there."

In fact, we learned that with collecting the Rosie stories. It was as often the children of the Rosies who would write in the stories about their mother or their aunt, whoever, and who had inherited the artifacts and wanted to make sure the artifacts went someplace where they'd be preserved. I think in some respects the children may have understood better the change to our society from the Rosies than the Rosies themselves. So it's clearly a story with great interest that will go on.

Cándida Smith: Was there coordination between you two, the two museums, on the degree to which the World War II story is being balanced between the two museums?

Hart: No. One of my frustrations of being a one-person Park for two years, and then being a two-person Park for the next two years—really, I wished we had the staff, or that I had the time to coordinate better with several different groups.

I did get to meet with the folks that were carrying out the veterans of World War II oral history project out of Washington, D.C. I did get to go in the Library of Congress and meet with them a couple of times when I was in Washington on other business, was very impressed with what they were doing. They were collecting Rosie stories. They weren't particularly advertising that, but when the stories came in they would accept them, and I would have liked to have worked much more closely with them. But, you know, it takes time.

Rick Smith and I, the Chief of Interpretation, the other person in the Park, dearly wanted to go to New Orleans and see their museum and talk to them and find out how they came by their collections, and who was coming to see them, and all those fascinating things that would foretell something about our visitor center. But we never had time to get down there.

There was also a National Alliance of Rosies that's a wonderful group that I would connect with periodically. I wanted to go to their national meetings. I wanted to work with them more closely, but I just didn't have the time.

Audio file 6

06:00:00:07

Hart: You're double-checking that I cover all the names on that list eventually?

Cándida Smith: Yes, I am. I'd like to move on to—I think it flows naturally out of this—to maybe say a little bit about the bringing onboard of Rick Smith as Chief of Interpretation, what his responsibilities were, and how all of this comes together in the development of the primary interpretive themes, which I think is an official language.

Hart: Right. Very good, Richard. The Park budget went from \$114,000 to \$160,000 the first year of the Bush administration. The administration came in and said there would be no increases anywhere, anyhow, for anything. John Reynolds was Regional Director and said that just didn't cut it. We have a handful of parks in dire straits, and Rosie's one of them. So he managed to get the budget up to \$160,000, which, by the time you add in benefits and a little bit of administrative money, doesn't pay for two people. But nonetheless, I was working on the papers, the job description, the recruiting, and all the paperwork that goes with hiring a high-level administrative person, because I felt that we'd already gotten the \$200,000 grant from the California Coastal Commission, and there was nothing I could do with it.

Fortunately, Gary Hembree, with the city Redevelopment Authority said he'd take care of it. So the money was transferred to Gary, who did the contracting with the Park Service to do all of the research studies, which is really the second half of the question that you asked me before this one. I used almost all of that California Coastal Conservancy money on studies that were urgently needed to support the future development of the Park.

The grant funds went through Gary Hembree in the city to the HABS / HAER Unit of the National Park Service, the Historic American Building Survey / Historic American Engineering Record, which is a unit of the Park Service I am extremely fond of and in great admiration of. They hire graduate students to do the research, and some professionals. It depends on the topic. So all of that money went through Rich O'Connor in the HABS / HAER office in Washington, and that's how we got the histories done. We got the history of Shipyard Number Three. We got the history of the Ford Building, the history of the Kaiser Hospital, the history of the child care centers, the history of the labor movement in the shipyard, and the overview of all of those. All that got done out of that California Coastal Conservancy grant in year one.

Cándida Smith: Who were the historians who did the studies?

Hart: Fred Quivik, who's an industrial archeologist, architectural historian, I think, did a superb job with Shipyard Number Three and the Ford Building, and so he was also hired to do the overview. He's a consultant who's been in that field for years and years. Alicia Barber, who was a PhD student at University

of Texas, did the Kaiser Hospital and the child care centers. Let's see, who did the hospital? Oh, Alicia did the hospital as well.

Atchison Village worker housing really got done by Tom Butt as part of the—he's the principal of an architectural preservation firm. He did the National Register nomination, or had that done, for the Rosie Trust. So he really got the history of that done.

What we came to call Nystrom Village, which included the Maritime Child Care Center, the Nystrom school, and the war worker housing that's now public housing, and the very important remnant housing from the farming era of Richmond, was done by Architectural Resources Group, architectural historians in San Francisco.

There was a good deal of work done on the Maritime Center also by Charlie Duncan, who worked for—I'll think of it in a minute—the other big architectural historian firm in San Francisco.

The Red Oak Victory was really done as a nomination to the National Register by a Park Service person, whose name I'll remember in a minute. It was done before I got there. And the nomination for Shipyard Number Three, which included a lot of the history—Fred Quivik's work was more comprehensive, but there was a National Register nomination of Shipyard Number Three that had been done by the city early on. I don't remember who did that. All of those were extremely important, because very little was known about any of it.

Henry Kaiser did, as I mentioned, document his work with photographs, professional photographs, which was extremely helpful. But given the nature of what they were all doing, which was building a building while they designed the building and while they designed the program, and then starting the program while they were still building the building, that was true of everything, from the child care centers to the hospital to the Shipyard. They didn't sit around writing up what they were doing or why they did it, so all of those research projects were delving into primary resources, and figuring out the very fundamentals that had never been written down about those previously. And a great loss of records, you know. After the war many buildings were torn down. Offices were shut down, and whole boxes of records we know got tossed. So that's how the history got done.

Then to get back to your current question, which was, again, remind me?

Cándida Smith: The development of the primary interpretive themes for the park.

Hart: Thank you. To my amazement, one of my projects became wrapping up all these studies before I left, which was four years after we got the money. I would not have thought it would have taken that long, but as I said, the

research turned out to be primary research in some pretty obscure places. There was no one place you could go. Fortunately, there was the UC Berkeley library with its incredible resources. And incredible resources in Richmond. And all those studies did get finished just before I left.

Cándida Smith: Have these studies been published?

Hart: Yes. The GNP team, at my request, took that on, getting them on the website for Rosie. That process was still underway when I left, but when you next get to a computer, hopefully you can open up to the Rosie the Riveter Park site within the National Park Service website, and pull up every one of those studies, and as well the National Landmark Study, although I think—that's a thread maybe I could tie together. That would probably show up in the planning document section of the National Park Service website.

So I was pushing very hard to get this research done, and also some basic kind of Park Service resource studies done, and working very hard on hiring a high-level administrative person to support me in the efforts to pull in more grants and be able to responsibly manage, and supervise the grants.

In the meantime, Rick Smith, who was then head of interpretation at Yosemite, had requested a hardship transfer to the Bay Area because of a family health issue. The Deputy Regional Director, at the time, Art Eck, came to me and suggested a proposal. Our budget wouldn't cover him, but he could transfer Rick Smith into Rosie, and he'd be the Chief of Interpretation.

I read Rick's letter, and I read his résumé, and I thought, well, he'll have to do the budget work, but I know he's not going to be doing the administrative work, like getting reimbursed for travel. No matter how little money you have, there's still a lot of processes and forms you have to fill out.

06-00:10:08

So Rick came up from Yosemite, and I said, "You will have to do the budget work. You know, you basically write grant applications for all the money, like we got for the round two of interviews with UC Berkeley was based on a grant application that was successful. So that'll be part of your job, and we'll continue to farm out this other work to any assistant anywhere who will do it for us." There were five or six people doing our administrative work for us. I said, "I think we can stumble around, still doing that. And you can be Chief of Interpretation."

Rick went up and toured the Park with me one whole day, and fell in love with it. I well remembered taking a brilliant young planner around on the same tour, maybe a month before then, because I was hoping he could be the head of our GMP team at the time. And as I wrapped up the day with this young planner, who'd done the very impressive work with the Park Service, worked with the Forest Service, really had done a wide range of work, I said, "Well, I'd really love it if you would be the head of our planning team." And

he sat there really quietly for a minute, and he said, This park terrifies me. I couldn't work here. [laughs] I said, "What do you mean?" He said it was just overwhelming, that he wouldn't know where to start, that he couldn't do it. I greatly appreciated his honesty and his ability to evaluate his own abilities but it set me back a couple of days. I thought, "Well, what am I doing here?"

Rick was the opposite. End of the day, Rick was so excited he didn't want to go back to Yosemite. He didn't want to stop the tour. He just wanted to keep on going. He loved the resources. He loved the story. He loved the Park. We hit it off immediately. He has a sense of humor that I miss dearly. It kept both of us going through a lot of hard times. And that was it. We started on the paperwork to transfer him into the Park, and he moved his family up and went to work immediately. He is such a trooper. He is just such a rock of strength and focus and talent. His talent amazed me constantly.

Rick somehow or another found the time to write a self-driving auto tour, and I couldn't even guess how he did it. We both were so consumed with stuff that we had to do, the huge level of tending to the Park Service that you have to do, writing reports and justifications, and going to meetings and going to trainings, plus working with these partners, and working with the Rosie Trust, and getting these projects done. But he somehow got the driving tour done. He did that on his own.

He worked with a group of people from Richmond to do the exhibits in City Hall. We had a small grant, so he had to be very creative. It was largely photographs included in a really interesting piece of metalwork, and a collection of more photographs on the wall. He got that done. He worked with another group of people to get those beautiful interpretive elements along the Bay Trail. I never came up with a word quite descriptive of how beautiful they are, but they're like the essence of the prow of a ship. They are about twelve feet tall, and there are eight of them now along the Bay Trail, telling the story of the Bay Trail and the Park, all funded by the California Coastal Conservancy again, and ABAG for the Bay Trail. There were metal boards with porcelain interpretive panels on each of these magnificent sculptures. They're just gorgeous. They're only about this deep, but the beautiful curve that goes up that makes you think of not only ships, but vision and hope in the future, and all sorts of wonderful positive things. And each of them had this fired porcelain interpretive panel on it, carefully reflecting the range of different kinds of workers in the shipyard.

Those were installed and dedicated just about a year ago, October or November a year ago, and an additional one of those will go into the Shipyard with some more funding, including the Daughters of the American Revolution funding. There'll be a place where you can drive your car, get out and read the story of the Shipyard. The Park budget is so limited; only one person got added after four years. There won't be staff over there for quite a while, but these elements will tell you what happened in Shipyard Number Three.

Rick Smith also created a Power Point that we used millions of times at our public meetings. He's now been promoted to Assistant Superintendent. When I left, I think the region finally came to understand that you really can't have a National Park without any administrative support. Perhaps they noticed that the Regional Director's secretary was doing all our travel papers. Perhaps they got annoyed by that. I don't know. [laughs] She liked doing it. She actually came out and worked in the Park for about a month, was a wonderful person. Perhaps that was what brought the issue home to region; I don't know.

When I retired Regional Director Jarvis combined three other Parks with Rosie under the new Superintendent, Martha Lee, and so Rosie is now combined with, or under the same supervision, as Eugene O'Neill, the John Muir House, and the Port Chicago site. So there is now administrative support, although they had full-time jobs before this arrangement, but there is administrative support, and maintenance and law enforcement available to the Park now. So Rick is now the Assistant Superintendent, and the expectation is he will manage the other three Parks, and Martha Lee will manage Rosie. There's a Chief of Interpretation under him now, but Rick is still over interpretation.

Cándida Smith: The Chief of Interpretation is different from the cultural resources person?

Hart: Oh, fundamentally. The Chief of Interpretation at Rosie in the next few years will be focusing on developing the plans for the visitor center, and coming up with some kind of interpretive program. We simply never had the money to have any staff to give programs, but presumably there will be some sharing of the staff coming over to Richmond from East Contra Costa and giving programs.

The cultural resource person, who is the new person just put on staff—I don't think she's even started yet, and this is now November of 2005, October 2005, and she has been just recently hired—as I envisioned that position she would be the person who's on top of the artifacts and stories that are coming in, on top of the oral histories that you're doing at UC Berkeley, on top of all—by on top of I mean very much aware of, very informed about, fully comprehending all of these things, all the research that was done on all the sites and the history, and the national study—have a solid understanding of all of that, so that what goes into the visitor center is substantive. It's very easy to spend a lot of money with some really, really attractive exhibits that don't go very deep. And this is a deep story.

So at Rosie it's, "what's the instant understanding of the significance of Rosie?" Rick wrote those interpretive elements for the Park, and they're focused on the social change, the social change in equal opportunity, the social change of women's rights, the public acceptance of child care so that women could go to work. Not that we're in anything like universal healthcare, but the understanding that working Americans and Americans in general

deserve and benefit from healthcare, those changes that came out of the war, and the story of the monumental mobilization of the country to create the resources that allowed us to win the war.

When you go in the visitor center, you need to understand that big picture almost instantly, and then you need the filling in of the richness of the story, and that's where the Rosie stories become so critical. Because it was many, many stories. You can say the big picture in a paragraph, but the real difference, the difference between the African-American story, the Italian story, the Japanese story, really comes from the individual stories.

06-00:20:20

So how do you connect that individual with the simple—not simple, but simply-portrayed—overall context statement of why this is important? You don't get that skill from interpretive exhibit designers. You don't get that skill from model makers. You don't necessarily get it from historians. It takes a special kind of person to determine This is significant. This will tell this story. That's what the new cultural resource person—that's, in my opinion, their primary job. Secondary job is to apply for a million grants within the Park Service and outside the Park Service to fund all the projects that need to be done, like continuing the oral history project that you're heading up.

Cándida Smith: Are there themes that you would like, or that some people in the community would like, to see explored which for a variety of reasons you politically can't touch? I mean, would religion be a controversial subject, or gay and lesbian participation in the home front experience, or fleeting romance, sexuality? Where are the boundaries for what the Park can do without finding itself in a landmine?

Hart: I believe that for much of it you simply tell what are known to be—you know, history's not that simple—I want to say “what are known to be the facts.” I understand it's not that simple. But when it's personal stories, you know, you can count on that person believed that to be true, and therefore that's valid history.

One of the very interesting things about the evolution of healthcare in the Shipyard is the hospital—there were three hospitals really. Well, there were kind of four. There were first aid stations all over the Shipyard. There was a triage First Aid Station in the Shipyard. There was the Kaiser Hospital in Richmond, and then there was the big hospital in Oakland, and the severity of your injuries—and there were many injuries in the Shipyard, and more than a few deaths—determined whether you got treated at the First Aid Station in Richmond or in Oakland. As time went on they needed more beds for serious injuries, and so they turned Richmond into a hospital rather than a—the Richmond hospital became a real hospital with beds for overnight stays.

One of the expansions, one of the many expansions—I think it quadrupled in size, basically, over four years—was a maternity ward, to everybody's amazement. They somehow thought they'd have women workers without having any pregnancies, and it didn't work that way. [laughs] And the man who was head of the hospital at the time, during the war, went on a tour of the Park and was talking about this, and said they were all—I mean, nobody expected to have to have maternity services, OB/GYN. They did also notice that the pregnancy rate was considerably higher for the night shift, and particularly for those who were working down in the hulls of the ships. There was a double hull in every ship, [laughs] so there was a lot of privacy in the bottoms of the ships on the nightshift, and guess what? A lot of babies came from there.

Well, that's simple fact. And it's interesting, and it's fascinating to think that all these men doctors never thought they would need a maternity ward. Whether it came from the midnight shift in the Shipyard or just from life in general, you'd think they would have predicted that need, but they didn't. But they did meet it once they realized that there was a need. So that's a reality, and there's no reason not to talk about it. It wouldn't be a featured story, probably.

But religion can be trickier. I don't know of anything during the war that would be controversial. It's clear, and partly from your work, the Berkeley Oral History Project, you've emphasized how important it was that the churches sprang up in storefronts and living rooms and wherever they could—again, 20,000 people lived in Richmond in year one, and 120,000 in year four, so they had to build all those buildings that people met in, lived in, worked in. It was the churches that held the society together, to a great extent, established churches that created spaces in Richmond, and churches that just sprang up, out of their own need.

I don't know of anything that's controversial about that. They did an enormous and very necessary good in Richmond that wasn't being fulfilled any other way. And certainly, when you have 100,000 new residents in a small community, you would want some social order. You would want some cohesiveness, some meaning to the way people were living, so that was all a good, as far as I know.

On the other hand, in this time today, in 2005 religion can be very controversial, and how one interprets—I mean, I don't see any possibility of skewing how many churches were built, or what denomination they were, or what they did. I mean, that's simple information to document. What their beliefs were and how they practiced them and what that meant could become controversial in 2005. It hasn't yet. There really isn't a public interpretive program at Rosie yet, so there's nothing to become controversial. There are some pretty modest exhibits in City Hall, and a self-drive auto tour, and a

PowerPoint, but it's not a program that's reaching thousands of people. But it could become controversial.

Cándida Smith: Well, wouldn't that be a liberation? After all, the Park is located in one of the ground zeros of the gay liberation, in terms of the Bay Area, and even by World War II there was a definable homosexual presence in San Francisco that the histories have been written about. Are you going to be able to, in the same way that African Americans can look at what they're doing and say, "This is my story"?; would gays and lesbians be able to come to the Park and say, "This is my story, too"?

Hart: I don't know the answer to that. I'm not aware, based on any of the research that we have so far, or my awareness of your histories, I'm not aware that that was an issue during the war. I don't know, for example, if anybody cared when they were hiring, if there were questions asked. I really don't know what that story was in the shipyard, and my focus is always on what is the historical story.

As I was talking about religion, people can take their current perceptions of our society and exercise them as they choose, but for me the question is, what was happening during World War II? Was it an issue then, and what was the issue? I mean, the fact that the African Americans in Shipyard Number Three could not join the union is an extremely important story, and therefore they created an alternate union. If it turns out—or if there's research I'm not aware of—but if it turns out that there was open discrimination against gay and lesbian workers, and somehow that was worked through, or it was not, or somehow or another it was an issue, then it's an important part of the story.

In terms of somebody today taking on the Park as symbolic of their efforts or their desires or wishes, that certainly happens, but it's not—that would not be part of the Park Service interpretive program. The Park Service interpretive program would focus on what happened during World War II.

[interview interruption]

06:00:29:46

I've heard about possible communist influence or participation or involvement in the Henry Kaiser Shipyard, and I just was saying that I don't actually believe I've even read our labor study yet on Shipyard Number Three. It should be posted on the website. You could take a look at it. I don't believe that question came up in the history of the Shipyard. We have the two studies on Shipyard Number Three. I don't believe that came up in either one.

Cándida Smith: It would have varied from union to union. The Boilermakers certainly would not have had much of any communist influence. The UAW was strongly influenced by members of the Communist Party, but there was a division in the union between the Reuther social democratic side and the—I forget the name of the guy, but I think it's Frankenstein, who was more to the left. Both

would be considered on the left and probably socialistic by many standards. So the UAW was this union where this might have, in fact, been an issue in the Ford Assembly Building.

You know, it's hard for us to reconstruct that through oral histories because the people who are around to be interviewed right now were, what, in their early to mid-twenties generally, and may or may not have—I mean, typically they're just not interested in that sort of thing. They weren't in a position, generally, to be in leadership. That's one of the difficult things, is it's hard to interview people who were in leadership capacities in any field of life during World War II now.

Hart: Well, I was just thinking, though, the person that—I know attempts have been made to get to him, and I'm trying to remember his name—that was one of the managers of the Shipyard but has not agreed to be interviewed. But you did interview—who's the gentleman that spends half the year in Argentina?

Cándida Smith: Yes, we did interview him.

Hart: Did this come up with him when you were talking to him?

Cándida Smith: I'd have to—

[interview interruption]

Cándida Smith: I wonder if we might go down some of the names that you jotted down in your notes as being important for the experience, which I don't recall having come up in our five and a half hours so far, and see what you have to say about them. The first name that's on your list is Patty.

Hart: Patty Neubacher was in charge of money for the region. She was a proponent of the Manzanar model for funding. She was unable to increase the funding for Rosie for the four years I was Superintendent.

Cándida Smith: And she worked for Ray Murray?

Hart: No. She reported directly to Regional Director.

Cándida Smith: You have discussed Ray Murray previously, but I wanted to clarify something that you've alluded to earlier today. I think you were saying that he was the one who went out to do the site inspection when the bill was first being proposed, and proposed a much larger park?

Hart: Right.

Cándida Smith: So in that sense the Park is his vision?

Hart: Very much so, very much his early creation. The Park owes a great deal to Ray Murray.

Cándida Smith: So he saw the possibility of bringing together the Shipyard, the Ford Assembly Building, and the various others. So was he then instrumental in helping you push things forward, or getting on a faster track than the organization might otherwise prefer?

Hart: It's a complicated story. I have great admiration for Ray. He's been in that position for many, many, many years, and accomplished miracles, often on his own. He's a person that's in his office till midnight every night, at least. His support varied over time. We worked closely together during my work editing the study, and then while the legislation was being drafted. But I was not the one he wanted to be Superintendent. When I traveled back that fall for two or three weeks in 2000 he was, I will just say, not helpful. Somehow, right about the time that we switched to that second GMP team captain, a year or so later, he became very supportive again, personally and professionally, and really helped out in ways that were tremendously helpful to me.

He wasn't able however to engender any action from the larger regional office to better support the Park. That didn't happen.

Cándida Smith: We should talk a little bit more about the third team captain.

06-00:39:45

Hart: Stephan Nofield, the hero of the planning for this Park, just an amazing young man, with a lot of experience. A lot of Park Service people come in and work their entire career in the Park Service, and therefore have a very Park-Service-centric view of the world. Stephan had done several different kinds of jobs. He led whale-watching tours for a while, which gave him a direct experience of working with the public on a visitor experience.

But most especially, he was a planner for the town of Provincetown; I can't think of a more varied community than Provincetown, or a more vocal, or a more agitated or involved community than Provincetown, Massachusetts. Stephan is the kind of person that's sensitive to people. That's just his nature, and he's inclusive with people, and he's got a very gentle way with people. And anybody who'd survive as a community planner in Provincetown would obviously learn a lot there also. And he also learned how towns work, you know, what drives their budget, what drives their priorities.

He was just right out there—they were in his face every day. He was brilliant. He knew planning. He wrote very well. He spoke very well. Everything you'd ever want from a planner was Stephan Nofield, and he was the one who was able to fully engage with the partners and the community when he came to town. They loved working with him. It was fun working with Stephan. It was always fun. He has a fascinating brain, and he gets tremendous credit for pulling our planning together. He also brought on the GMP team Keri Cahill,

another planner from the Denver Service Center. She too was well experienced to work with the Rosie team.

Jesse Washington and Joe Green—Jesse was head of Parks and Recreation for the city of Richmond, and Joe Green was the Librarian. When I first got to Richmond and started meeting with Isaiah Turner—actually, this happened ever before I got there, I think. Ray Murray, I think, requested that the city appoint people who'd have a responsibility for making sure the Park happened, and it turned out to be Joe Green, the Librarian, and Jesse Washington, the head of Parks and Recreation, and they were both very helpful in teaching me how the city worked, and who was in charge of what, and how you got on the agenda for the City Council. Jesse let us use his conference room for meetings, over and over for months. We were in there at least once a week. They were both really helpful to me in those early months.

Don Hardison was another name you mentioned, and Don was one of those people that I could just count on for anything. He worked in Shipyard Number Three during the war under Henry Kaiser. He was an architect, and he designed—well, in my terms he would take the hull, design it into pieces, taking into consideration the flex and the shape and so forth, and figure out, how big does this piece of metal have to be? What size and shape is this plate of metal going to need to be to be riveted to the piece next to it, to end up with a ship? And so he would design the molds that the women would use to cut the pieces that they would rivet into the hull.

But because of his position he knew a great deal about the Shipyard, and who was doing what, and, when somebody would tell us they were doing such and such in this building, he could say, no, that was in the General Warehouse. There were plates and silverware in there, not bombs. There were no bombs in the shipyard. That's not why that building looks like that. And he was just incredibly helpful to me personally, he and his wife Betty.

Don was also very much involved in the restoration of the *Red Oak Victory*, and because of his professional expertise was leaned on for any number of things. When the Red Oak Victory was thinking of docking alongside the Ford building, they turned to Don to design—there's no dock there now—a dock that would work for the Red Oak Victory and for the visitors getting on the ship, and come up with a cost estimate at the point when they were trying to raise money to do that. So people depended on him for all sorts of things. He did drawings of the Red Oak Victory so that we knew what it actually looked like, and the size of the rooms and so forth. He was just a saint of a man in terms of helpfulness.

One of the names you mentioned was Donna Graves. She is a consultant in arts and culture. She was helpful in orienting us to the community and the issues. She was actually on the staff of the Redevelopment Authority when I started. She was instrumental in developing the Rosie the Riveter Memorial

landscape sculpture. She was on the committee that did the exhibits in City Hall, and she was very instrumental in the interpretive elements, the prows of a ship, those elements that are along the Bay Trail. So she was very helpful to getting the Park off the ground.

Cándida Smith: What are the perspectives that each of these people brought, their personal perspectives of what the Park should do and shouldn't do? How did what each of them brought help you synthesize a broader vision for the Park?

Hart: The notion that was in my head when I got to Richmond came from the study, which was reflected in the legislation, so that's what I thought the Park would look like. I learned from all of them, particularly Tom and Gary, and Donna, before I began to know other people in the community, they taught me what Richmond was about, and how it worked, and what they thought, and what they might want, and what interested them. As my contacts spread out in the community then I would get it firsthand from the various people I was listening to. But they were invaluable in orienting me to Richmond so that I didn't make any huge mistakes when I first got there, and offend people.

In terms of how each of them affected the way the Park evolved, I would guess if we had another thirty hours of tape maybe we could go into that [laughs], because it was so incremental and so broad. I mean, there were the huge breakthroughs like Jay Mancini with his idea of going around the Port rather than going through it. Was there another breakthrough like that? Everybody that I worked with—that was the beauty of the job and that was the exhaustion of the job, I was working with—I think my closest circle was probably seventy-five people by the time I left, that I talked to constantly, and I listened to every one of them.

Howard Levitt, who did wonderful things in the months he was there, was the Interim Superintendent after I retired. In our transition, he asked for my advice. I said, "It's very simple. Listen, listen, listen. Listen and listen. At the very end of the meeting, say what you think." That was the way I did everything about that Park, because it was more theirs than it was the Park Service's, and it had to be theirs, and the only way for that to work was to find out what they wanted and what they thought. So to go back through what each of them contributed would be a huge project, and I am so grateful to you for taping my talking about it, because I can at least get the names out there, and give people credit for making all this happen. But that's a whole book, to talk about what they individually contributed.

Cándida Smith: We should talk about your decision to retire when you did, what were the factors involved in that and what you felt the future of the Park was likely to be, what direction had been set that your successor will be developing further.

Hart: Well, the simplest part of that decision was my health. I had been delivering a letter in Point Richmond that first summer in about mid-July. I'd been in town

about six months. I was stopped at a stop sign in Point Richmond, and a very elderly gentleman in a very large car rolled into the back of my car. I didn't think it was much of a deal at the time. There wasn't any observable damage to my car. I took his name and drove back to my office.

And I talked to my boss about it a couple of days later, but I didn't—it was one of those injuries that just got worse and worse and worse over time. It was a lower back wrenching, which I felt very clearly at the time. I just didn't realize that I'd still be living with it five years later. By a month or two later I was in constant pain. At that point I was going to the chiropractor every week, acupuncture every week, and massage every week, and I was still in a lot of pain all the time. I found an office chair that was really comfortable for my back. It was made out of bungee cords, and I think that really is one of the reasons why I so easily slid into a habit of working very late in the office every night, because that chair was—the only thing that was as comfortable as that chair was my bed at home.

I was in constant pain. One of the things that I just dreaded was the VIP tours, and I used to beg the developers, whichever of the three developers was in charge of the Ford building, to open an entrance down by the Craneway where our visitor center would be, but it was always at the far end of the building where the security gate was, and I'd have to walk a quarter mile on the concrete in the Ford building to get down to the Craneway. Some days it was just agony, and then I'd have to walk back again, and in between I'd have to stand down there and talk to people. It was cold and windy inside the building. It was always wet in there, and I would just be in agony on a lot of those VIP tours. I came to dread the group tours. We had six or seven groups come down from the State Library in their vans. For me to sit in a van and tell the driver where to go, and keep turning back to talk to people behind me was just excruciating.

That went on for four years, plus working in the office till 9:00 pm many nights, and under tremendous pressure all the time, especially once the Ford project started. They'd say they were going to send a television PSA, and I'd have two hours to review it. And we'd all be sitting around trying to pull the PSA up on our poor little computer system, that was a distant cousin of the computer system in Oakland, and try and give them the turnaround they demanded. It was relentless pressure of one deadline after another, all with extremely limited resources.

And the people that were helping me, the chiropractor, the acupuncturist, said they were keeping me going but they weren't healing me. They weren't even keeping up with the kind of pressure I was under. And particularly the acupuncturist I was going to, who was very much a spiritual advisor also, said that my body was talking to me, trying to tell me that it can't do what I was making it do, and if I didn't listen to it, it was going to get worse. I would go out of there on a gurney. I ignored him for a full year. I think the turning point

was the Ford project, of being under such unrelenting pressure for months on end. I finally decided to listen to him.

We were getting a hundred phone calls a day, and I'd sit there, and I'd hear these phones ringing, and I'd know we've got two people on the staff here; how are we going to get through this? We had a backlog of 2,500 messages that had been left on our phones and never been answered, and someone had complained to Ford that we weren't answering their phone call. The message came down, get rid of the backlog. We had two weeks. They'd give us \$15,000. We had two weeks to get rid of that backlog.

And I'm like, "We've got three people here. Are you crazy?" Just because you've got forty million people working for you, can't you imagine what's going on at this end of the telephone? So we organized two phone-a-thons. We had the public come into the office of the affiliation of county unions. They gave us their phone bank, and the phone company mobilized their employees, and we put out an ad for volunteers. The volunteers answered 1200 phone messages in two days, and then we had a phone-a-thon over at Golden Gate National Park the next week, and Golden Gate employees answered the other 1200 messages.

But it was more than I could take at sixty-two. I think it's as simple as that. I started thinking maybe I really did need to retire, because I didn't see any relief coming. I didn't see any money coming. I didn't see any more staff coming. Ford's finances had fallen into a hole with their problems with the rollovers and the tires, and they had set in motion this enormous project, and had no resources to help us with the follow-up.

So I began to think more and more about my own health, and then started to think, "Well, if I were to leave, what would I be comfortable with? Where would I want this Park to be so that I could feel free to leave?" I looked at that and what plateaus the Park might get to that would be stable places, I began to think that my leaving could be helpful because the regional office in Oakland of the Park Service, and a lot of the people in the community, knew that I was holding a lot of stuff together. I was the centerpiece of the communication, the center of the circle of communication, and if I left there were certain things that were definitely going to be hard to keep going. So it took on a different meaning to me. I thought, well, this could be a very positive thing, not just for my health but for the Park.

Audio file 7

07-00:00:16

Hart:

So the one person I started talking to was Stephan Nofield, our head of our GMP planning, and I said, "I will not bail out on you. Unless we can figure out a way that this is positive, I won't leave now." And Stephan was wonderful. He was personally supportive and very creative and helpful, and

we'd be on the phone for an hour and a half at a time, once or twice a week in the beginning. We both quickly came to the conclusion that what was needed was not the Park Service. The Park Service was going to have to catch up, at that point, with what was going on in Richmond. What was needed was for each of the property owners to get clear about what they were willing to do with their own property, what was their vision, commitment to making it happen—obviously the money was a huge question, but commit to having it happen when the money could be secured—and to have all these property owners come in and share their plans with each other so that the group of them could finally start working together.

They would be in charrettes together, but that was brainstorming. They weren't committing to anything in those charrettes. So this would be personal-professional commitment to make the Park happen. And then we worked backwards. Well, we worked backwards from Stephan's schedule, because he had many projects to work on. So we took his schedule, we took what I knew of the schedule in Richmond, and we said, "Okay. We think it would take this many meetings and this much process, and this much discussion, and we need to get out the first big newsletter. Then we need to—." You know, we just laid out what it would take, in our best judgment, to get to this joint commitment.

I had in my mind the idea of leaving the end of January, although I was flexible about it. So we worked backwards from that and decided that that actually was a good time and laid out this very ambitious schedule of meetings and the preparation for the meetings and all that, which fit in with what we were doing, and it actually fit in with his schedule. We both knew we had this very strong desire to have this personal commitment from the Park property owners.

Before that final workshop, the team came out and met individually with the property owners, and then on a Friday all the property owners came together and shared their plans. That was the week before—by this time in November I decided I definitely would retire, and I announced it and announced it as February 3, I think it was. So that big week of meetings was the second week before I left, and it worked.

I think part of the reason it worked was that people were very shocked when I said I was leaving. Apparently, even in this state of weakened health at the time, people didn't think I looked like I was sixty-two at the time. They thought I was younger than sixty-two, it was like, they just thought it was going to be forever till I retired, and I'm like, "No. No, I'm not going to die with my boots on." So it was a great shock to people.

I called every one of those major partners. It was over seventy phone calls. A few of them were messages, but mostly they were conversations, and the message was always, "We're heading toward this agreement, this pact of what each property owner is going to do, and it's up to you to make this happen."

The Park Service has not showed up with money. It's not showed up with staff. It's not showed up with much of anything. I can't promise you it ever will. *You need to make it happen.*" I wasn't necessarily that blunt with everybody I talked to, but that was my message. "It's your turn. You have to make this happen, and you have to get out, knowingly, in front of the Park Service, and get the Park Service to respond and get the visitor center built at least," which is the one piece it's comfortable with.

And I'd have to say that worked. It scared people that I was leaving. It shocked them, and it scared them, and the one City Councilwoman, Maria Viramontes, said to me what I really hoped people were thinking. She said, and I quote, "I'm stunned. I'm shocked. I'm devastated. I never had to worry about the Park when you were there." Remembering this is making me cry. "And now I have to worry about it. Now I have to make it happen." I'm like, "You got it, Maria. You got it. That is the message. I can't make this Park happen anymore. It's got to be you all."

The other huge event that I wanted before I retired was the Park Service commitment to building the visitor center. [Takes deep breath.]

[interview interruption]

Cándida Smith: Stopped briefly.

Hart: I was overcome with emotion, thinking about those four years and the decision to wrap up my part of it, and saying off camera that all four years were emotional for me. They varied, but it was always difficult. That first year it was, what did I do to myself, and how can I get back to the East Coast? And the second into the third year was, why am I doing this? If nobody else cares about this, really, I mean, they think it's interesting and new and different, but they're not committed to it, why am I doing this? And maybe I shouldn't be doing it. And if Richmond doesn't want this, I shouldn't be doing this.

And then the later phases were just being overwhelmed with the work, particularly when the Ford project came through, just overwhelmed with impossible deadlines that just never let up for ten months. Once we had about 5,000 phone calls, 5,000 contacts, and realized how important this was, we went to the Hill in Washington to tell various people what was going on, make sure they knew the kind of response we were getting. And Congressman Miller's staff person said, "Why don't we do a Congressional Resolution honoring their work?" I was so excited about that idea. Amelia Jenkins, she left shortly after that. The idea just ignited people on the Hill. Many staffers are women, and they got so excited about the idea.

So then we decided to have a big reception on the Hill in May to celebrate the Resolution, and bring some Rosies from around the country to the celebration. So then we'd created a mountain for ourselves to climb. We had to get this

Resolution passed by May, which we didn't quite pull off. It was well underway and the wording was written. I got to write it. That was one of the great highlights of that job. It got edited, of course, but I did get to write it.

So we created a train wreck for ourselves and had to just work like crazy people to get the Resolution far enough along to be presentable for the reception. The reception was incredible, and then five Rosies got invited to the White House breakfast with the President on Memorial Day. It was ninety-five veterans and five Rosies, but every other year it had been a hundred veterans and no Rosies. So that pressure was just relentless for months and months.

But I digress. The other piece that I wanted so badly to happen, either while I was there or because I had left—I wanted the Park Service to commit to actually funding and building the visitor center in the Ford building, which we'd talked around and around for five years. And in fairness, three developers had come and gone. So we kept starting over with our plans, and starting over with our relationship, and starting over with our negotiations every time.

07-00:10:00

But this time it seemed solid, and it *was* solid. So Rick and I developed a PR program, basically, aimed at the region, and we did a mind map one day. It made it fun, you know. I was using about six different colors, and it went anywhere from Rick taking Patty to lunch to making sure that the beautiful, very impressive architectural drawings for the Ford building got down to the regional office. It was all about impressing them that it was real, that there was a lot of work completed, that our relationship with this developer was solid, that this developer was going to make it happen, that it wasn't a gamble to put it on the funding list.

We set up an advisory group in the region, and collected all their input and their support. It was a campaign. The priority-setting meeting was the week after I retired, and I was gambling that there would also be some of the same reaction: Oh, my god. Now we're going to have to do something. Judy's leaving. And it worked. They not only put it on the funding list, but they actually bumped it ahead of somebody else, the unheard of. [laughs] And last I heard there's actually \$200,000 in the federal Appropriations Bill this year to start the planning. Now, that's not going to go very far. It's a five million dollar project. But once you get money, then you say, "We have a project ongoing. We need to keep it going." You know, you're not just in line. You're actually getting money, and there's a lot of momentum to finishing projects that got started, so having a started project was desperately important. So now there's a started project on the visitor center.

So the two big things that I wanted both happened, with enormous gratitude to Stephan Nofield for really pushing through all those pieces that we plotted out

to get the partner commitments that would become the General Management Plan, and to Rick Smith and Elizabeth Tucker for plotting out all these pieces to get the region to come around and say yes to the visitor center, and then completing all those tasks. It was a lot of work. I think there were three or four formal meetings and presentations in the region, each of which was like a mini-charrette. I wasn't as complicated at the big ones we did, but they were a lot of work. And it worked; the visitor center finally got funding.

So the first filming that you did—I checked my planner; that was on a Wednesday morning. I had officially retired on the Thursday before. The retirement party was the Wednesday before. I spent all day Friday working with the new Interim Superintendent, and all day Saturday, Sunday, and Monday packing up my office. I was there till two o'clock in the morning, because it wasn't just Rosie; it was my whole thirty-year career that I was packing up.

Then a couple of very dear friends came and helped me pack my home, because the moving truck was coming Thursday morning at eight o'clock, the next day after you filmed that first part of this, and when I looked at it I thought I looked as tired as I felt. [laughs] And I was really glad you did it then, because you caught me in the middle of just an overwhelming amount of emotion that—it's making me cry again—that the work got done, and the appreciation that got expressed was just—clearly, people had gotten to the point where they cared about the Park, and they cared about me, and they were sorry that I was leaving, because they had grown to care about me. But more important, they'd grown to care about the Park. And that hadn't been true when I started and they all thought I was crazy. Literally. So I was overwhelmed then, and I'm overwhelmed now.

Cándida Smith: You had an additional issue that you wanted to discuss about the Ford project, which does seem like it was a major turning, in some ways one of the major turning points for the whole Park.

Hart: It definitely was. It proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that there was enormous interest in this story. I mean, saying it was a nationally significant story, which the Park Service said from day one, is a little dry. But there clearly was this enormous outpouring of interest and support and commitment and love of the Park.

I got such moving letters after I retired. It had always bothered me that the people who submitted their stories and artifacts did not get a personal letter acknowledging it. We had our whole process of, you know, assigning numbers and taking it into the collection, and they'd eventually get a formal piece of paper that has numbers on it, but I wanted to write a thank-you letter. So when I retired, dear Elizabeth produced 2,200 thank you letters for me to sign. I said, "We really appreciate your story. We really appreciate the fact that you've sent this artifact. It'll become part of the Park. Thank you, and I

want to let you know I'm retiring." I got the most beautiful cards back from some of those ladies, thanking me for the work I'd done, and wishing me well in retirement. It was quite moving.

But it's important to talk more about that project, because it was huge. It was at least three years in the making. We talked about it with Jody Keating, who was the program officer at the National Park Foundation, the national nonprofit that works with the Park Service at the Washington level, and this wonderful woman, Jackie Lowey. Jackie had been a Deputy Director of the Park Service, and was an amazingly wise and wonderful, spirited person then working as a consultant. So Jody and Jackie and I had been scheming for about three years how to connect with the Ford Motor Company, which had a contract with the National Park Foundation to support the parks. And it was, after all, the Ford Assembly Building where the visitor center was going. Ford was a big part of the story in Richmond.

And so finally the project was Ford would use their advertising budget to advertise Ford, and also call for Rosie stories. I think they gave us \$50,000 between the Park Foundation and Ford, and we hired two amazing women. Michele Seville was a long-time Richmond resident, very involved in the arts community, and Elizabeth Tucker, who had formerly worked for the Park Service in Yosemite, so Rick Smith knew her. And she had moved up to the Bay Area. So we put Michele and Elizabeth on the payroll, and they did such heroic work.

The idea got formulated in August. By September Ford had decided—because Ford made all the decisions—Ford decided they wanted the big press conference to be on Veterans Day. So we had to gear up for this huge ceremony in Richmond in six weeks. Elizabeth and Michele and Rick and I just worked like crazy people. No, we worked like very hard-working, intelligent people, and we worked with their advertising agency folks, who were the crazy ones. [laughs] It was a very exciting time.

We had a fabulous press conference. We had Rosies from all around the country. Ford had flown them in from Kansas, Texas, Maryland, and California, and we invited about twenty other Rosies from the Richmond area. It was to be a press conference. Well, somebody heard about it, and it got announced on the radio that morning. We got there, and our private press conference had a crowd of about three hundred people, which made for a very exciting morning all the way around. There was a mad scramble to assemble more hard hats for the unexpected visitors. But everybody loved it.

The Ford building looked fabulous. They had thousands of dollars worth of red, white, and blue balloons all over the building, which did warm it up a lot. It was a cold, windy, and drippy day like it always was in November, and rain water had come in the broken windows and was standing on the floor but the balloons made it look very festive, along with tables and chairs and flowers

and food. Ford was working with their advertising company to put this on and they did a fabulous job.

07-00:20:04

And then Ford got really excited after that press conference. They were interested before, but then the response starting pouring in. Ford's focus was their website, and they wanted Rosies to enter their stories on the Ford website, and we did get thousands that way, but they were primarily the children of Rosies. They could go onto the Ford website, the Park Service website, or they could write us, or they could call us, and that all went out in the press information. Rosies mostly got on their phones and called the Park office.

And, of course, from November 11 we headed into the holiday season, and the Ford advertising company had put together a public service announcement that was so fetching, is the word that comes to mind. It had the Rosie the Riveter song, and it had historic, moving footage of Rosies working, and a very simple call at the end with the Ford logo on it, and it said, "Call this number if you have a Rosie story."

By the time we went through Christmas and New Years and everybody came back to work, we were getting a hundred phone calls a day in our office, and the mail was pouring in, and we still had Michele and Elizabeth, who were supposed to be on the payroll for, like, another month. I called "Help," and Ford sent a little more money, the Park Foundation came up with a little more money, the Park Service came up with a little bit more money. We ended up keeping Michele on until June, and Elizabeth's still there. We were able to put her on the Park payroll after the middle of the summer. And the two of them pulled in volunteers. They were like huge magnets. We would typically have ten, twelve people working back there all day long, answering the phones, and processing the packages that would come in; they got some graduate students that actually had training in that area.

We worked through the Resolution for Congress, and then the reception in May in Washington with the Rosies, celebrating the Resolution. Then there was a press conference the next day also in Washington with Sissy Spacek, that was really more Ford talking about the Women in Military Museum in Arlington, Virginia, and then the White House breakfast on Memorial Day.

And then the boxes started to come with the artifacts that were just amazing. It was an incredible project, because it was such an outpouring of emotion, as well as memories. And, of course, it's still going on. The artifacts are still coming in. The stories are still coming in. Ford said they didn't have any more money. They've had severe financial troubles that were well known publicly, and they really couldn't support the project anymore.

Thanks again to Stephanie Toothman, the cultural resources chief in the Seattle office, the Park Service did come up with funding for things like boxes and storage cabinets, and labels and white gloves, and plastic envelopes and archival sleeves, and all those things you need to keep artifacts preserved, and fortunately came up with a big metal cabinet that has pull-out drawers. Because they are just in a back storage room, really, of Richmond City Hall, and Rosies come from around the country, and they want to see the museum. They want to see their donation. They want to see the exhibit. We show them the exhibits in the City Hall lobby, which are pretty modest, but then we can take them back to the workroom and pull out these shelves and show them their artifacts so they at least can get to see them. They're hardly on display but, you know, it's the beginning of just an amazing, amazing project.

I am very eagerly anticipating and have very high hopes for the staff. The new Superintendent is Martha Lee, and she's just hired Lucy Lawless as a Cultural Resource Specialist. Rick Smith is Assistant Superintendent, and Elizabeth Tucker is now a full-fledged Ranger in the Park. They will be the core staff that goes into planning the visitor center. I can hardly wait to see how these artifacts and stories and oral histories somehow come together in this magnificent kind of greenhouse space overlooking the bay in San Francisco, with an eighty-foot ceiling, I think.

The general concept that we presented to the Park Service was a piece of a ship. So the piece of the ship if it were life-sized would be sixty-feet high, and somehow the artifacts and the stories suspended, attached to—you walk into—somehow this is the centerpiece of that enormous space. I can hardly wait to see it.

[Narrator addendum: The developer moved ahead with his plans for the Craneway before the Park Service was ready to proceed with the planned visitor center. The visitor center opened with temporary exhibits in 2012 in the Oil House adjacent to the Ford building.]

And with great thanks to Ford. We could not possibly have collected those stories on our own. There just is no way. My one hope is that somehow some simpler plan for collecting Rosie stories could travel around the country, and I hope you work on this, Richard. [laughs] That somehow women can—we've done a couple of these, you know. We sent out signs and said, "Yes, the Park Service is co-sponsoring this gathering of Rosies in the local library," and they sit down and meet each other for the first time, probably, and write down their stories and send the stories in to the Park. I know it's nothing like the four-hour interviews that you conduct with people, and help them get back to their memories. It's nothing like that, but I still would like to see something like that happen.

I also wanted to talk about Time magazine, because they were one of the partners in this National Park Foundation Project, Proud Partners was what

they called it. They, without any cost to the Park or the Park Service, put a five-page advertorial in Time magazine. It featured Ford, but Ford's insignia was never any bigger than the Park Service arrowhead or the National Park Foundation logo. And it described the Park. It described Richmond. It talked about Rosies. It talked about Ford's role, that they had Rosie because Rose Monroe was an employee who became the star in the movie *Rosie the Riveter*. A beautiful piece which they let us review and edit, and change what needed to be changed, absolutely a gorgeous piece in full color.

That article ignited interest in Richmond in a way that would be hard to imagine what could have been more effective, that they could see their community, Richmond, which is often in the papers about its homicide rate and its other social problems, to see Richmond featured in Time magazine. People just streamed into my office the next day. I had the press coverage laminated, and by then Isaiah Turner was gone, so we could hang up things on the wall, so I had this full-page ad in USA Today of the call for stories, and the big pictures that were in every paper hanging up on our cubicle walls, showing people the kind of press coverage that they got for this Veterans Day press conference.

07-00:30:31

And we'd taken apart the *Time* magazine and put it all over, and given copies to each of the City Councilors, and the Mayor and the City Manager. They were just overwhelmed that Richmond would be featured so beautifully in *Time* magazine, and it probably did more to create that majority of interest in the City Council, and that very deep commitment now with the Mayor and the City Manager. It did more than any other thing we could possibly have done. It was the old "come at it sideways," you know? Who would think that *Time* magazine would be promoting Richmond?

Cándida Smith: Do you know who the person was at Ford, or at *Time* magazine, rather, who made that story happen?

Hart: No, I don't. We never got to talk to anybody from *Time*.

The woman who was head of international marketing—I mean, she was the top person for marketing for Ford—was involved in the project, and the woman who I think might have been slightly higher but in a different track, who was head of, like, operations around the world for Ford, were the—they were the top team sent forward. They were the ones that came to the press conferences. There was a wonderful woman, Robin Bishop, who was, I believe, in charge of the Office of International Policy, just the most gracious, charming, intelligent, wonderful person to work with, very calm and calming. She would personally negotiate all the parts of Ford who were often in different places, and she would negotiate with the advertising company, Hill and Knowlton. She would calm the waters and negotiate all that.

Jackie Lowey and Robin Bishop were the two people who pulled it together and kept everybody speaking to each other. Those conference phone calls were really something else. [laughs] Extremely difficult at times, usually with the advertising people. And as many as eight on the line at once. And whenever Jackie called on her own I knew something was seriously amiss. I'd known Jackie for years and I just adore her. She'd say she had to tell me this; she had to tell me that. And I particularly remember the phone call about the backlog of the 2500 messages. She said I had to clear it up in two weeks. I said, "Jackie, that's impossible." She said she knew I'd figure out a way to do it. I'm like, "*Jackie!!*" She said I had to do it. They'd given me \$15,000. It's not much, she said, but this whole project would fall apart if I didn't get rid of that backlog in two weeks. I'm like, "We can't." "You have to." "We can't." "You have to." [laughs] And that's when we decided to do the phone-a-thons. That was the only way we could think of to possibly deal with it. But she was amazing to work with. And I'm sure that Robin had a million conversations like that within her group.

Cándida Smith: The thing that astonishes me in the whole story—I've seen it unfold, and as you've narrated it—is the requirement for heroism on your part and on the part of everyone involved. It seems like that last anecdote actually does in many ways symbolize the whole thing. Either you're superwoman or nothing will happen. It will all fall apart. Which, of course, explains why you would be thinking about retiring. [Hart laughs] But I wonder to what degree this is an anomaly, or to what degree this is something that is being built into different aspects of American life that you would see. Is your story unique within the National Park Service, the federal government?

Hart: Well, you know, I appreciate your asking that. I appreciate the compliment behind that. People do say about both Rosie and Women's Rights National Historical Parks that they wouldn't have happened if I hadn't been there to make them happen.

Many expressed their opinion that both Parks were impossible. But they weren't. The word impossible means to me, just try another path.

I always have a vision, a dream, a picture of where I want to end up. If one route is blocked, I just look for another, or create another. I begin with the legislation creating the Park, and then create my personal vision, and inspire others to join in making it happen then work to make the vision a reality. I never doubt that the Park will happen. I never let up; some have said my middle name is Perseverance.

The Rosie the Riveter Park presents special challenge to the Park Service. Its success is dependent on the City of Richmond and Contra Costa County. The Park Service will probably own no land or property there, and it needs to inform and inspire and collaborate with others to do the work. The Park is part of an urban community struggling with racial tension, poverty, and crime. All

of the historic structures were threatened with demolition, or neglect. The Rosies and their stories were not known. The history of the story was not well known.

Most parks did not struggle with these issues, so there was a lack of experience in the Park Service overcoming these issues. My experience and education before I joined the National Park Service were important in facing the challenges. All of my positions before the Park Service were embedded in controversy. I also had worked in the most challenged of African-American neighborhoods in Boston during the most challenging time after the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Bobby Kennedy. I had spent most of my career working in urban areas, usually in distressed areas. My BA degree from Cornell included English literature, philosophy, and psychology. My Master of Arts degree was in Law.

I had a passion to create new and positive experiences for people, and a passion for understanding the big picture of history. I wanted untold stories to be told. It became my mission once I began with the Park Service.

It was my honor, privilege and joy to have been the Founding Superintendent of Rosie the Riveter World War II Home Front National Historical Park.

It is also my honor, privilege and joy to have been the Founding Superintendent of Women's Rights National Historical Park in Seneca Falls, New York.

Conclusion by Judy Hart

On January 21, 2013, Judy Hart finished her review of the transcript of the interview. Simultaneously, the President of the United States, Barack Obama, included "Seneca Falls" in his inauguration speech and referred to the words in the "Declaration of Sentiments." That declaration, demanding women's right to vote, in 1848, was publically announced in Seneca Falls, the location of the National Park today. Visit both Parks!

Contributors to the Rosie the Riveter / World War II Home Front National Historical Park: It took an army, but the following were especially dedicated to the Park.

Rosie the Riveters and Wendy the Welders

The Park commemorates and interprets the work, as well as the challenges, personal contributions and victories, of millions of women who went to work in factories building the ships, planes, tanks, and trucks crucial to winning World War II, and all Americans who contributed to the war effort on the home front. They are the heroes of the Park!

United States Congressman George Miller was the spearhead for the legislation creating the Park, and continued to support the Park along with John Lawrence, his Chief of Staff.

Elected officials and staff of the City of Richmond are congratulated for their history-making work and include Irma Anderson, Mayor; Leveron Bryant, Deputy Mayor; Tom Butt, City Council; Donna Powers, first woman elected to City Council; Isiah Turner, City Manager; Jay Corey, Deputy City Manager; Jim Matzorkis, Port Director; Tom Mitchell, Redevelopment Head; Gary Hembree, Redevelopment staff; Donna Graves, cultural consultant; Joe Green, Librarian; Jesse Washington, Parks and Recreation head; Steve Duran, subsequent Redevelopment head; and the four additional Interim City Managers in the fourth year of Park development.

Contra Costa County officials were crucial to the success of the Park, especially including County Supervisor John Gioia and Facilities Manager Al Prince.

The support of Will Travis, Executive Director of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, made it possible to bring visitors into historic Shipyard Number Three, which is also the active shipping port for Richmond.

Rosie the Riveter Trust was a very early partner supporting every initiative for the Park, including the authorizing legislation creating the Park: Tom Butt, President; John Gioia, County Supervisor; Rosemary Corbin, former Richmond Mayor; and Diane Hedler, Kaiser Permanente.

Richmond Port Director Jim Matzorkis became a major supporter for bringing the public into Historic Shipyard Number Three, his Port, and for preserving the historic structures and setting.

The enormous challenge of restoring and bringing to new use the Ford Assembly Building was supported by the work of Eddie Orton, developer #3, Ethan Silva and Gerard Howland, developer #2, and Forest City, developer #1.

The Maritime Child Care Center was preserved, restored, and opened to the public by the tireless efforts of Tom Butt, John Gioia and Al Prince.

The *SS Red Oak Victory* was rescued from her mothballed state and restored by the endless devotion of Lois Boyle, President, Richmond History Museum; Don Harding, shipyard supervisor during World War II; and an amazing Volunteer restoration crew.

The historic Richmond Whirley Crane was generously donated by owner Gary Levine, and stabilized and moved to historic Shipyard Number Three with special thanks to Mark Howe, volunteer manager for moving the Whirley Crane, and Tom Butt, and the donation of the time of the enormous barge that moved the Whirley Crane down the shipping canal and back into Shipyard Number Three.

Shelby Sampson gave special help with the Atchison Village war worker housing.

Special thanks go to the Northern California Muslim Association for their kindness and care for the historic Kaiser Hospital, their new home.

Particular thanks go also to Consultant Larry Kennings, LAK Associates, for his sensitive work protecting historic Shipyard Number Three when threatened by a use which might have prevented visitor access.

The National Park Service was the basis of support for the entire project. The following deserve particular recognition:

The Park's founding staff: Judy Hart, Park Superintendent; Rick Smith, Park Chief of Interpretation; Elizabeth Tucker, Park Ranger; Michelle Seville, Park Ranger; and a fleet of dedicated volunteers.

The Washington DC headquarters of the National Park Service: Deny Galvin, Deputy Director; Kate Stevenson, Associate Director for Cultural Resources; Warren Brown, Chief of Planning; Don Hellmann, Chief of Legislation; Rich O'Connor, HABS/HAER; and Nicholas Targ, Solicitor, Interior Department Solicitors Office, Washington DC.

The Park Service regional office in San Francisco and Oakland: John Reynolds, Regional Director; Ray Murray, Planning Chief; Stephanie Toothman, Chief of Cultural Resources; Jon Jarvis, second Regional Director; Bill Walters, Deputy Regional Director #1; Art Eck, subsequent Deputy Regional Director; George Turnbull, Deputy Regional Director #3; and Patty Neubacher, Budget Chief.

Stephan Nofield, GMP Team Captain, created the partnership of owners in Richmond who will make the Park, while he worked from the Park Service Denver office.

Brian O'Neill, Superintendent, Golden Gate National Park, San Francisco, and Howard Levitt gave heroic service to the Rosie Park.

Finally, tremendous gratitude is owed to the fleet of additional volunteers and helpers who helped lift off of the Rosie the Riveter / World War II Home Front National Historical Park, and especially, to the Rosies and Wendies and all those whose devoted work on the home front helped win World War II. And changed our history for all Americans.

Judy Hart
August 2014