R&R Accessory Items

TRAVEL BAG*
Constructed of durable Cordura® nylon with two side pockets and two end zip compartments. Gray. $59.75

CUSTOMIZING BAGS
*Both bags are available with either of two embroidered inscriptions:
Option 1 — National Park Service
Option 2 — Ranger, National Park Service
Please specify option by circling either 1 or 2 on order form.

DUFFLE BAG*
Featuring wrap around handles with velcro closure, shoulder strap. In grey Cordura® nylon. $39.75

CHUMS
Fashion eyeglass retainer in NPS green. Secures glasses, preventing loss during arduous activities. $3.75

THIRST AID FANNY PACK
A snug, foam-lined pouch on this pack insulates your favorite beverage. Fits any standard bicycle water bottle. Made of grey, waterproof, medium-weight nylon. Comes with water bottle. $18.75

Add $2.50 shipping and handling for all orders.

R&R carries a full line of equipment. For questions and price quotations, contact Linda Balatti at the Washington address listed above, or call 202/543-9577.
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**President’s Message**

We are on a roll! Association members are making themselves heard in a number of areas and on a variety of issues.

Karen Wade’s “Toward 1993” group has received better than 50 percent response from her request for long term goals. They are now consolidating the comments and drafting alternative positions. Kris Bardsley received over 200 returns to her seasonal survey. A couple of interesting items surfaced from this survey. First, 25 percent of the respondents had never heard of ANPR. It appears we have a potentially rich lode to mine. Secondly, a preliminary review of the survey indicates that the issue of being able to apply to more than two parks is not the answer to the lack of application problem. It seems more likely that the larger problem is a lack of law enforcement seasonal applicants and a lack of qualified applicants. See Kris’ article elsewhere in this issue for details.

The above work group issues are just two of the reasons you should attend Rendezvous XII at Snowbird. One general session will be devoted to long term ANPR goals and objectives. We need your advice and comment on these alternatives. Two workshops will feature seasonal concerns. Come and share your ideas and concerns.

A third compelling reason to be at Snowbird will be the general session on the National Parks and Conservation Association’s National Park System Plan. Destry Jarvis and NPCA will discuss the report and want our thoughts on it. So read, at least, the Executive Summary and come to the Rendezvous prepared to share your perspectives on it with them.

Speaking of NPCA and the Rendezvous, both the Freeman Tilden and Stephen T. Mather awards will be presented there. ANPR is honored to be the forum for these award presentations.

Elsewhere in this issue of Ranger, you will see a new comments section. This section will feature synopses of ANPR responses to issues, proposals, drafts, and other matters that affect our members and the Association.

One such lengthy response is our review of the draft NPS Management Policies revisions. Andy Ringgold, Bill Supernaughe, Dick Martin, Linda Kelly, Bill Halain, Eileen Salenik, Edna Good, Mack Shaver, and Jim Leach reviewed portions of the draft and provided ideas which Bill Halainen edited into a cohesive response. Special recognition and thanks go to Andy Ringgold and Bill Supernauaghe for the depth and breadth of their analyses. Our comments are thorough, analytical and very well written.

The Ranger Museum project is also moving forward. Yellowstone National Park is producing a prospectus which will be available to use for fundraising. This brochure should be ready in time for the General Superintendent Conference at Grand Teton. While on the subject of the Ranger Museum, if you were on a fire in 1987 and have not donated one percent of your fire premium pay to the museum, how about mailing a check to Debbie Gorman?

One of the criticisms surfacing now and again about ANPR is that the same people do all the work. There are several reasons why this tends to be true, not the least of which is that those people get things done on schedule. The criticism, however, is valid. The makeup of Karen Wade’s group and some of the people asked to develop the Association’s response to the draft Management Policies reflect that concern and represent an attempt to mitigate it. We need more breadth of active participation in ANPR activities.

If you have a burning issue or desire to help with any kind of project, how about sending me a note or talking with your Regional Representative? We need all the innovative ideas and approaches we can muster.

Although ANPR may remain an unknown to some seasonals, we are getting recognition elsewhere. By the time you read this, we will have been audited by the Internal Revenue Service....
Letters

Letters to the editor should be typed and about 500 words long. Send to: Editor, RANGER, Apt. D-422, 3004 Lee Highway, Arlington, VA 22201.

Editor:

It happened to read an article in the Miami Herald the other day which examined the results of a national survey conducted by the American Council on Education and by researchers at UCLA. The survey of 290,000 students showed that the majority of them want more than ever to become wealthy in business careers. A major survey we have conducted that has truly provided the genesis for a major work force change.

Sometimes I’m disappointed that in our zeal to preserve and protect for future generations of park users we forget to provide for the present and future generations of park workers. We forget, I think, that the key to park protection is the happiness and productivity of the park employee.

If you look at the employment roles of this organization, you’ll quickly come to the conclusion that there are plenty of young workers willing to work for pennies, devoting hours of unappreciated extra time, living in a hodge-podge of expensive standardized housing. Certainly, these young folks can’t truly claim the yuppie tag, as they’re too poor — and still idealistic. But they are products of a new time with a different philosophical base, and, at times, a different view of things.

Look at those same roles, and you’ll also find a lot of people (oldtimers included) who are leaving the Service — Everglades alone has lost eight permanent rangers to other agencies in the last few years. There have always been cases of people leaving for other opportunities, but I sense there is more of this happening than ever before throughout the Service. Those rangers left and took jobs with other federal agencies which offered higher grades and pay for comparable jobs within the NPS. What these folks were doing in the NPS they are now doing in another agency for a grade 9 or 11. It’s hard to keep all this in perspective when you’re a product of a high-achiever generation that equates success and accomplishment with dreams of wealth, a flashy car and a condo before age 25 (I know — a classic overgeneralization).

No matter what the generation, the need to make a decent living and feel good about the job is a constant. The responses to this social change in the work force are pay rates that often qualify employees for food stamps and career progressions that don’t exist and aren’t comparable with either private industry or other federal agencies.

Some things don’t ever change. I realize that I want some of the same things this new generation wants; perhaps the difference, if there is one, lies in a one-generation change in perspective. Perhaps I’m at a grade level now that dulls my memory of those lean years and misgivings I’ve also experienced. I hope it’s not that. This organization has got to start understanding its people better and start meeting their needs in light of the social change we are all involved in. It’s the only way the human resources of this organization can remain viable.

Rob Arnberger
Everglades

Editor:

Early this year a group of Yosemite rangers organized. We recruited only law enforcement rangers, not the entire 025 series. ANPR tries to attract everyone, and because of that has to try to please everyone. By focusing our energies on a narrower agenda — one appealing mainly to commissioned rangers — we feel we’re more likely to reach our goals. Many of us feel ANPR is unresponsive to our needs precisely because it’s run by managers, with a goal of supporting management. The time has come for field rangers to be supported, even at the expense of management.

Our goals are modest. We believe commissioned rangers qualify for law enforcement retirement, and that if we wait for management to pursue it well all be retired first. We believe that rangers, injured while making arrests or saving lives, should not have to sue under “third party liability” rules; until that’s changed, many of us hesitate to do our jobs. We believe seasonal shouldn’t have to become clerks or customs officers to gain status and a chance to compete for permanent NPS jobs. We believe seasonal should have health benefits. And we believe management has spent little if any effort on any of these fronts.

Some of us are formally and officially “on call” three or more nights a pay period, required to be at home and available. Many of us had to buy our own duty leather, own own revolvers, our own high-intensity flashlights, our own body armor. (Do maintenance employees have to buy their own hand tools, safety boots, and safety glasses? Then why do we have to buy our own tools and safety equipment?) We transport prisoners for long distances, alone, in cars without prisoner cages. We go to the firing range and EMT refreshers on our own time. Does any of this sound familiar? Some of these issues come up at Rendezvous time, to the familiar chorus that they are “supervisory” problems. But supervisory problems that persist year after year, at park after park, reflect basic management issues.

We considered several unions, and on March 15 formed the Yosemite Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP). We aren’t a union, at least not yet; we’ve decided to try reaching our goals through lobbying, and possibly through legal action, instead of through collective bargaining. Besides, we want supervisors to be able to join. FOP has 190,000 members

Continued on page 38
All in the Family

All submissions must be either typed or printed and should include the author's return address and/or phone number. Send to: Editor, Ranger, Apt. D-422, 3004 Lee Highway, Arlington, VA 22201. The deadline for the fall issue is July 29th. If you are moving and also changing your mailing address, please include past and present addresses. These will be forwarded to the business manager, who maintains the list of current addresses.

Transfers
George Baisley - from supervisory park ranger, Boston, to chief ranger, Statue of Liberty/Ellis Island.
Ann Bell - from district ranger, New River Bridge, to same, El Morro.
Margaret Benke - from park ranger, Assateague, to same, Cuyahoga.
Celeste Bernardo - from park ranger, Independence, to same, Golden Gate.
Merry Beyerle - from park ranger, Bighorn Canyon, to same, El Morro.
Tom Bills - from biological technician (exotic plants), Center for Urban Ecology, NCR, to biological technician (wildlife), Grand Tetons.
Susan Bloomfield - from seasonal park ranger (resource management), Shenandoah, to clerk-typist, NCR.
Diane Chalfant - from park ranger, Apostle Islands, to chief of interpretation, same.
Cheryl Cline - from archeologist, Alaska Regional Office, to park ranger, Kennesaw Mountain.
Phyllis Creamtoni - from park ranger, Shenandoah, to same, Carlsbad Caverns.
Terry Dimatto - from supervisory park ranger, Fort McHenry, to park manager, George Rogers Clark.
Lawrence Edwards - from seasonal ranger, C&O Canal, to park ranger, Shenandoah Mountain.
Martin Gallery - from park ranger, Four Locks subdistrict, C&O Canal, to district ranger, Allegheny district, C&O Canal.
Jack Gossett - from park ranger, Kennesaw Mountain, to same, Natchez Trace.
Chris Harmon - from park ranger, Independence, to same, Statue of Liberty.
Troy Harmon - from seasonal park ranger, Appomattox, to park ranger, Shenandoah, to same, White River.
Jake Hoogland - from historian, Western Team, Denver Service Center, to chief, Environmental Compliance, WASO.
Nancy Hunter - from seasonal park ranger, Yosemite, to park ranger, Glen Canyon.
Kate James - from secretary, Marin Headlands, Golden Gate, to same, Yosemite.
Margaret Johnston - from district ranger, Death Valley, to same, Canyonlands.
Kyle Jones - from biological technician, Acadia, to resource management specialist, Cape Cod.
Karen Marie Sweeney Justice - from seasonal park ranger, Shenandoah, to same, Lowell.
Randy Justice - from seasonal park ranger, Shenandoah, to lead park ranger, Lowell.
Paul Kelly - from park ranger (permanent), Amistad, to park ranger (seasonal), Yellowstone.
Katie Lawhorn - from seasonal park ranger, Boston, to park ranger, same.
Chris Lea - from park ranger, Harpers Ferry, to same, C&O Canal.
Stan Lock - from resource management specialist, NCR, to assistant director, Wolf Trap.
Bob Maguire - from park ranger, Padre Island, to same, Ozark.
Alan Mebane - from supervisory park ranger, Everglades, to same, Indiana Dunes.
Joanne Michalovic-Hanley - from program manager, International Affairs, WASO, to management assistant, concessions, George Washington Memorial Parkway.
Jeri Andrews - from administrative officer, North Cascades, to "superintendent's wife", Mammoth Cave.
Bill Orlando - from park ranger, Harpers Ferry, to same, C&O Canal.
Aida Parkinson - from secretary, Natural Bridges, to resource management specialist, Denver Service Center.
Brian Peters - from park ranger, Castillo De San Marcos, to same, Indiana Dunes.
Jon Peterson - from seasonal maintenance worker, Lake Clark, to park ranger, Kennesaw Mountain.
John Piltyzke - from park ranger, Boston, to supervisory park ranger, same.
Carol Pollio - from administrative technician, Salem Maritime, to park ranger (RM&VP), Gateway (Sandy Hook Unit).
Dave Roberts - from chief, I & RM, Fort Union, to same, Tonto.
Doug Rose - from park ranger, Independence, to same, Big Hole.
Karen Rossa - from seasonal park ranger, Wind Cave, to park ranger, Boston.
Rose Runball-Petrie - from seasonal park ranger, Pinnacles, to park ranger, Independence.
Ralph Satterberg - from computer assistant, Greenbelt Park/Baltimore-Washington Parkway, to supervisory park ranger, Everglades.
Jonathan Schaffer - from seasonal park ranger, Sequoia/Kings Canyon, to park ranger, Boston.
Craig Sheldon - from supervisory park ranger, Fort Necessity, to same, South District interpreter, Cape Hatteras.
Rick Smith - from supervisio park ranger, Carlsbad Caverns, to associate regional director for operations, Southwest Regional Office.
Jack Spinelli - from interpreter planner, NCR, to same, Harpers Ferry.
Lauren Lee (Houck) Stillwell - from seasonal park ranger, Arches, to seasonal park ranger (interpretation), Great Basin.
Robert Stinson - from seasonal park ranger, Grand Teton, to park ranger, Organ Pipe Cactus.
Charlie Strickfaden - from park ranger, Grand Canyon, to same, Great Smoky Mountains.
Kay Threlbald - from park ranger, Tonto, to supervisory, park ranger, Jefferson National Expansion.
Paula Valentine - from interpretive specialist, RMRO, to district naturalist, Everglades.
Wayne Valentine - from resource area ranger, Inyo National Forest, to same, Biscayne.
Bill Vanlunwagen - from park ranger, Cuyahoga, to same, Lake Mead.
Bill Wade - from superintendent, Mather Training Center, to same, Shenandoah.

Retirements
Bruce Chambers - from park ranger, Boston, to disability retirement.

Departures
Tom Biller - from supervisory park ranger, LBJ, to desert ranger, BLM, Palm Springs, California.
Malone Dickens - from supervisory park ranger, Everglades, to intelligence research specialist, US Customs, Miami, Florida.
Carol DiSalvo - from plant pathologist/entomologist, Center for Urban Ecology, NCR, to IPM specialist, DECRAN Cranberry Growers, Massachusetts.
Marta Kelly - from supervisory park ranger, Indiana Dunes, to resignation.
Carol Sporko - from park ranger, Center for Urban Ecology, NCR, to gypsy moth coordinator, City of Alexandria, Virginia.
Ann Westerberg - from park ranger, Indiana Dunes, to secretary, Department of Justice.

Missing Persons
There are a number of members of the Association who have disappeared — at least to the roles of the organization. If you know of their whereabouts, please let us know or have them get in touch with this magazine. These are the missing persons with last known addresses:
Robert Judkins, Deming, New Mexico
David Taylor, Denver, Colorado
Patty Haggerty, Davis, California
John McKay, Denali, Alaska
Richard Guerrieri, Estes Park, Colorado
Denise Galley, Durango, Colorado
Thomas Hudspeth, Yellowstone, Wyoming
Carol Knipper, Interior, South Dakota
Dean Gettigner, Forr Rucker, Alabama
Alan Fieldon, Ventura, California
Kenneth Davis, Gretna, Louisiana
Christie Kalkowski, Jackson, Wyoming
Steve Hunt, Anchorage, Alaska
Barry Myynan, Blanding, Utah
Matthew Chase, Portland, Oregon
Duanne Buck, Vienna, Virginia

Melissa Warner - from secretary, Ranger Activities, WASO, to position classification specialist, Personnel, WASO.

5
ANPR Comments

Although this Association has frequently voiced its concerns to the Directorate, the Department and others on a variety of issues, we have not regularly apprised the membership of actions we have advocated or positions we have taken. Beginning with this issue, Ranger will print excerpts from letters, papers and other documents through which we have addressed concerns of the membership and the profession.

* * * * *

ANPR has responded to the request for comments on the current draft revisions to Management Policies with twelve detailed pages of recommended revisions in a multitude of areas, including land protection, park facilities, natural resource management, wilderness preservation and management, concessions management, and use of the parks (a heading which covers, among other things, both interpretation and protection). Association President Rick Gale had this to say in his cover letter to the Director:

"Thank you for providing the Association of National Park Rangers with the opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions to Management Policies. Since ANPR is an organization which represents over 1,700 rangers, managers and other NPS employees who are charged with implementing the policies found in this document, we have a vital interest in assuring that they accurately reflect the National Park Service legislative mandate and are in full accord with professional management standards. In order to assure that the Management Policies received a thorough review, I asked several ANPR members with extensive experience in both policy formulation and field management to evaluate the current draft and recommend additions, deletions and corrections. Their combined efforts are attached.

"With the exception of some significant and perplexing departures from the National Park Service Organic Act, principally in the Introduction, we feel that the document is a generally well-written and welcome update of NPS policies... Thank you again for providing us with the opportunity to reflect the concerns of ANPR members in the final revision to this very important document."

Here are some high points from our comments:

• On page four of the Introduction, the new policies state that the Service's conservation mandate takes a precedence "only in those instances when impairment is a consequence of current activity." Said

ANPR: "(This sentence) contains language that is radically at odds with the historic precedent and legislative mission of the National Park Service. There is no defensible rationale for subordinating the conservation mandate to those situations 'when impairment is a consequence of current action.' We strongly feel that the sentence should be deleted and replaced with the following: 'In those instances where impairment is a consequence of current or continued activity, the conservation mandate takes precedence.'"

• Concerning the discussion of impairment and overuse in the subsequent paragraph, we argued that this discussion was "weak, incomplete, confusing and provides no useful or clear statement of policy to guide managers or planners. (The text) should provide a strong, brief statement of the agency's policy pertaining to actual and potential impairments generated by administrative actions, visitor use and external activities... The one sentence reference to the NPS response in the case of overuse or improper use is tentative, almost apologetic and totally inadequate. The underlying policy that should be stated is that any NPS action, including a development, that would result in an adverse effect or impairment to a resource is justified only if it is undertaken in the interest of accomplishing a higher priority resource protection objective or if it is essential in order to provide for visitor enjoyment."

• The Association advocated a stronger position on resource protection in the chapter on natural resource management: "The Service ought to adapt a more aggressive policy toward the protection of threatened or endangered plants and animals, (so) the first line of the policy statement should be revised as follows: '...the National Park Service will actively pursue a program to identify and promote...’"

• ANPR recommended that the Service include sections in the chapter on wilderness management to cover, among other things, mechanized equipment for subsistence uses, mining on unpatented mining claims in wilderness areas, and access across park wilderness where access is guaranteed by law.

• On the matter of visitor safety, the Association questioned "whether it is either possible or appropriate for the NPS, through policy, to assign to park visitors responsibility for their own safety..." and suggested that the policy be "reworded to reflect the Service's position that visitors assume a certain degree of risk when entering areas that by definition are managed and maintained as natural, historic or recreational environments."

If you're interested in a complete copy of the Association's comments, please send a stamped, self-addressed 10"x12" envelope to the editor.

* * * * *

President Rick Gale has written to the Director concerning the failure of some NPS regions to notify employees about job openings. Here's what he had to say:

"It has come to our attention that several regions are still not complying with National Park Service policy on the distribution of vacancy announcements. Under that policy, WASO, Center and Regional Personnel Offices are required to distribute vacancy announcements throughout the area of consideration for all GM/GS-14 and below positions issued by their respective offices.

"Assistant Director Powers issued a memorandum to the regions in non-compliance on September 2, 1987. These regions were Rocky Mountain, Southeast and North Atlantic. We understand from our membership that these regions, as well as the Southwest Region, are still not mailing Servicewide vacancy announcements.

"The Association knows that you, Dick Powers and Mario Fraire all strongly support compliance with this Servicewide policy. However, failure to ensure follow-through at the regional level seriously undermines your credibility, and that of the Washington Office, in the eyes of the field, and contributes to low employee morale.

"The Association of National Park Rangers feels obligated to bring this continuing problem to your attention. If ANPR can be of any further assistance in resolving this issue, please let us know."

* * * * *

Speaking for ANPR at the request of Rick Gale, Cliff Chetwin has replied to a questionnaire which was sent out in March by the chair of the Committee to Develop the Association for NPS Natural Resource Managers "to determine the viability (of creating) an association for NPS resource managers." A summary of that letter follows:

While supporting the development of a forum for professional interaction among resource managers, the letter argues that there's no reason why this can't be done within the context of the Association, as "ANPR is committed to reflecting the profession in its entirety, which includes resources management."

"With this in mind, I question the wisdom of founding an organization which must immediately compete for virtually the same members, the same discretionary
dollars and the same annual leave," the letter states. "We face a serious problem in restoring the resource management function to the pre-eminence it once held in the ranger profession, and I believe that the proposed organization would only be counter-productive to this need."

"In reviewing ANPR's efforts over the past 11 years, it is obvious that resources management has not shared the limelight with issues such as housing, classification, mobility, health insurance for seasonal, dual careers, etc. However, is this the fault of ANPR or of those of us who should have been the leaders in bringing resource management issues to the forefront but did not? I believe it to be the latter. ANPR has over 1,500 members, most of whom are park rangers, and most of whom are the folk actually carrying out resource management in the field. It seems to me that this existing vehicle, which already has a quality journal and an established, well-attended annual meeting, could be utilized to meet our needs.

"Resources management is a key element within the ranger profession, but it is not the only element. Emphasizing any one element to the exclusion of the others not only harms the profession as a whole, but ultimately results in poorer management and protection of the priceless resources which the American people have entrusted to our care."

## Legislative Actions

**Bill Lienisch**  
**NPCA**

After many years of work, legislation to expand the boundary of Big Cypress National Preserve by 146,000 acres was signed into law in late April. The bill will provide for protection of critical wildlife habitat, increased protection for South Florida's water supply, and additional recreational resources for Florida's growing population.

Hearings have been held in Congress on the Administration's proposed budget for the National Park Service. Several concerns have been raised, generally focusing on the issue of whether the proposed budget is adequate. There is a fairly widespread belief that the budget needs to be increased substantially. Congress is particularly concerned that revenue resulting from increased fees is being used to offset proposed cuts in the budget rather than to enhance the budget as intended by Congress. While it is still early in the budget process, it appears that Congress will add over $100 million to the proposed budget, increasing the acquisition and construction accounts as well as ensuring that fee revenue is used to actually increase the budget.

A hearing was held in mid-May on Representative Bruce Vento's legislation, H.R. 3964, to establish a National Park System Review Board. This legislation directs this three-person board to review programs and activities of the National Park Service. In addition to establishing the board, the legislation makes the Director responsible to the President and to any officer of the Department of Interior. The Director would be appointed by the President for a five-year term and would be subject to Senate confirmation. The legislation also establishes professional criteria for the Director, including a demonstrated ability "...to administer, protect, and preserve the natural and cultural resources of the United States."

This legislation is designed to provide the Service freedom in establishing its own policies and to allow the Director to provide Congress and others with the actual opinion of park professionals on issues facing the National Park Service rather than having Park Service positions dictated by political appointees of the Administration.

Hearings were also held on Representative Udall's legislation to create the American Heritage Trust. This legislation is designed to increase and stabilize funding for both the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Historic Preservation Fund. It is an outgrowth, in part, of recommendations made by the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. If enacted, it would lead to increased land acquisition funding for the National Park Service.

Among other legislation before Congress, there are bills to expand the boundary of Congaree Swamp NM, establish wilderness at Great Smoky Mountains NP, establish a Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, and to provide for additional protection for park geothermal resources.

## Seasonal Insurance

The Association has arranged an insurance program which for the first time makes health and life insurance available at reasonable rates to permanent and nonpermanent employees who are Association members. Included are:

- a major medical plan which provides comprehensive health care benefits for you and your family, with up to $1 million maximum lifetime benefits per insured person, a choice of deductibles, affordable group rates and comprehensive benefits both in and out of hospital;
- a supplemental hospital plan which provides up to $100 per day in cash to help pay for those extra "out-of-pocket" medical expenses your basic insurance doesn't cover and offers a choice of daily cash benefits up to the above noted ceiling, optional spouse and dependent coverage, affordable group rates and guaranteed acceptance if under age 60 and actively at work;
- a Medicare supplement plan which helps fill the gaps in Federal Medicare benefits;
- group term life insurance up to $150,000 maximum coverage, with optional spouse and dependent coverage, and affordable group rates.

If you'd like more information on this program, write to Marsh McLennan Associates, P.O. Box 7157, San Francisco, CA 94120, or call 1-800-227-4316 (1-800-982-8080 in California).
For those readers who enjoy the thrill of alpine climbing or have ever dreamed of scaling a mountain of ice to stand on its summit above the clouds, I heartily recommend *Island in the Sky*. But to those of you who are climbers, be forewarned! After reading these nineteenth century accounts of ascents of Mount Rainier, the dimensions of your own mountaineering feats may seem lessened. This was true in my own case.

I have been an active climber for many years and considered my three ascents of Washington State’s 14,410 foot Mount Rainier as testimony to my mountaineering abilities. But when compared to the obstacles and challenges which faced these pioneering climbers, my accomplishments seem more like weekend strolls.

The author has also researched the history of the lakes, and presents these histories in the lengthy narratives. Along with such historical insights, general information on “how-to” fish the lake is provided, with additional information on the biological studies which have been conducted throughout Yellowstone National Park.

Island in the Sky is a collection of fourteen exciting and expressive first-person accounts of explorations and ascents of Mount Rainier. Schullery opens each account with a brief narrative outlining the relationship between its author and the volcano, and provides the circumstances and conditions under which the climb was attempted.

Each account vividly points out how the comforts of modern day climbing are taken for granted. Early climbers did not have the luxury of driving paved roads to designated climbing routes, the protection of gortex or nylon clothing, the security of high-tech climbing gear, the comfort of a sleeping bag rated to 20 below zero in an all-season tent, or mountain rescue teams in case of emergency. Rather, these adventurers, many never having climbed before, challenged Mount Rainier without modern-day advantages and often succeeded.

Hazard Stevens and Philemon Van Trump are credited with the first successful ascent in 1870. In a discussion of their approach, Stevens states that “we repeatedly missed the trail, and lost hours in retracing our steps and searching for the right course. The weather was hot and sultry, and rendered more oppressive by the dense foliage: myriads of gnats and mosquitoes tormented us and drove our poor animals almost frantic.” And to think that I have dreaded the “long” drive to Mount Rainier!

Today’s climbers are required to register with the National Park Service, and must list their gear and route. Imagine the concern of an on-duty park ranger if Fay Fuller, first woman to reach Mount Rainier’s lofty summit in 1890, to describe her gear for her summit attempt: “Before starting I donned heavy flannels, woolen hose, warm mittens and goggles, blacked my face with charcoal to modify the sun’s glare, drove long caulks and brads into my shoes, rolled two single blankets containing provisions for three days and strapped them from the shoulder under the arm to the waist, ... grasped my alpenstock and was resolved to climb until exhausted.”

After reading George Dickson’s 1892 account, both hikers and climbers will have a heightened appreciation of the warmth and safety offered by their tent and sleeping bags: “Under the shadow of Gibraltar, ... (we spread) our rubber blankets on the softest rock we could find, we covered ourselves with our woolen blankets and huddled up together, trying to get up a little warmth, and kept on trying all night, but with very poor success. A bitter cold wind blew around us, and we got little or no sleep, and were all very glad when it became light enough to travel. By unanimous consent this place we named Camp Misery.”

It is clear that the techniques of climbing have changed over the years; however, the reasons behind the climb remain the same. To enjoy the scenic views. To test your will to go on when your body wants to quit. To stand on the summit, filled with the power of victory and a renewed sense of purpose.

Mount Rainier, dominating the northwest landscape, lures adventurers to its slopes today as it has in the past. Fortunately for those who hike and climb about Mount Rainier today, the scenery remains virtually unchanged from these early accounts. Mount Rainier received national park status in 1899, and exists in its present condition as a pristine wilderness of ice and snow with wooded slopes. These accounts, provided by Paul Schullery, are all the more valuable to us for this fact.

Scott Shane
Colonial
Seasonal Concerns
Kris Bardsley
Yosemite

At the Rendezvous in New Jersey last fall, a group of interested individuals met to discuss seasonal interests and concerns and ways by which the Seasonal Interests Committee of the Association of National Park Rangers could assist them in resolving some of these concerns. The group agreed that the first step was to determine the scope and nature of seasonal problems. In December, the committee began developing a series of questions that would be used as part of a seasonal interest survey. In March, the survey was completed, and approximately 300 were sent to seasonals and permanents throughout the Park Service.

The response to the survey proved tremendous, as nearly 200 (two-thirds) of them were returned. Of those responding, 83 were seasonal employees and 105 were permanent. Length of time in the Service ranged from one month to 25 years, with the majority of respondents having worked from two to seven years; they'd worked in from one to 16 different park areas, with the majority having worked in from one to four parks. Grade levels included GS-3 (11), GS-4 (43), GS-5 (52), GS-6 (4), GS-7 (25), GS-9 (37), GS-11 (12), GS-12 (1), GS-13 (1), and WG-5 (2). Seventy-two percent of the respondents possessed a bachelors degree or above. The National Park Service was a career objective for 136 of those surveyed; 24 said it was not an objective, 25 were unsure, and 3 did not respond. Fifty-two percent of the individuals responding were supervisors. The one-page survey contained five questions. These questions appear below. Each is followed by representative comments taken from the responses and a general discussion of issues that were raised.

Hiring
1. Please comment on the current seasonal hiring process (is it a problem/should individuals be able to apply to several parks/do positions go unfilled in your park, etc.).

The response to this question showed a genuine concern about the current seasonal hiring process by both seasonal and permanent employees. Only about 10% of the respondents felt that the current hiring process was adequate. Here are some key concerns:

The application itself was considered by many as a major barrier, due to its length and unclear directions. The self-evaluation section was heavily criticized as being unfair and inaccurate.

"The forms are exceedingly long and repetitious and self-evaluation of skills tends to lead to honest, modest applicants not being considered as qualified as those who inflate their abilities — very subjective."

"Any application that depends on self-evaluation tends to be unfair in that it penalizes honesty and invites inflation of your qualifications. This is compounded by the fact that a 3 rating, supposedly meaning that you have fulfilled all responsibilities of the position, receives only 60% credit. If you want full credit for your experience you must mark a 4, leading to inflated evaluations. This only compounds the perception that seasonals must be able to walk on water to get and retain their positions."

Current application deadlines have limited the number of seasonal applicants. Many college students do not begin their search for a summer job until after January 15th; those who have changes in their job status later than January 15th do not have an opportunity to apply unless a special announcement is issued. Although some parks have increased their recruitment efforts over the past several years, there does not appear to be a national effort directed increasing the number of individuals applying for seasonal positions.

"Need more recruitment programs to solicit more qualified applicants."

"Seasonal recruitment is difficult in this urban park due to high costs of living and the park not having seasonal housing, etc."

The rating of applicants by the Washington office continues to be a problem, both for the applicants and for the parks. Applications are occasionally lost or misrated. Parks receiving their registers first (normally those on the East coast, smaller parks which process fewer applicants, and those parks with speedy personnel offices) get a jump on the hiring process.

"Ratings in WASO are being poorly done."

"The current seasonal hiring process seems extremely impersonal. It would be nice if seasonals could apply directly to the park themselves instead of Washington where their application is boiled down to a number on a register."

The lack of qualified applicants and difficulties in hiring those who are qualified ranked as the number one concern among those responding. Fifty-eight of the supervisors who responded felt that the number of qualified applicants continues to decrease each year. Parks such as Yosemite, Gateway's, Sandy Hook Unit, Delaware Water Gap, Shenandoah, and Apostle Island all mentioned that they had difficulty filling positions, most commonly law enforcement positions.

"Quality/quantity of the seasonal pool has grown smaller over the last 10 years as a reflection of today's society and values. Some positions are being filled with employees minimally qualified for more demanding patrol positions."

"Recruiting highly qualified seasonal (i.e. law enforcement, EMT, boat operation) is difficult for us here at Apostle Island National Lakeshore. This year I didn't have enough qualified applicants eligible for law enforcement commissions."

A frequently expressed barrier to reaching qualified applicants is what many considered to be the "unqualified" veterans blocking the register. Other barriers to hiring qualified employees included low salaries, lack of adequate housing, and the cost of training. }
"Veterans still tie up registers and prevent potential career employees from obtaining positions, especially retired veterans (I am a veteran)."

"Low unemployment, high cost of living in the area — folks turn us down because they cannot afford to work in the area at the salary level."

"Need housing and/or urban cost of living adjustment."

"Severe shortages of seasonal law enforcement applicants (occurs) due to the high cost of obtaining that type of training."

The responses also included numerous solutions to these problems, including simplifying the applications, lengthening the application period, and allowing individuals to apply directly to each park. The number one suggestion was to increase the number of parks each individual could apply to. Most felt that you should be able to apply to two parks per region, similar to the winter application procedures. Other suggestions included allowing individuals to be rehired across categories (i.e. employing an interpretation rehire to do law enforcement) and allowing individuals to apply to more than two categories. It was also suggested that law enforcement applications be pooled, and that, once each park hired all personnel for law enforcement, the remaining names be sent to WASO and be available for other parks to use when their registers become exhausted.

"We have a problem with the sub-specialties and have trouble because we'd like to rehire returning seasonals into different specialties but can't without competition — let's make it easier for seasonals to be considered for a greater variety of jobs."

"Individuals should be able to apply to 2 parks per region instead of the entire system. Our registers are extremely thin, with qualified applicants being a rare commodity."

"I don't think applying for more parks really helps us because our registers would be larger, but deceiving, because it reduces the chance in applicant will accept an appointment from 50% to 33% or less."

"It's an annual penance. We are not a 'glamor park' so we don't get all that many applicants. Also the local economy is booming and people can make more at McDonalds than they can collecting fees here. Result: unfilled positions, generally lower quality employees than five years ago."

Over the past several years, there has been a marked drop in the number of individuals applying for positions in the National Park Service. The lack of training, low salary, poor and expensive housing, and difficult and confusing application procedures have contributed to this decline. Without a conscious effort to increase paid training, improve pay and housing, and simplify the application procedure, the National Park Service will continue to experience a critical shortage of seasonal applicants.

"Many people say that the seasonal employee is the backbone of the National Park Service... I'm not sure how the Service is going to operate with a broken back."

"Aside from all the professional skills training, the most useful type of training would be those courses concerning interpersonal relationships/dealing with people."

Many respondents dealt with the quality of training. Some felt that the quality of seasonal law enforcement training should be improved. The cost of law enforcement training (as well as other types of training) continues to increase, and a number of people felt that this is a cost that seasonals may not be able to continue to afford. There was a strong feeling that more seasonal training should be paid for by the National Park Service. Many suggested that more of those courses which are currently only available to permanents be opened to seasonals as well.

"Better access to training, i.e. regional L.E. refreshers during off seasons, courses available at Mather and Albright."

"Make more training courses offered to permanents open to seasonals, i.e. special fire courses, resource management, L.E. etc. I know many people who would jump at the chance even with a shared travel expense."

"Training that does not cost them monies from their own pocket."

Refresher training and on the job training raised several questions. Due to a lack of funding, many parks are forced to bring their seasonals to work without any training or orientation. Seasonals in many areas are being forced to pay private schools in order to maintain their law enforcement commissions. This continued cost of maintaining law enforcement and emergency medical service certifications is becoming prohibitive to seasonals drawing GS-5 salaries.

"Sponsor regular refresher training — law enforcement, emergency medical service, etc. — which is paid for."

"What I'd like is a better budget so I could bring seasonals on in time to give them some training before the rush."

In order to improve the quality of our seasonal work force, the National Park Service must identify and provide training which will insure professionalism among all park rangers.

**Prime Problem**

3. What is the biggest problem facing seasonal employees today and what can NPS or ANPR do to improve the situation?

Seventy-five of the individuals surveyed responded that the number one problem facing seasonals was the lack of a career ladder and/or the inability of seasonals to move into permanent positions. Concerns ranged from the inability
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The Seasonal Interest Committee: Past, Present and Future
Barbara Maynes
Prince William Forest Park

"To many visitors, seasonal rangers are the N.P.S."
"Seasonals are the backbone of the Park Service."
"The Park Service would be lost without its seasonal staff."

While nearly everyone associated with the NPS recognizes and appreciates the truth in these nearly cliche statements, seasonal employees within the Park Service still face a variety of issues which directly affect the quality of their employment and lives. The difficulty of obtaining career-enriching training, the lack of job security, the hardships associated with becoming a permanent — these problems and others have confronted seasonal employees for years.

Born of the desire to confront and resolve some of these issues, the ANPR Seasonal Interest Committee was established in 1982 at Rendezvous VI. The group’s program was to identify, examine, and then act on some of the most pressing issues involving seasonal employees.

The group’s first major goal was to determine the concerns of seasonals, so the committee distributed a survey the next year asking seasonals to comment on problems facing them. From the approximately 100 responses received, the work group developed a position paper, clearly stating the Association’s support of seasonal employees and establishing a list of recommendations for both the Association and Service to consider and work on. This agenda set in 1983 has helped to guide the work group since.

Top among the recommended goals were:
- establishment of group health insurance plans tailored to the needs of seasonal rangers;
- revision of the seasonal employment application and its two-park application limit;
- development of training programs for seasonal employees in the areas of NPS orientation and special skills;
- improvement and increase of government housing for seasonals;
- establishment of a step increase program for seasonals;
- establishment of an ANPR telephone hotline to inform people of OPM register openings and other career opportunities;
- development of an Individual Development Plan (IDP) type of program for seasonals; and
- exploration of various possibilities for a career ladder from seasonal to permanent employment.

In the five years since the writing of the position paper, some of these goals have been accomplished. One of the more notable successes to date has been the establishment of group health and life insurance plans which are open to all ANPR members, whether seasonal or permanent (see article on page 31). When this program was made available to members in early 1986, it was the first and only group insurance program open to seasonal park rangers. The somewhat lower premium rates available through group programs have made health insurance more affordable for seasonals.

While still a costly program, it remains the only group health insurance option open to seasonal NPS employees, and has helped to fill at least part of the huge void of tangible employee benefits for seasonal employees.

The Association has done a number of things to improve the information flow concerning seasonal and permanent hiring procedures. Seasonal hiring surveys documenting the numbers of applications received by parks and the numbers of seasonal hires have appeared four times in Ranger since 1983. Although there was a lag in this service between 1983 and 1986, the hiring surveys are now firmly written into the schedules of both the Seasonal Interest Committee and Ranger magazine.

The information provided by these surveys helps seasonals determine how best to “spend” their two applications. Judging by conversations with other seasonals (as well as the memories of evenings spent poring over the surveys), this service has apparently been particularly valuable. One of the goals set by the Committee at the Rendezvous XI meeting is to continue and further refine these surveys.

There have also been Ranger articles and numerous Rendezvous workshops which have provided advice on how best to fill out SF-171’s and apply to Office of Personnel Management registers. Since the process of becoming permanently employed continues to be of major concern to many seasonals, the Association will continue to provide seasonals with whatever “helpful hints” its members can pull together.

Increased and more widely advertised training for seasonals continues to be an important concern. Interestingly, the recognition of this need was instrumental in the establishment of the Seasonal Committee. In 1981, then-seasonal Mike Sutton served on an NPS task force at Albright Training Center which examined seasonal training needs and alternatives. Mike later became the first chairman of the Seasonal Interest Committee, and the finding of the NPS-sponsored task force were included in the Association’s first seasonal position paper. Much was written about this issue in the early 1980’s and several objectives have since been met. A listing of schools offering law enforcement training for seasonal NPS rangers was published in Ranger in 1984, and the ANPR Training Committee has offered several courses which have been open to both seasonals and permanent members. These accomplishments have provided a number of people with the opportunity to participate in otherwise unavailable training.

Although some gains have been made, there is much more work to be done. Many of the concerns addressed in the 1983 position paper have yet to be resolved. There are other issues which also need to be addressed, and seasonal employees still face a number of inequities when compared to permanent employees. Some of these seem to be simply part and parcel of the huge bureaucratic system. And some of them may prove to be too big and too firmly entrenched for ANPR to handle.

However, well thought-out and realistic objectives can provide a framework for efficient work. Although only some of the goals set in 1983 have been attained, the committee’s recommendations and actions helped guide both the Association and Seasonal Interest Committee toward the development of training programs, hiring surveys and group insurance. While information on training opportunities for seasonals (and the opportunities themselves) are still minimal, the Seasonal Interest Committee has re-targeted this issue and set the objective of developing a directory of training opportunities for seasonals.

The results of the seasonal survey included in this issue will provide the committee with information to establish objectives which will accurately reflect the issues of most concern to seasonal employees. As in 1983, many of the concerns revolve around the well-known problems of career ladders and employee development. We have a long way to go in improving the treatment of seasonals, and tackling organizations as large as the Office of Personnel Management and National Park Service will present us with considerable challenges.

By breaking down the big issues into smaller and more manageable ones, however, we will increase our chances for making improvements in the system and helping seasonal employees to have more enjoyable, rewarding and productive jobs.

The incentive for hard work in this direction is high — the statements made in the first paragraph are cliches because they are true. Improvement of the seasonal situation will help make it easier for employees to affirm the truth of those statements and for the Service to fulfill its mission.
to get a straight answer from OPM to a general lack of understanding on how to obtain a permanent position. Most felt that the National Park Service should create an intake program for seasonals who have worked an established number of years and provide them the opportunity to apply directly for entry level positions. ANPR was asked to provide assistance on obtaining information for seasonals, including advice on how to get a permanent job, instructions on preparing applications, and realistic statistics about how many seasonals actually obtain permanent positions.

"I think seasonals who have career interests toward the NPS need more access to information on permanent job openings. I know that this information is available, but it is like pulling teeth on an alligator to get OPM to disseminate that information."

"After a certain length of time in the same position, seasonals/part-timers should be able to become permanent!"

"More training, experience and creative intake methods need to be utilized to convert our quality seasonals to PFT."

"Fighting OPM battle! Can't get them on the phone; ratings don't make sense; appeals take forever...but don't know what we can do!"

"Many, if not most, seasonal employees want (and expect) to get permanent NPS jobs. Most will not. We need to provide the opportunity and assistance for those few who can be hired, but we also need to not give them false expectations for permanent employment."

The second most common answer to this question concerned pay. Most felt that, like permanent employees, seasonals are greatly underpaid. There continues to be an increase in training and professionalism required of our seasonal employees; however, seasonals have not seen an increase in salary along with these increased demands. A step increase program was widely discussed. Seasonals who return to the same position are not rewarded even though in most cases their performance due to previous experience far exceeds that of new seasonals. There are also few awards and incentives for seasonals, as many supervisors are not aware that performance awards may be given to seasonal employees.

"Poor pay/lack of advancement. A GS-4 of 20 years, who has increased in (his or her) skills and knowledge each year, should not be paid the same amount as a first-year GS-4 with absolutely no prior NPS experience."

"The biggest problem facing seasonals is the same as that facing permanent — they don't get paid enough money. That is the root of all NPS personnel problems and until that is at least addressed all other dialogue is superfluous."

"The disparity in salary with the rest of society is driving more people away. We can't continue to exist with a max. 2% salary increase annually while all other costs go up 5-8%."

Housing was named as the third highest problem affecting seasonals today. The lack of housing, the quality of housing and the cost of housing were the three major concerns expressed. Housing problems were directly related to budget problems. Solutions included building additional housing, upgrading current housing, providing reasonable alternatives, and offering housing allowance in urban areas.

"There are several (problems), but the biggest ones include poor housing and low pay for the experience level. I guess the biggest of these for me is poor housing. NPS needs to somehow obtain greater appropriations for new housing, and then follow that up with much stricter check-in/check-out procedure for residences to insure their good condition at the end of a season. Better housing can really boost moral."

"Seasonal housing (should be audited) by someone outside the park to assure decent/safe/sanitary housing."

"Standardize housing rates for all positions with the same grade or place a cap on the rates by grade."

Benefits were listed as the fourth biggest concern facing seasonals. Medical, life, and retirement benefits were all mentioned as priority seasonal needs. Many individuals have appreciated the health insurance from ANPR (see page 31), but most felt that the cost outweighs the benefits. There were few solutions mentioned to this problem, but most respondents said that the National Park Service should be responsible for providing these types of benefits.

"No benefits! I realize that some positions which are temporary offer some health and life benefits and that there are benefits offered through an insurance company."

"Probably the biggest problem facing seasonals is the lack of benefits. Some seasonals are not receiving any benefits such as sick leave, annual leave, training, housing, health insurance, etc." 

"There is still not enough being done re: medical insurance and retirement benefits. Seasonals should be able to derive some type of retirement benefit. The current group plan cost is prohibitive at best."

Those four areas identified as the biggest problems facing seasonals today include career advancement, low salary, housing, and benefits. Each of these concerns carries with it suggestions on how to alleviate part of the problem; however, all of the solutions require additional funding for the National Park Service, a requirement which is normally difficult to achieve.

ANPR Membership

4. Are you currently a member of ANPR? If not, why not?

One hundred and three of the individuals who responded are currently members of ANPR; of the 79 individuals who are not members, 33 stated that they did not know what ANPR was or what the organization was. Several who are not currently members had strong reasons for not joining the organization.

"No — I cannot afford the activities ANPR offers. There seems to be an elite group within ANPR which does not appeal to me."

Continued on page 14
How To Get A Permanent Job
Kris Bardsey
Yosemite

Getting your first permanent position with the National Park Service — something that is still a dream for some, has just become a reality for others, and is a long since forgotten memory for most of us. Each individual I spoke with about how to get a permanent job had different ideas and beliefs about the “best way in”. However, there are several common denominators among all these varied perspectives: namely, patience, persistence, perseverance, and a little bit of luck.

This article identifies just a few of the ways individuals have succeeded in getting their first permanent positions with the National Park Service. None of them is ideal, but they do represent the practical realities of getting an 025 position in the PS. Until the Service develops some form of entrance program for rangers, these are the techniques that seasonals will continue to employ.

An article on how to get a permanent job would be incomplete and a disservice to those reading it if it didn’t include a brief comment about your chance of getting a job. I could not come up with exact statistics on your chances of getting a permanent position, but the odds are not good. In 1986, fewer than 50 positions Service wide were filled from OPM park ranger registers.

In a memorandum dated April 25, 1986 to all employees, Director Mott underscored this reality: “We consider our temporary seasonal employees as very valuable members of the work force. They have a sense of dedication and skills which make them an excellent source for permanent positions. We must be realistic, however, and point out that these opportunities are very limited.”

Although there are procedures on how to get a permanent position and tips on how to complete your SF-171 that you can learn, the situation is still such that there are no guarantees when it comes to landing a permanent position as a National Park Service ranger.

The first step to getting a permanent job is deciding if that is what you really want. Sounds easy, right? Many folks I talked with thought so, too. However, after a couple of years as a permanent employee, many rangers have decided that the seasonal life was the only life, or that the Park Service simply was not for them. You also might want to give thought to other career opportunities with the National Park Service, such as in administration or maintenance. These divisions tend to fill vacancies from registers and other hiring authorities much more frequently than the ranger series does.

Now that you have answered a few basic questions, it is time to get to work. No matter what type of permanent position you choose to pursue or how you choose to pursue it, you will need to put together a Standard Form 171 (SF-171).

Writing your SF-171 should be viewed as a challenge. Just as there are numerous ways to get a permanent job, there are also numerous ways to write your SF-171. There are a number of publications put out by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and private individuals on how to write your “171”, and several past issues of Ranger have provided valuable information on techniques and formats for completing this document. Once your application is completed, have someone review it for content, completeness, punctuation, spelling and grammar. Remember, this application will be representing you and could be your key to getting a permanent job.

So...you have made the decision to work for the National Park Service, and you have completed a neat, accurate, and (of course) very professional SF-171. Now you are ready to begin the application process.

OPM Registers

An OPM register is a list of names of applicants who have been rated as being qualified for a specific type of position. Each register is developed by OPM based on several different factors. The application must meet basic qualification standards that have been established for the position, and is then ranked according to “relative qualifications”. Relative qualifications include training, experience, education, and test scores, if they are required for that position. After this procedure is completed, all applicants with veteran’s preference have points added to their rating based on their veteran’s preference status.

Each OPM office maintains its own registers for each type of position based on the needs of agencies which they service. The challenge of applying to these registers is that they are not open all the time, they are never all open at the same time, they are not consistent from year to year on when they are open, they are normally open for only a few days, and you often do not find out about them until the last minute. So, if all of this is true, how do you get your name on the register?

Many individuals have found the postcard to be the best and least expensive means of finding out when registers will be open. Every month, you drop a postcard with your name and address to the OPM offices that maintain the registers you are interested in, asking when the register will be open. When you find out that the register is opening, dust off your SF-171 and send it off.

Several pieces of advice are worth passing on. Many OPM offices will open a register for one day only, or until they’ve received an established number of applicants. Do not wait until the last minute to send in your application. Many OPM offices require additional forms; when you hear that a specific register is open, call the OPM office and ask what forms you will need to submit. If you do not include all forms, OPM normally will not rate your application. Consider sending your application return receipt requested so that you can be assured that OPM received your application and have proof that you sent it in case it is lost.

As noted above, not many ranger positions are filled from OPM registers. A common alternative for entering the National Park Service is through the clerk/typist register. This OPM register requires that you take a basic skills test. Depending on the demand for clerk/typists in a given area, this test may or may not be offered on a routine basis. Contact your local OPM office for test dates and requirements. The clerk/typist register is used by many agencies to fill this type of position. Be aware that if you turn down an offer for a clerk/typist position from other agencies, your name may be removed from the register.

Other Agencies

Frequently, seasonal employees look to other agencies as a back door into the National Park Service. Although this is not a recommended approach, it has been employed extensively in recent years. Until a formal entrance procedure is put into place, it will continue to be used.

Agencies such as the Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Park Police, Internal Revenue Service, and U.S. Customs Service are often used by seasonals trying to obtain permanent status. Information about obtaining permanent positions with these and other agencies may be obtained by writing to the appropriate agency’s personnel office in Washington, D.C. (Additional information about applying for permanent positions with other federal agencies is currently being gathered by the Seasonal Interest Committee and will be published in future editions of Ranger).

Cooperative Education

Cooperative education (Co-op) students work in parks while attending college in order to study a specific field related to park management. These programs are developed by national parks in conjunction with accredited institutions. Individuals selected for these types of positions are considered permanent employees upon graduation from college. They may apply

Continued on page 38
As the chairperson of the Seasonal Interest Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who took the time to respond to this survey. A special thanks to the committee members and the regional representatives who mailed out the individual surveys.

The tremendous response we received indicated to me an overwhelming concern for seasonal employees in the National Park Service. I believe that the survey succeeded in clearly identifying those areas, and with that objective met, the Seasonal Interest Committee can now begin working towards resolving some of these issues.

Committee Goals

5. What areas of seasonal concern should the ANPR Seasonal Interest Committee address?

Responses to this question were varied; however, the following five areas appeared most frequently:

1) Housing: Increase the number of houses available, decrease the rent, improve the condition, consider privacy, and consider married couples. (47)

2) Career Opportunities: Decrease the barriers for obtaining permanent positions, create an intake program, allow seasonals to have some type of status when applying for permanent positions, provide information on how to obtain a permanent position, assist with application procedures. (45)

3) Training: Increase the training which is open to seasonals, require the NPS to pay for refresher training, improve seasonal law enforcement training, insure that individuals receive a basic orientation to NPS. (40)

4) Pay: Increase GS levels for seasonals, consider step increases, incentive awards, special funds for training. (35)

5) Benefits: Improve medical benefits, provide less expensive medical benefits, provide other types of benefits, including retirement, liability, and life insurance. (32)

Although these were the areas most frequently discussed, other comments included providing tax information for seasonal employees, dealing with stress and job burnout, strengthening seasonal rights, establishing a seasonal international exchange program, and improving supervision.

"A more complete benefit package, i.e.: retirement/medical/life."

"Increase wages — above poverty level — at least McDonalds pays more than NPS."

"Our urban parks are serving as a revolving door for employees coming here to gain permanent status and/or to attend FLETC and then transferring to traditional western parks. Suggestion: Attendance at FLETC should entail a one year obligation to the host park."

"Convert some long-standing seasonal positions to subject-to-furlough. There are career seasonals in the system who have no hope for benefits enjoyed by permanents."

"Perhaps a resource book of housing options when none are available through the park, such as those used by college housing officials to suggest places for students. A local housing directory."

"Recognition of seasonals as human beings."

"Focus on mid-level and top-level management, and stress to these permanent NPS folks that the seasonal work force is worth caring for. These people are by and large representing the NPS to our public constituency."

"Motivate the NPS to care more about seasonals and their movement. Especially since seasonals are getting fewer."

Conclusions

The suggestions for areas of concern that should be addressed by the Seasonal Interest Committee have been well defined by many individuals. It is more than apparent that these issues greatly affect both seasonal and permanent employees by relaying information you may have obtained on how to get a permanent position. If you decide to help, you can make a difference.

As a permanent supervisor, it is difficult for me to believe that the old idea that thousands of seasonals are sitting around waiting for a position with the National Park Service still exists. This and other surveys continue to show thatso to completely resolve this issue. Assist your park and fellow employees by relaying information you may have obtained on how to get a permanent position. If you decide to help, you can make a difference.

As a permanent supervisor, it is difficult for me to believe that the old idea that thousands of seasonals are sitting around waiting for a position with the National Park Service still exists. This and other surveys continue to show that the Park Service is experiencing a marked decrease in the number of applicants for seasonal positions. We need to encourage seasonals and assist them in any way possible, not tell them to get out if they don't like current policies. I would like to encourage permanent employees to also get involved in the Seasonal Interest Committee or assist seasonals in your park with career counseling or assistance with SF-171s.

As an association, we have a responsibility to address the issues identified in this survey. We must encourage National Park Service managers to take an interest in seasonal issues and concerns. In order to maintain the current level of professionalism exhibited by our seasonals, we must assist and support them in their vital role as National Park Service employees.
Ranger Salaries: Past, Present and Future

Hugh Dougher, Voyageurs

"With our salary of $900 per year and the high prices of everything we have to purchase to eat and use leaves but a small margin... You must know that it is impossible for us to build our own houses..."

So complained fledgling Yellowstone Assistant Superintendent D.E. Sawyer in an 1883 letter to Minnesota Congressman H.B. Strait. Today, position classification and pay comparability issues indicate salaries continue to be a prime concern of rangers.

This article explores ranger pay issues through historical perspectives and statistical comparisons.

An Historical Overview

Salary issues have influenced the ranger profession in both development and tradition. Salary conflicts caused the resignation of the first park ranger, resulted in the assignment of the cavalry to protect the parks, served as minor justification for the creation of the National Park Service, and influenced both the establishment and abolishment of the park technician series.

The Early Years

The salary issues began with a twist—a supervisor complaining his employee was earning too much! Harry Yount, identified in Horace Albright's book Oh, Ranger! as the first national park ranger, was hired in 1880 as Yellowstone's gamekeeper at $1,000 per annum. Within a year, Superintendent Phileatus W. Norris became dissatisfied with Yount's performance. Feeling he could hire an ordinary mountaineer who would "at half the cost be far more efficient and reliable", Norris arranged for Yount's resignation.

Yount was replaced not by a mountaineer but by a group of inexperienced political appointees including the D.E. Sawyer quoted above. Their dismal performance caused the Territory of Wyoming to pass legislation in 1885 providing for regulations protecting the park, as well as the appointment of two justices of the peace and two constables to enforce compliance. These state employees received $300-400 per year, with the added incentive of retaining and splitting all collected fines.

While the legislature's apparent intent was to subsidize minimal salaries and reward initiative, the potentially lucrative reward system encouraged overzealous enforcement. These peace officers in effect became "piece" officers — as in piece work. Within five months, one unlucky constable arrested Illinois Congressman Judge Lewis Payson on the charge of improperly extinguishing his campfire. Payson contested, and the repercussions precipitated the subsequent loss of appropriations for park salaries and the successful request for park protection by the United States Cavalry.

Return of Civilian Rangers

The Forest Reserve Act of 1891 authorized the President to set aside "forest reserves". Appropriations authorized by this act were used both to staff these tracts of land and to reestablish civilian management of the parks. This financial connection determined the future name of today's park guardians.

The personnel the Department of the Interior hired to manage the 41 million acres of forest reserves — the future National Forests — were primarily responsible for monitoring range allotments. Thus they logically came to be called "rangers".

In 1898, upon the recall of the cavalry from the California parks for expected deployment to the Spanish-American War, Interior assigned a Special Forest Agent and two assistants to Yosemite, General Grant, and Sequoia National Parks to prevent stock trespass and poaching. Their salaries were paid from Forest Reserve funds. Variously known as "rangers", "park rangers", "forest rangers", and "guides", the civilians assigned to the parks were officially designated park rangers when the forest reserves and related funding were transferred to the Department of the Agriculture in 1905.

The two forest rangers hired at Yosemite in 1898 were Archie Leonard and Charley Leidig. Their salaries were established at $600 per year, with the provision that they pay for their horses and equipment. When the cavalry left for the winter, Leonard and Leidig were invited to remain on duty. They agreed on the condition that they receive raises to $1,200 per year. In December they offered to accept less, and in January of 1899 their salaries were established at $900 per year. Four months later this was reduced to $720 per annum to correspond with the standard for other forest rangers.

So began almost two decades of salary fluctuations, as the government sought to establish pay uniformity for all park and forest rangers. During this period, the salaries of rangers working in the parks varied depending upon the particular park: in 1910, these salaries ranged from $900 for both Yellowstone Chief Scout Jim McBride and Mt. Rainier Ranger Thomas O'Farrell to $1,500 for Sequoia Ranger Walter Fry This disparity was one early indication of a developing need for a central managing agency which would later become the National Park Service.

General Superintendent for the Parks

Yosemite forest ranger Charles Leidig (middle) and Archie Leonard (second from right) agreed to work in the park for salaries of $1,200 per year, but eventually settled for $720. Photo from Yosemite Research Library.
Mark Daniels standardized ranger salaries in 1915 — and made them comparable to forest ranger salaries — in the publication "Regulations Governing Rangers In The National Parks". Chief ranger salaries were established at $1,500, ranger first class (permanents) at $1,350, and seasonals at $900. Yellowstone scouts were incorporated into this pay schedule in 1919.

In 1920, these regulations were revised to provide higher salaries to rangers working in larger parks. This new system was based on the belief that rangers assigned to the larger parks performed a greater variety of duties. A chief ranger, depending upon park acreage, visitation, number of employees and appropriations, received between $1,200 and $1,800, a park ranger between $900 and $1,320, and temporaries from $900 to $1,200.

The Struggle to Upgrade Positions

Park ranger positions first came under Civil Service Commission regulations in the 1930's when they were placed in the non-professional "Crafts and Custodial Service". In 1949 rangers were incorporated into the General Schedule (GS) rating system by the Classification Act of 1949.

Between the 1930's and 1950's, ranger salaries fell behind naturalist, engineer, and forester levels. The standard entry level for rangers was GS-5, for example, as compared with GS-7 for naturalists. John Henneberger, in his unpublished history of the NPS ranger, To Protect and Preserve, presents a two-prong hypothesis for this double standard — the inadequate representation of rangers in the Washington and regional offices and the original 1930 classification of ranger duties as protective and custodial rather than professional.

Beginning in 1937, the Division of Ranger Activities addressed this inequity by initiating efforts to professionalize the series and thereby raise grade levels. Pre-selection examinations were begun, and an educational requirement of 30 hours of college credit was established. The educational requirement was later increased to four years of college, with one year of graduate college credit being established. The educational requirement by deciding that "the type of degree apparently has no impact on successful performance".

Several documents support this statement. The 1985 "GS-025/026 Management Field Review" report said that the 025/026 dilemma came about because the Service hired "over-qualified technicians who were allowed to perform park ranger-type work at lower grade levels". The report also recognized that non-classification issues such as budget restrictions were commonly allowed to affect proper classification. In his article entitled, "The 025 Comparability Study: An Update" (Ranger, Vol. III, No. 2), Walt Dabney, Chief of Ranger Activities, stated that poor supervision and position management permitted technicians to routinely perform functions beyond their job classification.

By maintaining a low grade structure and allowing technicians to perform higher-level ranger duties, the NPS came to exploit the demand for Service employment.

Beginning in the late 1970's, the Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR) led an effort to combine the 025 rangers and 026 technicians into one professional park ranger series. ANPR hoped that the elimination of the 026 classification would provide a realistic career ladder for 025/026 employees by significantly improving overall grade levels. As part of this effort, ANPR proposed in the 1979 "025 Park Management Study and Discussion" paper that the ranger journeyman level be established at GS-11. At least three NPS regions generally concurred by recommending that the journeyman level be recognized as GS-9 (December 1, 1981 memo from Chief, Branch of Compensation and Program Evaluation, to Associate Director). At the same time, ANPR supported a professional 025 series by recommending a positive education requirement.

The Current 025 Series

Although the 026 series was finally eliminated in 1985, the desired broad ranger grade increases did not follow. Rather than convert technicians to the existing GS-025 classification series, OPM combined the 025 and 026 standards into a new, diluted 025 series.

The standards of this current 025 series consider all GS level positions as full-performance levels (the old standards identified GS-5 and GS-7 as training levels). The grading criteria is centered around managerial and supervisory functions, field level journeyman duties are relegated to the lower grades, and OPM has nullified the long-term efforts of the Ranger Division and ANPR to establish a positive education requirement by deciding that "the type of degree apparently has no impact on successful performance".

Reclassification — The 1811 Series

In 1978, a park technician supervised by Olympic's law enforcement specialist requested a desk audit. The auditors determined that his position should be reclassified to the 1811 investigator series. The Service opposed this reclassification, as reflected in an August 10, 1979 memorandum from the Associate Director, Administration, which stated that "it is not the policy or intent of the National Park Service to maintain a separate law enforcement cadre of "criminal investigators"...". The Olympic position was subsequently restructured and investigative responsibilities were deleted.

During that same year, Yosemite's personnel office audited and reclassified two GS-6 technician positions to GS-7/9 1811 investigators. Although the employees were officially notified by personnel actions, the reclassifications were withheld. At least one of the involved employees appealed. In 1980 the Service compromised by classifying the positions as GS-7/9 025.
In both the 083/085 police series standards and Section 529 of House Joint Resolution 395 (HJ 395). By cross-referencing the 083/085 police series standards, it seems likely that many GS-5 rangers with over 25% of their duties in law enforcement will be upgraded to GS-7. HJ 395 is the legislation which resulted in the recent US Park Police pay raises. This law allows agencies having recruitment or retention difficulties with law enforcement personnel to request higher rates of pay for these employees. Decreasing numbers of qualified seasonal applicants, difficulties experienced by some parks in retaining lower-graded employees, and resignations by rangers for higher-graded positions in other federal agencies may provide sufficient justification for the Park Service to seek these higher pay rates.

The “Ranger Salaries in 1984 Equivalent Dollars” portion of Figure 1 presents actual ranger salaries adjusted to a single standard: the purchasing power of the 1984 dollar. The 1984 dollar was chosen as the standard because that year is the most recent for which a yearly price index is readily available. The purchasing power of the 1984 dollar was calculated by dividing the average price index (100.0) for the standard base period (1967) by the price index for a given year and expressing the result in dollars.

This graph, an effort to compare salaries over time, shows a steady drop in the purchasing power of ranger salaries from the all-time peak of 1972.

Data for the “Average Salary of Full-Time American Employee” portion of Figure 1 is based on information listed in several U.S. Bureau of the Census statistical publications. This graph demonstrates that until the mid-1970's the average American salary was consistently below or in the lower range of ranger salaries. Beginning then and continuing to the present, the national average has experienced a greater growth than ranger wages, so that by 1985 the national average was only slightly below the GS-9 level. Extrapolation of this trend suggests that the average American salary will continue to climb faster than ranger salaries.

The average federal civilian, full-time employee salary (not charted) has also increased at a rate greater than that of the average ranger. This federal civilian employee average, historically in the upper range of ranger salaries, climbed above the GS-9 level for the first time in 1984, and has continued to increase at a greater rate than the GS-9's rate every year since.

As a group, these statistics indicate relatively decreasing ranger income.

Comparability

As early as 1903, acting superintendents at Yosemite and Sequoia unsuccessfully recommended substantial pay increases for their rangers, citing both the
substantial costs incurred in providing
personally-owned stock and equipment
and the nature of the job. Today, the
argument for increased pay continues, but now
usually focuses on comparability.

A not infrequent point of contention
among rangers is that their salaries are
below those of employees in similar pro-
cessions performing comparable duties. To
explore this parity issue, salary rates of
rangers are compared with those of the
eight comparable professions listed in
Figure 3 (opposite page).

Three basic field levels of responsibil-
ity are compared: “entry”, “journeyman”, and “lead or field super-
visor”. “Entry level” is defined as the re-
cruit or trainee; “journeyman” as the full
performance field level; and “lead or field super-
visor” as the lowest level of employee supervising others, expected to maintain
field skills, and perhaps having some
budget responsibilities.

These levels of responsibility were
selected because they generally fit the per-
sonnel structures of the compared pro-
cessions. However, these levels are not as
defined for NPS rangers, because rangers
are initially hired for permanent positions
in grades GS-3 through GS-5, OPM
classifies all GS-025 grades as “full-per-
formance”, and first-line supervisors can
be graded anywhere from GS-7 to GS-11.

For the purpose of this study, GS-4 is
equated to an NPS ranger entry level.
GS-5, GS-6, GS-7, and GS-8 combined are
considered journeyman level, and GS-9 is
defined as the lead or field supervisor level.

GS-4 is presented as the entry level, as
it is the lowest grade representing a signifi-
cant portion of the 025 series (13% of pos-
tions between GS-4 and GS-9, as shown in
Figure 4), and because the GS-4 register is
the only GS-025 register available from at least
one OPM office (San Francisco).

GS-5 through GS-8 are classed as
journeymen level, since persons in these
grades commonly have similar levels of
training and perform duties at the same
levels of responsibility and independence as
full-performance employees in comparable pro-
cessions. The NPS ranger journeyman
level salary listed in figure 3 was calculated by
multiplying the appropriate salary for
each grade by the number of positions in
that grade (see Figure 4), adding the pro-
ducts, and dividing the sum by the total
number of GS-5 through GS-9 positions.

GS-9 is defined as the lead or field supervi-
sion level, since duties at this grade
most closely meet the earlier defined
criteria for this level. Although not all GS-9
rangers have supervisory responsibilities,
this is the lowest grade within which these
duties are common. Rangers at this grade
generally are also expected to employ field
skills on a regular basis.

Figure 4 presents the grade distri-
bution of 025 rangers, entry level through
lead or field supervisor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Salary (Actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-4/1</td>
<td>13,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-5/1</td>
<td>14,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-6/1</td>
<td>16,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-7/1</td>
<td>18,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-8/1</td>
<td>20,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-9/1</td>
<td>22,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data used to calculate both the
state park rangers’ and state forestry
employees’ salaries listed in figure 3 was
available only in the form of a “lead unit
employee” category, which combines
the entry and journeynan levels of these pro-
cessions. The respective $18,311 and
$18,508 salaries are the mean of the mini-
um and maximum field unit salaries of
the 48 reporting states. These numbers
and percentages of rangers at these grades are as follows: GS-4 - 189 (9%), GS-5 - 776
(36%), GS-6 - 46 (2%), GS-7 - 568 (26%),
GS-8 - 2 (-), and GS-9 - 597 (27%). As can
be seen, the change that has occurred to the
workforce since 1986 has been in the in-
crease in GS-7's.

Although the salary figures given are
for 1987, they were employed because the
salaries given by other agencies are in 1987
dollars.

Figure 2.

Ranger Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>SALARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Yellowstone</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Gamekeeper, Yellowstone</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Yellowstone</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Forest Ranger, Forest Reserves</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Assistant Special Forest Agent, CA</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Forest Ranger, Forest Reserves</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Forest Rangers, Parks and Reserves</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Scout, Yellowstone</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Forest Ranger, Forest Reserves</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Forest Ranger, National Parks</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Forest Ranger, Interior, (Glacier)</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Forest Ranger, Yosemite</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Yosemite</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Mt. Rainier</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Yosemite</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Sequoia</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Yosemite</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Park Ranger, General Grant</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Yosemite</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Yosemite</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Seasonal</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Park Ranger, 1st Class</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Ylwst. Scout, Base</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Base</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Maximum</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Base</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Maximum</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Park Ranger</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Grade 8</td>
<td>1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Park Ranger, Base</td>
<td>2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-5, Base</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-9</td>
<td>7,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-9</td>
<td>10,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-5</td>
<td>13,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-5</td>
<td>20,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-9</td>
<td>13,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-5</td>
<td>21,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-5</td>
<td>14,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Park Ranger, GS-9</td>
<td>21,714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 3. Average Salaries, Basic Rates, 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Entry Level</th>
<th>Journeyman Level</th>
<th>Lead or Field Supervisor Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NPS Park Rangers</strong></td>
<td>13,248</td>
<td>17,952</td>
<td>23,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(GS-4/1)</td>
<td>(GS-5/1)</td>
<td>(GS-7/1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Park Rangers</strong></td>
<td>18,311</td>
<td>22,458</td>
<td>26,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(KY)</td>
<td>(KA)</td>
<td>(WA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Forestry Employees</strong></td>
<td>18,508</td>
<td>28,269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(forestry technician)</td>
<td>(forester)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Park Police</strong></td>
<td>20,556</td>
<td>21,366</td>
<td>27,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Grade 1-1)</td>
<td>(Grade 2-1)</td>
<td>(Grade 5-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Firemen, Rural U.S.</strong></td>
<td>19,019</td>
<td>22,196</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Game Wardens</strong></td>
<td>17,906</td>
<td>22,387</td>
<td>not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMS Responders</strong></td>
<td>20,684</td>
<td>23,347</td>
<td>28,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(KY)</td>
<td>(MO)</td>
<td>(OH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AR)</td>
<td>(IL)</td>
<td>(CO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td>13,860-32,280</td>
<td>14,723-37,500</td>
<td>16,372-43,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-87 year</td>
<td>(Grade 5-1)</td>
<td>(Grade 5-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** A variety of national associations, the January issue of the Journal of Emergency Medical Services, the Winter 1987-1988 issue of the International Game Warden magazine, and the 1987 OPM and U.S. Park Police Salary Tables.

### Figure 5. JOURNEYMAN RANGER SALARIES COMPARED WITH JOURNEYMAN LEVELS OF SIMILAR PROFESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>1987 Journeyman Ranger Salary</th>
<th>1987 Average Journeyman Salaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPS Rangers</td>
<td>$23,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Rangers</td>
<td>$26,551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Park Police</td>
<td>$27,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Police</td>
<td>$28,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Firemen</td>
<td>$28,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Game Wardens</td>
<td>$28,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS Responders</td>
<td>$28,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>$28,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Hopefully approximate the actual average journeyman level salary for these professions.

U.S. Park Police salaries are presented since they perform duties similar to rangers stationed in urban environments. The U.S. Park Police salaries listed in Figure 3 reflect 1987 wages prior to the 4-12 percent pay increases they received last January.

The salaries of rural policemen and firemen are presented because their duties are most comparable to those of rangers assigned to traditional parks.

Teachers' salaries are included as representative of a profession whose duties and educational backgrounds are frequently similar to those of NPS interpreters.

With the exception of the U.S. Park Police, all salaries are presented as averages. The salary ranges for the other professions can, of course, be fairly broad, and are dependent upon factors such as specific agency and region of the country. Generally, salaries increase from rural to urban, are lowest in the South, and highest in the West. Actual salaries of other agency personnel working adjacent to a particular park and performing comparable duties may vary from the given averages. Salary ranges for two professions, state park rangers and state game wardens, are provided as examples of the extent of these variations.

The bar graphs of Figure 5 compare the mean 1987 journeyman level salary of park rangers with the 1987 salaries of the other eight professions.

The journeyman NPS ranger salary lagged behind the salaries of peers in the other professions anywhere from $359 to $8,599. And, as Figure 4 demonstrates, 55 percent of rangers between the grades of GS-4 and GS-9 earned less than this average journeyman NPS ranger salary.

More significant than actual numbers, however, is the fact that the mean NPS journeyman ranger salary is below those of all other professions. The same holds true for both the entry level and the lead or field supervisor level. This across-the-board consistency is the strongest indication that ranger salaries are depressed.

### Multiplicity of Duties

Another argument heard for upgrading ranger salaries is that rangers are multi-skilled, performing combinations of duties including SAR, EMS, fire, interpretation, law enforcement, fee collection, resources management, and supervision. This structure saves the agency personnel and housing costs by minimizing the number of persons needed to provide basic services (the deputy sheriff, fireman, EMT, and dogcatcher rolled into one), but increases employee competency demands. Some argue that this multiplicity results in an overall job complexity greater than the
sum of the individual skills, and should be recognized as a grade determining factor within a single broad area (such as protection), perhaps either by premium pay or by rating positions on a point value system.

This idea was examined by surveying the pay policies of two agencies employing multi-disciplined personnel — the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) and Sunnyvale (CA) Department of Public Safety.

CDF personnel are commonly assigned to rural fire stations, and are trained in and respond to wildland fires, structural fires, and EMS calls. The maximum salary for the full performance CDF firefighter is $26,700 per annum, with certified firefighter/paramedics receiving an additional premium of $1,500.

Sunnyvale is a city of 114,000 located 30 miles south of San Francisco. Its public safety officers perform combined police and fire duties. Sunnyvale addresses the multi-discipline issue by paying its officers high salaries ($42,474 as the maximum full performance pay). As with Park Service rangers, Sunnyvale public service officers are not required to have college degrees. However, the city encourages career development by awarding premiums of $1,000 per annum to officers possessing bachelor degrees, and an additional $1,000 to those with master degrees.

What's Going On Today
With Pay For Park Rangers

There's been considerable concern about pay issues throughout the government lately, as Federal pay now lags nearly 25% behind the private sector. As a result, there have been actions recently which affect ranger pay, grade classification and pay comparability. The Office of Personnel Management has released a rewritten Grade Evaluation Guide for Police and Security Guard Positions (GS 083-085) and recent legislative initiatives (House Joint Resolution 395 and Senate Bill 1911) potentially affect rangers who are performing law enforcement and wildland firefighting duties.

The Assistant Director, Personnel and Administrative Services, forwarded an advance copy of the Evaluation Guide for Police and Security Guard Positions, GS 083-085, to field areas on March 21, 1988. OPM authorized the use of the guide immediately because of the high interest in classification of jobs in these occupations. The memorandum authorized field areas to use the guide to evaluate positions impacted by the new criteria.

Some tasks that are indicative of the knowledge required by a position which would probably "score" as a GS-7 if given the normal amount of "independence" from supervision that is found in a "typical" field position include:

- pursuing and apprehending persons fleeing a crime scene or attempting to resist arrest;
- subduing individuals causing disturbances, such as in family disputes;
- identifying and arresting violators based on eyewitness accounts;
- taking charge of a crime or accident scene and restricting access to those persons required on the scene;
- making arrests and performing booking procedures.

Through cross-referencing, GS-025 rangers with over 25% law enforcement duties in these areas could qualify as GS-7's. Even though individuals may be performing some or all of the above, supervisors still have the latitude to structure positions and could keep a position at the GS-5 level by controlling supervision or other aspects of the job. The key is the supervisory decision on how to structure the work.

House Joint Resolution 395 was the continuing resolution for Fiscal Year 88 which was passed on December 21, 1987. Included in this bill was a provision which granted OPM authority to grant special pay relief to the Uniformed Division of the Secret Service, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing Police, GSA Police, the U.S. Park Police, and other federal employees where a problem with recruitment or retention can be documented.

Under HJ 395, specific geographic locations or parks may qualify for special pay upon a finding that the Government's recruitment or retention of well-qualified persons is significantly handicapped as a result of higher pay rates in similar occupations in one or more areas or locations.

Senate Bill 1911 to amend title 5, United States Code, would authorize overtime payment to all forest fire fighting employees without limitation while serving on forest fire emergencies. This bill was recently introduced by Senators Hatfield and Domenici, and currently rests in the Committee on Government Affairs.

Employees would receive time and a half when working overtime and would not "max" out on a pay period basis. The cap would remain on annual salaries. Some consideration is being given to including other emergency personnel who are not firefighters and find themselves in similar situations with regard to pay.

Jim Loach
WASO

Concluding Comments

This paper has shown that ranger pay is depressed. Compared with both national averages and the pay structures of similar professions, today's rangers are generally poorly compensated. And, in real dollar terms, ranger salaries have been decreasing over the past decade.

Efforts to improve the salary situation have spanned ranger history. To date these efforts have had only limited or short term success.

Previous attempts to increase pay have been limited to the parameters of existing law — from individual negotiations by early Yosemite rangers to OPM's agreement to abolish the park technician series. Current efforts of the same mold, such as the 083/085 police series standards and House Joint Resolution 395, are encouraging but shouldn't be expected to completely resolve the issue. Both will have limited impact on non-law enforcement positions.

OPM personnel management policies have never addressed the unique duties and diverse responsibilities of NPS rangers. And the Service has traditionally been unwilling or unable to support the necessary broad changes which would result in a reasonable grade structure. These realities suggest that the definitive solution lies outside agency options.

While rangers have historically avoided the two non-management options commonly used by government employees to achieve pay increases — collective bargaining and legislative relief — this trend is changing. NAPRF's decision to lobby Congress, and NFCA's recommendation for an elevated ranger grade structure are clearly legislative in nature.

No matter the method, the issue of appropriate ranger salaries must be resolved. Until it is, the perception of inadequate wages will continue to impact the National Park Service and its employees — as it has since the time of Yellowstone Assistant Superintendent D.E. Sawyer.
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Seasonal Applications: What’s Happening?

William O. Dwyer and Julia A. Heath

There was a time when the last thing that concerned the National Park Service was its labor supply, especially its seasonal labor supply. There seemed to be an endless flow of college students, teachers, and others who dreamed of becoming park rangers for the summer. Furthermore, such a high percentage of these seasonals aspired to become permanents that hundreds of applicants stood in line for each vacancy. Although there is still a supply of potential seasonal and permanent rangers, there is a realistic cause for concern. The supply is shrinking and that, of necessity, means that the supply of competent rangers is also shrinking.

The statistics on summer seasonal ranger applicants offer an opportunity to assess these trends. In 1979, there were 33,000 applications for summer seasonal positions. Since that time, this number has steadily decreased to about 52% of the 1979 levels. There was a slight upturn for the 1988 summer season, but there are several indications that it will never reach the levels of a decade ago. The supply of these people has been steadily decreasing and, with respect to the law enforcement-trained seasonals, has reached the point where there may not be enough qualified applicants to fill existing positions. Figure 1 provides a graphic look at the problem the NPS is facing in this arena.

A rather straight forward labor trend analysis (employing a logarithmic curve fit, r = .94) predicts that by 1995 the NPS can expect a total summer seasonal pool of somewhere under 10,000 applications. Of the three basic categories of seasonal rangers, the Park Service is experiencing the most difficulty with recruiting people who possess the necessary skills and training to work as seasonal law enforcement rangers. Because about 20% of all summer seasonal applicants are seeking seasonal law enforcement positions, the projections would indicate that by 1995 there will be in the neighborhood of only 2,000 summer seasonal applications. Although there are no accurate data available, many parks report that a fair percentage (perhaps 50%) of these applicants are not qualified for the positions, thus shrinking the pool even further.

The Problem

The purpose of this article is to address this issue of the shrinking labor supply by discussing some of the possible causes and investigating a few alternative solutions. Let’s begin by examining five possible reasons for the decrease in summer seasonal applications:

1. The decrease may be caused by an overall reduction in the size of the population pool within the age range from which seasonal ranger applicants typically come. Since 1979, there has been a summer seasonal application decrease of approximately 48%. Although it represents only a five-year span, Figure 1 clearly indicates that the current reduction in the labor supply is a factor in seasonal hiring, it promises to become more salient in the future.

2. The decrease may be caused in part by a shift in the college population away from majors that attract people who would be likely to have an interest in working as part-time rangers. There is definite truth to this assertion. Figure 2 presents the trends in baccalaureate degrees conferred between 1978 and 1984 for selected disciplines. There is a clear trend away from majoring in those disciplines that have traditionally formed the pool of seasonal applicants (e.g., parks and recreation, life sciences, agriculture and natural resources, and social sciences). This trend is certain to continue, fueling the decreasing interest in Park Service employment.

3. Seasonal applications may be declining because those who investigate career possibilities in the National Park Service discover that permanent openings are scarce, and the starting pay is generally about 25% lower than that which can generally be expected by recent college graduates. Figure 3 (page 24) presents some comparison data for different disciplines for 1986.

Because expectations about future salaries greatly influence choice of college major and subsequent career, the relatively low starting salaries offered to NPS rangers affects not only the number of college graduates choosing a Park Service career but also the choices being made by those earlier in their college careers.

4. The National Park Service does not pay its seasonal rangers enough. There is certainly truth to this assertion. It is apparent that the pay scale of the Park Service has not kept up with summer employment opportunities in the rest of the country. This is especially true when the significant increases in seasonal housing costs are taken into account. Even for those people who want to work in park settings, many others are offered better pay scales. On the average, a seasonal will spend about $3 per hour on his or her housing. There are no accurate data maintained on a national level regarding how much the average college student can expect to make at a summer job, but the after-housing wages offered by the NPS are probably not adequate to attract people in the necessary numbers.

We did not conduct a thorough survey of the numerous state and federal agencies, but when pay and housing are taken into account, it is often more economically feasible to work for a state park system. Michigan, for example, pays its seasonal law enforcement rangers $8.15 per hour. Arkansas pays $6.20 per hour, but provides free housing and utilities. It is also true that permanent employment opportunities are often better in state park systems.

Even in the federal system, the pay situation in some other agencies is better than in the NPS. In the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, for example, a first year seasonal patrol officer with a bachelor’s degree will start as a GS-5.

5. A related issue is that college students may be acquiring a generally clearer focus on what their labor is worth in the business world. In attempting to recruit students for our law enforcement programs, we often encounter the sentiment that it is demeaning for the NPS to expect people with extensive training in law enforcement, first aid, search, and other areas to work for $6.50 an hour, an amount comparable with most semi-skilled and even unskilled summer jobs (e.g., dish washing, working at Burger King, camp counseling, etc.)

There are also a number of alternative explanations for the decreasing law enforcement seasonal applicant pool:

1. Given the limited pay opportunities discussed above, it may not be economically feasible to acquire the necessary training to become a seasonal law enforcement park ranger. Figure 4 (page 24) presents a cumulative graph of the number of people who have successfully completed a certified seasonal ranger training program since the first one was established in 1978.

In some instances, these data are estimations, especially for the early years, but they are certainly correct within a 10% error margin. Furthermore, not all of the 1988 schools have been conducted. Over the years, several schools have been added to the list of approved programs. At present there are 10, and it can be seen from the figure that the overall numbers of people they have graduated has reached a peak in
1983 and has been generally decreasing since that time. According to our survey, the tuition costs of the schools currently in operation are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Tuition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>$633 ($293 CA residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylva</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hocking</td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteville</td>
<td>$702 ($100 through Continuing Ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermillion</td>
<td>$757 ($600 MN residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slippery Rock</td>
<td>$1020 ($915 PA residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>$1225 ($375 WA residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis State</td>
<td>$1344 ($440 TN residents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>$920 ($380 AK residents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the additional charges for board and room are added to the tuition, the average trainee may have to work over two months as a seasonal just to pay off the training costs.

2. Not all of the people who successfully complete seasonal law enforcement training choose to work in the National Park Service. In our survey of the various schools, we found that in most cases accurate data on this point are unavailable. However, the general perception was that a considerable percentage (sometimes up to one-half) of the graduates go elsewhere. At Memphis State, for example, 37% of the graduates have gone to other agencies. By contrast, the program at Islands Community College has graduated 102 people, none of whom have gone to the National Parks. The other agencies hiring these trainees represent a varied list, including Forest Service, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, several state park systems and even local and county systems. Again, the specific reasons for graduates choosing these other agencies are variant and not well documented, but generally it appears that their choices are based on better salary and potential for permanent employment.

3. Another source of the problem may be the application procedure itself. At present a seasonal applicant can apply to only two of the 340 park areas. It is very easy (especially without counseling) to pick the wrong two and not get hired. Of course, those parks needing seasonal law enforcement rangers often issue local registers after their Washington register has been exhausted (at Memphis State we received 34 this spring), but many seasonal applicants find it difficult to stay in the information pipeline. This is especially true for the ones who attend the intensified six-week schools far from their homes. Knowing they can apply to only two parks clearly scares off a certain percentage of those who might otherwise be interested in pursuing seasonal law enforcement opportunities. An additional difficulty with the post-Washington local register system as it is developing is that it forces parks into attempting to hire late in the spring and after many otherwise good applicants have given up and found other summer work.

Some Possible Solutions

1. Reduce the need for commissioned seasonal rangers by trying to hire permanent rangers to fill the law enforcement function. Currently, there are over 500 summer seasonal law enforcement rangers hired by the National Park Service. Assuming that they each make about $5,000 during the season, that amounts to a seasonal labor bill of around $2,500,000. To replace those people with 500 GS-5 permanent rangers would cost roughly four times that amount or $10,000,000. And that is assuming that they remain at GS-5/1 for their entire careers.

2. Reduce the need for seasonal law enforcement rangers by redefining some of their positions so they can be filled by non-commissioned seasonal rangers. Over the past few years there has been a steady increase in the number of seasonal law enforcement rangers hired. In 1985, for example, there were 450 summer seasonal L.E. positions filled, and by 1987 that figure had climbed to 530.
It is certainly true that some of these positions may not be absolutely necessary. Some campgrounds, for example, could possibly make do with fewer commissioned seasonals on the staff. The same may be true with some back-country jobs. The only problem with this approach is that the "fix" is limited in scope, and the burgeoning civil case law on security negligence clearly indicates that reducing protection and security levels is one of the best ways for an agency to expose itself to liability, should a security negligence suit arise. (See Murrell & Dwyer, 1986).

3. Reduce the training requirements for employment as a seasonal law enforcement ranger and attempt to recruit from the larger pool that may develop. Although there are about 3,300 summer seasonal law enforcement applications that are sent to the Washington register each year, a good percentage of those indicating that they would like a seasonal law enforcement job are actually not qualified for the federal commission. As far as we know, there are no accurate data on this point, but many parks report that they receive law enforcement registers on which up to 50% of the names are not really qualified. Perhaps a reduction in the requirements would make more of these people employable, but such a change would be viewed as lowering the standards for the position and, like reducing the number of law enforcement rangers, would be greatly welcomed by the lawyers representing a potential plaintiff in a lawsuit involving security negligence or a civil rights violation. From a legal perspective, once a standard of care has been established as necessary, it is difficult for an agency to decide later to save money by reducing that standard of care.

4. Another possible "fix" would be to increase the pool of law enforcement-trained seasonal rangers by going back to the old system of hiring untrained seasonals and then providing them with training through the National Park Service. This was done in the early 1970s when a few seasonal basic law enforcement schools were conducted which provided 120 hours of training over a two-week period. Were this system to be reinstated, it would have to provide the current standard 245 hours and not 120. Similar to (3) above, any reduction in the 245 hour requirement could be viewed as accepting a lower standard of care for the purpose of saving money. The only alternative would be to provide NPS training for the full 245 hours to seasonals who would be willing to work in law enforcement positions. Even if training would be conducted at the rate of 60 hours a week (which would certainly violate acceptable standards of training where retention of information was important), such a school would take more than four weeks to conduct. At a 40 hours/week rate, which is generally accepted in the field, the course would take six weeks to conduct.

5. Another alternative would be to encourage the development of more certifiable seasonal law enforcement training programs in colleges and universities throughout the country. At present there are ten certified schools that are training in the neighborhood of 400 people a year. Many of them are not operating at capacity. Of course, part of the problem lies in the fact that potential students find the training costs too excessive to be justified by a seasonal's wages. Although accurate data are not available, it appears as though a significant proportion of these trainees (perhaps over a third) never go to work for the National Park Service. As a partial "fix", it is certainly true that more schools may produce more rangers. However, there is no reason to believe that the graduates from additional schools would find work in the NPS any more appealing than those graduating from the current programs. This is especially true if there is a thrust to encourage the establishment of programs in "minority" schools, because the graduates of these programs will be energetically recruited by other agencies that offer more money and better prospects for permanent employment. Additionally, if more certified programs were developed, it would further increase the quality-control problems.
associated with coordination, communication, and curriculum standardization that the seasonal law enforcement training coordinators currently face at FLETC.

6. Although it is not a “fix” for the Service as a whole, at the individual park level steps could be taken to improve the retention rate for seasonal law enforcement rangers. As a national average, about 50% of the seasonal law enforcement positions are filled by employees who are “new hires” in that particular park area. These new hires are comprised of people who have received recent training and are working as law enforcement seasonals for the first summer as well as those who have worked as law enforcement seasonals before and have moved to a new park. To increase the retention rate, individual parks could reinstate the job security that used to be associated with the “highly recommended for rehire” status as well as provide step increases to those who return to the same park. Of course, both of these changes would require policy alterations at the Washington level.

7. Another partial solution to the problem would be to eliminate the Washington register for seasonal law enforcement positions and allow the parks to issue local registers earlier in the spring when the potential employees are still available. The problem with the Washington register is that, for many parks, it does not generally contain an adequate list of law enforcement applicants, and it forces parks to initiate the local register system too late in the spring.

8. By now it should be obvious that the only clear long-term solution to insuring an adequate supply of qualified seasonal applicants is to offer competitive compensation (i.e., salary and housing). What else can we say?
A Guide To Twenty-Year Retirement

Mary Sargent Martin
Alaska Regional Office

The final regulations for law enforcement officers' and firefighters' special retirement coverage under the Civil Service Retirement System were published in the Federal Register on December 17, 1987 and went into effect on January 19, 1988. The following information is being offered to help you understand the implications and benefits of this retirement coverage.

As almost every federal employee is now aware, there are now two systems of retirement coverage offered by the government — the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) and the Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS). Over the last couple of years, much has been published for all employees regarding the differences and benefits of each of these systems. An overview of the general particulars of CSRS and FERS would therefore be largely redundant, so the focus of this article will instead be directed to the special retirement provisions of each system for law enforcement officers and firefighters.

Basic CSRS law enforcement/firefighter retirement provisions are found in 5 USC 8336(c). This is where the term "6c" positions (a reference used by designated law enforcement officers in other agencies) originated. This law allows the immediate retirement of employees who have reached age 50 and have 20 years in "covered" positions, and requires the mandatory separation of law enforcement officers/firefighters who have reached age 55 or completed 20 years of covered service if over age 55. There are provisions, however, which allow the head of an agency to exempt an employee from automatic separation until he/she reaches age 60.

Employees in covered positions contribute a higher percentage of their salary (7.5% instead of 7%), but receive a greater annuity benefit. The annuity is based on 2.5% of high-three salary for each of the 20 years of covered service, with 2% for each year over 20. For regular CSRS annuitants, the computation is 1.5% for 5 years, 1.75% for the next 5 years, and 2% for all service over 10 years.

A law enforcement officer is defined as an employee whose primary duties, as set forth in the official position description, require the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States.” Specifically excluded are employees involved with maintaining law and order, protecting life and property, guarding against or inspecting law violations, investigating other than criminal offenses (i.e. tort claims or general/background investigations), or employees whose duties only occasionally meet the above definition. These are some what subtle distinctions, but can be critical in the evaluation of requests for coverage.

A firefighter is defined as an employee "who performs duties, as set forth in the position description, require the performance of work directly connected with the control and extinguishment of fires, or the maintenance and use of firefighting apparatus and equipment."

The distinction between a primary position — where an employee is not a supervisor — and a secondary position — where an employee serves in an administrative or supervisory capacity over the law enforcement/firefighting function — is important. Once a position is designated as either primary or secondary, eligibility for special retirement provisions may be dependent upon the individual. For example:

- Entry into most primary positions is limited to individuals who have not yet reached their 35th birthday. Although the maximum entry age is optional under CSRS, most agencies have adopted that requirement.
- If an individual is occupying a secondary position, his/her eligibility for law enforcement/firefighter retirement is dependent upon having immediately transferred to that position from a primary position. It is entirely possible for an employee in a designated secondary position to be ineligible for 20 year retirement. In fact, this will be one of the difficulties in establishing eligibility in the NPS, since a significant number of employees permanently entered the Service in supervisory or secondary positions.
- If an employee transfers from a primary or secondary position to a non-covered position, she/he loses eligibility for early retirement unless the 20 years in a covered position requirement has been met. Although the law currently allows for breaks in secondary service coverage, chances are that this may change.

Employees covered under the Civil Service Retirement System who feel that their current and/or past positions should be designated as meeting the conditions for coverage under either primary (5 CFR 831.903) or secondary (5 CFR 831.904) classifications generally have until September 30, 1989 to file requests for coverage determinations. Such requests may be submitted for OPM approval by either the agency or the employee. Employees who are interested in submitting a determination request must do so through the agency (DOl) head and should submit the following information for each position held:

1. An official position description, annotated to show the percentage of time spent on each duty. If a position description is not available or current, a detailed narrative description of duties and responsibilities must be submitted and must include all agency documents describing the official duties of the position. If a position description that is not current is the one presently encumbered, an explanation must be submitted. If the agency is submitting the request, a timetable for revision of the position description is also necessary.
2. A functional statement for the organization in which the position is (was) located, along with an organizational chart which shows two levels above and below the position. (Available from the position classification specialist in your personnel office).
3. The critical/non-critical elements and performance standards for the position.
4. The classification evaluation statement. (Also available from the classifier).
5. The agency qualification and medical standards, or a statement that they are the same as the X-118 standard.
6. A statement of current, or proposed, maximum entry age.
7. A list of the provisions of federal criminal laws the incumbent is (was) responsible for enforcing (i.e. 36CFR), if the applicant is seeking coverage as a law enforcement officer.

For secondary positions, an agency must also submit:

1. Certification that the position requires experience equivalent to that of a primary law enforcement or firefighting position.
2. For supervisory positions, certification that the position meets the requirements for a first-line supervisor.

Since the documentation available to an employee is often insufficient, other documentation, such as affidavits (from co-workers, personnelists, and supervisors), job announcements, applications, and award certificates, can be extremely helpful in the determination process. In situations where an employee is requesting coverage and entered firefighting or law enforcement through an otherwise secondary position, OPM will accept documentation which shows that even though a position was titled supervisory, it should, in fact, be designated as primary for coverage purposes.
If the request for coverage under 5 USC 8336(c) is from the employee, the employee bears the responsibility for burden of proof. Information that is helpful in reviewing an employee request includes specific information regarding duties performed, including arrests made and list of provisions of law enforced (for law enforcement officers) or the number and names of fires fought, dates of fires and position occupied while on firefighting duty (for firefighters).

Remember, requests must be submitted through the agency, as any request sent directly to OPM will be returned to the agency. The NPS/DOT is then responsible for submitting an advisory opinion to OPM as to whether or not the position should be covered. Provisions exist for appeal if OPM renders an adverse decision.

Employees under FERS also have special benefits for law enforcement and firefighting, but there are differences in the rules and system. Most significant is the fact that it is the agency (DOE) head and not OPM who determines whether or not a position meets the law enforcement or firefighter definition. The FERS definition includes a requirement that the positions be limited to “young” and “vigorous” employees. The definition of a primary position under FERS stipulates that the agency must establish physical requirements and a maximum entry age for law enforcement/firefighting positions.

FERS employees are required to serve in a primary position (and primary may include some first-line supervisors) for three years, and must transfer directly to a secondary position in order to be eligible for the early retirement benefit (this has changed from the ten year requirement in the original law). Any break in secondary service coverage will end eligibility.

In order to qualify as a primary law enforcement/firefighter position under FERS, the primary purpose duties must total at least 50% of the job; under CSRS, however, the primary purpose of the job generally determines the coverage, and there is no percentage requirement.

Another difference between CSRS and FERS is that FERS employees can retire at any age with 25 years of covered service or at age 50 with 20 years covered service (as under CSRS). Again, mandatory retirement is required at age 55.

FERS law enforcement/firefighting employees pay a .5% higher withholding rate and receive 1.7% of the high three salary for the first 20 years of covered service and 1% for any time over 20 years. An employee who enters a position not subject to the .5% higher withholding rate and does not within six months of entering the position formally seek a determination as to the appropriate retirement coverage will lose his/hir right to further petition for law enforcement/firefighting retirement coverage. The agency’s determination that the position is not covered will be presumed to be correct.

There have been two recent Merit System Protection Board (MSPB) decisions overturning OPM on NPS ranger application for this special retirement coverage under CSRS. MSPB is the administrative agency of appeal when OPM renders a negative retirement decision. In the first, Sellers vs. OPM, the hearing examiner made the following significant rulings:

- OPM regulations do not define “primary”, so MSPB used the qualifications “first”, “principal”, “chief”, and “leading” in determining the percentage of time spent in “primary” duties.
- Information not contained in a position description was accepted, as a p.d. was deemed to be only one indication of a person’s duties and not the controlling factor.
- Sellers’ record of fighting over 140 fires in his career was considered.
- OPM “misinterpreted” DOI’s opinion, which was inconclusive.
- At Glacier, Sellers title was supervisory park ranger, but MSPB ruled this to be a “primary” position.

The second decision was Shilts vs. OPM. Shilts held a “generalist” park ranger position which included both firefighting and law enforcement duties, and MSPB reached the following conclusions:

- Again, “primary” was not defined by OPM or the law. MSPB used the same criteria as in Sellers vs. OPM — they reviewed the terms “essentially”, “mostly”, “essential”, applied the definitions from Black’s Law Dictionary, and concluded that a decision was to be made as to the “one” most important job function.
- Shilts’ most important primary duty was firefighting (even though he performed other duties), and MSPB considered all associated duties (training, equipment maintenance, etc.).
- An individual can get credit for firefighting/law enforcement sequentially, but not concurrently.
- “Required occupancy” as a condition of employment was a factor considered in the evaluation process, and Shilts received credit for his Olympic district ranger and Rocky Mountain district ranger positions, each of which had a requirement to live in the district.
- Prescribed burn work activities were also considered.
- OPM should not have relied on DOI/NPS not deducting increased retirement monies (for 8336(c) retirements) in denying Shilts’ initial application. MSPB ruled that agency failure to withhold was more likely “through inadvertence and/or because of agency’s uncertainty regarding guidelines.”
- Position descriptions were considered to be unreliable because “(Shilts) was a specialist in a generalist’s position and because the descriptions for Park Ranger tended to be generic in nature.”

In each of these cases, the MSPB relied on, among many other factors, the individual’s record rating, the number of hours of training given and received, and testimony from former supervisors.
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Rendezvous XII

Rendezvous XII continues to come together!

Since this is the last article to provide details, I’ll attempt to include new information, reprint some old, and hopefully answer any and all questions. With the arrival of Mike and Jan Hill to Timpanogos Cave, I’m happy to say that I’ve gained two experienced and eager assistants in planning the Rendezvous. Jan has already taken over one important detail — beverages.

Rooms and Facilities

Rendezvous XII will be held from October 8th to the 14th at Snowbird ski and summer resort. We have secured 25 rooms for Saturday, October 8th and 250 rooms for the period from Sunday, October 9th through Thursday, October 13th. Checkout is 11:00 a.m. Friday. Snowbird will provide rooms at group rates for the period three days prior and three days after the Rendezvous on a space available basis. Room rates at the Cliff Lodge will be $49, single or double occupancy. There will be a charge of $5 per night for each additional person over 16 years old.

A limited number of dorm-style rooms (4 beds with one bath each) are available for $16.00 per person per night. Snowbird says that these rooms are very comfortable.

Individuals making their own reservations through Snowbird’s Central Reservations Office (1-800-453-3000) will be required to mail in a $25 per room deposit immediately following confirmation. This deposit will be refunded in its entirety if cancelled prior to 48 hours before arrival. If you have been putting it off, now is the time to make your reservations. Rooms are going fast!

Amenities

Snowbird has 11 full-service restaurants and fast food operations which offer a variety of cuisine and prices. There are also several lounges throughout the resort. Amenities at the Cliff Lodge include three restaurants, one of which is a rooftop restaurant and lounge; a 21,000 square foot roof-top health and beauty spa with heated year-round pools and saunas; room service; laundry facilities; satellite/cable television; and several retail shops. An eleven-story glass atrium/lobby and lounge is the focal point of the Cliff Lodge and provides a panoramic view of rugged Peruvian Gulch and the surrounding Wasatch mountains.

Access

Snowbird is just 25 miles (35 minutes) southeast of downtown Salt Lake City, and only 31 miles (40-45 minutes) from the Salt Lake City International Airport. Fly into the Salt Lake City International Airport on American, American West, Continental, Delta, Eastern, Republic, Skywest, TWA, or United Airlines. For you landlubbers, Greyhound and Trailways buses and Amtrak trains service Salt Lake City.

Most members are aware of the special arrangement we have with Executive Travel of Fort Meyers, Florida, wherein ANPR receives a rebate for every trip arranged by that organization. They guarantee the lowest fares available, have no service charges, and offer free ticket delivery and flight insurance. Reservations may be made by calling 1-800-337-6735 (939-5567 in Florida); once you’ve reached the travel agent, be sure to specify the account name as “ANPR”. Our contract with Executive Travel for this event is limited to airline, hotel, and rental car reservations. (See the following article for details).

Transportation between the airport and Snowbird is by rental car (all major companies available) or by Canyon Transportation, a private company used by Snowbird. If you plan on going into Salt Lake City a few times, or exploring the general area, you will want your own vehicle, as there is no public transportation and Snowbird is isolated up Little Cottonwood Canyon.

If you only need transportation between the airport and Snowbird, Canyon Transportation will operate bus and van shuttles for as little as $107 adult each way (under 6 years is $5 and in-lap children are free). This rate applies under the following conditions: Travel to Snowbird must occur between 10:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. and to the airport between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. (leaving hour), and a minimum of 50 reservations must be made on that day during that 12-hour period. Trips not meeting these criteria will cost $40 per van, regardless of number of passengers, and not less than $10 per person (half for children). If, for example, only 30 people arrive on Saturday, October 8th, they are subject to the higher rate. But the cost will still work out to $10 per person for any group of four adults. If you are willing to wait an hour or two and can gather a few more riders, you will probably get the lower rate. Canyon Transportation will watch baggage. This company is willing to work with you to save both money and unnecessary runs up to Snowbird. For reservations write Canyon Transportation, P.O. Box 1762, Sandy, UT 84091, or call 1-800-255-1841 and ask for Eddie Kay.

Babysitting

Snowbird will provide day care services to toilet-trained children in the Children’s Center during our normal meeting hours (8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.), and on the evening of our dance from 9:00 p.m. to midnight. The cost is $1 per child per hour, if ANPR guarantees a minimum of five children. The Children’s Center is a new and spacious facility full of toys, tables and a VCR and TV which receive public television stations. There are beds and blankets for naps. Day care providers organize activities, including games, hikes and explorations around the hotel. Snowbird will also provide a list of in-room...
babysitters at a rate of $6 per hour per room, with a maximum of three children per room. Any other special arrangements can be made through the Children’s Center. Parents are responsible for their own arrangements. If you have further questions or need more information, please contact Brenda Ranum, Director, Child Care, 801-521-6040, ext. 5026.

Pre-Registration
Kathy Loux of Denali is handling registration. She stresses the importance of registering in advance so that Rendezvous organizers will know how many are attending and can make plans accordingly. The pre-registration form can be found on the inside back cover of this magazine. It should be filled out and sent in as soon as possible.

Camping
The Forest Service operates two campgrounds in Little Cottonwood Canyon. Albion Basin is a few miles above Snowbird and closes on the first snow. At Tanner's Flat, below Snowbird, water is turned off early, but sites remain open until a significant snowfall. Rates are $6/night Friday through Thursday, and $5/night Friday and Saturday. Both campgrounds are situated above 8,000 feet elevation, with Albion Basin close to 10,000 feet.

Social Activities
A local and very popular band, The Horse Brothers, will be playing at our dance on Thursday, October 13th. The Fun Run is coming together; we just need to review course options with the sports coordinator at Snowbird.

Area Information
Little Cottonwood Canyon offers several hiking trails, mountain biking, and steep road touring. Jeep trails take you over the Wasatch Range to other canyons, resort areas and valleys beyond. Salt Lake City has numerous historic sites, museums, restaurants, theaters and shopping. Golden Spike NHS is about 2-3 hours away and Timpanogos Cave NM is 40 minutes from Snowbird. We will have brochures and maps from the Utah Travel Council and a list of possible outings available at the registration desk. I am writing this on May 6th and watching it snow hard, which reminds me to point out the changeability of Rocky Mountain weather. Although the calendar will say it’s autumn, with lovely, warm days and crisp nights, be prepared for either summer or winter!

Scott W. Isaacson
Rendezvous Site Coordinator
Timpanogos Cave

Traveling to the Rendezvous
Executive Travel has passed on the following information concerning travel arrangements which they have worked out for the Rendezvous. Please remember that 30% of the commission Executive Travel receives on trips booked by Association members goes back to ANPR's treasury. Those flying United Airlines will receive a 5% discount off the lowest applicable fare, and a 40% discount off full coach rates. Travel must be conducted between October 3rd and October 19th. Reservations can be made directly with United, and Uniglobe Executive Travel will do all the ticketing. The ticket designator is CF40W.

If you fly Eastern, your rates will be 5% off the lowest applicable fare and 60% off full coach. Travel dates are October 8th through October 22nd. Continental flyers will receive 5% off the lowest applicable fare and 40% off full first class and coach. Executive Travel will do all ticketing. Members can call the Eastern/Continental desk to book directly; the phone number is 1-800-468-7022. Identify yourself as a traveler to the ANPR convention. The designator for Eastern is EZ# 10AP47; the designator for Continental is YZ# 8002.

All tickets need to be issued by September 23rd.

If you need ground transportation, Executive Travel can also book you an Alamo car.

The business hours for Executive Travel are 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. on Saturday. You can reach them at 1-800-237-6735 (Florida residents should call 939-5567; there is no longer an 800 number for within state calls).

Rendezvous Raffle
Planning for the raffle is well under-way. We hope to be organized and ready this year; we also want to return to those years gone past when most of the raffle items were handmade and showed off the talents of our membership.

We are asking the membership to consider donating something of “what you do or create.” If you can’t make the Rendezvous, please consider sending something anyway. Here’s what been done to date:

- Nancy Wizner (22900 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 240, Woodland Hills, CA 92364) is handling the corporate donations.

Association of National Park Rangers — Rendezvous XII Pre-Registration
(Use this form ONLY before September 11, 1987)

Name (please print) ____________________________ Spouse’s Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________ Name and ages of children attending with you ____________________________
Registration Fee: (Four day package, before 9/11/88) ____________________________
Member - $25 ____________________________
Non-Member - $33 ____________________________
If spouse will accompany and plan even minimal participation: ____________________________
Member’s Spouse - $12 ____________________________
Non-Member’s Spouse - $17 ____________________________

Commemorative Items: ____________________________
T-shirts - $8: How many? XL ______ L ______ M ______ S ______
Total Enclosed: (all categories): ____________________________

Day Care: Will you be using? ____________________________

Please check if you are attending your first Rendezvous ____________________________
Please make checks payable to ANPR. Return to Kathy Loux, P.O. Box 9, Denali NP, Alaska 99755.

Pre-registration ends on October 1st. After that date, member packages will be $35, non-member packages will be $43.
She has prepared letters and will be soliciting equipment donations from leading companies. If you have a potential candidate, let her know.

- Rob Arnberger (8825 SW 160 Street, Miami, FL 33157) is handling Association member donations. Once again, the emphasis is on arts, crafts and handmade items. Let me know if you will provide something for the raffle.

- Diane Moses (Dinosaur National Monument, Jensen, UT 84035) will be receiving all corporate and member donations and bringing them to Snowbird. Both post office mail and UPS deliveries should be sent to this address. If you can’t make the Rendezvous, then mail your item to Diane, who will bring it to the gathering.

- Each regional rep has been contacted and asked to provide a list at least five potential corporate donors to Nancy Wizner and list of at least ten regional members who will craft something to Rob Arnberger.

Remember, the raffle has long been the mainstay of income for the Association, and has provided fun and good times for the membership. In order for it to remain healthy, we must have member participation in providing donations. If the donations are member-made and crafted, then winning an item means a bit more and giving an item means a lot.

Rob Arnberger
Everglades

Rendezvous Agenda

Although the final details for the Rendezvous have not yet been worked out, most of the foundation for the program has been laid. The general sequence of events should be as follows:

Sunday — October 9
8:00 am-1:00 pm Board meeting (members welcome)
12:00 pm-6:00 pm Registration
3:00 pm-Midnight Keg social
4:00 pm-5:00 pm New member orientation

Monday — October 10
6:00 am-7:00 am Jazzercise
7:30 am-8:00 am Registration
8:00 am-10:00 am General session: Welcome, introductions, president’s message, board and committee reports
10:00 am-10:30 am Break
10:30 am-11:00 am Raffle
11:00 am-12:00 pm Lunch
1:30 pm-5:30 pm Workshops (5 sessions, 2 hours each)
5:45 pm-6:45 pm Fun Run (1 and 3 mile courses)
8:30 pm-10:00 pm Swing dance lessons

Tuesday — October 11
6:00 am-7:00 am Jazzercise
7:30 am-8:00 am Registration
8:00 am-8:30 am Raffle and fines
8:30 am-9:30 am Keynote address
9:30-10:00 am Break
10:00 am-12:00 pm General session — Discussion of ANPR future
12:00 pm-1:30 pm Lunch
1:30 pm-2:00 pm Raffle
2:00 pm-3:00 pm Keynote address
3:00 pm-3:30 pm Break
3:30 pm-5:30 pm General session — Business meeting and intro of topics for discussion at Thursday business meeting
7:30 pm-9:00 pm Special interest group meetings
7:30 pm-9:00 pm Swing dance lessons (possible)
9:00 pm-12:00 pm Disk jockey dance (possible)

Wednesday, October 12
6:00 am-7:00 am Jazzercise
7:00 am-? Past president’s breakfast
8:00 am-12:00 pm Workshops (5 sessions, 2 hours each)
12:00 pm-? Open afternoon with optional activities
7:30 pm-9:00 pm Swing dance lessons

Thursday — October 13
6:00 am-7:00 am Jazzercise
8:00 am-9:30 am Keynote address
9:30 am-10:00 am Break
10:00 am-12:00 pm General session — NPCA report
12:00 am-1:30 pm Lunch
1:30 pm-2:00 pm Raffle and auction
2:00 pm-3:00 pm Keynote address
3:00 pm-3:30 pm Break
3:30 pm-5:30 pm General session — Business meeting, last raffle, super raffle, closeout
9:00 pm-1:00 am Dance

Friday — October 14
Checkout

Several speakers are likely — Lorraine Mintzmeyer, Rocky Mountain regional director; John Good, a former NPS Superintendent; Wayne Owens, Congressman from Utah; environmental writer Rod Nash; and the CEO for Chevron Oil. Robert Redford, unfortunately, had to decline, as he’ll be busy producing a movie. Snowbird owner and noted climber Dick Bass and Denver Post environmental reporter Jim Carrier are also possible speakers.

There are a number of possible topics for the workshops, including updates in protection, interpretation, natural and cultural resources; a report on the 21st century task force; fire and law enforcement retirement; ranger pay; seasonal concerns; financial planning; SF-171 preparation; telecommunications; post traumatic stress counseling; and supervisory/property liability.

There’ll also be joint sessions with Park Arts, and a possible pre-Rendezvous training session. The Mather and/or Tilden awards may also be presented during the Rendezvous.

There will be other board sessions besides the one noted in the schedule during the Rendezvous, but the times have not yet been locked in. Meetings may be held on Saturday, Wednesday afternoon or Friday morning. The exact schedule will be posted at the Rendezvous.

Jim Brady
Grand Teton

Association of National Park Rangers

Operating Account Statement
January 1, 1987 - December 31, 1987

Beginning Balance
(December 31, 1986) $39,412.22

Receipts
$62,468.70

Accrued Interest $3,453.54
Ranger Magazine 1,188.00
Dues/Membership 31,650.00
Rendezvous X & XI 9,547.02
Executive Travel 776.24
Super Raffle 14,020.00
‘Fines’ 583.00

Expenses $39,211.54
Bank charges 45.79
Ranger Magazine 15,275.13
Dues/Membership 105.00
Rendezvous X & XI 7,944.66
Legal Fees 370.50
Travel 593.09
Postage 2,199.04
Supplies 389.95
Printing 1,690.91
Mail Service 240.00
Business Manager 3,333.33
Ranger Museum 0.00
Super Raffle 3,733.78
Regular Raffle 26.00
Telephone 148.86
Editor’s Computer 2,915.50
Miscellaneous 200.00

Ending Balance
(December 31, 1987) $62,669.38
Undergoing An IRS Audit

In August of 1987, we were notified that the IRS would be conducting an audit of our 1986 Federal Income Tax Return, Form 1040. The notification letter indicated that the deductions for required occupancy of government quarters and for Rendezvous X were being questioned.

The following are some general recommendations based on what we experienced:

- Have all your bills, receipts, official correspondence, and personal papers organized and readily available for the auditor (leave and earning statements will be required as partial proof for required occupancy).
- Be prepared to answer a host of seemingly ridiculous preliminary questions.
- Be prepared to spend a minimum of one hour with the auditor.
- Answer the questions honestly; don’t be antagonistic.

We’d also like to offer some specific information and advice regarding the two areas which the audit focused on. First, the Rendezvous:

- In order to deduct this, you must be able to prove that there was an educational benefit to you, that it will benefit your job performance, and that your employer did not pay for any expenses.
- We used the Rendezvous schedule of events booklet to show the sessions attended (bring notes if possible), and the ANPR constitution on the back of the booklet to justify the educational benefit. The auditor copied the constitution, and highlighted the section on the purpose of the organization. The auditor was impressed by the wording of the document.
- We used information on Rendezvous X contained in Ranger magazine to document that the room rate for one or two persons was the same, and to indicate which motels were charging that rate. This was acceptable documentation to the auditor.
- Paid receipts were required for all expenses deducted. Receipts were required for all meals, lodging, and transportation that directly related to the Rendezvous and, for travel to and from the site to our home. The rule is simple: If you didn’t get a receipt, don’t deduct it!
- If you combine Rendezvous attendance with a personal vacation, don’t claim anything which is not related to the Rendezvous. We kept a log of our trip showing the following:
  a) vehicle starting mileage for the trip
  b) location and mileage of every gas fill, and cost of gas
  c) location of each night’s stay and cost
  d) notations about which parts were vacation and which were Rendezvous-related
  e) vehicle ending mileage for the trip

- If you take your personal vehicle and take the standard mileage deduction, be sure you can document beginning and ending mileages for the calendar year. Service work with mileages written on is good documentation, even if done personally.

Everything we originally deducted was allowed by the auditor based on the documentation supplied in the Ranger magazine and ANPR’s constitution.

We also have some suggestions regarding required occupancy:

- The auditor told us that required occupancy is a “red flag” for them. The auditor said that the IRS can’t accept that people can’t live where they want to, or that they are told to live in certain houses in certain locations and have to pay whatever rent is charged by their employer — even the U.S. government!
- I produced official correspondence from the park administrative officer stating that I was required to live in government furnished quarters for the benefit of the government, and the amount of money taken out for rent for the year.
- It is a good idea to bring a copy of the vacancy announcement for the job you are currently in to show that you were required to occupy government quarters as a condition of accepting the job.
- The auditor copied the letter from the A.O. to be put in their files, and then asked me if the letter was “real”. The auditor then asked if we really couldn’t live where we wanted to, and then restated IRS skepticism regarding required occupancy.
- The auditor requested a random sampling of leave and earnings statements to support the rent deduction, including PP1 and PP26. These statements will also show whether all applicable taxes were withheld before or after the rent was deducted.

The deduction was allowed, but I was informed that the IRS will eventually audit every Federal employee who claims the deduction for required occupancy.

For information purposes, I asked the auditor if it was possible to deduct any portion of my telephone bill as job-related. The auditor said that, if there is only one telephone line in the house, no portion of the telephone bill is deductible even if you are required to have a phone for emergency use. A second line with a separate number was allowed, but I was informed that the deduction was allowed, but I was informed that the IRS will audit every Federal employee who claims the deduction for required occupancy.

Seasonal Health Insurance

Our association undertook a project several years ago that would prove to be one of the most successful it has yet attempted. In response to the call for help from many of our members, we began looking for ways to fill the void in the medical coverage of NPS seasonal employees. Today, thanks to the dedication of a few individuals, the association’s insurance plan is alive and well.

In the last year, there have been some improvements to the plan. The group term life insurance plan now has a maximum coverage of up to $250,000, a substantial increase from the former $150,000 ceiling. Dependent coverage is also available. The daily room rate for the hospitalization has also been increased, and is now up to $300 per day.

Despite an excellent job of getting the word out, some misconceptions about the plan still exist:

- While developed originally for seasonal employees, the plan is not limited to those members only. Permanent and retired members may want to take a closer look at what is available.
- Our hospitalization plan does not have any maternity coverage, but that coverage is available through Marsh McLenan Associates on an individual basis.
- Group life insurance is also available. Marsh McLenan feels that this plan is being under-utilized by our seasonal members. For only $70 per year, a non-smoking member under the age of 30 can acquire $100,000 worth of coverage. If you are between ages 30 and 35, add $10 per year. This charge can be paid off in two six-month installments.

Marsh McLenan feels that the program is getting a good response, and predicts it will continue to grow. They expect to put out a new mailing to the membership this year. Spend some time and look it over, then pass it onto someone else who may need it.

If you would like more information on this program, write to Marsh McLenan Associates, P.O. Box 7157, San Francisco, CA 94120-9801, or call 1-800-227-4316 (1-800-982-8080 in California).

Chris Pergiel
Grand Canyon
Board Member Reports

Western Vice President

Vice President Mack Shaver, Theodore Roosevelt. Address: Theodore Roosevelt National Park, P.O. Box 7, Medora, ND 58645. Phone: (701) 623-4466 (work) and (701) 623-4313 (home).

Sometime, when you get a minute, list all of the purposes of ANPR. Then put down the benefits of membership in the organization. Now ask yourself: “What one thing do we have, as a group, that most directly addresses the purposes and provides the benefits that ANPR represents?” To me, the answer to that question is our annual Ranger Rendezvous.

The theme of every Rendezvous is professionalism — in ranging and in managing the National Park System. Each Rendezvous is a place to become immersed in new technology, in issues facing our profession and in issues facing our parks. The business meetings, workshops and free time or social activities promote discussion on subjects vital to ANPR, the NPS and to each of us in our professional and private lives.

The mechanism which makes the Rendezvous work is communications. Through keynote speakers with time for questions, participant-oriented workshops, free time around the keg to rekindle old friendships, debate on the business meeting floor or free time to meet new people and explore new ideas, each year's get-together provides enjoyment and growth for the organizations and individuals involved. The intense, condensed nature of each conclave accomplishes more than hundreds of phone calls and letters throughout the remainder of the year.

Besides, the whole thing is fun! The planned social activities, the free time scheduled throughout the affair, the always pleasant and scenic surroundings, and the sharing of the entire experience with friends who have similar interests make the event resemble a big family reunion — or even a vacation.

So why have most of our members never attended a Rendezvous? Yes, it costs some money and it uses valuable annual leave time. But, then, so does the family vacation, which often isn't taken in a place nearly as pleasant (or as inexpensive) as the typical Rendezvous site. Many vacations, unfortunately, aren't nearly as personally rewarding as are our annual conventions.

There seem to be a lot of our members who would like to see some new issues taken up by the association or who see the organization being more successful if it had a different focus. Some also ask why there aren't some younger, non-manager types on the board. I challenge those of you who have thoughts like these to meet the rest of us in Snowbird in October — debate your ideas on the floor, caucus around the keg, campaign for the candidate of your choice — but, most of all, communicate for and about ranging and have fun!

Eastern Vice President

Vice President Debbie Trout, Great Smokies. Address: Route 11, Sevierville, TN 37862. Phone: (615) 428-4239 (work) and (615) 453-6816 (home).

Commitment or addiction or just an “easy touch”? In the case of ANPR, it's a fine line among them. Just last year, I remember saying, rather emphatically: “No more; it's time for a break.” Then Rick Gale called, said that Mike Hill had accepted the superintendentcy at Timpanogos Cave, and asked me to fill in as eastern vice president. There was an immediate “rush” as I started to think of all the projects and issues we are currently facing, then answered with an equally emphatic “Yes!” Then Rick started handing out the tasks and deadlines...

First a couple of important notes. A big “thanks” to Jan and Mike Hill for their active work to represent members. Both are still working just as hard for ANPR, only at a different location. And a welcome to new Southeast regional rep Dave Lattimore is in order. Dave has been a member for years, and has served as Pacific Northwest rep in the past.

Over the past few years, we've had a good deal of discussion concerning ANPR's business manager; there is little commitment or addiction or just an “easy touch”! The important thing is to keep it going. It's up to us as members to make it work.

Chose an area in which you are interested. Contact regional reps, vice-presidents or the president and volunteer to take on a project. Become committed! It really can lead to an addiction — one you may never want to give up.

Business Manager

Business Manager Debbie Gorman, Saratoga. Address: RD 2, Box 33, Stillwater, NY 12170. Phone: (518) 793-3140 (work/home).

Unless a membership problem arises, you may never have direct contact with ANPR’s business manager; there is little need, in fact, for more personal contact than already exists. One of my responsibilities, however, is to help all of you better understand the business and administrative aspect of the Association. In order to accomplish this goal, I will be keeping you posted on business operations in each issue of Ranger.

I'd like to begin by explaining the contents of your mailing label, as enough questions have arisen about the membership information contained therein to warrant a detailed discussion of the subject.

Before discussing labels, though, I need to make a particular point about bulk mail — it is not forwarded by the Post Office! Every issue of Ranger must have a correct name and address to reach you. When you transfer, you need to submit a change of address immediately; these should be sent directly to my address (ANPR, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831) to assure prompt handling. Several years ago, the business manager and editor counted up all the changes of address received in year and determined that about 20% of our membership changes address each year. That's a lot of undelivered Rangers.

The upper right corner of your label shows your membership category. While most will find the 1-MEM code for active members, others will have 2-ASC for associates, 3-SUS for sustaining members, and 4-LIFE for life members. All this information is taken from your application/renewal form. For this reason, I ask that you fill in the application completely and legibly, with accurate, up-to-date data.

The same area of the label contains your expiration date. With the number of transfers we have, it sometimes takes a while for mail to catch up. Renewal notices are sent one month prior to expiration. It's our policy to retain a member on the rolls for three months after his or her membership expires. Should no payment be received by the end of that period, the member is then removed from the rolls. Upon
removal, the member's name and address are kept on a pending list, and another renewal notice is subsequently sent out. By employing this procedure, we hope to retain potentially "lost" members. The expiration date on your label should also serve as a reminder to you to get your membership fee in on time.

Take a moment now and check that label. Please contact me if there appears to be any inaccurate data entered in our computer. If you have received this issue late, it could very well be for one of the reasons listed above.

I welcome any questions, comments or suggestions from current or potential ANPR members, and will personally reply to each. During the last Rendezvous, I sensed a desire on the part of members to become more involved in our business affairs. I therefore maintain an "open door" for anyone who takes the time to contact me for any reason. Here's your chance; a few moments of your time could make a big difference to the Association. Get involved! Be creative! Take the time to get something off your chest! The opportunity awaits, and so do I.

Secretary/Treasurer

Secretary/Treasurer Debbie Bird, Yellowstone. Address: Debbie Bird, P.O. Box 168, Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190. Phone: (307) 545-7315 (home) and (307) 344-7581 (work).

North Atlantic Regional Rep

Representative Jim Gorman, Saratoga. Address: RD 2, Box 33, Stillwater, NY 12170. Phone: (518) 664-9821 (work) and (518) 793-3140 (home).

The last three months have been a busy time for your regional representative. The year began with an attempt at a mini-rendezvous in conjunction with MAR and NCR. For a variety of reasons, we were not able to pull it off. However, I would like to express my appreciation to Roberta D'Amico and Rick Erisman for their time and hard work on this project. Perhaps we'll have better luck next time.

I have spent a lot of time disseminating information directed at me as a regional rep for NAR. I received information from Rocky Mountain Region regarding proposed changes in seasonal hiring flexibility. The memo I received requested that I share that information with all the region's superintendents and NARO personnel office, which I did.

In February, I received a letter from the chair of the seasonal interest committee requesting that I distribute a survey/questionnaire on a seasonal survey. Each member of ANPR was sent a copy of that survey, as were all chief rangers in the region. I thank all of you who took the time to complete the form and send it on.

As your elected representatives, we need and want the feedback of ANPR membership and your cooperation is truly appreciated.

Additionally, I addressed a memo to all regional members requesting input on pertinent issues (one was the seasonal survey). I had been asked by Mike Hill (then Vice-President East) to determine membership opinion as to goals for the next three to five years. A questionnaire seemed the best way to get feedback, so one was included in the packet. I sent out 150 packets, but only received 20 back!

To those of you who responded, I appreciate your thoughts and comments. They will be forwarded to the appropriate committee. To those of you who didn't, I wish I knew why. I feel that it is my responsibility to represent all ANPR members in this region, but it is difficult to do so if I don't get your questions, suggestions, ideas, or even criticism.

Finally, the spring memo addressed two other items: recruitment of new members and park reps. Don't give up on recruitment. As stated in the memo, if each of us can recruit one new member, we can double the regional membership! As far as park reps are concerned, I have added three new members to the list. Hopefully, by the next issue, I can have a complete listing by park.

I am here to serve the regional membership. Call or write with any problems or concerns! I look forward to hearing from you!

National Capital Regional Rep

Representative Rick Erisman, C&O Canal. Address: P.O. Box 19, Oldtown, MD 21555. Phone: (301) 739-5742 (home) and (301) 722-8226 (work).

I would like to thank the following individuals for their interest in and support of the mini-rendezvous program in March: Warren Bielenburg (Shenandoah), Deke Cripe (WASO), Greg Stiles (Shenandoah), Bill Halainen (WASO), Warren Brown (WASO/Field Seminar), Suzie Gilley (Virginia Dept. of Game & Inland Fisheries), Stan Lock (NCR/Wolf Trap), Dr. David Orr (MAR), Lowell Sturgill (NCR), Jack Spinnler (NCR/HFC), Greg Stiles (Shenandoah), Bill Wade (MTC/Shenandoah) and Ron Wrye (NCR).

Congratulations to Roberta D'Amico for her enthusiasm in efforts to initiate and coordinate another attempt to offer the membership both an educational opportunity and forum for social enrichment.

For those who were unable to participate in the May 12 gathering at Carderock on the C&O Canal, please mark your calendar for Thursday, August 18 at 5:00 p.m. Please provide your own food and beverage. Facilities are limited and firewood or charcoal grills for cooking would be appreciated. All members and their families are encouraged to participate.

NCR/MAR Events Calendar

ANPR will be sponsoring a number of educational and social events around Washington this summer. All details have not yet been worked out; members in the area will be advised of developments.

June 25
Field seminar on battlefield protection, focusing on the proposed mall adjacent to Manassas National Battlefield Park. The seminar will begin at 1 p.m. NPS Chief Historian Ed Bearss will talk about the historic events that took place there; Warren Brown from WASO Planning and Special Studies will speak on land protection planning; and Acting Superintendent Susan Moore will discuss the controversy over the proposed mall.
Contact Jake Hoogland at (703) 499-2560.

July 21
ANPR/NPCA softball game at Carderock at 6 p.m. NPCA has challenged us to a softball game and we need all the help we can get — rumor has it that these guys are actually training for the match! Bring a glove and your own refreshments.
Contact Jon Anglin at (703) 560-1802.

August 18
Social gathering and cookout at Carderock beginning around 6 p.m. Families welcome. Bring your own refreshments and charcoal; grills are available. Contact Rick Erisman at (301) 395-5742.

August 20
Canoe trip on Shenandoah River. We're looking at renting canoes for about $30 per day for a 7-mile trip on flat water a ways from Harpers Ferry. Date and time TBA. Contact Jane Schmidt at (703) 241-7421.

September 10
Hike in Shenandoah National Park. This will probably be a day hike on Piney Ridge Trail, with park resource management specialist Dave Haskell along to talk about local flora and fauna. Contact Larry Bell at (703) 252-2372.
Mid-Atlantic Regional Rep
Representative Roberta D'Amico, Colonial. Address: Highway Contract 1, Box 408 H, Gloucester Point, VA 23062. Phone: (804) 698-3400 ext. 34 (work) and (804) 624-9220 (home).

News on the mini-rendezvous is both good and bad.

The good news is that it was cancelled due to low registration. I hope that those who were interested in attending received the cancellation notice prior to the event. And so it goes.

The good news is that there was good feedback to balance the disappointment. Numerous people could not come because they had commitments elsewhere. It was also good to receive so many suggestions, general input and offers of assistance. Please keep them coming, folks. Thanks to Rick Erisman, Jim and Debbie Gorman, Phyllis Cremonini, Bev Albrecht, Jack Kummer, Barb Stewart, Mary Lowe and others for their help. They made it worth the effort.

I've been involved in a number of discussions lately on ANPR membership. I question whether there really is apathy or just lack of communication. There are many perceptions regarding member expectations and what sort of involvement members should have with the organization. It is just a subscription to the magazine? What does this organization really do? Inquiring minds want to know. Ask questions, discuss the issues. Do whatever you feel comfortable doing.

The NPS is an organization based on communications. Make use of park reps. Mid-Atlantic park reps have a bundle of stuff from me. Gettysburg and Richmond now have park reps — Dan Huffman and Pete Baril, respectively. Shanandoah now needs one. So do ALPO, APCO, BOWA and GEWA. And, if all else fails, you can contact me, your Mid-Atlantic regional rep.

Southeast Regional Rep
Representative Dave Lattimore, Natural Trace Address: Rocky Springs Ranger Station, Star Route Box 14C, Carlisle, MS 39094. Phone: (601) 535-7142 (home) and (601) 437-5252 (work).

I'll be filling in for Jan Hill, who transferred to Timpanogos Cave, until the Rendezvous, at which point there'll be an opportunity for debate. In my mind, working from within the ANPR framework would be much more successful than starting all over again. Comments?

As you can see from her article, more than a few people responded.

I was also asked by Dennis Ditmanson to circulate a proposal which recommended allowing seasonals to apply to more than the usual two parks. Prior to getting involved in a direct mailing to each regional superintendent, I inquired to see if our regional director had any problem with an inquiry of this nature, since his predecessor had advised the parks that they did not have to reply to inquiries from "outside organizations." I initially talked with the regional director by phone, then followed up with a letter of explanation. That was over two months ago, and no reply has been forthcoming. I'm sorry, because our ANPR relationship with the regional office would improve. Possibly my successor will have better luck at making inroads.

Rocky Mountain Regional Rep
Representative Dennis Ditmanson, Custer Battlefield. Address: Custer Battlefield NM, P.O. Box 39, Crow Agency, MT 59022. Phone: (406) 638-2621 (work).

The spring issue of Ranger contained a number of items that could generally be grouped under the heading of the "future". I'd urge everyone to go back and review the letters from George Durkee and Pat Quinn: Noel Poe's report on the goal-setting workshop at Rendezvous XI; and the call for comments from the task force headed by Karen Wade. The underlying concern being voiced is that this organization has not, or is not, living up to the expectations of many of its members. True or not, the perception is that members' needs are not being served.

There is also the phenomena of new organizations. The National Alliance of Park Rangers and Firefighters and The Association for NPS Natural Resource Managers are but a couple whose statements of purpose seem to echo those of ANPR. Or at least what ANPR set out to be.

It seems to me that this organization has already paid its dues in terms of the learning period that all groups go through. It has achieved a modicum of credibility with both the Service and outside entities and only suffers from a problem of "what's next".

A number of folks have recently made the point that an organization is only as strong as its members. If it's not going where you want it to, speak up, change it! The meeting format change suggested for Rendezvous XII should provide ample opportunity for debate. In my mind, working from within the ANPR framework would be much more successful than starting all over again. Comments?

As a reminder, Rendezvous XII is back in the Rocky Mountain Region, and I'd urge a good turnout, both to assure a lively debate on issues of concern, and to help host attendees from other regions.

Many thanks to those from around the region who have offered their thoughts, suggestions, and comments. See you all in October.

Southwest Regional Rep
Representative Dale Thompson, Big Bend. Address: Chisos Basin, Big Bend National Park, TX 79834. Phone: (915) 477-2251 (work).

After separating the regional membership roster by park, I put out mailings which included individual park rosters to a number of prospective park reps. This will make it possible for them to identify non-members. With some good salesmanship and arm-twisting, park reps should be able to double regional membership. I'll report more on how this project is going next issue. My own recruitment efforts are going well, with 12 new members signed up since January 1st.

Southwest Regional Director John Cook visited Big Bend in April. He voiced strong support for ANPR during a trail ride to the south rim of the Chisos Mountains and at a general staff meeting. He emphasized the Association's accomplishments, including the seasonal insurance program. He also said that we are on the right track in setting goals for ANPR.

After talking with several members and seasonals in Big Bend, I sent one goal that seemed to be of general concern to all to Karen Wade, chair of the goal-setting committee. That goal advocates the establishment of a career ladder or intake program for long-term seasonals.

Please contact me if you have any ideas on this or anything else. Think about attending Rendezvous XII, send in your contributions to the ranger museum, and...
send your thoughts on ANPR goals to
Karen Wade at Guadalupe Mountains im-
mediately.

West Regional Rep
Representative Frank Dean, Yose-
mite. Address: P.O. Box 577, Yosemite, CA 95389. Phone: (209) 252-4848 (work) and (209) 372-4242 (home).
The spring thaw has revealed a curious
mixture of unrest and apathy in Western Region. Many people have expressed their
concerns to me regarding the present and
future status of ANPR. There is an ob-
vious frustration among many members
who feel that ANPR has not been effective,
and may be hampered by its stated goal of
always supporting management. This
frustration has fostered two separate
unionization efforts in Yosemite and Se-
quoa/Kings Canyon.

Rangers in Yosemite have formed a
Fraternal Order of Police lodge to address
some local issues which park management,
and may speak to broader topics on the na-
tional level at a later date. Another
organization, The National Alliance of
Park Rangers and Firefighters, states it is
open to anyone in the 025 series. This
organization, The National Alliance of
Park Rangers and Firefighters, states it is
open to anyone in the 025 series. This
organization is attempting, among other
things, to use a lobbyist and letter-writing
campaigns to Congress to provide competi-
tive status for seasonal employees, and
attempting to get a revision of OPM grade
guidelines for rangers. In addition, a group
of NPS resource management employees is
attempting to start a professional organiza-
tion focusing on resource management
concerns.

Despite these “hot spots”, most park
areas and ANPR members have been very
quiet. With a task force currently working
on a five year plan for the Association, it is
imperative that the silent majority be heard
from at this time. What do you think about
these recent union efforts? What are your
hopes for ANPR? Please contact me, or
call Bill Halainen’s “Hot Line”, to express
your views.

Pacific Northwest Regional Rep
Representative Jan Dick, Nez Perce.
Address: P.O. Box 84, Spalding, ID 83551.
Phone: (208) 843-2926 (home) and (208)
843-2261 (work).
After several months of relative quiet,
we have had some activity and movement
within the Pacific Northwest Region. A
questionnaire was sent out to all PNR
member in March from the regional
representative to get a better feel for issues
and concerns within the region. About
two-thirds of the questionnaires were re-
turned.

Training, housing and skills erosion
from ranger positions were three common
concerns of most of the respondents. Three
regional work groups have been set up to
look into these issues further and come up
with some resolutions.

John Roth (MORA), Janet Edwards
(PNR) and George Bowen (OLYM) were
assigned to the task of looking into training
and ways for expanding training
opportunities. Galen Stark (MORA) and
Fred Vanhorn (CRLA) are looking into
housing problems identified by the mem-
bership to recommend solutions. Randy
Brooks (MORA) is looking into the prob-
lem of skills erosion from many 025 posi-
tions as we move toward specialists in the
specific areas of resource management and
visitor protection.

New park reps have been selected to
serve until the end of 1989. They are Dave
Steigelmeyer (CODA), Jim Milestone
(CRLA) and (ORCA), Jill Eckberg
(FOCL), Don Vogel (JODA), Paul Hen-
derson (KLSE), John Roth (MORA), Tim
Olivarius (NOCA), George Bowen
(OLYM), Reed Jarvis (PNR) and Steve
Gobat (SAJH). Jan will work with the
other parks in the region who do not have
ANPR representation until park reps can
be selected.

Park reps will be used extensively over
the next term to maintain contact with AN-
PR membership in their respective parks
and offices in the Pacific Northwest. They
will also provide a contact person in each
park for the regional rep.

Jan is working on a monthly ANPR
newsletter for the PNR membership to
begin in June. Anyone with information or
materials to contribute to it is encouraged
to mail it to him. If you haven't already
received a copy, contact your park rep.

Finally, a hearty welcome to Rick
Gale, who recently moved to within the
geographic boundaries of the Pacific
Northwest Region at BIFC. Each day when
I go to work now I am reminded by a high-
way sign that Boise, Idaho is only 237 miles
away. I promise, Rick, to do a good job.

Alaska Regional Rep
Representative Mary Karraker. Ad-
dress: c/o National Park Service, Bettles,
AK 99726.
As we went to press, Mary “Jeff”
Karraker agreed to take over for Hal Gro-
vert, who transferred to Fort McHenry.
What follows is Hal’s “Farewell” regional
rep report:
I am moving to a new assignment at
Fort McHenry in Baltimore, and have re-
signed as the Alaska Regional Representa-
tive. I want to thank all of you for electing
me, and for all the help and support that I
have received from you. I have enjoyed be-
ing your representative and ask that you
support and assist my replacement as well.
At the recent law enforcement refresh-
er held in Anchorage, $275 was raised
through a variety of means including fines,
auctions, donations, etc. It was decided by
the group to donate this money to the
Ranger Museum. The only problem that
occurred was when Jeff Karraker tried to
go through airport security on her way
back to Fairbanks with $275.00 in quarters.
I would like to issue every region a
challenge to at least raise as much as
Alaska did and make a donation to the
museum.

On March 9, an ANPR meeting was
held in Anchorage at Jean Swearingen's
house with twenty-six people in attend-
dance. It was a very good meeting and very
productive, with the major topic of discus-
sion being the future course of the ANPR.
The majority of comments centered
around ANPR becoming more involved in
resource issues and Ranger printing more
resource related issues and topics. Discus-
sion also included having ANPR set up
recommended professional standards.

Planning on a trip soon? Looking for
a travel agency that can offer you full
services and low rates? Interested in an agency
that will return a portion of the commis-
sion it receives for arranging your trip to
the Association?

Executive Travel of Fort Myers,
Florida, has worked out an arrangement
with ANPR whereby it will arrange the
travel of Association members (and anyone
else who supports the organization) and
then return 30 percent of the commission it
receives to the Association.

Reservations may be made by calling
locally in Florida 939-5567 or by calling
1-800-237-6735 in the rest of the United
States). Once you've reached them, simply
arrange your travel as you would with any
other travel agency and specify the account
as “ANPR”.

35
Committee Reports

Housing
Leader Tom Cherry, Cuyahoga. Address: 449 Wyoga Lake Boulevard, Stow, OH 44224. Phone: (216) 929-4995 (home) and (216) 650-4414 ext. 232 (work).

The first bit of news is that Rick Smith will no longer be sitting on the director's housing oversite committee, as Rick is now the associate director of operations in Southwest Region. He has been replaced on that committee by Jim Laney, superintendent of Southern Arizona Group. Jim can be reached at (602) 261-4956 or FTS 261-4956. I, for one, am truly sorry that Rick will not be continuing. He brought to the committee a wealth of knowledge and an understanding of both the needs of field personnel and the concerns of management. I know of few others able to incorporate input from all levels, then reason, deduce, rationalize, and compromise in order to come up with a workable plan. We appreciate all the work you've done, Rick. Thanks!

Before this issue of *Ranger* goes to press, ANPR will have made its (your) comments directly to OMB in review of Circular A-45. The reason A-45 is so important is that the Department of Interior bases its property management regulations (41 CFR Part 114) on the circular, and NPS-36 is written entirely in compliance with the circular. Both Interior and NPS have used A-45 on more than one occasion to justify premature actions and as cause for no action. Total and complete compliance with every written word — as well as perceived intent on the part of OMB authors' non-written words — has been our agency's historic response. We'll have to wait and see what happens this time.

A special note to J.O., R.M., J.S., D.L. and D.C. — Your written comments were considered, incorporated and passed on. Thanks!

In the spring issue of *Ranger*, we ran an update of the Yosemite Tenant's Association suit adjacent to this committee report. I have since received a phone call from Pat Smith, WASO housing officer, requesting space for the "other side" to be presented. The whole idea of the update was to keep you informed and let you know that this was not a dead issue, so how could we refuse Pat's request? We couldn't and wouldn't, and in fact we welcome her comments in the spirit of continuing to offer an open forum to all who are interested/concerned with NPS issues.

Ranger Museum
Leader Jim Tuck, Fort Smith. Address: P.O. Box 1406, Fort Smith, AR 72902. Phone: (501) 783-3961 (work).

Dual Careers
Co-leader Lorrie Sprague, Yosemite. Address: Hodgdon Meadows, Yosemite NP, Groveland, CA 95321. Phone: (209) 379-2078 (home).

Co-leader Jan Hill, Timpanogos Cave. Address: Rural Route 3, Box 200, American Fork, UT 84003.

Seasional Interests
Leader Kris Bardstey, Yosemite. Address: Hodgdon Meadow Ranger Station, Star Route, Groveland, CA 95321. Phone: (209) 379-2241 (home) and (209) 372-0354 (work).

Over the past several months the seasonal interest committee has continued to work on the four major objectives established by the committee in November:
1. — Hiring Surveys — The winter seasonal hiring survey appeared in the Spring issue of *Ranger*. Barb Maynes has begun to work on the summer seasonal hiring survey which will appear in the Fall issue.
2. — Summer edition of *Ranger* — The articles that appear in this issue of *Ranger* are dedicated to seasonal interests and concerns. I hope they have been interesting and informative. I would like to thank everyone who wrote articles for their time and efforts.
3. — Training Handbook — Phyllis Cremonini has recently transferred to Carlsbad Caverns and will be working on this project once settled in her new park.
4. — Seasonal Workshop — Two sessions have been set aside during Rendezvous XII. These workshops will provide a forum to discuss seasonal interests and concerns. We will also review the results of the seasonal interest survey and develop the 1989 goals for the seasonal interest committee.

Employee Development

Co-leader Laurie Coughlan, Eisenhower. Address: P.O. Box 342, Gettysburg, PA 17325. Phone: (717) 334-0716 (home) and (717) 334-1124 (work).

Rendezvous
Leader Dennis Burnett, Cape Cod. Address: Cape Cod National Seashore, South Wellfleet, MA 02663. Phone: (617) 349-3785 (work).

Sales
Leader Kurt Topham, Herbert Hoover. Address: P.O. Box 239, West Branch, IA 52358. Phone: (319) 643-5594 (home) and (319) 643-2541 (work).

Yosemite Housing
Suit: The NPS Reply
Pat Smith
WASO

The report of the Yosemite Tenants Association which was submitted by its secretary and appeared in the spring *Ranger* was so replete with mischaracterizations and biased statements on the lawsuit that a response is required.

The report presents the issues that the Yosemite Tenants Association perceives are present in the litigation and ignores the issues identified by the Department. More importantly, it ignores the fact that the courts will ultimately decide what issues are pertinent. The following specific comments discuss the areas of concern as they appear in Mr. Snyder's letter:

1. Withholding of rent. The Department's practice of withholding rent is permitted by law, is practical, and is fair to tenants. No taking can occur because the rent is deducted after rent accrues. A tenancy comparable to the private sector would require the advance payment of rent for one month and a substantial security deposit.

2. Use of the 1981 survey. In May of 1984, Judge Price issued a preliminary injunction temporarily barring collection of adjusted rents effective at Yosemite on May 1, 1983. However, in his order, Judge Price specifically provided the Department with an opportunity to answer the Court's concerns, identified as the basis for the temporary injunction. The 1981 survey methodology was never invalidated by the Court. In subsequent briefings provided to the Court, it was the Department's position that each of the questions raised by the Court had been satisfactorily answered, and that the previously adjusted rates should be reinstated.

The Association, rather than submitting the matter to the Court for a decision, took advantage of an order previously issued by Judge Price and blocked submission for almost a year. The delay by the Association was so egregious that the Court in November of 1985 dismissed the complaint for lack of diligent prosecution. A written order followed in May of 1986. The written order dissolves the injunction.

On the basis of the oral dismissal, actions were taken to reinstate the May 1, 1983, level rents. Rents were further adjusted to reflect required changes mandated by Presidential regulations issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). The adjustments applied all previous Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustments. Accordingly, when the rates were
The Department’s different interpretation of the Court’s order was immediate and clearly explained to the Association’s attorney. However, requests by the Department’s attorneys to have the Association’s attorney explain and document other perceived violations were ignored. Although the Association was aware of the actions taken by the Government in early 1984, it did nothing to bring its frivolous contempt claims to the Court until October 1986.

4. Adherence to regulations. The Association’s report implies that the Department has asserted that it does not have to comply with the requirements of regulations. To the contrary, the Department was diligent in attempting to comply rigorously with regulations, as well as other self-imposed requirements. The Department did argue that CPI adjustments could be implemented out of sequence, notwithstanding the OMB regulations. For the Yosemite case, CPI adjustments were implemented out of sequence because of the injunction. In fact, the injunction itself required imposition of CPI adjustments in a manner not provided for by regulations. After the injunction was dissolved, it would have been patently unfair to have Yosemite tenants pay less than other Park Service tenants.

6. Use of park rental comparables within the park. The Association complains of non-use of nearest actual comparables within the park; that is, subsidized housing, particularly of the major park concessioners. The use of such subsidized rentals as a basis to set Government rents is specifically prohibited by Presidential regulations. During this litigation, the Association specifically disavowed any challenge to those regulations. Federal law specifically prohibits the Department from setting rents in amounts that would constitute a subsidy.

7. Settlement offer. In July, 1986, the Department and the Service, working with the Solicitor’s Office, attempted to negotiate a settlement with the Association. The National Park Service concurred with Assistant U.S. Attorney Louis Demas that a settlement offer be made on the following terms:

- The planned rent adjustments based on the 1985 survey would be implemented as scheduled on August 31, 1986.
- The Association would not seek judicial relief from the August 31, 1986, rent adjustments unless and until administrative remedies had been exhausted. Administrative challenges to the validity of the survey would be expeditiously forwarded to the Office of Hearings and Appeals.
- The Department would not attempt to collect rental amounts that were not collected during the pendency of, and as a result of, the preliminary injunction. (That is, the “backrents” would not be collected.)
- Each party would bear its own costs and attorneys fees.

Under this settlement, the Association would have been free to make an administrative appeal. If the appeal proved unsuccessful, the Association would have been able to file a new law suit challenging the survey methodology.

In late July 1986, the U.S. Attorney’s Office informed the Service and the Department that the proposed settlement agreement was rejected by the Association at a meeting held on July 29, 1986. The sole reason for the rejection was reported to be the following condition:

“...with the disputed portion of the rent paid into a Government established escrow account, without any interest thereon payable to the tenant, pending a final decision in such litigation.”

This condition was deemed by the Department to be essential because of the Association’s demonstrated past practice of attempting to get injunctive relief and then stalling the proceedings.

8. Regulations. In 1984, OMB Circular A-45 was amended after study, publication, and opportunity for comment. The Association submitted no comments. A-45 is again being reviewed by OMB, and the Association has been aware of its opportunity to comment if they so desire.

The Association also failed to submit any comments during the revision of the Departmental housing regulations.

In its unduly protracted litigation, the Association attempts to obtain relief from law and Presidential regulations that it refuses to challenge. Both law and regulation prohibit tying rent to pay, and the Association’s continuing lawsuits ignore this reality. It has ignored reality to the point where, in the summer of 1986, it rejected a very favorable settlement and instead chose the divisiveness of litigation.

The goal of the Department and the Service is to establish fair rents in compliance with published laws and regulations. Survey rental rates are used throughout the National Park System, except for Hawaii, Guam, and the Alaska region. The Department is currently reviewing Alaska and Hawaii for inclusion in the regional survey process.

The regional survey process is also used to establish rents for many other agencies with civilian housing outside of the Department. Some examples of these agencies are the U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Customs Ser-
service, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Indian Health Service, and the Bureau of Prisons. These agencies have been satisfied with the survey methodology.

The Department acknowledges that mistakes can be made, but there are administrative procedures that can be used effectively to rectify errors. Many examples of successful use of the administrative process have been submitted to the Court. Errors called to the attention of the Department have been readily corrected before it became necessary to file an appeal.

Because this case is still in litigation, any questions regarding this matter should be referred directly to Assistant U.S. Attorney Louis Demas in Sacramento, CA. His telephone number is FTS 460-2746 (415/551-2748).

On May 27th, just as Ranger was going to press, Judge Edward Price of the District Court for the Eastern District of California issued his judgement on this case: “Plaintiff’s (Yosemite Tenants’ Association) motion for summary judgement is denied. Defendant’s (Department of Interior) motion for summary judgement is granted. Counsel for defense is directed to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law within 20 days of the date of this memorandum of decision.” Further details on the court’s decision will appear in the next issue, as will any comments or rebuttals by the tenants' association.

Letters continued from page 4

nationally, Washington lobbyists, and legal defense insurance. It also has clout, in the form of attorneys experienced in law enforcement issues.

ANPR is a fine organization... for beer, for general information exchange, and for meeting and greeting. But it doesn’t speak up for us, it doesn’t stand up for us, and it doesn’t do much to help us. We think that FOP will. It’ll do it even more effectively if you join FOP too.

Randy August
Yosemite

Hot Line

Well, the “hot line” has not been what you’d call a raging success. Although it’s been on-line now since January, there’ve only been about three calls placed to the editor. So we’ll go to Plan B: If you’ve got something you want to get off your chest, call me between 8 and 10 p.m. on Monday nights and I’ll call you right back, charging the call to ANPR. That should reduce any monetary concerns you might have...

The number to call is 703/522-4756. How about a jingle?

Permanent Job continued from page 13

for permanent positions, and be non-competitively placed in positions for which they are qualified.

Selective Placement

Affirmative action for handicapped individuals provides for the placement of these individuals in permanent positions for which they are basically qualified.

Peace Corps, Action

And Vista Volunteers

Individuals who successfully complete a full term with either the Peace Corps, Action or Vista may be placed in permanent positions for which they are basically qualified.

Conclusion

As you can see, obtaining your first permanent position in the National Park Service is not always easy. As a National Park Service supervisor, it is the most frequently asked question I hear from people I work with. Yes, it’s important that you understand the “how to” of getting your first permanent job, but the matter goes beyond that — it’s equally important to realize that you are not always going to walk into a permanent job where, as Horace Albright aptly summarized, “...keeping things orderly, and putting out forest fires, and giving lectures on Nature, and out rescuing dudes in danger...”

Many first permanent positions are clerk/typist positions where, through the office window, you watch your friends performing duties you joined the National Park Service to perform. Nonetheless, when you do get your first permanent position, make a commitment to it. Whether it’s a position with another agency, a clerk/typist position, or a park ranger position in an urban park, don’t take the job with the philosophy that you’ll use it just to get permanent status then move on in a few days or weeks. This type of attitude will not only make going to work every day difficult, but it could also give your employer and co-workers a distorted view of your real capabilities and potential. And it’s unfair to the office that hired you.

Instead, learn to enjoy whatever it is you are doing. Although it may be difficult to see at the time, the skills you obtain along the way are likely to prove useful in future positions. Give it your best shot and once again, with patience, perseverance, persistence and a little bit of luck, you’ll get your next permanent position with the National Park Service.
Comments Still Sought On ANPR’s Future

Karen Wade
Guadalupe Mountains

President Rick Gale has established a task force to work with the membership of ANPR to develop five-year goals for our organization. This is our chance to make ANPR a vital, aggressive and fully professional organization capable of improving the lot of rangers and affecting the future of the National Park System.

Are you one of the people who feels that, while our intentions have been good, we are still weak in planning, action and follow-through? Now is your chance to provide meaningful input to those who are consolidating the ideas of our active members into a blueprint for the future.

Although the deadline (May 30th) has passed for submitting comments for the draft report, we are still interested in your thoughts on any of the following topics (or others that might occur to you):

I. Advocacy
   A. Issues
   B. Processes
      1. Member Input
      2. Media
      3. Elected Representatives
      4. Public/Private Agencies
II. Professionalism
   A. Standards
   B. Training
   C. Field Programs
   D. Organizational Liaison
      1. National
      2. International
III. Social Action
   A. Rendezvous
   B. Mini-Rendezvous
   C. Regional Activities
   D. Park Activities
IV. Support
   A. Benefits
   B. Career Assistance
   C. Counseling
V. ANPR Organizational Matters
   A. Finances
   B. Administration
   C. Meetings
   D. Structure
VI. Communications
   A. Ranger
   B. Professional Publications
   C. Regional/Park Newsletters

You don’t even need to fully flesh out your ideas; just get them in writing and send them to one of the following task force members:

- Brion Fitzgerald, Assateague Island NS, Route 2, Box 294, Berlin, MD 21811. Work: (301) 641-1443.
- Tessy Shirakawa, Route 4, Box 357, Luray, VA 22835. Home: (703) 999-2243 ext. 281.

A draft action plan will appear in the fall Ranger, and a full discussion on this draft will occur at the Rendezvous. Let us know your thoughts and feelings!

---

Association of National Park Rangers

Name (last, first, MI): ____________________________________________ Title: ____________________________ Date: ________________

Box or street: __________________________________________________ Division: __________________________

City: __________________ State: ________ Zip: ___________

NPS employees: Park four-letter code (i.e., YELL) ____________

Region (i.e., RMR; WASO use NCR) ________

- Voluntary contribution to Ranger Museum □ ............................

Type of Membership (Check one): □ Active — all NPS employees, permanent, seasonal or retiree $ 20.00
□ Associate — individuals other than NPS employees $ 20.00
□ Sustaining — individuals and organizations $ 50.00
□ Life — open to all individuals* $200.00
□ Subscription — 2 copies of each issue available only to organizations $ 20.00

Life membership may be paid in four installments of $50.00 each within 12 months.

RETURN TO: ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL PARK RANGERS, P.O. Box 222, Yellowstone National Park, WY 82190
LINK THE PAST WITH THE PRESENT!

The interpreter plays an important role in maintaining the fragile chain of understanding that our rich heritage provides us!

If budgetary constraints, lack of time or personnel prevent you from providing the continual visitor support that you feel is necessary, seek the GRAPHIC SOLUTION! When custom designed, screenprinted and embedded in fiberglass, the interpretive exhibit becomes the most cost effective method of interpreting our heritage.

Graphic Solutions

P.O. Box 1288 • 355 South Potomac St. • Hagerstown, Maryland 21740 • (301) 791-6920

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

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED