Wilderness: Managing the Untrammeled
Letters

Parks Canada

My repeated attempts to phone Barbara Goodman and thank her for inviting me to the St. Paul Rendezvous have failed due to your government’s prolonged shutdown. Undaunted, I decided to use this more public and effective forum.

The Rendezvous was an outstanding event. It allowed me to catch up with all the ANPR rangers I met at Zakopane (Poland) and to partake in a panel discussion with Chris Andress and other NPS colleagues. I felt honored to play a part. The contacts established have already resulted in the exchange of valuable information between our services.

On a related note, we in Canada are excited about the prospects of hosting a joint Canada-U.S. Rendezvous in the near future. It would be the first such event and give a tremendous boost to the fledgling Canadian association. So thank you, Barbara, for providing a further opportunity to foster closer ties between our associations. I hope to be at Corpus Christi and build on our new relationship.

Tom Kovacs
Director, Natural Resources Branch
Parks Canada

Wishing You Strength

Until we have more sympathetic people in government, it looks like our plans to get together will have to wait. My window to join you somewhere for a public talk is now very small, and perhaps should wait until the timing is right for both of us.

And I regret that, just now, I can’t address the issue on my mind, the concerns we share, in print. The way my writing schedule has come around, I can’t take on another piece.

My admiration for what you are all doing in the face of such opposition is enormous. I am eager, always, to make that sense of admiration clear to others, and look forward to a time when I can stand up and say so in a public forum.

Until then, I wish you every strength, and a big change of wind in your sails.

Barry Lopez
Finn Rock, Oregon

Apology Due

The first amendment notwithstanding, I am disturbed that Ranger would print the first paragraph of Law Enforcement Abuse of Civil Rights,” (Winter 1995-96, p. 16) in which the authors openly accuse virtually all law enforcement officers, including rangers, of participating in civil rights violations and then of covering up these offenses in a “...carefully written incident report...”

Rather than a well-reasoned and substantiated opening statement to a highly informative article, the authors use Ranger as a forum for what is, at best, a highly biased personal attack upon the tens of thousands of law enforcement officers in this country who are well versed in civil rights law and who don’t tolerate abuse by fellow officers.

Obviously, as in any profession, there are the few bad apples who create the Rodney King incidents, and we must be diligent in rooting them out. However, to claim that we are all like this infers a police state of rampant constitutional abuse which the citizens we protect and serve would never tolerate, and which simply doesn’t exist, except perhaps in the authors’ minds.

The authors owe law enforcement officers, in general, and park rangers, specifically, an apology.

Law Enforcement Rangers

If I may be allowed to clarify my earlier letter (Ranger, Fall 1995), I failed to make my point clear in my comments about NPS law enforcement rangers. I have received several letters to the effect that I don’t understand and/or respect the job that law enforcement ranger do.

Far from it. I have the utmost respect for these rangers and the jobs they do. My issue is not with the rangers, their jobs, their training or their usefulness. Rather, it is with the color of their uniforms.

My point is this, and only this: For the reasons listed in my earlier letter, when a sidearm is a necessary piece of daily equipment — and it often is — then the uniform should be blue and not green and gray.

KellyAnn Gorman
Lexington, MA

More letters on pages 26, 28
President’s Message

For 20 days during December 1995 and January 1996 the National Park Service was closed as part of the broader federal government shutdown due to a lack of funding. The public for those days was not well served by its government or its national parks.

On Jan. 17, Congresswoman Barbara Jordan from Texas died. She was one of a kind. She served three terms in Congress, and with her oratory, she was compared to God. She was a traditional liberal, but not an automatic one, according to a recent TV remembrance. She believed that Americans must be “a community in which every last one of us participates,” and that she was going to “make this American democracy DO RIGHT!” She had a sense of values, of public values. We should mourn her loss.

Now to us. The NPS and its high value to the American public was more than amply demonstrated during the shut-down. On the front page of most American papers during that time, the closure of the national parks was consistently up there with stories about Medicare and Medicaid.

People care about their heritage — natural and cultural and historical. It is one place or its national parks.

As you read this, it appears that the discussion over the administration’s policy on what constitutes a “visitor service” as stipulated in the continuing resolution that put us back to work on Jan. 8, may well be history. We may even have a satisfactory budget resolution or appropriations bill passed that make this a moot point.

However, the definition of public service — of “visitor services” for the NPS — is a major test of government. Do visitor services and protection of resources for future generations still have the public’s (visitor’s) support? I believe they do, and so I wrote to the administration and Congress (see ANPR Actions, page 21).

This is a debate and issue of historic importance for the NPS. It is one we as an organization, and you as an individual must not leave unaddressed.

Barbara Jordan said it best: “Every last one of us” must participate, and make this American democracy “DO RIGHT!”

Darlene J. Adams

“People care about their heritage — natural and cultural and historical.”
EMERGING CHALLENGES IN WILDERNESS MANAGEMENT

By Hugh Dougher
North Cascades

In 1896, Queen Victoria lamented that the public "affairs are so different from what they so used to be." Imagine her chagrin had she anticipated the even greater transformations that were about to unfold in the new century.

Consider for a moment the evolution that has occurred in society just since the Wilderness Act was established in 1964, and how the changes during this one-third of a century have influenced America's perceptions and use of wild areas.

Change is driven by population and technology. The world's population is growing, and technology is advancing at an incredible rate. In the upcoming decades we can expect society to continue to transform and evolve, probably at an even faster pace than the recent past. If we are to effectively protect and manage wilderness into the next century — the new millennium — we must strive to anticipate these changes and be prepared to manage their effects on wilderness.

Over the past six months I've asked a broad range of individuals the question: "What do you see as emerging issues in wilderness management during the next decade?" Respondents included wilderness managers and rangers from the U.S. and Canada, commercial operators, user groups and environmental activists. Their insightful comments follow.

DEMOGRAPHICS

Duncan Gooding, a member of the board of directors for the Outdoor Recreation Coalition of America (ORCA) shared that organization's 1995 Human Powered Outdoor Recreation State of the Industry Report. This document highlights the importance of instilling a wilderness ethic in children. The report states that about two-thirds of people currently recreating outdoors were introduced to their favorite outdoor activity before the age of 17, and half of those before the age of 8.

The same report reveals that tent camping and backpacking are still the time-honored favorite activities, and are steadily gaining popularity with increases of about 12 percent in 1994. Between 1989 and the year 2000, both day hiking and backpacking are projected to increase about 30 percent, and from 2000 to 2040 the increase will be 190 percent and 155 percent, respectively.
Between 1990 and 2025 ORCA predicts ethnic white participation in hiking will grow the slowest, with only a 4 percent increase in day hiking, and a 5 percent decrease in backpacking. Ethnic black participation will experience significant increases; 45 percent for day hiking and 15 percent for backpacking. But the greatest increase will be for racial and ethnic groups other than white, black or Hispanic: between 40-50 percent for both activities.

In summary, ORCA predicts that over the next several decades, America’s population will experience slower growth, age significantly, have greater minority components, and be more urban.

**OBSERVATIONS OF INDUSTRY AND ADVOCACY GROUPS**

ORCA’s report also states that mountain and rock climbing claimed 6.2 million participants in 1994, an increase of 32 percent in just one year. The report hypothesizes that this exploding use is attributable in part to the popularity of artificial climbing walls, which are springing up around the country. According to the report, the Climbing Gym Association, an organization of climbing gym owners and managers, has enlisted 127 new members in just over one year’s time.

Keith Leonard of the Access Fund supports ORCA’s observations, and says climbing gyms are now the “feeder streams” of climbing sports. He senses that the exploding popularity of outdoor rock climbing is coming straight out of the gyms, and it is these users that are driving further sport evolution. He’s concerned that these climbing gymnasts are not being exposed to the traditional opportunities for learning wildland ethics.

Leonard feels the growth in climbing is also being fueled by the advertising media, which projects climbing as sexy, and generally glorifies unrestrained recreation use.

Leonard sees increasing specialization of outdoor recreation as translating to more types of user groups placing greater demands on specific resources. He predicts this in turn will increase the potential for conflict. Leonard believes the issue of solitude will become more controversial, with some user groups arguing that the Wilderness Act doesn’t require solitude as a pervasive condition.

Leonard says that in the future, advocacy groups such as the Access Fund will increasingly broaden focus to develop productive partnerships with land management agencies so they can be part of the solution. He feels that in many cases access restrictions and regulations reflect a conservative approach by managers handicapped with inadequate information. He believes advocacy groups will become more active in assisting agencies clearly articulate impacts and expectations, help develop management prescriptions, and better understand user desires. He senses that for these partnerships to work, common ground will have to be found between the action-oriented advocacy groups, and the process-oriented bureaucracies.

The Mountaineers, a conservation organization of 15,000 members in the Pacific Northwest, echoes Leonard’s observations. In his recent *State of the Club* message, Mountaineers President Craig Rowley said the organization’s two greatest future challenges will be access and land use management. He foresees increased use of wilderness, which will result in greater impacts, which in turn will drive increased regulation. He says it is imperative that the Mountaineers work closer with land managers in efforts to minimize impacts and avoid excessive regulation.

Marcia Hanson, vice president of the same organization, expanded on Leonard’s and Rowley’s observations in a recent conversation. She says an important future challenge in wilderness management will be balancing use with impact. She predicts that user groups and the public will continue to support decisions designed to protect natural resources, but will increasingly challenge definitions and standards related to social conditions (such as solitude). She believes greater interagency consistency is needed, but guidelines should be appropriately general; areas should be managed for individual objectives and standards.

Jay Watson of the Wilderness Society, in a recent presentation to an interagency wilderness management course, says that while social values such as solitude will continue to be a central goal in wilderness management, the preservation of natural processes is emerging as one of the most important wilderness values. Wilderness management is the closest we can come to long-term, ecosystem-based management, he says.

Watson reflects ORCA’s projections — and Leonard’s and Hanson’s observations — in his statement that if wilderness is to survive, wilderness education must expand to reach a much broader spectrum of the American people.

Duncan Gooding of ORCA (and also president of the American Alpine Institute) echoed Leonard’s and Rowley’s observations concerning the potential for broader partnerships. He senses an increasing interest from the outdoor manufacturing and retail industry to assist management agencies with wilderness and backcountry projects.

**A CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE**

In October 1995, I asked a group of Parks Canada backcountry wardens/managers representing parks in the Canadian Rockies for their observations. Their responses reflected many of the comments already discussed, and included challenges such as managing increased use, greater conflicts between user groups, the need for more effective public education, ecosystem management and protecting ecological integrity.

Currently, frontcountry areas in parks in the Canadian Rockies are popular with tourists from the Asian Pacific region. Wardens now are observing a slow shift, with these visitors beginning to enter the backcountry for day hikes. As with the ORCA report
already discussed, they see the potential for an explosive increase in overnight backcountry use by these tourists. This potential, combined with the prediction that overall visitation to popular Canadian parks will double by 2010, suggests that backcountry use patterns will change dramatically in some Canadian parks over the next several decades.

The wardens pointed to results of a recent study of Alberta children that found these children know less about the importance of parks than their parents did at the same age. Wardens said the parks are only what people conceive them to be, and it is critical to instill a strong environmental ethic in the general public.

One retired warden observed that while 30 years ago the town of Banff was a gem of civilization in a sea of wilderness, today Banff National Park is becoming a gem of wilderness in a sea of civilization.

Wardens expressed concern that the almost 9,000 square miles comprising the four contiguous parks of Banff, Jasper, Kootenay, and Yoho may not be adequate for the long-term sustainability of species like grizzly and wolf. They worry about ecological integrity, the public’s lack of understanding about the importance of ecosystem management, resource extraction on neighboring lands, and the reality that protected areas are increasingly becoming genetic islands without connectivity.

Park wardens cited two additional challenges — revenue generation and commercial exploitation. Parks Canada currently is implementing revenue generation initiatives including significant increases in user fees. Some wardens are concerned that these fee increases may undercut public support, increase perceptions that parks are for tourists and not locals, and shift use trends in unexpected ways. Wardens also stressed the need to improve management of commercial activities such as guide services.

COMMENTS FROM U.S. WILDERNESS MANAGERS AND RANGERS

Challenges identified by the participants of an interagency restoration workshop held in the Lolo National Forest in September 1995 included many of the above issues, such as developing productive public-private sector partnerships, improving interagency coordination, protecting ecological integrity (specifically as related to fish stocking), and broadening public education. Other concerns mentioned were avoiding resource manipulation, improving techniques to monitor and restore impacts, stopping increasing crime, improving career development opportunities for wilderness managers, and instilling a deeper understanding of the Wilderness Act in agency leaders.

TOP ISSUES

A commonly mentioned challenge was the need to better manage day use. This item was identified as a critical issue by nearly all the land management groups surveyed.

Other common concerns, which have already been discussed, included the need to broaden the general public’s understanding of the values of wilderness, especially non-recreational values, and increasing the effectiveness of interagency and agency-private sector partnerships.

SOME FINAL OBSERVATIONS

I was enthused by the expressed desire of industry and advocacy groups to work closer with wilderness managers, and by the recognition by such wilderness managers of the importance of such partnerships.

I was surprised with the similarity of comments, and also that these comments transcended national, agency and public-private sector boundaries. When I began the survey I expected to gather a shopping list of specific issues, such as whether or not to allow goats as pack animals, the appropriateness of permanent climbing anchors, the use of cell phones and more. Instead, respondents consistently identified a small set of broad challenges. This commonality suggests that wilderness advocates, managers and users agree that the spectrum of future issues can be managed in a proactive manner through strategies such as education and strong partnerships.

This consensus by respondents as to the major challenges facing wilderness, together with the expressed willingness of these groups and individuals to work together, provides powerful potential for the future protection of wilderness.

Our task is to turn this potential into reality.

Hugh Dougher is the Wilderness District Ranger, North Cascades National Park Service Complex, Washington. Some of the information in this article was presented at the "Wilderness: Changes and Challenges" workshop at the 1995 Ranger Rendezvous in St. Paul, Minn.
Dinosaurs
By Norm Simons
Golden Gate NRA

With the advent of Ranger Futures, 6c Enhanced 20-year retirement and federal downsizing, most park law enforcement rangers (and interpreters) nationwide are assuming new roles that may permanently change our perceptions as rangers.

I recently attended the retirement party for one of my "heroes," a highly regarded role model ranger of many years. He sagely told me the newer rangers coming in will never have the opportunity to experience the memories we had in the old ranger service.

You older rangers out there consider that. Consider how you used to patrol, the hours you put in, the problem bears you moved, those medical emergencies or rescues you handled. Or maybe those ski patrols and snow surveys, rappelling into eagle nests, collaring wolves, caribou calves or elk, dogsled patrols, or horse patrols. Do you still do those? Consider the past, and what we have to look forward to in the new NPS future.

While highly beneficial to the Service in the long run, many fear the new era of specialization and technology (computers, high-tech equipment and more) may be detrimental to the Service and NPS family in the short term. Repeatedly I have heard people say we are losing our skills, our ability to be rangers — to range. If that is the case, I'm one of those dinosaurs.

I still believe in the old ranger skills (in spite of working in an urban park) and ethics, including public service, firefighting, EMS, rescues, resource protection, and hiking, climbing and skiing skills. Many colleagues consider me to be a "law enforcement type," but I won't ever forget those magic moments, listed above, that made me feel special.

I do still like catching bad guys ("bandits" we called 'em in the Great Land), making that good arrest, especially after a hard, often lengthy investigation. But even those days seem to be waning, with the designation of criminal investigators and numerous law enforcement specialists who effectively remove many of us from performing total law enforcement duties.

After moving from Alaska in 1990, I traded my skis and dog team in for a patrol car; traded my old .357 Smith for a 9mm Sig, and became a family man, essentially working an eight-hour job in an urban park. I often feel obsolete, unneeded and non-essential these days. But every now and then, it happens. I get a spark.

Recently a jogger reported seeing a mountain lion at close quarters in the scenic rolling hills of Tennessee Valley. This is in the Marin Headlands on the North Side of the Golden Gate Bridge.

Cats aren't rare around Golden Gate. We have numerous domestic cats (feline housecatus feralus), not to mention our semi-tame bobcat, lynx rufus. But a real, live mountain lion (felis concolor), though fairly common in forested areas of the Bay and state parks to our north, are uncommon in the grassy open space of Golden Gate NRA.

So I drove my trusty new steed (a '95 Chevy Caprice patrol car) up into the backcountry (former grazing land), to the Fox Trail (fire road). The incident occurred on a dirt road, possibly leaving tracks, so I had an opportunity to investigate the possibilities: house cat, bobcat or mountain lion.

Having grown up hunting, hiking, climbing and skiing in much of the West and Alaska, I have seen my share of critter tracks. I generally know what animals make what tracks. And if there is a questionable track (such as comparing dog, fox, coyote), you often have to consider animal behavior and evaluate the entire scene, much like a crime scene, in order to accurately confirm or deny the presence of unusual predators.

If you are from a wilderness park, this may seem pretty boring. However, for an urban park ranger, formerly from wilderness parks and losing the old ranger lifestyle, these things suddenly become important.

Have you retained the old ranger knowledge and skills, maintained that old curiosity, that drive, to learn? Is it important to get excited about a lovely coyote? To go out there and do a job? Unequivocally, YES!

For at least three reasons. Maybe four.

Point #1 — These urban parks indeed are "real" parks, with real wildlife, often including threatened or endangered species, unique features, or important cultural aspects, or any combination thereof. In the Bay area (and California) we have a large population of cougars. Unfortunately, cougars attacked and killed two people in California in the recent past, so any sightings in an urban area can and do engender fear in an urban populace that has little experience or understanding of these special cats.

Point #2 — We not only have to protect these animals, we have a duty to educate the public about the cats (and their habitat requirements), in order to dispel unneeded fears, and allow the public to live in relative harmony with them (not unlike grizzly bears and wolves for those of you in wilderness parks).

Point #3 — In order to properly investigate wildlife poaching and interpret wildlife, you need to know something about wildlife, including history, behavior and wildlife management principles. Many of us "dinosaur" rangers have grown up with these skills. However, many new era rangers have little experience with hunting, wildlife, and may not have the same values or ethics as in the old days. This is a matter of education of our own staff, even crucial in a time when political moves are being made to reduce park budgets, declassify parks and reduce environmental protection laws.

Point #4 — Because I've been spoiled by seeing Alaskan wildlife, I took many things for granted. Now it becomes particularly appealing to view a rarely seen animal, or its track, because you know something wild, something special is out there, and it rekindles that spirit of wilderness within you. It's the reason many of us became rangers.

Recently I marveled at seeing my first coyote (canis latrans) in Golden Gate. Like mountain lions, they are rare here. To see a predator stalk and catch prey, as I did that day, was rejuvenating.

I did find the mountain lion tracks where the jogger reported them, picking them out from fox, bobcat, illegal dog tracks (running with a person) and horse tracks all in the same small area. So, I was able to apply old skills to establish and pass on new information to both our resource management staff and the public.

This was a wake up call to remind myself of the importance of resource values, whether in an urban or wilderness park. It doesn't matter if you are a modern urban law enforcement ranger or a dinosaur resource ranger.

So, this dinosaur is trying to keep the old techniques alive, while learning new technology that will better enable me to protect the resource, catch the bad guys, while enlisting the public to assist us in our endeavor to save our public lands.

Maybe there is room for evolution! •

Norm Simons is a law enforcement ranger in the North District at Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
On the Trail to Minimum Impact

By Tim Devine  
Rocky Mountain National Park

As we left the trailhead, the sun was shining, the air and pace were brisk, and spirits were high. Everyone was quickly adjusting to the heavy loads being carried for the week-long trip into spectacular Rocky Mountain high country. Some, coming from near sea level, were glad they conditioned ahead of time for the 10,000-foot-plus elevation of the Rawah Wilderness Area in north central Colorado.

The group of 12, large by most backcountry standards, was gradually getting to know each other. The preceding day had been spent indoors talking about the basics of backpacking and how to minimize impacts on the land. No, this wasn’t a beginning “learn to backpack” course, and fellow hiking companions weren’t green, wannabe backcountry campers. We were in the company of some highly seasoned outdoor enthusiasts/professionals. The group had come together to learn, share and discover the principles and ethics of Leave No Trace, a national educational program developed by the National Outdoor Leadership School, the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

We all thought we were pretty good at minimum impact camping. We were all outdoor professionals and besides, wasn’t that what we learned in Boy and Girl Scouts not so long ago? For some, the week was a great refresher course; for others, it was a new awakening. At least now we would all be “reading off the same page” and out of the same book when we went to pass on the principles and ethics of Leave No Trace.

Planning and preparing for the trip into the backcountry was probably the most important step to minimum impact. We didn’t need a permit for traveling or camping in the area. We did, however, get a copy of and went over with everyone the regulations and special concerns for the area. Food had been repackaged into reusable containers, and portions were figured out to minimize excess, in both weight and waste. Gear and clothing were selected to properly equip us for the Rocky Mountain high country in mid-September.

It was eight miles along a heavily used trail to our first campsite. Hiking single file down the middle of the trail tread, and wearing gaiters to ward off the mud puddles created from a recent thunderstorm, we were able to avoid damaging vegetation on the edges of the trail. Otherwise, this eventually would lead to erosion and braiding. One stretch was fairly steep with numerous switchbacks. It was tempting to beeline it straight up hill, but our better judgment and training prevailed. The resource won!

Our first two nights were spent in designated campsites. Activities were confined to the compacted areas. Cooking was done on small camp stoves. This avoided the necessity of wood fires, which were allowed in the area. All our cooking, cleaning and personal hygiene actions were conducted at least 200 feet (70 adult steps) from the nearest water.
MISSION STATEMENT
The mission of the Leave No Trace program is to develop a nationally recognized minimum-impact backcountry educational system, which will educate wildland user groups, federal agencies and the public through training and effective written and video materials.

...and lightning snowstorm. We knew of the potential for snow from the weather forecast we had obtained prior to the trip and we were well prepared. The thunder and lightning was an added surprise. We scurried down the other side of the ridge to safer ground below treeline.

Four inches of newly fallen snow greeted us at our final camping spot. From previous scouting trips, we knew this area was rarely camped in. Good campsites are found, not made. We spread out and selected areas for our tarps and tents, careful not to damage vegetation hidden under the blanket of light, powdery snow.

One small wood fire was built after much discussion and debate. Most would have preferred to enjoy the night darkness as we had previously. Others found that candle lanterns and flashlights wouldn’t satisfy their craving on this cold, damp night. It did provide an opportunity to practice building a minimum impact fire.

Because we hadn’t carried a fire pan, we constructed a mound fire on top of a ground cloth using mineral soil gathered from the base of a fallen spruce. Dead and down wood was gathered in its natural form and not broken into pieces until it was placed on the fire. The fire burned down to mostly white ash, and the cold ash and unused wood were scattered. The ground cloth provided a great means to contain and return the mineral soil to the fallen spruce. Not a trace of the fire could be found, and it wasn’t any trouble. All too often fire scars dot the backcountry and leave long-lasting impact.

Morning came and the last few miles to the trailhead were filled with stories of ignorant and/or uncaring backcountry visitors we had all come in contact with or seen evidence of back home. One story conveyed the plight of a once little known archeological site that had recently become a popular day hike destination. The lack of respect for historical artifacts and our natural heritage had destroyed the once rich and important site in a short time. We must learn to leave what we find so others can be excited by their discoveries. Leave No Trace is as much awareness and attitude as skills and abilities.

As we neared the end of our adventure, the sun appeared from behind a puffy cloud. The air was still brisk, but our pace had slowed, partially from the strenuous journey and partially from not wanting the trip to end. Yet, spirits were still high as we came away with a better understanding of, and energy to teach, Leave No Trace principles and ethics.

Learning, sharing, living, practicing, and discussing had all been part of this Masters of Leave No Trace Trainers’ course. We have an obligation to ourselves, to the public, and to the areas we love, to promote and use minimum impact living techniques. We must make the skills habit, and search inside for the ethic. □

Tim Devine is the resource management specialist at Rocky Mountain National Park.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
Trips into the backcountry that include an awareness and the use of minimum-impact practices conserve natural conditions of the outdoors. This makes an adventure enjoyable and allows others the same experience.

Six Leave No Trace principles serve to educate and remind backcountry users. Combining these principles with your personal judgment, awareness and experience will help preserve natural resources.

➢ Plan ahead and prepare.
➢ Camp and travel on durable surfaces.
➢ Pack it in, pack it out.
➢ Properly dispose of what you can’t pack out.
➢ Leave what you find.
➢ Minimize use and impact of fires.

Contact the LNT Hotline at 1-800-332-4100 for more information.
Become a Master of Leave No Trace

By Roger Semler and Tim Devine

Enrich your knowledge of minimum impact skills and improve your ability to teach, and promote Leave No Trace (LNT) Outdoor Skills and Ethics. Become a “Master of Leave No Trace” by attending a training course conducted by the National Outdoor Leadership School in cooperation with federal land management agencies.

Becoming a Master of Leave No Trace requires successful completion of a five-day training session, most of which is conducted in a backcountry/field setting. Enrollment for most courses is limited to 10 participants, and the backcountry routes are generally moderately difficult. Most of the courses involve backpacking, although there are also courses that address specific Leave No Trace concerns for stock use, sea kayaking, canoeing and river rafting. Tuition for a Master course is $650.

The Master courses place a strong emphasis on developing teaching skills and methods for presenting Leave No Trace information in an effective way. Instruction also focuses on learning styles, teaching aids and props, and other proven techniques for successful teaching and instruction in the field. Each course provides the participant with opportunities to explore and practice teaching skills and techniques by making presentations to fellow course participants. Additional advice is shared on how to develop training aids, lesson plans and action plans that are applicable to your home park or area. The course also provides information on the latest Leave No Trace skills and techniques currently recommended for various environments and outdoor activities.

While it is true that many people already may have a thorough knowledge of Leave No Trace skills and ethics, each course has something positive to offer a modern day park ranger, naturalist or other outdoor professional. The Masters course also offers an excellent opportunity to interact with other land managers and professionals. A typical course may have participants from each of the major land management agencies, as well as from the private sector. There are excellent opportunities to discuss land management policies, techniques, and concerns.

Many of those who have completed the Masters training return home with a renewed interest and vigor for promoting Leave No Trace in their work area, or develop innovative ideas on how they can establish a successful Leave No Trace program at home.

New Masters become part of a cadre of trained professionals who can serve as resident Leave No Trace experts and instructors. Many of the Masters devote a great deal of their time and energy promoting the national Leave No Trace educational program.

There are more than 300 Masters of Leave No Trace nationwide. About 10 of them are from the National Park Service, and most of them are located west of the Mississippi.

The NPS could certainly use more Masters. Anyone interested in developing or improving Leave No Trace educational and promotional efforts in their park and area should consider this course.

Here are just a few examples of Leave No Trace outreach efforts that NPS Masters have been involved with:

- Incorporating LNT messages into various park handouts, site bulletins, brochures and Natural History Association publications.

### CURRICULA

**Completed**
- Rocky Mountains
- Southeastern States
- Pacific Northwest
- Western River Corridors
- Temperate Coastal Zones
- Desert and Canyon Country
- Backcountry Horse Use

**Under Development**
- Rock Climbing
- Alpine and Snow
- Cave Environments
- Northeastern States
- Great Lakes Region
- Alaskan Tundra
• Developing various LNT outreach programs for scouts, civic organizations, school districts and others.
• Incorporating LNT awareness and education into park interpretive programs, naturalist hikes and outreach presentations.
• Incorporating LNT awareness and education into park staff training sessions (fire crews, trail crews, backcountry rangers, naturalists, front desk personnel, researchers and concession employees).
• Developing LNT messages for trailhead bulletin boards, visitor center displays and more.
• Developing LNT messages for dissemination through the media (newspaper and magazine articles, radio and TV spots).
• Incorporating LNT standards and guidelines into concession contracts and special use permits, collecting permits, research programs and more.
• Developing a volunteer Leave No Trace patrol cadre.

Roger Semler is the wilderness manager at Glacier National Park. Tim Devine is the resource management specialist at Rocky Mountain National Park.

If you have questions about the Master of Leave No Trace program, contact Roger Semler at Glacier, (406) 888-5441. If you want to enroll in a Master of Leave No Trace course, contact the LNT hotline toll-free at (800) 332-4100, ext. 282. The courses fill quickly, so don't delay.

1996 Master Leave No Trace Course Dates

The dates listed below are approximate. Enrollment is limited to 10 participants for most courses. Backcountry routes are moderately difficult; good physical condition is important. Inclement weather is always possible. All courses involve backpacking except where noted.

Tuition for the five-day training course is $650 and includes most meals, group gear, curriculum materials and a subscription to the Master Network newsletter. Participants are responsible for travel to and from the course location and in-town lodging for the days you aren’t in the backcountry.

If you want to enroll in a Master of Leave No Trace course, contact the LNT hotline toll-free at (800) 332-4100, ext. 282. The courses fill quickly, so don’t delay.

1996 COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 22-26</td>
<td>Canoe</td>
<td>Ely, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22-26</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Zion NP, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29-May 3</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Brevard, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6-10</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Watersmeet, Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13-17</td>
<td>Stock</td>
<td>Huson, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20-24</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Flagstaff, Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20-24</td>
<td>Tundra Hiking</td>
<td>Anchorage, Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2-7</td>
<td>Kayak</td>
<td>Petersburg, Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17-21</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Banff NP, Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 24-27</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Ennis, Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8-12</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Pinecrest, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15-19</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Leadville, Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 19-23</td>
<td>Stock</td>
<td>Boulder, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 8-13</td>
<td>River Rafting</td>
<td>Vernal, Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 16-20</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Conway, Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 23-27</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Bishop, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 23-27</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Bethel, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 23-27</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>Red Desert, Wyoming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Better Resource Protection?

Two bills were introduced in Congress just after Thanksgiving that would authorize states to operate national parks during a federal shutdown. (See ANPR Actions on page 21 for details.)

ANPR and ANPME spoke out forcefully against these bills in letters to the chairmen and ranking members of the relevant authorizing committees. The two associations’ position was summarized in the first paragraph:

“We in the Association of National Park Rangers and the Association of National Park Maintenance Employees believe that these bills make little sense operationally and are, in essence, attempts to contravene the fundamental purposes and ideals of the National Park System and to compromise the principle of federal management of these and other public lands, which, despite popular rhetoric, are owned by all the people of this country.”

The letter refuted the idea that states could easily manage national parks, arguing, among other things, that:

- state employees lack the special skills and detailed knowledge needed to run parks;
- the states which had expressed interest in managing parks during shutdowns were not prepared to manage the communities within parks as part of such operations;
- the states would seek financial remuneration, thereby negating what little logic the bills contained; and
- at the heart of the matter, these two bills constituted “an effort to use the budget impasse to assert state and county supremacy over the federal government (the McCain bill authorizes ‘political subdivisions of the State’ to manage national parks), to insinuate state and county governments into the management of parks, refuges and other federally owned and managed lands, and to establish a precedent for future and more extensive takeovers of such lands.”

We received a supportive letter from Rep. George Miller, D-Calif., printed below. Just before publication of this issue we received a response from Rep. Don Young, R-Alaska, also printed below. Although over this past year we have heard the debate of federal vs. local management of nationally significant resources, Chairman Young’s letter is the first clear statement of local preference ANPR has received from an influential member of Congress.

Members should take note of his letter. Responses for publication in Ranger are encouraged.

— ANPR President Deanne Adams

Letter from Rep. George Miller

Dec. 15, 1995

Thank you for your letter on behalf of the Association of National Park Rangers and the National Park Maintenance Employees opposing H.R. 2677, the National Park and National Wildlife Refuge Freedom Act, sponsored by Rep. Don Young of Alaska.

I led the successful effort in the House of Representatives to block its passage (copy of the floor debate and vote attached).

In my view, this so-called “Freedom Act” is a clear affront to the dedicated federal employees of the National Park System. A false assumption underlying this misguided bill is that national park employees possess no special expertise and can be immediately replaced even by National Guard or other state personnel without special training. I couldn’t disagree more.

This legislation is merely political grandstanding, an attempt to divert attention from the Republican leadership’s inability to produce a Department of Interior appropriations bill which is in the public interest and acceptable to the President. Among many flaws, the bill (H.R. 1977) just passed by Congress has numerous offensive legislative riders, including a provision which undercuts the National Park Service’s ability to manage the Mojave National Preserve in California.

Thanks again for your letter. I hope you will clarify for your members my views on this important matter.

— George Miller
Senior Democrat
Committee on Resources
Thank you for your letter regarding legislation I introduced recently, the National Park Freedom Act (H.R. 2677). This bipartisan effort represents simply a good faith attempt on behalf of Congress to keep our national parks and refuges open during short periods of budgetary impasse, as has happened on over 30 occasions during the last 12 years. I would like to address several points raised in your letter.

First, Congress did pass an Interior Appropriations bill (H.R. 1977) prior to the last shutdown, but President Clinton vetoed it.

Second, the decision of which federal employees are deemed emergency, and therefore not furloughed is strictly an administrative decision. The chief of the Forest Service elected to leave every single concessioner who operates on Forest Service lands, from the smallest outfitter to Vail Ski Area, open and declared all of the Forest Service personnel necessary for public safety associated with these concessioners as emergency personnel. The director of the National Park Service elected to close every single National Park Service concession. Interestingly, our committee found that while parks were closed to public use, there were just as many park rangers on duty at many parks during the shutdown as there were prior to the shutdown.

Finally, I must strongly disagree with your contention that only federal employees are uniquely qualified in this country to perform resource management. A growing body of evidence suggests that land management by locally accountable state and county employees is not only almost universally more cost effective than management from Washington, D.C., but results in better resource protection.

"... land management by locally accountable state and county employees is not only almost universally more cost effective than management from Washington, D.C., but results in better resource protection."

— Chairman Don Young

DONALD J. YOUNG
Chairman
Committee on Resources
Caught In The Crossfire

By Mike Hill
Petersburg National Battlefield Park

There is a fundamental debate about the proper role, function, and size of the federal government going on. In November 1995, this debate produced the longest shutdown of that government ever. In December and January it produced an even longer shutdown.

One side of that debate claims that the federal government is too big, too intrusive in everyday life, and costs too much. The other side claims that the responsibility of government is the welfare of the citizens, particularly the old, the poor and the unemployed, and it should do whatever it takes to assure that welfare. Both sides find support for their arguments in the preamble to the Constitution; the first arguing for “the blessings of liberty,” and the second claiming to “promote the general welfare.”

This is not a new occurrence, as only a superficial perusal of the historical holdings of the National Park System will attest. Rather, this kind of debate is something our country has periodically gone through since its founding. It can even be argued that this kind of debate, and the decisions made from it, were the underlying reasons that the Articles of Confederation didn’t work. The same debate, again, brought us our present Constitution; the great Civil War, the Jim Crow response to Reconstruction, and, more recently, the New Deal. We’re at it again. The encouraging thing is that only once did we degenerate from shouting to shooting.

The National Park System is caught in the crossfire of competing ideologies, and may suffer collateral damage. It is equally probable that this uniquely American idea, in the end, will emerge stronger for its antecedents than great, this is a debate of great importance. In its plainest terms this debate is the same as that on the Senate floor in 1872 when legislation to establish the first national park in the world was being considered. That debate centered on the cost of operation of the park and loss to the livestock industry of the valuable grasslands found in the park.

Today it is fundamentally the same debate. The National Park System costs too much to operate and the resources found there could be put to more immediate economic use.

In order to fully understand the nature of the debate and the implications for ourselves and our posterity we need to evaluate and address the underlying assumptions on each side. The extreme conservative position is that government is intrinsically suspect if not outright bad in all cases and that the validity of any federal governmental function should be its specific inclusion in the Constitution. “The question should not be which government services can be privatized, but whether any services should be performed by the government” (attributed to “The Virtues of Privatization,” a March 1995 white paper by the House Budget Committee by The Federal Times, Jan. 22, 1996).

The extreme liberal position is that “promot[ing] the general welfare” is an inclusive concept and that programs that do that are a legitimate function of government. The only remaining questions are: Which level of government? How comprehensive a program? And how is it funded?

Predictably, the opinions of the majority of Americans, as reflected by polls, letters to the editor, and conversations on radio and television talk shows lie between these extremes, most probably on a bell shaped curve distribution. Because of the larger debate, the future of the uniquely American idea of national parks is in jeopardy.

The purpose of national parks has become confused over time and even more in the rhetoric of the debate. The conservatives associate national parks with all other land management agencies (multiple use), the extreme preservationists (historical areas), and, by extension, the pantheistic, agnostic or atheististic “liberal agenda.” They recognize an entertainment and economic value but attribute no moral, ethical or intrinsic value to parks and draw no distinction between the words inspiration and enjoyment in the National Park Service enabling legislation. Many feel that the same ends can be met by the private sector or by other levels of government as well or better.

“Is the height of arrogance to think that people can’t take in the beauty of the Grand Canyon because a federal bureaucrat is not standing at your elbow. I’m hearing that only the federal government can do it right. It’s shocking that the other side thinks the states couldn’t do it...” “There is nothing mystical about being a National Park Service employee. State employees could do as well or better.” (Rep. Shadegg, R-Ariz., House Resources Committee hearing, Dec. 12, 1995)

Some liberals see national parks as a vehicle to further other agendas (i.e., green space, urban revitalization, biological diversity, etc.), and as a form of social program which provides recreation. Certain academics use a university analogy to describe the national park system but neither academics nor liberals question the validity of national parks or even parks generally as a legitimate governmental function.

That the electorate supports the national park idea is obvious. For many years the annual visitation to the national park system has been within a few percentage points of
“For those who believe that the National Park System is an inheritance that we hold in trust for our children, that national parks are one of the things that a truly great nation does, the challenge is to enter the present debate at the basic level.”

the total population of the United States. This “service” has been provided at a 1995 per-capita cost of $5.69. Many people support the “best idea we ever had” but do not or cannot explain why. The National Park Service (NPS) is consistently the most popular federal agency in Roper polls, yet an informal “furlough poll” of an upper middle class professional neighborhood in Virginia could produce no non-NPS people who knew what the NPS does, why it does it, nor why it should. Yet, there was unanimous sentiment that the NPS ought to keep doing it. The widespread support that the NPS enjoys is more intuitive than rational.

The NPS and its most ardent supporters have contributed to making the national park idea a warm fuzzy concept instead of a concrete idea. Park values, heritage preservation, heritage tourism, biological diversity, wilderness values and other jargon doesn't resonate well against concrete, simple “cut the government,” “bureaucrats are bad” kinds of statements. The problem is exacerbated by the fact that the NPS is, in fact, a bureau in the federal government, hence a bureaucracy, and its employees are, by definition, bureaucrats. The conventional wisdom of the time is that the word bureaucrat is an epithet.

“Bureaucracies will do everything they can to protect themselves.” (Rep. Scott Klug, R. Wis., quoted in Federal Times, Jan. 22, 1996) Any explanation of the importance of a National Park System that doesn't resonate with the same clarity as the general anti-government rhetoric will be perceived and portrayed as simple, self-serving bureaucratic survival tactics.

“We in the House are now in control. We do not have to consult with the Senate. We do not have to consult with the Democrats. If we do not like an agency . . . it will not be funded.” (Rep. Tom DeLay, R-Texas, House majority whip, quoted in Federal Times Jan. 22, 1996).

For those who believe that the National Park System is an inheritance that we hold in trust for our children, that national parks are one of the things that a truly great nation does, the challenge is to enter the present debate at the basic level. The need is to speak, not to what kind or how big a System, but why have a System at all and where it fits in the larger scheme of appropriate governmental activities.

The issue is not the survival of the bureau. Rather, the fight should be over the survival of the national park idea, which is not just an idea at this point in human history, but a proven concept that has been emulated throughout the world under a variety of forms of government.

If people believe that the national parks are nothing more than tourist attractions that bring money into the community, or “frills” that a state or county or private enterprise can and should provide instead, then the best idea we ever had is vulnerable. If, on the other hand, people believe that there are some places that are just so important to the people of the United States that they should be held forever as part of the national trust, then and only then can the fringe benefit of income to the local communities be counted on.

If the Smithsonian has been called the nation's attic, the National Park System is the nation's homestead. More than just property, more than just an attraction, the System is a collection of pieces of property that we can afford to own and we would never want to part with, because collectively, they made us what we are.

It would be truly ironic if the United States of America — the richest, most powerful nation in the history of the world, the nation which created the first national park in the world — became the first to dismember a National Park System because it decided that it couldn’t afford it.

Mike Hill is the superintendent at Petersburg National Battlefield Park in Virginia.
FIRESTORM

Nevada Barr’s gripping new mystery finds park ranger Anna Pigeon in the company of a killer after a wildfire flare-up in the remote wilderness of northern California.

A roar filled Anna’s ears. She didn’t know if she was screaming or not. Probably she was. A terrible fear of being crushed by the immensity of what was coming poured through her and she had to fight down a panicked need to throw off the flimsy aluminum shelter and run. Nowhere left, she told herself and she remembered her father’s voice from childhood telling her if she ever became lost to stay put and he’d come find her. Stay put, she told herself.

She must have spoken the words aloud because fine, burning grit filled her mouth and throat. Each breath scorched the membranes of her nose and fired deep in her lungs.

Wind grabbed at the shelter, tore up the edges, thrusting fistfuls of super-heated air beneath. Pushing her elbows and knees against the bottom of the shelter where it folded under, Anna fought to hold the shelter down, the fire out.

Her mind rattled, grabbed onto a prayer long forgotten: now I lay me down to sleep — The end flashed like a telegram behind her eyes before the first words were formed and she jettisoned the rest as too prophetic.

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America . . . She filled her mind with soundless shouting. An impotent wizard fending off genuine magic with a barren incantation.

All hell broke loose above and around her.

Fire pierced the aluminum tent in a dozen places. Sparks were falling, burning through: the shelter was a scam. Soon she would burst into flame. Spurts of adrenaline wracked the insides. With the odd unpleasant thrill came a stray thought: how much of the stuff could one gland secrete? Surely a quart had been pumped through her veins in the last hour.

Red, burning, a spark fell on her sleeve. She flicked her arm but couldn’t dislodge it. No smolder of cloth followed, no burning through to the flesh. With a jolt of relief that brought tears to her eyes she realized the sparks were not sparks, not embers, but pinholes along the folds in her shelter. The orange light was the light of the fire, but outside glowing through. Classes in fire behavior she’d thought long forgotten came back to her. All shelters had these pinpricks, signs of wear and age. Normal. Okay. Normal. One nation under God, indivisible . . .

A slap as of a giant hand smashed down on her shoulders and breath gusted from her lungs. She sucked in fire and clamped her jaws closed against it. The shelter pressed down on her back, the saving pocket of air squeezed away. The yellow pack she wore protected her spine but the skin on her shoulders bubbled and Anna bucked. The tent was pushed up off her back and the searing dropped to a tolerable level.

Her nose and eyes were packed with ash and dirt. Through the thick leather gloves the little fingers of both hands, flat on the ground and holding down the shelter, began to throb. They kept the tent down, the devil out, and Anna didn’t dare pull them away from the heat.

With liberty and justice for all.

Burrowing blind as a mole, she pushed into the sand and blessed all events social and geological that had formed the creek bed and led her into it before the storm broke. Sand wouldn’t burn. A mental image of the creek bed melted, a ribbon of molten glass with their bodies burned into it like flies trapped in amber, flickered through her mind and she started again: I pledge allegiance . . .

The blessing hadn’t extended to Hamlin. The ledge they’d left him on was covered in brush, half a foot deep in leaves and litter. LeFleur: maybe he’d cleared a space for the boy, covered him with a fire shelter. But it was no good. It would only prolong the burning. Newt Hamlin was toast. A ludicrous cartoon version of Wile E. Coyote burned to a crisp sprang up from Anna’s subconscious.

And to the republic for which it stands . . .

The air was too hot to breathe. Anna pressed her lips to the sand, sucking slowly as her grandmother had once taught her to suck tea
through a sugar cube. The little fingers of both hands hurt so bad she would have wept but there was no moisture in this convection oven shroud. No sweat, no tears. What was the temperature, she wondered. Five hundred degrees stuck in her mind but she didn’t know if she’d read it, heard it, or was making it up.

Five hundred degrees. Anna pushed her mind back to the days when she was still a meat eater. Chicken was baked at three-fifty. Roast beef at maybe four hundred. Twenty or thirty minutes for each pound. One hundred and eighteen pounds at five hundred degrees Fahrenheit — two thousand minutes. Numbers scrambled and Anna gave up the exercise. It would be a while before she was fully baked.

One nation . . .
Pinpricks of light on the right side of her tent swelled, the burning orange pushing through with such intensity they painted her sleeve like the beams from the laser sight on a high-powered rifle. The skin on her little fingers burned. In her mind’s eye she saw it curling away, blackened and seared, leaving only the clean white of finger bones.

Noise crested, became solid, clogged the machinery of her ears and mind. Her head filled with the roar till it seemed it must explode. Her lungs were crushed with it, the bones of her body shaking, softening as if the molecules vibrated against each other. Anna hunkered into the sand, thought, like breath and sight and hearing, blasted away.

Award-winning novelist Nevada Barr is the author of three previous Anna Pigeon mysteries, Track of the Cat, A Superior Death and Ill Wind. She lives in Mississippi and is a ranger on the Natchez Trace Parkway.
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A QUESTION OF BALANCE

By Myra Dec and Kim Sikoryak

Acts of aggression and violence toward uniformed National Park Service personnel in the performance of their duties is increasing. These acts range from verbal abuse to threats to physical attacks, some of which have resulted in death. This violence is not gender specific and the statistics may shock you.

In 1993 the authors, then of the Southwest Region, began a research endeavor to assess the degree of violence occurring as well as the need for training which would provide conflict management skills to non-commissioned personnel. Less than one-half of all uniformed 025 series National Park Service Rangers are commissioned and/or trained in skills that could decrease their risk of falling victim to a crime of violence while on duty. In 1994 a survey was completed in the Southwest Region among non-commissioned personnel.

The results from this survey showed these situations had occurred to personnel while on duty:

Survey of Employees Experiencing Violent Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>% Experiencing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>felt threatened</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbally attacked</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>touched or grabbed in an inappropriate manner</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt threatened or in danger by someone they knew</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealt with those under the influence of drugs or alcohol</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealt with groups such as gangs, political activists</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt unable to handle interpersonal situations due to lack of training</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threatened or physically attacked going to or from work</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealt with those under the influence of drugs or alcohol</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealt with groups such as gangs, political activists</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt unable to handle interpersonal situations due to lack of training</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threatened or physically attacked going to or from work</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were verbally attacked</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>were touched or grabbed in an inappropriate manner</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt threatened or in danger by someone they knew</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealt with those under the influence of drugs or alcohol</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dealt with groups such as gangs, political activists</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt unable to handle interpersonal situations due to lack of training</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threatened or physically attacked going to or from work</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey also asked respondents what training would be beneficial. Skills identified include:

1. How to read an encounter and determine when an unusual or uncomfortable situation is becoming potentially dangerous.
2. How to assess situational risk, and how to minimize or avoid risk.
3. How to defuse hostile situations, or at least prevent escalation until help arrives.
4. How to hold your own in a conversation without being argumentative.
5. How to escape a dangerous situation or buy time until help arrives.
6. How to use non-verbal signals to look professional and be treated with respect.
7. How to identify individuals and groups that may present problems.
8. How to provide training in this area for co-workers.

In 1994 when this survey was initiated, there were 7,351 rangers employed by the NPS (3,541 permanent and 3,810-3,520 seasonal employees depending on the season). There were 1,520 permanent commissions and about 900 seasonal commissions at that time. It was difficult to determine how many non-commissioned rangers had been attacked because those statistics were not maintained. A yearly report, “Assaults on Federal Officers,” determines how many commissioned rangers are subjected to violence, but doesn’t report aggression towards non-commissioned 025 series employees. By examining the prior three years of morning reports, conducting a survey and contacting OWCP for lost work/wage records, we determined that at least 25 percent of non-commissioned rangers reported being harassed, threatened or attacked on the job.

Additional statistics are sobering, although common: 42 percent of women employed by the federal government have been sexually harassed, and one out of every four women will likely be the victim of rape. But the issue of violence is not a women’s issue, it is a human issue.

In 1994, Forbes Magazine presented its readers with a surprising statistic: 9 percent of rapes occurring annually, outside of prison, occur to men. Acts of aggression that perhaps were commonly considered to be gender specific, are not.

The Vail Agenda made it clear that professionalism is paramount: “The National Park Service must create and maintain a highly professional organization and work force” (p.4).

It also recognized changing social dynamics in the 1990s: “Finally, law enforcement, particularly in the urban parks, has become a more complicated task as drugs and urban violence ignore park boundaries. At the same time, the isolation of some rural parks has proved an irresistible lure to other forms of criminality” (p. 45).

The Service’s response to these trends has focused on the needs of protection rangers dealing with changing criminality, when in fact we all deal with it first-hand and often alone. While conducting the survey in the Southwest, we received this comment from a GS-5 Fire Management employee:

“I had seasonal LE training in 1983 and worked a long season in LE (front-country/backcountry/fee collection). I learned how to deal with a great number of potentially hazardous situations and have used those skills several times over
the years in non-commissioned jobs. All NPS personnel should be able to recognize the signs of drug or alcohol intoxication and serious mental illness. I've been able to avoid DUIs on the way to and from work, dealt with intoxicated visitors and dealt with armed mentally ill visitors and felons. If you can recognize a bad situation setting up, you increase your time options in getting yourself out safely. Working with Interp and Fire, I have felt/been threatened much more often than I ever did working in a law enforcement function.

As the evidence mounted, it became clear that the issue at hand was often, very simply, "survival." How long does it take for a rape, kidnapping, beating or murder to occur? Less than five minutes? We know that in a life-threatening situation, help may not arrive fast enough. Statistics prove that.

Do we train non-commissioned personnel to assess risk, to understand their limits and options, to buy survival time? We know that non-commissioned personnel are most often the ones to first encounter the public either at fee booths, in visitors centers, at programs or on trails. This includes the drunk, the hostile, the mentally deranged, the opportunistic criminal and others.

We know that without information and training regarding situation assessment, non-commissioned personnel will not be able to make the best professional decisions for themselves or their area. Without team pre-planning when a conflict does occur — and it will — the employee without training will be left to make a monumental decision in a frightened, confused and impaired state.

It is not a question of if a ranger will be confronted by conflict, but a question of how they will identify and resolve that conflict. As trainers and managers, we have a great deal of influence in how these conflict scenarios play out. The issue, then, is not only survival, but how the Service values the personal worth of non-commissioned rangers.

In the first Essential Interpretive Skills course, offered in 1995, Mather Training Center included an elective component entitled "Incident Survival," instructed by Kim Sikoryak and Bill Gwaltney. The response was extremely positive.

In preparation for this course and three smaller pilot courses, Paul Henry at FLETC served as an adviser and reviewed text/lesson plans. The combination of non-commissioned and commissioned views provided a well-balanced program. Topics included: personal assessment, risk assessment, problem solving, stress management, threat assessment, facility assessment, fear management and response strategies. The training helped participants understand their strengths and weaknesses, and set goals for improvement. It provided information on new communication skills regarding escalation, and introduced the participants many assessment tools.

The issue of self-defense response techniques remains controversial. Some non-commissioned rangers feel comfortable in the knowledge that they have not yet been personally involved in such incidents. Some commissioned rangers feel uncomfortable with the idea that non-commissioned personnel should receive any self-defense training less than that afforded law enforcement staff. Meanwhile, more than half the ranger corps feels unprepared to handle the conflict that might be just around the corner.

While researching the topic of violence in the NPS over the past three years, we have spoken with many non-commissioned men and women who have been kidnapped, bound, beaten, raped and shot. They remain dedicated to the NPS in spite of the lack of concern that they have been given regarding their safety and well-being.

The NPS enjoys a professional, dedicated ranger force worth training and empowering to buy their own survival time.

Statistics, and the people behind the statistics, tell us that aggression toward untrained, non-commissioned rangers is escalating at an alarming rate. In the balance of budget and training, where does this issue fall out? What weight do we place on the value of an individual?

Knowledge is power. The NPS possesses the knowledge that acts of aggression reach over one-half of its ranger force, as well as the knowledge it can impart to that staff to help them survive that aggression. From Washington to field offices to each superintendent and chief, that knowledge carries with it the responsibility to tip the scales of survival in our favor.

It's a question of balance. ☐
IRF Update

By Bill Halainen
Delaware Water Gap

Although actions continue on several fronts, including networking, preparation of conference proceedings, and development of ethics standards for rangers, the main issue of interest to both IRF and this association at present concerns selection of the site for the next world ranger congress.

Past ANPR President Rick Smith traveled to Costa Rica (at no cost to ANPR) with IRF Chairman Gordon Miller in January to evaluate the country as a possible site for the next congress. Over a five-day period they inspected many hotels; met with members of Acorena, the Costa Rican ranger federation affiliate; interviewed the principal in a company that would like to serve as the federation affiliate; and met with many key figures and organizations, including the Minister for Natural Resources.

Smith reports that “without exception, everyone in the government and everyone in the private sector was very enthusiastic about a potential congress in Costa Rica.”

The Costa Rican National Park Foundation and an NGO (non-governmental organization) that funds a conservation area both promised to provide financial support to fund Costa Rican ranger participation in the congress. The minister will write a letter of support that can be used to help convince other IRF nations that the congress should be held in Costa Rica. Smith and Miller also were told the president of Costa Rica will be asked to write a letter of support that can be used in fund raising should the congress be held there.

Miller will travel to South Africa in March to review sites, then will ask member countries to chose between the two so organizational efforts can begin in April. If Costa Rica is selected, Miller will ask ANPR to serve as the chief organizing association, as Acorena is still in the developmental phase. Smith has volunteered to head up a group of retirees to work on organizing the meeting.

Omega World Travel

The Association has signed an agreement with Omega World Travel, headquartered in Falls Church, Va. Omega is one of the top travel companies in the United States and is the largest woman-owned travel agency in the world. All travel booked through Omega will directly benefit the Association in the form of travel credits for official Association travel or cash rebates to the Association.

Any personal travel (including transportation, car rentals, hotels, cruises, package tours and more) by members or their families, friends or acquaintances qualifies under the program.

Omega guarantees it will provide the lowest airfare at the time of ticketing or it will refund double the difference. Also, if a traveler is dissatisfied with any portion of a trip, Omega will refund 100 percent of its commissions on that portion of the trip.

Omega will provide ticket delivery via overnight mail, or it can provide prepaid tickets to any airport or airline ticket office. In addition, Omega’s 24-hour, toll-free number (800-US-Omega), accessible nationwide, can be used for information or difficulties encountered during travel.

Make travel reservations by calling this Omega branch office:
Omega World Travel
12711 Shops Lane • Fairfax, VA 22033-3834
(703) 818-8848 • (800) 283-3239 • (703) 818-8822
Hours: 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. M-F; 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. (Eastern time)


In Print

Dwight Rettie signs copies of his book at last year's Ranger Rendezvous in St. Paul, Minn.

Our National Park System: Carving for America's Greatest Natural and Historic Treasures;
Dwight F. Rettie; University of Illinois Press; 1995.

By Russ Dickenson

very member of the Association of National Park Rangers should read this carefully researched and scholarly study of the National Park System. Dwight Rettie has produced an outstanding review and analysis of the many unusual contributing factors in the evolution of the System.

Oldtimers quickly note that the concept of "System" is largely a latter-day concept. Perhaps so, perhaps not. Rettie sets the stage for how it happened.

For anyone in the legislative arena, NPS support groups, and admirers of parks, it is important to know the history, policies and issues that brought the Service to this remarkable critical point in time. Dwight accomplishes this with straightforward, readable chapters, reflecting his long experience in the park and recreation profession. More specifically, it reflects the insights gained in the daily grind of Service operations. The issues, episodes and policy dilemmas are described with clarity. After all, the author was a participant in many.

I was there, too. As a contemporary, I credit Rettie not only with the accuracy and quality of his research, his understanding of the issues, but his basic fairness.

No "kiss-and-tell" in this book; no trash­ing of enemies and/or comrades. Just straightforward and thoughtful observations regarding the National Park System, what is needed, and probably required for the future.

Stewart Udall, former secretary of the Interior Department, has written a remarkable and memorable foreword.

This is a must. Read this book! Training centers, take notice.

Russ Dickenson was the director of the National Park Service from 1980-1985.

(Rettie's book may be ordered toll-free at (800) 545-4703 at a special 20-percent publisher's discount for ANPR and ANPME members. Mention your membership when ordering.)

Seasonal Survey Moves to Electronic Age

A NPR members at the Rendezvous in St. Paul last November decided ANPR should renew the seasonal hiring survey. Because survey costs weren't a budgeted item, using electronic mail was suggested.

Two furloughs and the "Blizzard of '96" delayed "mailing" of the survey, park responses and follow-up requests. When WASO extended the summer seasonal application deadline to Feb. 8, postcards were mailed to all ANPR seasonal members to let them know.

Just over 200 parks responded to the survey. Twenty parks said they hired no seasonals last summer. Many more expect tighter budgets will mean no or fewer seasonals in 1996. Several parks that expect to hire no seasonals were on WASO's list summer 1996 list.

The survey was sent via America Online to the generic Internet addresses all parks are supposed to have: XXXX_Administration@nps.gov (where XXXX is the park's four-letter acronym).

The survey asked parks to report on actual positions hired in summer 1995 and to comment on possible hiring for 1996.

The parks that responded hired 1,171 interpretive rangers, 442 law enforcement rangers and 418 general rangers in summer 1995. Rehires accounted for 55 percent of the interpretive and general positions, and 65 percent of the law enforcement posts.

Forty parks reported using Ad Hoc (supplemental) WASO registers to fill one or more positions. Fifty-three parks said they used local vacancy announcements to fill one or more positions. (The use of Ad Hoc registers means the park exhausted its regular register. Local vacancy announcements can mean an exhausted register or a season that starts before the summer register is available.)

The survey also asked about seasonal positions that are no longer in the ranger series. (These positions are currently filled through local vacancy announcements or OPM tests.) The parks that responded hired a total of 182 biological technicians (42 percent rehires), 193 forestry technicians (63 percent rehires), 79 cash clerks (37 percent rehires), 66 visitor use assistants (53 percent rehires), and 28 guides (57 percent rehires).

Parks were also asked about housing. Of those that responded, 12 percent have housing for all seasonals, 20 percent have housing for most seasonals, 18 percent have housing for some seasonals, 41 percent have no housing for seasonals, and 9 percent didn't answer. Forty parks said they have trailer/RV spaces available for seasonals.

Overall, the responses were good and should help seasonals narrow their selections and use their two choices wisely. They also should help seasonals find additional positions advertised through local vacancy announcements. The survey results were mailed to ANPR seasonal members the last week in January.

— Kathy Williams
Columbia Cascades SSO

RANGER: THE JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL PARK RANGERS
Rendezvous XX heads to Corpus Christi

Plan to attend this year's Rendezvous XX — the 20th anniversary of ANPR. It is scheduled from Nov. 4-9 in Corpus Christi, also called the Isles of Texas.

One of the most popular tropical destinations in the country, the area has miles of beautiful Gulf beaches, fun family activities and unique meeting facilities. Rendezvous will be headquartered at the Corpus Christi Marriott Bayfront, which overlooks Corpus Christi Bay. It's just a short distance to Padre Island National Seashore.

The room rate for single and doubles will be $59 per night. Reservations can be made by calling toll-free, (800) 874-4585 before Oct. 3.

The hotel features restaurants, a comedy club, health club, indoor/outdoor pool, whirlpool and saunas. Racquetball courts are available, as well as an 18-hole championship golf course.

Among the area's attractions are more than 130 miles of beaches, world-class sport fishing, sailing and water skiing, Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Corpus Christi Museum, Texas State Aquarium, USS Lexington Museum and the Columbus Fleet. Other activities include birding and sailboarding.

The average temperature in November is about 66 degrees, while the average rainfall is less than 2 inches.

National parks within a reasonable distance from Corpus Christi include Amistad, San Antonio Missions and Big Thicket. Most air travel to Corpus Christi goes through Dallas or Houston. The Corpus Christi International Airport is just 10 minutes from downtown.

To reflect the importance of this anniversary, this Rendezvous will be different, exciting and one not to be missed!

Ten Years Ago in Ranger

The black-and-white cover on the Spring 1986 issue showed a 1940s graphic of a ranger standing before a burnt forest. The poster said: “Worth Fighting For: Help Your Park Ranger PREVENT FIRES.” The issue was dedicated to “Fire Management in the NPS.” The lead article on the subject was written by Scott Erickson, fire management specialist in the WASO branch of fire in Boise, ID. Relying extensively on Stephen Pyne's definitive work on fire, “Fire in America,” Scott recognized that fire “is a phenomena which touches the lives of everyone who works in or manages cultural or natural areas which are in any degree covered by wild vegetation,” which leaves few of us out. Rick Gale, not yet ANPR president, wrote an article on the National Incident Management Teams, in which he said the NPS “has never had a systematic program for identifying and developing future members of national level fire teams.”

Maureen Finnerty, as ANPR president, reported on a meeting with Director Mott, in which she elicited their support for several employee issues, including the new seasonal insurance program sponsored by ANPR. She also deflected the director's concerns regarding his “perceived heavy law enforcement image displayed by some rangers in parks he has visited.” She suggested he take a broader look at the public image that NPS employees present, from uniform wear, to vehicle maintenance, to treatment of park visitors. In a letter to the editor, John Cook, then from Great Smokies, suggested in his “first letter to the editor — maybe my last” that the “next time you [ANPR] get the Director captive” that you “let him know not only our concerns about us, the Service, but the preservation of the System.” (How are we doing in 1996, folks?)

Finally, an Editor’s Notes section (Bill Halainen, editor) remarked that this issue of Ranger was being sent, at the request of the chief warden's office, “to 00 wardens throughout the Canadian national parks,” and that ANPR had developed contacts with rangers in Australia, Bermuda, Scotland and New Zealand. The seeds of IRF were being sown, and 10 years later they have born fruit. World Parks — World Guardians.
The past few months have been busy for this Association, as we took actions to protect the National Park System and its employees from threats on several fronts. The following is a brief summary of those actions. The full texts of the documents alluded to can be found in SitRep, ANPR’s in-house newsletter, which is available from your regional rep.

State Management of National Parks

Legislation proposed by Rep. Don Young, R-Alaska, would permit the Secretary to accept donations of services of “qualified State employees to perform in a Unit, in a period of Government budgetary shutdown, functions otherwise authorized to be performed by Department of Interior personnel.” It also applied to national wildlife refuges.

The bill submitted by Sen. McCain, R-Ariz., had language which would authorize the Secretary to enter into an agreement “with a State and political subdivisions of the State” to operate the parks during such shutdowns and “during any period in a fiscal year in which the National Park Service is unable to maintain the normal level of park operations.” It also authorized the Secretary to use available appropriations to “provide any training that employees of the State or political subdivisions of the State may need to perform operations.”

ANPR and ANPME spoke out forcefully against these bills in letters to the chairmen and ranking members of the relevant authorizing committees.

ANPR received responses from Senior Committee Democrat George Miller and Committee Chairman Don Young. (See copies of these letters on page 10, Better Resource Management?)

We are continuing to closely watch Congress for further signs of action on these bills in conjunction with our colleagues in ANPME, NPCA and the Service.

Furlough Furore

Just after the second of the two recent government shutdowns came to an end, President Adams sent a letter to Secretary Babbitt pointing out some of the serious impacts the shutdowns had had on the Service. The letter was sent to him because those in the NPS were already conversant with the issues, and those on the Hill were conversant and/or disinterested. These were the issues raised in the letter:

1. The nature of the shutdowns was a problem. Some have called them “designer” shutdowns, in which only those agencies were closed which were either symbolic or had hard-to-notice impacts on the public, thereby allowing opponents of the government to contend that the lack of severe consequences demonstrated that some agencies are unnecessary.
2. No effort was made to point out that impacts would necessarily be minimal in a short duration shutdown that occurs during a holiday period, and that a shutdown of six months or a year would have much more serious consequences and reveal the full scope and nature of the important work we do.
3. The partial opening of some parks further compromised the impact of the shutdown.
4. The terms “essential” and “non-essential” were divisive and gave the impression that some employees could be easily eliminated.
5. The practice of paying both those who worked and those who were furloughed exactly the same wages raised serious and legitimate questions about the fairness of such an arrangement — and an inevitable reluctance by some members of the former group to carry the burden for all.
6. Precedent was established for state involvement in management of the national parks.

President Adams closed the letter by stating that “the cumulative effect of the shutdowns on the employees of the National Park Service can be summed up in one sentence: The closures have been deeply disturbing, discouraging and disheartening.” She encouraged the Secretary to share these perspectives with the President and to work with the Congress to assure that no such shutdowns occur in the future.

Letters on “Visitor Services”

The continuing resolution that ended the second furlough had a provision in it which stipulated that the NPS could only expend funds on “projects and activities necessary to accommodate visitors and to provide for visitor services in the National Park System . . .” Shortly after its passage, ANPR became aware of a debate within the Department over interpretation of that provision. A narrow interpretation, which some favored, could have led to a furlough through the end of the fiscal year for many NPS employees.

Following consultation with other officers and boardmembers, President Adams took several actions in strong opposition to such an interpretation — letters faxed to Secretary Babbitt, Director Kennedy and the members of the National Leadership Council; letters faxed to the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate and House authorizing and appropriating committees with NPS oversight; and a letter distributed throughout the ANPR network asking members and employees to write to both the Administration and Congress in opposition to such a move.

The two key points in these letters were that visitor services can’t be separated from all other NPS activities, and that visitor services involve the employees of all the varied professional and support disciplines in the NPS on a day-to-day basis.

Although no formal replies to these letters were received, ANPR’s position in support of all NPS employees drew solid support and favorable comments from around the Service.

The issue became moot when Congress passed a new, broader continuing resolution in late January. ANPR will continue to monitor all such documents in the future and will oppose any similar efforts — ill thought out or otherwise — that threaten the Service or its employees. — Bill Halainen, Delaware Water Gap
Newly elected national officers for ANPR

Ken Mabery, re-elected to a second two-year term as ANPR's vice president of professional issues, is the management assistant at El Malpais National Monument in New Mexico. He joined the El Malpais staff in 1988 as chief ranger until his promotion last October.

Other NPS positions have been ranger activities specialist at Southwest Regional Office in Santa Fe, superintendent at Fort Union in northeastern New Mexico and at Pecos National Monument, and chief ranger at El Morro and Chaco Culture.

As the son of a Park Service employee, Mabery spent his high school years in the Arches and Canyonlands areas. He has bachelor's degrees in international relations and geology from New Mexico Highlands University, and a master's in resource geography from Oregon State University. His favorite pastime is collecting Indian arts and crafts.

Mabery's goals as an ANPR officer are to broaden membership involvement in ANPR business, scope and address professional issues in a timely manner, and enhance community involvement.

Mabery lives in Grants, N.M., with his wife, Marilyne, and their two cats.

Bill Halainen, ANPR's new vice president for communications, has been a ranger in the NPS since 1974. He first worked as a seasonal interpreter at Little Bighorn and Mesa Verde, then as a permanent protection ranger at Colonial and Minute Man.

Between 1985 and 1994, he worked in Ranger Activities in WASO as Service-wide uniform program manager and communications specialist. Since then he has been a management assistant at Delaware Water Gap.

Halainen joined ANPR in 1979 and was editor of Ranger from 1982 to 1993. He has served in various other capacities, including liaison to the International Ranger Federation.

He lives in Milford, Pa., with his wife, Cathy, and their two children.

Sarah Craighead, newly elected ANPR treasurer, has stepped down from her previous post as Rocky Mountain regional representative.

Currently she is the assistant chief of interpretation at Mesa Verde. She grew up in Kentucky and earned a bachelor's degree in biology from Transylvania University in Lexington, Ky.

She started working for the NPS in college as a seasonal at Mammoth Cave. Her first permanent job was at Independence, and she also has worked at Acadia, Ocmulgee NM, Carlsbad Caverns, Grand Canyon, Manassas National Battlefield and National Capital Regional Office.

She and her husband, Rick Shireman, and two dogs live at Mesa Verde.

Five Regional Posts Filled
ANPR members also elected regional representatives for five of ANPR's 10 regions.

There were 304 ballots counted. More than 40 ballots had postmarks after the Jan. 5, 1996, deadline and weren't tallied.

Elected to a one-year term was David Kratz in the North Atlantic Region. Other winners, all for two-year terms, are:

Darlene Koontz, Southeast Region, FLETIC
Barry Sullivan, Mid-Atlantic Region, Delaware Water Gap
Judy Chetwin, Southwest Region, Southwest System Support Office
Meg Weesner, Western Region, Saguaro
Kathy Jope, Pacific Northwest Region, Columbia Cascades System Support Office

ANPR members will vote to fill these offices in the next election in December. All are two-year terms. People interested in running for an office should contact Cindy Ott-Jones, Nominations Committee (address and phone on back cover).

President
Secretary
North Atlantic Region
National Capital Region
Midwest Region
Rocky Mountain Region
Alaska Region
Resource Management

The National Biological Service (NBS) is being merged into the U.S. Geological Survey, even before Congress passes the FY '96 budget bill for Interior, which mandates the changeover. The principal agencies, as well as their clients (e.g., the NPS), are nervous and reluctant, but talks commenced during the winter to make the transition as painless as possible.

Behind the scenes, it appears that there may be more willingness on the part of the department to consider letting the NPS recover or buy back some of our former scientists. We certainly don’t have the FTEs or dollars to pay for these positions. There’s also concern we may see Servicewide project funds for natural resources used to cover salaries if the scientists return to our fold.

It's a terrible dilemma: we’ve seen almost a complete erosion of our own research capability since the advent of the NBS, but is the cost of getting it back worth the erosion of a good part of the rest of the natural resources program? My own preference will be viewed by some as heartless, but I think we need to be both aggressive and careful here. Let’s make an attempt to get back those park-based (and occasional CPSU-based) scientists that contributed significantly to park management needs, and offer our best wishes to the rest.

Training. The Servicewide natural resources training program, like other disciplines, has been on hold while training is revamped for the entire agency. There will be an effort, however, to hold the new “Fundamentals of Natural Resource Management” course this year, with the costs paid for by outside funds if they can be secured.

Information Management/Data. Two items of interest here. The new Natural Resources Information Division (NRID) in Fort Collins has a chief, Rich Gregory, who was until recently the head of the NBS Information transfer program. He’s a fisheries biologist who used to be with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Of more direct import to parks, the defense/intelligence community is expanding the availability of classified imagery to NPS and other land management agencies. We have to use it under very controlled conditions but can generate byproducts such as vegetation maps that then can be used without restriction. For more information, contact Leslie Armstrong of the NRID at (303) 969-2964.

— Bob Krumenaker

Shenandoah

Graduate FellowshipHonors Park Service Historian

National Park Service Director Roger Kennedy, his wife, Frances H. Kennedy, and the National Park Foundation have created the Edwin C. Bearrs Fellowship to support graduate education in American history and studies.

The fellowship is open to all employees career employees with at least five years of service who are engaged in historical research and education. Director and Mrs. Kennedy announced the fellowship Feb. 9 at a retirement party honoring Bearrs.

Bearrs retired Sept. 30, 1995, after a distinguished 40-year career as an NPS historian. He was chief historian for the NPS from 1981 until 1994. He began as a park historian at Vicksburg National Military Park, where he initiated a research project that led to the discovery and raising of the gunboat, Cairo. Bearrs is a leading author-
ANPR Reports

Vice President, Professional Issues

It is difficult to think of a more pressing professional issue (or group of issues) than the effects of recent political furloughs. The furloughs may be over for this year, although the future is unclear for March 15’s effect on some federal employees, including some in the Park Service.

In the last 20 or so years, the Park Service has weathered political and professional attacks from Secretaries of the Interior (remember James Watt?), and the Administration in general (remember the years of “Fed Bashing?”). I much prefer those good old days to what we just came through. Although the public outcry against closing national parks and indiscriminate attacks on the need for “non-essential” federal employees, was less than commanding at the outset of the furloughs, the groundswell did arrive. I hope you have seen the letters from Director Kennedy, Deputy Director Reynolds, ANPR President Deanne Adams and NPCA’s President Paul Pritchard. Other letters have been distributed less widely, but the sentiment was the same: The National Park Service and its employees are great stewards of our nation’s heritage.

Even if the furloughs are over for this year, the assault on our jobs is not. Nor will it be until the nation has a balanced budget—or until the nation stands up collectively and individually and says that national parks are worth preserving as a first cut in the budget debate.

This is the status the military and NASA enjoyed during the Cold War. The nation demanded that NASA and the military have plenty of money to guard against the spread of communism and insure that the U.S. win the race for space (and related technologies). While other programs were subject to congressional scrutiny and debate, only brief attention was given to expenditures that kept the “Red Horde” at bay.

How does the Park Service achieve this status? Can we continue to do our jobs and let public support insure the continuation of the national park concept and environmental protection? Are there other ways that federal employee professionals can spread the word? Despite the National Park Service’s recent approval rating of 69 percent (Roper Poll), this rating has been slipping in recent years. The Vail Agenda gives us some tools, well within our professional mandate, including partnerships and education programs. At the last Ranger Rendezvous, Director Kennedy reminded us that federal employees retain their constitutional rights to freedom of speech and expression.

Remember that parks continue to be reservoirs of natural processes and human history. Through our stewardship, they are outstanding laboratories for environmental education and places where people (not just visitors) can learn to challenge themselves and their understanding of mankind’s place in the world. These are messages that we have delivered to receptive audiences for years. The challenge today is to reach out to less receptive audiences. If people are not listening, perhaps we are not delivering the messages in the appropriate manner.

WASO Responds

Editor’s Note: This letter was sent electronically to Vice President for Professional Issues Ken Mabery from Associate Director for Administration Mary Bradford.

I was looking through the latest Ranger magazine yesterday, and saw your article about useless and excessive guidelines and polices that constrain management and employees. Terrific. It was a good piece, and I’d like to build on it by telling you what has been happening on that front recently, and how we are proceeding to eliminate or streamline many of the very things you mention.

May I expound? It’s Sunday as I write this, and am sitting on an airplane . . .

You may be familiar with the effort underway governmentwide to reduce internal management regs (guidelines, special directives, special directives and the like.) We had been told that the Department planned a major effort, and when they got rid of stuff, we could piggyback on their work because many egregious departmental requirements would be eliminated. Well, as you can imagine, it was mostly all hat and no horse, as they say in Texas.

So, we looked at our own house to examine what we were doing to ourselves. After several false starts (case-by-case analyses, old delegations proposals, compiling lists of don’ts, etc.), we have come up with a very promising solution. We have developed, through our records management folks, a full list of all special directives, guidelines, and other policy documents that WASO has issued over the years. We then sorted them by the office with the responsibility to issue and maintain them — and wow, was it enlightening. There is stuff in there that is ancient (leftover 1970s rules); pointless and widely ignored (policy on use of blue envelopes, for example); excessively controlling (cultural comes to mind); and things that make sense in principle but are too detailed to be of much use.

I had a meeting with all the WASO associate directors and shared the list, and tasked them all to review everything in their realm, scrub the list, and recommend delegations to the field wherever possible. I will send you, via cc:Mail, a copy of the document distributed to them. One fascinating aspect — John Reynolds was as stunned as I by this — is that the largest majority of such directives is housed in Operations and Educa-
tion. What a list. Housing stuff, rules of all sorts, NPS-9, dams reports, etc. After that are Admin and Cultural, followed by Professional Services (including Office of Policy, which handles such things as use of the arrowhead), with Natural Resources the least oppressive. I think when I was asked to take on this project, it was naturally assumed that most would be administrative in nature — not so. Each profession lays many of their problems on themselves.

So what does it mean and when will we see some relief? I hope to have a full reform package together by the end of March. In addition to my staff, we finally have someone devoted to this project from the Solicitor’s office to help us over the legal/legislative hurdles. And all the Associate Directors have designated a keyperson to clean this up. It is my expectation that nearly 50% of what is out there will be eliminated or redelegated — maybe more, if we can loosen the deathgrip of program managers — including 025ers.

What are non-legal hurdles? Well, it turns out that every policy or directive, no matter how obscure, has a defender.

You mention NPS-9 as a good thing. Yet Maureen and the rest of us have been inundated with negative comments from all over about that one — probably the most controversial guideline to come out in long time. So you see it won’t be easy, on any front. One person’s nonsense is another’s raison d’etre.

Tony Sisto and Bill Halainen are copied on this because this project could be a topic for a short piece in Ranger next issue, if you think anyone would be interested. Ain’t as sexy as SAR or even retirement notes, but may be worth a line or two. You can plagiarize from this any way you like.

It sure does affect the way we do business and how people think of WASO. I know there’s a widespread impression we are just sitting on our hands, but that doesn’t match the energy and initiative that I see devoted to streamlining, particularly in Administration and Professional Services, as we lose lots of staff here.

Take care, and I hope you’ll join the effort with us.

—Mary Bradford
Associate Director for Administration

Vice President, Communications and Representation

My focus over the next two years will be on matters falling under two headings — those pertaining to communications, representation and other projects within this post’s bailiwick, and those pertaining to the developing struggle to protect the integrity of the System and the Service.

Goals under the former are to:
- increase the contents, relevance and frequency of SitReport, the Association’s internal newsletter;
- develop an electronic mail version of the newsletter for dissemination to members and subscribers;
- establish an ANPR publications program, focusing initially on professional papers;
- develop a membership brochure that explicitly states the virtues of belonging to ANPR;
- greatly strengthen liaisons with kin-

dred associations in both the United States and overseas;
- work to further strengthen the contents and quality of Ranger;
- seek board members who have been in the Association for fewer than 10 years;
- develop a comprehensive program for relations and regular communications with the media.

Goals to protect the integrity of the System and the Service are still being developed with the board in response to rapidly changing political, financial and organizational realities. They will conform to three primary themes — renewal of traditions, strengthening of community, and development of a thematically unified, sustained, flexible and comprehensive program for championing the National Park Service and National Park System.

—Bill Halainen
Delaware Water Gap

NEW ANPR ITEMS FOR SALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COST</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quill Pen with ANPR logo</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bic Metal Point Pen with ANPR logo (gray or black, circle color)</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulated mug, large (20 oz.)</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulated mug, small (12 oz.)</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattoo</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shipping & Handling
Orders up to $10 ... $3.50
$10.10 to $20 ....... $4.00
$20.10 to $50 ....... $5.00
$50.01 to $100 ...... $7.00
Over $100 ........... $10.00

VA residents add 4.5% sales tax
Shipping & handling (see chart)

TOTAL (U.S. currency only)

Send order form and check, payable to ANPR, to:
Pat Thompson
310 Carrsbrook Drive
Charlottesville, VA 22901
Regional Reports

Pacific Northwest

Thanks to all who voted in the recent election. Your active participation in the Association is what makes it work.

I appreciate the trust you’ve placed in me and will do my best to fulfill that trust. As regional representative, my role is to represent you, your interests and your ideas. To do this, communication is essential. I want to hear your thoughts — about the Association, the NPS, stewardship of the parks and the ranger profession.

We also need to communicate with others — with other disciplines in the NPS and with individuals and organizations outside of the NPS. Although there often is a tendency, during difficult times, to raise protective walls and defend what little we still have some control over, the wisest course is just the opposite.

As change inevitably continues in the NPS and the world around us, we will gain the most over the long run by working to eliminate barriers that divide us, by sharing what we have to achieve the greatest good, and by working together — welcoming input from those who have different backgrounds, talents, and perspectives — to accomplish the important goals that we share.

— Kathy Jope
Columbia Cascades SSO

Western

Thank you for re-electing me as representative for Western Region parks, and thanks especially to Jeff Ohlfs of Joshua Tree for declaring his interest in serving on the ANPR board. The Association needs volunteers like Jeff who are willing to carry out the work of the Association.

Several members have volunteered to be park representatives. I still need park reps for some of the largest parks in the region. Please contact me if you’re interested.

We need new members also. Our membership was down last year, but it is essential to add members and promote the park ranger profession in these uncertain times.

A major challenge in the upcoming year will be to finalize our proposal for reorganizing ANPR. I serve on the task group that is evaluating alternative structures. I’d like to hear from members on this issue.

— Meg Weesner Saguaro

Letters (continued)

6c: Kudos to ANPR

I have received approval for my 6c enhanced retirement totaling 15 years to date. While not necessarily an earthshaking announcement, the manner in which I received approval may be noteworthy, and certainly I need to give ANPR a major thank-you for their assistance.

I am a CSRS employee and never filed anything to obtain 6c coverage prior to 1995. However, I finally got the lead out, and over a nine-month period put together a package using ANPR’s letter of intent to file as my main justification for coverage.

I had been an ANPR member prior to the filing deadline date. In addition, I argued my case based on a specific high-ranking NPS official who advised my FLETCC CIS class not to put in for 6c coverage in February 1989, and I had witnesses to the fact. I also requested the assistance of two state senators and a congresswoman to intervene on my behalf.

While I think all of my arguments were persuasive, I believe the foresight of ANPR to file on behalf of all its members was extremely significant in the resulting approval of my package.

Big kudos to ANPR, and thanks for looking out for all of us.

— Norm Simons
Golden Gate NRA

Retirement Committee

Retirement Non-Worries — Many Americans aren’t very realistic about retirement planning, according to the results of a survey commissioned by Keyport Life Insurance Co.

The survey, which queried 753 people, found 43 percent of the respondents don’t know how much money they’ll need for retirement, although two-thirds believe they’ll enjoy the standard of living they have now — or a better one — when they stop working.

Half of those polled who are not yet saving for retirement say they’re not sure when they’ll start putting money aside, or say they have no intentions of saving any money.

Hopefully, none of these surveyed are members of ANPR. A person who starts putting at least 5 percent (the government matching with 5 percent) in the TSP the first pay period of a 30-year career, will reap a total of $294,000. About 7.5 percent of this total ($22,671) will be the direct result of the first year’s contribution. So start early and don’t quit!

— Frank Betts, Retired

ROAD MAP for my heirs

ANPR has prepared this “Road Map” to assist family or friends in handling the many details required when a spouse or loved one dies.

The notebook contains personal information (fill-in-the blank) forms about:

- who to notify and your desires about final arrangements
- civil service, military & Social Security benefit details
- insurance facts
- bank account, property, credit card, TSP, investment & retirement account numbers & information
- synopsis of life, obituary & family history
- list of disposition of personal items
- anatomical gift wishes
- examples of durable power of attorney for health care & finances

This Road Map is a must and makes for a caring, loving gift for family and friends.

The book costs $10, plus $4 for shipping and handling. Colorado residents add 3% sales tax.

U.S. currency only.

Make check payable to ANPR.
Send to: Frank Betts
4560 Larkbunting Drive, #7A
Fort Collins, CO 80526

More letters on page 28
Please send news about you and your family. All submissions must be typed or printed and should include the author's return address and phone number.

Send to Teresa Ford, Editor, 26 S. Mt. Vernon Club Road, Golden, CO 80401.

Changes of address should be sent separately to Debbie Gorman, ANPR Business Manager, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831.

Brad Bennett (GRCA 91-93, 95-96) is a winter seasonal visitor use assistant at Grand Canyon, South Entrance Station. He was a summer seasonal interpretive park ranger at Desert View, Grand Canyon. His wife, Em, has found a position with the Head Start program in the Grand Canyon area. They are maintaining a residence at 2405 N. East St., #A, Flagstaff, AZ 86004; (520) 773-4681.

Dennis L. Carruth (CACH, NATR, REDW, LOWE, CANA) now is a site manager for the NPS and Forest Service facilities at Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument and Gila Center, serving the Gila and Aldo Leopold Wilderness areas. Previously he was chief of operations at Bering Land Bridge National Preserve. His spouse, Anne Coupland, will look for seasonal or temporary positions in the southern Arizona and New Mexico area as a reinstatement eligible. Address: Route 11, Box 112, Silver City, NM 88061.

Glen A. Dodson (BLR189-90, GLCA 91-92, BUFF 93, KATM 94, GLCA 94-95) is the new East District ranger at Gates of the Arctic National Park. Previously he was the area protection ranger in the Wahweap Subdistrict of the Downlake District, Glen Canyon NRA. His wife, Elizabeth A. Dodson, will take leave without pay from her job as protection/dispatch at Glen Canyon to pursue her dream to become a writer. Address: P.O. Box 9038, CPU Coldfoot, Fairbanks, AK 99701.

Bob Love (SEKI, WRO, LAVO, SAGU, YELL) has left the position of Canyon Subdistrict ranger at Yellowstone to work as the West District ranger at Rocky Mountain. Address/phone: 98 County Road 491, #16, Grand Lake, CO 80447; office, (970) 627-3471; home, (970) 627-5094.

Mark Maciha (PEFO 79-81, 84-87, GRCA 82-84, LAME 87-87, DEVA 89-99-96) is a supervisory park ranger at Carlsbad Caverns. He left a supervisory park ranger position in the South District at Death Valley. Address/phone: 22 Permian Way, Carlsbad, NM 88220; work, (505) 785-2232.

Marten Schmitz (CACA 85 & 86, FODA 85, GRBA 86, JELA 86-87 & 88-89, NAVA 87-88, PEFO 89-96) has left a protection park ranger position at Petrified Forest and is a park ranger in protection/resource management at Agate Fossil Beds NM. Margarita Aguilar Schmitz (CHAM 84, BIBE 85, GRBA 86, Cleveland National Forest 87-88, Angeles National Forest 90-91, PEFO 91-96) has left an interpretive park ranger position at Petrified Forest. She hopes to continue her career at Agate Fossil Beds or Scotts Bluff. They became parents of a son in November 1993. Address: 301 River Road, Harrison, NE 69346.

C. Mack Shaver (BAND 67, HOAL 67, SEKI 68-72, LAME 72-74, CHIS 74-76, GLCA 76-79, NWA 79-88, THRO 88-89, CHIS 90-96) has retired. His last position was superintendent at Channel Islands. Address/phone: 15 Red Rock Way, N-307, San Francisco, CA 94131; (415) 821-0300.

DO YOU COLLECT MEMORABILIA? (badges, patches, books and more)

Let's get together and start a club!

Tentatively called the Arrowhead Club, we will be a network of collectors who can barter, trade and locate items for collection. A newsletter will be developed with guest articles and a space to list trade items.

Interested?

Call ANPR member Jonathan Schafler (520) 524-6834

Keeping the history alive!

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR INTERPRETATION

New membership rates for 1996!

Flexible dues — added benefits

For information call: Philip Tedesco Membership Manager (970) 484-8283.

Missing ANPR Members

We've lost touch with the following people. If you know their whereabouts, contact Debbie Gorman, P.O. Box 307, Gunsevoort, NY 12831.

Stephen Cruse
Curt Dimmick
Alexandria, VA
Yellowstone NP

Jan Gauthier
St. Croix, MN
Haywood Harrell
Shilooh, TN
Philip Heckman
Berlin, MD
Kheryl Klubnikin
Agoura Hills, CA
Sandra Knight
Philadelphia, PA
Hilary Lilley
Gooding, ID
Dawn & Marshall
Marblemount, WA
Letters (continued)

Send Your E-Mail Address

In case you missed it in the last issue of Ranger, I am compiling a directory of ANPR members' e-mail addresses. Send me your e-mail address and some information about yourself, and I will send you the e-mail addresses of other ANPR members.

I will update the list as I get new addresses, so if you have recently joined an on-line service, send me a message at jmc004@aol.com.

If you have questions or want information about America Online, write me at 36390 Old Ocean City Road, Willards, MD 21874 or call at (410) 835-3121. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Jeannine McElveen

Ballot Comments

This letter is in response to anonymous comments on an ANPR ballot postmarked from Redding, Calif.

Dear Redding, Calif.:

I appreciate your comments attached to the ballot you took the time to return. I will be the first person to agree that it was frustrating to see only three of the nine vacant positions having more than one nominee. But I believe you are confused concerning the reason that there were nine vacant positions.

ANPR's Board of Directors is currently made of 17 positions, one of which is appointed (vice president, special concerns) and one which is honorary (immediate past president). The remaining 15 vacancies, all having two-year terms, are staggered. This keeps the board "fresh" and disperses the number of ballots to handle over a longer period of time, to name a couple of reasons. Of course, this does not address the issue of why so many single nominee positions appeared on the ballot.

I will definitely take some of the blame, due to lack of organization and research on my part. But I also know that most, if not all, of the regional representatives broadcasted pleas to the membership to take an interest in a board position, as did I. Board members names and phone numbers were easily found on the back cover of Ranger. I know that my phone remained way too silent.

To comment on your "good ole boys" statement is actually pointless, but I will anyway. The current board is a wonderful mixture of young and not-so-young employees from all disciplines in the NPS. What is the definition of a "good ole boy" anyway? Am I one? I don't see how. I didn't attend my first Rendezvous until 1988, but decided to get on a committee and have been hooked ever since. It's really painless!

To finish, no, it wasn't just you thinking something was wrong with the ballot situation. But what is wrong is a lack of interest in trying to correct the predicament. People love to moan and groan when they are unhappy with life's choices, but rarely seem to take risks to change those choices. ANPR needs people to take some risks and show interest in this organization!

Cindy Ott-Jones
Nominations Committee Chairperson
(and sadly, sole member)

Slovak Ranger Says Thanks

I was born in a ranger station in Tatra National Park, Slovakia, and since the first days of my life I have absorbed the spirit of Tatra Mountain, the highest mountain in the Carpathian mountain range. My father worked for the National Park Service and I do, too.

I am spending all my money, time, energy and enthusiasm to be a ranger and support protection of this miraculous place. In the last 30 years many changes have happened, but Tatra still is the prime national park in Slovakia and in all of Europe. Today I am a ranger in the West Tatra District and I love my job.

I didn't doubt I would be a ranger. But since my first years in Slovakia's Parks Service, I have planned more. I intended to improve the ranger service and install a new experience and a new ways in all ranger work — patrolling, education, monitoring, cooperation with local people and more.

For this reason in 1982 I established an international program, People and Parks. The main aim is to encourage solving conflicts between official park policy and the demands of people living in or near protected areas.

I have cooperated with colleagues abroad, first with letters, then by traveling and studying different protected areas. I have visited parks in East European countries, then in Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, Russia, Canada and the United States.

I worked as a volunteer in Yosemite, Yellowstone and Olympic in 1990 and in Banff in 1993. I have learned a lot, and most of my experiences I've shared with my colleagues. I've also made presentations, written articles and used concepts in my daily work.

Wherever I traveled I found that rangers are a very enthusiastic group of people.

I will make my third trip to North America this summer and will volunteer at Wrangell-St. Elias, Glacier Bay and Denali.

The first IRF World Congress in Zakopane, Poland, was crucial. I am establishing a ranger section for the Association of Slovak's National Parks and Protected Areas, and I also made many new friends. Rick Mossman of Wrangell-St. Elias agreed with my plan, and I have been accepted to be a volunteer in one of the greatest protected areas in the world.

With the help of rangers I have solved accommodations and food concerns. Now I must solve a few more things — travel expenses and supplies.

Everything looks perfect. I have a great summer in front of me. I still feel a need to express my appreciation to all rangers and parks employees who I have met on my way. My cordial thanks to all the ranger family, and especially Mike Finley, Lorne West and Scott Carpenter, Yosemite; Robert Barbee and Roger Andrasik, Yellowstone; Maureen Finnerty and Ruth Scott, Olympic, and many more.

Bless you, ranger family, for your help. Bless you for the VIP program.

— Vlada Vancura
Slovakia

Letters to the editor are welcome. Signed letters of 100 words or less may be published, space permitting. Please include address and daytime phone. Ranger reserves the right to edit letters for grammar or length. Mail to Editor, 26 S. Mt. Vernon Club Road, Golden, CO 80401.

Another letter on page 26
MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION — Association of National Park Rangers

Important: Please specify — □ New Membership   □ Renewal    Date ______

Name (Last, first, MI) ___________________________________ Title __________________

Box or Street __________________________________________

City ___________________ State ______ Zip ________ Home phone ________ Work Phone ________

NPS Employees: Park four-letter code (i.e. YELL) __ ___ ___ __

Field Area or Cluster (i.e. RMP; WASO use NCR) __ ___ ___ ___

Category                                                                                      Type of Membership
Active (all NPS employees)                                                                      (check one)
  Permanent                                                                                   Individual
    □ $30                                                                                     □ $60
  Seasonal                                                                                   Joint
    □ $20                                                                                     □ $27
  Retired                                                                                     Individual
    □ $20                                                                                     □ $27
  Life (open to all individuals)*                                                           
    Active (NPS employees)                                                                   Individual
      □ $375                                                                                  □ $600
    Associate                                                                              Individual
      □ $375                                                                                  □ $600

Associate (individuals other than NPS employees)                        □ $30
  Regular
    □ $30
  Student
    □ $50

(Individuals & groups)
  Supporting
    □ $100
  Contributing
    □ $500

Subscriptions
  □ $30
  * Life payment may be made in five installments of $75 (individual), or $100 (joint), over a 24-month period.

Important Notice
In order for ANPR to be an effective, member-oriented organization, we need to be able to provide park and regional representatives with lists of members in their areas. It is, therefore, vital that you enter the park and regional four-letter codes before submitting your application.

Administrative Use
Date ____________________
Rec’d $____ Check #______
By ______________________

Return membership form and check payable to ANPR to:
Association of National Park Rangers, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831
Membership dues are not deductible as a charitable expense.

Tell us your news!

Ranger will publish your job or family news in the All in the Family section.

Name ______________________

Past Parks — Use four-letter acronym/years at each park, field area, cluster (YELL 88-90, GRCA 91-94) ____________________________

New Position (title and area) __________________________________

Old Position (title and area) ___________________________________

Address/phone number (optional — provide if you want it listed in Ranger) __________________________________________

Other information ____________________________________________

Send news to:
Teresa Ford, Editor
26 S. Mt. Vernon Club Road
Golden, CO 80401
# Directory of ANPR Board Members, Task Group Leaders & Staff

## Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Deanne Adams, CCSSO</td>
<td>3009 13th Ave. West, Seattle, WA 98119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Special Concerns</td>
<td>Vaughn Baker, Shenandoah</td>
<td>RR 2, Box 437, Luray, VA 22835</td>
<td>(540) 743-9357</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shenbaker@aol.com">shenbaker@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Professional Issues</td>
<td>Ken Mabery, El Malpais</td>
<td>1749 Blue Spruce, Grants, NM 87020</td>
<td>(505) 287-4538</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maberyken@aol.com">maberyken@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President, Communication/Representation</td>
<td>Bill Halainen, Delaware Water Gap</td>
<td>4032 Conashaugh Lakes, Milford, PA 18337</td>
<td>(717) 686-3828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Tina Orcutt, Jean Lafitte</td>
<td>782 Maui Court, Diamondhead, MS 39525</td>
<td>(601) 255-6181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Sarah Craighead, Mesa Verde</td>
<td>P.O. Box 4, Mesa Verde, CO 81330</td>
<td>(970) 882-2376</td>
<td><a href="mailto:craighead@aol.com">craighead@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Past President</td>
<td>Rick Gale, WASO</td>
<td>3153 E. Anchorway Court, Falls Church, VA 22042</td>
<td>(703) 560-3493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Regional Reps

- **Midwest Regional Rep**
  - Bruce McKeeman, Voyageurs
  - 218 Shorewood Drive, International Falls, MN 56649
  - (218) 283-4874 • bmckeeman@aol.com

- **Rocky Mountain Regional Rep**
  - Gary Mosen, Glacier
  - Box 331, West Glacier, MT 59936
  - (406) 888-5210

- **Southwest Regional Rep**
  - Judy Chetwin, Southwest SSO
  - 29 Valencia Loop, Santa Fe, NM 87505
  - (505) 466-3854

- **Western Region**
  - Meg Woerner, Saguaro
  - 9352 E. Trail Ridge Place, Tucson, AZ 85710
  - (520) 290-1723

- **Pacific Northwest Regional Rep**
  - Kathy Jope
  - 15375 NE Sandy Hook Road, Poulsbo, WA 98370-7823
  - (360) 697-2192 • kjope@aol.com

- **Alaska Regional Rep**
  - Lisa Eckert, Denali
  - P.O. Box 102, Denali National Park, AK 99755
  - (907) 683-2915 • 103214.237@compuserve.com

- **Budget and Finance**
  - Charles Andrews
  - 212 Albert Dr, San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
  - (805) 544-4397 • andrewsct@aol.com

- **Work Life**
  - Sheila Cooke-Kayser, Boston NHP
  - 4 Pickering Court, Danvers, MA 01923
  - (508) 777-9227

- **Employee Development**
  - Jeri Mihalic, Albright/Glacier
  - 1896 Riverwood Drive, Columbia Falls, MT 59912
  - (406) 892-5151

- **International Affairs**
  - Barbara Goodman, DeSoto
  - 4725 50th St. West, #103, Falls Church, VA 22042
  - (703) 638-9278

- **Mentoring**
  - Bob Cherry, Blue Ridge
  - 301 Perkins St, Boone, N.C. 28607
  - (704) 265-2827

- **Nominations**
  - Cindy Ott-Jones, FLETC
  - 1000 Mallory St., #84, St. Simons Island, GA 31522
  - (912) 638-9278

- **Promotional Items**
  - Tress Shrinkaw, Petrified Forest
  - P.O. Box 2296, Petrified Forest, AZ 86028
  - (520) 809-1956

- **Ranger Magazine**
  - Tony Sisto, Fort Vancouver
  - 3009 13th Ave. West, Seattle, WA 98119 • (206) 285-8342 • anprsisto@aol.com

- **Rendezvous**
  - Bill Wade, Shenandoah
  - 652 Mount Heights Road, Front Royal, VA 22630
  - (540) 635-8829 • jwbillwade@aol.com

- **Retirement**
  - Frank Betts
  - 4560 Larkbunting Drive, #7A, Fort Collins, CO 80526
  - (970) 326-0765 • frankbetts@aol.com

- **Seasonal/Temporary Interests**
  - Lisa Eckert, Denali
  - P.O. Box 102, Denali National Park, AK 99755
  - (907) 683-2915 • 103214.237@compuserve.com

- **Twenty-Year Retirement**
  - Paul Broyles, Fire
  - 3867 E. Shady Glen Drive, Boise, ID 83706
  - (208) 342-4719

- **Staff**
  - Teresa Ford
  - 26 S. Mt. Vernon Club Road, Golden, CO 80401
  - Office & Fax • (303) 526-1380 • fordedit@aol.com

- **Business Manager**
  - Debbie Gorman, Saratoga
  - P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831
  - Office & Fax • (518) 743-1146 • dgmorgan@aol.com

---

Association of National Park Rangers
P.O. Box 307
Gansevoort, NY 12831

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED
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