Visitor and Resource Protection
Roles and Functions of the 025 Law Enforcement Ranger
Historic issue

You and your colleagues are to be congratulated for the historic issue of the Ranger for Summer 2005. Nowhere else do I know of any publication that has ever prepared such an interesting, authentic insight into the men and the first lady who have been privileged to lead our beloved National Park Service.

Arthur Demaray was my friend, mentor and guiding counselor. You are right—he is a rare gem and his formal tenure as director was brief, but no director had more long-range impact on the legends and the traditions of the National Park Service than Arthur. Thanks to Chris Wilkinson for making that point so eloquently.


Interp issue — mixed reviews

This is half letter to the editor and half professional issues related.

I was glad to see that the Spring 2005 issue of Ranger was devoted to interpretation. Especially enjoyed Suzanne Gall Marsh’s article. It was pertinent to my own job as an interpreter at Gulf Islands National Seashore.

I was less pleased with a couple of the other articles. Three pages were too many to devote to the history of the Interpretive Development Program. A detailed recounting was boring and irrelevant. And I noticed many of the articles were written by some of the usual suspects: those who have been privileged to lead our beloved National Park Service.

I see a broad stagnation of the interpretive field. There’s a lot of self-referencing, self-congratulating and self-serving, blue-sky rhetoric. The new training module focusing on resource liaison is a step in the right direction, except that it should be the foundation of interpretation and not an afterthought. Interpretation is supposed to get people to care about the national parks but it isn’t working if Congress’ manhandling of the Service’s budget is any measure.

The ultimate result for interpreters is not just the degradation of the parks, but total public disinterest in our profession. Interpretive budgets have been cut as deeply as any other division, and interpretive operations across the system can’t function anymore without volunteers. In what other discipline are professionals interchangeable with or replaceable by nonprofessionals who work for free? I almost can’t believe Stephen F. Austin State University offers a master’s degree in a field that I fear is dying.

I suppose if I think there are better ways to write about interpretation I should offer to write the articles myself. I plan on attending the NAI’s National Interpreters Workshop this fall and would be willing to write about my experiences there.

Adam Prato Ocean Springs, Miss.

Share your views!

Signed letters to the editor 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. Send to fordedit@aol.com or Editor, Ranger Magazine, P.O. Box 108, Lamed, KS 67750-0108.
President's Message

Throughout my career with the National Park Service it has been my experience that there is one common factor in well-run parks—interdivisional cooperation and teamwork. That is why I am happy to have another issue of Ranger highlight a very important career field, law enforcement.

No matter what career field one may be in, it is important to have an understanding of the functions and challenges faced by other fields. The accomplishment of the law enforcement mission in the Park Service is critical for all of us. Without the crime prevention, emergency medical services or search and rescue provided by law enforcement, many employees and visitors would find their experience in our parks to be less than ideal. I hope that we all make efforts to know and understand what our co-workers go through and how we can make their jobs easier.

I would also like to take this opportunity to encourage all of you to come to Charleston this December. ANPR is hard at work to make this Rendezvous a memorable one. Don’t forget that Charleston is a truly beautiful city with great opportunities for recreation, dining and shopping. So please take the time to renew old acquaintances, make new ones and create great memories.

You will find more information about the Rendezvous on page 25.

Lee S. Werst

ON PATROL: A visitor and resource protection ranger provides routine patrols on the Niobrara River. Photo by Stuart Schneider, Niobrara.

ANPR Nominations for Board of Directors

ANPR is seeking nominations for board positions that will expire at the end of this year. These three-year board terms will begin Jan. 1, 2006. Nominations will be taken at the upcoming Ranger Rendezvous in December, with election ballots mailed to members soon after that.

✓ Treasurer
✓ Board Member for Education and Training
✓ Board Member for Internal Communications
✓ Board Member for Strategic Planning

Contact Lee Werst, ANPR president, for more details, anprpres@aol.com. Please consider serving your organization in these important volunteer positions.
In passing the 1976 amendments to the General Authorities Act, Congress provided the National Park Service with a clear mandate authorizing designated employees to perform law enforcement functions within units of the National Park System. The Congressional Record further clarified that Congress intended that "law enforcement activities in parks will be continued to be viewed as a function of a broad program of visitor and resource protection." Congress further stated that "law enforcement should be a function of the protection ranger along with a diversity of other protection concerns." Of key importance is that "National Park Service protection rangers should maintain the appearance of representatives of a people-serving agency, and not as members of an organization whose only function is law enforcement."

Individuals assigned law enforcement duties must use that authority judiciously. Law enforcement "commissioned employees must appreciate and understand both the spirit and the letter of the law.... In carrying out their law enforcement duties, the NPS requires that its commissioned personnel exercise sound judgment and discretion, striving to maintain the sensitivity called for in achieving the overall goal of professional resource and visitor protection consistent with the NPS mission." Our responsibility for protection of life, property and the resources entrusted to our care is achieved through a preventive enforcement posture that relies first on education and deterrence, then on apprehension and prosecution. Response to violations should be handled utilizing a reasonable enforcement response with the goal of achieving compliance.

The breadth of laws, codes, and regulations that NPS law enforcement protection rangers must understand and draw upon to maintain order and civility within units of the National Park System are as varied as the many parks that we manage. Our distinct and unique authority ranges from laws regulating wildlife to enforcing traffic laws, from enforcement of laws protecting against destruction and/or theft of antiquities and archeological resources, to crimes against people. The duties of a NPS protection ranger are greater in scope than granted to most police.

The demand of the job requires not only knowledge of law and rules of procedure but the physical ability to meet the rigorous fitness requirements expected of law enforcement personnel. While our first recourse is to gain compliance through education, we must always be vigilant of the inherent dangers that come with the responsibility to maintain law and order. All contacts of an enforcement nature require a heightened sense of alertness until an assessment of the situation can be made. Law enforcement personnel understand this important initial assessment and adjust defenses and manner of approach accordingly.

The primary duties of NPS law enforcement protection rangers are to keep the peace through the investigation, apprehension, or detention of individuals suspected or convicted of offenses against the laws of the United States. In consonance with these primary duties, NPS protection rangers also perform resource education and public use management functions. Protection rangers must have more than just a general knowledge of park resources. They should be well versed in environmental stewardship, ecosystem dynamics, history, and the significance of place so that they may impart this knowledge to the public, NPS administrators and others who would benefit from this knowledge. Protection rangers educate and inform about the significance of park resources as a means to garner park support, to deter illegal and unsafe activities, and to promote the concept of a "people-serving agency." Protection rangers serve as members of incident management teams, search and rescue teams, respond to hazardous material spills, medical aid calls, terrorist threats, and all other like incidents requiring a presence of authority.

Park law enforcement programs will be managed by superintendents as part of a comprehensive, interdisciplinary effort to protect resources, manage public use, and promote public safety. The park senior law enforcement ranger is charged with the responsibility for implementing law enforcement activities within a park consistent with applicable laws, policy, and guidelines.

The NPS law enforcement protection ranger is a highly skilled career professional whose primary duties require the ability to...
Transportation modes used by protection rangers include bicycles at Delaware Water Gap and dog sleds at Gates of the Arctic. Photos from NPS Ranger Activities files.

STEWARD: Transportation modes used by protection rangers include bicycles at Delaware Water Gap and dog sleds at Gates of the Arctic. Photos from NPS Ranger Activities files.

shift from a passive to an aggressive enforcement mode on a moment’s notice, at any given time of the day, during the extent of a career, and to do so while working in some of this country’s most extreme environments. Expertise and dedication of this kind demands a special quality suited only for a select few. The NPS protection ranger is a protector, educator and steward of those special places having the distinction of being designated a unit of the National Park System.

Ernest Quintana originally wrote this as a memo to superintendents, law enforcement commissioned protection rangers and interested staff of the Midwest Region in his role as regional director of the Midwest Region.

References
House of Representatives Report #1569, 94th Congress, 2nd Session, 1976
Law Enforcement Reference Manual #9, Chapter 1
National Park Service Management Policies, 8.3.2
Cover Letter for Ranger Applicants to Yellowstone National Park, 1926, by Horace Albright, Superintendent

Department of the Interior, National Park Service
Yellowstone National Park, Yellowstone Park, Wyoming

Office of the Superintendent

Dear Mr. [Name]:

We have received your letter indicating your desire to become a ranger in Yellowstone National Park for the season of 1926. Before giving it further consideration we ask you to read this circular letter very carefully and thoughtfully, and if you are still interested in the ranger position after completing your study of this communication, fill out the enclosed blank and return it to the Park headquarters with a picture of yourself.

In General

It has been our experience that young men often apply for a place on the park ranger force with the impression or understanding that the ranger is a sort of sinecure with nothing resembling hard work to perform, and that the beauties and wonders of Yellowstone Park, and very frequent trips about the park and innumerable dances and other diversions to occupy one's leisure hours.

Again, young men often apply for ranger positions with the feeling that the duties of the place require no special training or experience and that any man with a reasonably good education can perform these duties regardless of whether he has a good or bad personality or whether he has or has not experience in outdoor activities.

Also, many young men apply for ranger positions in the hope of making and saving considerable money to aid them in continuing their college work.

The conceptions of the duties of the ranger as just mentioned are just as untrue as it is possible for them to be, and unfortunately the pay is so small that boys earning their way through college, and who live at a distance from the Park cannot afford to become a ranger if tendered a place.

The Ranger Job

The term of service of a temporary ranger is three months from June 15th, but the superintendent has authority to reduce the force at any time he believes it to be in the interest of the Government to do this. However, a ranger can be sure of 75 days employment.

The pay is $100.00 per month. The successful applicant must pay his own travel expenses to and from the Park, and must subsist himself in the Park. He must furnish his own clothes, including a uniform costing about $45.00. He must bring his own bed. The Government pays each man $100.00 per month and furnished quarter, light and fuel, also certain articles of furniture including bunk, tables, dishes, cooking utensils, etc.

The ranger usually must do his own cooking and always has to care for the station. In certain places rangers must board with road crews which are furnished very plain but wholesome food at $1.00 per person per day.

We make no promises regarding transportation around the Park to see its wonders, and often rangers do not get a chance to see all of the Park unless they can be granted leave form their duties and make their own arrangements for the trip. Men who render excellent service and are retained until the close of the season are given an opportunity to tour the Park if facilities are available, otherwise not. If you apply, do not do so with the expectation that you will surely see more than the part of the park you traverse in reaching your station.

Qualifications of a Ranger

Applicants for a ranger's position must be 21 years of age or must attain that age by June 15th. If you are not 21 or will not be by June 15th don't apply. If you have a reputation of appearing unusually youthful or immature for a man of 21, don't apply. We want men who are mature in appearance. We prefer men of 25 to 30 years of age.

The ranger is primarily a policeman, therefore he should be big in frame, tall, and of average weight for his age and height. We always prefer big men to small men, other conditions being equal. If you are small of stature, better not apply.

The ranger comes more closely in contact with the visiting public than any other park officer, and he is the representative of the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the National Park Service and the Superintendent of the Park in dealing with the public. Naturally, therefore, the ranger must have a pleasing personality; he must be tactful, diplomatic and courteous; he must be patient. If you are not possessed of such characteristics, please don't apply. Without them you would become, if selected, a failure from the beginning of your service.
The ranger is often called upon to guide large parties of tourists and to lecture to them on the features of the Park. He should have a good strong voice and some experience in public speaking. Detail public speaking and training on the application form.

The ranger is charged with the protection of the natural features of the Park, especially the forests. Applicants should present evidence of their having had experience in camping out in the woods. Forestry students who have had training in forestry work and forest fire fighting are given preference to other applicants if they possess the qualifications as to age, size and personality. The ranger must be qualified to ride and care for horses.

The ranger must know how to cook ordinary foods and must have experience in kitchen police. If you cannot cook and care for a ranger station, don’t apply. You would be an unpopular burden on your fellow rangers and the butt of all station jokes should you be selected without this essential qualification.

We want big mature men with fine personalities, and experience in the out-of-doors in riding, camping, woodcraft, fighting fires and similar activities.

**Duties of a Ranger**

The ranger force is the park police force, and is on duty night and day in the protection of the park. Protection work primarily relates to the care of the forests, the fish and game, the geyser and hot spring formations and the campgrounds. Of equal importance is the detection of violations of the speed rules.

The ranger force is the information-supplying organization. The issuance of publications, answering of questions, lecturing, and guiding of all accomplished by rangers.

The ranger force is charged with care of all Government property; hence must watch the use of such property by other Government men as well as constantly care for the ranger stations and other property used by the ranger organization itself.

**Routine of the Ranger Station**

Rangers must rise at 6:00 a.m. if not on night duty, and must retire not later than 11:00 p.m. They may attend dances or other entertainment not more than two evenings a week. They must obey every order of their station chief, who is a permanent ranger. Leave from the station will be granted only in emergencies and then only by the chief ranger. Semi-military discipline is in effect at all times.

A ranger is on duty from the time he arises until he retires, and may even be called from his bed for emergency service. He is not subject to an eight-hour law, and he is not paid for services rendered in excess of an eight-hour period.

In Conclusion

The ranger who renders satisfactory service is a very busy man all the time. There is no vacation about his work. The duties are exacting and require the utmost patience and tact at all times. A ranger’s job is no place for a nervous, quick-tempered man, nor for one who is unaccustomed to hard work. If you cannot work hard ten or twelve hours a day, and always with patience and a smile on your face, don’t fill out the attached blank.

Carefully reflect on what you have just read. You have perhaps believed Government jobs to be “soft” and “easy.” Most of them are not, and certainly there are no such jobs in the National Park Service. The ranger’s job is especially hard. There will not be more than 20 vacancies in next year’s force of ranger, and there is really very little chance of your being considered unless you possess all of the qualifications mentioned herein. Please do not return the enclosed blank unless you believe you are fully qualified, and unless you mean business. Remember there is no vacation in work, and mighty little money. If you wish to come for pleasure you will be disappointed. If you want a summer in the park as an experience in outdoor activity amid forests and fine invigorating atmosphere, apply if you are qualified. Otherwise, please plan to visit the Yellowstone National Park as a tourist.

If you apply and are accepted, no promises will be made as to the station to which you will be assigned, nor will promises be made as to assignment to foot, horse or motorcycle patrol. You will be examined upon reporting for duty on June 15th, and will be assigned to the station having duties that we believe you can best perform.

Do not apply unless you are positive you can report June 15th and remain until September 15th. If there is a chance of your not reporting, if accepted, we do not want your application.

If you have special qualifications which cannot be listed on the attached blank, write them on a separate sheet of paper. Send us a picture of yourself in outdoor costume if possible, otherwise a portrait will be acceptable. Pictures must be clear.

Cordially yours,

Horace M. Albright
Superintendent
The General Authorities Act

The "General Authorities Act," signed into law Oct. 7, 1976, (Public Law 94-458) provided among other things, the first consolidated law enforcement authority applicable to the National Park Service. Section 10 of this law (16 USC 1a-6) stated that "in addition to any other authority conferred by law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate, pursuant to standards prescribed in regulations by the Secretary, certain officers or employees of the Department of the Interior who shall maintain law and order and protect persons and property within areas of the National Park System. In the performance of such duties, the officers or employees, so designated, may:

1. Carry firearms and make arrests without warrant for any offense against the United States committed in his presence, or for any felony cognizable under the laws of the United States if he has reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such felony, provided such arrests occur within that system or the person to be arrested is fleeing therefrom to avoid arrest;

2. Execute any warrant or other process issued by a court or officer of competent jurisdiction for the enforcement of the provisions of any federal law or regulation issued pursuant to law arising out of an offense committed in that system or, where the person subject to the warrant or process is in that system, in connection with any federal offense; and

3. Conduct investigations of offenses against the United States committed in that system in the absence of investigation thereof by any other federal law enforcement agency having investigative jurisdiction over the offense committed or with the concurrence of such other agency."

Prior to this, law enforcement authority had been vague, scattered throughout the several sections of Title 16. For instance, the Act of March 3, 1897, applied to national military parks only, where "the superintendent or any guardian of such park is authorized to arrest forthwith any person engaged or who may have been engaged in committing any misdemeanor named in the Act." Perpetrators were to be fined "not less than ten dollars."

The act of March 2, 1933, also gave authority to "commissioners, superintendents, caretakers, officers, or guards of national military parks, national parks, battlefield sites, national monuments and miscellaneous memorials to arrest and prosecute persons for violations of regulations."

However, the broad authority that the National Park Service had operated under for over 70 years prior to the passage of the Authorities Act was a 1905 law in which all "persons employed in the forest reserve and national park service of the United States shall have authority to make arrests for the violation of the laws and regulations relating to the forest reserves and national parks."

What perhaps had served adequately for the early decades of the 20th century was no longer sufficient. Law enforcement had changed and was changing—dramatically. In 1970 another piece of general legislation made numerous administrative changes to NPS procedures, but did not touch law enforcement authority. Then came Stoneman Meadows in Yosemite. The klaxon lights of public scrutiny, caused by the Yosemite riots and other serious law enforcement incidents in the 1970s, helped focus management action. By 1976, the time had more than come to address the professionalism and authority by and under which the NPS was able to conduct protection operations in the latter part of the 20th century.

According to NPS Management Policies, "Park law enforcement activities will be managed by superintendents as part of a comprehensive, interdisciplinary effort to protect resources, manage public use, and promote public safety and appropriate enjoyment. This is in keeping with guidance provided by Congress in 1976 when it amended the General Authorities Act (16 USC 1a-3): "The committee intends that the clear and specific enforcement authority contained in this subsection, while necessary for the protection of the federal employees so involved, will be implemented by the secretary to ensure that law enforcement activities in our National Park System will continue to be viewed as one function of a broad program of visitor and resource protection." (House Report No. 94-1569, Sept. 16, 1976)."

Only employees who meet the standards prescribed by, and who are designated by, the Secretary of the Interior, may perform law enforcement duties. The duties of these commissioned employees will not be limited to just law enforcement; they will also continue to incorporate a diversity of other protection concerns, as stipulated in House Report No. 94-1569.

Regional challenges

Compiled by Mark Herberger

The 025 visitor and resource protection ranger serves ever-increasingly important and complex roles in our National Park Service mission. According to Management Policies, in carrying out the law enforcement program, the Service will make reasonable efforts to provide for the protection, safety and security of park visitors, employees, concessioners, and public and private property and to protect the natural and cultural resources entrusted to its care.

A visitor and resource protection ranger is required to have a firm foundation of law enforcement KSAs. Most 025 protection rangers serve with additional skills such as search and rescue, fire fighting, emergency medical response, visitor management and safety operations. In today's NPS, especially since Ranger Careers, a key component of the 025 ranger profession is being not only a resource protector but also a resource educator.

Obviously, all of this work is coupled with a variety of day-to-day challenges of one kind or another. In June of this year, individuals responsible for visitor and resource protection operations (mostly chief rangers) at parks within the Midwest Region were contacted to acquire information on what they perceived as "the No. 1 challenge in fulfilling their visitor and resource protection responsibilities." (One- or two-sentence replies were requested). Of the 42 inquiries (some chief rangers serve more than one park unit and some areas had vacant positions at the time), 28 responded with these comments:

"Inflation, increased costs of operation, and unfunded mandates continue to erode park budgets and the ability to be proactive in many protection operations. Downsizing and reinventing government have taken a toll. Employee training, i.e. maintaining necessary skills (continued on next page)
Ranger Law Enforcement in the post 9/11 environment

A Case Study from the National Capital Region

By Einar S. Olsen
Washington Office

While writing this article on July 8, the day after the London terrorist attacks, I began thinking about potential similar attacks in Washington, D.C. I also was reminded of the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11, 2001. That day had a major impact on the ranger law enforcement program in the region.

Up until then ranger law enforcement in this region was generally a quiet affair. In the hours after the attack at the Pentagon, the rangers were transformed into a de facto initial attack force. At the request of the U.S. Park Police, 18 of the region’s 46 protection rangers were dispatched, staged and sent to the Pentagon area and the National Mall to care for 50 children and workers who had fled the Pentagon, and to secure the mall area with the USPP. In addition, rangers also responded to assist Catoctin Mountain Park and the National Mall to care for 50 children and workers who had fled the Pentagon, and to secure the mall area with the USPP. In addition, rangers also responded to assist Catoctin Mountain Park and the National Mall to care for 50 children and workers who had fled the Pentagon, and to secure the mall area with the USPP.

Since that day the mission of the rangers in the region has expanded permanently to include homeland security-related functions. Soon after 9/11, a regional emergency response plan was developed to complement a national plan that sets the stage for stovepiping the region’s rangers under regional office control at codes orange and red to help facilitate their rapid deployment. Full staffing of the region’s 24-hour emergency communications center was quickly completed. The center provided valuable communications support on 9/11 when all land and mobile phone service was saturated. In the years to follow ranger staffing in the region slowly grew to 56 positions, where it stands today.

Following 9/11 the mission of the USPP grew enormously to ensure more security at key monuments and other areas. The challenges faced by rangers and USPP would lead to more cooperative efforts in areas such as training, special events security, demonstrations, fisheries enforcement, boundary encroachments, river safety, DUI enforcement, disorderly conduct operations and overflights. This has led to a greater variety of assignments for rangers and a greater appreciation among the USPP and rangers for each other. Most recently, 18 rangers from NCR supplemented by four Northeast Region rangers assisted the USPP with security for the July 4 celebration on the National Mall. The cooperation among the parks is now the best it has ever been.

Training has taken on a greater seriousness. For the past two years NCR rangers have attended in-service training at the Camp Dawson National Guard facility in West Virginia, where training emphasized realistic hands-on scenarios we may face in this new world order. Rangers have also been issued weapons of mass destruction personal protective equipment, and most have attended HAZWOPER 24-hour first responder training. In an effort to assist the USPP with demonstrations, about half the rangers in the region have attended civil disturbance unit training and have been issued riot gear. These collective efforts are slowly transforming the NCR rangers into a real initial attack force capable of supporting a number of needs.

Even while this transformation is occurring, rangers are still providing the traditional protection services to their parks. The rangers are partnering with the USPP and other agencies on fisheries enforcement and river safety task forces.

Regional challenges

and proficiency in LE, SAR, EMS, fire and homeland security operations, will be the greatest challenge. Success will be measured by the level of protection afforded park visitors and resources, and compliance with all elements of the NPS mission.

"I consider the recruitment, training and retention of good people to be the greatest challenge. It is hard to keep continuity in the program when staff are leaving for other positions shortly after being hired. Many parks, mine included, are revolving doors for incoming visitor protection rangers at both the seasonal and permanent level. They stay only long enough to get the experience or get the status and then move on."

(continued on page 10)


"The terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, and their aftermath left few Americans unaffected. As the federal agency with primary responsibility for protecting and preserving many of the nation’s most significant cultural and historic sites, the National Park Service had a unique perspective and role in responding to this tragedy. The most profound personal impact within the Service was no doubt on those employees who either witnessed the attacks firsthand or were directly involved in the immediate response..."

Einar Olsen is regional chief ranger for the National Capital Region. He has worked nationally for the Fairfax County Park Authority, U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service. He has worked mostly in NCR parks and has also worked for the Geological Resources Division.
Throughout this long partnership, a great deal has been accomplished in protection of visitor health but one goal has continued to elude the NPS Public Health Program (PHP)—a disease surveillance system.

The usual foundation of any public health program is surveillance, a disease radar system designed to detect unusual disease transmission and outbreaks so that public health professionals can respond, limit transmission, learn about the incident and turn this information into prevention. The National Park System, however, has one overriding characteristic that makes this sort of effort difficult—almost all of our “population at risk” is transient. Unlike a community, where people generally stay put long enough for exposure and illness to occur in the same location, within our park setting becoming ill may occur in Ohio days or weeks after being exposed to a disease agent in a park, say in Arizona. Being able to detect illness and connect it to a park visit has always been thought to be either impossible or so difficult that we shouldn’t even bother trying.

Several years ago, in an attempt to finally explore this question, a simple, informal pilot was started at Grand Canyon, largely in response to previously identified cases of illness associated with rafters on the Colorado River. What was discovered through this trial was so amazing and productive that just a few years after starting, we know not only that we can detect disease transmission within the system, but we can often detect it in the very early stages as it just begins to circulate.

What has made this possible is a simple but often illusive approach called partnership. The PHP had always assumed that to operate a surveillance system, elaborate staffing, database and epidemiologic systems would be required. From our pilots we’ve discovered that the most useful approach is to have an alert NPS ranger who knows what’s normal in the visitor population of their park and is willing to pick up the phone to let us know when something seems different.

By simply discussing the basic concepts of disease surveillance with various visitor and resource protection rangers, and providing them with the PHP contact information, we have been able to detect at least six separate outbreaks at Grand Canyon and Yellowstone (our efforts were later expanded to Yellowstone). Rangers at other parks not even involved in this experiment have also detected outbreaks for us, including Glacier and Bryce Canyon. Just this past summer at Bryce Canyon, an alert chief ranger noticed a higher than usual number of EMS transports and called our program to let us know. This notification led to a PHP response with two of our officers spending the July 4 weekend at the park where they identified at least 40 people who were ill, most likely from a viral agent. Even more astounding, is the fact that these “pilots” and conversations have been informal, and without any added paperwork or “systems.”

Here’s how it can work. Any visitor and resource protection ranger who has been at a park for any real length of time usually has a great deal of contact with visitors, day in and day out. They learn that there are patterns such as being asked the same question repeatedly or hearing the same complaints from visitors about the bathrooms at XYZ campground.

Paying attention to these patterns and recognizing changes often helps a ranger or park find out about new issues that can be very helpful to the management of an area. It works the same for disease transmission. Diseases of various types constantly and routinely circulate within populations and communities. These routine or “background” levels of disease transmission have established patterns that usually involve the same organisms and some constant, relatively low level of people ill at any one time.

Periodically, however, for various reasons, a change in where people are from, weather, animals or a whole host of other variables creates a new opportunity for a pathogen (a disease-causing virus, bacteria or parasite). If the opportunity is right, this disturbance can produce disease transmission by a pathogen not usually found in an area or at levels that are higher than average. We call this sort of event, outside of “normal,” an outbreak.

A good visual example is a viral outbreak at a large western park (see the chart on the next page). At the beginning of the chart, you can see what most likely are normal or background levels of disease transmission with a few cases occurring, some time between them (the incubation period) and then some more cases. Around the 21st or so of June, something changes, a lot of people are exposed in a short period of time, and an outbreak occurs.

PILOT PROGRAM: With the assistance of visitor and resource protection rangers at Grand Canyon, the Public Health Service initiated a pilot program for disease surveillance. Since that time, alert 025 rangers have detected several disease transmissions above average or “normal” levels over the past couple of years, including transmission events at Yosemite, Bryce Canyon and Glen Canyon.
Knowing what is usual in the visitor population of any given park, say three people a week complaining of gastrointestinal “flu,” or two a month that see a sick and dying bat, and being alert for any change in that pattern turns the average 0.25 protection ranger into a lean, mean disease transmission detection machine. This detection, followed by a call to the PHP to communicate the possibility, turns the observation into a partnership that becomes a disease surveillance system.

The Public Health Program has staff located in each region (the southeast position is vacant at the moment) and we encourage you to contact any of these individuals or the WASO office if at any time you notice or suspect anything unusual. We know that “ranger disease radar” works and we would love to hear from you, talk over whatever information you might have, and have the opportunity to decide if it warrants further investigation or response.

Capt. Charles L. Higgins of the U.S. Public Health Service has 27 years of experience in public health at the local, state and federal levels. As a commissioned officer he serves under the surgeon general and is assigned to federal agencies to assist them with public health issues. He has worked as a regional public health consultant at the Intermountain Regional Office; and for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Food and Drug Administration. He holds a master’s degree in environmental health from Colorado State University.

Public Health Service Staff
Here is a list of PHP staff and contact numbers. All of these individuals also are listed in the NPS e-mail directory.

Regional Public Health Consultants
Northeast
Capt. Barry Hartfield, 978-970-5033

National Capital
Capt. Richard Durrett, 202-619-7070

Southeast
Vacant

Midwest
Capt. Robert Reiss, 402-221-3786

Intermountain
Capt. John Collins, 303-969-2922 (Denver)
Capt. Joe Winkelmaier, 505-988-6040 (Santa Fe)
Lt. George Larsen, 307-344-2273 (Yellowstone)
Lt. Adam Kramer, 929-226-0168 (Flagstaff)

Pacific West
Cdr. Paul Robinson, 510-817-1375 (Oakland)
Cdr. John Leffel, 206-220-4270 (Seattle — covers Northwest and Alaska)

Alaska
Cdr. John Leffel, 206-220-4270

WASO Staff
Director, Office of Public Health
Capt. Chuck Higgins, 202-513-7217
Program Analyst Sonya Coakley, 202-513-7215

Individual Parks with Public Health Staff
Gateway, Lt. Craig Ungerecht, 718-354-4693
Sequoia Kings Canyon, Paul Schwartz, 559-565-3144
Lake Mead, J. Shannon Swann 702-293-8985
Yosemite, Bernice Dommer, 209-379-1033

PARTNERSHIP: Visitor and resource protection rangers within park units act as the eyes and ears for the NPS Public Health Program. After detecting and reporting an unusual outbreak on the Colorado River, park staff and the public health officer work with CDC technicians to sample for viral conditions on the river.
Honor Guard

The NPS-LETC has successfully implemented an honor guard program to represent the National Park Service and its employees and families at employee funerals where the loss is suffered in the line of duty. The honor guard is also deployed to ceremonies, parades and special events of national significance, or at any function at the request of the director, where a highly trained precision color guard is needed to represent the NPS in an extraordinarily dignified manner.

The honor guard assures that an appropriate ceremonial and customary funeral or other service may be provided to a family or survivor that demonstrates "honorable service of the decent" to the United States and its citizens.

RESPECTFUL TRIBUTE: The honor guard represented the NPS, its families and employees at the August funeral of park ranger Jeff Christensen, who lost his life while on patrol at Rocky Mountain National Park. NPS photos.

The honor guard assists all employees and their families during their time of deep emotional duress from the sudden and catastrophic loss of their loved ones.

The honor guard is fully staffed, readily equipped, highly trained, and immediately available when called upon.

Graduates take the oath, earn Type 1 commission

The National Park Service's basic training program for commissioned rangers is undergoing significant changes.

NPRI 503 is the last class to graduate from the current integrated academy. Beginning August 2005 the NPS has joined the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Marine Fisheries, Tennessee Valley Authority, U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Park Police in an 18-week basic law enforcement academy for land management agencies. It's called Land Management Police Training Program or LMPTP.

NPS trainees will report to FLETC before the LMPTP program for pre-academy work, and will remain after graduation for a post-academy session. These sessions are currently under development by the NPS-LETC staff.

As of January 2005, the traditional nomination process to attend the NPS basic training program has been changed. The NPS-LETC has developed a master database of employees waiting to attend basic training. Individuals will be assigned to classes based on their EOD dates into the NPS. As new law enforcement personnel are hired, they will be added to the database and assigned a class in the academy.

At the end of May 2005, the list contained nearly 70 names. For fiscal year 2005, the NPS Law Enforcement Training Center received funding to train 96 basic students, including field training. And finally, beginning October 2005, all basic academy trainees will be required to meet the Interior Department's fitness standards, prior to starting basic training and at graduation.
U.S. Ranger Fraternal Order of Police Lodge
17 years old and a force at Interior Department
By Randall Kendrick

The United States Ranger Fraternal Order of Police Lodge was begun in Yosemite and quickly spread nationwide. Its membership was given a big boost when the National Alliance of Park Rangers and Firefighters merged their membership into the FOP Lodge in 1991.

The Ranger Lodge’s prime goal at present is to prod management to take the steps needed to bring the National Park Service’s abysmal safety record into line with other federal law enforcement agencies. When the Department of Justice ended its five-year study in 2000 it stated, “When only assaults that result in death or injury are considered, the National Park Service had a rate of 15 per 1,000 officers, about three times the next highest rate of 5.1 per 1,000 at the U.S. Customs Service.” To compare, the FBI had a rate of 1.1 per 1,000 officers and the DEA had a rate of 1.2 per 1,000. Clearly this needs immediate attention as was noted by the Inspector General of Interior in his long study of management of law enforcement in the NPS. But, there has been little action.

Three years ago the International Association of Chiefs of Police noted that although appropriations for the NPS had risen 55 percent in the past few years, the number of commissioned rangers declined by 9 percent. The money is going somewhere but not where we feel its needed most. We want priorities changed and more commissioned rangers hired. Our goal is to have park rangers in a separate series from those other uniformed NPS employees. This is the management example used throughout most of the history of the NPS but was changed 35 years ago to add naturalists, historians and archeologists to the GS-025 series. Prior to this lumping, the three mentioned professions all had their own series. We believe that the interpreters suffered loss of professional standing because of this, and certainly the park rangers did. As a matter of fact, it wasn’t too long after the lumping took place that the attack on commissioned rangers took place in the form of hiring park technicians and park aides to do what had been journeyman ranger work.

With a separate series, the lodge strongly advocates a management structure where only career law enforcement officers staff it. This is in line with the inspector general’s recommendation and the practice of 99 percent of the federal, state and local law enforcement agencies in the United States. With a professional structure, we advocate a separate budget for law enforcement.

We feel this professionalization of ranger work will go a long way toward bringing down the awful safety record rangers have had to endure.

Once this issue is settled, rangers can go about their duties with radios that work in all parts of the park. With a dedicated dispatch service, no single officer patrols, and at least average backup response, the work of protecting the parks’ resources and the people who visit them will be much improved.

Our second goal is to get our law enforcement/firefighter enhanced retirement guaranteed in federal law. Right now, commissioned park rangers are among the few federal law enforcement entities with enhanced, or 6 [c], retirements that are not codified in law. We are seeing career rangers with extensive documented law enforcement backgrounds being forced to defend their careers before FLERT and lose 6[c] in some cases. This is clearly devastating to morale and is a big reason why 220 plus rangers have left the NPS for other federal law enforcement agencies in the past three years.

Another area of deep concern for the members of the Ranger Lodge is the ill treatment of commissioned seasonals. As recently as the mid 1960s, there were many park rangers — school teachers mostly — who worked only a few months of the year for the NPS yet were subject to-furlough (STF). This meant that they were eligible for a federal pension and could enroll in the health insurance plan. In fact, the NPS was named, along with the Internal Revenue Service, as examples of agencies with the need for workers on less than a 12-month basis year after year. The Civil Service Commission [then so named] said these workers should rightly be STF. In the late 1960s the NPS quit issuing STF status to seasonals and the last of them were gone by the early 1990s.

Twelve years ago an NPS maintenance worker in Washington, DC, was stricken on the job and died. He had little money to provide to his wife and children and the family had difficulty in funding a suitable funeral, as was reported in the Federal Times. Congress asked the managers of the NPS how a worker could be on the job for eight years and not have the benefits federal employees should have. Congress was told the employee was a seasonal (although he worked 10 months of the year) and was not eligible. As a result, Congress passed a law that said that if an agency had the need for a job more than six months per year on a recurring basis, that job had to be STF. I think we all recall that the NPS’s response was to cut seasonals back to 1,039 hours in a 12-month period, one hour below the law’s threshold — clearly 180 degrees away from the intent of the law. Our organization strongly supports STF status for all seasonal commissioned rangers regardless of the number of months per year they work. If the NPS could afford it for all (or many) temporary workers 40 years ago, the NPS can afford it today. This is especially compelling considering the dangers and harsh working conditions that are faced by commissioned temporary park rangers.

The Ranger FOP Lodge is a professional society dedicated to improving the work lives of its members. We draw our membership from the NPS, Bureau of Land Management, Fish Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and Corps of Engineers. The majority of members are from the NPS. We offer legal services, media coverage and congressional liaison provided by the FOP’s Washington office. The FOP has 321,000 members nationwide and we are proud to be a part of that number.

Randall Kendrick began his career with the National Park Service in 1962 at Zion. He retired from the Blue Ridge Parkway in 1995. At that time he was president of the Ranger Lodge to its executive director, a position he still holds. He has published local handouts on the birds, wildflowers, trees and ferns and has been published by the American Fern Society. He has appeared on the CBS Evening News and live radio, and has served as a consultant for ABC’s 20/20 program.

The National Park Trust invites ANPR members to sign up for Parkland News, the e-mail news source dedicated exclusively to America’s parklands, wildlife habitat and open space issues.

www.parktrust.org
legacy@parktrust.org

RANDALL KENDRICK
Law Enforcement Reforms

By the WASO Visitor and Resource Protection Division
As of December 2004

Department of the Interior Secretary Gale Norton approved a series of recommendations in 2002 made to her by a Law Enforcement Review Panel in a report titled “Law Enforcement at the Department of the Interior – Recommendations to the Secretary for Implementing Law Enforcement Reforms.” Some of the recommendations in the report require bureau action, others require action by the department. Below is the status of recommendations pertinent to the National Park Service.

Directive 6 – Senior SES Director of Law Enforcement
- Established and filled associate director, visitor and resource protection (chief ranger) position.
- Created Division of Law Enforcement and Emergency Services at the national level.
- Filled position of division chief of Law Enforcement and Emergency Services.

Directive 7 – Special Agent Reporting
- Established national special agent in charge (SAC) position.
- Implemented supervisory line authority process.
- Establishing regional SAC positions where workload operational analysis deems positions are necessary.
- Will establish 1811 workshops for workload analysis, reporting guidelines, case load management.

Directive 8 – Centralized Management System
- Special agents now are managed centrally (per directive #7).
- Commissioned rangers in field report to commissioned supervisors.
- Special agents are on-call to provide assistance 24/7.
- Established Internal Affairs Unit in Washington Office as part of comprehensive implementation strategy for line authority for special agents (see #7).
- Director mandated background investigations (BI) for managers and top secret clearance for “icon” park superintendents; BIs in progress.
- Law enforcement for managers course was held in March 2004; two courses scheduled for FY 2005 for 48 participants each.
- Established Multi-Region Coordination Group (MRCG) to prioritize and coordinate resource deployment for national emergencies.
- Centralized coordinated resource deployment for national emergencies at the EICC – SHEN. Merging of MRCG and EICC will take place FY 2005.

Directive 9 – Activity-Based Costing
- NPS is participating in department’s ABC workgroup.

Directive 11 – Staffing Model Methodologies
- Law enforcement needs assessments have been prepared for all parks. First cut rollout for FY 2006 has been accomplished with prioritization based on park law enforcement needs assessments (LENA) and departmental guidance.
- OFS requests have been adjusted/prepared to address critical law enforcement needs.
- LENA oversight will be major component of law enforcement and emergency services staff ranger position, to be filled in FY 2005.

Directive 12 – Officer Safety
- Field training evaluation program continues to build on success: 19 participating parks assisted in the training of 77 rangers in the pilot 2004 year, with only one ranger requiring additional field training oversight.
- The automated, computerized documentation process and data collection system for evaluating student performance while in the field training program has also been a great success, with daily observation information available to the program managers within moments of transmission from the field.
- The field training evaluation program software will become web-based in 2005, and the administratively uncontrolled overtime tracking software for the program has been developed and was implemented as a web-based program.
- Fitness program validation testing continues with FLETC staff support.
- FLETC continues to support special operations training course for 2005.
- TelNet scheduling is ongoing to provide legal updates/use of force issues twice monthly for park refreshers for FY 2005.

Directive 13 – Reduce Dependence on Seasonal and Part-Time Law Enforcement/Ensure Appropriate Training
- Developing strategy to phase level II to level I commission.
- Mandatory training is provided per department standards (DM-446), NPS standard (RM-9) and FLETC standards.

Directive 16 – Senior Level Security Manager
- Established security manager position; recruiting permanent position.
The Ranger Profession

By Aniceto “Cheto” Olais

Angers lead the way,” a line borrowed from the U.S. Army Ranger Creed, is one we were exposed to in the late ’70s when I first started to work for the National Park Service. Veteran rangers at the time kept referring to it and how it related to my work as a GS-3 park aide. I did not understand it fully at the time, but as I gained experience and started to fit into my cordovan leather uniform boots, which were spit shined every day, it became evident that this was a special group.

As time went on, the ranger profession has changed in some ways — and in others it has remained relatively the same. Initiatives have come and gone, but rangers in most cases continue to do traditional ranger work, from saving a life to responding to a structural fire or arresting a drunk driver.

Our authority in law enforcement did not change during my tenure, but the focus has greatly increased. Dedicated rangers who have died “leading the way” have forced us to reexamine our law enforcement program. The attacks on Sept. 11, 2001, in this country imposed similar results, which led to a stronger law enforcement role for park rangers nationwide.

As an advocate of maintaining strong law enforcement qualities and skills for all commissioned law enforcement rangers, we must continue to support the rangers in all they do, to include the role of law enforcement. Ranges who elect to perform law enforcement duties in the NPS are sworn to uphold laws protecting both park resources and visitors. We cannot choose to just enforce resource-related crimes and ignore the other. As we all know, they are interrelated and we must be cognizant of their relationships. The severe consequences remain the same.

If you don’t acquire the proper training or possess the mindset of taking a life if warranted, then law enforcement ranger work is not for you. It is the most hazardous part of our job as law enforcement commissioned park rangers.

The specific part of ranger work is no different than from a police officer on the streets of Phoenix, Arizona. Dealing with a wide variety of individuals who are generally law abiding park visitors, but could well be wanted felons, make our job most challenging. Bad guys behave the same when in parks as they do on the corner street in Phoenix. These contacts may vary tremendously from park to park, but the outcomes are generally the same. In this field you will educate, investigate, issue citations, make arrests, be assaulted, and may even God forbid, use deadly force, because you had to protect yourself or others. It is what we do.

We no longer carry our revolvers in our backpacks; we openly display them for all to see. It is a change that has met much resistance within our ranks. But in time, it has become an expectation from those we serve.

Rangers on the other hand, are different from the city cops in regard to what else we do. Rangers lead the way in how we do business in our national parks. Being able to go from taking down an unruly suspect to answering questions about a particular mammal that awakened visitors in the campground requires the attributes of a chameleon. The flexibility of a multi-skilled ranger are attributes not many organizations possess.

Our ranger tradition is known worldwide. Professionals continually comment on what rangers do, and they ask how it feels to be one! The traditional values many of us strive for are buried deep into our souls. We all want to make a difference during our short tenure. We want to pass on to others what we have learned in hopes of them doing the same. The evolution continues.

In most recent times, we have experienced additional time and dollars needed to meet the law enforcement requirements for certification and evaluation. Time has brought us the much needed Field Training and Evaluation Program. Yes, it is a heck of a long time for rangers to be away from parks, but the question would be, “Is it worth the time and money spent?”

I would suggest asking this question to those who have been through the program and those managers who are receiving trained rangers. I think that most will agree with the program and its objectives.

What effect does all this have on rangers these days? Being able to maintain certification as a park medic, structural fire engine, critical incident stress de-briefer, SAR team member and a commissioned law enforcement ranger is hard to accomplish today. It can be done with lots of commitment and initiative on the ranger’s part, but there are not enough hours in the day to make it happen and stay efficient in all the disciplines. Program managers may question the effectiveness of a program when 50 percent of

MEDEVAC: Rangers at Yosemite assist with a medical evacuation.
The Ranger Profession (continued from previous page)

Rangers who manage programs need to make the right choice, even if it is the unpopular and more rugged of the routes offered. Too many times rangers in our business have taken the easy road, thus making it harder for others to maintain effective programs. The higher standard each one of us is held to should be reinforced each day by supervisors, district rangers and chiefs. In order for managers to expect this level of performance, they must be able to first supply the staff with the tools needed and then make sure you perform at the same level you expect others to perform. That is, you should strive to keep up the swiftest three-mile pack tester, bench your weight and more, and take the physical tests and other certifications every time you expect them of others.

I have had the fortunate opportunity to work with many of the best rangers in the country during my NPS tenure. Those who have worked with me side by side at various park areas and those who have trained with me know that each one of you lead the way in your respective park areas. The NPS/LETC-sponsored special operations course has graduated more than 300 of the best rangers out there who were willing to work together as a team, acquire new skills, sharpen others, and lead the way into the future of the National Park Service.

Receiving the prestigious Harry Yount Award this past spring was an incredible honor to both me and my family. This peer-nominated award for those who “further the art and science of rangering,” can be presented to many a ranger I know who fits this description. However, there is only one winner. And for that, I am very honored to be amongst those previous Yount recipients. It is tribute that all rangers who “lead the way” should be dreaming about. You can and will make a difference.

Aniceto “Cheto” Olais has left his position of chief ranger at Zion for a support position at the intermountain regional law enforcement specialist. He was one of the key persons in the establishment of the park’s law enforcement programs and has been instrumental in developing and implementing many aspects of the park’s visitor and resource protection programs. He is a true professional and will be missed.

Regional challenges (continued from page 10)

“Lack of understanding of the risks, role and function of the resource and visitor protection program and the subsequent lack of support from superintendents. This is illustrated in negative comments made by managers towards our profession, the growing trend of downgrading or eliminating ranger positions and redirecting support money in direct and open conflict with the director’s policy.”

“The biggest challenge I face in every job with the NPS is visitor protection and resource management is balancing visitor use with preservation. Balancing recreation, use and preservation will only get more difficult as population grows and open spaces get harder to find.”

“Inadequate operational budget to provide resource education.”

“The overall erosion of our staff and finances. There always seems to be sufficient money to deal with the latest flavor of the day initiative out of WASO, but the nuts and bolts mission of the National Park Service apparently doesn’t have the same draw. What I could do with a mere fraction of the money spent on the “outsourcing” of operations on our lands that don’t belong to the NPS? Lack of adequate staffing—one ranger is often gone on SET and HLS assignments leaving protecting the park to one NPS ranger for river patrol. The other ranger position was often vacant for long periods of time; a new ranger was at FLET and field training assignment for much of past year (December ’04 through August ’05). We could use two seasonal LE rangers (unfunded) for more help. Other challenges: absence of backup; no federally approved jail nearby; lack of cooperation among local LE agencies.”

“Nuisance vandalism. That may sound rather petty but being an urban park with a college campus within walking distance we continually suffer from skateboard damage to park features, graffiti, stolen flags, monuments, dismantled fences, broken hedges and more. This adds up to lots of maintenance and lots of dollars. The lack of respect from young people is scary.”

(continued on next page)
Protection through Connection
The Resource Stewardship and Protection Curriculum

By Jeri Hall
Albright Training Center

"Population growth and ... illegal activity threaten park resources as never before. Theft and marketing of artifacts, animal parts, plant life, and other illegal commercial activities threaten to bleed away the vital resource base of the parks."

The challenge of protecting the natural and cultural resources of the national parks is complex and requires coordination of a variety of important functions. These include applying a high level of resource knowledge to park management, educating the public about park resources and their protection, and professionally enforcing resource laws. One especially troubling concern is the vulnerability of park resources to theft and trade. In response to these needs the National Park Service has engineered an interdisciplinary, four-course training curriculum for the professional development of staffs to play a more effective, coordinated role in resource protection.

Known as the Resource Stewardship and Protection Curriculum, the training emphasizes the proactive protection of resources by integrating park rangers, resource managers, interpreters, facility managers and others. Ironically, specialized training of these staffs over the past couple of decades has isolated them from one another. The team approach, however, is stimulating collaboration among different park operations and regions and proving to be an effective strategy for the protection of highly threatened park resources. The curriculum has been developed by teams of interdisciplinary NPS field employees in partnership with the Eppley Institute for Parks and Public Lands of Indiana University.

Since its beginnings in Yosemite and the Pacific West Region in 1999, the curriculum has gained support and is now managed at the national level. From FY 2002 through 2005 it was funded by the Natural Resource Protection Fund of the Natural Resource Challenge and the Pacific West Region, allowing for the curriculum’s development, evaluation and refinement, and delivery to audiences throughout the NPS. This program is one example of how the Natural Resource Challenge has reached out not just to the scientists and resource managers but also to the enforcement and maintenance staffs of the NPS. Growing support for the training is indicative of an exciting transformation in the Park Service to a shared sense of responsibility for the welfare of park resources.

Four courses have evolved, from an original seven courses, which reflect a philosophy of interdisciplinary collaboration for enhanced resource protection. “Introduction to Resource Stewardship,” the first course, has been presented to over 250 employees. The second course in the series, “Resource Stewardship for Protection Rangers,” has had more than 110 commissioned rangers as participants over the last six years. Due to increasing demand, this second course will be delivered in a revised format beginning in 2006 for interdisciplinary teams and be retitled as “Interdisciplinary Resource Protection and Law.” This course will be a prerequisite for the third course, “Intermediate Resource Protection for Interdisciplinary Teams,” which was designed in 2003 in conjunction with Indiana University and has been presented as a pilot to 25 participants. Course four has not yet been developed but is envisioned to provide second-level supervisors, division chiefs and others having resource protection program lead responsibilities to fully integrate a strong resource protection program into daily as well as short- and long-range operations.

Course two and three provide participants with a solid understanding of the resource mission of the NPS and the primary laws, legal authorities, case law interpretation and policies used to protect park resources. Participants receive instruction in the functions and roles that contribute to effective interdisciplinary group work and practice these skills through resource protection case studies. Course two focuses on the ability of the employee to recognize a diversity of natural and cultural resources existing throughout the park system and the types of threats and vulnerabilities associated with these resources. Participants use the legal basis (including compliance) for resource protection, and develop skills and strategies to respond and take action. The focus for course three is on the complexity in identifying resources at risk, the interpretation of the complex legal and environmental framework surrounding resource stewardship, and the ability to anticipate and plan for ways in which to protect the resource. The courses promote an interdisciplinary approach using team dynamics and functions, leadership skills development, integration of expertise, and guidance for decision-making.

This effort presents a long-term, strategic approach for the training of NPS employees in the use of resource protection techniques for natural and cultural resources. The course work is already giving these staffs the essential competencies to build proactive resource protection programs throughout the NPS. Interdisciplinary partnerships among natural and cultural resource employees, visitor and resource protection rangers, and other NPS personnel are enhancing the application of field-based techniques to protect park resources.

The curriculum’s success has led to its acceptance as a national curriculum, and it is managed from the Horace M. Albright Training Center. A train-the-trainer course, presented in September 2005, will increase the instructor cadres to prepare for course deliveries in 2006. For more information on the protection curriculum go to www.nps.gov/training/nhrs/nrshome.htm.

Jeri Hall, a 26-year employee of the NPS, recently moved from Yosemite to the Horace M. Albright Training Center as the servicewide natural resource stewardship training manager and lead of the stewardship, visitor and resource protection training team.

Regional challenges (continued from previous page)

“I’d say it is not having enough funding to support a second LE position, which means a lack of presence/coverage in the park.”

“The greatest LE (protection) challenge in a small, rural park is having a person to do LE. We generally do not need a person assigned full-time to protection duties but because collateral assignments have been eliminated from the NPS, many small parks are left without anyone commissioned. The once or twice a year the park (continued on page 18)
The Evolution of NPS Law Enforcement

By Jennifer Sedge

When park scout Felix Burgess captured the notorious poacher Ed Howell in Yellowstone, all he needed was his snowshoes, his .38 caliber and the luck of being in the right place at the right time. That was in 1894, when poachers operated on a more rudimentary level.

In today’s marketplace, with forces such as the Internet and overnight shipping, poachers of wildlife and plants from national parks operate on a level of sophistication equivalent to any other black market enterprise. In this 21st century, a poacher can find a buyer for his goods and ship them to a client oversees at the click of a button. Are traditional law enforcement tactics still enough to meet the National Park Service’s protective capacity of law enforcement rangers? The goal of this experiment was to use a level of ecosystem-wide interdiction that encompassed law enforcement, science, education and regulation. Was it a success? Read on to learn more about the Appalachian Chain Demonstration Project (ACDP) and how it may inform the evolution of NPS’ law enforcement capacity.

What Demonstration?
The ACDP focused on four medicinal plants in the Appalachian Mountains that may be at risk for poaching: American ginseng (Panax quinquefolius), bloodroot (Sanguinaria canadensis), black cohosh (Cimicifuga racemosa), galax (Galax aphylla) and goldenseal (Hydrastis canadensis). Specifically, this project sought to explore and test solutions to key weaknesses in the protective capacity of NPS law enforcement that were identified in the project design.

1. Improving Scientific Understanding

The three parks who worked together to implement a three-year experiment, dubbed the Appalachian Chain Demonstration Project (ACDP), that tested specific tools for improving the protective capacity of law enforcement rangers. The goal of this experiment was to use a level of ecosystem-wide interdiction that encompassed law enforcement, science, education and regulation. Was it a success? Read on to learn more about the Appalachian Chain Demonstration Project (ACDP) and how it may inform the evolution of NPS’ law enforcement capacity.

What Demonstration?
The ACDP focused on four medicinal plants in the Appalachian Mountains that may be at risk for poaching: American ginseng (Panax quinquefolius), bloodroot (Sanguinaria canadensis), black cohosh (Cimicifuga racemosa), galax (Galax aphylla) and goldenseal (Hydrastis canadensis). Specifically, this project sought to explore and test solutions to key weaknesses in the protective capacity of NPS law enforcement that were identified in the project design.

1. Improving Scientific Understanding

1. Exploitative threats to resources are poorly understood and quantified.
2. Protective efforts are self-limited by administrative boundaries.
3. Resource sciences, enforcement, and education rarely work in unison against specific resource threats.
4. Enforcement capabilities have not evolved to meet emerging threats.
5. Workforce assets are not consistently focused on the most at-risk resources.

Here’s how the ACDP turned these weaknesses into opportunities for improvement.

2. Reaching Across Boundaries

Natural and cultural resources and their threats rarely obey administrative boundaries. As a resource becomes scarce outside boundaries, pressure increases on the resource within park boundaries. Therefore, “any protection scheme can’t end at our borders,” says Clayton.
Jordon, deputy chief ranger at Shenandoah. Federal and state lands that surround a national park may share similar resources and exploitation issues. And according to Janet Rock, park botanist at Great Smoky Mountains, with parks that have both species and resource threats in common, “why not put all heads together to keep from duplicating efforts?”

A primary aim of the ACDP was to reach out across the administrative boundaries of the national parks, to engage agencies that share similar resources. Four federal agencies including the NPS, Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Geological Survey, teamed with state agencies and researchers at three universities to share information, poaching data and enforcement methods. Protection was viewed from an ecosystemwide perspective.

“To restore resource stability within park boundaries, NPS will frequently be required to exercise leadership in resources protection at the eco-system level,” says Ken Johnson, director of the Institute for Conservation Law Enforcement.

According to Jim Corbin, a plant protection specialist with the North Carolina Department of Agriculture, this type of collaboration is intimidating to would be poachers and it helps law enforcement professionals “cover more ground by putting more personnel in the field.” At one meeting funded by the ACDP, the team brought together regulatory personnel from two federal and four state agencies surrounding the three parks to discuss loopholes in laws, reporting procedures and poaching threats to ginseng. This forum provided tremendous exchange of information regarding resource protection and evolving threats and is expected to result in better ecosystem level regulations.

3. Reaching Across Desks

National parks are full of dedicated individuals who work within their discipline to protect and preserve park resources. But in many cases, these disciplines do not work together in carefully targeted teams to mitigate specific resource threats. Law enforcement rangers do not need to duplicate the work of other fields, but must engage in designed partnerships to utilize the efforts of each discipline when executing a protection strategy. John Garrison, chief ranger at Blue Ridge Parkway, says, “I don’t believe we could ever match the capacity found in other disciplines. But we sure haven’t been real good at tapping in to it either.”

The ACDP used the knowledge and skills of professionals from a wide range of disciplines, such as law enforcement rangers and agents, botanists, forensic specialists, data management specialists, economists, educators, biogeoographers and protected area land managers.

4. Formulating New Strategies

Rangers range, and in doing so, they frequently operate reactively to problems that are encountered in the field. This has typified NPS law enforcement strategy since park scout Burgess caught his man in 1894. However, this method may not be effective at protecting resources that are targeted for exploitation by sophisticated poaching rings.Nor is it likely to be successful as an argument for increased funding.

“We’re locked in a policing mindset that is so steeped in its own tradition that it’s not getting the maximum benefit from its people” says Garrison.

The rangers formulated and implemented several new law enforcement tools and strategies that might be more effective in protecting plants that are at risk for exploitation. They developed models to predict the behavior of poachers and assess the threat to the resource. Using this information, they targeted behaviors to meet these demands. They also used covert operations to evaluate the level of exploitation and funded research into improved forensic techniques and information management tools.

The ACDP included Operation VIPER, an undercover operation that targeted a thriving black market in national park resources such as American ginseng. Operation VIPER (Virginia Interagency Effort to Protect Environmental Resources) resulted in prosecutions involving 487 state violations and 204 federal violations.

“This case demonstrates the incredible level of depth and sophistication of these criminal enterprises that target our resources,” says supervisory special agent Skip Wissinger, the NPS’ case agent.

5. Focusing Priorities

The rangers in this study were looking for a way to identify the resources that are most “at-risk” and focus their protection efforts accordingly. “Rangers doing undefined and undirected patrol work could result in some good casework in resource protection. But this practice often results in nothing more than just a presence,” says Garrison. Traditional ranging alone produced little measurable success in deterring the exploitation of resources that were actually in decline.

For example, each of the three parks has traditionally placed a large emphasis on illegal deer hunting. But as Garrison points out, “The population of the eastern white-tailed deer is at the point of being a nuisance in many of the areas that we work in. And while we sit there waiting for someone to take an overpopulated resource, a collector or their agent may walk right past us with the last viable colony of a particular plant, insect or microorganism.” And while he agrees that the criminality of the two cases is identical, he emphasizes that the impact on the park resources cannot be compared.

Rather than the traditional “shotgun” approach to law enforcement that aims to protect the resource as a whole, Clayton Jordan describes the model of enforcement used in the ACDP as a “high-powered rifle” approach that targeted specific threats to specific resources. By focusing and prioritizing the efforts of the personnel within the project, they were able to link specific goals and outcomes to their employees.

What Now?

The fieldwork of the ACDP was completed in 2004. But the collaborative partnerships formed and information learned during this project will go on to support future endeavors to innovate the ranger profession. Threats to park resources continue to evolve from the days when Ed Howell was poaching buffalo in Yellowstone.

And inventive solutions, like those found in the ACDP, may offer the tools necessary to help law enforcement rangers evolve too, and uphold their mandate as protectors of our national parks.

For more information on the theory and practice of the ACDP see http://www.jmu.edu/ACDP.

Jennifer Savedge is a freelance writer living in Luray, Virginia, just outside Shenandoah.
First Amendment Advice from First-Hand Experience

By Lee Dickinson
WASO

I received my 30-year plaque at a ceremony on the lawn of the South Interior Building this past July 4. The date was ironic. For the first 26-plus years of my career I worked at Independence, and the 4th was never a holiday for employees there. Seems like I worked every Fourth of July, though I’m sure one or two years the holiday probably fell on a lieu day.

My present job is in WASO as the special park uses program manager. When people ask what I do for a living my answer is still, “I’m a park ranger for the National Park Service,” though I guess technically that’s not quite true anymore. Am I a typical park ranger? In some ways yes, and in some ways no.

When I started my career the “real” park ranger was male, worked west of the Mississippi and never walked on concrete. I was female, working in an urban historical park. Over the years I performed a wide range of duties, like working in an urban historical park. Over the years I performed a wide range of duties, like most rangers do. I began and ended my (field ranger) career at Independence in interpretation. In between I served as a public information officer, an archivist, the special events coordinator, and even had some law enforcement training back when they were training just about everyone to write a citation. But atypically, I never transferred to another park. I got loaned out occasionally, but my duty station until I moved to WASO was Philadelphia.

So the question is why. Was the attraction that kept me in an urban historical park for 26 years? First and foremost it was probably the depth of the interpretive story. I spent a career explaining to visitors that the events of the last quarter of the 18th century occurring in Philadelphia had a direct bearing on their lives today. The Declaration of Independence, the U.S. Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the evolution of the Supreme Court are all part of the events that occurred in the buildings where I worked. And that’s what really put the hold on me. I was fascinated with the First Amendment and became a staunch supporter of its protection over folks who demonstrated in the park.

I served as special events coordinator at Independence for more than 10 years. One year Independence, at the time less than 50 acres, issued more than 900 permits. We issued every type of permit: special events, filming, photography, first amendment and distribution of printed material; permits for one person to permits for thousands of people.

First Amendment permits were the most fascinating. Drawn by the symbolism of the Liberty Bell and Independence Hall, applications came from every side of every issue. The first lesson learned was that in the final analysis the message of the applicant didn’t matter. For or against any issue, it was our responsibility to grant the applicant the right to express his/her point of view without unduly impacting either the other visitors or the resource. Permits could include terms and conditions that regulated the time, place or manner of the proposed activity, but barring some extraordinary circumstances, we had only one response in terms of accepting or declining the request: we never said no. We always found space for the request. Did we ever run out of room? It came close once in 1998 during the Presidents’ Summit for Volunteerism.

The closing ceremony included every living president from President Ford to President Clinton, with the exception of President Reagan who was too sick to travel.

Our visitors were not always pleased. After walking by a demonstration expressing a message a particular visitor might did not agree with, it was not unusual to get asked, “How can you let them do that here?” There was something stirring about pointing to Congress Hall across the street and informing the visitor that in 1791 the Bill of Rights was officially added to the Constitution as Congress met in that building. And add that the First Amendment not only protected demonstrators but protected them too.

One of my coworkers called it turning lemons into lemonade. We were not always successful in convincing the visitor that the demonstration was appropriate, but they got a dandy civics lesson.

I was teaching a session on First Amendment activities at a special park uses course a few years ago. One participant had just described for the class the very large Fourth of July event held in their park every year. We then went on to talk about a hypothetical First Amendment request for about 400 people. The participant added that the park would never approve such a request because they didn’t have a big enough First Amendment area. I smiled. How could you justify having a party for thousands of people, but turn down a First Amendment request for lack of room? The answer is that you can’t. When in doubt go back and check out 36 CFR 2.4.2. The regulation starts out by saying that a First Amendment area may be designated on a map maintained in the superintendent’s office.

Regional challenges (continued from page 15)

needs LE capabilities, we must request assistance from a ‘nearby’ (125 - 200 miles away) NPS unit. In an exigent circumstance, this technique is useless. Relying on local agreements with a sheriff or community constable is only effective against the most serious of offenders because they will generally not enforce 36 CFR or resource violations. The alternative is to hire a full-time LE ranger and have them either making up assignments to keep busy or having them detailed to NPS trouble spots, which defeats the purpose of hiring them since they are no longer in the park.”

“Trying to ensure that rangers are safe and effective law enforcement officers, yet still maintaining a kind of generalist (wearing many hats) ranger ability in the park.”

“Lack of adequate funding is the most significant challenge that limits me in fulfilling my visitor and resource protection responsibilities. A couple of shots: 1. We had an OFS request approved after many years of waiting to strengthen our law enforcement and emergency services operation, [but] now that the money

(continued on next page)
The regulation goes on to say that an area may only be designated as not available if it falls within one of a number of categories. The bottom line is that if an area is available for a special event, it is available for a First Amendment activity.

It's funny how I don't remember a lot of specifics about many of the First Amendment permits that were issued. I just have a memory of there being many, many permits, covering an unlimited number of subjects. Some standout, like the woman who got a permit to distribute religious tracts and speak every week for years. I still remember her name.

Then there was the demonstration that formed across the street from Independence Hall just prior to the visit of the president of China. There were rallies supporting Mumia Abu Jamal. At one rally I asked a young lady sitting on the curb if she was ill and got a string of obscenities from her male companion apparently for only seeming to care. It is my most vivid memory of being judged by my uniform.

Just before the visit of the president of China to Independence Hall, we were told by members of the Chinese delegation that the president would not visit if the demonstration that had formed across the street from Independence Hall was not moved to another location. The demonstration was not moved, and I gather that the president, or at least members of his delegation, were given a quick lesson in the First Amendment.

And then there were the three demonstrations that received permits for a Saturday morning protest a Ku Klux Klan rally before the Klan representative canceled the rally due to fear for the group's safety. The other groups still showed up and some of their positions were as extreme as the Klan's.

I can sum up my support for First Amendment activities in one short story. After a permit had been issued to the Klan for a rally, there was a considerable amount of concern on the part of park staff and the community at large. To many, Independence Hall seemed the wrong place to allow a rally of the Klan. Some people were concerned about the group’s message, some by the potential risk to people and resources.

I asked a good friend, a black law enforcement ranger, how he felt protecting a group like the Klan. He replied (and I'm paraphrasing) that he had marched in the civil rights marches of the 1960s, and if he didn't do his job and protect this group's right to gather and speak, then what he had marched for earlier didn't mean anything.

Lee Wilksom serves as the special park uses manager at the WASO Visitor and Resource Protection Division.

NPS Wilderness Program

Compiled from the WASO National Wilderness and Recreation Programs Office, Rick Potts, Manager

W ilderness is a special portion of the National Park System that American citizens and the United States Congress have jointly declared will be kept as wild and natural as possible. Wilderness designation is a declaration of people's care and desire to protect special areas in the National Park System. As a result of the Wilderness Act of 1964 and subsequent legislation, 46 national parks contain 44 million acres of designated wilderness — nearly 53 percent of all Park Service lands.

By passing wilderness legislation, Congress reduced the discretion NPS managers had in choosing among a variety of development options and recreational uses. In addition, they decided that NPS areas should be evaluated for wilderness designation and if appropriate, some areas be managed as wilderness. Although national parks are protected areas, Congress chose to apply the Act to the National Park Service to augment protection of these areas. It was appropriately responding to the trend within the agency to make parks more and more accessible and comfortable to visitors through additional development.

Within the National Park Service, wilderness operations are managed under the Visitor and Resource Protection directorate through the National Wilderness and Recreation Programs Office. The Wilderness Program assists the National Park Service and individual parks in implementing the requirements of the 1964 Wilderness Act through policy and guidance development, training for managers and staff, technical assistance, and advisory services.

The Wilderness Act states that "In order to assure that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions, leaving no lands designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness." Although there is great similarity between the NPS Organic Act and the Wilderness Act, Congress applied the Wilderness Act to the National Park Service to strengthen its protective capabilities.

Because wilderness stewardship is ultimately the responsibility of managers and many types of staff specialists in wilderness parks, a major focus of the program is on providing wilderness stewardship training and individual park training workshops through the interagency Arthur Carhart National Wilderness Training Center.

The program is guided by a National Wilderness Steering Committee comprised of superintendents and a variety of staff specialists from across the National Park System. This committee advises the associate director of visitor and resource protection on a wide range of wilderness and wildland issues to ensure that wilderness stewardship is a part of comprehensive and integrated park management.

has arrived we have become the bad guys in wanting to hang on to and use for its intended purpose. (All NPS operations are short on dollars, and our funding increase is expected to meet the competing demands of managing a park.) 2. The ever-increasing administrative requirements in ever-growing responsibilities of our jobs pull people away from the basic function of serving visitors and protecting resources. Being in an isolated environment further complicates it without modern communication capabilities."

"From my recent experience, the No. 1 challenge in fulfilling visitor and resources protection responsibilities are bone-headed superintendents who make stupid decisions or set bad precedents in order to promote their personal agenda or to promote their own career ambitions."

"Lack of funds to hire sufficient staff. I am in my third chief ranger position in busy LE parks; in each park in which I was the chief ranger, we (continued on next page)
Regional challenges

(continued from previous page)

were always short handed, despite my good fortune to have worked for supportive superintendents (there are many superintendents who are not supportive of protection, but that is another story). Incident numbers and impacts continue to increase; staff continue to decrease. Protection in the NPS lacks soft money sources and depends on base funding. When parks occasionally do get OFS base increases for law enforcement, most of the money is diverted to other park functions than what the increase request was based on. The erosive factors of underfunded pay increases combined with regional assessments adversely affects all park programs and takes its toll over time, like a chronic illness. What soft money there is has strings attached. This is not a sustainable approach and we are seeing the deterioration of park resources occurring on our watch because of it.

Lack of funding. I do not have needed funding to protect resources and visitors at the park. I have been unable to meet the no-net-loss requirements, and in FY 05 I was ($120,000) in the red. The other divisions in the park have helped make up the deficit the last two years. I have completed a law enforcement needs assessment and multiple OFS requests and most of the requests make the top 60 in priority but never get funded. We always seem to be the bridesmaid not the bride.

"Hard to narrow down the No. 1 challenge. I would say the following two items. The lack of time required to have a dedicated law enforcement program is hampered by the amount of collateral duties that is heaped upon the dedicated law enforcement ranger. The rangers have always been the backbone of the agency, but with more administrative staff now required due to the computer demands, basic structural changes have reduced our forces to a minimal. E-mail, Intranet and other electronic influences are time-devouring devices and while useful can be overly burdensome. This has resulted in an administratively top-heavy agency, which is now a cliche version of cyberdog's 'fiber optic tail wagging its electronic head.'

"The (park unit) does not have any LE rangers. The NPS owns little land at this unit, but we still have the protection responsibilities. We've completed the LENA and the OFS request for protection personnel and equipment."

"Lack of time to work for the park resources and visitors stemming from the bureaucratic processes that we are continually bombarded with."

"Overcoming the limits of budget and staffing levels to do the very best job we can in protecting people and resources at some of the most special places in America. Our parks are not just 'average places,' the values protected are tremendous, and many times there are very special protection concerns. I believe that the American people expect a very high level of protection in our parks. In some cases, we need to just continue to get better: improve procedures, training and to be more efficient with what we have. There is always room for positive progress. But in many cases, it may take more money, staffing and resources to do the very best job we can do. When it comes to protecting human life and valuable resources, doing less does not seem like a good option."

"The catering to special interests and lack of support for LE operations by NPS management, concurrent with the absence of effective prosecution/sentencing for serious crime occurring in the park."

"The No. 1 challenge is not so much the daily challenge of protecting resources and educating the visitors, it's very much the challenge of motivating the LE staff to do those very activities when they know they are viewed by many in the association and NPS as being the antithesis of what is fondly remembered as the generalist protection ranger. Rejecting them out of hand as suggested by Rick Smith at the Rapid City Rendezvous (who stated, 'I'm not entirely sure that ANPR can hold on to, or even wants to hold onto, these members if their interests stray too much further from the resources protection and education functions that once were the hallmarks of the protection ranger profession'), makes for a hard sell that they are a part of a team and their function is essential to resource protection and visitor education, and they are supported and appreciated by the association."

"The No. 1 challenge in fulfilling the goals set forth for the division of visitor and resource protection is: both financial and managerial support of the LE program within the National Park Service."

I have been a NPS ranger for 22 years in seven parks; I have not seen the NPS in worse shape than it is today. Our training dollars are gone. Our vehicles are gone. Pretty soon the park resources will be gone (some are already gone). I guess we're all good at identifying the problems, it's finding the solutions that is the tough part."

---

RIVER RESCUE: Rangers at Canyonlands

---

Share your views!

Please share your views on the preceding articles — or any topic — in the next Ranger magazine. Signed letters to the editor 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. Send to fordedit@aol.com or Editor, 26 S. Mt. Vernon Club Road, Golden, CO 80401.
Interpretation
Interpretation Crib Notes: Informal Visitor Contacts—Of the 10 benchmark competencies assessed by the National Park Service Interpretive Development Program, Demonstrating Successful Informal Visitor Contacts (curriculum Module 102) is one of the most challenging but also one of the most important. While most of the other modules involve sending in an actual written or video recorded interpretive product, making it possible to complete and submit as a part of everyday business, the Informal Visitor Contacts competency requires that interpreters describe and analyze six informal visitor encounters using a log entry form consisting of 14 short answer and essay questions. Preparing this submission is time-consuming but can be a valuable exercise for any ranger, new or experienced. We often don’t put the same amount of planning and forethought into informal interpretation as we do for formal programs, but some of the most meaningful interpretive encounters can happen in a few impromptu moments. Here are a few tips and suggestions that may help submitters analyze their encounters and prepare their submissions for this important competency.

Certifiers are looking for a series of log entries that demonstrate that the interpreter understands when, why and how to provide basic and in-depth information and when, why and how to provide opportunities for the audience to form their own intellectual and emotional connections with resource meanings. This is the core of the competency and, succinctly put, it means that the certifiers are looking at each submission on an information/interpretation continuum — does the interpreter assess the needs of the audience and correctly decide to provide simple orientation, simple information, in-depth information, interpretation or all of the above? And, in order to evaluate this process, you must provide the certifiers with as much detail in your logs as you possibly can. It is better to be thorough in your descriptions than economical with your words.

Some of the most important information that you can provide in your logs are the descriptions of the audience cues that influenced your decisions to move the contact in a particular direction. Cues can be questions, remarks, body language, gestures, or other behaviors exhibited by visitors over the course of your contact with them. If a visitor appears agitated or in a hurry, include it in your narrative, especially if it influenced the way in which you handled the contact. If a visitor asks a question or makes a remark that clearly underscores the emotional or intellectual connection you were seeking to forge, include that moment in the narrative. In the many submissions I have reviewed, a lack of thoroughness in describing the audience cues that influenced the interpreter’s decision path has been a recurring motif in submissions found to be approaching certification standards.

Think holistic. You may include in your logs one of the greatest interpretive encounters in the history of interpretation, but if your other five log entries are not descriptive or do not demonstrate your knowledge of the information/interpretation continuum, the submission will not demonstrate certification standards. Certifiers make their determinations based upon the logs as a whole, not on one or two phenomenal log entries. As a whole, the logs must demonstrate an understanding of the information/interpretation continuum and contain narrative that makes your decisions and motives about the contacts transparent.

Finally, do not try to convince yourself for the certifiers that a purely informational contact contained opportunities for intellectual or emotional connections. If it was inappropriate to attempt to move the contact toward interpretation, state your reasons unequivocally, supported by audience cues. If the contact you are describing was interpretive, you should spend time on a detailed response to the last question in the questionnaire, addressing the parenthetical prompts. One of the important aspects of the certification is for the interpreter to be able to articulate an understanding of an intentional methodology for introducing visitors to the intangible meanings associated with park resources. In your log descriptions you should clearly identify the meanings you chose to introduce and why, and then analyze how you attempted to develop those meanings by selecting interpretive techniques (questioning, stories, quotations, props, role playing, presenting evidence, etc.). And do not just stipulate that a connection occurred; describe how you intended for your actions to provoke intellectual discovery, revelation, understanding or some other intellectual response. Describe how your decisions and words may have evoked emotional empathy, awe, wonder or other emotional responses.

The suggestions above address some of the common problems that are often seen in submissions for this competency. Additional tips and a sample log entry can be found at www.nps.gov/idp/interp/102/submit.htm. If you use your knowledge of interpretation, answer each log question thoroughly, include the audience cues that influenced your decision making process, a mix of interpretive and informational contacts (demonstrating an understanding of the difference between providing information and interpretation) and make it evident that you know what you are talking about when you address your opportunities for emotional and intellectual connections to meanings, you should find yourself to be well on the way to your first of 10 benchmark competency feathers in your flat hat. Thanks to Becky Lacome of Mother Training Center for her preliminary review of this article.
— Rick Kendall, Death Valley

Maintenance
Ranger magazine is still looking for someone to handle writing duties for this section. If you are interested in telling others about maintenance happenings, or you know someone who could, please step forward and help inform the ANPR membership. Contact the editor at fordedit@aol.com.

Protection
Columnist Kevin Moses was away on a fire assignment for many days before and after the press deadline for the fall edition of Ranger. His column will appear in the next issue.

Resource Management
As the Recreational Fee Demonstration program comes to an end, Congress has passed the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, which authorized collection of recreation fees not only for NPS but for other land management agencies — the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Forest Service. The legislation addresses how sites may retain up to 80 percent of the recreation fees and site-specific agency pass revenues and use them. Parks are still awaiting specific guidelines on how the funds may be spent, but preliminary word is that they will narrow the types of projects that can compete for these dollars, which concerns resource managers who have in recent years used the “Fee Demo” funds for a variety of resource protection and management projects. New fee revenues may be used for:
- repair, maintenance and facility enhancement related directly to visitor enjoyment, visitor access, and health and safety
- interpretation, visitor information, visitor service, visitor needs assessments and signs
- habitat restoration related to wild-
life-dependent recreation that is limited to hunting, fishing, wildlife observation or photography

- law enforcement related to public use and recreation
- direct operating or capital costs associated with the recreational fee program, and
- fee management agreements or a visitor reservation service.

This will benefit continuing efforts to tackle a backlog of cultural resource maintenance and repair projects and wildlife habitat restoration projects. However, monitoring and management efforts for other resources from archeological resources to wildlife don’t appear to qualify — and the new fee revenues specifically may not be used for biological monitoring related to threatened and endangered species.

There may be a perception that the Natural Resource Challenge has and will cover these types of programs and projects. The Challenge, which established Inventory and Monitoring (I&M) networks, Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Units (CESUs), and Research Learning Centers, as well as Exotic Plant Management Teams and other capacities to address common needs, has been successful in bringing added dollars, staff and attention to a number of servicewide initiatives that benefit parks across the nation.

It was originally envisioned to be a five-year program; however, it was declared a success after the fourth year of an approximately $20 million/year base increase — leaving a shortfall in funding the last of the planned I&M networks and CESUs. In order to fund the final I&M networks, nearly $4 million in funds are being reprogrammed from the Natural Resource Protection Program (NRPP). This has been the largest “funding pot” available for park research or resource management projects for more than 20 years, providing for potentially one-to three-year projects of up to $300,000 per year.

The types of projects that were funded as NRPP — natural resource management included activities not covered by the natural resource program centers, I&M networks or EPMTs — projects such as fencing portions of parks to keep native species from crossing park boundaries onto lands where they caused unacceptable conflicts, or help control feral animals; and assessing parks’ geologic, hydrologic, and biologic resources through multi-year studies. Meanwhile, projects previously approved to start in FY2006 are being delayed one or two fiscal years, and competition for the remaining NRPP dollars and other funding sources will increase even further.

— Sue Consolo Murphy

Grand Teton

ANPR Reports

Retirement

Target Retirement Funds — In talking with a number of people in the NPS Human Resources Division I am not only troubled but disappointed in learning that there are still employees who are not fully contributing or even investing in the TSP. These individuals are usually newer employees. It is imperative that these employees contribute while they are young so that in 30 years they will be financially in good shape to weather those long years in retirement.

New employees should receive better explanations about the TSP and then be automatically enrolled in the TSP. Once that 15 percent of their salary is regularly invested in the TSP, folks will become used to a smaller pay check and never miss it.

A little catch-up reminder: Employees are eligible to make catch-up contributions to their TSP accounts of up to $4,000 if they are already age 50 or will turn 50 in 2005. In addition they must be making contributions to their regular TSP account at either the maximum percentage allowed by their retirement plan or an amount that will result in reaching the IRS annual elective deferral limit ($14,000 for 2005) by the end of the year.

As those of you who have attended our workshops know, we recommend transfer (rollover) of the TSP funds into large families of mutual funds such as Fidelity, Vanguard or T. Rowe Price, etc. Our philosophy is that a key portion of the money you have in the TSP should be reinvested into stock funds in one of these families. These savings will continue to grow and provide income through your 20, 30 or hopefully 40-plus years of retirement. Putting a major portion of this money in annuities, bonds or other fixed income investments is risky because of the ever-present thing called inflation. However, investing for emergencies in money market funds or other short-term, liquid investments, is always recommended.

After retirement you all will have fixed income through your CSRS or FERS pension. CSRS employees will receive more because they contributed more over the years. Although FERS pension will be less, FERS employees will also have Social Security payments.

Target retirement funds are becoming more common place and they provide some interesting insights on the process of portfolio retirement diversification. These are “funds of their own funds” which Fidelity, Vanguard and T. Rowe Price advertise.

ANPR Reports

ANPR Actions

Actions by Association President

Over the past few months the ANPR president has spent the majority of time on these items:

- Setting up and presiding over several ANPR Board of Directors conference calls.
- Responding to a request by a correspondent from the Las Vegas Daily Sun.
- Continuing work to finalize the association’s budget for the current fiscal year.
- Holding numerous conversations with friends and partners of the association to find new methods for increasing membership and fundraising.
- Sending lettersto the U.S. Attorney General and U.S. Parole Commission to protest the proposed parole of Veronza Bowers. In April 1974, Bowers was convicted and sentenced in San Francisco Federal District Court to a life term in prison for the murder of Ranger Ken Patrick. The letters communicated ANPR’s position that Bowers should remain behind bars for life.
- Numerous conversations with friends and partners of the association to find new methods for increasing membership and fundraising.
- Issuing an invitation to NPS Director Fran Mainella to attend the next Ranger Rendezvous in Charleston, S.C.
- Issuing an invitation to Sen. Craig Thomas, R-Wyo., to attend the next Ranger Rendezvous in Charleston, S.C.
Don’t confuse these with lifestyle funds that the TSP is planning to introduce. Lifestyle funds switch contributions into fixed income investments closer to retirement. I personally believe that, rather than becoming more conservative before retirement, to continue a diversified allotment of 40 percent C Fund, 40 percent S Fund and 20 percent I Fund right up to retirement. Target retirement funds are similar in diversification but still hold a good percentage (40 percent to 50 percent) of assets in income-producing stock equity funds. After looking at the target retirement funds of the above companies I have come to the conclusion that T. Rowe Price has an excellent stable of stock funds that cover small caps, mid-caps, large caps and foreign stocks. T. Rowe Price uses high-yield bonds rather than government bonds. Their funds are called the 2000 funds and range from 2005 (most conservative) through 2040 (most aggressive.) Of course these are no-load funds and, since they are funds of their own funds, the management fees are very low. This is also true of Fidelity, Vanguard and perhaps other no-load fund companies.

— Frank Betts

IRF Update

Do you want a free week in Scotland? Apply to the ANPR Muir Fund and you have a chance. The fund will pay for registration fees for at least two ANPR members to attend the IRF Congress next July. The application requirements are:

1. You became a first-time ANPR member in the past five years and have remained a member since joining;
2. You currently are an NPS employee (permanent or seasonal);
3. You are able to attend the full week of the Congress (July 14-21, 2006); and
4. You submit a written description on why you would like to attend the Congress, what you could add to it, and what you hope to gain from it.

Those chosen will be provided free registration for the Congress (which includes room and board and all Congress programs for the week — approximately $1,000 in value). Unfortunately, we will not be able to provide airfare.

Don’t miss this opportunity! If interested, please send your request to me at tsisto47@aol.com. Even if you can’t apply for the Muir Fund, consider attending this important world ranger congress anyway. You will not regret it!

Membership in World Commission on Protected Areas: The WCPA is one of six commissions providing policy advice on conservation issues to the World Conservation Union (IUCN — see www.iucn.org), whose purpose is "to promote the establishment and effective management of a worldwide, representative network of terrestrial and marine protected areas as an integral contribution to the IUCN mission."

The WCPA regional vice chair for North America is David Harmon, executive director of the George Wright Society. Recently, acting on a suggestion by Rick Smith, Harmon asked if ANPR would like to establish a collaboration between ANPR and WCPA wherever there is mutual interest in our respected activities. In Harmon’s role as vice chair, he has the authority to offer a small number of invitees to become members of the WCPA. As a result, I was invited and will serve as a member of WCPA, and will serve as a liaison for ANPR and WCPA activities. One suggested avenue is for ANPR and IUCN/WCPA to establish an memo of understanding or other similar arrangement between IRF and IUCN. If anyone has suggestions on how to make this arrangement flourish, please share with me at tsisto47@aol.com.

— Tony Sisto

---

If you’re serious about advancing your career . . .

Try the ANPR Mentoring Program

Whether you want to be a protégé or a mentor, the first step is filling out an application. You will find the forms on ANPR’s website at www.anpr.org. Go to the link under Membership Services. It’s easier than ever to sign up online.

For more information contact Bill Supernauh, ANPR’s mentoring coordinator, at bsuper@gwtc.net.

---

PILOT ROCK®

PICNIC TABLES

LENGTH SHAPE COLOR

Rectangular or square; portable or stationary.
Galvanized, painted, or plastic frames.
Wheelchair accessible styles.
Tops and seats of lumber, aluminum, recycled plastic, or vinyl coated steel. Color options.
So many choices!
We have a picnic table to fit your park or camp.

R. J. Thomas Mfg. Co., Inc. • P. O. Box 946 • Cherokee, IA 51012-0946
Ph: 712-225-5115 • 800-762-5002 • Fax: 712-225-5796
E-mail: pilotrock@rjthomas.com • Web Site: www.pilotrock.com
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I'm Just a Seasonal: The Life of a Seasonal Ranger in Yosemite National Park

Review by Bill Supernaugh

I was prepared to be somewhat disappointed in a book entitled, *I'm Just a Seasonal* — perhaps the title was a put-off. It sounded apologetic or dismissive at first glance. As I delved into Smitty's book though, I became fascinated with his straightforward presentation style and his retelling of a time and a life that has all but disappeared from the National Park System.

I can remember the era of “permanent” seasonals just like Smith who spent the bulk of the year in teaching positions and returned season after season to work in the national parks. This was truly a “career seasonal” appointment and many of these young men (were there any women that had similar opportunities?) had career status, including health insurance and retirement benefits for a summer seasonal position. What a concept!

Perhaps the lifestyle and commitment of the Smittys of this organization still can be found in the backcountry of some of our national park units. I just don’t know. This reader became ensnared by the descriptions of this generalist field ranger who, it seems, did it all, following Horace Albright’s original letter of instruction regarding the duties and expectations placed upon the park ranger profession. The journal entries quoted in the book tell of a time when our uniformed employees took personal pride in the variety of the duties they performed — interpretation, resource management and visitor protection all rolled into one. It harkens back to a less complex and rule-driven culture within the National Park Service and serves as a gentle reminder that rangers need to range.

For the student of NPS history and culture this book will find a place on the bookshelf somewhere between *90 Day Wonder* and *Defenders of Yellowstone*. It reminds us that there may still be a valid place in the organization for the generalist ranger if we don’t wait too long to reinvent it. There was something profound in the passage where Smitty recounts a reunion of nine Yosemite seasonals who had over 210 years (seasons) of service among them. Where can we match that today?

Smitty was a contemporary and coworker of longtime seasonal Fred Koegler, the current ANPR board member for seasonal perspectives. The book is available through the publisher. Smith is a founder of the California State Park Ranger Association, and a portion of the proceeds are made available to that organization to further their goals. This book is worth a look and a walk down memory lane.

Bill Supernaugh is an ANPR board member.

Whether you’re at the bottom of the ladder or climbing to the top . . . you’re welcome to join ANPR’s mentoring program.

If you’re serious about advancing your career or have knowledge to impart to a younger employee, the first step is filling out an application as a protégé or a mentor. It’s easy — you will find the forms on ANPR’s website at www.anpr.org. Go to the link under Membership Services. It’s easy to sign up online — and could make a difference in your career.

For more information contact Bill Supernaugh, ANPR’s mentoring coordinator, at bsuper@gwte.net.

Looking for an unusual gift for a co-worker or friend?

A gift membership to ANPR includes a subscription to Ranger magazine.

See inside back cover for details.

Rendezvous contacts

Erin Broadbent, program chair
cbroadbent@nol.com

Dan Moses, overall Rendezvous coordinator and raffle organizer (with Diane Moses), mosessed@aol.com

Wendy Lauritzen, exhibitors
ohlaiigcr@dobsontelecom.com

Dan Greenblatt, super raffle
dan_greenblatt@msn.com

Teresa Ford, photo contest
fordedie@aol.com
Navigating New Waters” is the theme of this year’s Ranger Rendezvous Dec. 4-8 at the Francis Marion Hotel in Charleston, S.C. ANPR has received tentative commitments from NPS Director Fran Mainella and Sen. Craig Thomas, R-Wyo., as keynote speakers.

Once again the Rendezvous will feature a variety of workshops and field trips along with our traditional activities of raffles, receptions, hospitality room and networking with fellow rangers and NPS employees. Scheduled workshops include sessions and book signings with Jordan Fisher Smith, author of *Nature Noir*, and Nancy Mulcady-Mecham, author of *True Stories From a Ranger’s Career in America’s National Parks.*

Scheduled field trips include a dinner cruise to Fort Sumter and a Civil War tour of the low country, Middleton Plantation and Gullah country. Other planned activities are the traditional Harpers Ferry movie night and a talent show featuring NPS employee music groups.

The annual Rendezvous is a key fundraising activity for ANPR. Not only is the Rendezvous a chance to meet old friends and swap stories but it is an opportunity for new employees to network with experienced NPS employees, discuss job opportunities, and develop lasting friendships while attending workshops and listening to professional presentations.

ANPR depends on income from attendance at Rendezvous to help offset its annual budget shortfalls. This year a special invitation is being extended to ANPR’s life members. Life members pay one-time dues that are not used to meet the annual ANPR budget. Rather than soliciting lifetime members for further annual donations to help in our budget needs, ANPR is inviting all life members to show their continued financial support to our association by registering and attending the Rendezvous, and participating in the on-site fundraising activities such as the raffles and field trips.

Please plan to attend the Rendezvous and show your continued support for ANPR.

Check the ANPR website at [www.anpr.org](http://www.anpr.org) for online registration and future detailed agenda postings as information becomes available. Call the Francis Marion Hotel for room reservations at 877-756-2121 or 843-722-0600. The room rate is $82 per night and our room block will only be held until Nov. 1.

Air service is available with most major airlines (Delta, Continental, Northwest, United and US Airways) to Charleston’s airport.

In addition, East Coast residents can travel to the Rendezvous via Amtrak’s Atlantic Coast service. Go to [www.amtrak.com](http://www.amtrak.com) or call 800-USA-RAIL (800-872-7245).

— Dan Moses
Check out the new *The Tracking Way* magazine and you may find helpful ideas to use in your work.

*The Tracking Way* magazine gives voice to the importance of stewardship of the earth—values that national park rangers are committed to and, through a variety of programming and contact with the public, attempt to ignite in those who visit national parks.

*The Tracking Way* magazine merges poetry, prose and artwork to bring to life the connections between human beings, their cultures and the natural world. Rangers might find that the practical articles are useful resources for nature talks and interpretive programs. Each issue of the magazine includes an article about tracking a particular animal, such as "Tracking a Bobcat" by John McCarter in the first issue, and a "How To" department about traditional skills for inhabiting the earth. Perhaps these types of articles could be used to design programs for school groups or scout troops.

Use the Mystery Tracks appearing on the back cover of each issue to teach kids how to use field guides and to practice reading tracks in national parks or in their own neighborhoods. Every issue offers a variety of creative approaches for understanding your specific place.

Various poems and the short story department might lend themselves well to being read at evening campfire programs or to illustrate a particular topic during an interpretive program. Here you have youth—native and non-native—expressing a connection to and respect for the earth. Holding this up as an example might support your mission of inspiring young people, encouraging a lifetime commitment to the preservation of cultural and natural areas.

The magazine regularly includes youth contributors from around the country and respected adult contributors such as:

- John Stokes (regular column): A teacher of tracking and survival skills, musician, storyteller, and founder and director of The Tracking Project.
- Jake Swamp (regular column): Co-founder and director of The Tree of Peace Society.
- John McCarter: A wildlife tracker for more than 20 years and one of New England's leading authorities on animal tracks and signs.
- Joseph Bruchac: An Abenaki storyteller, poet, novelist and co-author of *Keepers of the Earth* and *Keepers of the Animals*.
- Michael J. Caduto: A naturalist, educator, storyteller and co-author of *Keepers of the Earth*.

Regular features and departments include:

- Poetry, commentary and fiction by teens
- Art by teens
- A "how to" about traditional skills such as fire making
- Some Thoughts About Peace (by Jake Swamp)

For further information about the new publication or to subscribe, visit [www.inthisplace.org](http://www.inthisplace.org) or contact inthisplace@earthlink.net.
Charlie Strickfaden (LABE, FOCL, WHIS, MOCA, GRCA, GRSM, BISC, DENA, FONE, GOGA, PORE, SEKI) has transferred from chief ranger at Fort McHenry to chief ranger at the Flagstaff Area Monuments (Walnut Canyon, Wupatki and Sunset Crater Volcano). Heidi Strickfaden (PORE, SEKI, National Capital Parks, Central) is taking a temporary hiatus to explore Flagstaff and spend time with their daughter, Megan. Temporary mailing address/phone: 6400 North Highway 89, Flagstaff, AZ 86004; (work), 928-526-1157, ext. 228.

Allen D. Vaira, who started his NPS career in 1978 at Yellowstone, and also worked at Denali, Death Valley, Klondike Gold Rush and Grand Canyon, retired from Yellowstone June 1. He intends to return to Alaska in September. E-mail: parkranger_42@hotmail.com.

Missing Members
We've lost track of these members! Please send information to ANPR, P.O. Box 108, Larned, KS 67550-0108; anprbusiness@anpr.org.

John Krambrikn Eatonville, WA
David Parker Saint Augustine, FL
Jon Radke Phoenix, AZ
Daniel Swank Grass Lake, MI

Welcome to the ANPR family!

Here are the newest members of the Association of National Park Rangers:

Bruce Bytnar ............................................ Raphine, VA
Carolyn Christianer .................................. Sunnyvale, CA
Michael Connolly ......................... Kings Canyon NP, CA
Margaret Corno ..................................... Millstadt, IL
Marianne Duwendack ....................... Swanton, OH
Matthew Greuel .................................. Fremont, CA
Robert Hoyle .................................. Fairview, NC
Alden Miller ........................................ Chiefland, OR
Christina Mills ................................... Needle, CA
Ed Prenzler ....................................... Goldsboro, ME
Brant Porter ...................................... Palacios, TX
Andrew Przy ...................................... Flagstaff, AZ
Nancy Hadlock & Richard Potashin .......... Independence, CA
Laura Joss & Skip Meehan ............... Moab, UT
Heather Stephen .................................. Interior, SD
Steve Stinnett .................................. Brunswick, GA

Manning Cabin celebrates 100 years at Saguaro

Manning Cabin, a log structure in the remote backcountry of Saguaro, is 100 years old this year. The park will be holding a special event Oct. 23 to commemorate this anniversary.

One of the goals of our anniversary celebration is to collect more information and photographs from throughout the 100-year history of the cabin. More than a few NPS employees and retirees have spent parts of their careers at Manning. If you have worked there or spent significant time in the backcountry of Saguaro, we want to hear from you.

Most people think that Saguaro is made up of cactus and desert. But the east district of the park also includes mountains up to 8,666 feet and conifer forests. It was here that 41-year-old Levi H. Manning, then mayor of Tucson, built his cabin in 1905 as a summer retreat for his family. They used the cabin for only a few years; their homestead rights were revoked when the area was included in the Catalina Forest Reserve in 1907.

Manning Cabin was used by the Forest Service as a base for firefighting operations, but in 1933 it became part of Saguaro National Monument and was transferred to the National Park Service. The cabin has served continuously as a backcountry station for firefighters, rangers, trail workers, mule packers and researchers.

Much of the cabin’s original structure is still intact, and the scene has changed little in the past 100 years. The only access to the cabin is on foot or on horseback over at least nine miles of rugged trails, with an elevation gain of almost 5,000 feet. There is still a source of good water near the cabin, and the park maintains a backcountry campground nearby.

This fall’s celebration will focus on the entire history of the cabin, including firefighting, wilderness management and the people who have known the cabin best, its residents. The event will be in Tucson (not at the cabin) and will include a reception, exhibits, oral histories, presentations and western lore.

If you have a photograph or story to contribute to our collection, please call the park at 520-733-5153. If you want to join us for this celebration, please contact Meg Weesner at 520-733-5170 or meg_weesner@nps.gov for more information about the event. Everyone is invited.
HOME SWEET HOME: The Rev. G.H. Williams, at left, takes visitors on guided tours of the Martin Luther King Jr. birth home in Atlanta, Ga. Williams, now 80 and King's contemporary, is in his second career after serving as a church pastor for many years. He marched with King in civil rights rallies in the 1960s.

King was born Jan. 15, 1929, in an upstairs bedroom of the two-story Victorian house at 501 Auburn Ave. During the next 12 years he lived in this home with his parents, grandparents, siblings, aunts, uncles and their boarders. The home is located in the residential section of "Sweet Auburn," the center of black Atlanta.

Williams gives gracious tours of the home, and laces his presentation with impeccable manners, humor and specifics about life at the home in the 1930s. He has worked at the Martin Luther King Jr. site as a ranger for about seven years.

Now in its 4th printing!

Stock it in your park bookstores — and refer prospective parks employees to this informative publication. Go to www.anpr.org/publications.htm for bulk ordering details.

ANPR promotional products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-sleeved polo shirt, black, Men's M-L-XL-XXL</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies' grey heather, white, honey gold (eight sizes and colors)</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladies' short-sleeved polo, black, Men's M-L-XL-XXL</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloves, grey heather, white, honey gold (six colors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canister, black</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballcap, khaki</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-shirts from 2006 Retirement in Rapid City, S.D.</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball, &quot;Resistance&quot;</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANPR coffee mug (banana)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wristband, black</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANPR billboard pin or 75th anniversary pin, silver with relief, 34½&quot;</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSRP, tan with ANPR logo</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANPR diecut, silver</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can opener</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shipping & Handling (orders sent insured mail)

Orders up to $25 ........................................ $6.00
$25.01 to $50 ......................................... $7.50
$50.01 to $75 ......................................... $9.00
$75.01 to $100 ......................................... $11.50
Over $100 e-mail for cost
Orders outside U.S. e-mail for cost

Payment by Visa or MasterCard accepted:

Visa ______ or MasterCard ______

Credit Card # ______
Expiration date ______
Name on Account ______
Cardholder signature ______

Questions? Contact the ANPR business office at ANPRbusiness@anpr.org.

All Terrain is a proud sponsor of the Association of National Park Rangers

Check it out @ www.allterrain.com

Order All Terrain products online. At checkout you can designate ANPR as a beneficiary of All Terrain's environmental partners program — and 10% of the purchase price will go to ANPR.
MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION — Association of National Park Rangers

O Renewal  or  O New Membership  Date _______________  Park Code _______________  Region _______________  □ Retired?

Name(s) __________________________________________________________ Office phone _____________________________
Address ___________________________ State ______ Zip+4 ___________ Home phone _____________________________
City ___________________________ Home e-mail address _____________________________

Note: It costs $45 a year to service a membership. ANPR suggests additional dues based on your annual income according to the chart below.

Type of Membership
(check one)

Active (all NPS employees and retirees)

Individual

One year | Two years | Joint | One year | Two years

$25 | $45 | $40 | $75
Under $25,000 annual salary (GS-5 or equivalent)

$35 | $65 | $50 | $95
$25,000 - $34,999 (GS-7 or equivalent)

$45 | $85 | $60 | $115
$35,000 - $64,999 (GS-11 or equivalent)

$60 | $115 | $75 | $145
$65,000 + (GS-15 and above)

$75 | $145 | $90 | $175

Associate Members (other than NPS employees)

Individual

$45 | $85 | $60 | $115

Associate

$25 | $45 | $40 | $75

Special Supporters

□ Friend ($250-$999)

□ Sponsor ($500-$4,999)

□ Ranger Club ($5,000 & up)

□ Old Faithful Club ($10,000 & up)

Life Members (May be made in three equal payments over three years; indicate if paying in one installment □ or three □)

Active

$500 | $1,000

□ $500 | □ $1,000

Library/Subscription Rate (two copies of each issue of Ranger sent quarterly)

$100

To help even more, I am enclosing an extra contribution □ $10 □ $25 □ $50 □ $100 □ Other

Return membership form and check payable to ANPR to:

Association of National Park Rangers, P.O. Box 108, Larned, KS 67550-0108

Membership dues are not deductible as a charitable expense.

Important Notice

In order for ANPR to be an effective, member-oriented organization, we need to be able to provide board members with lists of members by area. It is, therefore, vital that you enter the park and region four-letter codes before submitting your application.

Payment by Visa or MasterCard accepted:

Visa ______ MasterCard ______

Card # _____________________________
Expiration date _____________________
Name on Account _____________________
Signature ____________________________

□ I want to volunteer for ANPR and can help in this way:

□ Fund Raising

□ Rendezvous Activities

□ Mentoring

□ Other (list: _____________________________)

□ ANPR may publish a membership directory, for distribution to members. May we publish:
your e-mail address? □ yes □ no

□ To assist the ANPR board in planning Association actions, please provide the following information.

□ Do you live in park housing?

□ Number of years as a NPS employee

□ GS/WG level (This will not be listed in a membership directory)

□ Your job/discipline area (interpreter, concession specialist, resource manager)

Send news to:

Teresa Ford, Editor
26 S. Mt. Vernon Club Road
Golden, CO 80401
or e-mail: fordedit@aol.com or check ANPR’s website: www.anpr.org and go to Member Services page

Share your news with others!

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 ______________________________________
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Directory of ANPR Board Members, Task Group Leaders & Staff

Board of Directors

President
Lee Werst, Timpanogos Cave
841 W 830 N, Orem, UT 84057
(801) 802-7371 • ANPRpres@aol.com

Treasurer
Wendy Lauritzen, Washita Battlefield
Route 1, Box 35A, Crawford, OK 73638
(580) 983-2291 • ohranger@dobsonteleco.com

Secretary
Melanie Berg, Badlands
25225 Ben Reifel Place, Interior, SD 57750
(605) 433-5580 • mtnsfar@gwtc.net

Education and Training
Kendell Thompson, Arlington House
2834 Greenway Blvd., Falls Church, VA 22042
(703) 536-0864 • outdoorsies@verizon.net

Special Concerns
Fred Koegler, Yosemite
5041 Dunsmore Ave., La Crescenta, CA 91214
(818) 249-0170 • koegler@pacbell.net

Strategic Planning
Ed Rizzotto, Boston Support Office
P.O. Box 407, Hingham, MA 02043
(781) 749-0770 • treehome@pobox.com

Past President
Deanne Adams, Pacific West Region
1348 Glen Drive, San Leandro, CA 94577
(510) 633-1282 • anthonyandadams@aol.com

Task Group Leaders

Elections
Barry Sullivan, Gateway
101A Mont Sec Ave., Staten Island, NY 10305
sullivanb@aol.com

International Affairs
Tony Sisco, Retired
1348 Glen Drive, San Leandro, CA 94577
(510) 633-1282 • tjsisco47@aol.com

Internal Communications
Bill Supernauh, Badlands
25246 Ben Reifel Place, Interior, SD 57750
(605) 433-5550 • bsuper@gwtc.net

Fund Raising Activities
Sean McGuigan, Fire Island
(202) 513-7125 • smcpararanger@aol.com

Membership Services
Kirsten Talken-Spaulding, Prince William Forest
103 Raintree Blvd., Stafford, VA 22556
(540) 657-7525 • k.talken@gmx.net

Professional Issues
Dave Anderson, WASO - Atlanta
181 Ridgeview Ave., Decatur, GA 30030
404-373-8548 • npsdlaatI@hotmail.com

Seasonal Perspectives
Tom Bowling-Schaff, Lava Beds
1 Indian Wells Headquarters, Tulelake, CA 96150
(530) 667-5018 • ranger658@moose-mail.com

Mentoring
Bill Supernauh, Badlands
25246 Ben Reifel Place, Interior, SD 57750
(605) 433-5550 • bsuper@gwtc.net

Celebration Steering Committee
Rick Gale, Retired
3984 S. Federal Way, B-104, Boise, ID 83716
(208) 336-9745 • rigale@aol.com

Rendezvous
Dan Moses, Retired
418 Lafitte Way, New Bern, NC 28560
(252) 626-9692 • mosesdd@aol.com

Retirement
Frank Beers, Retired
95 Cobblecrest Road, Driggs, ID 83422
(208) 354-8675 • fjbeets@msn.com

Ranger Editorial Adviser
Mark Herberger, Minuteman Missile
P.O. Box 391, Wall, SD 57790
(605) 433-5552 • Mark_E_Herberger@nps.gov

Staff

Business Manager
Jim VonFeldt
P.O. Box 108, Larred, KS 67550-0108
(620) 285-2107 • fax: (620) 285-2110 • jlv@cpavbv.com
Membership: ANPRbusincss@anpr.org

Editor, Ranger
Teresa Ford
26 S. Mt. Vernon Club Road, Golden, CO 80401
Home office & fax • (303) 526-1380 • fordedit@aol.com

Stay in touch
www.anpr.org
News, features, member services — and more