



Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES BRANCH



**Report of Interview**

<b>Investigation Subject: Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO)</b>	<b>Park Case Number: n/a</b>		
	<b>ISB Case Number: OI-HQ-10-0628-R</b>		
<b>Location: Northeast Iowa</b>	<b>Case Status</b>	<b>Report Date</b>	<b>Report Number</b>
	Open	06/22/2011	018
<b>Report Subject: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) – Regional Director – 2004-2011</b>			
Supplement: Investigative Report			

1 **SUMMARY: From 1999-2010 numerous maintenance and building projects were allegedly funded and**  
 2 **completed without proper compliance required by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).**  
 3

4 The following is an interview with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) who was the Midwest Regional Director for the National  
 5 Park Service from 2004 – 2011.  
 6

---

7 Case Name: Effigy Mounds National Monument (EFMO)  
 8 Person Interviewed: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
 9 Date/Time: 06/22/2011 0900-1145  
 10 Location: (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) residence – Plattsmouth NE  
 11 Present for Interview: SA Barland-Liles  
 12 Method of Documentation: Interview notes  
 13

14 **Narrative**

15  
 16 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6) first visited Effigy Mounds National Monument during the fall of 2004 when (b) (6) was conducting  
 17 an eighteen month orientation of all Midwest National Park units shortly after (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) arrival as Regional Director.  
 18

19 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) remembers meeting a highly spirited staff led by Superintendent (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
 20 provided a tour of the monument and discussed (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) vision of providing disability access to some of the cultural  
 21 resources. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) told (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) raised boardwalks would be the primary method to provide access. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)  
 22 stated providing disability access was “admirable” but recognized an inherent conflict the boardwalks would have  
 23 with the other responsibilities of the park including preserving cultural and natural resources and landscapes.  
 24 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) pointed out the park was simultaneously had a long term goal of obtaining Wild and Scenic River  
 25 recognition for the Yellow River section that bisects the park. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated any good park manager would  
 26 recognize and mitigate these conflicts.  
 27

28 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6) stressed to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) the need to develop a long-term plan that would ensure public review and  
 29 input and to complete all required compliance processes. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6) knew the park was in the process of

<b>Reporting Official/Title</b> David Barland-Liles / Special Agent	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b> 02/22/2011
<b>Approving Official/Title</b> Les Seago / ASAC	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>

Distribution: Original – Case File      Other:      Other:

*This report is the property of the National Park Service and is loaned to your agency. It and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission.*  
 This report is **FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**. Public availability is to be determined under Title 5, USC section 552.

1 completing a new General Management Plan (GMP) which was one tool to obtain success with these matters.  
2 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stressed to (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) the importance of allowing the GMP process, the expertise of required Regional  
3 reviews, and the compliance process to dictate the scale of the projects. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated any good park manager  
4 would ensure the requirements of public input and compliance would be achieved prior to project funding.  
5

6 In 2009, (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was approached by (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Regional Chief of Interpretation, Tom Ritter. Ritter stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) recently  
7 saw projects that were completed at EFMO without proper compliance. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) mobilized an auditing team to  
8 conduct an "Operations Evaluation" of EFMO. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) assigned (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) Associate Regional Director, Jim Loach to  
9 lead the team.  
10

11 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated the evaluation uncovered EFMO completed projects with a disregard for the compliance process.  
12 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) learned (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) management team collapsed under (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) leadership and was not utilized to provide unified,  
13 proper advice. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated any good manager should have recognized the seriousness of this collapse and  
14 made adjustments to pull the team back together. This breakdown in the management team led to a lack of project  
15 compliance oversight which enabled (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) to complete projects without compliance support.  
16

17 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) knows the GMP process is "agonizingly slow" and often takes 5-8 years. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stressed  
18 there are no shortcuts and if the process is not completed properly "All good intentions are lost." (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated  
19 moving cautiously is the only way for a park manager to assure success. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) allowed the  
20 availability of funding and project goals to drive (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) management of the park rather than the planning and  
21 compliance process.  
22

23 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated the Operations Evaluation and subsequent reviews also uncovered additional planned projects  
24 within the proposed GMP that would have continued to detrimentally affect the park. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) immediately  
25 suspended the GMP.  
26

27 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) waited approximately one year after the Operations Evaluation to make a decision related to  
28 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) future with the National Park Service. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) wanted to give (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) the opportunity to help EFMO recover and  
29 prove (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) as a park manager. During that year (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) continued to lose confidence in (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) and was unsatisfied  
30 with (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) abilities as a park manager. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) decided to intervene and remove (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) offered (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) the  
31 opportunity to resign or be reassigned to a non-leadership position at the Regional Office. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was  
32 surprised (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) accepted a reassignment instead of resigning. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) repeatedly stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) was  
33 accountable and responsible for what occurred at EFMO but remains unconvinced (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) believes (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did anything  
34 wrong.  
35

36 (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) did not consider firing (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) because (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) had "No devious design to do something wrong."  
37

38 After the Operations Evaluation (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) focused on providing full disclosure of the violations and dealing with  
39 the consequences. (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) stated it was the most difficult part of (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) career because "We did not live up to the  
40 trust expected of us." (b) (6), (b) (7)(C) retired in January of 2011.  
41  
42

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY