Economic Hardship
Letters

Editor:

Writing this letter is the last thing I thought I would ever do. Having been an NPS employee for 26 years and spanning the divisional boundaries on several occasions, I had a very intense feeling that the ANPR was just a large social group of rangers. For this assumption I must apologize. I recently transferred to the BLM as a fire equipment specialist, which in itself was a major step as I am a “Park Service brat” and leaving was not easy.

My recent involvement with ANPR is a result of the efforts of the Association to challenge and hopefully set the record straight with regards to the fire/law enforcement retirement problem within the Park Service and in the federal service as a whole. This is an extremely sensitive undertaking and could well mean a better retirement for all that qualify.

I urge anyone working in maintenance, interpretation, administration, resource management or protection to join in this effort. There are many of us who have transitioned the divisional line that may well meet the requirements for fire/law enforcement retirement. The more individuals that put forth the effort to assist the Association, the cheaper the legal cost will be for all individuals and the better chance we have of winning approvals from the NPS and OPM.

I would like to thank the Association for their crucial undertaking and support of the Park Service employees. I have included my check for an associate membership. Join the Association; it appears that we have of winning approvals from the NPS and OPM.

Ted Rex
BLM
Boise Interagency Fire Center

Editor:

In April, I resigned from my position of sub-district ranger at Buffalo National River to join the Peace Corps for two years. I wanted to take this opportunity to briefly summarize some of the benefits of Peace Corps service to Ranger readers:

- Following successful completion of two years of service, a volunteer will have one year of non-competitive government status, meaning an applicant can apply directly for government jobs and bypass OPM.
- Before serving a volunteer undergoes two to three months of training, which can be in a field like park management, environmental education or forestry.
- Opportunity to learn a new language.

- Living and travel expenses are paid, plus $200 per month of service is deposited in your account at home as a re-adjustment allowance.
- Opportunity to travel and to get involved in international environmental preservation.

The Peace Corps could be an excellent opportunity for seasonals trying to gain experience or get “status”. In my case, I’ve wanted to volunteer for a long time and the time is finally right. In addition, my wife and I plan to pursue a dual career in the NPS when we return and this will provide the needed status for my wife.

I would invite anyone who wants more information to call the Peace Corps at 800-424-8580.

Dave Parker
Peace Corps
Paraguay

Editor:

I must say that I appreciate all ANPR has done to advance the cause of the park ranger profession, but I wish to comment on what I see as deficiencies in the strength of the organization.

First, the seasonal health insurance is far too expensive for what is covered. There are just too many limitations and exclusions to make it valuable to us. I participated in the Marsh & McLennon plan, but I am going ot have to cancel due to their recently raised premiums and my limited budget as a seasonal ranger.

There must be some way ANPR can organize our strengths to bargain with the NPS for better pay and better treatment. At best, we are treated somewhat less than the value of our service to the public and to the NPS. Rising housing costs, blacklisting, administrative incompetence and chances for permanent status need to be at the forefront of our organization’s efforts!

Perhaps some sort of ANPR permanent employment job announcement newsletter could be developed to assist those seeking status. I enjoy the off-season, but wish my work season could be longer and at a salary level equal to my college graduate status. The government probably pays us more in off-seasonal unemployment than it would cost to utilize our services on a longer season or full time basis. Perhaps this should be studied to see if permanent status would indeed be cheaper.

Petty concerns, really, but the conditions of seasonal NPS work aren’t becoming any better. Keep up the good work!!

Mark Sterkel
Navajo
President’s Message

There are some major, exciting activities happening at this time with the Association. In some ways, these are historic in that ANPR is breaking new ground in a variety of ways.

We have been asked to give testimony before the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands in support of HR-1484, which would establish a National Park System Review Board and provide for the appointment of the National Park Service’s Director by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Association’s testimony and the full text of the bill can be found in “Association Actions” in this issue of Ranger.

The time permitted by the Office of Personnel Management’s administrative regulations for agency receipt of employee requests for determination of coverage under the Special Retirement Provisions for Law Enforcement Officers and Firefighters (popularly known as 20-year retirement) expires on September 20, 1989. Accordingly, I recently polled the Board of Directors to determine whether ANPR should take all necessary steps to ensure that this special retirement coverage will be applicable to National Park Service rangers. The Board gave overwhelming support to this proposal. ANPR has therefore contracted with the law firm of Fawcett and Mauk to develop, among other things, sample packages detailing typical careers in the NPS which should qualify the incumbent for enhanced annuity law enforcement/firefighter retirement.

The guidelines are formatted so that an employee can merely substitute the relevant material from his or her career in the NPS for the corresponding entries in the guide.

The Association has retained the firm for a fee of $5,000, against which the attorneys will charge their costs. We do not intend to finance this effort, however, since it does not benefit all members of ANPR. We will instead sell the guidelines to those members — or non-members — who are interested in it. The project will ultimately be self-supporting. If those persons who’ve professed an interest in seeking 20-year retirement chose not to acquire the guidelines, we will terminate the project. (See the notice adjacent to Loren Casebeer’s article on 20-year retirement for further information.)

The third major ANPR effort currently underway is the recently completed economic survey. More than 280 responses were received to the second questionnaire, and have been compiled with the findings of the first survey into the report which appears in this issue. By the time you read this, I hope to have presented the results of the survey and the proposed actions to the new National Park Service Directorate for whatever action and implementation the National Park Service and will provide.

Following that meeting, the Board of Directors will consider and endorse additional courses of action to achieve the remainder of the recommended actions.

I commend each and every respondent who took the time to provide careful and detailed responses to the questionnaire. They were well-drafted and extremely thoughtful. I only wish all ANPR members could read the individual responses as I was privileged to do. Failing that, I urge you to carefully study the results reported in this issue of Ranger. If that generates any thoughts or ideas in your mind, I invite you to send them to me. Only by utilizing the collective wisdom of all ANPR members can we develop the most logical, rational and innovative plans for remedying and reversing some of the economic hardships facing our membership and, by inference, all NPS rangers.

Despite the completeness of the report itself, I need to highlight some of the findings. Probably the one fact that most underscores the serious nature of the economic problems facing park rangers was that 88 percent of the permanent respondents and 80 percent of the seasonal respondents indicated their desire and willingness to provide further information or testimony on this issue. To me, that should in and of itself send a loud and clear message to all concerned — and, maybe even more importantly, to all those who should need to be concerned.

The second message was one of disgruntlement. Maybe to no one’s surprise but my own, a very significant number of respondents, both permanent and seasonal, indicated that the primary factors that have led them to resign from the National Park Service or would lead them to resign were the lack of recognition of the worth of employees, the degradation of the sense of the NPS “family”, the frustration with poor or incompetent supervision and management, the denigration of the ability of employees, and the apparent lack of dedication by park managers to the NPS mission, again, this is a finding that simply cannot be overlooked or left unanswered.

Progress is being made toward achieving the goals and objectives of the Association’s long range plan, albeit very slowly. As I mentioned in this column in the spring 1989 Ranger, we have asked individuals to coordinate particular goals, and have sought key individuals to serve as overseers for each objective. A total of 22 of the 46 goals were assigned to individuals who volunteered at the last Rendezvous to coordinate and develop an ANPR response or action plan. To date, I have heard from only two of those 22; I can only assume that...
Legislative Actions

Bill Lienesch
NPCA

Congress has been very active thus far this spring on a variety of park and related public land issues. The Alaskan oil spill has received a great deal of interest, including oversight hearings on its effects on Kenai Fjords and Katmai.

The House has had hearings on legislation to create a Truman National Historic Site as well as a site, known as Whitehaven, associated with President Grant. Hearings were also held on legislation to expand Everglades National Park and Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park. The Senate held hearings on the creation of a Petroglyphs National Monument as well as legislation to expand Harpers Ferry National Historical Park.

Legislation to create a National Park Service review board was also the subject of a hearing in the House. This legislation, introduced by Subcommittee Chairman Bruce Vento, is identical to his bill that passed the House last year by a vote of 248-130. Witnesses at the hearing expressed concern about the growing politicization of the Park Service. Companion legislation has been introduced by Senator Bradley.

The House Interior Committee has finished work on Chairman Mo Udall’s legislation to create an American Heritage Trust. This legislation would provide more secure and more stable funding for both the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Historic Preservation Fund. In a heated markup session, the Republican members walked out after losing votes on three proposed amendments that would have significantly weakened the legislation.

The Interior Appropriations Subcommittee has concluded hearings on the FY1990 legislation. Various Representatives requested substantial increases to the Park Service budget, especially to the construction and land acquisition accounts. The Subcommittee is expected to begin to move the legislation in late spring.

Conservationists are becoming increasingly concerned about Bush Administration appointments for positions overseeing the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management and elsewhere in the Department of the Interior. The appointments are reminiscent of the previous Administration and run counter to the Bush campaign themes on the environment. NPCA and other conservation organizations have been working hard on the appointment for Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. Some of the names of persons rumored to be in line for the position have been totally unacceptable. If such a person is named, a confirmation fight is probable.

ANPR Actions

At the specific request of the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, the Association has offered its written testimony concerning H.R. 1484, a bill which would establish a National Park System Review Board. The text of that bill and our testimony follow.

First, the full text of H.R. 1484:

A BILL to establish a National Park System Review Board, and for other purposes.

Section 1. National Park System Review Board

(a) Establishment and Functions. — There is hereby established a National Park System Review Board (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the “Board”). The Board shall maintain a continuing review of programs and activities of the National Park Service and of existing and proposed National Park System units. The Board shall transmit to the President and to each House of the Congress an annual report containing the results of its review, together with any recommendations for the management of the National Park System or any proposed additions to such system, as it considers appropriate. Concurrently with the submission of the annual budget of the United States by the President, the Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress budget recommendations for the National Park Service and for the Board. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any rule, regulation, or policy directive, the Board shall transmit such annual report and budget recommendations, and provide any other information on the request of any committee or subcommittee of Congress, by report, testimony, or otherwise, without review, clearance, or approval by any other administrative authority except to the extent that the Board may deem such review, clearance, or approval appropriate.

(b) Membership and Terms of Office. — The President shall appoint members of the Board from among persons who, because of education or experience, are considered knowledgeable regarding policy issues affecting the natural or cultural resources of the Nation. The Board shall consist of three members serving for terms of four years, except that the terms of the members first taking office shall expire (as designated by the President at the time of appointment) as follows: One member after one year, one member after three years, and one member after five years. Members of the Board may be removed by the President only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(c) Administrative Provisions. — The Board shall elect a Chairman from amongst its members. A majority of the Board serving at any one time shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The Board shall have an official seal, which shall be judicially noticed. The Board shall meet at the call of the Chairman. Any member of the Board may, with the authorization of the Chairman, conduct public meetings. There shall be at least six meetings of the Board each year. In carrying out its functions, the Board may adopt bylaws, rules, and regulations necessary for the administration of its functions and may, subject to the amounts provided in an appropriation act, contract for any necessary services.

(d) Public Meetings; Public Comment. — All meetings of the Board shall be open to the public and the Board shall solicit, and review, public comments on all recommendations to be made by the Board.

(e) Compensation. — Members of the Board shall each be paid annual compensation at a rate not to exceed the highest rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule. While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(f) Staff; Experts and Consultants. The Board may appoint and fix the pay of such personnel as it considers appropriate, including at least a chief of staff, a secretary to the Board, a legal counsel, five investigators, and ten support staff. The staff shall be appointed subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and shall be paid in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Board may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5 of the United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed basic pay payable for GS-13 of the General Schedule. Upon request of the Board, the head of any Federal agency is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Board to assist the Board in carrying out its duties under this Act.

(g) Obtaining Data. — Notwithstanding sections 552 through 552b of title 5 of the United States Code, the Board may secure directly from the National Park Service information necessary to enable it to carry out this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Board, the Director of the
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that the Association of National Park Rangers feels compelled to testify in writing rather than in person is perhaps one of the strongest arguments in favor of H.R. 1484. Composed of 1,600 professional rangers, the Association is committed to the preservation and protection of the cultural, recreational and natural heritages of our nation. No member of the Association felt that he or she could take the career risk of testifying in favor of certain aspects of H.R. 1484.
Mr. Chairman, the Association strongly supports the creation of a National Park System Review Board. The advice and counsel of the members of the Board would be of great benefit to the Director of the National Park Service. The Board's public meetings would provide a forum for debate on the policy issues that surround the management of our nation's park resources. Coupled with the records of Congressional hearings, there would exist an unprecedented public record upon which to base future legislative initiatives and agency policy decisions. The Board's budget recommendations would provide the executive and legislative branches an unencumbered view of the needs of the National Park Service and its annual report would assist in establishing priorities for the allocation of fiscal and human resources.
The Association also supports the plan to require that the Director of the National Park Service be a Presidential appointee, subject to confirmation by the United States Senate. As you are well aware, the Director's position is one of only two of the ten Bureau Directors within the Department of the Interior that is not a Presidential appointment. Appointment by the President would confer upon the position additional prestige. Senate confirmation would allow a public debate upon the merits of the appointment. We would suggest, however, that H.R. 1484 be amended to provide further guidance on the qualifications for the Director. A future Director should be a career parks person with some experience in Federal service. We believe the term of the office should be extended to seven years to provide for the kind of continuity of leadership that agencies such as the United States Forest Service have enjoyed. The Congress could then have considerable confidence in the integrity of the information that such a Director would provide its committees.
The Association believes that the Congress has provided sufficient guidance to the National Park Service on what areas the Congress feels are critical for future management action. We do not support, therefore, the legislative prescription for three Deputy Directors. We believe that the Director should have the latitude to establish the kind of organization that would respond to the management challenges surrounding the administration of the National Park System.
The Association does not have an official view on the wisdom of removing the National Park Service from the direct supervision of the Department of the Interior. We see advantages and disadvantages in the current organization and in the organization outlined in H.R. 1484. What we would ask is that the ability of park professionals to voice points of view on significant policy issues be restored and protected. We have watched with dismay as senior National Park Service professionals have testified at Congressional or other public hearings. What they say is often at odds with what we know they believe. The nation cannot afford to have the resource values of the National Park System sacrificed for narrow partisan goals. The margin for error in managing sensitive resources is exceedingly small. We must be absolutely sure that National Park Service policy and alternatives for action are based on the soundest resources information that is available.

Continued on page 6
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, 640 N. Harrison St., Arlington, VA 22205. The deadline for the fall issue is August 1st. If you are moving and also changing your address, please include past and present addresses. These will be forwarded to the business manager, who maintains the list of current addresses.

Entries should include relevant information about park area and professional specialty, and grade (optional) i.e. Steve Mather — from GS-5 park ranger (interpreter), Furthest District, Backwater NM, to GS-7/9/11 park ranger (chief of interpretation), Career Dream NP. If you are so inclined, you may also include your new address and phone number so your friends will know how to reach you.

Transfers

Kirsten Bevinetto Artman — from coordinator, Park Education Materials Center, NPCA, to staff assistant/receptionist, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Larry Bell — from staff park ranger (resource management coordinator), Ranger Activities, WASO, to superintendent, Chaco Canyon.

Bill Blake — from GS-11 assistant district ranger, Yosemite, to GS-12 chief ranger, New River Gorge.

Scot Bowen — from GS-5 park ranger (protection), Big Thicket, to GS-5 seasonal park ranger (protection), Sequoia and Kings Canyon. Scot's address is: P.O. Box 74, Lodgepole, Sequoia NP, CA 93262 (209-565-3387).

George Buckingham — from chief ranger Bryce Canyon, to same, Crater Lake. Address: P.O. Box 38, Crater Lake, OR 97604 (503-594-2210).

Rhonda Brooks — from GS-5 park ranger (generalist), Consejo District, Santa Monica Mountains, to GS-5 park ranger (interpretation), Dangling Rope District, Rainbow Bridge/Glen Canyon. Rhonda's address: Glen Canyon NKA, Dangling Rope, P.O. Box 1507, Page, AZ 86040.

Bonnie Clarfield — from GS-5 park ranger (interpretation), Dangling Rope District, Rainbow Bridge/Glen Canyon, to GS-5 park ranger (generalist), Santa Monica Mountains. Bonnie can be reached at Rancho Sierra Vista Ranger Station, 4122 W. Potrero Road, Newbury Park, CA 91320.

Kim Cooper — from GS-5 park ranger (visitor protection), Indiana Dunes, to GS-7 subdistrict ranger, Erbie Subdistrict, Buffalo. She can be reached at HCR-73, Box 222, Dogpatch, AR 72648.

Nancy Fischer — from GS-6 lead park ranger, Golden Gate, to GS-7 supervisory park ranger, same.

Mitchel Fong — from park ranger (visitor protection), Boston, to same, Needles District, Canyonlands.

Peter Givens — from GS-7 chief ranger, Cowpens, to GS-9 park ranger (interpretive specialist), Virginia Unit, Blue Ridge Parkway.

Laurie Heupel — from GS-4 seasonal park ranger (interpretation), Glen Canyon, to GS-5 park ranger (interpretation), Jefferson National Expansion.

Gregory Jablonski — from deputy sheriff, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to park ranger, Kennebunk Mountain.

Ken Kehrer, Jr. — from GS-9 district ranger, North District, Capitol Reef, to GS-11 district ranger, West District, Denali. Address: Box 9, Denali National Park, AK 99755-0009.

Bob Martin — from subdistrict ranger, Bullfrog, Glen Canyon, to assistant district ranger, Central District, Shenandoah.

Mark Miller — from GS-4 seasonal park ranger (law enforcement), Buffalo, to GS-5 permanent park ranger (law enforcement), Jefferson National Expansion.

Jane Moore — from GS-6 lead park ranger, Golden Gate, to GS-7 supervisory park ranger, same.

Gary Pollock — from GS-5 park ranger, Central District, Shenandoah, to GS-7 park ranger (front-country supervisor), North District, Shenandoah. Bob can be reached at P.O. Box 1412, Front Royal, VA 22603 (703-636-4302).

George Rummel — from GS-4 seasonal park ranger (law enforcement), Buffalo, to GS-5 permanent park ranger (law enforcement), Jefferson National Expansion.

Tessy Shirakawa — from supervisory park ranger (interpretation), Shenandoah, to interpretive specialist, Alaska Regional Office.

Bernard Stoffel — from GS-5 park ranger (law enforcement), Virgin Islands, to GS-5 park ranger (resource management), Lava Beds.

Deirda Kramer-Stoffel — from "waiting," San Francisco, to GS-4 maintenance clerk, Lava Beds.

Denise Stuhr — from GS-4 seasonal park ranger (interpretation), Rocky Mountain Regional Office, to GS-5 park ranger (interpretation), Jefferson National Expansion.

Eddie Wells — from GS-5 park ranger (resource management and visitor protection), Chickamauga — Chattanooga, to GS-7 park ranger (resource management and visitor protection), Flamingo District, Everglades. Address: P.O. Box 279, Homestead, FL 33030 (813-695-3101, extension 318).

Tracy Whitaker — from GS-5 seasonal park ranger (law enforcement), Buffalo, to GS-5 permanent park ranger (law enforcement), Buffalo.

Vicki Wolfe — from GS-5 park ranger (interpreter), Independence, to GS-7 park ranger (assistant interpretive specialist), Upper Delaware. Address: Box 204, Delaware Water Gap, PA 18327 (717-992-7193).

Jim Zahradka — from GS-7 park ranger, "Buffalo chaser," Theodore Roosevelt, to GS-9 subdistrict ranger, Everglades. Address: Tamiami Ranger Station, SRD Box 51, Ochopee, FL 33943.

Departures

Dave Parker — from GS-7 subdistrict ranger, Buffalo, to volunteer (forestry), Peace Corps, Paraguay. You can contact Dave and Laurie Parker at Cuerpo de Paz, Boreal, 162, c/Mail Lopez, Asuncion, Paraguay.

Pamela Zimmerman — from supervisory park ranger, Petrified Forest, to resignation.

ANPR Actions continued from page 5

"Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the invitation to comment on H.R. 1484. If you need further information or if we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us." * * *

The Association has also written to Rep. Dan Rostenkowski, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, regarding the Public Pension Parity Act of 1989. The text of President Gable's letter follows:

"I am writing on behalf of the Association of National Park Rangers to express our interest and concern in legislation before your committee; HR 1085, The Public Pension Parity Act of 1989. This is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for that portion of a governmental pension received by an individual which does not exceed the maximum benefits payable under Title II of the Social Security Act which could have been excluded from income for the taxable year.

"Most retired National Park Rangers receive a pension in lieu of the Social Security benefits received by private sector retirees. These Park Rangers who have committed their careers to public service in protecting our Nation's most valuable cultural and natural resources deserve equitable taxation of their retirement benefits. Currently they are not treated similarly to the private sector retiree under the Internal Revenue Code.

"The Association of National Park Rangers believes that it is completely inequitable to tax the retirement benefits of these public employees in a manner which is different from the private sector's Social Security retirement benefits.

"The private sector may exempt their Social Security from their gross income if the income does not exceed $25,000 for individuals or $32,000 for couples. Public sector employees are fully taxed on their pension benefits which penalizes Park Rangers for having devoted a career to public service.

"This legislation would amend the Internal Revenue Code so that a public retiree, including Park Rangers, could deduct that portion of their governmental pension up to the maximum Social Security retirement benefits for an individual or couple from their gross income. This seems entirely appropriate and corrects an unfair situation.

"We ask that you support a positive report and see that this measure is passed to amend the Internal Revenue Code."
Report on Ranger Economic Hardship
The Association of National Park Rangers

Introduction
The National Park Service was born in 1916, the embodiment of a uniquely American vision of heritage and land protection which continues to be one of this country’s major contributions to world culture. The idea of preserving natural and cultural resources for their noncommercial values has served as a model for some 120 other nations which have established their own systems of parks or reserves.

The diversity of our national park system is staggering. There are now well over 350 areas, extending from Acadia on the coast of Maine to War in the Pacific in Guam, from Gates of the Arctic above the Arctic Circle to the Virgin Islands in the Caribbean. They vary in size from the few hundred square yards of Thaddeus Kosciuszko in downtown Philadelphia to the 11 million acres of Wrangel-St. Elias, which would take more than 30 years to explore even if you could cover 1,000 acres a day.

There are few Americans who don't know and cherish our nation’s great parks. They come in great numbers to see the awe inspiring geology of the Grand Canyon and Yosemite, to climb the majestic peaks of Mt. Rainier and Mt. McKinley, to hike the vast wildlands of Glacier and the Great Smokies, and to see the wildlife and forests of Yellowstone and Redwoods and Olympic.

Although the Service is best known for such premier natural areas, it also protects a wide variety of other sites, many of them located in or near major metropolitan areas. Almost two-thirds of the areas in the system preserve and protect sites important to us for their historical or cultural associations. These units of the system are an open textbook of the nation’s history and heritage. Within them, we can hear the muffled drums and cannons of the Revolutionary War at Minute Man or Colonial, and suffer with Washington’s troops in Morristown and Valley Forge. We can sense the excitement of nation building at Independence Hall in Philadelphia. We can trace the bloody trail of General Grant as he clashed with General Lee at places such as the Wilderness, Spotsylvania, Cold Harbor, and Petersburg, then end, finally and mercifully, at the stillness of Appomattox.

This report was prepared by members of the Association. In early June, copies were presented to the Director, all Regional Directors, Rep. Bruce Vento, Sen. Bill Bradley, a half dozen conservation organizations, and numerous friends and allies.

We can revisit both the noble and ignoble aspects of America’s westward expansion at places like Custer Battlefield, Pipe Spring, Homestead and Fort Laramie.

Sites within America’s national park system also commemorate individuals and groups of people who contributed to our nation’s development. The achievements of Black Americans are honored at Booker T. Washington, Frederick Douglas Home and Martin Luther King. American women are commemorated at Women’s Rights and Clara Barton. Sites dedicated to our Hispanic heritage include Castillo de San Marcos, De Soto, Coronado, and San Antonio Missions. The long history of Native Americans in this land is recognized at a wide variety of locations, from Mount Rushmore in South Dakota to prehistoric sites like Mesa Verde and Chaco Culture which preserve the ancient homes and artifacts of the cultures of the American Southwest. And there are units of the system dedicated to almost all of this country’s presidents, to great artists such as Carl Sandburg, Longfellow, Poe and Eugene O’Neill, and to inventors such as Edison and the Wright Brothers.

Along with these natural and cultural areas, the National Park Service has been charged with the protection and administration of a variety of other sites. In 1936, Congress ordered the Service to study the impoundment behind Hoover Dam for its recreational potential; this led to the creation of Lake Mead, our first recreational area, and to the subsequent addition of a variety of other such sites, including Glen Canyon, Lake Meredith and Coulee Dam. A year later, Cape Hatteras became the first of many national seashores. The great public works projects of the 30’s gave us the Natchez Trace, Blue Ridge and George Washington Memorial parkways. Urban recreation areas came into the system with the creation of Gateway in New York City and Golden Gate in San Francisco in 1972.

The national parks are, in sum, a remarkable collection of places. And National Park Service rangers are the protectors, explainers, hosts and caretakers of this unique and extraordinary system. They are the United States’ representatives to the over 200,000,000 people from this country and all over the world who visit our parks each year.

Rangers are expected to answer questions and present programs to groups and individuals at virtually every educational level. Rangers are expected to find you when you’re lost, help you when you’re hurt, rescue you when you’re stuck, and enforce the law when you or others can’t abide by it. Rangers are entrusted with the care of our irreplaceable cultural and natural treasures, and they’re responsible for assuring that visitors have a safe, enjoyable and educational visit while they’re there. And rangers are expected to be knowledgeable, courteous, helpful and professional.

Like most other agencies, the National Park Service moves employees to new locations regularly when they successfully compete for vacancies with new challenges and opportunities. Unlike most other land management agencies, the National Park Service is responsible for managing many areas in high-cost metropolitan and resort locations. Most lower-grader ranger positions are in fact located in and around large metropolitan areas. Of the approximately 3,180 permanent rangers in the Service, 1,600 are GS-7 or below and nearly 750 are GS-5’s.

In order to assess this situation, the Association undertook a survey of its membership in December, 1988, to more precisely determine the scope and nature of financial problems within the ranger ranks. A questionnaire was prepared and circulated to most of the Association’s 1,600 members. Within a short period of time, about 230 of these questionnaires were returned. Although they didn’t provide a complete picture of economic distress for rangers throughout the Service, they did identify some serious problems. A second, more specific questionnaire was accordingly developed and sent out in April, 1989. This time, about 270 responses
were received. Together, the replies of these rangers provide the basis for this report on economic hardship within our profession.

Background

Before presenting their replies, the issue of ranger pay needs to be placed in historical perspective. According to the best evidence available, rangers have not always been so poorly compensated. An examination of past and present pay received by Park Service rangers appeared in an article by Hugh Dougher entitled “Ranger Salaries: Past, Present and Future” in the summer, 1988, issue of Ranger: The Journal of the Association of National Park Rangers.

Before the National Park Service was created in 1916, ranger pay rates were established by park superintendents and were highly variable. The General Superintendent for the Parks standardized salaries in 1915 and made them comparable to those received by Forest Service rangers. In 1920, these regulations were revised to provide higher salaries to rangers working in larger parks. “This spread system,” says Dougher, “was based on the belief that rangers assigned to the larger parks performed a greater variety of duties.” Nonetheless, ranger salaries overall were higher than the average salary received by full-time American employees nationwide.

Park ranger positions first came under Civil Service regulations in the 1930’s when they were placed in the non-professional crafts and custodial services series, where they remained until the Classification Act of 1949 established a separate ranger series. Between the 1930’s and 1950’s, Dougher reports, “ranger salaries fell behind naturalist, engineer and forester levels.” In 1937, the ranger division in the Service’s Washington office initiated efforts to professionalize the series and thereby raise grade levels. Over ensuing years, grades and pay rose, keeping pace with the average of seven years and 11 months.

In 1968, the Service consolidated many disparate ranger duties into two new series — the park management (GS-025) and park technician (GS-026) series. The former was to be a professional ranger series, the latter was to be a non-professional, technical series. Both were to have career ladders, and it was recommended that the 026 ladder top out at GS-11. When implemented, however, grades in the 026 series usually topped out at GS-7, with few exceptions.

“The technician series, with its relatively large number of vacancies, quickly became a career route for aspiring rangers,” the article states. “However, the combination of few 025 vacancies and a low 026 grade structure caused a log jam to develop among lower-graded employees.

In an effort to be competitive for the limited 025 promotions, frustrated technicians willingly assumed duties beyond their grade levels.”

In the late 1970’s, this Association began pressing for the combination of the 025 and 026 series into one professional park ranger series. It was hoped that such an action would improve overall grade levels (and therefore pay) and also provide a realistic career ladder for employees in both series. But the effect was quite the opposite. The new standards diluted the 025 series and did little to improve the 026 series. All positions at all grades were considered to be full-performance levels, so there was no longer a progression from trainee to journeyman grade levels.

At the same time, overall pay was beginning to slip. During the past decade, employees have received small annual cost-of-living adjustments, and the net effect has been a de facto pay cut. Although higher-graded rangers still earned a bit more than the average American worker, those in lower grades (GS-7 and below) fell steadily behind. By the early 1980’s, the combination of low salaries, high cost of living (particularly in urban areas, where many parks are located), diminished career opportunities and non-existent career ladders began to have their effect. Rangers, especially in the GS-4 to GS-9 ranks, began feeling the economic noose tightening.

Now, in 1989, pay rates for the rangers we entrust with the protection, management and interpretation of our national heritage have declined to a level which often makes them uncompetitive with even the lowest salaried employees in the private sector. Rangers at the entry levels in each of the four principal field grades — GS-4 ($13,513), GS-5 ($15,118), GS-7 ($18,726) and GS-9 ($22,407) — make less than the average salary of a full-time American worker took home in 1987 ($26,006). And rangers in those grades now comprise 68% (2,158 of 3,182 rangers) of the work force in the series. This has made life hard for rangers in most parks, and difficult to impossible for those living in semi-urban and urban areas.

Overview of Respondents

Before discussing the current economic hardships of many park rangers in detail, an overview of respondents is in order.

As noted above, the Association of National Park Rangers conducted two surveys on rangers’ economic situations. All together, we received about 500 replies, with a small number of respondents (no more than 10%) forwarding answers to each questionnaire. The statistical information which follows was derived from the second questionnaire, but the subsequent general statements and observations (except where noted) were taken from the responses to both questionnaires.

Although many replies came from sites in urban areas, there were few geographic areas which were not represented. Questionnaires were returned from the Virgin Islands and Alaska Regional Office, from Santa Monica Mountains and George Washington Carver, from Amistad and Acadia. Responses were received from regional offices, training and service centers, and upwards of 100 areas in all ten of the Service’s regions.

Employees in grades from GS-4 to GS-14 were represented in each of the surveys, but the majority clustered around the grades below GS-9. The grades of the 218 permanent rangers who responded to the second questionnaire, for example, broke down as follows:

GS-4 8
GS-5 77
GS-6 27
GS-7 39
GS-8 2

As is the case with the profession in general, these rangers (along with the 50 seasonals who also replied to the second survey) possessed a high level of experience, education and training. The seasonals had an average cumulative length of service of two years and 11 months; the permanent rangers had been in the ranks for an average of seven years and 11 months. Both seasonals and permanents had worked in an average of three parks (2.92 for seasonal, 2.95 for permanent).

During the course of their years in the Service, these rangers had received an impressive amount of training. Permanents had an average of 1,025 hours of training, or an average of 3.2 weeks per year of service; the seasonals averaged 240 hours of training, or 2.0 weeks per year of service. If we assume an average cost of $50 per training hour, then the Service has expended over $50,000 to train each responding permanent and $12,000 to train each seasonal.

Along with the high level of training, the surveyed rangers had a considerable amount of education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Seasonals</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Permanents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS+</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

The disparity between income and expenses for today's rangers had made life in many areas of the country exceedingly difficult. For many, economic hardship does not mean foregoing a second car or a compact disc player. It means having to borrow money to pay groceries or sharing shabby quarters with others in order to make the monthly rent. It means spending all of your money on daily expenses, with no chance to save for your children or to someday buy a home. It means living on a thin margin that can disappear at a moment's notice:

"Even at the rate I pay for housing, I have to work many hours of overtime just to eke out an existence, buying clothes at thrift shops, baby needs at clothing exchanges and food at retail warehouses."

"Currently, we can save less than $20 a month. My child will never be able to go to college. I'll probably never be able to own my own house, and I look forward to retirement thinking how will I manage when I can barely make it now."

"A paycheck without overtime can be 100% accounted for. When overtime is encountered, especially in large amounts, the money can be spent on luxury items or banked. Luxury items include nice dinners/furniture/entertainment, etc."

"Each pay period, after paying mortgage and bills, we have $150 to pay for groceries, gas, clothing, etc."

"My mother has difficulty in walking. I want to install a toilet on the first floor in our home for her convenience, but cannot afford the luxury."

As might be expected, such barebones living makes it necessary for many rangers to seek — willingly or otherwise — other forms of economic assistance. Although the first questionnaire did not specifically ask for information on additional or spousal employment, many people made a point of remarking on such necessities — 60 mentioned relying on a spouse's income, while 41 said that either they or their spouses worked from one to three extra jobs to supplement their income. Among other forms of assistance, 16 said they relied on overtime or premium pay (particularly from fighting Western fires over the last several years), 14 received support from their parents, and 12 were using up their savings. A few reported that they'd sought and received food stamps or child care assistance.

The information provided in response to the second questionnaire was more detailed and graphic. As far as supplemental employment was concerned, 21 respondents relied on second jobs to get by, and another 96 depended on spousal income.

<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>NPS rangers*</td>
<td>$13,248</td>
<td>$17,952</td>
<td>$23,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State park rangers**</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$18,311</td>
<td>$25,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State foresters***</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$18,508</td>
<td>$28,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Park Police#</td>
<td>$20,556</td>
<td>$21,366</td>
<td>$27,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural policemen</td>
<td>$19,019</td>
<td>$22,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural firemen</td>
<td>$9,906</td>
<td>$22,387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State wardens##</td>
<td>$20,684</td>
<td>$23,347</td>
<td>$28,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS responders###</td>
<td>$18,710</td>
<td>$24,100</td>
<td>$28,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$26,551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumed entry level is GS-4/1. Journeyman level is average of salaries for GS-5/1 through GS-9/1. Supervisor level is average of salaries for GS-7/1 through GS-9/1.
** Tables employed did not distinguish between entry and journeyman levels for state rangers. The $18,311 figure is the mean of the minimum ($8,400 in Kentucky) and maximum ($42,694 in Kansas) of the "field unit salaries" of the 48 reporting states. The low end for supervisors was $12,768 (West Virginia) and the high end was $50,820 (California).
*** Same as above. The $18,508 figure is a mean for 48 reporting states.
# Entry level is grade 1-1; journeyman is grade 2-1; supervisor is grade 5-1.
## Range for each level: Entry — $13,860 (Kentucky) to $32,280 (Missouri); journeyman — $14,472 (Arkansas) to $37,500 (Illinois); supervisor — $16,872 (Ohio) to $43,632 (Colorado).
### Entry level is same as EMT; journeyman level is same as paramedic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>1st Level Supervisor</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US NPS</td>
<td>$15,118</td>
<td>$19,654</td>
<td>$18,726</td>
<td>$24,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US F&amp;W&amp;S</td>
<td>$27,716</td>
<td>$36,032</td>
<td>$39,501</td>
<td>$51,354</td>
<td>Plus 25% OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Postal Inspector</td>
<td>$39,609</td>
<td>$55,283</td>
<td>$41,507</td>
<td>$55,952</td>
<td>Plus COLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US ANS</td>
<td>$18,726</td>
<td>$43,181</td>
<td>$39,501</td>
<td>$51,354</td>
<td>Plus 25% OT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Marshall</td>
<td>$18,726</td>
<td>$36,032</td>
<td>$33,218</td>
<td>$43,181</td>
<td>Plus COLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton PD, NJ</td>
<td>$21,048</td>
<td>$32,955</td>
<td>$33,929</td>
<td>$37,336</td>
<td>Plus benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon PD, NJ</td>
<td>$19,616</td>
<td>$30,405</td>
<td>$33,446</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plus benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacketson PD, NJ</td>
<td>$21,840</td>
<td>$27,789</td>
<td>$28,834</td>
<td>$30,729</td>
<td>Plus benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton PD, PA</td>
<td>$21,691</td>
<td>$22,483</td>
<td>$23,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkes-Barre PD, PA</td>
<td>$22,750</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroudsburg PD, PA</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>$22,460</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Game, PA</td>
<td>$19,028</td>
<td>$23,722</td>
<td>$24,140</td>
<td>$30,441</td>
<td>Plus vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fish, PA</td>
<td>$19,028</td>
<td>$23,722</td>
<td>$24,900</td>
<td>$33,878</td>
<td>Plus 3% in '88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Parks, PA</td>
<td>$15,726</td>
<td>$19,990</td>
<td>$17,252</td>
<td>$22,455</td>
<td>Plus benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fish/Game, NJ</td>
<td>$22,085</td>
<td>$35,789</td>
<td>$29,590</td>
<td>$41,431</td>
<td>Plus vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Parks, NJ</td>
<td>$18,170</td>
<td>$25,437</td>
<td>$21,033</td>
<td>$29,449</td>
<td>Plus benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Police, PA</td>
<td>$19,967</td>
<td>$31,964</td>
<td>$29,251</td>
<td>$33,779</td>
<td>Plus benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Police, NJ</td>
<td>$20,271</td>
<td>$33,355</td>
<td>$28,797</td>
<td>$37,405</td>
<td>Plus $5 K food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
check. That 'nest egg' (which we had hoped would go towards another home) soon disappeared however, and we had to turn elsewhere for help. With four children, we found that we qualified for WIC [an assistance program], food stamps and HEAT assistance. If the school had offered the free lunch program for low income families, we would have qualified for that as well.

"In the past, I have lived in government housing (the rent was reasonable), but I still could hardly afford to live. I had to apply for food stamps just so I could afford to take my children to a doctor."

"I've had at least five people on my staff receiving food stamps and WIC programs."

Although ranger economic problems manifest themselves in many ways, perhaps the most accurate and apparent indicators are the types of residences, living arrangements and neighborhoods that our peers have been forced into by low pay. Among the most striking and recurring characteristics of the answers, in fact, are the accounts of life styles that rangers are required to live in order to pursue their profession.

At least a quarter of the replies to the first survey indicated that the respondent either shared a bedroom or quarters with others or lived with their parents. Many reported that they were forced to commute long distances in order to find affordable housing.

The replies to the second questionnaire provided more specific details. Of the 218 permanent rangers who replied, 55 (just over 25%) were forced by their economic situation to either live with parents, siblings or roommates or shared their residence with people not of their immediate family; 45 of 50 seasonals were in the same situation. The questionnaire also asked a more specific question concerning living arrangements: "Except for family members, do you have to share a bedroom, kitchen facilities or bathroom with others?" Over three quarters of respondents who are sharing quarters with non-family members replied in the affirmative.

A number of rangers described the quality of their residences and neighborhoods. Here are some passages which provide graphic descriptions of their living situations:

"The only apartment I can afford is a studio which has no kitchen or stove, just a small refrigerator, and I wash dishes in the bathroom sink."

"I live in a low-rent area of San Francisco. Except for the cockroaches and trans-sexual prostitutes, it’s not a bad place."

"At 31 years of age, I manage to live on my GS-7 salary in an expensive urban area because I have no family to support, have given up most of my privacy to live less expensively with two coworkers, and have learned to live on a diet concentrating on spaghetti and macaroni and cheese."

"I had no furniture for about a year. I slept on the floor for that amount of time. I couldn’t afford to buy furniture until after I received my paycheck from the work I did while fighting a fire."

## Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Difference Per Annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-04</td>
<td>Seasonal park ranger</td>
<td>$13,513</td>
<td>$278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio — ranger cadet</td>
<td>$13,791</td>
<td>$610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ventura (CA) — ranger trainee</td>
<td>$14,123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-05</td>
<td>Beginning park ranger</td>
<td>$15,118</td>
<td>$3,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio — park ranger</td>
<td>$18,949</td>
<td>$4,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland — park ranger</td>
<td>$19,469</td>
<td>$7,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles — park ranger</td>
<td>$22,889</td>
<td>$3,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ventura (CA) — park ranger</td>
<td>$18,782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-07</td>
<td>Park ranger</td>
<td>$18,726</td>
<td>$1,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio — park ranger/specialist</td>
<td>$20,218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-09</td>
<td>Supervisory park ranger</td>
<td>$22,907</td>
<td>$2,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio — park ranger/supervisor</td>
<td>$20,426</td>
<td>$7,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland — sergeant</td>
<td>$29,960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>District park ranger</td>
<td>$27,716</td>
<td>$4,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland — lieutenant</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Chief park ranger</td>
<td>$32,218</td>
<td>$1,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland — captain</td>
<td>$35,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To go beyond the immediacy of paying daily bills. In order to ascertain the full range of impacts that economic hardship has on rangers, the second questionnaire asked the following question: “Has your economic situation had any significant negative impacts on your life?”

Just under a third of the respondents (79 of 218 permanents and 11 of 50 seasonal) answered this open-ended question by saying that the prime impact of chronic low pay was their inability to even consider buying a residence — a not unexpected response, particularly in metropolitan areas. According to a recent survey, the cost of a 2,000-square-foot, three-bedroom, two-bath home in several urban areas with many parks nearby ranges from $556,667 in San Francisco to $167,667 in Philadelphia, $216,667 on the south side of Long Island, $214,333 in a modest community outside of Boston, $134,500 in Miami, and $169,450 in northern Virginia and southern Maryland. The salary of even a GS-9 ranger — considered to be more than adequate by many rangers — is insufficient to even come close to mortgage payments for such residences. Because most ranger salaries are so low, mortgages on comparable homes in more “rural” cities like Cheyenne ($112,300), Great Falls ($108,333), Albuquerque ($106,167) and Salt Lake City ($112,800) are still far too expensive to purchase. As noted above, this means that most rangers must rent homes or apartments, and, in a majority of cases, share them with others in order to mitigate costs.

Table 4
Comparison of NPS Ranger Salaries with United States Park Police Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Annual Salary</th>
<th>Difference Per Annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-05</td>
<td>Beginning ranger</td>
<td>$15,118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$24,452</td>
<td>$9,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-07</td>
<td>Ranger</td>
<td>$18,726</td>
<td>$6,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$25,262</td>
<td>$6,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-09</td>
<td>Supervisory ranger</td>
<td>$22,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>$32,016</td>
<td>$9,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>District ranger</td>
<td>$27,716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>$36,308</td>
<td>$8,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Chief ranger</td>
<td>$33,218</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>$36,308</td>
<td>$3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>$42,202</td>
<td>$8,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Regional chief ranger</td>
<td>$39,501</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>$42,202</td>
<td>$2,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>$48,918</td>
<td>$9,417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Comparisons are meant to be representative of roughly comparable levels of responsibility, as no direct correlation of duties is possible.
- Salaries are only shown for entry level steps.

It angers me that NPS management has allowed this scenario, as well as nearly-as-bad scenarios in non-urban parks. And it angers me that the NPS is essentially taking advantage of the good will of the ranger corps who bring some measure of idealism and caring to their work.”

“I'm a second generation NPS employee and I would not recommend this life style for my children.”

Ultimately, these economic problems force many people to make the hard decision of whether or not to stay in the Service. Many of those who have chosen to remain have done so only with perplexity at why the National Park Service allows such conditions to continue:

“The point is not whether we can live on what we are paid. The question is whether we are paid for the work we do.”

“Ultimately, my drive to work for the NPS will not be shaken by low wages and benefits. But as a way of life for my family, I wish and hope that these conditions might improve. And I firmly believe our profession deserves more.”

“Why must the Park Service make doing what one loves and what one is good at so difficult? It’s losing lots of good people to other government agencies giving better financial deals, while our parks are deteriorating before us.”

“It is sad to think that we are doing a job that we love and educating people on the beauty of our country, but we can’t even live and survive in this beautiful country.”

Many others have decided to leave the agency, or are at least seriously considering such a course of action. Despite a profound reluctance to give up a job that they hold in highest esteem, economic realities make it impossible to resist the allure of positions in the private sector and other Federal agencies that pay more and often have fewer responsibilities.

The second questionnaire asked the following question: “Have you seriously considered leaving the NPS? If so, please specify the two primary reasons which are most likely to cause your departure.” Of the 268 respondents, a full 64% (140 permanents and 32 seasonals) said that they have thought of leaving or are actually preparing to leave the Service. Of these, 46% (104 permanents and 20 seasonals) said that inadequate pay would or will be the primary reason for leaving the agency. The second most common reply (25% of combined responses) was that they would or will depart because of the lack of career opportunities. Among the other principal causative factors listed by a significant number of permanent rangers were lack of recogni-
tion of an employee's ability or worth, poorly qualified or incompetent super­visors and managers, the lack of dedication many managers have to the Service's mis­sion and bureaucratic paperwork require­ments. Seasonals listed several of these and also mentioned the lack of job security, difficulty in obtaining permanent positions and the lack of seasonal benefits (such as within grade increases and NPS-sponsored health insurance).

Here are some of the comments re­ceived from rangers about leaving the Na­tional Park Service:

"My wife and I have decided to leave the NPS. I feel that I can no longer in good conscience ask my family to con­tinue to make the ever-increasing finan­cial and emotional sacrifices demanded by the NPS of it's employees. The financial strain and sacrifice is just too great... (The NPS) expects its em­ployees to willingly work long hours on a moment's notice for little pay in areas of extremely high costs of living and gives no consideration to the needs or requirements of that employee's family."

"It is becoming increasingly difficult to keep up with the responsibilities of life and family with the increases in the cost of living, the decreases in the earning power of the dollar, and widening gap in pay comparability between the private sector and government employees, the pay freezes, the increased cost of rent, the reduced government and management commitment to protecting retirement benefits and position ad­vancement."

"Given that NPS salaries are now insuf­ficient to allow for an independent existence unless one has a working spouse, it takes a rare person to resist for long the easy opportunity to make more elsewhere."

"It's really quite clear as I add my bills against what I am bringing home per pay period that I cannot afford to work for the Park Service and I am quickly using up my savings and will be going into debt. For this reason, I will be re­signing from the NPS this summer."  

"I cannot afford to keep losing finan­cial ground! The costs of living are outdistancing us rapidly, and we're con­stantly afraid of unexpected and un­planned for major expenses that will 'break the camel's back.'"

"If within the year I (do not receive an anticipated promotion), I will, with no reservations, leave the NPS. I never thought I'd say this, but I now realize that my skills and talents, being average, are being squandered in a service that starts people off requiring as much as they do for just one dollar more per hour than a clerk at a (local) McDonald's... being roughly 28% be­hind the civilian pay scale just doesn't cut it anymore. I'm sick and tired of being paid in sunsets. We are each asked to provide exceptional standards of visitor services, and aren't paid even close to what would constitute proper pay..."  

Thirteen of the respondents to the sur­vey were people who had already left the Service. Although the group is statistically small, there is some revealing and relevant information contained in their responses. The thirteen had worked between three and 21 years in the Service, with an average of just under eight and a half years. All but two were GS-7's or lower at the time of their departure; all but two went on the other federal agencies and are now in grades from GS-9 to GS-13. Together, they had accumulated a total of 21,270 training hours within the NPS; assuming a training cost of $50 per hour, that works out to a sum of $1,061,000. Their comments on why they left echo the above passages:

"The foremost (reason for leaving was) the issue of pay... (along with) the costs associated with renting even government-provided housing (con­nected to a rate comparable to local fair market value) and the fact that with my job — including overtime — and my wife's two jobs we were just about breaking even."

"After 10 years with the NPS, an offer of a GS-9 in an area where a big old farm­house can be acquired for under $50,000 tipped the scales."

"The compensation for a GS-3 law en­forcement officer for the NPS was the same as a federal elevator operator."

"Low pay combined with poor quality housing. A person does not expect to become wealthy in the NPS... Nevertheless, you expect to be able to marry, have a child and save towards a home."

"I hope to be back in the NPS some­day, but not as the GS-7 who left after 10 years service. After seeing how the Service reduce rents or provide rental assistance (i.e., law enforcement and emergency services) and resource management skills — are leaving in increasing numbers for positions with higher grades and better career ladders in other federal agencies. Nor is it any secret that other agencies actively recruit from the ranks of National Park Service rangers. Within the NPS, they can find fully trained, qualified and highly motivated employees and avoid incurring the expenses associated with recruiting and training new people:"

"At a recent 40-hour ARPA course I attended, there were three NPS students out of 30. Most of the other students were from BLM, the Forest Service and BIA. 80% of (them) were ex-NPS."

"We are about to lose two more park rangers to OPM to become background investigators. One of these rangers was told in his interview that OPM views the NPS as its 'training' agency. One OPM office currently has ten employees that used to work for the NPS as park rangers. Their journeyman level is now GS-11."

"We have lost seven permanent rangers in the last two years to other agencies. All have left for promotions."

The final question asked in the second survey concerned ways in which compensa­tion and benefit problems ought to be ad­dressed: "What specific actions do you think should be taken to remedy current problems?"

The majority of employees (170 of 268) felt that the compensation issue should be resolved by taking one or all of several approaches, including raising either federal salaries and/or the journeyman grade for rangers, providing cost of living adjustments (COLA's) in urban areas and ensuring that law enforcement and fire qualified rangers receive 20-year retirement benefits. Seasonals also recommended that action be taken to entitle them to within-grade increases and health benefits. A quarter of the responses listed professionalization of the ranger series as a necessary first step toward improving pay and benefits, though there was no clear consens­us as to how this goal should be accom­plished.

Almost half of the respondents (131) said that improvements in the housing situation would help ameliorate rangers' economic burdens. They recommended that the Service reduce rents or provide rental caps in park housing and consider military­like subsidies for non-park rentals. They also advocated construction of park hous­ing in urban areas and improvements in the quality of existing housing.

Here are some of their closing com­ments on the problems the Service faces and the possible courses of action that should be taken:

"Most of the regulations promulgated that affect housing, wages, (and) em­ployee conditions also contain excep­tions, and the agency can pursue changes in regulations. I have seen nothing to lead me to believe the agency itself has taken a strong, positive stand to address the issues that make our housing problems different than (those of) the general government worker, to
make our wages commensurate with our duties, even less take any positive action to affect employee living conditions in a real, positive manner... Either the agency is unwilling to admit that some of these problems are real and serious to us, the employees, or they are not willing to take the political risk necessary to challenge certain rules and regulations that in many cases were not originally written with our situation in mind."

"It's about time that we stand up as a Service and say that we have been providing all this service in the past for the love of the park, but its time they realize that love can only provide for nice parks for so long. We need to have money to run them also. And maybe they will see that the personnel are the ones going without so that the park can survive."

"This agency operates without nearly enough regard for the real needs of its highly motivated work force, and consequently the rate of dissatisfaction is high. We can look across the street at another agency that grades its high school graduate clerical help more highly than a college educated ranger entrusted with resource preservation of America's greatest treasures. It is difficult to remember the ideals you are working toward while having to make a choice between affording a trip to the dentist or a new tire for the car."

"Many managers still feel — and NPS policies reflect the feeling — that employees should count themselves lucky to be working for the NPS and be willing, along with their families, to make any sacrifice that the NPS demands. The NPS cannot continually add more and more duties and responsibilities to its employees with less and less staffing and funding. At some point, the NPS must stand up for its employees and say enough is enough."

"There may be a hundred reasons why (the NPS) can't change current conditions. Those of us still working for the NPS have heard them all. My friends who have left the Service believed they were true and got tired of listening to them. But they knew there were many other agencies and businesses that had more reasonable managerial approaches to employee development and personnel practices. It is time for park manager, regional directors and those in Washington to stop telling those below them why they can't change the situation; it is time for them to go to those above them and tell them why they have to change the situation."

Comparability

It is apparent that in many cases rangers are not being compensated for the work they do, and this truth becomes particularly evident when ranger salaries are compared to those of employees of other agencies who perform similar or comparable work.

Table 1 is taken from the article on ranger pay which appeared in Ranger. It contrasts National Park Service ranger salaries with those of several Federal, state and local agencies. The figures are obtained from a variety of national associations, the January, 1987, issue of the Journal of Emergency Medical Services, the winter, 1987-1988 issue of International Game Warden and the 1987 pay tables from OPM and the United States Park Police. The figures given for state game wardens provide high and low figures for each level by state. Teachers are included because interpretive rangers in the National Park Service have duties that are in many ways akin to those of teachers.

Table 2 is based on a survey conducted by Delaware Water Gap, a national recreation area in western New Jersey and eastern Pennsylvania. The park compared the salaries of its wardens with those of Federal, state and local law enforcement officers in adjacent jurisdictions in those states.

Table 3 is a similar comparison, this time between pay received by National Park Service wardens and the salaries of several state, county and metropolitan police agencies.

Table 4 compares 1988 salary rates for wardens and United States Park Police officers at roughly comparable grades.

Table 5 examines the differences in salaries between wardens and wage board (maintenance) employees in Alaska. Although all employees receive a 25% COLA in Alaska, wage board employees still make a salary much higher than wardens with greater responsibilities and more complex duties.

Table 6 presents a similar comparison of wage board and ranger salaries in seven urban areas in the Lower 48. Table 7 points out another pay-related problem — affordable housing. As can be seen from a sampling of responses regarding rents and quarters, wardens often end up allocating unusually high percentages of their take home pay to rent. Since many housing units within parks have had their rents raised over the last half dozen years, the impact of high rents is a phenomena which is not exclusive to those wardens living outside of parks.

Analysis

We feel that the responses we received to the questionnaires represent only the tip of the iceberg of a very serious problem. The high percentage of responses — about 500 replies out of two mailings to an Association comprised of approximately 1,500 members — show that the problem of low pay received by National Park Service wardens is widespread. Since the survey went only to members and missed both permanent, non-Association wardens and summer seasonals, there is a high probability that many other wardens currently find themselves in similar economic situations.

Table 5

Alaska GS/WB Salary Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Per Hour</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference Per Annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-04</td>
<td>First year seasonal</td>
<td>$ 8.09</td>
<td>+ $5.13</td>
<td>+ $10,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-02</td>
<td>Unskilled laborer</td>
<td>$13.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-05</td>
<td>Experienced seasonal/beginning permanent</td>
<td>$ 9.05</td>
<td>+ $4.99</td>
<td>+ $10,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-03</td>
<td>Skilled laborer</td>
<td>$14.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-09</td>
<td>Supervisory ranger</td>
<td>$13.71</td>
<td>+ $4.23</td>
<td>+ $ 8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-08</td>
<td>Truck driver</td>
<td>$17.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-11</td>
<td>District ranger</td>
<td>$16.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-09</td>
<td>Carpenter/plumber/etc.</td>
<td>$18.67</td>
<td>+ $2.07</td>
<td>+ $ 4,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-10</td>
<td>Equipment operator</td>
<td>$19.40</td>
<td>+ $2.80</td>
<td>+ $ 5,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-08</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>$26.18</td>
<td>+ $9.58</td>
<td>+ $19,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12</td>
<td>Chief ranger</td>
<td>$19.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-08</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>$26.18</td>
<td>+ $6.28</td>
<td>+ $13,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-09</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>$26.89</td>
<td>+ $6.99</td>
<td>+ $14,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-13</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>$23.66</td>
<td>+ $3.23</td>
<td>+ $ 6,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-09</td>
<td>Foreman</td>
<td>$26.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Comparisons are meant to be representatives of roughly comparable levels of responsibility, as no direct correlation of duties is possible.
- Salaries are only shown for entry level steps.
Although respondents to the surveys talked about a number of serious internal problems besides low pay, such as poor management and the increasing bureaucratization of the agency, we have chosen to focus our attention on concerns regarding just compensation because it is the most fundamental and pervasive problem facing the National Park Service today. It has caused profound morale problems in the field and has led to increasing attrition at lower grades. In the past, rangers were able to tolerate low career mobility, inadequate housing and other problems because they were at least somewhat adequately compensated for their work. But that is no longer the case.

We have provided some cursory background information on the reasons for low pay within the National Park Service, but our purpose in compiling these surveys is to seek a resolution of the problem rather than attempt to ascribe blame to individuals, the agency or external forces. While recognizing that some further analysis will be necessary to determine what remedies need to be applied, we feel that we must work together to find ways to correct this situation without further studies or other delays.

Our concern extends beyond immediate economic relief for rangers on the low end of the pay spectrum, however: we feel that the inter-related issues of fair compensation, grade structure, positive education requirements, position management and classification, hiring authority, training and career development also need to be examined. As an agency, we have employed "band-aid" solutions to these complex problems for too many years. While the Association vigorously endorses immediate action to correct pay problems, we feel that a single, comprehensive plan needs to be developed to provide a long-term remedy to the larger problem of creating and maintaining a cadre of highly professional employees to manage the Service in future years.

Space limitations precluded a full compilation of the comments received from the respondents, but they were passionate, articulate and filled with many insightful observations and recommendations. In many cases, they contained pleas for help. A compilation of these will be provided to any interested party. Of even greater significance is the fact that 195 of the permanent employees (88%) and 40 of the seasonal employees (80%) who replied to the second questionnaire indicated their willingness to provide additional information (including names and phone numbers) and testimony if needed. We feel that this fact alone is a singular indicator of the intensity of employee feeling on these inter-related issue.

**Table 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade/Step</th>
<th>Salary Monthly</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-04/05</td>
<td>$15,313</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-05/01</td>
<td>$15,118</td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Less than 100 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-05/01</td>
<td>$15,118</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Spouse works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-05/04</td>
<td>$16,630</td>
<td>$475</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-05/06</td>
<td>$17,638</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Spouse works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-06/03</td>
<td>$17,975</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Spouse works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-07/02</td>
<td>$19,350</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-07/02</td>
<td>$19,350</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-07/03</td>
<td>$19,974</td>
<td>$672</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-09/02</td>
<td>$21,430</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-09/04</td>
<td>$22,812</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-11/02</td>
<td>$28,640</td>
<td>$810</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12/02</td>
<td>$34,325</td>
<td>$925</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-12/03</td>
<td>$35,432</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Per Hour</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Difference Per Annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GS-04</td>
<td>First year seasonal</td>
<td>$6.47</td>
<td>$0.41</td>
<td>$853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-05</td>
<td>Experienced seasonal/</td>
<td>$7.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beginning permanent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-03</td>
<td>Skilled laborer: Boston</td>
<td>$7.27</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$9.23</td>
<td>$1.99</td>
<td>$4,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$8.29</td>
<td>$1.05</td>
<td>$2,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York (upstate)</td>
<td>$7.98</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td>$1,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>$8.42</td>
<td>$1.18</td>
<td>$2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$9.36</td>
<td>$2.12</td>
<td>$4,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$7.44</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>$416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS-09</td>
<td>Supervisory ranger</td>
<td>$10.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-08</td>
<td>Truck driver: Boston</td>
<td>$9.54</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$2,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$11.41</td>
<td>$0.44</td>
<td>$915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$10.83</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York (upstate)</td>
<td>$10.35</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
<td>$1,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>$10.08</td>
<td>$0.89</td>
<td>$1,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$11.92</td>
<td>$0.95</td>
<td>$1,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$10.70</td>
<td>$0.27</td>
<td>$517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG-09</td>
<td>Carpenter/plumber/et al:</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>$0.97</td>
<td>$2,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>$11.83</td>
<td>$0.86</td>
<td>$1,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>$11.25</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>$582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York (upstate)</td>
<td>$10.74</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
<td>$478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>$10.42</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$1,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$12.43</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$3,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$11.25</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>$582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation with Volcker Commission Report

This past spring, the National Commission on the Public Service (known as the Volcker Commission) released its final report, entitled “Leadership for America: Rebuilding the Public Service.” Although several of their findings have a direct bearing on this report, we feel that their comments on pay have particular relevance and need to be quoted at length before proceeding to our own recommendations. Although they principally address white collar professionals within the government, we feel that the “grey collar” ranger profession should also be included in this heading because of its reliance on well-educated and highly trained employees: “The federal government will never be able to pay its employees more than the private sector, nor should it try. However, if government is to recruit from among outstanding college graduates, and build a high-performance workforce, it must be willing to pay reasonably competitive salaries. Government does not have to match private pay dollar-for-dollar in every position, particularly at the highest levels. But if it is to remain a credible career choice, government simply cannot permit the purchasing power of federal pay to decline year after year and the gap between public and private pay for comparable jobs to widen... financial sacrifice as price of a government job is both difficult to absorb and to justify. More important, if government is to fill these key civil service jobs... with qualified employees, it must stay at or close to at least average levels of pay offered by other employers.

“Unfortunately, after a decade of budget cuts and pay freezes, salaries of most federal employees are clearly lagging behind the private sector. According to the most recent survey conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the gap on average, nationwide is 22 percent. Whether or not that figure accurately captures the differential for particular jobs and areas, there is no doubt that the pay gap has become a disincentive in both recruiting and retaining a high-performance work force. Many young Americans feel they can no longer afford to take a government job, while many civil servants can no longer ignore the call of private pay. If this trend continues, the result could be mediocrity in carrying out the essential tasks of government.

“The Commission believes the President and Congress must give a higher budget priority to civil service pay. It is important to recognize, however, that it is no longer appropriate or workable to use a national average to establish an appropriate level of pay. The world of work has changed too much to use such a broad approach... The Commission concludes that the current goal of national pay comparability is unworkable. It recommends instead a pay-setting system that recognizes the fact that public employees live and work in localities characterized by widely different living costs and labor market pressures, and adjusts compensation upward accordingly. Under such a system, federal employees would continue to receive the same base pay for the same job, but in large areas of the country many would also receive an allowance designed to compensate for higher living costs and labor competition. In addition, the Commission believes that the present ability to pay special pay rates for occupations where there are shortages or strong competitive pressures from the private sector should be extended and broadened.”

The Association concurs with the Commission’s finding regarding pay with one qualification. The report later recommends that “a substantial portion of the cost (of pay increases) can and should be absorbed through existing personnel accounts, whether through targeted reductions in employment or the elimination of programs that no longer serve essential public need.” Since the National Park Service has increased dramatically in size in the past decade but has had no comparable gain in ranger staffing or overall budgets, we feel that the Service should be provided with the necessary supplemental funding to underwrite the needed pay increases. The agency has functioned on too little for too long a time, and further drains on current allocations would do serious harm to the management of the parks, including additional reductions in permanent and seasonal staffing.

Recommendations

The Association of National Park Rangers recommends that the following actions be taken to alleviate the problem of economic hardship within the ranks of National Park Service rangers. We are prepared to assist in any way possible in achieving the following objectives:

Continued on page 23
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Law Enforcement and Firefighter Retirement: A Brief History
Loren Casebeer

With increasing interest, a number of National Park Service rangers and others are assessing their eligibility under the laws governing federal law enforcement officers and firefighter retirement. Not surprisingly, the "grapevine" and other informal communications systems have served to inform — and occasionally misinform — employees about what the law actually says. The following article contains information from a variety of sources on this subject. Where information is quoted, the quotes are direct, though occasionally the tense has been changed to make the readability easier. The substance of the quote, however, has not been changed. Footnotes are provided to direct the reader to the source in the event credibility is an issue or readers desire to review the original material in greater detail.

The history of law enforcement retirement programs began with the passage of Public Law 80-168 (July 11, 1947), which provided for retirement for FBI agents at age 50 after 20 years of service, with an annuity computation of two percent of average salary. The following year, Public Law 80-879 (July 2, 1948) extended the same provision to officers and employees whose duties "are primarily the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States." Public Law 92-382 (August 14, 1972) accorded the same liberalized retirement benefits to firefighters.

Law enforcement and firefighter retirement, as we know it today, was born as House of Representatives Report #9281 (HR 9281). On September 23, 1973, it was introduced to the House by Congressman Thaddeus J. Dulski of New York. The bill was introduced, debated, and passed by the House (by a vote of 299 to 93) on the same day.

It was nine months before HR 9281 was considered by the Senate. On June 24, 1974, Senator Mike Mansfield introduced Senate Report 93-948 which adopted most of the provisions of HR 9281. The Senate version of HR 9281 made several minor technical changes which altered the format of the United States Code, but very little of the actual substance was changed. The Senate version delayed two dates in the original bill by one year in order to accommodate the nine month delay HR 9281 encountered on its travel to the Senate. SR 93-348 was introduced and passed by the Senate on the same day. According to the record, the bill was never subjected to debate in the Senate, and passed on an unrecorded voice vote.

The slightly modified Senate bill then returned to the House, and was passed by a voice vote on June 28, 1974, thus becoming Public Law 93-350. The President signed P.L. 93-350 on July 12, 1974.

PL 93-350 is codified at Title 5 United States Code, Section 8336(c), and is often referred to as simply "6c". For purposes of this article, the use of "6c" is intended to mean the full legal citation, i.e., 6 USC 8336(c). Let's look at some of the facts, legislative history and congressional intentions that lead to 6c retirement.

By 1973 both federal law enforcement officers and firefighters were covered under enhanced retirement provisions, so what was the purpose of PL 93-350? The legislative history provides some clarification:

"These liberalized provisions, while initially effective, have proven to be less so as the gap between law-enforcement officers' and firefighters' retirement provisions and those for Federal employees in general has slowly diminished. HR 9281 carried out the historic Congressional intent by improving the preference initially given law-enforcement officers so as to restore the viability of the concept that it should be economically feasible for employees in those occupations to retire at age 50."

Back in 1948, a retirement computation using a two percent multiplier for each year of service was quite a bonus for affected employees, as general schedule federal employee retirement was computed at less than two percent annually. The new differential favoring law enforcement officers and firefighters was specifically intended by Congress (but more on that later). To most readers, a fraction of one percent annual difference would not seem to have much impact on a worker's eventual retirement, but look again! The effects are cumulative, and that is where the significance becomes apparent.

General schedule employee retirement benefits got better and better over the years, but the flat 2 percent multiplier for law-enforcement employees remained the same. The differential had diminished from 33 percent to only 7 percent after 30 years of service. The net effect was that "the retirement provisions for Federal law-enforcement officers lagged farther and farther behind those provisions for the law-enforcement officers of State, county, and municipalities." Even among other federal officers, the retirement benefits of 6c employees were falling behind. Firefighters and law enforcement officers in the District of Columbia, for instance, had "extremely favorable" retirement provisions even though their conditions of employment were similar to those of employees covered under HR 9281. These benefits had come with Public Law 91-509 in 1970, which covered the city's police and fire departments, the Executive Protection Service, the Park Police and certain contingents of the Secret Service.

The retirement package found in PL 91-509 provided for retirement on an immediate annuity after 20 years of service, regardless of age, and employed a salary multiplier based on the salary at time of retirement rather than a high three-year average. The annuity was to be computed by multiplying two and a half percent times the first 20 years and three percent for all years over 20. Other benefits were also offered under this law which will not be discussed in this article.

PL 93-350 did not change eligibility requirements for coverage under the enhanced retirement, but it did increase 6c employee benefits:

"The Committee has concluded it is becoming less and less economically feasible for a Federal law enforcement official or firefighter to retire in his early fifties at the present rate of computation. HR 9281 raises the multiplier to 2.5 percent for the first 20 years, plus 2 percent for the years exceeding 20, thus encouraging retirement after 20 years of service and making it less worthwhile to continue working after that time."

PL 93-350 made another vital change for employees covered by 6c retirement. For those employees who were receiving "administratively uncontrollable overtime" (most agencies call this AUO), the law encluded AUO in their retirement earnings. For many 6c personnel, that means that up to 25 percent of their annual salary may be added to both their paycheck and their "high three" for retirement purposes.

Let's look at the rationale Congress used in determining that enhanced retirement was both desirable and necessary for federal law enforcement officers and firefighters.

When he introduced HR 9281 on the floor of the Congress of the United States, Congressman Dulski was quite clear on its intent:

"Madam Chairman, I rise in support of HR 9281, which is designed to more effectively attain the objective for which preferential retirement was originally accorded Federal law enforcement per-
sonnel, and more recently, firefighting personnel. That is, to maintain a staff of relatively young and vigorous men capable of carrying out the Government's criminal law enforcement and firefighting functions by the replacement of older men who, because of the stringent physical requirements of their positions and the unusual mental, emotional, and physical stresses encountered in performing their duties, are no longer able to perform at peak efficiency.

Congressman Dulski then enlarged upon the purposes of HR 9281:

"First, to assist in maintaining a relatively young, vibrant, and effective work force in the Federal law enforcement agencies and the Federal firefighters. To achieve this we must make it economically feasible for them to retire at an early age. Second, to make the recruitment programs for these agencies competitive with local law enforcement and firefighter agencies. While the intent of the legislation is not to reward our law enforcement officers and firefighters for performing their dangerous duties, but rather in recognition of the everyday psychological stress they must endure, it is a fact that these public servants do suffer fatalities and serious injuries during the course of daily activities."  

Congressman Dulski went on to brief Congress on a variety of assaults on various federal law enforcement officers that occurred during the first six months of 1973. He described several assaults on FBI agents, and presented assault statistics on a variety of other federal officers. Among these were corrections officers of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and patrol agents of the U.S. Border Patrol, the U.S. Marshall Service, the U.S. Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Forest Service.

It has been suggested that inclusion of the "U.S. Park Service" in the assault statistics actually meant the United States Park Police (USPP) but Congressman Dulski specifically mentioned the USPP later in his presentation before the Congress. Since the USPP retirement system had already been authorized by the President in 1970, there would be little point in using USPP statistics to substantiate changes in 6c retirement. Thus, when he referred to "U.S. Park Service," there should be little doubt he meant the only other law enforcement officers of the National Park Service, i.e. the park rangers. In addition, it is unlikely that Congressman Dulski would seek to prove the need for 6c retirement changes using statistics from federal law enforcement officers who would not themselves qualify for the proposed benefits.

In justifying enhanced retirement, Congress looked at benefits offered by local police and fire agencies. Examples were cited of the benefit package provided to policemen and patrolmen of the New York City Police Department. Note the use of the words policeman and patrolman.

Congress used policeman and patrolman jobs to justify their proposal. At no time during the debate was any specific attention given to investigators, detectives, or other specialties in law enforcement. Congress referred to federal law enforcement officers in the same way it referred to federal firefighters. They debated in terms of personnel who enforced the criminal law (or fought fire . . .), not in esoteric terms or specializations among investigators, detectives, or other specialists involved in police service. They used a common, understandable approach to who was a law enforcement officer.

Did Congress intend that 6c retirement would be a benefit provided to a select group of federal officers? Not according to the record. On numerous occasions, Congress stated that they intended to cover 56,000 officers under the enhanced retirement provisions. Note the number 56,000 and the year — 1973. The number is both sizeable and quite specific in terms of how many officers were intended for coverage in 1973.

The tone of 6c was generally liberal regarding who was to be covered; however, Congress clearly set one group of employees outside 6c eligibility. Proponents of the HR 9281 were asked if the provisions would include the "... guards of GSA buildings." New York's Congressman Brasco stated that:

"The generic definition covers those who are involved in criminal investigations, apprehension, or detention of criminals. Therefore, the building guards would not be covered."

During the debate, Congressman Brasco was again clear when he presented examples of positions he lumped into the category of federal law enforcement officer:

"Would the gentleman not agree with me that particularly, in most of our efforts where there is concerted action between the Federal law enforcement officer, FBI, police, and dangerous drug and narcotic police, with the local police department on the same raid, going in there for the same criminals, where they are doing the same job, but the inequities in terms of retirement and other benefits are so different, is that not a reason (to approve the retirement changes)??"

Clearly, Congress did not intend to disallow (from 6c retirement) personnel who were in fact doing federal criminal enforcement work as a primary part of their job simply because they fell outside the bureaucratic guidelines of a particular position or job series. To put it another way, the essential point is what work the employee does primarily, rather than how his/her position is classified, the general
objective or goals of the employing agency, or the level to which a position is graded.

Law enforcement is law enforcement. It involves the investigation or apprehension or detention of persons suspected of, or convicted of, violations of federal criminal laws. Every single law enforcement officer, regardless of department or jurisdiction must be dedicated to the maintenance of law and order and the protection of life and property, lest he or she fail to meet the fundamental responsibilities of the profession.

Congress recognized that particular challenges, stressors, and dangers set federal law enforcement careers apart from more customary forms of civil service. With these realities in mind, our legislators decided that a preferential retirement system was necessary to permit federal officers to retire at age 50. The country needed a cadre of young, vigorous federal officers to meet the demands of federal law enforcement. In addition, preferential retirement would permit — even encourage — older officers to retire, thereby making room for younger officers to take their places.

Congress compared the challenges, dangers, and benefits of federal law enforcement with police officers from municipal, county, and state police agencies. Congress did not intend, nor did it attempt, to differentiate among detectives, patrolmen, or corrections officers; they were all federal law enforcers in the congressional view. Who was (or was not ... ) carrying the true torch of law enforcement was not an issue until retirement administration began adding up the new program costs.

The criteria for preferential retirement excluded a few groups, i.e. federal security officers and building guards. Even considering these exclusions, Congress generously extended the benefits to 56,000 officers and firefighters (1973 figures). The Civil Service Commission (CSC) and later the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) "... opposed virtually every major feature ..." of the preferential retirement, for a variety of reasons. 16

CSC/OPM's reaction to the bill was characterized by strong opposition based largely on fiscal considerations. The agency even hinted that Congress' proposal might be fiscally irresponsible. 17 Congress carefully considered CSC/OPM's objections, and passed the legislation without significant modification twelve days later.

OPM has managed employee participation in 6c retirement with noticeable restraint over the years. OPM's reluctance to include qualified employees under 6c coverage is visible in several areas:

(1) There is a significant discrepancy between the 93rd Congress' definition of a federal law enforcement officer in Public Law 93-350 and the definition used by OPM in 5 CFR 831.902. The 93rd Congress stated that:

"... Law enforcement officer means an employee the duties of whose position are primarily the investigation, apprehension, or detention of individuals suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States, including an employee engaged in this activity who is transferred to a supervisory or administrative position."

The Office of Personnel Management's 1983 definition of a law enforcement officer [5 CFR 831.903 (a)] stated:

"Law enforcement officer includes 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. Law enforcement officer does not include an employee in a position the primary and regular duties of which involve maintaining law and order, protecting life and property ... or whose duties occasionally require ... investigation, apprehension, or detention."

In 1987, the OPM definition in 5 CFR 831.902 stated:"

"Law enforcement officer means an employee, the duties of whose position are primarily the investigation, apprehension, or detention of individuals suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States, including an employee engaged in this activity who is transferred to a supervisory or administrative position."

(2) Agencies not specifically mentioned in the legislation often have difficulty obtaining coverage for enforcement personnel. Unless their officers are classified within the 1800 classification family such as the 1800 series (criminal investigator) or the 1896 series (Border Patrol agent) — the process becomes even more difficult. Likewise, if a position is classified in the 1800 classification family and, notably, those classified 1811), the prospects soar for receiving OPM credit for 6c retirement purposes. Simply put, there is nothing in the law giving 6c retirement credit only to 1800 classification family employees, though the practice appears common at OPM.

(3) This reluctance is readily visible in the number of personnel receiving 6c retirement. In 1973 Congress expected 56,000 federal officers and firefighters to benefit from the legislation. Of this total, the legislative history for PL 93-350 only records 41,700 officers and firefighters whose agencies were specifically named in 6c legislation. Against the documented intent of Congress, 14,300 Federal officers and firefighters have been excluded, purposefully or by accident, from 6c benefits because the individuals (or their agencies) were not specifically named by Congress. Given the difficulty agencies and individuals encounter obtaining 6c coverage, a case can be made showing OPM may have limited the coverage inappropriately. Simply put: Unless an employee works for an agency specifically articulated in the legislation, or the employee is classified in the 1811 (or related) series, the changes that OPM will approve their coverage as a law enforcement officer is slim.

(4) A continuation of OPM's restrictive interpretation is seen in the number of employees currently covered under 6c retirement benefits. The 93rd Congress expected 56,000 federal officers and firefighters would be covered under its legislation. The retirement provisions have never covered 56,000 employee, even fourteen years after Congress passed the legislation. GAO Report Number B-233343 (February 2, 1989) "... found that as of June 30, 1987, 44,646 employees were covered by law enforcement retirement benefits, an increase of 34 percent since December 1982." (emphasis added) 18

OPM seems to have taken the position that unless an employee works for an enforcement agency, or is classified in one of the chosen series, the employee cannot be a primary federal law enforcement officer for purposes of 6c. The practice is unreasonable. Objectivity suggests the criterion for 6c is found in the activities performed on the job, not the classification
series or the fundamental responsibility of the employing agency. For example, the National Park Service is not primarily a law enforcement agency, yet many NPS rangers are fundamentally (primarily) utilized as federal law enforcement officers.

In OPM's zeal to save public funds, it has over-regulated the 6c eligibility requirements for employees actively engaged in the police/patrol (arrest) function of federal law enforcement. There is faulty logic not covering personnel who are required to respond to overt, in-progress, hazardous, criminal law enforcement incidents, yet at the same time giving 6c coverage to investigators who may respond to the same incident an hour, day, or week after the fact. By analogy and using pure OPM logic, firefighters responding “Code 3” to a fire who enter a smoke filled building or maneuver a fire hose amid the blaze would not be covered. At the same time, OPM policy would cover the arson investigator who arrive the next day to sift through the charred remains after the fire was extinguished and many of the overt dangers and physical demands were no longer present. OPM logic is faulty — thus, the implementation policy is weak.

Even the OPM coverage standards are inconsistent. Firefighters are covered regardless of their primary firefighting activity. They are covered if actively engaged in pre-suppression activities, actual fire suppression, or after-the-fact fire investigation. Conversely, law enforcement officers are virtually limited to the investigative phase of enforcement (the 1800 classification family) in order to be covered. It would appear OPM has figured out what is versus who-is-versus-who-is-not a federal law enforcement officer, complicated by a fundamental economic desire to save public funds, OPM has administered federal law enforcement/firefighter Retirement with greater restraint than Congress intended.

Footnotes
3 Congressional Record — U.S. Senate. Volume 120, part 16. (June 24, 1974) page 20727.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid., page 3700 - 3701.
12 Ibid., page 30590.
13 Ibid., page 30592.
14 Ibid., page 30594.
15 Ibid.

Notice

The Association of National Park Rangers, in conjunction with the law firm of Skinner, Fawcett and Mauk, has developed a comprehensive guideline for preparing law enforcement/firefighter retirement packages in compliance with Office of Personnel Management regulations before the September 30, 1989 deadline for filing such applications. Copies of these guidelines are available for sale from your regional representative or from Rick Gale, president of ANPR.

ANPR is asking that you calculate the difference between your projected annuity with the enhancement of law enforcement/firefighter provisions and the same retirement under a standard CSRS/FERS package. We ask that you then compare the equivalent of one month's difference between the two as the price of the guidelines. This monthly difference works out to about $300 to $400 for most people, and is one of the better investments you can make with your money.

If you have doubts about spending that kind of money for this package, contact Rick Gale and he'll provide you with further details.
Managing Threats

"Threats management" is a major service initiative formulated to preserve the resources that we "rangers" were entrusted with by the Organic Act of 1916. Everglades ecosystem have been recognized as an International Biosphere Reserve, a World Heritage Site, and as a Wetland of International Importance. Everglades National Park, identified as one of the ten most threatened national parks in the System, is, indeed, an excellent academy for our present and future National Park Service managers, and was selected as the on-site case study for the NPS training course "Planning Beyond Park Boundaries" attended by a cross-section of park managers recently.

Everglades rangers recognize that a proactive approach to management of National Park System units is required if they are to survive. The Organic Act of 1916, each area's legislative history, the Wilderness Act, the Redwoods Act, the Endangered Species Act, and other legislation provide the legal foundation from which a manager can make a stand on resource threat issues. No longer can management involvement be limited to attending monthly civic organization meetings. Proactive management today means awareness and involvement in city, county, and state development and planning. Familiarity with state and local politics and strong local contacts help build park allies in times of need.

Individual ranger involvement provides additional management support through its programs of interpretation, visitor protection, resources management, and research. Managers must use these professional resources as tools to build and maintain an awareness of what is happening now, and what may happen tomorrow, next year, and in the coming decades. Unlike the defensive management strategies of the past, a proactive threats manager finds it easier to stop or divert a bucket of water at its source before it's spilled rather than trying to stop the water after it's fallen ten feet.

At Everglades, rangers at all levels are active participants in external threats awareness programs. Drug interdiction activities, for example, not only assist protection rangers in identifying and intercepting drug shipments entering south Florida through the park, but also provide a networking relationship with state, county, and Federal government organizations and special interest groups to address other threats, such as commercial fishing violations. Through aggressive interpretation, rangers integrate the park's external threats theme into public presentations and environmental education programs presented to school groups throughout south Florida.

By performing aggressive marine and air surveillance and maintaining the drug interdiction contacts, Gulf Coast District Ranger Kevin Fitzgerald has drastically reduced drug activities through the district. A recent court judgement resulting from the seizure of a commercial fishing boat operating in the park cost the owner not only a heavy fine, but awarded the park the dollar value of the illegal catch. The waters of the park function as a major hatchery for many species of fish, and this arrest and seizure played an important role in the protection of future fish populations while sending a clear message to the commercial fishing community.

Flamingo District Ranger Hunter Sharp also faces drug enforcement problems inherent to extensive, under-developed wilderness coastline, but in an entirely different atmosphere. Flamingo,
Positioned at the end of the park’s 38-mile road, is the center of visitor activities, with the primary park concessioner operating an extensive resort complex. Visitor use frequently conflicts and threatens resources. Search and rescue efforts are focused on marine backcountry use in a hostile mangrove wilderness where engine breakdowns, lack of fuel, capricious weather, physical exhaustion, and just plain loss of direction account for many hours of search. In a recent event, an engine room fire broke out in a concession tour boat and threatened the passengers and crew, but the potential for a fuel spill into the pristine waters of Florida Bay was also an urgent concern. flamingo rangers responded, safely removed the passengers, extinguished the fire, and took necessary action to keep the vessel stabilized and afloat in exceptionally rough seas until the Coast Guard arrived with a boat large enough to provide tow service to port.

The endangered manatee frequents park waters, especially during the winter. Rangers located one of these gentle, slow-moving animals which had been injured when struck by a motorboat. The manatee was captured and its condition carefully monitored until it could be relocated to a wildlife rehabilitation center to recover; when struck by a motorboat. The manatee causes. As the seagrass provides a vital link to the ecosystem, the manatee serves as a vital link to the ecosystem.

Rangers are struggling with management issues which will address the need to protect endangered species, such as manatee and crocodile, from harmful interaction with boats while still allowing visitor access to more than 500,000 acres of marine wilderness.

Eastern Florida Bay is patrolled by Key Largo District Rangers Linda Cramer and Dave Vecera, who provide assistance to visitors and protection to the many tiny islands, or keys, most of which are protected refuges for nesting birds such as white and brown pelicans, roseate spoonbills, ospreys, and bald eagles. Their frequent observations of the marine environment provided early reports of areas in the bay where seagrasses appeared to be dying. Subsequent investigations by park researchers confirmed that such a die-off is occurring, and experts in marine environments have begun work to determine the causes. As the seagrass provides a vital link in the fishery food chain, an extensive die-off could affect all the species of marine organisms in Florida Bay.

Pine Island District Ranger Ken Garvin manages the area that abuts the urban sprawl and agricultural problems of metropolitan Dade County. Water management practices and intensive chemical use on adjacent farmlands are major threat issues.

The rangers in this district coordinate efforts with state regulatory agencies to monitor and control these illegal activities, which include plowing land without permits, hunting, dumping, and burning of plastics and rubber. For the last year, Ken has worked closely with the East Everglades Acquisition task force as they developed their recommendations for expanding the park’s boundaries. His research, analysis, and mapping of the area contributed significantly to the completion of their report, which was enthusiastically endorsed by Florida’s Governor Martinez, and legislation to authorize the addition of more than 100,000 acres along the eastern boundary has been introduced in this session of Congress.

Recently, a private aircraft crashed in this district. Once the pilot was safely rescued, all efforts were directed to protecting park resources from leaking fuel. Rangers and mechanics acted quickly to prevent environmental damage from the crash site, which was very close to wood-stork rookeries and Cape Sable sparrow nesting habitat. The aircraft was removed without further damage to the resource.

Cooperative efforts with other agencies play a significant role in averting park threats. Extremely dry weather and long-range weather forecasts indicated that a wildland fire eight miles outside the park had every likelihood of running into the park. As trainees, Pine Island Subdistrict Ranger Mark Lewis and Kevin Fitzgerald served as incident commanders, ordering resources, providing guidance, and operating an ICS unified command with Florida Division of Forestry units. The aggressive, timely, and effective response to this threat stopped the fire some four miles from potential disaster.

Aggressive threats management will continue to play an important role in the success or failure of Everglades National Park. From water management issues which require the attention of the top echelon of National Park Service officials, to the field ranger who stops the dumping of toxic materials — all are focused on the ultimate effect on the park.

Protecting the Ecosystem

Ecosystem management was identified as critical to Everglades National Park resources before the concept achieved widespread acknowledgement. The earliest park supporters envisioned a protected area which roughly encompassed the entire southern tip of Florida, excluding only the developed east and west coastal fringes, which, in the 1930's, were only a hint of what was to come in the next five decades. These dedicated conservationists had, in fact, quite effectively identified the terminus of the Everglades system.

When the park was finally established in 1947, however, bits and pieces had been withdrawn and excluded, and the authorized boundary followed neither geographical nor ecological lines — it zigged and zagged to satisfy political compromises and private interests, following illogical but legally definable metes and bounds.

The first visible indications of short-sightedness came during the droughts of the 1960’s, when construction of the state’s water management system cut off all water flow from the north. The Congress responded with legislation guaranteeing minimum water deliveries to the park.

In the early 1970’s, the park was faced with the spectre of an international jetport, with attendant residential and commercial support development for one million people, just north of its boundaries. Congress again reacted and established Big Cypress National Preserve to stop development and protect the watershed.

By the mid-1980’s, the National Park Service had responsibility for management of almost two million acres of Everglades habitat; yet scientific data continued to mount that the natural resources were suffering. Wildlife populations, particularly wading bird species, had declined dramatically — a condition biologists linked to alterations of water and regime and loss of habitat.

When Superintendent Mike Finley arrived at Everglades from Alaska in 1986, he was no stranger to south Florida issues, having worked on the special regulations for Everglades and Big Cypress several years earlier in Washington. But many of the management decisions of the past had to be readdressed, while new ones developed almost daily.

The pollution of the Everglades drainage system with nutrient build-up from agriculture and dairy practices currently threatens the collapse of Lake Okeechobee and ultimately Everglades National Park. Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge already is losing natural marsh habitat to a monoculture of cattails at a rate of four acres per day.

The buffer zone concept envisioned by various state study groups is not working in the East Everglades; zoning variances are granted regularly as development marches ever westward. The farmers’ demands for manipulation of water levels to their benefit, together with residents’ concern for protection of property, counters park efforts to restore traditional water flow.

A new well field is needed to insure future potable water supplies for the Miami area, and the preferred location is in the undeveloped east Everglades adjacent to the park’s boundary; however, hydrologists recognize that this practice would draw water out of the park, causing further loss of both surface water and the critical marsh characteristics of the northeast Shark River Slough.

The United States Air Force needs a military operations area (MOA) — airspace...
set aside exclusively for military jet fighters to train pilots for low-level, sub-sonic attack maneuvers — and has proposed that it be established over Everglades National Park.

How can a superintendent be expected to fulfill his mandated responsibility to preserve and protect a natural area “unimpaired for future generations” when faced with such a barrage of threats? It certainly can’t be done from the safety of headquarters after the damage is done. Even if the headquarters is at the top of an ecosystem over which you have control, that attitude is insular and dangerous.

For Everglades, it has required staggering research efforts to determine just what constitutes this unique ecosystem: How far does it extend? What does it require to function? Then the management questions begin: What management actions can be effected within the park? What must others do to correct current and future deficiencies? Who can help?

Using Congressional reports, legislated mandates, and existing law as its authority, the park has actively extended its involvement to local, county, and state agencies responsible for south Florida planning and management, concentrating on water-related issues. There are those who maintain that the superintendent has moved from managing to meddling in areas outside his jurisdiction. Superintendent Finley argues that he is simply doing the job he was hired to do — protecting a national treasure. The enabling legislation mandates “preservation intact” of the “primitive natural conditions.” He has no latitude to pick and choose which elements to protect; he cannot assign one resource priority over another; he must not manipulate the system to benefit a particular species; he cannot permit or allow any practice in derogation of park values.

This approach has had a profound impact both on the local perception of park managers and the park’s relationships with government agencies and special interest groups. To reinforce the understanding of the park’s mission, all levels of management have joined the interpretive staff in scheduling off-site presentations focusing on park issues and threats and developing an educated and supportive constituency. From those who are understandably in an adversarial role, there is the acceptance that when the superintendent acts, it is an extension of and consistent with the law of the land, based on the best scientific data available.

Scientists from the South Florida Research Center participate in countless meetings, hearings, and workshops, discussing the environmental problems facing the park. There is a growing awareness of the correlation these conditions have with the quality of life for the general population. The lawsuit filed by the U.S. Attorney charging state regulatory agencies with failure to enforce water quality standards for the Everglades has dramatically focused public attention on the issue of pollution in south Florida. It is also awakening the realization that ecosystem management is an approach that must be given far wider application than just for protected natural areas.

While Everglades National Park is, perhaps, unique with respect to its total dependence for survival on a water supply with is managed and manipulated through half the length of the state, the nature of its problems with external threats is mirrored in every region and community throughout the nation. Our global environment is a composite in which changes in components alter the whole. We are only beginning to comprehend how subtle yet extensive these adaptations can be. Everglades is a bellwether which amply demonstrates the need to go beyond our boundaries in order to protect and preserve what is within.

Opportunity Interpretation

The interpreter scans the Everglades horizon. A quick glance absorbs the big picture. Whether from “lofty” Rock Reef Pass (elevation one meter) or the edge of Florida Bay, the landscape is conspicuously flat. Sensing that visitors have a tendency to associate flat with ordinary, the interpreter blinks and focuses on how to make this subtle subtropical ecosystem extraordinary.

The mind works overtime conjuring up a kaleidoscope of possibilities. Memory recalls simple truth in Emerson’s quote: “... the eye is the first circle; the horizon which it forms is the second; and throughout nature this primary figure is repeated without end. It is the highest emblem in the cipher of the world ...” Maybe simple to interpreters who enjoy the works of Emerson; maybe not for John Q. Visitor. Save the thought, but a more basic approach is required.

Turning to the magical bag of tricks, the interpreter spies a crumpled 3x5 card. In an instant he is transported to another part of the world as he reads: “Why is it when faced with something we don’t fully understand, our first impulse is to measure its dimensions with our minds, the scientific imperative?” Could this be basic enough? Can flat have dimensions? Then he remembers that visitors to the desert...
horizon. Plumbing, something else appears on the mentioned. And just as the visitor imagines acres have been reduced to a single alligator focus in on the subterranean limestone — information about the critical issue of how big do alligators grow. The records of 17-footers in Florida and 19-footers in South Florida environment and I've gotten a new respect for the Everglades now that I have visited them!".

Regardless of our title or position description, we all, like Jennifer, share a common respect. Everglades National Park is fighting for its life. Interpreters are on the cutting edge, as the stage is set for the battle. Former NPS Director Newton Drury summed up the hazards of incremental degradation of park resources in his statement: "If we are going to succeed in preserving the greatness of the National Parks, they must be held inviolate. They represent the last great stands of primitive America. If we are going to whistle away at them, should we recognize at the very beginning that such whittlings are cumulative, and the end result will be mediocrity".

Ignored critical issues are "whittlings."

Southwest did not think so until someone helped with a measuring device. Enter the interpreter.

It seems that two people stood side by side and surveyed another type of horizon, one of seemingly endless miles of desert. One observer, perhaps like an Everglades visitor, saw a tedious repetition of the same thing. The other observer was the old man of the desert and he was something entirely different. True to that first impulse, the old man was asked if he knew how big the desert was and he said he thought he did. He said that "the desert was as large as the architecture of thought and as small as the universe within the eye of its smallest living thing". Then he was asked what he could teach of the desert. He said he wasn't sure, but as they watched the shadow of wings sweep a canyon wall he did say this, "If you touch the desert with the tips of your mind, see it out of the corner of your heart, if you look deep within the desert's eye, you will learn all there is of joy and sorrow and what it means to be alive". Now there is "three-dimensional flat!":

Jarred by this revelation and armed with research on every possible Everglades subject, the interpreter set out along the Anhinga Trail just daring visitors to think ordinary. Throughout the park, similar preparations were being made. As the busy winter schedule fell into place, camping visitors could enjoy almost eighty programs during their two week stay. Yes, they ask how big do alligators grow. The records of 17-footers in Florida and 19-footers in Louisiana satisfied their curiosity.

But opportunity knocked with every question. Opportunities to weave important information into answers to questions — information about the critical issue of water and its distribution, timing, quality, and quantity. How it affects not only the alligator, but all species that rely on it for survival. Included are many on the endangered list, and the successful return of the alligator from near extinction leads to yet other discussions. The "teachable moment" has been seized. The 1.4 million acres have been reduced to a single alligator cruising so close that distance is not even mentioned. And just as the visitor imagines the underwater world of the gator hole and focuses in on the subterranean limestone plumbing, something else appears on the horizon.

As many as four low-flying F-16's on their almost daily approach to Homestead Air Force Base drown out the interpreter. Attention is abruptly yanked from the depths of the water to atmospheric intrusions. So much for "subtle subtropical ecosystem". The interpreter's response is not subtle either. But rather than express indignation, another opportunity to address critical issues is captured as it happens. Through regular updates and management encouragement, critical issues are openly discussed. Additional encouragement comes from visitors such as 12-year-old Jennifer Solomon, who wrote this after her visit to Hidden Lake Interpretive Center: "The Florida wetland is important to our South Florida environment and I've gotten a new respect for the Everglades now that I have visited them!".

1) Cost of living adjustments (COLA's) of at least 25% should be instituted without further delay in a number of major metropolitan areas, including (but not limited to) the following cities and their environs: Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Richmond, Cleveland, Atlanta, New Orleans, Chicago, St. Louis, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. The Virgin Islands and south Florida should also be included.

2) A housing allowance system similar to the one employed by the military should be instituted. Employees required to live in government quarters should not be charged rent; those living outside the park should receive a housing allowance appropriate for the area. Military allowance systems should be examined to determine how such allowances are calculated. As an alternative, we recommend that rents for employees required to live in government quarters be set at a level no higher than 20% of the employee's base salary. Employees living outside the park should receive an allowance to cover any housing costs in excess of 20% of the employee's base salary.

3) The grade structure of the 025 series should be examined and revised upward, with GS-7 being the minimum grade other than in training level positions. Non-ranger positions would be reclassified out of the series.

4) A task force comprised of managers, personnel specialists, and field employees should be assembled to develop a comprehensive personnel management plan for the future of the ranger profession. The task force should be required to produce an explicit action plan within a specified period of time.

5) A positive education requirement for new ranger should be established which will require a degree in fields associated with natural or cultural sciences.
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Looking Back

Ernest Britten: Best of the Breed
John Henneberger

Even before the Park Service was officially created in 1916, rangers were at work in the parks, patrolling the backcountry, greeting visitors and caring for the parks. Although much of their work was inglorious and mundane, they laid the groundwork for the ranger profession for years to come.

One of the earliest of these rangers was Ernest Britten, who worked in General Grant and Sequoia National Parks from 1898 to 1903. His record of performance stands out above all others who worked the parks in their formative years, as the Department of Interior wrestled fitfully to provide for their management and protection.

Britten's story is rather involved, for it involves both the military and several offices within the Department. He worked with all of them during this period, when agencies' roles were being clarified and duties were being defined. In order to put his position in perspective, his first necessary to talk a bit about the Army's role in the parks.

The U.S. Army was assigned the chief protection role in the parks in 1890. This was a continuation of the practice begun in Yellowstone in 1886 after civilian administration and protection had failed there. Prior to 1886, the Yellowstone protection force of assistant superintendents, the equivalent of a ranger force, were for the most part ineffective, though they were greatly hampered by political interference, lack of funds, and failure by Congress to give them legislative backup in the form of necessary to talk a bit about the Army's role in the parks.

The U.S. Army was assigned the chief protection role in the parks in 1890. This was a continuation of the practice begun in Yellowstone in 1886 after civilian administration and protection had failed there. Prior to 1886, the Yellowstone protection force of assistant superintendents, the equivalent of a ranger force, were for the most part ineffective, though they were greatly hampered by political interference, lack of funds, and failure by Congress to give them legislative backup in the form of necessary to talk a bit about the Army's role in the parks.

Sheep trespass was their primary concern. The most the cavalry could do was expel the illegal grazers, who would return as soon as the patrols went to another part of the park, or simply wait for the Army to leave in the fall when they returned to the Presidio for the winter.

The Army initially relied on the heavy Sierra snow pack to protect the parks during the winter. Occasionally, the Department dispatched special timber agents from a nearby General Land Office (GLO) to Sequoia to check on stock trespass and illegal timber cutting. The "agent" was the principal protection arm of the federal government in fighting timber trespass on public lands. Agents were first used at the beginning of the 19th century on naval live oak and public domain lands. By 1890's they were becoming a somewhat credible force in the field to protect public forest lands.

When the Army informed Interior in 1898 that they would not be able to dispatch cavalry units to the California parks due to the Spanish-American War, the Department turned to its nearest special forest agents to set up protection for these parks. Assistant special forest agents were authorized in June, 1898, to guard the parks until the Army returned.

Ernest Britten's first park protection job was as one of the assistant special forest agents in Sequoia during the summer of 1898. He was a local boy who had grown up in the Three Rivers area. Living adjacent to the park, he was readily available for employment there. What attracted Britten to park work? Most likely it was simply that it was a job. However, some other early rangers have written about being attracted to outdoor life.

"I was always partial to the mountains and the woods," one remarked. Said another: "In the early days of 1904, I was looking for something to do other than the range business, which I felt did not hold any future to me that was worthwhile." A third accidentally became a ranger when approached in the woods by a forest reserve official who "was looking for a good man that would like to work as a Forest Ranger for 'Uncle Sam'."

Britten was married, 36 at the time. He was an attractive man, slender, outgoing, friendly, and honest. He was selected with two others for duty in the southern part of Sequoia. Pay was four dollars a day. They supplied their own horses and saddles, camped out in the park, and had to lodge themselves outside. There were no roads or cabins in Sequoia at the time.

The Sequoia agents worked from June to August under the direction of the forest supervisor of the Sierra Forest Reserve. Drought conditions prevailed in the Sierra region that summer, causing a greater number of sheepherders to run their stock into the park. Two thousand sheep were ejected from the park during the first part of the summer alone. And there were more forest fires than usual. All the agents and rangers in the region were dispatched to an extensive forest fire that burned furiously in the side canyons of the Kings River in August. Britten worked the rugged Kaweah River drainage on patrols of 15-day durations. His diaries reveal that he enjoyed his excursions into the High Sierra.

In August, the assistant special forest agents were discharged when the cavalry returned to the California parks. The GLO's acting superintendent for Yosemite, Sequoia and General Grant asked, and received, permission to employ forest rangers to assist the Army on their patrols and to guard the three parks in the winter when they were gone. Two local Yosemite men, Charley Leidig and Archie Leonard, were put on as forest rangers in Yosemite, thus becoming the first men to hold the ranger title in the national parks.

Even though Britten was recommended for Sequoia, he was not assigned directly to the park. Instead, he was assigned to the Sierra Forest Reserve as a ranger, with his duties to be extended into Sequoia to protect the park. This arrangement of reserve rangers patrolling into Sequoia, and on occasion into Yosemite, continued for many years. As one Army acting superintendent put it: "... in some cases protecting the Reserve protects the park..."

The ranger title had just emerged in the forest reserves in July, 1898, when Congress created an organization to manage and protect them. The agent title was not used for the men on the ground in the reserves, as it was for public domain timber lands, due to the influence of German foresters who were then working in the federal government on forestry matters. They preferred the European forestry structure over the American agent system. Without their dominating presence in American forestry, the ranger title would probably have not appeared in the national forests, and then later in the parks. Protections efforts today would probably be performed in the national parks by "special park agents," or some similar designation.

Britten assisted the Army in locating boundary lines, as well as acting as a guide for their patrols. In January, 1900, he was converted to a forest ranger, to work directly for Sequoia, and assume charge of the park. Britten left Three Rivers in early January to begin his first winter patrol. One of the first incidents he was involved in on that patrol illustrates the difficulties of enforcing laws in the parks in the early years.

Britten discovered two men hunting inside the park on the Kaweah. Britten was uncertain what to do, for though his instructions said to eject them, there were no
explicit details on how to go about it, or what to do with the hunters' firearms. He was also leary about dealing with armed men. They were local fellows who had been hunting this part of the Sierra all their lives, and they did not understand why they couldn't continue to shoot deer. They were not about to have their guns taken.

This was a traditional confrontation — one that has gone on since ancient times — between rangers and local people accustomed to taking from the forest what game and timber they needed and wanted. It was the outlaw ethic of medieval days, when Robin Hood was braced by the royal rangers for poaching the King's deer in Sherwood and Nottingham Forests.

Having no authority to arrest them, Britten decided to temporarily take their guns, for which he gave a receipt. He escorted them out of the park and returned the guns to them. Ejection from the park was the most severe penalty which existed in the early days.

Britten's patrols carried him into General Grant Grove during February. He found some stock trespass, and quite a bit of hunting inside the park. He ran the hunters out, then dealt with the sheepherders, who were often just as dangerous. His daughter relates: "When dealing with sheepherders he never knew when he would get a bullet in the back. But once he talked to them, he got understanding and resolved difficulties." Britten also found a miner prospecting in the park; he told the prospector he could not file a claim inside the park, and the miner left.

Britten continued his patrol activity until the cavalry arrived in June. Britten reported to Captain West, the acting superintendent, who found Ernest to be energetic, acquainted with the park, and knowledgeable about the local people.

From the monthly reports rangers were required to submit, we can see a ranger life of patrolling, guiding the Army, helping locate and build trails, and fighting fire — typical ranger duties of the period in both the reserves and the parks. Terse excerpts from Britten's July, 1900, report confirm this:

2. In company with Lt. Ellinge patrolled South Fork of Kaweah River to Clough Cave. Posted six rules and regulations of Sequoia N. P. near park line. Returned to Three Rivers. Distance 28 miles.
4. Procured saddle animals from Sharp's Ranch. Dist. 8 miles.
5. Guided pack train and detail to Red-wood cabin on South Fork of Kaweah River. Returned to Three Rivers. Dist. 26 miles.
7. Met Capt. West at Mineral King gate to Hockett Mds. Returned to camp at Mineral King in the evening.
9-10. From Three Rivers to Oak Grove to Mineral King Dist. 30 miles.
10. Established camp. Went to Captain West's camp for instructions. Dist. 8 miles.
12. Met Capt. West at Mineral King gate to Hockett Mds. Returned to camp at Mineral King in the evening.
13. Worked on trail and sundry.
15. In company with Ranger Hendman went to a fire on Little Kern River between Shotgun and Rifle Creek. Got fire under control by evening. Dist. 14 miles.

Britten was often out on patrols for up to thirty days. This proved disastrous to his first marriage. His wife and daughter were alone for extended periods. Upon returning from one long patrol, he found his wife in rendezvous with the cavalry's doctor. Divorce resulted.

The troops left in November and Britten was again alone for the winter. In addition to his normal winter patrols, he began to become involved in the initial construction of improvements for Sequoia and General Grant which were started the summer of 1900 following the first appropriations for the park. He purchased supplies and made up the payrolls for the road and trail construction men, and at times supervised construction of both the road being built to Giant Forest and subsequent ranger cabin construction. He handled the maintenance on the road to open it to early tourists.

As additional rangers were put on in succeeding years, Britten was made "park ranger in charge," or "chief ranger," at a higher salary than the other rangers. In the winter, he was placed in charge of Yosemite, which irked the Yosemite rangers. Britten acted as more than just a protection ranger. He was involved in the management of the parks. Much of this was due to his initiative, which was in contrast to the Yosemite rangers, who displayed little enterprise and were seldom brought into park matters, other than their routine protection duties.

Reports tell of Britten investigating water claims filed by local people inside the park matters, other than their routine protection duties. Continued on page 34
Rendezvous XIII at Hot Springs

Jeff Ohlfs
Hot Springs

The water is heating up for Rendezvous XIII, which will be held from October 22 to October 27 at The Arlington Resort Hotel and Spa in Hot Springs, Arkansas. As with the rest of the nation, October will bring forth a brilliance of color to the hills around Hot Springs. The theme of this year's Rendezvous is "All One Family," emphasizing the 'green blood' relationship we feel with our co-workers and retirees.

Hot Springs National Park is the oldest park unit of the National Park Service, established in 1832 as a Federal reservation and redesignated a National Park in 1921. It is also the only national park in an urban area. The park contains about 47 natural hot springs, historic Bathhouse Row, and 5,834 acres of oak-pine-hickory forested mountains. By October, the renovated Fordyce Bathhouse will have been open five months as the new park visitor center.

The following is a report on pre-registration, lodging, access, and events which is based on information submitted by Rendezvous site coordinator Dick Knowlen (Hot Springs) and program coordinator Dave Milbic (Mammoth Cave).

If you haven't renewed your membership or are planning on joining before coming, you'll first need to take care of this. There's a membership blank on the inside back cover.

Area Information

The city of Hot Springs is a year-round health and pleasure resort and one of the most popular retirement areas in the nation. The town has a population of about 35,200. Two products which are native to Hot Springs are novaculite or Arkansas whetstone, which is sold worldwide as a commercial whetstone, and the Hot Springs (quartz) diamonds.

Hot Springs has a casual atmosphere with an unpredictable autumn, so you should be prepared for a variety of possibilities. There's a possibility it may rain, but with the humidity you'll want a light-weight rain jacket. The nights may be cool, with temperatures in the low 40's. The area receives an average of five inches of rain in October. The temperature in October ranges from 50 to 77 degrees. Don't forget bathing suits for the spas and saunas. The more exclusive restaurants will require suitable attire.

Transportation

Hot Springs is located in the southwest corner of Arkansas. It can be reached by car off Interstate 30 or 40. Hot Springs has a municipal airport which I would recommend only for those who like to fly their own planes. Otherwise, United, Braniff Express, American, Northwest, Southwest, TWA, and Delta fly into Little Rock. Car rentals are available from Hertz, Avis, National, and Budget at the airport. There is also a shuttle from the airport to any accommodation in town for $15.00 one way per person. Call Warren-Merritt at 1-800-643-1505 to make arrangements. Executive Travel, of Fort Meyers, Florida, is available to members in planning their trips. You can contact them at 1-800-237-6735 (outside Florida) or 1-813-939-5567 (inside Florida) between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time, weekdays. Be sure to specify the account name as "ANPR". Irene Smith, office manager for Executive Travel, says we can use two airlines with convention discounts — United and American — each of which offers five percent off its lowest applicable fare. With United (1-800-521-4041 and refer to ID # 404EV), there is also a 40% discount off full "y" fares. With American (1-800-433-1790 and refer to Star file # S95484), there is a 45% discount off full "y" fares. Use of these two airlines with the proper identification number will give ANPR credit towards the convention. Executive Travel also has convention discounts for Alamo car rentals in Little Rock. Remember that ANPR receives a percentage of Executive Travel's commission when you use their services, and that they provide the cheapest rates available. So give them a call!

Once at the Arlington, you will have access to cabs that can take you anywhere in town.

Accommodations

The 490-room, historic Arlington Resort Hotel and Spa will simultaneously host the Rendezvous and a gathering of the Employees and Alumni Association of the National Park Service. The hotel is located in the heart of the central historic district and across the street from the park in downtown Hot Springs. The hotel offers the traditional hot springs bath house, swimming pool, hot tubs, game rooms, shopping mall, exercise room, several restaurants and lounges, and privileges at a nearby country club. The room rate was set in 1987 at $45 per night, single or double occupancy, plus tax. Rendezvous room reservation ends September 22nd. Any reservation made after that date will be on a first-come, first-served basis. About 200 rooms have been reserved. Advanced registration and reservation deposits can be made by calling The Arlington Resort Hotel and Spa at 1-800-643-1502 (outside Arkansas) or 501-623-7771 (inside Arkansas).

For those budget-conscious individuals, other lodging is available in town from low-priced motels on up to the Hilton and Ramada Inn. However, we encourage everyone to stay at the Arlington. They have provided us with a very reasonable rate which represents a substantial reduction from normal seasonal rates, which run as high as three times the rate offered the Association. All the Rendezvous activities will take place here, and you'll also be in downtown Hot Springs.

You can camp at Gulpha Gorge Cam-
Rendezvous Program:
A Family Affair

Unlike past years, the program coordinators have chosen a theme for Rendezvous XIII — one which reflects the tradition that the Service is "all one family." The program will be a mixture of topics which relate to that theme.

With people from both ANPR and E&AA attending, we hope the program will reflect the interests and experiences of everyone. We've tried to pick topics that will interest the newest seasonal ranger or the oldest mossback that shows up.

ANPR Program Coordinator Dave Mihalic and E&AA Program Coordinator John Chapman have worked together on developing the agenda, which starts with a new member orientation just before the traditional social on Sunday, October 22nd, and has keynote from former directors, the new director (he's been invited), and several surprises before winding up on Thursday, October 26th.

George Hartzog is one keynote speaker who will tie all generations of the Park Service family together. If Director Ridenour accepts, he will be able to talk to us about future directions for the agency. While there will be news from the Washington office in some of the workshops, several others are planned to address women in the Service, seasonal concerns, the recent "blue ribbon" panel on Park Futures, and taking the plunge and working in Washington (DC).

It's almost become a tradition to set aside one free afternoon, and the activities offered then will be varied. Of course, Hot Springs' baths will be tempting, but we also hope to introduce the Director (and all the other duffers out there) to a "Kowski Tournament." A pistol shoot is being organized and several other options will be available.

The "family" theme is appropriate. With so many challenges facing the Service we need to remember that in togetherness is strength. We know retiree's will be interested in some of the changes, like what's happening in the quarters program. And when they find out some of the problems current occupants face, maybe they can contribute to the solutions.

"All One Family" is an appropriate theme. The new Visa card sponsored by the E&AA will split the "profit" between the Horace Albright Fund, the E&AA's Education Trust Fund, and the ANPR's Ranger Museum fund-raising effort.

If you have suggestions for a workshop topic you can contact me at P.O. Box 28, Mammoth Cave, KY 42259.

Dave Mihalic
Mammoth Cave

$8 plus $2 postage and handling.
Membership money and applications should be sent to A.N.P.R., P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY, 12831, and should not be submitted with the registration form!

Activities
Both the Kowski Golf Tournament and Police Pistol Competition will be held on Wednesday afternoon. The hospitality room will be opened daily. Special tours of the new Fordyce Visitor Center and thermal walks of the park will be offered all week. Additional discounts to various attractions in the area should be available.

The dance will be held on Thursday night and will feature Craig Carter and his "Spur of the Moment" band. They've played all over the West, and will be touring Europe later in the fall. Carter plays a traditional style of country music, mixed with progressive country and rock.

Fun Run
This year's Fun Run incorporates sections of three of the four historic routes of the Oertel System of Graduated Exercise. This system was created in 1915 to combine varying degrees of terrain exercise and the thermal baths to cure or alleviate heart problems. The system at Hot Springs National Park is possibly the only one of its kind in the United States. The course will be a total of 3.02 miles or 15,924 feet, with a maximum rise and descent of 431 feet. The route is Oertel rated "moderately steep," "slightly inclined," and "comparatively level." For those less adventurous, an alternate Fun Walk/Run has been established using the Grand Promenade National Recreation Trail and historic Bathhouse Row for a total of .96 miles or 5,086 feet. Upon completion, you'll be looking forward to that thermal bath!

Raffle
Nancy Wizner (Santa Monica Mountains) is the raffle coordinator. Nancy will be assisted by Dick Knowlen, Kathy Clossin (Everglades), and Bob Love (Saguaro). Anybody wishing to donate items this year should bring them or mail them, starting in August, to Dick Knowlen (1100 Woodlawn #5, Hot Springs, AR, 71913). Remember that the mainstay of the Rendezvous is the raffle, which is in turn supported by the wonderful and unique gifts that are donated by the members. So help us and the Association by bringing a raffle prize. The raffle made over $3,000 for the Association last year. It was great fun for all and showed the talent of many of our rangers, their families and friends.

Meals
Dining options are varied, including everything from a meal on the boat, Belle of Hot Springs, or at the Hamilton House (which has Al Capone's Tunnel) on the lake to your favorite fast food joints.

Alcoholic Beverage Restrictions
Arkansas has dry counties, and, where permitted, the age limit is 21. Here are some regulations to be aware of: The Arlington will provide two hospitality rooms for the keg and socializing. The Arlington requests that we not roam around with conspicuous containers of alcohol, so please respect their wishes and bring an unlabeled mug or thermos. If you forget, you can buy an A.N.P.R. mug at the Rendezvous. City ordinances prohibit open containers publicly or in vehicles. Park regulations allow for open containers outside of vehicles for those 21 and over. Most restaurants serve alcoholic beverages. However, only certain establishments provide alcohol on Sunday. There are no public or store sales of alcohol on Sunday in the City of Hot Springs or Garland County.

Babysitting
The Arlington Hotel will provide two rooms with registered babysitters from 7:45 a.m. to 12:15 p.m. and 1:45 p.m. to 5:15 p.m. An advance notice of 24 hours is required for this service, along with schedul-
ing after-hours babysitting. The price will be $5 per hour per child. Families with more than one child are charged an additional $1 per hour. If you’ll need a babysitter, please indicate so on the pre-registration form. Then see Dick Knowlen or me upon arrival and we’ll get you in touch with the Hotel management.

Attractions

There are numerous nearby attractions. We are a one-hour (55 mile) drive from Little Rock or three hours from Memphis by car. We recommend stopping by one of the other Arkansas “crown jewels.” From Hot Springs, they are Pea Ridge (5.5 hours, or 222 miles), Buffalo River (4 hours, or 159 miles), Arkansas Post (2.5 hours or 123 miles), and Fort Smith (2.5 hours or 128 miles).

The city offers several attractions for the whole family. The evening Bathhouse Show, Hot Springs Mountain Tower, Arkansas Alligator Farm, Hot Springs Art Center, Tussaud Wax Museum, Music Mountain Jamboree, Reed’s Museum of Automobiles, Dryden Pottery, White and Yellow Duck Fleet, National Park Aquarium, I.Q. Zoo, Educated Animal Zoo, Tiny Town, Mid-America Museum, and romantic horse carriage rides. The Hotel is in the downtown shopping area for those that indulge in this activity.

Outdoor activities include Lakes Ouachita, Hamilton, and Catherine, all within a half-hour’s drive. State parks include Lakes Ouachita and Catherine, DeGray, Toltec Mounds, Crater of Diamonds, Pinnacle Mountain, and Petit Jean. And there’s Ouachita National Forest and the Army Corps facilities at Lakes Ouachita and De Gray.

Training

A training course is again being planned for either before or after the Rendezvous. The interest of the membership in the past has been towards position management and supervision. If you have any suggestions, contact me or Laurie Coughlan, at Eisenhower (717-334-1124).

E&AA Meeting

The Employees and Alumni Association of the National Park Service is a non-profit organization whose objectives are to help maintain and improve morale of Service employees, foster continuing close ties between the Service and its alumni, encourage public understanding of the Service and the System, and, most importantly, publish Courier. E&AA is planning to hold its annual gathering at the same time as our Rendezvous in the same hotel. This will allow members from each organization to attend the other’s activities as they choose. John Chapman, Rocky Mountain Regional Office, is E&AA’s coordinator for their activities.

The employees of Hot Springs National Park and the city’s Chamber of Commerce look forward to seeing you in October and serving as host for this year’s Rendezvous. For additional information, contact Dick Knowlen or Jeff Ohlfs at Hot Springs National Park, Arkansas 71902 (501-624-3124).

R&R Accessory Items

UNIFORMS, INC.

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

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.
Board Member Reports

President

President Rick Gale, Branch of Fire Management, Boise. Address: 4074 S. Irondo Way, Boise, ID 83706. Phone: (208) 343-2412 (home) and (208) 334-9541 (work).

Rick's report appears on page three. His address is listed here for your information.

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).

With the completion of the "Towards 1993" report, our president has assigned specific goals to members who volunteered to work on the related tasks during the last Rendezvous. Jan Dick (regional rep in PNR) and I are coordinating efforts to attain the goals associated with membership, communications and social enrichment.

One of our first tasks is to prepare a new recruitment brochure, which will be done as soon as the new dues structure is determined. Keith Hoofnagle has kindly agreed to help and to let us use Rangeroons to illustrate the brochure. We want to keep the text to a minimum, but also include it to illustrate the brochure. We're also looking at some other ideas for increasing membership. One proposal is to print an annual report listing our successes, goal accomplishments, financial status and so forth. This would be used in spreading the word about ANPR and gaining support. Any thoughts?

Regional reps, particularly in the west, are working hard at communicating with the field through newsletters, park rep programs, mini-rendezvous and other approaches. Please return that effort with feedback, ideas, and spending volunteer time on a task force.

See you at Hot Springs!

Eastern Vice President

Vice President Hal Grovert, Ft. McHenry. Address: Fort McHenry, East Fort Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21230. Phone: (301) 539-6058 (home) and (301) 962-4290 (work).

I recently met with Rick Gale when he was passing through Shenandoah and we caught up on what each of us has been doing and made initial plans for Rick's visit with Director Ridenour.

In March, I helped Bill Halainen put together and send out the economic survey. I really hope that all of you took the time to fill it out and get it back to Rick.

With the summer season fast approaching, seasonal hiring is underway and we'll soon be conducting our seasonal orientation and training courses. It's very important that we each take it upon ourselves to make a presentation about ANPR membership and benefits at these sessions in each of our parks and at least get the word out about our organization to seasonal members.

The last thing I want to talk about concerns undertaking tasks for the Association. It's easy to have enthusiasm at the Rendezvous and to volunteer to work on assignments and committees. It's another thing to get things done when you're back home and job, family and everything else in your lives comes back into focus. All of us are volunteers in this association, and all of us lead busy lives. If you are unsure as to what to do, then ask. If you realize that you bit off more than you can chew, then tell someone. The worst thing that any of us can do is do nothing at all.

Secretary/Treasurer

Secretary/Treasurer Pat Tolle, Everglades. Address: P.O. Box 279, Everglades NP, Homestead, FL 33030. Phone: (305) 248-7830 (home) and (305) 247-6211 (work).

Here's the annual Rendezvous issue, packed with information on the coming gathering in Hot Springs. As you read through the articles and begin to make preliminary plans, here are a few answers to questions that may come to your mind:

Q: What's the best way to get there?
A: If the most convenient way for you seems to involve a common carrier, please consider making your arrangements with Executive Travel. Their goal is to provide you with the most convenient travel plans at the lowest possible price. No fees or commissions are charged. If that's not enough, they also donate a percentage of the commission they received from the carriers back to ANPR. It won't hurt to call and compare. Their toll free number is 1-800-237-6735 (if you live in Florida, call 939-5567).

Q: When should I make reservations and pre-register?
A: As soon as possible! A block of rooms has been set aside for the Rendezvous, and it appears that this Rendezvous will be well attended. This is a great time to get together with those folks you don't see often enough, and attend a very worthwhile function at the same time. Call up a few friends and encourage them to go, but do it soon. It's helpful to those putting programs together to know how many will be attending this event.

Q: How much will it cost?
A: Although every effort is made to keep costs down, you may still find it expensive to get to Hot Springs. Travel may be costly; room rates are reasonable, but can add up quickly. While there will be better access to more affordable dining than in past years, meal and entertainment costs may be the only areas where you can stretch your dollars. I encourage you to research the money-saving options available for the Rendezvous. You might start with the information provided in this issue.

Q: What do I get for the money it costs for registration?
A: The $30 fee covers four days of workshops, informative speakers and presentations, refreshments and the cost of rooms for socializing...the list goes on and on. It is a challenge to those who spend long hours planning the Rendezvous to do so within financial limits and still render unmatched quality. The Rendezvous is paid for exclusively by the attendees, and is not subsidized through general operating funds. I doubt whether you could find another organization able to do the same under these conditions. So how do we do it? While we are forced to pay top dollar for many services, we are lucky to have members dedicated to the goals and purposes of ANPR who donate their time and expertise in organizing each Rendezvous. Because of this, the Rendezvous program and services have attained outstanding levels of quality. If you can lend your talents to any of the many areas of need that make a great Rendezvous, it's not too late to pitch in.

North Atlantic Regional Rep

Representative Jim Gorman, Saratoga. Address: P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831. Phone: (518) 793-3140 (work) and (518) 664-9821 (home).

I've spent a lot of time recently handling requests for the various insurance packages offered through ANPR. A lot of folks are asking about personal liability insurance, and even more — in excess of 50 requests — are showing interest in seasonal health insurance. Let's hope they all sign up with ANPR!

I've made an initial contact with the people at the University of Massachusetts' seasonal law enforcement program. The first class will be graduating soon and present a new source of recruitment for the Association.

Finally, I have spent time doing research for Rick on the economic hardship...
survey. Thanks to many of you in the region, I was able to get excellent data on wage grade scales, special pay structures and the general cost of living in the North Atlantic region. After seeing some of the figures, it’s amazing that any of us still manage to live and work here. Thanks once again to all of you who responded to my requests.

Mid-Atlantic Regional Rep
Representative Roberta D’Amico, Mid-Atlantic Regional Office. Address: 710 Eldridge Avenue, W. Collingswood, NJ 08107. Phone: (609) 858-4316 (home) and (215) 597-3679 (work).

Communications to and from park reps within the region continues to grow. In the last quarter alone, the ANPR bulletin, an election update and an additional reminder to push the second financial questionnaire were distributed to members. Efforts continue to find reps in each park — one park has none, two have potential reps, and three are currently in limbo.

Rick Gale was at Shenandoah on April 17th and conducted an informal ANPR meeting which provided updates on current issues, including the financial questionnaire, seasonal concerns, and the “Toward 1993” goals. If you didn’t hear about this meeting, then the information relay via park reps is not working. Where did the communication fail? Please let me know or talk directly with your park rep. We all need to keep the channels open.

In rereading back issues of Ranger recently, I noticed a glaring repetition of calls of comments, assistance and membership action. The flip side of the call for help comes to mind — the membership query of “What does ANPR do for me?” This made me stop and think about organizations in general and ANPR in particular.

I’ve belonged to a variety of organizations, most of which have certain similarities — particularly if they are volunteer organizations. There’s always a core working group, armchair observers and supporters, and those who run between the two groups. Encouraging others to join ANPR or other organizations is always difficult, too, which goes against ANPR’s stated goal of increasing membership.

If I were to encourage someone to become a member of ANPR, I could state our purpose, list our past achievements or point to our “Toward 1993” goals. For some, these achievements may still be insufficient, for many people equate the dues to paying $5 per issue for four issues per year of Ranger. But there are other, less tangible reasons for belonging to this group.

Although I have been an armchair observer for much of my seven years of ANPR, I’ve nonetheless gained something from the organization that’s hard to define in black and white. I’ve recently moved into a position that has presented me with a situation with no defined resources to go to for answers. Over the past few months, I’ve called on past ANPR acquaintances for assistance, using the Association as a common ground. I’ve gotten answers to questions, usually preceded by a valuable discussion of the National Park Service.

No matter what our professional differences may be, most of us in the NPS are here because of the commitment to the Service’s mission. One of ANPR’s prime assets is its members and the resources which they can direct you to. It’s a professional organization that can serve you well. Don’t wait seven years to take advantage of it.

National Capital Regional Rep
Representative Mike Barnhart, C&O Canal. Address: Route 2, Box 377, Smithsburg, MD 21783. Phone: (301) 824-3931 (home) and (301) 739-4200 (work).

I’d like to begin by apologizing for not having a report in the last issue. I was busy sending out questionnaires and forgot the due date...

ANPR spent $30 to send out these questionnaires to NCR members, and got only 15 responses out of 128 sent. If we don’t get a reply from the Board on your wishes and respond to your needs, we have to have your input: in the future, please respond when we send questionnaires, as it’s our only way of knowing your desires.

I’d like to know what you think of the newsletters being sent out. Do you like them or dislike them? Do you think they are necessary? Please let me know.

I’ve met with new NCR Regional Director Bob Stanton, and will meet with him again sometime this spring. But I’d first like to hear what issues are of concern to the members. If you have any burning issues you’d like to see discussed, please drop me a line or call me.

We have numerous ANPR members transferring into and out of this region. I need volunteers in all of the parks to inform me of these transfers. If I don’t get any volunteers, I’ll take my membership list and appoint some.

I can only represent you if you help me by contacting me with your wishes and desires.

Southeast Regional Rep
Representative Scott McElveen, Great Smokies. Address: 10 Thrush Drive, Maggie Valley, NC 28751. Phone: (704) 926-0052 (home) and (704) 497-9147 (work).

The following people have volunteered to be park reps in Southeast: John Howard (Blue Ridge), Buck Thackeray (Big Cypress), Bill Carroll (Big South Fork/Obed), Chuck Harris (Cape Lookout), Ray Morris (Castillo/Fort Matanzas), Dick Newgren (Cumberland Island), Ken Garvin (Everglades), Bruce Rodgers (Fort Jefferson), Kent Cave (Fort Pulaski), Steve Klump (Great Smokies), Jan Graham (Gulf Island), Marilyn Parris (Horseshoe Bend), Lisa Vogel (Mammoth Cave), Sam Weddle (Vicksburg), Richard Jones (Virgin Islands), Bill Supernoahaus (FLETU and Heath Jarrett (Memphis State University). There are also several park rep volunteers for Biscayne and Cape Hatteras, but a final choice has not yet been made. The regional members and I owe a big thanks to these folks for their work. If you don’t see you park listed, then I still need a rep for your park and would appreciate your help. If you have not been receiving the ANPR News Bulletin, please contact me or your park rep so we can correct the situation.

There has been some concern in the region that membership dues are being used to finance the Rendezvous. This is misinformation and untrue. Each Rendezvous is paid for by those members who attend through registration fees and other sources. If expenses at a Rendezvous exceed revenues, then monies are taken out of the regular raffle account to cover the deficit. Only members attending a Rendezvous can purchase regular raffle tickets.

My meeting with Regional Director Bob Baker in February was informative, and I hope it established an open line of communication between us. Regional Director Baker is also an ANPR member, and he asked me to contact him with our concerns.

I will be speaking to seasonals at the in-service at Great Smokies and to students at the NPS seasonal law enforcement training at Southwestern Technical College to encourage them to become ANPR members. I ask that each of you make the same pitch at gatherings of NPS employees, especially seasonals.

I have in my possession a guide to applying for 20-year firefighter/law enforcement retirement. If you’re interested in obtaining a copy, contact me and I’ll get you one. How strongly do you feel that ANPR should pursue the 20-year retirement issue? Please let me know your feelings on this issue so that I can present them to the Board. Remember: We are working under a September 30, 1989 deadline!

Midwest Regional Rep
Representative Bob Krumenaker, Isle Royale. Address: P.O. Box 534, Houghton, MI 49931. Phone: (906) 482-9210 (home) and (906) 482-9086 (work).
Since last we spoke, I’ve pushed some paper in the direction of regional members, and many have responded. Thanks to several members for volunteering to serve as park reps — Larry Kangas, Pictured Rocks; Carl Dowhan, Indiana Dunes; Kurt Topham, Herbert Hoover; Laurie Heupel, Jefferson; Palma Wilson-Buell, Truman Home — and to all of you who responded to the dues and economic surveys, particularly those of you in urban areas with tales of woe. The word needs to get out if we’re to change things. Many parks in the region have been giving ANPR seasonal health insurance information routinely to all new seasonals, and I’ve fielded a number of calls on the subject. Thanks especially to Tom Ferranti of Isle Royale, who has worked with regional AO’s to get the word out. At least five MWR members have volunteered to chair work groups in response to the “Towards 1993” challenges. That’s spirit! We may have less than 10% of the ANPR membership, but Midwest now has almost 25% of the work group leaders. How about you? Get involved in your organization. Recruit a new member — there’s strength in numbers.

Rocky Mountain Regional Rep
Representative John Conoby, Cedar Breaks. Address: 168 East Center Street, Cedar City, UT 84720. Phone: (801) 586-2199 (home) and (801) 586-9451 (work).

My primary efforts have been focused on contacting members who have not renewed their memberships and on trying to recruit park representatives. New park reps for the region are Steve Robinson, Mesa Verde; Ken Kehr, Capitol Reef; Chuck Passek, Bryce Canyon; Jon Paynter, Colorado; Dan Jacobs, Fort Laramie; and Dan Kirschner, Great Sand Dunes. There are now ten parks in the region with park reps, and I hope to hear from volunteers from the remaining parks. Don’t delay — the phone lines are open now!

I’m also helping the group working on 20-year retirement. Remember that the deadline for filing is September 30, 1989. If you have information or need information on this issue, contact me or Mark Harvey at Lincoln Boyhood.

Southwest Regional Rep
Representative Dale Thompson, Big Bend. Address: Chisos Basin, Big Bend National Park, TX 79834. Phone: (915) 477-2244 (home) and (915) 477-2251 (work).

The recent mailing of the ANPR bulletin, the economic hardship questionnaire and the dues survey kept me busy over the last quarter. Many thanks to those park reps who assisted with distribution.

I could still use more help, particularly in the regional office, Lake Meredith, LBJ, San Antonio Missions and Wupatki - Sunset Crater. Currently we have only one member at each of the following areas — Chickasaw, Fort Davis, Fort Union, Chumash and Hubbel Trading Post. There are none at Padre Island, White Sands, Pea Ridge and Arkansas Post. If you know anyone in these areas, please contact them or send me their address.

West Regional Rep
Representative Frank Dean, Yosemite. Address: P.O. Box 577, Yosemite, CA 95389. Phone: (209) 252-4848 (work) and (209) 372-4242 (home).

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).

Alabama Regional Rep
Representative Mary Karraker, Yukon-Charley. Address: c/o Yukon-Charley Rivers NP, P.O. Box 64, Eagle, AK 99738. Phone: (907) 547-2233 (work).

The Alaska region had a meeting in Anchorage on February 9th. There were 34 members and friends in attendance, and a number of topics were discussed:
- Dues survey — The consensus was that permanents should pay $30 and seasonals $20. There were various complicated dues structures submitted on the written survey, but the majority favored a simple system. It was felt that there was a definite need for a membership brochure.
- Seasonal employment — There was interest in a mentor program and in reinstituting the intake program. Members seemed to favor better use of subject-to-furlough positions instead of recurring seasonal positions.
- ANPR — We’re still searching for an identity and how to be all things to all people. We talked of alienation of employees who are not rangers. Generally, the group at the meeting felt that the title “ranger” covers everyone in the NPS. It was acknowledged that this isn’t always felt by others. No solution to the problem was offered, except to broaden our outlook and make ourselves available to explain our goals to others. An annual report showing our accomplishments might help clarify what the organization is doing for all employees.
- Ranger museum — The consensus was that it should be an NPS-driven project, but that outside help would be necessary. Retired interpreters might assist with planning. Money-making items, such as art prints, coins, sculpture, and historical photos and posters, were discussed.

Overall, we had a lively meeting, and the Alaska contingent displayed a great deal of interest in keeping ANPR a strong, healthy organization.

President continued from page 3
Committee Reports

Rendezvous Site Selection
Chair: Dennis Burnett, Cape Cod. Address: Cape Cod National Seashore, South Wellfleet, MA 02663. Phone: (617) 349-1754 (home) and (617) 349-3785 (work).

The committee continues to explore future sites. Contract negotiations are ongoing with the Showboat in Las Vegas for Rendezvous XIV in 1990. Contract negotiations are complete for Rendezvous XV in 1991 at the Harbor Sheraton in Fort Myers, Florida. The front runner for Rendezvous XVI in 1992 is the "Y of the Rockies" in Estes Park, Colorado.

Twenty-Year Retirement
Chair: Mark Harvey, Lincoln Boyhood. Address: Box 51, Lincoln City, IN 47552.

The final report of the "Towards 1993" task force established two goals relating to the 20-year retirement issue (see page 18 & 19, Ranger, Winter 1988/89). Rick Gale has established a work group to accomplish these goals.

As a first step, the work group has prepared an information package about the 20-year retirement issue. It contains a reprint of the firefighter/law enforcement workbook prepared by the law firm of Skinner, Fawcett, and Mauk. This was the workbook given out at the 20-year retirement workshop last fall at Rendezvous XII. Persons wishing to receive the information package should write to me at Box 51, Lincoln City, IN 47552. Please include $4.00 in stamps to cover the postage.

We encourage anyone who may be eligible for 20-year retirement to submit a claim before the September 30, 1989 deadline. But you are also encouraged to carefully examine all aspects of 20-year retirement as they relate to your career planning prior to submission. For example, there are mandatory separation provisions for persons in covered positions. Also, if a favorable determination for coverage is made by OPM for your claim, payment of the additional employee withholding required must be made within 30 days. This includes all periods of previous service which have been determined to be covered.

The work group welcomes member ideas, comments, and suggestions for actions to take regarding the 20-year retirement issue. Please direct your correspondence to me at the above listed address. Among possible actions being considered are:

- Networking with other organizations interested in the 20-year retirement issue;
- Investigating the possibility of group legal actions to challenge OPM regulations covering 20-year retirement claims;
- Working on the establishment of an NPS task force to determine position coverage on a Servicewide basis;
- Tracking legislative initiatives to expand 20-year retirement coverage.

We are also interested in the progress of member claims for 20-year retirement coverage. We would like to hear of your problems and successes, and are especially interested in any NPS advisory opinions, OPM determinations, or Merit System Protection Board appeals rulings.

Membership Dues
Chair: Debbie Trout, Great Smokies. Address: Rt. 11, Sevierville, TN 37862. Phone: (615) 428-4239 (work) and (615) 453-6816 (home).

Should membership dues be increased, and, if so, by how much? Seems like a simple question, doesn’t it? Well, after wading through almost 400 responses to that question, let me tell you — simple it isn’t!

History
Tim Setnicka reminds us that “the first dues collection was simply a passing of Craig Johnson’s cowboy hat, into which we threw fifteen bucks.”

Later, things became a bit more formal. Dues were established at $10 for new members and $15 for renewals. The idea was that the lower rate would encourage more people to join ANPR. At the same time, there were lively discussions about lower dues for seasonals. The consensus was that everyone was entitled to be a "member", with no distinction for seasonals vs. permanents.

In 1982, at the Rendezvous, life membership dues were increased from $125 to $200.

In 1984, at the Rendezvous, membership dues were increased to $20. The discount for new members was discontinued.

In 1988, at the Rendezvous, membership dues were increased from $125 to $200.

The business manager’s report in the last issue of Ranger addressed the concerns of expenses vs. revenues. In its simplest form — dues vs. base expenses for FY88 — you can quickly see we are already dependent upon non-dues revenue. Regular and super raffle funds and contributions of time and personal funds are what have enabled us to make ends meet:

Income:
Dues $26,080
$26,080

Expenses:
Ranger $22,205
Postage $3,694
Printing $2,045
Business Manager $5,666

$33,610

Summary of Results
- The membership is in favor of maintaining the current dues structure with a moderate increase; they generally favor $30.
- The membership is in favor of lowering dues for seasonals. They generally recommend a rate of 3/4-3/4 of the permanent rate.
- The membership strongly opposes a sliding scale.
- On the issue of shared memberships, it is a virtual tie. A number of members suggested a family membership.
- On the issue of increasing life dues, it is evenly divided. If increased, the general recommendation is 10 times the annual rate, with the installment plan retained.
- The membership does not favor adding several levels for upgrading membership. A number did suggest categories between active membership and life membership with appropriate recognition.
- The membership is in favor of notifying spouses and offering the opportunity to continue membership or continue to receive Ranger.

Member Comments
We received extensive comments on the survey responses. Many of these comments were not directly related to the dues issue, but they certainly provided an eye-opening glimpse of member opinions. We will pull these comments and forward them to the President so that your voice is heard.

One issue that was mentioned by several members: Use of dues to subsidize the Rendezvous when many people are unable to attend. Absolutely no membership dues are used for the Rendezvous! The regular raffle was created with the primary purpose of covering any costs beyond expenses for Rendezvous. We have always agreed that membership dues should not be used for the Rendezvous, and they are not.
What Next

Bill VanInwagen is compiling information about dues structures of other organizations for ideas on family memberships and membership classes between active and life. This summer will be reviewed by the Membership Dues Committee and a final proposal will be presented to the board for review before Rendezvous XIII.

Again, thanks for taking time to return the survey and thanks to the regional reps for all their work.

Housing

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

Dual Careers

Chair: Barb Stewart, Shenandoah. Address: P.O. Box 1700, Front Royal, VA 22630. Phone: (804) 823-4675 (summer) and (703) 999-2243 (winter).

Seasonal Interests

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

Sales

Chair: Kurt Topham, Herbert Hoover. Address: P.O. Box 239, West Branch, IA 52358. Phone: (319) 643-5594 (home) and (319) 643-2541 (work).
### 1993 Workplan Directory

**Objective I — Employee Issues**
1. Intake Program
2. 025 Standards
3. Special Pay Rates
   - Discussed with regional directors *(Ranger, “ANPR Actions”, spring, 1989)*
   - Economic hardship survey conducted, fall, 1988; follow-up survey conducted, spring, 1989; report prepared and presented to Director; report printed *(Ranger, summer, 1989)*
4. Positive Educational Requirements
5. Seasonal Recruitment
6. Housing
7. Twenty-Year Retirement
   - Work group underway chaired by Mark Harvey, LIBO (March, 1989)
   - Instructional package prepared with law firm *(President’s Message, Ranger, summer, 1989)*
8. Permanent Status
9. Vacancy Announcements
10. Liability
11. Seasonal Recognition
12. Personnel Demonstration Projects
13. Park Operating Budgets
14. Dual Career Opportunities
15. Issues Comment Process

**Objective II — System Policy Issues**
1. Media Ties
2. Congressional Contacts
3. Comments on Actions
   - ANPR submits written testimony on H.R. 1484 at the request of House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands *(“ANPR Actions”, Ranger, summer, 1989)*
4. International Contacts
5. Subject-Matter Specialists
6. Position Papers
7. Park Features
8. Media Contact
9. Tax-Exempt Status
   - Economic impact of loss of tax-exempt status determined *(Ranger, “ANPR Actions”, spring, 1989)*
10. Policy Statement
11. Park Systems Articles
   - Ranger section established to report on actions of ranger organizations overseas and at home *(Ranger, “Common Ground”, spring, 1989)*
12. International Attendee at Rendezvous
13. Canadian Rendezvous

**Objective III — Membership Involvement and Services**
1. Health Insurance
   - Member health insurance program information carried regularly in Ranger
2. Internal Communications
4. Liability Insurance
5. Reduced Retirement Instructions
   - Guidance prepared for membership *(Ranger, summer, 1989)*
6. Social Activities
7. Rendezvous Locations
   - Las Vegas and Y of the Rockies looked at as prospective, low-cost, attractive sites *(Ranger, “Committee Reports”, spring and summer, 1989)*
8. Regional Organizations/Communications
9. Park Chapters
10. Committees
11. Recruitment
12. Member Involvement
13. Standing Committee on Communications
14. Member Recognition
15. Electronic Mail

**Objective IV — Professional Concerns**
1. Voluntary Standards
2. Training Agenda
3. Cross-training
4. Career Counseling
5. Pairing Project
6. Professional/Historical/Field Articles in Ranger
   - Articles on EMS evaluation and wildfire suppression techniques; “Looking Back” and “Working in the Parks” series begun *(Ranger, spring, 1989)*
7. Publishing
8. Bookstore
9. Employment Reprints
10. Equipment Purchases
11. Position Management Articles
12. Course Catalogue
13. 171 Videotape

**Objective V — Special Projects**
1. 75th NPS Anniversary
2. Ranger Museum Financing
3. Citizen Recognition
4. Special Populations
5. NASA Contact

---
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RANGER: SUMMER 1989
ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL PARK RANGERS
Rendezvous XIII Pre-Registration
(Use this form ONLY before 9/14/89)*

Name (please print) ________________________________ Spouse’s Name ________________________________

Address __________________________________________ Zip. ________________________________

Park or Area ______________________________________

Registration Fee
Four day package (before 9/14/89)*
$30.00 members $ ____________ $40.00 non-members $ ____________

If spouse will accompany and plans even minimal participation:
Spouse Fee (before 9/14/89)*
$15.00 members $ ____________ $20.00 non-members $ ____________

T-Shirt Total $ ____________

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED $ ____________

Please check if you are attending your first Rendezvous • Yes □ No

Are you interested in sharing a room? Every effort will be made to find someone else who is interested in sharing. You will be sent the name(s) of those wanting a roommate and final room arrangements will be up to you.

□ Yes □ No

Day Care, will you be using? □ Yes □ No

T-Shirts, $8.00 each
Small x ______ Medium x ______
Large x ______ XLg x ______

*Pre-registration ends 9/14/89. After 9/14/89, you will register at the Rendezvous. The package will be $40.00 for members, $50.00 for non-members. Refunds will be given for cancellations received before 9/20/89. There will be no refunds for cancellations received after 9/20/89.

Association of National Park Rangers

Important: Please specify
□ New Membership □ Renewal Date: ____________

Name (last, first, MI): ________________________________ Title: ________________________________

Box or street: ________________________________ 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

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

RETURN TO: ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL PARK RANGERS, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831
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 a very effective method of interpreting our heritage.