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MS: Um, just uh–do a sound check—s uh, maybe just tell me your name?

Pete: You say say “hello” or don’t say “hello”? Um, I’m Pete Ross.

MS: That’s perfect. That’s all I needed thank you so much! I’m…give me one sec. Okay, I’m rolling so whenever you’re ready say your name and introduce yourself.

Pete: I’m Pete Ross. I started at, working for Bethlehem Steel at the Sparrows Point on June the first, 1969, when it was approximately 31,000 employees. My last day of work at the plant, well I started as a laborer by the way, my last day of work at the plant was July the 20th, 2012, and I ended my career there as the director of the employee assistance program.

MS: How did you come to start working at Sparrows point?

Pete: Well I initially, right out of high school, came to Sparrows Point as a summer employee, and my intention was to work just for the summer and a go to college but as I just said I ended up staying there for 43 years because the money was good and the opportunities to learn things were there so I stayed. As I said I started out as a laborer and because the opportunity was there to transfer, and I seemed to have the ability to learn from books, I transitioned over the next 43 years to many production jobs and also many maintenance jobs, to being electricians, to mechanics, to crane operators, so in the course of my 43 years I worked throughout the whole plant which came to benefit me at the end when I switched to the employee assistance program because I knew all the employees throughout the whole plant and so that made me more effective at dealing with employees when they came to the employee assistance program for problems.

The first part of my career, the first 15 years, I was probably in the street more than—meaning laid off, more than I worked. But the last 25 years straight there was never a layoff that affected me in any way up until, as I said earlier, July the 20th when the plant went down for good.

Um, how I got involved with the employee assistance program, cause at the time I was working as an electrician in the hot mill, what they call a control tech, I developed over the years a part of myself with chemicals, drugs and alcohol, and so I started reading a lot of things, how to deal with the chemical dependency problem as, I guess, a band aid approach to dealing with my own personal issues. Now I’ve always been in the people helping business through my neighborhoods and my community and all that, but at work I was focusing on fixing things, equipment, that’s the jobs I did with the majority of my employment here at the plant. So when I decided to finally help myself and go through the program, the employee assistance program was in existence at the time which started in the 80s as a drug and alcohol program. I went through it myself March 1st 1986, I just celebrated 27 years of recovery myself, but anyway after coming out of treatment, a 28 day treatment, I got involved with the program down here at the plant, I was also involved with one up in the city. The two people that were working at the employee assistance program at the time, they were both recovering alcoholics and they had no drug experience so that was one of the components I bought to the process and I eventually took over the program as the 3rd director of the program in…I would say 1985. I’m sorry! 1995. And that’s what I did for the rest of the career I had down at the plant. And that really was, I found out, my true calling down at the plant, not that I couldn’t fix equipment, but being involved with the people and, once again, having the benefit of working throughout the whole plant the previous years, I pretty much knew everybody in the whole plant so that gave them a certain comfort level to come to me for assistance. Well one part of the problem as a EAP was I would say only probably 10 to 20 percent of people came there voluntarily, meaning most of the people who came to the Employee Assistance Program—they had already lost their job when they got there…so that made it doubly hard to help people initially, but I had developed a philosophy to people first, meaning try to help the person, then try to save their job, then trying to save their family. So throughout the next 24 years that I worked as an EAP I constantly evolved the program and extended it out to helping the families also, and took a holistic approach to treatment, meaning not just deal with the drugs and alcohol but help people with financial issues, relationship problems, so it became a full compulsive program and became very effective. And during the course of time I developed a relationship with management throughout the whole plant and with the union that they felt that I was effective in helping people. Now I was part of what was called the medical department, we had the implant medical department at the time, so I was supposed to be in a component of the medical department which wound up being a very valuable asset to them, because a lot of people saw the medical department as being an arm of the company, and that they were really an agent of the company and was really working against them so when they got their most severe problems they normally brought me in. So I ended up being the trouble shooter for the company and the union and the medical department, meaning dealing with people’s issues, meaning their personal issues, their job issues. I got involved with workplace violence, domestic violence, all the way across the board. And so it became a very healing process for me also because not only was I helping other people, but it helped me in the same process.

I think that, if anything, that would probably be my most, or the legacy that I feel that I supplied to the company. You know I was definitely a better counselor than I was an electrician or production worker. I mean I would say I was barely capable—I was capable but I really shined as a counselor down there. And it was very much a needed thing. I was the 3rd director of the EAP and they was a lot of problems they came in with at the end but it still became and effective process, meaning the program—because as we evolved into the 2000s you had to start dealing with insurance companies. And also the attitude at the plant changed, mainly from management. They became less supportive of the program, meaning that they felt that chemical dependency was, and I dealt with mental health issues also so I became very knowledgeable dealing with the community as far as other agencies and other providers as far as dealing with mental health and chemical dependency, but the company started taking a more, I’d say, less supportive approach to the process because they felt that it was a self-induced problem, meaning people created the problem themselves. And so they really started minimizing the financial support and the opportunity for people to get treatment. We found a way to get it done, and I guess if I have any regrets about the thing was not being able to save everybody, but that’s an unrealistic approach, understand that you can’t save everybody because people have to develop the desire to save themselves, for one thing, and they have to actually do the work. I mean, I found out that I just can’t fix everybody but the employees of the assistance program became a very vital part of the plant because it gave people—it gave employees or the employer back a whole employee, those who were successful at the process. And most important to me and I believe to the other people, that it put some families back together. I kept in mind that I’m not just dealing with an individual, I’m dealing with the whole family attached to it, and as I have to say if I have any regrets about the program it’s those who weren’t successful, who lost their jobs. We had some that not only lost their jobs but went back out using, that lost their lives, you know, died in the process and all that. But in the end the program was more effective than it, you know as far as for the employees and therefore for the company itself. That was very traumatic, the last 12 years for a lot of people, mentally, because the company went through a lot of transitions. And I’ve been hearing, and a lot of other people, for the last 20 years that the plant was going down and getting to the state that it was, uh…kept kind of sort of rising like the phoenix, and since 2002 it kept switching owners, they would have 5 owners in the last 12 years but the family finally got to the point where it shut down for good and that was very traumatic to a lot of people. With that said, the AP work continues, I mean I’m doing the same thing that I was doing except I’m just not getting compensated from the company and that’s good because, I mean, people still need help. The union’s still helping people, certain union members and so am I, and just going back to what I was doing before I became an EAP. The whole key is trying to help people transition to life without sparrows point because that was a very vital piece of the community. I men myself I had several relatives that worked down there, a couple children to have worked there also, many many relatives and neighbors and most people feel that it was a very vital point to it, it had a very vital impact on them being able to support their families, I know it did mine. It also put people through school, at homes, just build a life. It’s kind of like a culture shock for most people. Now I started down there at 18, month after I turned 18 and I’ll be 62 this year, so I was getting to that point of transitioning out anyway, but I probably would have worked longer if the plant would have still been there, I probably would have worked to 65. I felt like it was a job that I could do that much longer and I still had an impact, I was still helping people and that was the whole key when I started thinking about “well you’re 6o now, is it time to transition out?” but I’d say “well as long as still feel affective and still can help people there’s still a reason to be here.” It’s not just for a paycheck that I would stay, but then life sometimes has its own process and it may have saved me from myself I don’t know. But, I’m comfortable with the transition. I feel a little bad for the younger people who are at the point where they have to get out and retrain themselves, because down at sparrow’s point we used to call it “fantasy island”. It was kind of unrealistic when you got overcompensated to a degree and it was a dangerous place to work. The environment wasn’t that good but it compensated you pretty good compared to other jobs, meaning the pay, and it was a place where you didn’t have to—we got health benefits for your entire family and we didn’t have to pay for them. I enjoyed it being a union environment, I had been working all my life since I was 12 years old but I’d never worked in a union environment before but the process that was in place and the union negotiated benefits gave me the idea that I would never want to work in a way that was non-union based on—I saw the values and looked at the history of the union and it’s very beneficial for most people. So my experience has been great down there and…I’m in the process of going to school right now which because of the plant shut down because of steel imports we had the opportunity through the government to retrain ourselves or go to school so I’m in the process of going to school to—I never got a degree in chemical dependency. I had probably 50 certificates, always took certificate courses, so I decided because the opportunities there now to go ahead and get the degree and that’s what I’m in the process of doing right now, not that I plan on using it. I consider myself retired at this point and would do some other things on the side, but I guess I’m just taking the opportunity because it’s there. And uh, any questions I guess?

Interviewer: How would you say that the Dundalk community’s changed since the point’s closed?

Pete: Well, just from the outside what I’ve observed, I don’t live in Dundalk, I’ve seen a lot of businesses disappear. Over the last, like I said I’ve worked at the plant for 43 years, there used to be a lot of treatment centers I was involved with down here. A lot of them closed and part of that process was because managed care came in and, a system named managed care where they manage treatment actually, or manage insurance, and a lot of the businesses weren’t able to survive as the plant constantly lost its population. When I started it was 43—41 thousand people—31 thousand, I’m sorry! At the end it was 2,000 people working there and so the businesses couldn’t know, with the employees not being there, the businesses—a lot of them couldn’t survive. And I saw a lot of businesses shut down, saw a lot of people cause as the people got younger, as they grew they moved out of the community and a lot of the older people moved into, I guess, senior apartments or whatever, and it just seemed like the biggest impact was on businesses, a lot of them shut down. That was a long answer but…

MS: Ah, no, I like long answers.

Interviewer: If you could say two things about your entire experience at the point what would they be?

Pete: Two things? I’ll say…it was rewarding…because I had an impact on the prosperity of the plant by helping the people, helping the employees become whole again and…I’ll say it was—overall it was just a beautiful experience for me because I learned a lot of things, developed a lot of skills. Not only occupational skills, I learned a lot of people skills and I run into people constantly now that tell me how much I helped them and impacted their family and what they’re still doing, and so that’s kind of rewarding. Like say I did the EAP stuff for 24 years, I would say it’s rewarding and…I feel good about my experience down there.

Interviewer: I think you actually covered most of my questions.

MS: You did cover a lot. That was great. I’ll ask one… Is there a connection between working at sparrow’s point and…for lack of a better phrase chemical dependency?

Pete: Yes there is, actually, I guess I left that part out. When I first started there I started as a label on what was called the blast furnaces, and all the guys had this saying, because I developed my chemical dependency down there at the plant after I’d been there a year and a half, I was 19. I went there a month after turning 18 and I started. I had my first drink, and my first drug was with marijuana down there on the plant, and they used to have a saying, “you need to drink when you work here” because it would clear the steel bills out your throat, keep you from getting cancer, so that was like an inside joke. And that was true, most of the people drank, and then the young crowd that came in with me in the 70s that’s when more of the drug thing came in…so there was a correlation, because part of my helping treat people and taking a holistic approach I understood the impact of working terms works on your body. Working shift work, some people would work 3 shifts in one week. Dealing with that, dealing with the family, dealing with the pace of a lot of the production in the plant, people started using artificial things, I’ll say, standards to keep themselves going and that developed a lot of the chemical dependency in a lot of people. So, part of the approach to treating people or helping them treat themselves was taking that holistic approach. You know there’s a physical, mental, and emotional component to this, you know you have to hydrate properly, you’ve got to find a way to get the proper amount of rest, that kind of thing like that. So it definitely had an impact, in my opinion, on a lot of people that may have been, I would say, may have considered themselves a casual user that transitioned into the addictive level of their usage, it definitely was that for me.

Pete: Well (laughs), how they do it…real easily.

MS: There must have been some accidents.

Pete: Yeah there were accidents, I don’t know if you notice right outside of this union hall there’s a monument with people that came into the plant and never made it out alive that day, and some of them were my former clients. Whether they were under the influence at the time I don’t know I personally had, before I got myself together, came into the plant under the influence. Most people did, they used because they’d be working 3-11and you’d see people—and that was a big thing, I used to do presentations at the union meetings quite a bit particularly during the summertime cause people had the tendency to not think anything was wrong with, you know working 3-11 or 11-7, and they’d be out cutting the grass or doing whatever, drinking, doing all that kind of stuff and then they realize the impact of coming into the plant with it still in your system. See most people have the impression of, “if I’m not drunk,” or in their mind, high, “then it doesn’t impact my performance at work.” And so that’s how a lot of people wind up at the EAP later on because they had an accident or they caught them asleep, they’d send them over and test them and they were positive and they based it on levels, not how you feel it’s impacting your motor skills and people so here’s just natural progression, you do what you’re doing, you come into work and it’s still in you, “I can still do my job,” and that was part of the denial process I had to break through with a lot of people to successfully help them, that you know, you’re violating safety rules for one thing by coming into the plant under the influence just as well as you would be driving. And that was a hard impact, because for so many years very few people that wound up at the EAP, that wasn’t their first experience coming into the plant what they call “unfit”. It went on for years and years and years, and a lot of people at the plant was aware of people that had problems and they just looked past it as long as the people were successfully able to do their job—somewhat successfully, and production or management didn’t usually get involved until it became a problem to them: absenteeism, accidents, stuff like that.

Interviewer: If I were working in your department what might I hear or see on a typical day

Pete: You mean if you were working at the EAP?

Interviewer: Mhmm.

Pete: What you would see is on a typical day…you would get a call from the medical department, my office was right next to the medical department. You would get a call from the medical department or the union or sometimes from a family member, I got calls from—most of the referrals came from the medical department, the union, sometimes management, or a family member saying that person’s having a problem. You know, they’re messing up their money, they might have had an accident, might have gotten locked up. Part of the process, I used to go bail people out of jail, help people get on work release, we had plenty of people at the plant. So you’d get a call from somebody and then the employee would come in. I expanded and started working with the employees’ families also, getting their family members in treatment cause this is a family disease. What I found out over the years is if one person had a chemical dependency problem normally it transitioned to their other family members or even there was a kind of a mental health issue related to the person dealing with the chemical dependency problem. So the employee will be sent in and typically they will be suspended meaning their job is gone, so the first thing he would have to do is do an assessment of the employee keeping in mind that they’re not going to tell you everything that’s going on., not going to tell you 100 percent of the truth. So you learn over a period of time, you would as employees there, to adlib a little of the stuff that they’re telling me and read between the lines. Just like this person, when you get to asking them, “how much do you drink?” and they say, “4 beers” I used to multiply by 3 to get a more accurate account. Or how often you use. Then I’d ask about the impact on the family, so you’d do an assessment of what they tell you and then make a decision on what type of treatment they need. In most cases I would advocate for inpatient treatment because that takes them out of the cycle and puts them in a controlled environment where they can isolate and work on themselves and their issues and not deal with the family, issues that developed over that period of time. And also, once I’ve set up a treatment for the person, and a lot of the time you’ll get a lot of resistance because people were afraid to make that transition of moving to the unknown, and that was who in their first time around. And one of the things that was typical at the plant was repeat occurrences, I mean you have multiple people coming through for multiple treatments. Over the last 10 years of the plant that became less and less because the company became less tolerable of it. And as an EAP you have to learn how to work under the radar and still help people without the company…being aware of it, I’ll say it that way. Sometimes that means it was more risky cause you had to let them still be working, and that became a little challenge too, because is somebody—I did develop a policy in there, if you told me you use I would tell you you can’t go back in the plant, “I can’t let you go back in, I’m going to have to call,” or, “I can’t let you drive.” I would have to take a person home, so you’d see all kinds of things coming in; people with mental health issues people with chemical dependency issues, but 90% if not 95% of people you would see on the typical day, when they came in through that door, their job was already gone, meaning suspended. And their primary focus would be on getting their job back, but from an EAP holistic approach, our approach at the EAP would be, “no, we’ve got to get you whole, deal with the issue, then we’ll work on your job. Then if we’re fortunate or you’re fortunate then you may save your family, that’s something you’ve got to do once you get whole again, and then get your job.” So then after you set up your treatment for your employee, then you would typically try to get the real story. Call management, a lot of times I’ll pull a five year history on a person. The attendance, and then you’d see a pattern of missing time, you know right after paydays and things like that, and you’d also get the other story on why they were suspended. Because typically, their version on why they lost their job is different from management’s version, and so that gives you a more balance approach on what you’re dealing with and how to help the person. And the approach from an EAP would be always deal with the chemical component first, then you deal with the mental, then you deal with the lack of manageability, and that’s how it starts unfolding. And so in a typical day you may have multiple people: males, females; like I said, most of them suspended. Sometimes you’re getting calls from an irate me. Sometimes you’re getting calls from somebody that’s locked up. Somebody that’s been in an accident, it’s all…that was one of the beautiful things about the job to me is there was never what was called a “typical day”. Anything could happen and it normally did. There were some days that were a little more stable than others and some days it was like non-stop, phone constantly ringing, workplace violence issues (got a lot of them) because as a tensions build in the plant because…production levels were pushed and people were already overworked and felt underpaid. And that was another funny thing about the plant, you could take a survey of the plant and some people would say it’s the best place in the world to work, and some would say it’s the worst place based on how they were feeling at that moment. And as people got pushed harder and harder and the workforce got smaller and smaller people became more stresses out, more mental health issues. I learned a lot about dual dependency in this process because a lot of people who had diagnosed mental health issues, or undiagnosed mental health issues, seemed to have a tendency to self-medicate to deal with particularly the workplace issues. And then a lot of people got what we’d call, “between a rock and a hard place,” meaning they developed workplace issues that carried over to their personal lives or personal issues that they brought into the plant. I tried the holistic approach to get people to get themselves together. I used to try to advocate for them to leave their issues at the gate, meaning whatever your workplace issues, try to leave them here, don’t take them home that’s why you’re creating problems at home. And whatever problems you’ve got at home try not to bring them in here. You know people typically project their issues into whatever environment they’re in at the time so, back to your main question: On any given day anything can happen but it always has to do with somebody being suspended from work and you have to decide, “Is this strictly a mental health issue? Is there a chemical component? Because a lot of people would try to hide that there was a chemical component of their problem and the situation they created they’ll…they’ll stretch it as long as they can to insist that it’s a mental health, “I’m just stressed out. I’m just depressed.” And sometimes it would take some—and you learn over a period of time those that you don’t already know, those that you’ve only heard about, cause a lot of times when people get to the plan you’ve already heard that they’re having issues [incomprehensible] and I’ve gone and approached them and most wouldn’t do anything about their problem until they had to, meaning their job was gone, or they were locked up, or their wife threw them out, and most of the time it’s a whole combination of things, so…

Interviewer: Were there any departments that were more likely to send people to the EAP than the others?

Pete: Well, no. I would just say generally, no. What it was was there were some less likely, I’ll say that, mainly the maintenance departments, the mechanics, electricians, the carpenters, they seemed to have the tendency to be more tolerant of the employees that they knew had a problem because they had—because of the way the system was set up there was no production timeframe to meet, meaning maintenance people could go in if there’s a repair, they could do the repair, and there was normally a crew so you could cover for each other. So typically the maintenance departments were a little more lenient. They’d let someone go in the corner and sleep it off. They might only address the issue when they became accidents or attendance became such a big problem that they had to deal with it because of the way it was coming to them, or the other coworkers finally had enough and would complain. Now in production it was a little more—they had more of a tendency to have to deal with it because if a person couldn’t keep up with the production line or had accidents—see the company had come to develop a policy: If the company caught you asleep, if you had an accident, or, if, in their opinion, you were acting other than what they perceived as normal that day. And that became a big problem for a lot of people because they felt like management was picking on them or somebody just didn’t like me today. That’s why they sent me over here. And they would initially refuse the test. But most of the time, I would say, 99 out of a 100 times, if a person resisted to being testing was asked, there’s an issue. And then normally when you get them to take the test, they would turn up positive. And so once again the company or the medical department would bring me in to try to convince the person to cooperate and help themselves and most of the time I could get through to them because, as I say, I knew most people and a lot of people, I mean many many years when I finally met people under those circumstances of course they knew my name; a lot of people in the plant at the end especially the younger generation that came in I’d say around 2000 or something, they knew my name but they didn’t know who I was. They wouldn’t knew me if they saw me until they, like, saw me at the union meetings which a lot of them didn’t go to, or they got themselves into a jam.

Interviewer: What about management? Were they, um…? Did you have equal amounts of people you were helping from management?

Pete Ross: Well, the management component was slim, meaning the people I was involved with, through management. Now there were some upper level management that did send some lower level management people to me. But as a whole …. Now the policy and the program was supposed to be set up to help all employees, and I kept emphasizing that point. And that was important to the hourly employees because they felt they were being singled out and management wasn’t being addressed the same way. But the policy was set up for everybody. But I would say I probably only dealt with, over the course of time, maybe, twenty percent of the management people that had problems, because it was well known that management could leave out of the plant and go have their liquid lunches and come back; they held them to a separate criteria. And a lot of the management didn’t want to deal with an hourly person, which I was. But there were some. I guess management they had their choice and they sent them. And I’m just as effective with them because the process is the process. I mean, if you want the help and you want to keep your job and you want to stay alive, follow the process. And say a lot of people…because everybody had the opportunity, even hourly employees, they didn’t have to use the EAP. And I advocated that quite a bit. I said anytime you come to the EAP, nothing is authorized until you say, “Let’s move forward.” Now, I’d give them options. They could go call the 800 number insurance and set everything up on their own, but it was more effective to go through the EAP because I had set up, I had learned how to get through a lot of the roadblocks, had relationships. I could get people in treatment automatically, same day, things like that, versus them going through a long, long process. Because one of the things when you’re dealing with chemical dependency, or mental health, particularly when the person has lost their job, time is very important to get the process started because the company became less and less tolerant of somebody resisting the help when it’s there. So, management, back to your question, seemed to try, most of them, go under the radar. Now, I’ve dealt more with management from a family perspective, meaning helping their family members, more than the management itself. They’re still working at the plant, need to call in for a child with a problem or a spouse’s. I did a lot, a lot , of work with spouses and dependent children and the spouses always seemed to have been the hardest to work with because I didn’t have any what I used to call the hammer, I didn’t have nothing to kind of force their hand when they were resisting, didn’t want to comply. At least with employees, you had their job that they had to, you know, try to get in line with. Spouses, they were very problematic, let alone the dependent children. But I did get calls from management, only because they tried themselves and it wasn’t effective, dealing with their own child. There’s a problem a lot of times when the child is being rebellious or caught up, they resist, they’re very resistant to their parent and a lot of times, I mean, I would go around people’s houses, talk to the child, there are plenty, plenty, of individuals, I’m still doing it and I seem to be pretty effective most of the time, at least to get people to try and help themself. And one of the things about chemical dependency, there’s no guarantees, and I advocated that to the company (unintelligible), but it’s one day at a time, it really is. And most of the people that lost their job at the plant, the only way once treatment was, obviously they were stabilized, the company gave them an opportunity to keep their employment through what was called a “Last Chance” letter, which was a five-year probationary letter, meaning they had to be randomly tested for five years. I did develop some on-site group sessions—they used to be twice a week, and then they evolved down because of a lack of participation to one day a week where people could come on company time. And they became less and less, as I said earlier, the company became less and less supportive of the program; they started saying we’re not going to allow them to come over on company time. Their “Last Chance: letter would say they had to come over on their own time. But the EAP was successful. I made myself twenty-four hour accessible to everybody. They can call me anytime on the phone. I used to get calls in the plant, three o’clock in the morning, if someone was considered unfit , was working eleven to seven, I would come in, address the issue and escort them home, transport them home and then, bring them back the next day, pick them up and bring them back. If a person was declared unfit, by law we’re not supposed to let them drive, not supposed to let them go back in the plant. Had a lot of that going on and as I was saying, once you were suspended and the company was going to allow you to come back to work you had this 5 year letter. You had to attend three self-help meetings with AA—with meetings a week and get proof of that. I had slips, I had people, and they had to sign an agreement to have to come to a group session at least once a month which it was a weekly session. And they could come in and talk to me, 1 on 1, anytime at the EAP or call me on the phone, and that’s how the EAP kind of worked a lot. I got a lot of anonymous calls or, “I’m calling for a friend, bla, bla, blah. How does this work? How does that work?” And you would explain things like that. And eventually that person, even if you didn’t know who they were, eventually they would wind up over there because, once again, most people don’t deal with their issues until they’re forced to deal with them, and that’s just how the EAP works.

MS: Um, any other questions? I was going to ask one more…One last question more on a general level. Sparrow’s point is closed, the buildings may go away in the future, that landscape will change. What remains? What’s the legacy that remains? In a more general sense.

Pete: I guess the legacy that remains of the plant itself is that it was a source of income for many many generations of people for say a hundred years, or a little over a hundred years. And a lot of people had the opportunity, so-called uneducated or unskilled people, to go to a place and develop some skills and get some benefits and some income to not only support themselves but to take care of their families. It had a generational impact, a lot of people went to colleges based on the money that came out of the plant. A lot of people had access to medical benefits that didn’t have any other way, because one of the things at the plant was we never had to pay for health benefits, there was a union negotiated benefit. And so the overall impact is it…it affected generations, I’m sure a lot of the doctors or lawyers or other people, well I know a lot of them, and the politicians whose parents got them to where they are based on the money coming out of the plant. So overall that 100 years that it was there it impacted the whole community. The people that lived around the plant, most of them worked there. There used to be a whole town down there at the plant to support the people and then eventually they moved out of there, but I don’t know how much longer the impact would go once the plant and the landscape change. I anticipate there’s going to be cruise lines down there and private condos and all kinds of stuff like that. But I know it impacted me to where, you know coming out of high school I have—I’m transitioning into retirement really nice. I learned particularly once I got myself together, manage my money correctly, save some things in place. And a lot of other people did the same thing. There was a few that were unprepared when the plant went down and they’re scrambling, but as a whole I’ll say the impact of the plant being there—because I understand it built bridges that are around in those 100 years when steel and manufacturing was very popular here in this country. It had a tremendous impact and I guess it must still, that’s why you’re all here talking about doing a film, right?......Is that it?

MS: Yeah you’ve covered so much. Thank you…