

Oral History Number: 408-012

Interviewee: Hank Goetz

Interviewer: David Brooks

Date of Interview: June 2, 2006

Project: University of Montana Oral History Project

David Brooks: So it's June 2, 2006, and I'm David Brooks, the interviewer for the University of Montana's Oral History Project and this morning I'm talking with Hank Goetz, who has been a longtime director of the field stations at the College of Forestry and Conservation out at the Lubrecht Experimental Forest. And I guess what I'd like you to start by talking about is just a little of your personal and educational background, and what brought you to the area and to the college in the first place.

Hank Goetz: Ok, you bet. I'd be glad to. Well, I grew up in Wisconsin, central Wisconsin, and when I was 8 or 10 years old my folks brought us out, my brother and my real little sister, at that time, and I out on camping trips. And when I saw these mountains, I said, Oooh, man, these things are ok. I'd sure like to do these. And then as I got out of high school and my interests focused more in forestry—my granddad was a farmer, I guess, and my dad's a preacher, a Lutheran minister—and my interests I guess ran more to the outdoors and more to the farming and the growing of things than it did the ministry.

Wisconsin didn't have a forestry school; they had graduate work at the University of Wisconsin and they had a little podunk two-year conservation officer thing. So I said, well, I want to work out West anyway, so I came out to Montana and took a year or two years in Wisconsin doing preliminary stuff so I didn't have to pay the out-of-state tuition. And then came out here in 1960. Spent three years here and in '63 graduated.

Those years, the draft was still in effect and Wisconsin was really good about letting you go to school. But boy, the minute you got out of school you went right up to the top of the list, so when I got out in the spring of '63 I thought, boy, I know where I was gonna go, so I started looking at options a little bit. I went over and talked to the recruiter and he said, well, have you ever considered officer's candidate school? I said, I don't really know what you're talking about but tell me, and he told me. And he said, why don't you just go on over to Butte and take the test, you know, and no obligations or whatever, and then you'll have that behind you so if you get your draft notice you may have an option. So I went over and did it, and this was for infantry and of course that was fine with me, because the forestry was kind of a good background, you know as much as you could. I was interested in the Army because I figured I could walk a lot further than I could swim in the Navy or fly in the Air Force, right, so I said, ok, I can hack that ground-pounding thing.

I was working for the Forest Service at that time, up in the Blackfoot Valley, and we were on 10-days-in, four-days-off because we were back eight or nine miles off the end of the road. So a pack string would take us in and we worked 10 days and come out. And, I came out in

September, I think one time, and there was the greetings notice, the infamous greeting notice, from the draft board. So I took it down to the recruiter here, and he said you sign here if you want to do the OCS thing, and I'll go ahead and take care of whatever. So I don't know what he did with the draft board. You know, predated my enlistment or something.

So anyway, then I went in the Army and did all that kind of stuff, was an infantry officer. I hated the garrison duty so I'd volunteer for whatever came up, just couldn't stand the garrison duty. So I was up in Alaska, was down in the Dominican Republic—Johnson sent some folks down there for a little bit—and then I was over in Vietnam for a year from '65 to '66. When I got back, my obligation was two years upon completion of OCS, or washout, whichever [came first]. So I came back and I was one month shy of my commitment, and they said, well we'll just discharge you.

So I went back to Wisconsin to help my folks move, and then wanted to get back out to this country, so I came back out, went out to see. I'd had my fill of the government for a while after Vietnam. [laughs] I didn't particularly want to work for those guys again for a while. So the Northern Pacific Railway Company up there, who was the predecessor of Plum Creek Timber, had an opening for a forester at Seeley Lake, so I started to work for them in fall of '66 and spent through '69 [there]. Got married, my wife was there in Seeley, and we got married in '68.

The company wanted to promote me to a position in Seattle, which was kind of a stepping stone position. I said, sure I'll go out there, but I'd sure like a little bit of assurance or say, well you know if it works out there I'd like to come back to either Montana or northern Idaho, where they had land also. I said I had really no desire to work out on the West Coast. And they said, well, you know, no, if we feel the company needs you out there then that's where we feel we'd have to send you. And I made up my mind then I wasn't gonna sell my soul to that outfit. I turned down the job. They had the reputation, and maybe still do for that matter, you could turn down a job—they wouldn't fire you or anything—but you'd stay where you were the rest of your natural life. As luck would have it, in spring of '69, Arnie Bolle, who was the dean of the School of Forestry at the time, came up to Seeley Lake and Bob Wombach, who I think was associate dean, and Gary Knudsen, who was working for both of them on special projects over at the School of Forestry at that time, and they said, we're thinking of putting a full-time resident manager at the Lubrecht Experimental Forest, would you be interested?

They said we'll furnish you a house, and went over and looked at the house and my wife was not real happy with the house. It was one of these, the old married student housing buildings that they have, that used to be over where the Forestry Sciences Complex is. It was built up at the Hungry Horse Reservoir after World War II, I think is when those things were built. And then when that project was done they kind of got scattered around, the University had a bunch of them here. You'd see them, you could recognize them, they were little. They were the original pre-fab. They were put up in four by eight panels, 700-and-some square foot house. It was perched up there. The person who was running Lubrecht at that time was doing some graduate work down here and that was kind of an additional duty and back and forth. The foreign

students at the University would work at Lubrecht because they could do that without getting into work visa problems or whatever else, right. So they got some really cheap paint and painted the place and it was just atrocious. It was ugly. [laughs]

But despite my wife's misgivings, it really sounded like a good opportunity for me, because we both liked western Montana anyway and I always had admired Arnie. He said too, well then if you want to you can kind of peck away on a master's degree when you're here, with everything else. So I took that job in '69. I was there then through this last June. I guess I always looked at, if you got a job you like there's no sense going looking for trouble. So, I was far enough from the flagpole up there, I guess, being 30 miles out, 35 miles out. And given the nature of the deans over the years, and I don't know—I've worked for, well I've never sat down and counted but it's gotta be seven, eight, nine you know, counting interim deans and everything else. They pretty much let me run the program and grow the program and do things as I saw fit. So it was a real satisfying job from that standpoint. I always figured that most jobs, there's three things about it: one, you like the job, two, you like the area that the job's in, and then if you're lucky it's enough to put some beans on the table, you know.

There may have been times when sometimes the beans got a little scarce in those early years. When I was moving out of Lubrecht I came across a copy of my first contract with the University. And I don't know, it was for \$6,000 a year or something like that. I got to thinking about it, you know, compared to what I was making at the end. I always used Levis shrink-to-fits as kind of my inflation index. Those things were two or three bucks back then, I think maybe \$4.50 was the most I ever paid then, and now you can't buy a set of Levis for 30-something, right?

DB: Right.

HG: So I figured, well, hell I don't know if I'm making seven times—you know, maybe I'm making, when I finally quit I was making about seven times what I made when I started. So when it was all said and done, I don't know if I gained anything.

DB: You're keeping up with the Levis. [laughs]

HG: I kept up with the Levi inflation rate. [laughs] But it was a great place to work, and having the independence, I guess, and the ability to—Arnie was really, really great about wanting the forest to become part of the community up there. The forest was given to the School of Forestry in 1937 by the Anaconda Copper Mining Company. And Lubrecht happened to be the logging manager of Anaconda at the time and that's where the name came from. Charles Lubrecht, who's associated with Kate Webb, you know, I think is the grandson of Lou Lubrecht, William C. "Lou" Lubrecht. It was really interesting, the story goes that it took 10 years and 10 cases of scotch with dean—gosh what was his name? Thomas Spaulding was the dean—that he negotiated for 10 years with 10 cases of scotch to get Lubrecht. And I always thought, knowing

the way the Anaconda foresters liked their liquor, well you got a heck of a deal. If it only cost you 10 cases of scotch!

But it was all cutover timber land, at that time. The Blackfoot itself had been logged in three eras. The first one was the 1885-1900 and there were oxen left over from building the transcontinental railroad. I've always said, I guess the oxen were too tough to eat so they put them to work. Some of the city fathers that were here in Missoula, [they've got] their names in the concrete downtown, had formed this Big Blackfoot Milling Company and they needed logs. It was prior to the Forest Service or anything like that. The government was just saying, yeah, we'll give you permits for a dollar a section or a dollar an acre. You know, you just go cut. The story goes—again I've never tried to dig into it historically to see if it's actually true or not, but apocryphal, it makes a good story—that they had permits for 15 sections of land, 640 acres each, up the Blackfoot. And by the time the land office agent caught up with them, they were up at 90 sections, 15 years later! Hell, they were all the way up in Seeley Lake or up the Clearwater. But then they cut the logs in the winter, skid 'em down to the river with the oxen and stack 'em up on the ice, then come spring breakup the whole kit and caboodle would come down the river. They had a little sawmill that was down, right kind of under the overpass now, down there were the Town Pump area is, right at the confluence of the Blackfoot and Clearwater. They had a log pond there and they'd fish the logs out.

DB: And that was the old Simpson Dam [that] was there?

HG: [pauses]...the Simpson Dam, that came in later. Yeah, that was later. And the mill wasn't there. That mill came a little later too. This was a smaller sawmill down, actually at the confluence. Then the Anaconda Company then, I don't know when it was, in the teens or '20s, bought that mill, moved it up to the present site. They built that dam so they could form a log pond. They did the same thing then in the teens, in the Potomac Valley. They took one of the old narrow-gauge railroad engines and cars, tore it apart, and brought it up over the top of the Garnet Mountains from Drummond country, Clinton country, put it together in the Blackfoot and had a little short-line railroad that ran from what was called McNamara's Landing—and coming down today I noticed that place now that's got the cabins and shuttle service and such, there at what is more familiarly known as Johnsrud Park. They've adopted the name McNamara Landing for their business there. It was called McNamara Landing and they did the same thing then. Only then they skidded the—by that time the oxen had died or been eaten or whatever [chuckles], they were using horses. And they skidded the logs into the railroad, and the railroad then hauled them down there, unloaded them, and it was the same kind of deal.

The third period of logging was in the '20s and '30s. By that time the railroad had moved up and went through the years and the horses gradually faded away and they got into the crawler tractors. The rest of Lubrecht then was basically logged during the '20s and '30s. So what we inherited, or what we had there then—it was the Depression and land prices were—I had a neighbor there, Bill Potter, whose family was instrumental in starting the E Bar L Guest Ranch there, which is maybe the oldest family-owned guest ranch in Montana. It dates back to the

early '20s. He said, hell, my dad could have bought that whole mountain for a dollar an acre. He said there were two things his dad said: they'll never log that thing, it's too steep, you know, plus nobody had a dollar. You know, a dollar an acre, you couldn't afford an acre.

So that was kind of the climate I guess that the dean was negotiating in with Anaconda. He felt that we needed a school forest. I went back and looked at the *Missoulian* and *Sentinel* newspaper articles of that day and Irene Evers, who was the forestry librarian, helped me with that. Irene just died not too many years ago, and gosh, she was in her 80s and she was still working here at the library. The school used to have its own library, the School of Forestry had its own library down in the forestry school. I always thought Irene was responsible—more people graduated from that School of Forestry because of Irene Evers than they ever did for any prof or anybody else. She knew where everything was. I mean she helped guys write papers and she was a fantastic woman. Anyway, I went back to these papers and they made a big deal that the donation from Anaconda to the School of Forestry was worth just over \$20,000 and they gave us 19,000 and some acres. So, even with my limited math, you know, a buck an acre is what they valued it at time.

DB: Right. Now at some point, didn't the Northern Pacific donate land as well?

HG: The Northern Pacific in 1939 donated two sections, roughly 640 [acres] each, that are kind of, weren't a body of Lubrecht. They're right adjacent to the forest but they're a little removed. They did in 1939. So we've always referred to Lubrecht as having about 21,000 acres of deeded land. The boundary around Lubrecht itself, when you look at a map, encompasses about 28,000 acres or so, but there are parts of seven sections of Department of Natural Resources and Conservation land included within the boundary. The big difference in the management of the two is that any product that comes from those lands goes to support school sections or various school trusts.

It was really interesting, I think the way that [Lubrecht] came about. In March of 1937, the Legislature passed an act that created the Montana Forest and Conservation Experiment Station, which is kind of the research arm, if you will, of the School or the College of Forestry. You look at the enabling legislation for the Experimental Station. It goes through a whole bunch of things that they would do, you know, establish and maintain the library, at one time the School of Forestry had the State Nursery, and they were supposed to disseminate—you know, all of the—and then way down at the bottom, the last very thing was kind of a throw-away line, was to accept gifts of land for field stations. And then in October, magically, the Anaconda Company, gave that land to the School of Forestry.

DB: So somebody saw it coming.

HG: They cooked that baby up just bigger than life, and I'm really glad they did because it put the director of the Experimental Station was also then the dean of the School of Forestry. Set up very similarly to the College of Agriculture. It was exactly the same kind of thing only this

was in Forestry and that was in Ag. I guess, as I understand it, there are only three legislatively established experiment stations like that. The College of Mines has an equivalent kind of a thing, so those three.

The important thing about all that is that it gave the dean of the School of Forestry the direct role of management and deciding where the funds go. And the enabling deed from Anaconda in the legislation says that that will go in support of the forest and of the Experimental Station's activities. So I've always been thankful about that 'cause otherwise I figure, George Dennison or somebody would, you know, take some of that timber money and put a dome on the stadium down here or something like that. [laughs]. So it's kind of nice knowing that it would be very, very, very difficult, if not impossible, for a University-wide administrator to basically decide, well, we've got to cut a lot more trees on Lubrecht because I want to do this project, or I want to do that project, or I want to do something.

DB: Right.

HG: So I think that was really significant.

DB: Well, speaking of the role of deans, as well as cutting trees on Lubrecht—you know, when this land was originally donated, and it was donated by the Anaconda Company and Northern Pacific, both of whom were very interested in cutting trees. Anaconda Company used a massive amount of timber for mining shafts and whatnot.

HG: Mines, and right, right, exactly.

DB: Railroad obviously consumes a lot of timber. So these donors are clearly interested in the College of Forestry and the Experimental Station in terms of wood products. Now you mentioned coming in under Dean Bolle, who I know from the Bolle Commission, which fairly radically changed logging in this part of the country in that it finally faced up to the issue of clear-cutting. And you came in during that time of transition.

HG: I did, I did. Right. Just after the Bolle Report.

DB: So if you could talk a little bit about that and how the School, if this is a correct assessment, at some point, went from essentially training foresters to manage logging, or to be loggers, or to be in the woods for those purposes, to the more conservation-oriented side as we know it today.

HG: Ok. Yeah, that's a good question. When I was in school in the early '60s, it was a timber-oriented school. The School of Forestry, I think, has from square one always been a public land managing school, if you will. The School of Forestry, unlike many of the other colleges of forestry in the country, is at the liberal arts institution of the State, versus the Ag, Engineering, the old A&E, or Tech schools. If we would have followed in Montana the example that most

states have, the School of Forestry would be over in Bozeman, versus here at Missoula. The reason we got put here, was the State Forester's Office was in Missoula, and then the Region One of the Forest Service was here in Missoula. And that was established, the School of Forestry was established—I don't know if it was right concurrent, that's something that would be interesting to look up—either real close to the establishment of the Forest Service and the establishment of Region One...

DB: Right, which was 1907?

HG: 1905, 1907, in that country. Yeah right. 'Cause what, the Foresters' Ball's been in effect for, you know, just about day one with the School of Forestry, and they're coming up on their 80s.

DB: They're coming up on a hundred years probably, before too long.

HG: Pretty close, yeah. So anyway, the School of Forestry here, from everything I've ever been able to gather, was designed and built to provide foresters to primarily the Forest Service. And gosh, like in my graduating class, I would think it was safe to say that, particularly after World War II, as the demand for lumber really, really increased after the lull of the Depression in the world and all the vets came back, 95 percent of my cohorts, my fellow graduates went to work for the Forest Service. And it was tree harvesting-oriented. We also considered, because the Forest Service looked at water, recreation, range and wildlife and timber, you know it was a multiple-use, those five, but timber was clearly the driving factor and the others kind of came in behind it.

Of course, we inherited the whole forestry concept from Europe and from primarily Germany as where all our forestry ancestors came from. And it was very regulated, and that culture, you were a forester and a forest meister was a fairly prestigious position in the community because they had been growing forests for centuries and with their limited land base it was really, really critical that they treat trees as a growing crop. So we just assumed, you know, and foresters built that in to their culture, I guess, and psyche and everything else.

We assumed then, and we inherited this concept of even-aged management, if you will, that same way. You kind of treat trees like fields of corn on steroids. You grow 'em up and whack 'em down, send 'em out a little bit. And grow 'em and whack 'em and grow 'em and whack 'em. It was the old standard textbook methods: you clearcut it or you cut most of the trees and left some seed trees. That's the way we were taught. And the Forest Service, of course, was carrying on this cutting tradition, because we had lots of trees and we needed the wood in the country and the mills and the whole nine yards. So they were in the timber production business. There's no other way around it. Timber drove the Forest Service.

Quite frankly, the foresters, we were our own worst enemies from that standpoint. We kind of got into this whole tunnel vision that, well, if we picked up the old German culture of growing trees, that was altogether a different culture, altogether different set of circumstances. And

we'd try to transpose that then on primarily the Western landscape and the intermountain landscape versus the southeast or the west coast where they had the growing conditions and moisture and dah-da-da-dah: they could grow trees in a relatively rapid time.

Clearcutting, that whole controversy—clearcutting was a very, very legitimate tool, it still is, and historically wildfires were the initial clearcutters, if you will, in some forest types. You get it in the lodgepole, primarily, and western larch. In the higher elevations they'd get these stand-replacement fires every 100, 150, 200 years. Just wipe things out and they'd start out over again. Where we really made our big mistake, as far as foresters generically, is we took—ok, that works fine in Douglas fir or lodgepole or larch, on north-facing slopes at 6,000 feet. But then they imposed it down here on the Bitterroot, on south-facing slopes in a Ponderosa pine-type [forest] where Ponderosa pine historically was a fire-regime species. [Meaning] it grew in a multi- or uneven-aged stands with lots of frequent fires going through it, versus one great big one every couple hundred years. Put it [clear-cutting] out there on those dry hillsides and Christ, they planted trees 'til hell froze over and they couldn't get 'em to survive because it was hot, baking.

So then they got into the terracing, where they built little mini-roads across the contours to give 'em a flat spot and a little bit of relief from that sun. That's where people then looked up and said, you know, are we going to turn the national forests of western Montana into industrial tree farms? And I think that's where Arnie and Dick Shannon and Dick Behan and some of the others said, there are other ways. It wasn't—I don't think—they weren't against timber at all. It was just, we'd finally carried it, in their opinion, too far. And we couldn't justify the types of expense we were putting into the ground to try to grow trees. Arnie caught a lot of grief over that. An awful lot of grief. In fact there was a period of estrangement, I think, from the School of Forestry, with not only the Forest Service but then also the State Foresters Office and some of these others. Because they—the dean of the School of Forestry, you know, was a heretic in saying, my God, we shouldn't be doing clearcuts in the Bitterroot.

I don't know if I would say that that was a transformation point for the School of Forestry. I really don't think it was, in my opinion. I don't think schools—colleges and universities, I don't think by and large lead the charge when it comes to changing values or things in society. I say that after spending my whole life with the University, right? But what I've observed is society, outside of the University, and whether it be business or society in general, is changing and then the University gets a hold of it. I think the same thing happened in our School of Forestry. We made that change from basically being a saw-log-oriented school, you know, it was kind of a high class vo-tech school with a four-year degree, but we were trained to grow and cut trees. I guess I've never felt any need to apologize for that education, because we really got a good, strong, technical education.

We didn't get, in my opinion, enough of the social and the society and the people things that we should have. But when you look at the people that graduated in whatever—and I think it's still true today—people in the natural resource field have to have a really strong biological,

professional background and training, and then in addition to that, increasingly more and more, they need the people skills to go with it. But you have to have both of them. You cannot have just the technical skills, by and large, and you sure can't just have people skills and not know what the hell you're talking about when it comes to the biology and the science and that. Whether you're dealing with wildlife or trees or water or whatever else, you gotta have the combination. So I think then over the years, those people that inherently had the people skills, like dealing with people and these kinds of things, then moved on into more of the management positions and these kinds of things. The other folks that enjoyed, were comfortable doing the more technical things, you know, were more the woods-oriented kind of forester.

But what really changed—I don't think the School of Forestry changed the profession. The Forest Service changed, and society said to the Forest Service, hey, there's more value out there than just growing and cutting trees. Now it's gotten to the very, very extreme where a couple of these groups in town particularly, you know, that they don't want to see a tree cut on the National Forest. I mean that's Jake Kreilick and Matt what's-his-name [Koehler], that's their position in life. They are ignoring reality and they're ignoring biology and that trees grow and die and are going to be replaced. It's one thing when the white man, you know, was...pre-honky it didn't really make a hell of a lot of difference. I mean we could have the fires and the Indians and native people were—they were comfortable with—they would move when the fires came and you know, back and forth, they started them whenever. They weren't making any untold demands on those forests. So the natural rhythms and systems worked really well.

They don't now. Just, you know it's—they talk about forest health and human health. Well hell, human health's going to win out every time. We can't burn slash, you know without—if we get smoke in the valley, it's oh, my God. In '63 you could hardly see across the valley with all the teepee burners and everything else. But again, all that is changed and so the School has changed also. Not leading the charge, but recognizing—we're turning out a lot of 'ologists now, of all different kinds, because that's what the Forest Service is hiring. They're not hiring engineers, they're not hiring foresters, 'cause hell we're not cutting any trees.

DB: So with those perspectives that a lot of modern forestry is not necessarily the way it's always been done, or natural, somebody might say, but that also there is the demand. You mentioned that in your time as director at Lubrecht, you had the leeway, under numerous deans, to change and grow the program as you saw fit. What sort of trends in forestry were you following? What directions did you move in? [Do you have] some specific examples of things that go on out at the Experimental Forest that maybe have changed?

HG: Ok.

DB: I mean, if you go out there now, there are lots of varying-aged stands of trees and you mentioned that of course when you first got this land it was all cut over.

HG: Well, it was cut over but it was not cut over in the sense that it was a clearcut or anything like that. When you were given—they were dealing early on with horses, logging oxen, cross-cut saws and axes. They weren't logging on the slopes. They weren't taking trees that were real large that would have some defect in them, or have double-tops, this kind of stuff, because by the time they had to handsaw that sucker down and then cut out the rot or cut off the other [defects], they wouldn't fool with those kinds of things. They just took trees that were about 12 inches through diameter, about 4-and-a-half feet or so, because they wanted a top diameter of their logs that would be about 12 inches in diameter, for the technology of the saws that they had in those days. So any tree smaller than that they just left standing. And particularly in the young Ponderosa pine, bull pine it's called, it's a heavy—the wood is very heavy when it's young [because it's] full of a lot of water. Those suckers would sink in the ponds. They didn't want to cut those things and float them down the river, 'cause, hell, they'd sink.

So what we inherited at Lubrecht was a real hodge-podge. We had some areas, in fact both the railroad sections, had never been logged. They were too high and inaccessible in the '30s. They had never been logged. And other areas of the forest had been logged in varying degrees of intensity, I guess. So we had kind of a hodge-podge. We had trees that had not been cut, big old growth. We had trees that were too small to cut there. And we had other areas that, at the time they cut, had a lot of commercial trees, so those were pretty much wiped out and all we had was reproduction.

A lot of the cutting that we did on Lubrecht in the time I was there, was in a commercial thinning, clean-up, salvage kind of a mode. These last 10, 15 years in the Ponderosa pine, with the help of Carl Fiedler, who's a research silviculturist there at the School. Really, really, one of the top experts, I guess—I hate to use that word—when it comes to uneven-aged management. Where you have a range of tree sizes and ages on a given piece of ground. You don't go through the cut-regenerate-thin-cut-grow [cycle], you know, you always have trees of varying sizes. In the Ponderosa pine type it works beautifully, and the bulk of the forest is in that Ponderosa pine, Douglas fir type.

So that was the kind of stuff that we did there in Lubrecht. We did lots of thinning trials, at varying densities and spacings, and [with] different machinery and stuff that you can use to remove that material. We did an awful lot of biomass stuff in the mid-'80s. It's kind of interesting, they're kind of rediscovering that now. But we did an awful lot with small farm tractors and small equipment. Basically full tree skidding: bringing the whole tree, guts, feathers and everything, out to the landing, processing what we could get from the bowl for small saw logs or things like that, and then the rest of it chipped and used for hog fueling. Things were working really good then, until Montana Power said, whoa, you know. So they dropped their natural gas rate, [laughs] and that pretty well took care of using biomass in those days. Yeah, it was really interesting. They gave the pulp mill a little better interruptable rate of power, they called it, so it didn't make it economical. Now we're going around again.

I think in the management, our biggest responsibility, I look at more as stewardship. I am a firm believer in the term of being a land steward. Part of that stewardship is maintaining options. I think the best thing is, we're here for such a very short time, any land manager or land steward is here for such a very short time in the life of the forest and in the life of the landscape that our biggest responsibility is to pass that land along with the maximum amount of options for the next generation or the next manager or whatever. And in some of these harsher cutting systems, you've pretty well locked in, if you go out and you do in fact clearcut, you've pretty well locked yourself in to that system for at least 30 or 40 years, and 50 until the trees get up where you could maybe do something else.

Again, I think in the mix of management, and if we're going to try to duplicate in our modern management now, if you will, and not look at it just as tree farms but trying to mimic nature a little bit, duplicate nature, work with nature versus saying well, by god, we're going to force our system upon it. We have to look at systems that mimic. And clearcuts and some of these others do. Now you don't have to go out, like we tended to do, nice big square blocks on the side of the mountain, right? My god. And we made them too big in lots of instances where they wouldn't actually reseed and these—but you know, technically they can handle all that kind of stuff now.

So then we worked a lot with the landowners in the Blackfoot. We did a lot of cooperative programs in forestry. We did a lot in recreation. We had the Blackfoot River Quarter project up there in the early '70s and helped worked with the Nature Conservancy and others to get conservation easement legislation passed in the state. We're still working with the Nature Conservancy. In 1970 they had one man that was responsible for everything west of the Mississippi and he was located in San Francisco. And the Nature Conservancy today in Montana alone has a staff of 25 people. So things have really, really changed when it comes to the whole land-saving, land conservation, the change in the ownerships and the patterns and all these kinds of things.

When I started at Lubrecht, we did a little timber stuff, because we were always self-sufficient, by and large. Then over the years we expanded in our timber. In 1957, Dean Williams...I think was the dean at that time. He had called Fred Gerlack, a prof, into the office, and said, "Fred, we're gonna have a spring camp program. The people need to get out in the woods." He told Fred, you're gonna lead it up and we're gonna hold it this first year out at the Bear Creek logging camp—Anaconda's Bear Creek Logging Camp up the Blackfoot. In those days deans had a lot more authority. If they pulled something like that now the teacher's union would have a cat, right, and they'd be screaming, "nah he can't [do that]" probably. And Fred said, "Yes, sir."

Well, we were on the quarter system then. I think all the schools—maybe not Billings, but the two major universities anyway were on the quarter system. And so they said, ok, the sophomores in the School of Forestry will attend a sophomore spring camp, spend their 10 weeks in the woods. They did that in 1957, I think it was, and then in 1958, during that summer period they moved the old logging railroad boxcar from the camp to Lubrecht. Set 'em up there

at Lubrecht, and then they had one of the summer crews—we had a little sawmill there, and they went ahead and built some smaller cabins, built a little cook shack and a men's bathroom, because there weren't any women in forestry in those days. So they held the spring camp up there, where they spent the 10 weeks of the spring quarter doing, oh we had an ecology class, we had a surveying, we had forest measurements, we had some fire [classes]. It was 17 credits. It was a strong, tough curriculum.

And then I took it in '60, the first year I came. I did my tour up there. Then in addition to that, for a few years we had a senior camp, the same way, and that was up at Libby at the old J. Neils [Lumber Company] under Happy's Inn up on Highway 2. And I guess that may have been the high point of the real forestry, growing-and-cutting-of-trees emphasis in the School of Forestry. It started in '57, it was terminated in '69, and again that was a reflection, I think, of the changing values and everything that was going on. And then it started up again in '75, I think, '74, and it went on through, just on a voluntary basis, until—

It was '92 or '93 when the University, in all their wisdom—and I really think that decision really sucked, [laughs] in my opinion—the move from the quarter system to the semester system. I guess I say that from a—and I hope I'm not saying it just because that's how it was in the old days and that's the way it should've been. But it was touted as saving money and doing this. Billings, I think was on [it at] the time and I think the two University presidents were kind of in a spitting contest with the Board of Regents, and the Board of Regents said, well by god we'll show you who's boss. So they put everybody on the semester system.

It does have some advantages, I'm sure, in that the students can get into a subject a little longer. It has the real disadvantage of, you can't take as many different classes. You can't broaden yourself any because you're locked in for the whole semester. Whereas with the quarter, you could. What we did in the School [of Forestry], and I'm sure other departments did, in some of the subject areas, they'd be just a continuation of next quarter. They'd be 201 and 202 or something. One in the fall quarter and one in the winter or whatever. And it really lent itself well to the field-oriented classes because then the kids would come out in April, 1st of April or March, there's still maybe snow on the ground but you it was eventually going away. So you could spend April and May out there.

I was involved in the last, oh, 15 years we had that I taught the Forest Measurements class out at Lubrecht. So I really got to know a lot of the students over the years that way. In all those years of the students coming and going, I never heard—everybody has come back, literally everyone, and said that was the best quarter that they spent, or that was the best time they spent in school. They worked harder out at camp than they ever did anywhere else, but they tended to work in crews. Nowadays they grow a lot of trees virtually on the computer, right? But getting out there and learning to work with people and learning what the real trees look like, well, there's quite a little of that, I think, missing.

DB: So you mentioned getting people out to the woods, and that was a push, and primarily you've talked about getting students out. But I know from my own experience, I've been out to Lubrecht to hunt, skied the trails out there, even when they used to have chili feeds and stuff at the end of a ski—

HG: Oh yeah, they still do.

DB: I've been out there and stayed in those cabins with the University's cross-country team for camps. And so clearly at some point it started being available to the public in more ways and having, not necessarily what you'd consider forestry and conservation activities going on out there. One thing that I've heard a lot talked about is the Round River Program that went on out there which wasn't necessarily forestry.

HG: No, it was 180 degrees from forestry really! [laughs]

DB: Yeah. So share some of those sort of activities that have gone on—

HG: Well, do you remember when the Round River was for example? I don't—it was in the '70s sometime. My memory for dates is terrible.

DB: You know, I've heard it mentioned a lot and I don't know much about it.

HG: Well, Tom Power was involved. And Dunsmore—

DB: And Tom Power, is of course is an economy professor here.

HG: And Roger Dunsmore, who I think just retired not too many years ago, in the philosophy department. It was a real green—it was the mother of all environmental programs. It was, well, I think those were the days when, you know Tom and these other guys had the Bass Creek Commune. You know they were living down in the Bitterroot, and they brought that concept to Lubrecht. They had sweat lodges and the whole nine yards. Made some of the locals a little nervous about, you know, [wondering] what in the hell are all those hippies doing up at Lubrecht. [laughs] It was great. I thought it was good. But that was maybe the most radical change that the use of Lubrecht, you know in the old traditional pretty straight-laced, old-time forester, wood-oriented way, and here come all these tree huggers with this and that and whatever going on. But again it was a reflection of the times.

I made a point, I guess—we had the camp facilities there and it was really only used by the School in the spring. And it was kind of word of mouth saying, well, you know Lubrecht is up there in the summer, can we do—you know like the cross-country team's [camp], other universities—Iowa State University's got a Forestry School. Again, in Ames, Iowa. Christ it's 500 miles from a tree in Ames, Iowa. And the same thing with Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Oklahoma. I mean there were some trees over on the Arkansas border but you

know, it's not in the heart of [a forest]. So they had traveling camps, and they said, oh, we can go to Lubrecht. So we started, they would come around every three or four years. You always knew when the pros were fly-fishermen because they'd come out to Montana. If they were Muskee fishermen they'd go to Minnesota to work in the forest. [chuckles]

So we started using it there and again it was part of Arnie's [plan]...and I really worked with Arnie to try and make Lubrecht not some pointy-headed research station of the University just stuck out here in the valley, that we were in fact a part of the valley. So we used it for valley-wide activities. We had the first cross-country ski trails in, I think, the whole Missoula area. It was in the, again maybe the mid-'70s. One of the recreational classes wanted to establish a cross-country [trail]. We inherited the old road systems there and we had lots of loop things and they put out the first map and stuff in the mid-'70s, and the thing's still going strong. There have been others around.

DB: When there's snow anyway.

HG: When there's snow, yeah. This last year was a good one. We've always—we went up and down first allowing dogs, then not dogs and back and forth. And we got into some trouble with some of the more purist types. But we always said okay and then—we've kept it as kind of a family, you know, if you want to come out with your dog great. If you don't like dogs on the trail then, you know, you can go to Lolo Pass or you can go to someplace that charges you a little bit and they keep the dogs off. That's really worked out well. The forest's always been open for all kinds of recreation activities. We joined in the walk-in hunting areas, in fact helped start those in the mid-'70s. Same thing then with that recreation program along the river. We took 30 miles of the Blackfoot from Johnsrud Park up to the Missoula County line which is now Russ Gate's [Memorial] Park and 85 percent of that 33 miles was in private ownership and we established day-access use on private land and some overnight camping. This is well before the stream access law came in.

Looked at cooperative programs—how can we throw what resources we have together on the table and develop these kinds of things? That evolved then into get the Trout Unlimited Chapter in the Blackfoot that has dealt with mine issues and now the Blackfoot Challenge that has been going for 13 years with a watershed, ridge-top to ridge-top kind of approach. So we've been working together up there for lots of years. And then the use at Lubrecht just kind of naturally developed. We had a hell of a lot going on and we always had a real small staff. It was myself, and then in the '80s I finally got a forester Frank Moss, who was a forester there. Then Dean Stout, Ben Stout, was able to get through the Murdoch Foundation, we got the Forestry Center built in '82. Then we were really able to serve not only the community but the University as kind of a continuing education facility and held professional short courses. But then, oh, German immersion workshops and all those other folks used to come on up, and we welcomed that because we looked at it as a resource, not just for the School of Forestry, but for the University and the larger community. Again, because we were largely self-sufficient, it made

sense for us to rent things out and you know, at least meet some expenses and do some things that way.

In '95, the Lodge was built, over my pretty strong objections, I got overruled on that one. I knew we couldn't pay for it and I disagreed very strongly with the president, not directly to the president but through my dean—

DB: Who was pushing for the building of that?

HG: Well, it was part of President Dennison's [plan]. When he—well, they built the new dorm but then they did the Continuing Education Center down here, the Print Shop, they re-did the University Theater, you know, and in all those instances the people that were managing said there's no way in hell we're gonna [be able to] pay for these things. And it's proved out we couldn't. You know the problems with the University, with the fieldhouse and dah-da-da-dah. We've been paying for that. It used to be there used to be money available, I thought, here at the University, for extra things. The emphasis wasn't always on, you've gotta make money for this, you gotta do this, this and this. Part of the changing culture, I guess, not only at this University but nationally is that we've got to make money. Some of that, I felt, was to pay for some of those kinds of things.

So what we're doing up there is we're subsidizing the Lodge facility through the sale of timber. And we've gotten into them over the years, these last 10 years or so since we've had the Lodge, we've been—gosh we've got weddings, and all this kind of stuff which really is not our mission in life. We're doing it because we're trying to make a bond payment that there's no way we can make the bond payment. It's been a distraction, I really feel, in the last 10 years. Before we had the facility available and people used it. They knew it was rustic, you know, a euphemism for early American junk, right? But they expected that and we charged them accordingly and everybody was happy. Now the Lodge is kind of a bastardization, a little bit, of a Motel 6 and a dormitory. It's kind of the same way with the Sponge Island. You know the Center at Salmon Lake. Again, is that a legitimate—you know.

DB: You gotta keep pace with the Paws Up next door.

HG: Wel, I yeah. Yeah, that's an altogether different story. Yeah. [laughs]

DB: Well, I sort of want to end by making something that struck me as an analogy for you personally, that you started out with, that leads me to a question, which is: you started talking about your growing up in Wisconsin and you had a Lutheran minister as a father, you became attracted to the West and the mountains, and you know that—I feel like I've heard that story before. I'm thinking of John Muir and Aldo Leopold and they both spent their young life on farms in Wisconsin, had ministers as fathers, fell in love with the West and forestry and the national forest—

HG: Arnie Bolle the same way.

DB: Arnie Bolle, and so there's this tradition that you fall right in with, personally as well as your interest in what your career has been. And so my question is—also the University's forestry program has since its inception been one of the top [schools] in the country, if not one of the only ones. And I think when this school opened, you know there was one, Yale maybe—

HG: Yeah.

DB: —and those two have clearly been the standouts.

HG: Coincidentally, up until the School of Forestry changed their name to the College of Forestry and Conservation, there were only two schools of forestry in the United States. Here at Montana and at Yale.

DB: And at Yale.

HG: And I always said Yale was in pretty good company. [laughs]

DB: Right. And so on that note, being that Yale is in the company of the University of Montana, and that you're in the company of people like John Muir and Aldo Leopold and Bolle, what's your, if you can make it singular, what's your legacy from the, I guess 30, 35 years you've been there?

HG: Thirty-seven or whatever.

DB: You clearly aren't claiming the Lodge as your legacy. What have you left there that will be memorable, will be historic?

HG: What I would hope to leave there would be the spirit of working together to solve stuff in the valley. I guess I look at my time at Lubrecht not as looking back and saying, well I built the camp from here to here, we built the staff, or we did all that kind of—I would look at more where Lubrecht fits in the context of the valley. And how the Blackfoot Valley has been a real leader, and continues to be a real leader nationally, when it comes to solving resource-oriented problems, by sitting down at the table and saying, ok, we'll park our ego at the door, we'll park our company-culture at the door, we don't really care who gets credit for it, but let's try to solve this problem.

Again, on the options standpoint, pass on what we've tried to take care of whether it's five years or 35 years, and pass that [the land] on to the next set of people in a better condition than we found it. To me that's the most important thing you can do, and that's been the most satisfying. [I've had] just beautiful people to work with: Land Lindbergh, my neighbor and friend for all these years; Bill Potter, the same way. I've been very, very fortunate in having a string of

deans that have let me over the years go ahead and move Lubrecht in that [direction], and make it an open place where we don't care what kind of activity or what kind of research activity. I mean we've had some really crazy things go on up there. But that's what we're there for. We're there to serve, I guess, and maybe that's part of the Lutheran ministry background, is the idea of service. You know, that's what we're there for and I—

That's a thing that has bothered me about the University. If I had to say there was a negative change that I've seen, and I haven't really thought about this all that much, but it strikes me now and then, is that when I first became associated with the University—I've always been on the staff level, never a professor, I've been a visiting fireman professor but never anything official—was it used to be it was research, teaching, and public service. Those were the three main goals and missions of the University. I can remember that: bang bang bang. And it seems to me like the public service mission has gradually faded from the University's goals and objectives.

I may be harsh and I may be looking at it from a position of being more at Lubrecht than an everyday member of the University community, but it really seems to me that way. Looking at recognition and compensation in the teaching and in the professional, in the professors, they used to recognize—I mean they didn't try and take everybody and fit 'em into that round hole of teaching and/or the square hole of research. If they contributed in the larger community sense, that counted. That was *pax vobiscum*, something Latin, my son, go forward. But now, you wonder about that. Generating funds has maybe replaced public service, I don't know.

DB: So I said that was going to be my last question but you mentioned that crazy things have gone on out there. Give me one of them, the craziest memory.

HG: We had a student just four or five years ago, a pathology student, that wanted to study the decomposition rates of flesh. And he had a pig, and the University was a little narrow-minded about him putting this dead pig in a cage in the middle of the Oval, right, and letting the thing decompose. [chuckles] So he came out to Lubrecht, and said, I need a place for this to go on. We said, that's fine. Just make sure it's down-wind of camp. [laughs] And he did. That one has always kind of struck me as being fun.

Then we also had for, oh gosh, since Ben Stout's era, that would've been what, 15 years or more, we've had the wood-fired pottery kiln up at Lubrecht, too. I can never pronounce that—an Anagama [kiln], something—and one year when their gas kilns here didn't work they did all their stuff up there. Dave Smith, the guy that started this was a grad student, great guy, now is some pretty big muckety-muck professor at the University of Wisconsin. He'd come back in the summers. They've rebuilt it once. I've always said, you know you talk about true multiple-use and whatever, well we [have it]. It's located out there in the woods and so all those philistine foresters have a pottery kiln right in the middle. So that's pretty great.

DB: Great. Well it's a fascinating place and I appreciate you sharing your time and memories about it with me.

HG: I just, I can go on forever when it comes to that. You know, I guess it's lot of downloading to do after all those years.

DB: All right, well thank you Mr. Goetz.

HG: You bet.

[End of Interview]