The Endangered Ranger Hearing
Letters

Editor:

As you may be aware, those persons involved with the planning and coordination of the Eastern area rendezvous in Williamsburg, Virginia, received more than a little negative feedback from a variety of sources when this rendezvous was first suggested. Comments such as "isn't one rendezvous a year enough?" "no one will show" and "who do you think will come to such a small group" were heard by some of the planners.

On the first day of the rendezvous, Mary and I got up at 4:30 a.m. (not her favorite time of the day) and headed to Williamsburg. Our little boy (one year old) seemed to echo some of these earlier negative comments as he screamed for a good portion of the four-hour trip. After arriving a little more than an hour before the opening session, I rushed around unloading the car; picking up my registration package; attending a luncheon with other rendezvous coordinators, Director Rideour and Regional Directors Coleman and Stanton; and attending a brief meeting with three other members of a workshop panel I was participating in. I was a little more frazzled.

Later that afternoon, as I was running (literally) from the workshop to my room to change for the "Fun Run?", I ran smack into a little old hotel maid who landed in/on her linen cart (toilet paper rolls, miniature shampoo bottles and towels were flying everywhere). I will have to admit that at that moment I was asking myself why I was doing this, and could not think of any rational answer.

The next day a friend who was attending her first rendezvous approached me and in a few short words answered my question of why and those initial negative comments. She said "I haven't felt this good about my job or the NPS in a long time. What a great experience, I feel so good about my job or the NPS in a long time."

What is the value of a mini or area rendezvous? I think that portion of one of the laws of physics which goes something like "objects in motion tend to stay in motion" also applies to organizations, ANPR in particular. I always feel better about myself, ANPR and the Service after attending a rendezvous. I think these mini or area rendezvous tend to keep ANPR "in motion." As our friend turned to leave, I caught myself asking "how can we do it better next time?"

Brion Fitzgerald
Assateague Island

Editor:

I would like to commend all the people who made the Eastern area rendezvous at Williamsburg such a big success. It was well organized and the speakers and workshops were excellent — it is not often you can hear the Director, Mid-Atlantic Regional Director, National Capital Regional Director, and Associate Director for Operations all in the same place. The fact that these folks attended the rendezvous showed a concern for field employees that I hope we see more of.

This was an excellent way to get good information and ask management's stand on current issues, instead of relying on the usual rumour which filters down through the ranks. Question and answer periods afterwards provided some stimulating debate and answers to hot issues. I also found the workshop on "Leaving the NPS" thought-provoking — employees who had left the Service for other agencies gave their thoughts about the pros and cons of such a move. Very appropriate at this time.

This was my first rendezvous and I really enjoyed the intimacy of the small group. About 100 people attended, and I would venture to say that by the end of the week I had a chance to meet with, or at least recognize, most everyone. If ANPR is really committed to bringing the organization to lower-graded employees, then this is the prime vehicle. I found the shorter format, central location, and combination of OPM-certified training made it easier to get off and make the trip less expensive. (The day before the rendezvous an optional supervision course was offered at the hotel where the rendezvous was held.)

Several people I spoke to said they liked the smaller, more intimate group size over the larger one found at the national rendezvous. This regional rendezvous allowed neighboring parks, or parks with similar themes, such as the Civil or Revolutionary Wars, to recognize and meet each other. I was also pleased to meet ANPR members from the Mid-Atlantic Regional office. I found this a great way to get to know folks in my region, and discuss common goals and concerns. I would recommend it highly to other regions considering this smaller format.

I think ANPR still has an image problem with some employees in the National Park Service. By offering training as an additional option and providing the quality workshops and speakers evidenced at the Williamsburg rendezvous, we will continue to demonstrate that ANPR is a legitimate and active force dedicated to helping employees of the National Park Service.

Thanks again to everyone who volunteered their time for this enjoyable event.

Charlie Strickfaden
Fort Necessity
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President’s Message

Once again, the past few months have been exciting times. And the Association of National Park Rangers has been squarely in the middle of the action.

Elsewhere in this issue, you will read of the oversight hearings on personnel and employee issues facing federal land management agencies which were conducted jointly by the House Subcommittees on National Parks and Public Lands and Civil Service. Along with other employee and professional organizations and the agencies themselves, ANPR was invited to appear and present oral and written testimony. Perhaps the major effect of this testimony was the opportunity this hearing afforded us to get copies of the economic hardship survey in the hands of members of Congress serving on those two subcommittees.

Since last year, when the Association actively sought special pay to alleviate recruitment and retention problems among park rangers in high cost of living areas, 763 park rangers in the Boston, New York, Philadelphia and San Francisco metropolitan areas have received special pay increases. These pay increases averaged about $3,200 per annum.

Also, for the first time since the new GS-025 park ranger standard was issued in 1985, there are more GS-7 park rangers than there are GS-5 park rangers. This is due in large part to good position management on the part of managers and supervisors as well as effective use of classification supplements. The average pay increase as a result of these upgrades is $2,700 per annum.

The national park ranger museum project at Norris Soldier Station in Yellowstone is underway. The Williamsport Preservation Training Center has agreed to do the architectural and engineering design work for the building rehabilitation, and Harper’s Ferry Center is beginning exhibit planning and design. The goal is to have the museum completed so it can be dedicated on the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service. As you know, ANPR is committed to raising funds for the exhibits; a major fund raising effort is now underway in the private sector using a volunteer (to ANPR) but very professional fund raiser. The goal is to raise $250,000, and we now have $22,000 in various ranger museum accounts. If you have ideas or contacts regarding potential donors to the museum, please contact Maureen Flinnery (Olympic) immediately so we can follow up.

On a different note, it is clear to me that after 2½ years serving as your president that there needs to be some other

form of internal organization in ANPR so as to better spread the workload. As we are currently structured, there is no one on the board of directors (save the past president and secretary/treasurer) who represents the broad interests of the Association. All other board members are geographical representatives.

This makes it difficult, if not mostly impossible, for the president to delegate Association-wide issues or work loads to anyone on the board. As a result, the president personally handles virtually all ANPR business, or delegates tasks to individuals outside the board. This results in a loss of ownership of Association business by the board. It also means that the president is devoting 20-plus hours per week to ANPR business, a considerable commitment for anyone considering running for that office.

There is much Association business which, by necessity, must remain the purview of the president. However, a considerable amount of ANPR’s routine business could be accomplished by someone else representing the total membership or specific functions. Therefore, I suggest that the Association would be well served to consider an organizational structure which would give future presidents some flexibility in delegating some of the necessary but more mundane work of the Association.

In this regard, I urge all ANPR members to carefully review the proposal made by Hal Grovert and Bill Halainen at the last Rendezvous. That proposal is contained on page 21 of this issue of Ranger. This proposal is being discussed in more detail at Ranger Rendezvous XIV in Las Vegas. Be prepared to offer alternative suggestions at the Rendezvous — or give your thoughts to your regional representative if you cannot attend.
ANPR Actions

Economic Hardship Survey

Early in March, the Association was contacted and asked to testify at a joint hearing which was to be held in April on personnel issues affecting rangers in the NPS, USFS and BLM. The hearing was held before the Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands and the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on the Civil Service.

Association President Rick Gale flew to Washington to present ANPR's testimony. At the request of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, 100 bound copies of the economic hardship survey were also printed and made available to the subcommittees, the media and other witnesses at the hearing.

Much of the testimony on the National Park Service appears elsewhere in this issue. Also testifying at the hearing were Leonard Kline, an associate director at OPM; William Rice, deputy chief of the Forest Service; Cy Jamison, director of BLM; Max Peterson, executive vice president of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies; Dr. William Banzhaf, executive vice president of the Society of American Foresters; George Lea, president of the Public Lands Foundation; James Pierce, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees; and Ray Housey, Washington representative of the Society for Range Management.

Twenty-Year Retirement

The Association recently brought to the attention of U.S. District Judge Johnson the fact that OPM had failed to file an answer to our complaint. The attorney for OPM was also reminded. We now expect an answer from them no later than mid-June.

Following the answer to our complaint, the full administrative record will be provided to OPM. This administrative record will contain the rationale used by OPM in promulgating the administrative regulations regarding enhanced annuity retirement for firefighters and law enforcement officers. This should be produced in July.

Once we have received and reviewed the administrative record, we will enter into the discovery phase through the development and filing of interrogatories to OPM officials as well as requesting the production of documents. Depositions of OPM officials may also be taken during this phase. The discovery phase should be completed by late fall.

Based on discovery, the case will in all likelihood be decided on cross motions for summary judgement. A trial always remains a possibility.

The case preparation continues to cost money. Those of you who stand to benefit from a favorable decision for ANPR and who have not as yet contributed your fair share should do so now so that the Association will have the financial resources necessary to carry this complaint through to successful completion.

Meanwhile, ANPR has received a reply to its letter to the NPS (see the spring issue of Ranger, page 4) urging the Service to move forward quickly in its assessment of which positions Servicewide will qualify for coverage in the future:

"Thank you for your letter dated March 10, 1990, in which you expressed the concern of the Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR) regarding the National Park Service's approach with respect to enhanced retirement benefits for firefighters and law enforcement officers.

"As you have stated in your letter, the Service is beginning to adjudicate over 1,000 requests from individuals who have filed claims for enhanced annuity coverage for past service. We are giving this process our priority attention. Concurrent with this process, we are reviewing the positions that these employees now occupy to determine whether an agency recommendation for coverage is appropriate. This is an ongoing process. Although the final decision for

Enhanced Annuity Retirement: An Important Notice

All ANPR members who recently filed for individual coverage for enhanced annuity retirement benefits need to carefully consider the following information:

The regulation governing enhanced annuity retirement, 5 CFR 831.909(e), currently mandates that: "After September 30, 1989, coverage in a position or credit for service will not be granted for a period greater than one year prior to the date that the request from an individual is received by the employing agency, the agency where past service was performed, or OPM."

Simply stated, that means that each and every individual who filed for enhanced annuity retirement prior to September 30, 1989, and who is in the same position or in any other position which has not been designated as a covered position for terms of enhanced annuity retirement, must file a request for individual coverage for the period 9-30-89 through 9-30-90. This request must be received by the servicing personnel office no later than 9-30-90. Failure to do so may well jeopardize the individual's claim for continued coverage, resulting in a break in service from covered duties and invalidating subsequent requests for coverage.

This same process must be used in subsequent years until the position the individual occupies is designated as a covered position or until the individual completes 20 years of covered service. The important point is that the servicing office must receive each subsequent filing no later than one year from the previous year's filing. Clearly, this suggests that it is in each individual's best interest to keep carefully documented records of all filings and receipts of filings. ANPR suggests that the filing for the period 9-30-89 through 9-30-90 be a stand-alone filing. This means a new narrative for the period in question, including backup documentation of training and experience records, personnel actions, position descriptions (if applicable) and affidavits. In other words, this filing should be as complete as that for any other documented position previously filed.

ANPR recognizes that this is an onerous task, but it is also a necessary one to ensure each individual's continued request for enhanced annuity retirement benefits coverage. In this regard, ANPR has urged the National Park Service to expeditiously recommend positions qualifying for coverage, as contrasted with individual applications for coverage.
Ranger In Space

At the Rendezvous in 1988, the Association hammered out the final version of its “Towards 1993” work plan. One point of the plan stated the following: “Pursue an agreement between NASA and the NPS to put a ranger in space in 1991.” Although this raised some amusing discussions at the time about how much time rangers already spend in space, the Association has pursued this as a significant way to recognize rangers.

Accordingly, Rick Gale has sent the following letter to the chairman of the evaluation committee of NASA’s Space Flight Participation Program:

“The Association of National Park Rangers requests consideration by your committee to have a national park ranger fly as the third space flight participant on a space shuttle mission as the ranger in space project.

“Among other things, the Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR) is chartered to promote and enhance the park ranger profession and its spirit... In so meeting that purpose, the Association provides education to develop and improve the knowledge and skills of park rangers and those interested in the profession and provides information to the public.

“ANPR adopted in 1988 as one of its long range goals the park ranger in space project. We believe that park rangers possess the unique skills necessary to express and interpret the program. Since the first campfire in 1870, park rangers have been giving campfire programs, educational programs and guided tours to people of the world, communicating natural processes and historic events, people and places. There is not a unit of the National Park System which does not devote some interpretive program to the stars and outer space. Based on past experience, a national park ranger would be a logical choice to communicate the experiences of manned space flight and activities to the public.

“We request that you send us any pertinent application procedures. We would welcome the opportunity to supply any specific information you might require to make a favorable determination for a ranger in space project and would be happy to work with your committee to establish eligibility and selection requirements.

“A ranger in space would be a tribute and an honor for all park rangers—past, present and future. Thank you for your considerations.”

Legislative Actions

Bill Liensch
NPCA

Congress has been very active on several pieces of legislation this session. The Interior Appropriations Subcommittee has completed hearings on the proposed NPS budget for FY 1991. Much of the questioning at the hearings had to do with specific issues at individual parks. There was quite a bit of interest in the construction and maintenance budgets. The Administration has proposed a 25% cut in the construction budget and, based on the questions asked in the hearings, it is likely that at least a large portion of this cut will be restored.

The Senate concluded its consideration of the Clean Air Act amendments in April. The Senate package authorizes funds for the further study of visibility problems in Class I national parks and establishes regional commissions to make recommendations for improving visibility in these parks. The House passed its Clean Air bill in late May. Thanks to the efforts of Congressman Ron Wyden, the bill contains strong measures to improve the sections of the Clean Air Act dealing with parks and wilderness areas. The Environmental Protection Agency would be required to promulgate regional haze regulations within two years of enactment of the final legislation. The two bills now go to a conference committee to work out the differences between them.

The Senate has held a hearing on legislation to establish Weir Farm National Historic Site in Connecticut. Both the Senate and the House have concluded hearings on legislation to establish Petroglyphs National Monument. The House added a 5,500 acre expansion of Pecos National Monument to the Petroglyphs bill. The legislation is expected to pass in June.

Congress is also working on boundary expansions at other parks, including Gettysburg and Indiana Dunes. The House has also completed hearings and committee action on legislation to require the NPS to “conduct systematic and comprehensive reviews of the boundaries of units of the National Park System.” Under this legislation, the Service will develop criteria for boundary studies and will examine at least 25 park boundaries over the next three years. The parks chosen are to have the highest priority and are to be representative of boundary issues.

In late May, Representative Vento, chairman of the National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee, held an oversight hearing on park concessions. The hearing focused on the recently completed report by the inspector general. While the inspector general’s audit focused on fees paid the concessioners, it did examine some other issues as well. The major conclusion of the report is that the National Park Service did not receive adequate franchise fees from the larger concessioners and, as a result, is losing about $20 million per year. Several issues were discussed at the hearing, including ways in which the fees could go back to the Service rather than to the general treasury. Representative Vento indicated that the oversight hearing was an initial hearing and that his subcommittee will continue work on concessions issues.

Please send me copy(ies) of Park Ranger’s Guide to the Federal Criminal Code by Kernes & Birkland at $6.95 each. + S & H.

Name__________________________

Address________________________

City ____________________________

State __________ Zip ___________

Book(s) at $6.95 each $__________

Add $1.25 per book for shipping & handling $__________

WA State Residents add 7% sales tax $__________
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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. 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. We're also interested in reports of upcoming social gatherings or reunions of NPS employees. Please limit your entry to a few sentences and give the name, phone number and/or address of someone who can be contacted for further information.

Thanks to Phyllis Cremonini of Petrified Forest for sending in a thorough listing of recent personnel actions in her neighborhood. Why not take a minute to let us know what's going on in your park?

Transfers
Karen Ball — from supervisory park ranger, Santa Monica Mountains, to same, Petrified Forest.
Joan Blais — from GS-5 park ranger, Pinnacles, to GS-7 park ranger (law enforcement), Grand Canyon.
Robert Blais — from seasonal WG-5 maintenance laborer, Pinnacles, to GS-5 permanent park ranger (structural firefighter), Grand Canyon.
Gary Cummins — from superintendent, Cabrillo, to same, Petrified Forest.
Ken Davis — from GS-5 park ranger (interpretation and law enforcement), Barteria, to GS-7 park ranger (law enforcement), Great Smokies.
Ann Doberty — from cooperative student, Humboldt, to park ranger, Petrified Forest.
Catie Finn — from GS-5 park ranger, Fort Smith, to GS-7 park ranger (interpretation and fee collection), same, Address: 915 S. 22nd St., Fort Smith, AR 72901.
Ken Garvin — from GS-11 district ranger, Everglades, to GS-12 chief ranger, Chattahoochee River.
Cheryl Sand — from GS-5 park ranger, Glen Canyon, to supervisory park ranger, Petrified Forest.
Jack Gossett — from park ranger (law enforcement, resource management and interpretation), Natchez Trace, to park ranger (law enforcement and park medic), Wahweap, Glen Canyon.
Norman D. Hellmers — from GS-12 superintendent, Lincoln Boyhood, to GS-13 superintendent, Lincoln Home. Address: 413 South 8th Street, Springfield, IL 62701.
John Hill — from park ranger (permanent), Petrified Forest, to park ranger (seasonal), Shenandoah.
Shirley Hoh — from GS-7 park ranger, Homestead, to GS-9 district ranger, Theodore Roosevelt.
Beth Houseman — from fish and wildlife technician, Texas Parks and Wildlife (Coastal Fisheries Branch), to GS-9 permanent park ranger (interpretation), Big Thicket.
Kerry Isensee — from chief, interpretation and resource management, Wilson's Creek, to chief ranger, Petrified Forest.
Theresa Flynn Jung — from GS-7 lead park ranger (protection), Edison, to GS-9/11 chief of interpretation and resource management, same.
Melody Krueger — from GS-5 park ranger, Petrified Forest, to GS-7 park ranger, Death Valley.
Connie Latham — from park ranger, Petrified Forest, to same, Temple Bar District, Lake Mead.
Kathy Mauler — from GS-5 park ranger (visitor protection), Boston, to same, Sandy Hook, Gateway Address: P.O. Box 502, Sandy Hook, NJ 07732. Phone: (201) 291-3455.
Paul McLaughlin — from GS-9 supervisory park ranger, Yellowstone, to GS-9 resource management specialist, Lake Clark. Address: Lake Clark National Park and Preserve, Fort Alsworth, AK 99653.
Roger Moder — from GS-9 district ranger, Wahweap, Glen Canyon, to GS-11 assistant chief ranger, Big Bend. Address: P.O. Box 75, Big Bend, TX 79834.
Paige Ritterbusch — from park ranger, Santa Monica, to GS-12 assistant chief ranger, Big Bend.
Dave Roberts — from GS-7 park ranger (chief of interpretation and resource management), Tonto, to GS-9 chief ranger, Black Canyon of the Gunnison. Dave's address: P.O. Box 2098, Montrose, CO 81402.
Ginny Rousseau — from park ranger (instructor), Albright Training Center, to chief, Division of Ranger Activities, North Atlantic Regional Office.
Cheryl Sands — from GS-4 lead park ranger (fee collection), Everglades, to GS-5 park ranger (dispatch), Sequoia/Kings Canyon.
Carroll J. Schell — from GS-7 park ranger (visitor protection), Manassas, to GS-5 park ranger, Wichita Mountains NWR, US Fish and Wildlife Service. Address: 1125 16th St., Arcata, CA 95521 (707) 822-7648.
Ralph Satterberg — from park ranger, Everglades, to forestry technician (intelligence coordinator), Northwest Coordination Center, Portland, OR.

Reunions
• This year marks the 25th anniversary of the establishment of Delaware Water Gap. Reunion events are being planned for the weekend of August 31-September 1. If you'd like more information, send your name and address to Patti Sullivan, Delaware Water Gap NRA, River Road, Bushkill, PA 18324. Please pass the word on to other DEWA alumni.

• The E&AA Biannual Reunion will be held from September 10th to the 14th at Glacier/Waterton Lake, Glacier Park, Inc. at East Glacier is now taking reservations. All employees of the NPS are eligible for membership in E&AA, and this reunion is for all employees and alumni.

• There'll be a reunion of rangers who worked at Colonial from 1975 to 1980 in Gettysburg on Saturday, September 15. For further information, call John Andrews at (717) 334-0324.

Missing Persons
We've lost touch with the following members. The addresses given are the last ones we have on file. If you know where they are, please have them contact Debbie Gorman or this magazine:
John Stobinski — from park ranger, Canyon de Chelly, to same, Petrified Forest.
Charlie Strickfaden — from seasonal park ranger, Denali, to permanent park ranger, Fort Necessity.
Schelle Williams — from administrative technician, Petrified Forest, to administrative officer, Capital Reef.

Robert Anderson — from GS-5 park ranger (visitor protection), Manassas, to GS-5/7 park ranger, Wichita Mountains NWR, US Fish and Wildlife Service. Address: 1125 16th St., Arcata, CA 95521 (707) 822-7648.
Charlie Strickfaden — from seasonal park ranger, Denali, to permanent park ranger, Fort Necessity.
Schelle Williams — from administrative technician, Petrified Forest, to administrative officer, Capital Reef.
Robert Lewis McGhee, Jr.
December 29, 1939 - May 26, 1990

On the morning of May 26, 1990, an unimaginable chain of events caused the paths of Ranger Robert McGhee and two escaped convicts to cross. How the contact occurred or exactly what happened is unclear; however, in a matter of seconds the second ranger to be killed in the line of duty in the recent history of the National Park Service had been shot.

Before coming to the Park Service in 1975, Bob served his country as a Naval Seabee with two tours of duty in Vietnam. After retiring from the Navy, he joined Gulf Islands National Seashore as the YACC supervisor, and served in that capacity until 1981. He was a positive influence to the many young people who attended the YACC camp at Gulf Islands. Bob then transferred to the protection division. He attended FLETC class number 9PT-202 in 1982.

The two loves in his life were his family and his job. He approached both with equal enthusiasm.

Bob maintained a quiet home life and spent most of his free time caring for his family. In recent months his attention was focused on his intense desire to do everything possible to spoil his only grandchild, Trey.

Bob was much like any other ranger at Gulf Islands. He always came to work early and left late. He would not take sick or annual leave if it meant operations or others would be negatively affected. Bob could repair an outboard motor or give an interpretive talk with equal ease. He kept his radio on 24 hours a day and was always concerned with the well-being of his fellow employees. The two qualities that set him apart from others were his uncanny ability to always be neat and clean, even in 100 degree weather and high humidity, and the fact that he never asked anything from the Service — a promotion, a transfer or training.

The employees at Gulf Islands who knew and worked with Bob will be affected for a long time by his senseless death. He will be remembered not just because he was a fellow employee, but because he was a friend.

Bob Thomas
Mississippi District Ranger
Gulf Islands
Endangered Rangers: The House Hearing on the Future of Rangers


This hearing, which came about partly as a result of ANPR's publicizing of rangers economic hardship in these pages last summer, examined current conditions and morale of the agencies' personnel and the agencies' efforts to help their employees and managers adapt to the rapidly changing conditions land managing agencies face today.

In his comments to the press before the hearing, Rep. Vento was forthright about the problems that had aroused the subcommittees' concern.

"The rangers who protect this nation's public lands are themselves endangered by inadequate support and political interference at a time when these agencies face enormous challenges in the next decade," he said. "We must make sure that these professionals receive strong support if they are to protect our nation's resources to be themselves endangers."

Chairman Sikorski's Opening Comments

Today, in conjunction with the Subcommittee on the Civil Service, we are holding an oversight hearing on personnel issues facing the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Forest Service. All three agencies face challenges in having a work force that matches the diverse demands on them.

As you know, I am very concerned about the protection of our nation's natural and cultural resources in the public lands and parks. I am also concerned about the people who protect those parks and public lands — the employees of these three land managing agencies. I want a close match between the needs of the resources and the capabilities of the employees. A major focus of this hearing should be how we prepare agency work forces to perform the increasingly complex and as it becomes more diverse, it brings different strengths and issues that need to be considered.

I am concerned that instead of the increasing professional and scientific work force that these agencies need, we are getting a less qualified one. I am also concerned that in some cases employees are subsidizing the agencies with their low pay and poor living conditions. I want to see that both resources and employees are properly treated by the agencies. The resources and the people are too important to do otherwise. I do not want the rangers who protect these resources to be themselves endangered.

I look forward today to learning more about the issues these agencies and their employees face. I welcome the testimony that will help the Forest Service, Park Service and Bureau of Land Management and their employees best finish this century and enter into the next one.

Chairman Sikorski's Opening Comments

Today, we have the opportunity to hear about these and other concerns from America's three natural resource management agencies: the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the United States Forest Service. These agencies are charged with the responsibility of preservation, conservation, and development of America's great natural and historic resources, including over 600 million acres of land, nearly 30 percent of the total land base in the United States.

These responsibilities demand competent, patriotic, dedicated, and hard working employees. Personnel in these agencies must work together with their fellow federal employees, with state and local governments, private sector businesses and industries, advocates, and the general public, who use, relish and really own in trust the land the public servants manage each and every day and night of the year.

As we will see today, these agencies are facing difficult personnel problems. For example, pursuant to a consent decree, the Forest Service must increase the number of women and minorities in one of its western regions. And while the urban eastern parks of the National Park Service face high turnover, low pay grades, and limited advancement opportunities, the employees of the national parks in the western states have better pay grades, lower turnover, and better career advancement opportunities. The Bureau of Land Management has an aging work force, and is...
finding it increasingly difficult to recruit new management candidates from the shrinking pool of natural resource management professionals.

As we rapidly approach the 21st Century, the demands placed on the federal government will become greater and greater. With every law passed, every new computer installed, every Iron Curtain falling and foreign purchase of American land and resources, the demand for an American federal work force that is increasingly flexible, talented, and knowledgeable increases.

Today, we welcome representatives of the Office of Personnel Management, the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and other interested individuals and associations who are here to help us understand the problems facing our nation’s three land management agencies.

**President Gale’s Testimony**

Chairman Vento and Chairman Sikorski, thank you for the opportunity to share with you and other members of these subcommittees the thoughts of the Association of National Park Rangers on the general matter of employee compensation and benefits.

The Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR), formed in 1977, is a professional organization of approximately 1,600 National Park Service rangers from all regions, grades and specialties. It is neither a union nor a bargaining unit, but an association formed to advance the professional development of rangers, improve communications among rangers, and support the National Park Service and National Park System.

Chairman Vento and Sikorski, there are approximately 120 threatened or endangered plant or animal species within the National Park System. These species, as well as other irreplaceable natural and cultural resources, are protected by another threatened species — the national park ranger.

The National Park System is a remarkable collection of more than 350 separate areas, 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 million 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 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-graded ranger positions are in fact located in and around large metropolitan areas. As of March, there were 3,180 permanent rangers in the Service; of these, 1,593 (about half) were at grades GS-7 and below, and 825 were at grades GS-5 and below.

During the past few years, ANPR has frequently heard reports of instances of economic hardship among its members and other rangers. To assess the scope and nature of these problems, ANPR conducted a survey of economic hardship among rangers throughout the Service in early 1989. A copy of the report prepared from their responses has been provided to both your committees.

The 500 responses received indicated that the disparity between income and expenses for many rangers has made life in various areas of the country exceedingly difficult. The returned questionnaires showed that, for many rangers, economic hardship means borrowing money to pay for groceries or sharing shabby quarters with others in order to meet the monthly rent. It means expending all of their money on daily expenses, with no chance to save for their children or some day buy a home. It means living on such a thin margin that they cannot meet unforeseen economic emergencies. In short, the economic survival of many park rangers is now threatened.

In the conclusion of the economic hardship report we made a number of recommendations for actions which should be undertaken to ameliorate this unacceptable situation. We would like to focus on three of these today:

**Pay**

Although rangers living in several metropolitan areas — Boston, New York/New Jersey, Philadelphia and San Francisco — have recently received special pay rates and the Service has improved grades among some rangers (the number of rangers in grades GS-1 to 6 has dropped by 497 since 1985 and the number in grade GS-7 has increased by 453 positions), the fact remains that ranger salaries still are not competitive with either the private sector or other agencies for similar work. Even with special pay, a GS-5/1 in New York City makes $20,000. At least one agency provides their employees in New York as much money for housing allowances.

This situation can be remedied in two ways — by increasing salaries and improving grades. ANPR supports the recommendations made by the Volcker Commission regarding Civil Service pay. The Commission “recommends...a pay-setting system (in which) federal employees would continue to receive the same base pay for the same job, but in large areas of the country...would also receive an allowance designed to compensate for higher living costs and labor competition.”

We do not support the Volcker Commission’s contention that “a substantial portion of the cost (of pay increases) can and should be absorbed through existing personnel accounts...” Because many parks now expend as much as 90% or more of their operating budgets for salaries and other fixed costs, it is unrealistic to expect individual park areas to absorb pay increases. In many cases, this would lead to elimination of park programs, reduction of services, possible closures or cutbacks in existing staffing.
Professionalization of the Park Ranger Occupation

This Association believes that the park ranger series should become a professional series as defined by the Office of Personnel Management. This can be accomplished in three incremental steps:

1) Non-ranger positions — such as fee collectors, dispatchers, guards, ushers, and similar jobs better classified in more appropriate technical series — should be classified out of the GS-025 park ranger series.

2) Benchmark position descriptions should be developed for the professional specialties assimilated in the 025 series, including interpretation, resource and visitor protection, and cultural and natural resource management.

3) A positive education requirement should be instituted by which certain degrees in natural or cultural science disciplines would be mandatory for admission into the 025 series. The full performance journeyman grade level for park rangers would be GS-9.

ANPR recommends that the National Park Service begin to take action on the first two steps immediately.

Housing

National Park Service employees — both in and out of park housing — are paying rents which are increasingly taxing their financial resources. Federal law currently prohibits agencies from providing housing to offset low pay. ANPR therefore recommends that the following steps be taken:

1) The National Park Service should be exempted from the regulations and laws concerning government-furnished quarters and make the occupancy of such quarters by NPS employees a matter of public interest to benefit the visitor and the resource. If this option proves feasible, an exemption from OMB Circular A-45 should be granted with the stipulation that the National Park Service charge rents not to exceed the amount of money an employer would have to pay to a private mortgage company to purchase a comparable house.

2) The National Park Service should provide government quarters in high cost of living urban and resort areas using existing authorities.

3) The National Park Service should be directed to study the feasibility of providing a housing allowance for employees who do not live in government quarters similar to that authorized for military personnel, with the difference that the allowance be inversely proportional to pay. Because of the significance and complexity of this issue, we believe that the Service should be required to complete this study within one year and report to Congress on its findings and recommendations.

Chairmen Vento and Sikorski, thank you for the opportunity to participate in this oversight hearing. I would be pleased to answer any questions.

Director Ridernour's Testimony

The National Park Service is comprised of about 17,000 full time equivalent positions. The people who make up this Park Service "family" are employed in over 250 different occupations. These employees are responsible for the protection of some of our nation's most significant natural and cultural resources. They are also charged with providing services, assistance and protection to the 200 million citizens of the world who visit national park units each year. Because of these dual responsibilities of resource protection and visitor service, I personally feel the employees of the National Park Service are truly our most valuable resource.

However, the national parks are facing serious challenges in the management of these vital human resources — challenges shared by many agencies of government but which are of particular concern to land management agencies.

There was a time, about 15 years ago, when the Park Service was awash with applicants for our jobs. The nation's grass roots environmental and conservation movements were burgeoning, and tremendous interest was expressed in careers within the natural sciences. Millions of baby-boomers were coming out of our colleges and a nationwide recession was affecting the economy. During this same period, the National Park System was experiencing tremendous growth. Numerous advancement opportunities were available to newly-hired employees.

We could pick and choose from among many of the most competent and talented graduates coming out of our colleges and universities — employees with degrees in the natural and biological sciences, history, and parks and recreation management. We regularly hired graduates with bachelor's and masters degrees for even our lower-graded technician jobs — those with no known career advancement potential. The work force was young, vigorous, and in possession of skills and education which were on the cutting edge of technology in their respective disciplines.

It was practically unheard of during the first years of the 1970's for an employee to leave a career as a park ranger, so unusual, in fact, that rangers across the Service all heard about it when someone did resign. However, the establishment in the late 1970's of new parks in and near high cost urban areas changed this situation. By the end of the 80's, park units in proximity to large urban areas were often losing 20 percent and more of their permanent rangers each year.

Times have changed. We are now in an employment cycle influenced primarily by what has been called the "Baby Bust": we face the fact that millions fewer citizens are entering the labor market today, compared to the 1970's, and we face the realization that those numbers will continue to decline by ½ million per year throughout most of this decade. Also, baccalaureate conferrals in the natural sciences have declined by 30 percent over the past decade, while those in business have increased by 50 percent, further decreasing our potential employee market. The Park Service must compete in this shrinking market against employers who can offer significantly higher starting salaries, and much better career growth opportunities. Similar challenges are faced by agencies across the Federal government.

Like many Federal agencies, the Park Service is losing its ability to compete, especially for the pool of young, highly-qualified recent college graduates. In 1989, the Service hired 250 new park rangers — 60 percent were over the age of 30 at the time they were hired, and over 33 percent lacked a four-year college degree. Among those with degrees, only 50 percent held them in concentrations related to parks and recreation management, history, and the natural and biological sciences. Our difficulty competing for new-hires is only one of the problems we are facing.

The aging of our work force is a serious personnel management concern both for the present and as we move into the 21st century.

Within the ranger series, currently 50 percent of our permanent park rangers are over the age of 40, while fewer than 10 percent are under age of 30. The baby-boom segment of our work force, those currently between the ages of 32 and 42, comprise almost 30 percent of all rangers, and that percentage is growing each year as we hire far more baby-boomers than we lose.

Within the next decade, our average professional employee and our average park ranger will both have been out of college for almost 20 years. That's 20 years away from the cutting edge of technology in their respective disciplines. We anticipate that the Service will have to invest significant sums of money over the next decade if we are to maintain our current levels of scientific (ability) and (our management problems) increase in complexity.

An additional problem is that there are so many baby-boomers among our ranger work force that there will be hundreds of rangers who will retire from the Service without ever having held a job above grade GS-9. There are far greater numbers of baby-boomer rangers than there are positions above GS-9 in the
ranger series that they can be promoted to.

These large numbers of baby-boomers reduced advancement opportunities not only for themselves but also for younger employees. We are already seeing this phenomenon occurring among our rangers — there are currently only seven park rangers in the entire Park Service under the age of 30 who hold positions above grade GS-7.

Computer projections of our workforce show that some of these younger employees will likely experience “bust and boom” careers; they could be stalled in lower grades for years, and then be quickly promoted to the ranks of management with little experience once the baby-boomers reach retirement age.

In many of the Service’s professional occupations, we currently have only one employee under the age of 30 to replace 10 to 20 baby-boom age colleagues. This phenomenon is referred to by the Hudson Institute in their publication, Civil Service 2000, as “a slowly emerging crisis of competence” and what we in the Service have for years referred to as a “crisis of experience.” Whatever the name, the Federal government in general and the National Park Service in particular will find it difficult to recruit and advance enough younger workers to facilitate a smooth workforce transition once the baby-boom segment of our workforce retires.

These multiple challenges of pay, recruiting, attrition and advancement opportunity affect most employment categories within the Service and most kinds of employees. They are particularly problematic, however, for women and minorities, and have markedly adverse impacts upon the Service’s programs of equal opportunity recruitment and advancement.

The Service’s recruitment of entry level women rangers is quite successful — women comprise 40 percent of all newly hired rangers.

The Service is facing particular difficulty, however, in the recruitment of recently graduated African Americans into ranger positions. Competition for these graduates is intense, and the Park Service lacks the economic incentives and the promise of advancement that are fundamental requirements for the effective recruitment of these groups, especially from historically black colleges and universities.

Our recruitment problem is not, however, our primary equal opportunity difficulty. The biggest problem we are facing is our relative inability to retain these employees once they have been recruited. In the past year in the ranger series, the Park Service hired 70 white women but lost 75. We hired seven African Americans, but lost 16. We hired five Hispanic rangers, but lost nine. As a result of these retention problems, the current distribution of Park Rangers continues to under-represent Asian, African, Hispanic and white women, and Asian and African men.

Since the Service’s significant gains in the hiring of women and minorities are recent, it follows that our women and minorities are, as a group, younger, have fewer years of service, and hold lower grade levels compared to their white male colleagues. But it is exactly these three factors — age, length of service, and grade level — that are the greatest predictors of attrition within our workforce. Therefore, as a group, women and minorities have decidedly higher rates of attrition than do their white male counterparts.

We know from our experience that we can reduce attrition with grade advancement. But our huge numbers of baby-boomers make career advancement difficult for these younger, lower-graded employees. In addition, it is important to understand that the park ranger series, as an occupation, is not growing.

Park rangers, therefore, are hired to replace other rangers who have retired or who have left the Service because of low pay, high cost-of-living, lack of advancement opportunity and the promise of significantly better prospects in other government agencies or the private sector. In essence, our newly-hired park rangers, many of whom are women and minorities, are often hired into the same basic economic environment which precipitated the resignation of the former incumbent.

Mr. Chairman, we have discussed at length our statistics within the ranger series, because the rangers comprise nearly a quarter of our workforce. These issues do, however, apply to the entire workforce.

We have worked in earnest, using the tools currently available to us, to manage our workforce during these difficult times, to enhance recruitment efforts and to control our attrition rate. We have, in fact, had some recent successes.

Through classification initiatives and effective position management techniques, we have been able in the last three years to increase the grades of nearly 450 park rangers from GS-5 and 6 to GS-7. We have instituted special pay rates in high cost-of-living areas including New York, Boston, San Francisco, and Philadelphia, and have thus increased the pay of nearly 25 percent of lower-graded park rangers. As a direct result of these efforts, the attrition rate for rangers has declined from 9.6 percent to 8.1 percent over the past three years.

We are in the process of instituting an intake program which will recruit 40 GS-5 employees to be trained intensively and promoted over a two-year period to GS-9 positions. Candidates for the program will be selected both from within the ranks of the Service and from outside sources.

There are three primary goals of the intake program. First, to enhance signifi-
cantly our success in recruitment and retention of women and minorities. Second, to assure that young, well-educated candidates are competitively recruited and promoted to avoid our large numbers of baby-boom aged workers from impeding their career progression. Third, to better prepare current employees for future management-level positions within the Service.

To emphasize professionalism within the Service, we have significantly increased the numbers of employees in our specialized professional occupations. Our numbers in the engineering and scientific example, have grown by 15 percent each year for the past three years, and those numbers will continue to increase as the Service moves toward a more science-based and professional work force.

To help alleviate the career advancement bottlenecks of our park rangers, we have developed a comprehensive career management concept plan, which provides for alternative career paths within the ranger occupation and which provides recommendations on occupations within the Park Service that are expected to have the best career growth potential.

These initiatives, however, have limitations. For example, we can increase the grades of only so many park rangers, and we can institute special pay rates in only so many geographical locations.

We also face significant challenges to our budget allocation priorities. Many of our smaller parks are now expending over 80 percent of their operating budget for staff salaries. The addition of fixed expenses such as utility bills puts many parks over 90 percent of their operating budget. There may not be adequate funds in a park budget to provide 25 percent geographic pay raises, or significant job classification upgrades. Or the manager may have to decide to hire fewer employees, exaggerating other problems in a park which may be running on only five to ten employees. Although the Park Service operation budget continues to grow at a rate exceeding inflation, personnel costs must compete with other priorities.

We realize that the Service is ultimately responsible for the management of its human resources, and I hope that I have demonstrated to you, both from our knowledge of the challenges facing us and from our current initiatives, that we take this challenge seriously. You ask, however, what your committees can do to help us address these challenges.

A related personnel issue is the availability of adequate and affordable housing. Approximately 2,000 FTE field positions are "required occupancy" positions where the employee must live on-site in Park Service employee housing in order to perform essential services and duties. A 1987 Park Service study required by Congress indicates that the Service's current staffing levels have had interacting with a wide variety of National Park Service personnel.

Today NPCA would like to touch on what we view as several of the most critical issues facing NPS rangers, including salaries and grade structure, employee development, recruitment/retention, career mobility, and housing. But before examining these specific subjects, I would like to provide some general overview comments.

The National Park System has now grown to 355 units: a remarkable collection of areas that has made a significant contribution to world culture through the ideals the system represents and the superlative natural and cultural resources preserved therein. However, we sometimes forget that it was actually the formation of the National Park Service in 1916 that was the catalyst for bringing a small conglomerate of federal reservations together to form the core of the national park system. The first national parks survived without an organized bureau for 44 years.

Today, however, a vastly expanded National Park System, faced with increasing pressures from development and the changing needs of millions of visitors, requires active management and protection of resources and organized, professional stewardship.

From the first days when the superintendent of Yellowstone served without salary or staff, to today's modern organization of over 13,000 employees, the National Park Service has been the keeper of a sacred trust for citizens around the world. The efforts of the Service's founders to ensure that the nation's heritage would be preserved for posterity continue to be reflected in the commitment of the individuals who work in the NPS today. The parks would not continue to exist if not for the efforts of the National Park Service.

Though many of the concerns and problems that will be raised here are broadly applicable to the Park Service, a major concern of this hearing is a particular group of NPS employees: the rangers. National Park Service rangers are the frontline troops; the hosts, guardians, and interpreters of our remarkable parks. They are responsible for ensuring that visitors have safe, enjoyable, and educational visits, while simultaneously enforcing the laws and regulations that protect the resources. As the most visible element of the Service within the parks, the rangers are the primary ambassadors to an adoring national and international public that registers over 300 million visits per year.

As the designated caretakers of our national parks, however, the NPS must be watched and defended by the rest of us. We need to be vigilant on behalf of its employees to ensure that they are provided with the tools required to fulfill their important stewardship responsibilities. We also must be vigilant of conditions that

Mr. Lienesch's Testimony

The National Parks and Conservation Association (NPCA) appreciates the opportunity to testify on behalf of our 100,000 members at these oversight hearings on personnel issues. The employees of the National Park Service are rightfully regarded by the American public as outstanding civil servants. We are very appreciative of the efforts of both subcommittees to address the issues facing Park Service and other land management agency personnel.

In 1988, NPCA released the National Park System Plan, a comprehensive study of the National Park System and the National Park Service. Volume nine of that plan deals with many of the issues of interest in this hearing. While our testimony is based in large part on the findings included in our plan, it is also based on other studies of the Service, and the cumulative years of experience that our staff members
cause frustration with the bureaucracy or expose the Service to political pressures. These can result in failure to provide the professional care the system deserves.

The unique spirit of the agency is a major factory in attracting people to an NPS career. Yet the romantic aura surrounding the NPS tends to cloak pragmatic personnel issues. Today, however, NPS employees have increasing concerns about career advancement, opportunities for professional development, and how to maintain high standards of stewardship under staffing and budget constraints. When employee needs and basic expectations are not met, the result is demoralization and the mission of the Service — the protection of the parks — is endangered.

Meanwhile, as the problems grow at the individual level, change swirls around the parks, complicating the preservation responsibility of the NPS. The nation is obviously facing an environmental crisis in which the parks are bound. Resource threats are increasing, affecting the numbers, types and desired expertise of employees that the NPS needs to protect the parks. In addition, other important socioeconomic changes are also taking place that bear directly on the present and future personnel policies and requirements of the agency.

For example, trends within American society generally, and the National Park Service specifically, that must be addressed in future personnel policy include:

- the aging of the “baby-boom” population;
- change in the labor force from service-oriented workers to skilled laborers with computer backgrounds;
- change in families, with dual-wage earners the rule rather than the exception;
- continuing ethnic diversification of America, with a projected doubling of Hispanic and non-white U.S. residents by the year 2020;
- increasing numbers of mid-career workers and more competition for promotion and salary increases;
- potential shortages of qualified young workers;
- increasing numbers of complex family situations involving divorced parents, single-parent families, and two-career families;
- possible increasing resistance to relocation due to dual-career families, economic difficulties, and unwillingness to sever personal and community ties.

The National Park Service is consistently rated as one of the most, if not the most, popular federal agency. That reputation is built on the professionalism of its employees and the incredible popularity of the resources the agency manages. To the casual observer, that shine may never tarnish; all may seem well with the Service.

However, the reality is that the Park Service is suffering from a variety of internal and external pressures. Existing conditions are undermining the capabilities of the agency to manage the parks to the highest standards, and respond to the rapid rate of change in our society. Our commitment to the national parks themselves requires that we respond to the pressing issues affecting the ranger corps and other categories of NPS employees before the agency suffers continued decline in critical functions.

Salary/Grade Structure

While rangers have always been poorly compensated throughout the history of the Service, the purchasing power of ranger pay has steadily slipped in the past twenty years. Though employees have received small cost of living adjustments, many are struggling to make ends meet. And in many cases, where parks were forced to absorb the full cost of those increases, staff and services have been reduced — forcing NPS to carry out more services with relatively fewer employees. That inevitably leads to morale problems.

At the heart of the organizational and operational framework of the National Park Service is the “ranger corps.” This relatively small elite group of approximately 3,000 individuals is classified by Office of Personnel Management (OPM) standards as “non-professionals,” meaning there is no “positive education requirement” for those hired in the 025 job series.

While 025 park rangers may be characterized as “generalists” — at various times in their careers, each will be called upon to be a jack-of-several trades and master of several more: visitor protection, resource management, interpretation and overall park administration — they can hardly be considered as “non-professionals.”

Yet, by the early 1980’s, the combination of low salaries, high cost of living (particularly in urban areas), diminished career opportunities, and non-existent career ladders had drawn an ever-tightening economic noose around NPS rangers. The problem has gotten particularly acute at the lower ranks, where salaries for rangers we entrust with protecting our national heritage have eroded to such a level as to make them uncompetitive with even the lowest private sector salaries. Entry level salaries for GS-4 and GS-5 rangers are $14,573 and $16,305, respectively.

Mr. Chairman, on this subject of ranger salaries and grade structures, the Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR) is to be commended for its work in identifying and quantifying the problem. As you know, in 1989 ANPR completed a “Report on Ranger Economic Hardship,” based on a detailed questionnaire cir-
ANPR's "log jam" at lower levels that is producing much of the morale problems and turnover in the Service; of the approximately 3,180 rangers in the Service, 1,600 are GS-7 or below and 750 are GS-5. Rangers in these grades comprise 68 percent of the ranger force.

Frustration over low salaries at these levels, which comprise the backbone of the NPS, is one of the chief reasons that NPS is losing qualified employees to other agencies and the private sector. In 1989, the National Commission on the Public Service (known as the Volcker Commission) released a report entitled "Leadership for America: Rebuilding the Public Service." The Volcker Commission study reported an average gap of 22 percent between public and private wage scales. In its study, ANPR has made a convincing case that not only do NPS salaries at lower grade levels compare unfavorably with the private sector, but that comparative positions in the U.S. Park Police and state and local parks also pay more.

These conditions are undoubtedly a key reason why the ANPR study would elicit such responses as:

"The compensation for a GS-5 law enforcement ranger was the same as a federal elevator operator." "I hope to be back in the NPS some day, but not as the GS-7 who left after 10 years service. After seeing how the other 39 percent lives, it's hard to imagine returning to the government equivalent of indentured servitude." "I never thought I'd say this, but I now realize that my skills and talents... 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 McDonalds... I'm sick and tired of being paid in sunsets. We are asked to provide exceptional standards of visitor services, and aren't paid even close to what would constitute proper pay."

While the park ranger generalist has historically played an important role in the management of resources and visitors, the needs of the National Park System today are such that most park rangers need to possess specialized education and experience; some jobs require expertise in the field of history and archeology, biology, geology or park management. As recommended in NPCA's National Park System Plan: Investing in Park Futures report, the 025 ranger should have a "positive education requirement" just as employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service are required to possess an undergraduate degree in a resource field.

By requiring an undergraduate degree (and requiring that 50 percent of an individual's routine duties fall within a specific field, i.e., historic preservation), not only would a professional approach to resource and visitor management be enhanced, but also many of the salary and grade structure problems existent in the Service could be addressed.

For example, rangers complain that it is virtually impossible to live in certain high cost geographic areas (i.e. urban areas, Alaska, Hawaii) on a GS-05 salary (approximately $16,305 per annum). With a positive education requirement, the rangers' salary at the full performance level would be GS-09 (approximately $24,705 per annum), a much more livable wage.

The Volcker Commission noted that "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 work force, 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 after 10 years service) 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."

NPCA is deeply appreciative of the important actions taken by Congress over the past several years to increase the NPS budget substantially beyond administration requests. However, in an attempt to address the salary issue NPCA is concerned that the cost of the pay increases can no longer be absorbed largely by existing accounts. We are concerned, for example, that the administration has not requested enough money in the FY 1991 budget to cover the anticipated pay increase.

Employee Development (Training)

The NPS employee development program is one of the best in the federal government. Centralized course offerings, park and regionally-based courses, team-taught and individually self-paced correspondence courses — all are designed to provide the work force with up-to-date knowledge and skills. ANPR reported that NPS rangers were benefiting from impressive levels of training: permanent employees (rangers) responding to the survey had an average of 3.2 weeks per year.

However, there has not been enough success in enabling NPS professionals to interact with their colleagues in the academic and other communities. In the past, scientists, historians and others in "professional" job series have been denied permission to attend professional meetings and conferences because such meetings were viewed with skepticism by some who viewed them as "professional vacations" not "training."

The most serious deficiency in the NPS training program is in the area of management development. Specialists and ranger generalists who are selected to begin their first superintendency assignment often begin the job with little or no formal managerial training. As documented in our report, "There is no career management framework to ensure that employees attain a full range of management skills."

Housing

Serious concerns have been raised for several years about the quality of park housing. Housing is acutely poor in some situations, especially for seasonal employees. The National Park Service and Congress have been providing funds to begin to deal with the over $250 million needed to repair existing housing and provide new housing. Funds amounting to $20 million have been appropriated in FY 1989 and 1990 and another $14.7 million has been requested for FY 1991. While it would be better if more funds could be devoted to dealing with the large backlog, there is an ongoing program in place designed to lessen the existing problems.

However, it is also possible that the NPS may be able to adopt more flexible and creative approaches, including greater use of loans and housing subsidies in particular expensive areas, to address the housing problems in a more timely fashion. These approaches may also offer an effective means to minimize the impact of construction and operation of NPS facilities on park resources.

Dual Careers

The National Park Service is also faced with the problem of dual career employees. Obviously, this is not a phenomenon related just to the Service or the federal government. The Service is faced with some particular issues, however, in part because some parks are located in remote areas where it is difficult for spouses to find employment either with the National Park Service, other public agencies or in the private market.

Some NPS personnel have taken the initiative to deal with this problem by helping to develop a dual-career directory. Some parks and regions have also made efforts to try to accommodate dual careers. This is a problem that will deserve much
more attention, as there are increasing economic and other pressures causing an increase in the number of dual career couples.

Career Advancement and Employee Retention

While the Service has been called stable in terms of its personnel composition (the number of people entering and leaving), this hides a greater threat. Stagnation, disappointment, frustration and heightened expectations can build to a critical point, and are sometimes vented through departures. The "bottleneck" at the GS-5/7 level is well known.

In 1986, 29.5 percent of the GS-4s and GS-5s left the Service. While the NPS asserts that the overall rate of turnover in the Service, at about five percent per year, is consistent with figures for the total federal workforce, it masks the fact that most of the turnover is at the lower levels.

ANPR's surveys have indicated that the primary factors leading to resignation from the NPS 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 management, the denigration of the ability of employees, and the apparent lack of dedication by park managers to the NPS mission."

After an employee reaches the GS-9 level, there is limited opportunity to advance unless one enters the ranks of management (e.g., supervisory park ranger) or becomes a resource specialist (e.g. museum curator). In some fields, such as interpretation — "master interpreter," for example, is not a recognized personnel classification.

Opportunities for career advancement in the NPS have fallen short of expectations for many rangers. As documented in our report "a short supply of opportunities has created morale problems. It is not unusual for employees to remain at one grade level with the same responsibilities and pay for five to ten years."

While the vast majority of 025 park rangers seek positions with greater responsibility — and some hope to become superintendents — others, for personal or financial reasons, leave the ranks of the 025 series entirely. Some cannot support their families on their GS-5 or GS-7 salary; others (leave) because they are attracted to better paying positions in other departments and agencies... (or) the private sector. And a few rangers resign because of the growing frustration of seeing persons promoted who they consider less qualified.

The ANPR survey included detailed comments from 13 rangers who had left the Service. The 13 had worked an average of 5.5 years in the Service; all but two were GS-7 or below; all but two went to other federal agencies where they now have wage grades from GS-9 to GS-13. Together they had accumulated a total of 21,270 training hours, for a lost cost to the NPS of over $1,061,000 (assuming a cost of $50 per hour training costs).

While this may not be a definitive statistical analysis, it is apparent that more rangers with visitor protection and resource management skills are leaving for positions with higher grades and better career ladders in other federal agencies. Other agencies actively recruit from NPS ranks, where they find highly motivated, well-trained employees and avoid incurring the training expenses.

Seasonal Employees

Many of the issues that we have discussed apply equally to permanent and seasonal personnel. Seasonal Park Service staff face a number of additional problems, some of which are associated with being employed part-time. Lack of health insurance and a retirement plan are two examples. A great deal of time can and should be devoted to the particular problems of seasonal employees. These individuals are an integral part of park operations and over the years have provided a large part, if not the majority of, the direct contact with visitors.

One of the important issues covered in our National Park System Plan is the effect of tighter budgets on seasonal hiring. Many parks have dealt with the effect of tighter budgets by reducing seasonal hiring. At the same time, park visitation continues to increase and the visitor season is lengthening at many parks. As a result of decreased seasonal hiring, the visitors are not being served as well as they have been in the past. On the one hand, this is perhaps the inevitable result of efforts to balance the federal budget. On the other, it is a real price that is being paid by both the seasonal staff and the visitor, and one that is causing increasing concern.

In conclusion, there are a wide variety of issues that are affecting the ability of National Park Service personnel to carry out their important responsibilities. We have identified several of these; other witnesses today will provide more information on these and will discuss additional ones. To retain the caliber of employees that we have come to expect will require that progress be made on these issues simultaneously.

Excerpts from Ms. Scoville's Testimony

Representative Vento and Representative Sikorski, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to testify before your committees on issues women, wives, and mothers confront as members of the National Park Service family. I have been a Park Service wife for 28 of my 35 years of married life. I have pulled up stakes and moved eight times, raised three children to adulthood, taught school, and led scout troops. I am the National Park Women's representative on the Education Trust Fund of the Employee and Alumni Association of the National Park Service, and I participate in the affairs of the Association of National Park Rangers.

We all know that the world of today is not the world of 1962 when I was privileged to join the National Park Service family as the wife of a park ranger-archeologist at Gran Quivira National Monument in central New Mexico. I feel it instructive to contrast the conditions then with the conditions now.

Role of the park wife: I was expected to be at home with children; I was subordinate to the wife of my husband's supervisor, who was also our next door neighbor; I hosted visitors from the regional and Washington offices; I trained in structural fire fighting and first aid; and I actively participated in the social life of the local ranching families in the interest of park-community relationships. In short, I was a contributing but unpaid member of the park staff. . . .

I was fortunate. We joined the National Park Service family just before a period of rapid expansion in the number of units of the National Park System during the late 1960's through the late 1970's. Promotions for my husband came rapidly between 1967 and 1974. While government salaries then as now were low in comparison to the private sector, by 1974 I no longer had to manage the household frugally, just prudently. There was no economic imperative requiring me to work to make ends meet, although I did re-enter the job market in temporary positions in my field of childhood education and development to fill a strongly felt need for personal accomplishment. I was, however, unable to resume my professional career in these kinds of positions.

The disappointment was not just that I was excluded from my chosen field for which I was fully qualified and dearly loved. As important was that my self-esteem was bruised, for I was still dependent upon my husband's income and could not contribute in financially significant ways to our marriage. I feel that this is very important to contemporary women. They want partnerships, not dependencies.
We all know that the world of today is not the world I just described to you. Today's world is more complex, it takes two wage earners to make ends meet, and promotions have not been rapid in the National Park Service for a number of years.

So the concerns we must address with regard to Park Service women, wives, and mothers is the world of 1990 and the future, not the world of my past.

Let me share with you the problems and pressures that contemporary, younger women face. I have seen them over the past ten years in my work in day care centers; I have seen them in my two married children and the married children of my friends; and I have learned of them from talking to women at the Ranger Rendezvous held annually by the Association of National Park Rangers.

As we know, not all women want to work outside the home. But as we also know the economic necessity of paid work outside of the home is pervasive today. And, finally, many women want careers and to be wives, or wives and mothers. This dual career/tri-career life style brings tremendous pressures to bear upon the women, their spouses, and their children. These pressures not only affect their personal lives, but also affect the work place, and how well they and their spouses get their work done.

In any marriage, there are stresses and pressures. In dual-career marriages there are substantially added pressures and stresses coming from an unresolvable over-commitment of time and a never-ending battle of how to allocate that time: marriage, career, children. The dual career couple have to work out several issues. How to divide labor at home, particularly with regard to child care. How to carve out some personal time just to nurture the marriage or to nurture the kids (listen to the get-away weekend ads on radio if you do not believe that this is a real issue today). How to schedule everything — shopping, getting kids to school, teacher-parent conferences, doctors and dentist visits, and vacations together. These decisions have almost a nightmarish quality, and are continuously occurring stresses.

Now comes the good part — a transfer right in line with one spouse's career aspirations. Not necessarily a promotion, but the next step in career advancement. Now what happens to the stress level? Off the scale. It is great for one spouse. Will the other spouse have to take a downgrade, or move from a permanent to a temporary position, or just quit and hope for the best, if the transfer is accepted? What happens to the other spouse's career aspirations? Will it deal a fatal blow to her/his career development and potential?

When couples face this choice, hard looks are taken at the marriage and the career and the family. And hard choices are made. The choices include quitting the Park Service and quitting the marriage. This fact alone should give the Park Service some real basis for concern for the dual-career couple.

Now let's consider the particular pressures and stresses if children, especially preschool children, are involved. While day care is an essential answer, it brings with it pressures on the dual-career parents, and is not a bit easy on the children, particularly in their early development years. For example, parents have a difficult time dealing with their guilt at leaving their child in another person's care. Frequently, the child senses their distress and becomes tearful or fussy, which simply reinforces the parental guilt.

Major changes have occurred in the work force (regarding) who works and why they have to work. Women work for self-fulfillment, as do men, and women work for money, as do men. What needs to be addressed is the relationship between the individual's responsibilities to contribute to the solution of the problems I have noted and the Park Service's role as a responsible employer to contribute to the solution. Right now all of the burden is on the dual-career couple, especially the woman. Dual-career couples should have the opportunity, the equal opportunity, for career development and career advancement, and the fulfillment that comes from such contributions. Women of today and the future should not have to make the choice I had to make as a condition of being married to a career Park Service man, and neither should the man.

Excerpts from Dr. Kaufman's Testimony

In the course of researching my current study of the history of women and national parks, I have learned about the progress of women employees in the National Park Service over time. I have also examined some of successful affirmative action initiatives in individual regions and in national training programs that can serve as models for Service-wide action. Pay equity needs to be addressed, as do some persistent domestic issues.

Affirmative action initiatives should be continued and expanded. These include equitable training opportunities for women, active recruitment of women for vacancies, listing of vacancies at both the lower and expected grade, e.g. GS 11/12 so lower graded women can apply, and the insistence from high level administrators that women will be promoted.

An example of an equitable training opportunity in the Park Service is the ranger training course at the Albright Training Center at the Grand Canyon. It is one of the reasons for the increase of the number of women park rangers from virtually zero percent 25 years ago to approximately 28 percent at the present...

An example of the success of insistence from the administrators at the highest level that women be promoted is the recent increase in women appointed to the position of (park superintendent). Partly because of the support of the Secretary of the Interior, the number of women park superintendents has risen to thirty, approximately 12 percent of the total, after an actual decline in the mid-1980's to seven percent. This initiative needs to continue. Although women superintendents come from administration as well as from the park ranger series, perhaps a realistic goal would be 20 percent, comparable to the percent of women trained at Albright since 1972 — a source for many male superintendents.

Another successful affirmative action program that should be expanded is the Women's Executive Leadership Program administered by OPM for women at a grades of GS-11 or 12. This year, six women from the Park Service are part of 270 women in this program that gives women training on site in addition to 17 weeks of off-site training. It is less expensive than the Departmental Management Program, which has only trained a handful of Park Service women. Through 1988, the Natural Resource Specialist Trainee Program trained 25 talented women in that field.

In the professional ranks, there are several areas where strong recruitment of women and support of promotion needs to be addressed. Overall only 23 percent of professionals in the Park Service are women. Only 22 percent of archeologists in the Park Service are women, 18 percent of landscape architects, seven percent of engineers, and 39 percent of historians. Only in the latter field are the median grades comparable. In administration, women have made great progress in becoming administrative officers, constituting 47 percent, but the median grade for those women is a GS-9 as compared with a GS-11 for men. Although 54 percent of the employees in administration are women, the median grade for women is a GS-9 as compared to a GS-12 for men. Women are missing from the highest grades in both administrative and professional ranks: in grades GS-14 and GS-15 for those two areas combined, only 23 (12 percent) are women and 174 are men.

One employment area has not responded to affirmative action and needs to be addressed in a different way. In the Park Service 89 percent of the clerical staff are women and 96 percent of the maintenance staff are men.

Although the skills, education, training, and usefulness to the Park Service of a
In 1954, the median grade for women overall in the federal civil service was GS-4 and the median grade for men was GS-9; in 1988 in the Park Service the median grade for women was GS-6 and the median grade for men was GS-11 (not including maintenance positions paid on a wage grade scale). Holding a grade of GS-11 or above were 51 percent of men and 16 percent of women; holding a grade of GS-5 or below were 47 percent women and 18 percent men. There are many individual success stories among women Park Service employees; now it is time to make those stories apply Service wide.

Among the problems that prevent women from advancing in the Park Service or even causing them to leave are dual-career, child-care, and sexual harassment issues. Some parks have made good progress in these areas and their work should be continued, a more dependable route to pay equity would be to reclassify clerical work using pay equity standards assigning points for level of skill, amount of effort, qualifications, responsibilities, and working conditions. The General Accounting Office is now undertaking a pay equity study of the federal government due out next year. This study is an important, although tardy, first step in making the federal government a fair place for women workers.

Among the problems that prevent women from advancing in the Park Service or even causing them to leave are dual-career, child-care, and sexual harassment issues. Some parks have made good progress in these areas and their work should be implemented as Servicewide models. Big Bend, Everglades and Yosemite have all advertised positions in groups and listed them as dual-career possibilities. As a result, they attract some of the most dedicated and highly-trained couples in the Park Service. In remote locations like Tuolumne Meadows at Yosemite in the winter, couples who are both qualified rangers are now preferred.

Land management agencies could work together to set up hiring zones which would include all sites within community distance of each other. Each zone could not only circulate job vacancies as possible dual-career possibilities, but also actively work to coordinate the placement of couples.

Child care centers have allowed women to continue their careers in Yosemite and Golden Gate NRA. These centers have been started by park personnel on their own using park buildings. Either with Park Service monies or with funds from the anticipated passage of the child-care bill, money should become available for the Park Service to fund these centers so as not to lose valuable, highly-trained employees because there is no child care available.

Despite 25 years of affirmative action programs in the federal government—a push begun when the report of the President’s Commission on the Status of Women released in October 1963 stated that the federal government should be "a showcase of equal opportunity for women," —women's positions in the Park Service have been slow to improve overall.
climber injured at the base of Half Dome and given instruction to hundreds of backpackers on the fine art of tying their food in trees away from the herds of hungry bears. There were few requirements for the job then and little formal training. Today though, our duties, responsibilities and training are significantly greater than they were 20 years ago, yet our grade structure and position descriptions have remained essentially unchanged. As a result, our salaries and benefits are well below those of other agencies with similar responsibilities.

Over the last decade, changes have taken place within the Park Service which have profoundly affected the nature of our jobs. I've watched our profession go from the dream job of everyone I knew in college to something of a sad joke among my colleagues. I watch as more and more of my friends leave the Service because they can literally no longer afford to continue in their chosen profession.

Probably no change has been as dramatic as our increasing law enforcement responsibilities. Most of us did not become rangers to be cops, but we accept this obligation because it is an integral part of protecting our parks and the 287 million visitors who come each year. One of the most critical law enforcement problems facing us is the increase of poaching, where illegal hunters are stripping parks of wildlife. In 1988, serious crimes such as poaching, possession of stolen property, assault, and drugs accounted for more than 80,000 investigations and 9,000 arrests. There was a 5.8% increase in misdemeanors alone, as well as 86 assaults on rangers.

In one especially grim, six-week period last year, rangers were involved in three fatal shootings of armed suspects as well as responding to a hostage situation at Yellowstone. Nor do these statistics reflect the constant minor misdemeanors, such as littering and illegal campfires which, because of our unique mission to protect and preserve, are our highest priorities.

Since we are the ambulance and fire service in many parks, most of us are also emergency medical technicians or paramedics. Many of us have extensive fire training in both structural and wildland fires. Over 95 percent of our rangers have college degrees, often in either the natural sciences or history to meet our primary obligation of explaining our natural and historic heritage to the visiting public.

### ANPR Promotional Items

As a result of the last Rendezvous, our stock of items has dwindled considerably. We are now out of T-shirts, coffee mugs and ANPR pins. I am currently working on ordering the "basic" ANPR sales items for the upcoming Las Vegas Rendezvous. I do have some things available for you through mail order, however. Fill out the order form and mail it along with your check. I'll get them into the mail to you as soon as possible.

Make your check out to ANPR and mail it and the order form to:
Tessy Shirakawa
4210 Resurrection Drive
Anchorage, AK 99504

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>S &amp; H</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steins</td>
<td>$ 8.00</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANPR patches</td>
<td>$ 2.00</td>
<td>$ .50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANPR decals</td>
<td>$ 1.25</td>
<td>$ .50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plastic stadium cups</td>
<td>4 for $1.00</td>
<td>$.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMS decals</td>
<td>$ 1.25</td>
<td>$ .50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belt buckles, pewter</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belt buckles, brass</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pen sets</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folders, small</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name: ____________________________________________________________
Address: __________________________________________________________
Phone: ____________________________________________________________

RANGER: SUMMER 1990
again, Congress and the Park Service must undertake a similarly ambitious program to bring about a vitally needed renaissance within our endangered parks.

Excerpts from Mr. Sutton’s Testimony

Mr. Chairman and members of the committees, for the past 14 years and until last month, I served in the Department of the Interior, first as a second-generation park ranger with the National Park Service (1976-84) and later as a special agent with the Fish and Wildlife Service (1984-90). Recently, I began work as a program officer with the World Wildlife Fund, helping other countries preserve their parks and wildlife.

My NPS career typified that of many idealistic young employees. From 1976 to 1982, I served as a seasonal park ranger at Yosemite, Yellowstone, and Biscayne National Parks and Death Valley National Monument. In order to qualify to work for the NPS, I paid for my own training in law enforcement and emergency medical care. On duty, I performed the full spectrum of ranger activities, including law enforcement, emergency medical services, search and rescue, interpretation, wildland fire suppression, and resource management. However, this work conferred no tenure or career status. Seasonal rangers are temporary employees and hence are not eligible to compete for promotions or to receive benefits such as Federal retirement and insurance coverage.

Finally, after applying for career positions for several years, I managed to land a permanent, GS-5 ranger job at Virgin Islands National Park, where I served from 1982-84. While there, I received exemplary personnel evaluations and several special performance awards. Although I competed diligently for transfers and promotions, my career was stilled. There was clearly a bottleneck at the GS-5 grade level; hundreds of people were competing for the same openings. In those days, a vacancy at an attractive park such as Yosemite or Grand Teton would attract more than 200 applicants. Mobility, much less upward mobility, was clearly not forthcoming. After filing more than 25 applications for promotion and transfer, I became bitterly disappointed in the lack of career opportunity in the NPS.

Although I did not want to leave the NPS, I felt that I had no reasonable alternative. In 1984, I applied for an intake position as a special agent with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and was selected. It was the only job I had ever sought outside the Park Service. In contrast to my dead-end NPS job, FWS offered me a reasonable career ladder, GS-5/7/9/11/12, and ultimately a GS-13 within five years. What choice did I have? At an annual Ranger Rendezvous sponsored by the Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR), I was told that if I remained in the NPS, I had only a one-in-15 chance of ever making GS-9! Is it any wonder, then, that rangers with even a modicum of ambition are leaving the NPS for positions that offer more opportunity in other Federal agencies or the private sector?

Today, the NPS continues to employ a supply-side approach to personnel matters — what we used to call the “cannon fodder” mentality. The message to NPS employees was then, and remains today: “If you don’t like it, you can be replaced!” Until recently, there have always been plenty of applicants eager and willing to take jobs in the national parks for low pay, inadequate benefits, and substandard housing. For many years, the NPS has taken advantage of the fact that most employees consider themselves fortunate to be able to live and work in the national parks. But no matter how devoted rangers may be, most eventually wake up and realize that their dedication and loyalty are being exploited.

Fewer and fewer applicants are competing for seasonal ranger positions with the NPS. Many seasonals who do manage to land permanent ranger jobs are leaving to work in other Federal agencies or the private sector where they can gain promotions and earn a salary that will allow them to purchase a home and raise a family. The word is spreading among young people today — the NPS simply does not offer a viable career, especially for dual-career families.

Attrition, if not overwhelming in terms of sheer numbers, is sapping the vitality of the NPS by robbing the agency of its brightest and best. Those who can find better opportunities elsewhere are leaving the NPS, taking valuable training and experience with them. The question inevitably arises: Who will remain to lead the NPS into the 21st century? Where are the incentives for tomorrow’s superintendents and chief rangers to stay with the NPS? The ANPR has brought some attention to these concerns, but has not been an effective advocate for rangers because it has been unwilling to confront NPS management on critical issues. It is imperative that Congress and the NPS leadership act while there is still time to stem the tide of departures.

The following recommendations should be seriously considered as part of a comprehensive, legislative reform of NPS personnel practices, in consultation with the agency and the Office of Personnel Management:

- The unique, complex, and specialized nature of ranger work should be recognized and compensated. NPS grade levels should be raised so they are at least commensurate with those of similar Federal agencies.
- In order to provide rangers a reasonable career track, the NPS should revive the ranger career intake program that was abandoned in 1977.
- Housing for NPS employees should be subsidized by a housing allowance system similar to that of the military, and housing should be rent-free in cases where occupancy of government quarters is required.
- Seasonal rangers, often called the “backbone” of the NPS, should be eligible for promotions and the full benefits of Federal employment. They should be permitted to compete for entry into the ranger intake program.
- Rangers and other employees who are required to remain on standby while off-duty should receive adequate compensation, preferably overtime pay.
- Rangers whose duties involve primarily law enforcement and/or fire suppression should be eligible for the special retirement benefits accorded other Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters.

What’s Next?

The committee is now in the process of following up on the hearing by evaluating future courses of action. Questions have been formulated and sent to the Service for further information, and the responses will be employed in the assessment of options. As soon as we hear of developments, we’ll let you know through these pages and through your regional representatives.

Correction

In Polly Kaufman’s article, “NPS Women: Benefits of the Albright Ranger Training Program, 1964-1984” in the spring Ranger, the correct figures for the total percentage of women rangers should have been 22 percent for 1985 (025/026) and 28 percent for 1988 (025).
Looking Back

SAR and
World War II

Butch Farabee
WASO

The best thing to ever happen to mountaineers to the war effort. Men like Butch Farabee, Bob Bendt and Dee Molenaar; on Mt. Rainier and in Wisconsin's Camp McCoy and Colorado's Camp Hale. Park ranger Gordon "Pat" Patterson became the Director of the 87th Mountaineering School at 9,000-foot-high Camp Hale.

An elite detachment went to West Virginia in the spring of 1943 to train in mountainous terrain, and on July 19th the 10th Mountain Division (Light) was formed. Regimental combat teams of 3,000 to 4,000 men passed through each month. One crew worked with pack animals, and another crew of engineers improvised river crossings. Medics specialized in mountain medicine, first aid, and evacuation. And, of course, there was rock climbing...

Equipment had to be refined or developed. In late 1941, the War Department marshaled this country's best civilian mountaineers to the war effort. Men like Brad Washburn, Robert Bates, Terri Hackett, Robert Joan, and James Ford unselfishly provided their expertise.

Laminated skis replaced long wooden "planks", and bindings were perfected for quick release. The felt-like mukluks — "bunny boots" — which were developed still remain the standard high-altitude footgear to this day. New rucksacks evolved, as did baggy "mountain pants" with huge pockets to carry all the extras a soldier needed. Lightweight gasoline pressure stoves, cook kits and dehydrated foods were all developed for these men.

A new rubber sole with cleats on it led to a bulky but very versatile ski-mountain boot which could be used for skiing, rock climbing, snow and ice. New and better crampons, ice axes, pitons, carabiners and tents emerged. Pile-lined parkas and new, light eiderdown sleeping bags, with zippers guaranteed to open in a hurry, were perfected.

The "weasel," the first successful over-the-snow vehicle, was built especially for troop and supply transport. Studebaker's Eliaison Motor Toboggan became America's first snowmobile.

By far the greatest single contribution, however, was the nylon rope. Shortages in manila rope dictated the development of an immediate substitute. The Plymouth Cordage Company tested the synthetic alternative which was developed. It would stretch 39% before breaking; 7/16-inch diameter and 120-foot lengths were quickly adopted. This rope standard still exists today.

Just before going overseas, the full 10th Mountain Division was finally created. In 1944 they were sent to help in the stalled offensive in the Italian Apennines. In February of 1945, the battles of Riva Ridge and Mount Belvedere would make the Division legendary. Hundreds scaled 1,500-foot Riva Ridge under cover of darkness to catch the Germans by surprise. They cracked the "Gothic Line" stretching across northern Italy and opened up the Po River Valley to the Allied Forces. This remarkable effort eventually led to the capture of 20,000 German soldiers.

Continued on page 31
Common Ground

Rangers and wardens in all nations and states have a great deal in common, and many of them have professional associations. Since we face similar threats (environmental, economic and otherwise), it behooves us all to work toward improved communications and cooperation.

National


California State Park Rangers Association (CSGRA). President: Don Murphy. Executive Manager: Doug Bryce. Address: P.O. Box 28366, Sacramento, CA 95828. Publication: Newsletter.

CSGRA is working on a number of projects associated with the 125th anniversary of rangers in California in 1991. The association is looking for help in researching several subjects, including early NPS rangers in California, women rangers, and a history of park law enforcement. If you'd like to get involved, contact Susan Ross or Mike Lynch, 420 Palm Avenue, Lodl, CA 95240.

Fraternal Order of Police (FOP). President: Dewey Stokes. National organization with chapters in national parks. For parks west of the Mississippi: P.O. Box 944, Yosemite, CA 95389; for parks east of the Mississippi: P.O. Box 151, Fancy Gap, VA 59758. Publication: A national newsletter.

An FOP lodge was recently formed at Blue Ridge Parkway to serve rangers east of the Mississippi River, and grew to considerable size in its first few weeks. FOP east and west share a common newsletter and work together on national issues.

Representatives from east and west, together with national president Dewey Stokes, national legislative chairman Don Cahill and their aides, recently met in Washington with NPS officials, members of Congress and others to expedite enhanced retirement for commissioned rangers. Enhanced retirement would also qualify rangers for pay increases under recent legislation that gives pay raises to all federal law enforcement officers.

FOP is also working to establish a uniform shooting review process for the NPS, has nominated rangers involved in 1989's shooting incidents for Interior's valor award, and has seen that rangers killed in the line of duty will be remembered on the national law enforcement officers' memorial to be dedicated in Washington this year.

Association of Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics (AFSEE). Address: P.O. Box 45, Vida, OR 97488. Dues: Donations of from $20 and up. Publication: Inner Voice.


Women in Natural Resources was formed for "professionals in forestry, wildlife, range, fisheries, recreation and related social sciences." The most recent edition of the magazine which we have in hand (sent along by Lisa Vogel) is the December, 1989, edition; within its 50-plus pages are articles on women involved in the 1988 fire operations, another woman's experiences as a fire manager, writing skills, recycling, and wilderness management. There are also a number of regular departments on subjects such as conferences and publications.

International

Scottish Countryside Rangers Association (SCRA). Chairman: Bob Reid. Address: 6 Riverside Road, Larkhall, Lanarkshire, Scotland. Publication: Scramble.


The lead-off article in the spring issue of The Ranger, which is dedicated to "rangers and environmental education", is by the Secretary of State for the Environment, who states in an Earth Day-like message that England needs "green growth ... which does not sacrifice tomorrow in order to consume mindlessly today." In order to do this, the author says, "we need to ensure that environmental concerns are fully recognized in our decisions in other key policy areas, such as energy, transport, agriculture and industry."

The issue also carries a report on the annual general assembly of the European Federation of Nature and National Parks, which featured a discussion of ranger services in Europe. Among other trends identified in Europe, the conference noted that the criteria for qualifications for rangers are poorly developed, that rangers' duties are shifting toward more professional activities (including those related to information and interpretation), and that there's a clear trend in Europe toward enlarging and strengthening ranger services. The report concludes: "The overall thrust of the conference findings are very positive - expand ranger services and give rangers a more managerial role, greater responsibilities, better training and an increased professional status."

NOTICE

There will be a discussion of the proposal to reorganize the Board of Directors at the business meeting at the Rendezvous in Las Vegas, and you should be prepared to provide your thoughts and comments. The proposal calls for the creation of three vice presidents - one for professional issues, one for special concerns, and one for information and representation. The objective, as noted in Rick Gale's comments in his "President's Message" in this issue, is to provide the president with both direct support and proven expertise on issues.

Here are the "position descriptions" for the three vice presidents:

- Vice President, Information and Representation — Two-year position, elected from the membership at large. Vice President can be from any region. Serves as the principal contact between the president and the regional reps who oversee work groups dealing with ANPR-related activities.
- Vice President, Special Concerns — Two-year position, elected from the membership at large. Vice President can be from any region. Primarily responsible for coordinating special membership concerns. Establishes, advises and works with short-term and long-term work groups on issues such as housing, retirement, seasonal concerns, dual careers, etc.
- Vice President, Professional Issues — Two-year position, elected from the membership at large. Vice President can be from any region. Primarily responsible for coordinating special membership concerns. Establishes, advises and works with individual experts and work groups in professional areas, including interpretation, emergency services, law enforcement and resource management.

All three will be voting members on the board. A side benefit of such a reorganization is that vice presidents will no longer be tied to either the East or West, thereby eliminating the problem of the fairly frequent turnovers which occur when a vice president moves across the Mississippi.

Four positions — editor of Ranger, business manager, secretary and sales coordinator — will remain as staff positions directly under the president.
The Professional Ranger

The objective of this section is to provide all rangers with a general overview of recent development in our four primary areas of concern — interpretation, emergency services, cultural and natural resource management and resource and visitor protection. If you’re aware of an event or development in any of these areas, please get in touch with the person coordinating that section.

Resource Management

We seem to be in the era of “initiatives” which come upon us in rapid fire succession. Many disappear just as quickly. Several important ones for this year follow:

- Global climate change — By now, seven to 10 pilot NPS areas have probably been selected for intensive research efforts relating to global warming. The FY 91 budget includes $3 million dollars and 26 FTE’s for these projects. Emphasis in the proposal stages was on parks that were also biosphere reserves. Many are hoping that the NPS uses this opportunity to develop serious, in-depth ecosystem research programs in a few core areas as models that can later be expanded to other sites.

- Inventory and monitoring — It appears that the two years of competitive distribution of funding for pilot I&M programs in FY 88 and 89 will be followed by a more substantial program in FY 92 which will be aimed at a much larger number of parks. If funded, most parks with natural resources should receive some help for resource inventory projects, and a smaller number will supposedly see long-term assistance for intensive monitoring programs. Figures ranging from $10 to $42 million per year have been mentioned.

- Geographic Information Systems (GIS) — Director Ridenour is very interested in GIS and has asked the WASO GIS division to develop a proposal outlining the entire Service’s GIS needs for the remainder of the decade. National Park Service GIS applications will be the focus of a major session at a conference entitled “Resource Technology ’90”, which is scheduled for November 12-15. Unfortunately, this is the same week that the George Wright Society’s biennial NPS science conference will be held in El Paso, Texas.

- RMP’s — WASO has released review versions of the new Clipper software to be used for writing and updating resource management plan (RMP) project statements and programming sheets. These will be used as parks rewrite their RMP’s to follow the new format. The new RMP format and software will be used for consolidated natural and cultural resource plans and will recognize — for the first time — interdisciplinary resource management planning and subsistence concerns for the Alaskan parks. Many regions will be holding “scoping sessions” in pilot parks this summer which will bring together members of all park divisions to begin the arduous RMP process.

I’d like to encourage ideas and contributions to this section of “The Professional Ranger,” particularly from the cultural resource folks out there. My address and phone number are listed under the MWR regional rep section of “Board Reports.”

Bob Krumenaker
Isle Royale

Interpretation

- Diamond Anniversary — The 75th anniversary of the National Park Service in 1991 is almost here and it brings with it an opportunity for us to introduce the history and the mission of the Service to many more people than ever before. With the numerous activities planned it will be hard for an informed American not to know that we are having a 75th birthday. Here are some of those events:

  - A prime-time, nationally televised gala event which will feature nationally recognized celebrities who will introduce the NPS to viewers.
  - The publication of a book by Collins Publishers modeled on their successful book, Day in the Life of America, which will be a photographic essay of NPS employees at work and visitors in parks on a specific day.
  - Possible promotional publicity and programs using Charles Schulz’s “Peanuts” characters.
  - A national parks symposium to assess resource protection challenges and strategies, both nationally and globally.
  - A conference on the “partnership park” concept — the linking of urban parks and corridors to various national, state, local and private interests to foster needed research and cooperation.
  - A conference to promote women and minority employment.
  - The opening of the park ranger museum in Yellowstone. Bill Sonag, who is coordinating many of the 75th activities nationally, confirms that the possibility of a ribbon cutting in ’91 is well on its way to being a reality. Harpers Ferry and Denver are working diligently to finish the final design details, and construction is scheduled to begin soon.

How will we in the field interpret the anniversary, and how do we make this celebration something memorable and more than self-serving? The motto for the anniversary is “Protecting the Past, Managing the Present, Investing in the Future.” This axiom, which embodies the NPS mission, should be greatly accentuated through the media and through our one-on-one contacts with visitors. Without the participation of the public and the support of park employees, this opportune moment and message may be lost. There will never be a better opportunity to get the recruitment message out, to get the protection message out, and to sensitize the public to our nation’s treasures.

- Interpretive award — NCR gives out the Potomac Heritage Award each year to recognize the most creative interpretive program in the region. The 1989 winner was Prince William Forest Park for their program entitled “Sharing Nature With Children,” which shows parents how to teach their kids about the natural world. Environmental education activities were scheduled for the youngsters while their parents were tutored. NCR gives an additional FTE and dollars to the winning park to fund an extra interpretive summer seasonal.

- Tilden Award — This year’s Tilden award winner is Jim Small of Jimmy Carter NHS, who was the course coordinator at Mather for a new course entitled “Interpreting Military Resources Within a Broader Perspective.” The May course drew 24 field interpreters from parks with military themes and explored relevant and sometimes controversial subject matter common to parks that interpret conflict. Due to its success, the course participants recommended that it be offered at Mather on an annual or semi-annual basis.

- NPS education task force — The task force convened in San Francisco in January and began formulating a Servicewide environmental heritage education program. A complete report on their findings will appear in the summer edition of Interpretation.

- Conferences — Mark your calendars for these upcoming conferences. The 1990 Biennial Convention of the Conference of National Park Cooperating Associations will be held October 13-19 in Hawaii. Director Ridenour has been invited, and program plans include a trade show, a publications award ceremony and field trips to NPS sites in Hawaii. From November 12-17, the 1990 NAI Conference and Workshop will be in Charleston, South Carolina. NAI is breaking new ground with this year’s conference theme, which for the first time addresses cultural and hisorical interpretation: “What’s Past is Prologue: Our Legacy — Our Future.”

If you’d like to contribute ideas to this section or supply interpretive news of interest, you can contact me at Independence (215) 597-7128 or at home (215) 732-6312 or write to me at 250 South 13th St, Apt. 8B, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

Bob Fudge
Independence
Visitor and Resource Protection

- Lessons Learned — The law enforcement community at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center has reinstated its “Lessons Learned Committee”. This group, representing the Center’s instructional staff and participating agencies, meets regularly to review field incidents and examine them for actions which can be attributed to a training technique that was utilized well to end a situation or, conversely, a training deficiency or action that could have been included or reinforced in basic training programs. Specific examples which have been shared include:
  - deployment of the recently authorized extendable baton, the sound of which was sufficient to defuse two separate potential confrontations as Assateague;
  - the application of learned weapons retention techniques to disarm an assailant grappling with a Glen Canyon ranger for his weapon; and
  - the failure of an initial strike with a baton to terminate aggressive behavior at Canyon de Chelly (and other jurisdictions as well).

The latter incident points out the need to reinforce the concept that focused, high-energy strikes are sometimes required to be effective. The Center has instituted padded “red suit”, full contact drills in some of their baton training programs to teach students the correct amount of force that is required to subdue a non-compliant subject.

- Body armor — A series of test reports have been issued by the Technology Assistance Program (TAP) of the National Institute of Justice. The “Police Body Armor Consumer Product List” and the “Selection and Application Guide to Police Body Armor” are available by calling or writing to the TAP Information Center, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850 (301) 251-5060 or 1-800-24-TAPIC. There are also soft body armor units being manufactured specifically for NPS personnel this year and hope to do as well next year. Our 1991 projections also request space in firearms and driver instructor programs, physical fitness coordinator training, and investigative courses such as the national wildlife investigator training program and the eight week land management investigator training program. While these are usually advertised as “benefiting accounts”, don’t forget to check locally for the availability of drug, ARPA or FIREPRO dollars to offset the training costs.

Bill Supernauha
FLETC

Emergency Services

- Personal locator beacons — The Interagency Committee on Search and Rescue (ICSAR) is studying the potential impacts of PLB’s — small, distress-alerting beacons that can be carried by an individual traveling on foot in remote areas. A PLB is used to alert responders to the need for help when an individual gets into trouble. Butch Farabee, the NPS emergency services coordinator, is chairing the subcommittee that is conducting this review. If you have any comments on the potential impact of these locators on your operation, be sure to contact him ASAP! He can be reached at Ranger Activities, Stop 3310, NPS, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127, or call (202) 208-4188.

- National SAR system — The Federal Emergency Management Agency is in the process of developing a coordinated system for national SAR response for those major incidents requiring more resources than the states can provide. This study is geared more toward urban disasters than remote disasters, but will cover the gamut of subjects in emergency SAR response at the national level, including readiness, mobilization, deployment, training, data base of resources, etc. For more information, contact NASA headquarters at Box 3709, Fairfax, Virginia 22038, or call (703) 352-1349.

- Recall of ascenders — CMI has issued a recall on all ascenders shipped between March 1, 1989 and June 22, 1989. This is a precautionary recall which was issued when they found that one of their ascenders had been inadvertently subjected to excessive heat during the painting process. For more information, contact CMI at (800) 247-5901.

- Public safety diving guidelines — An updated second edition of Guidelines For Public Safety Diving and Operation of Public Safety Diving Programs has just been printed. The book covers guidelines for establishing a public safety diving program and the basic regulations and procedures for safety in a program. It was developed with a great deal of input from the American Academy of Underwater Sciences (AAUS). For more information on this and on a new oxygen training course developed by the diving community, contact Jim Corry at NASA headquarters.

- Wilderness medicine seminar — A wilderness medicine seminar will be held at Squaw Valley, Lake Tahoe, California, from August 1-5, 1990. The goal of the seminar is to teach both practical and theoretical wilderness medicine skills to health professionals, search and rescue personnel and lay people. The cost is $295.00 and more information can be gained by calling (800) 888-5632 or writing to P.O. Box 321, Yreka, CA 96097.

Bill Pierce
Devils Tower
Rendezvous XIV
In Las Vegas

Rendezvous XIV is fast approaching. Mark your calendar for the period from Sunday, October 7th, to Friday, October 12th, and plan to be at the Showboat Hotel and Casino in Las Vegas.

Those of you who are planning on attending should refer to the spring issue for travel arrangements and for points of interest to visit. Contact Executive Travel for your travel arrangements (1-800-237-6735). Remember, ANPR receives a percentage of each travel arrangement made through Executive.

Please note that American Airlines is offering ANPR members a discount on flights to Las Vegas. You can reach American at 1-800-433-1790. Refer to Star Number S0600GO. Executive Travel will issue the ticket.

The Showboat should be remodeled by the time we arrive. The room rate will be $43 per night plus tax, single or double occupancy ($5 each for a third and fourth persons). Advanced registration will require one night's deposit and should be made by calling the Showboat at 1-800-826-2800. All reservations should be made by September 7; after that date, it's first come, first served. Meals range from all-you-can-eat buffets at reasonable rates and with an international variety of cuisines, up to the more expensive dinner shows.

Camping
A variety of recreational vehicle camping sites are available at various hotel locations throughout the city. The KOA is located just a few blocks south of the hotel. The basic nightly rate is $13.95. Reservations can be made by writing Las Vegas KOA, 4315 Boulder Highway, Las Vegas, NV 89109. Camping is also available at Lake Mead's Las Vegas Wash, Boulder Beach, and Callville Bay campgrounds. They are located, respectively, 30, 40 and 50 minutes from Las Vegas. The nightly rate is $6.00, and sites are allocated on a first-come, first-served basis.

Babysitting
There is no charge for babysitting for Showboat guests. The service is available daily from 9 a.m. to midnight. Babysitting is limited to two to seven year olds. Reservations will be coordinated by Mark and Lynn Macha, Death Valley NM, CA 92328.

Climate and Dress
The weather in this desert resort is mild most of the year. A light coat and clothing are more than enough for comfort. Fall temperatures range between 53 and 80 degrees, with the average about 67 degrees. Humidity runs between 20% and 27%. There's always an 85% possibility of sunshine. Las Vegas only receives an average of 4.19 inches yearly. Dress is casual but a bit more formal for evening and dinner shows. The Showboat has a heated pool, so swimwear is a good idea.

Raffles
It's the end of an era, as Nancy Wizner (CAMO) and Cathy Clossin (EVER) are retiring from their roles as raffle coordinators. Your service to ANPR will not be forgotten.

Bob Love (YELL) and Phyllis Cremonini (PEFO) will be coordinating the raffle this year. Those wishing to donate items for the Rendezvous should either bring them along or mail them to: Phyllis Cremonini, 1 Park Road (if UPS) or P.O. Box 216 (if U.S. mail), Petrified Forest, AZ 86028. Each donated item should have an estimated valued attached to appease our IRS friends.

The raffle is both a worthwhile and exciting highlight of the Rendezvous each year. It contributes a substantial amount of income for the Association and provides members with the opportunity to take home handmade and crafted items made by our own talented "family" and friends. We encourage all of you to donate items for this worthy cause.

You should have received your Super Raffle tickets from Bill Wade by now. If you would like more or have not received any tickets, call Bill at (703) 999-2243. First prize this year will be a trip for up to four people to Cancun, Mexico, for seven days (with an estimated value of $2,700) or $1,700 cash. Second prize is a four-day skiing trip for two to Breckenridge, CO (estimated value of $1,800) or $1,000 cash. The third, fourth, and fifth prizes are, respectively, $750, $400 and $140 gift certificates from a leading outdoor vendor.

Pre-Registration
Kathy Loux (SAGU) has provided the pre-registration form you'll find inside the back cover of this issue. Let's make her job easier by pre-registering. Please note that the cut-off is September 21st. Members who have pre-registered will be able to obtain refunds if they can't make the Rendezvous. If you need to renew your members or join, please use the separate membership form and mail it to the address indicated. Do not send both forms to Kathy.

T-shirts will cost $8.00. Use the pre-registration form to ensure that you get a T-shirt. Members unable to attend and who wish to purchase a T-shirt can only do so by using the pre-registration form and enclosing $10.00 for each shirt (which covers postage and handling) prior to the September 21st cut-off.

Agenda
Ginny Rousseau (NARO) and Mike Ebersole (GRCA), Rendezvous Program Coordinators, have developed a "draft tentative flexible agenda." (See sidebar). Please note that the first two days of the Rendezvous overlap with the Association of Maintenance Employees' first annual gathering, so many of the sessions will be jointly held by the two groups.

Site Activities
As noted on the above agenda, there'll be free time on Wednesday afternoon. Dale Thompson (DEVA), site coordinator, has arranged the following activities:
• The Kowski Golf Tournament will be at 1:00 p.m. in Boulder City. Jerry Yarbrough (WHSA) will have details when you arrive. The greens fee is estimated at $20. Jerry reminds all you "linksters" to bring your clubs.
Rendezvous Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday, October 7</th>
<th>Monday, October 8</th>
<th>Tuesday, October 9</th>
<th>Wednesday, October 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 a.m.-10:00 p.m.</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>6:30 a.m.-7:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors Meeting Position Management All day</td>
<td>Exhibitor Hall open</td>
<td>Aerobics (with instructor Lisa Lemberski)</td>
<td>Aerobics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All day</td>
<td>Presentation: “Moose Don’t Lobby &amp; Squirrels Don’t Vote” — Rick Tate</td>
<td>Joint General Session with Association of Maintenance Employees: Welcome and Opening Remarks Rick Gale, President, ANPR, Alan O’Neill, Superintendent, LAME, Ed Rothfuss, Superintendent, DEVA, Stan Albright, Regional Director, WRO</td>
<td>Presentation: John Reynolds speaks on morale in the NPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.-10:00 a.m.</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.-9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors Meeting Position Management All day</td>
<td>Presentation: “Moose Don’t Lobby &amp; Squirrels Don’t Vote” — Rick Tate</td>
<td>Joint General Session with Association of Maintenance Employees: Welcome and Opening Remarks Rick Gale, President, ANPR, Alan O’Neill, Superintendent, LAME, Ed Rothfuss, Superintendent, DEVA, Stan Albright, Regional Director, WRO</td>
<td>Presentation: John Reynolds speaks on morale in the NPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.-12:00 noon</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.-9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors Meeting Position Management All day</td>
<td>Presentation: “Moose Don’t Lobby &amp; Squirrels Don’t Vote” — Rick Tate</td>
<td>Joint General Session with Association of Maintenance Employees: Welcome and Opening Remarks Rick Gale, President, ANPR, Alan O’Neill, Superintendent, LAME, Ed Rothfuss, Superintendent, DEVA, Stan Albright, Regional Director, WRO</td>
<td>Presentation: John Reynolds speaks on morale in the NPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.-12:00 noon</td>
<td>10:30 a.m.-12:00 noon</td>
<td>12:00 noon-1:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Raffle</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>1:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Hall closes</td>
<td>ANPR Business Meeting</td>
<td>Exhibition Hall closes</td>
<td>Exhibition Hall closes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 p.m.-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.-3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Regional Caucuses</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fellowship Pistol Match will also be at 1:00 p.m., and is being coordinated by Ray Wabers (LAME) and Paul Henry (JOTR). The entry fee will be $5.00. The NPS daytime PPC will be the only course of fire. You’ll need to bring a four-inch revolver and enough ammo meeting NPS-9 standards. Prizes will be a firearm for first place and other related law enforcement equipment for the remaining places.

A Lake Mead boat trip and a jokewater canoe trip from the dam to Willow Beach is being arranged by Bill Van Enwagen (LAME). The estimated costs will be $5 for the boat trip and $20 for the canoe trip. Both include lunch.

If you are interested in any of the above activities, please mark your pre-registration form appropriately, thereby reserving you a space in the fun and helping the coordinators make the necessary advance preparations. This is extremely important if you want the boat and canoe trip. Please indicate the number in your party. Fees will be paid at the reservation desk upon arrival. Please do not include entry fees with your pre-registration form and fees. Check only those activities which you wish to attend.

The Annual Fun Run will be at 5:00 p.m. and is being coordinated by Brent Pennington (LAME).

See you in VEGAS!

Jeff Ohlfs
Hot Springs
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Board Member Reports

President

President Rick Gale, Branch of Fire Management, Boise. Address: 4074 S. Iriondo Way, Boise, ID 83706. Phone: (208) 343-2312 (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, Channel Islands. Address: 681 Chinook Drive, Ventura, CA 93001. Phone: (805) 644-8157 (work).

We (the members of the board) have not been inundated with volunteers to do the work of the Association. I'm as guilty as anyone. It's so easy to get caught up in the press of a job, your family and other fun things that volunteer efforts often suffer. But someone is doing the work of the Association.

If you felt as proud as I did when reading Bill Halainen's report on our successes in the spring RANGER, it's obvious to you that some folks are working for us. But, as Rick never tires of saying, it's always the same few people who get the job done. Come on, you new folks! Get involved!

We'll be nominating some new officers in Las Vegas. Think about new blood, but also keep in mind that experience and a track record of willingness and effort are just as important. Keeping up the momentum that Rick and others have going right now is vital — if Bill is going to keep reporting on the successes of this organization.

Eastern Vice President

Vice President Hal Grovert, Ft. McHenry. Address: Fort McHenry, East Fort Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21230. Phone: (301) 539-4658 (home) and (301) 962-4290 (work).

Much of my energy this spring went into working on the area Rendezvous which was held in March in Williamsburg. It was a great time and I had a chance to meet a lot of new people. Lots of new folks became involved in ANPR and volunteered to take on new assignments. Not everything ran smoothly, but working out the kinks was half the fun as people who hadn't previously been greatly involved with ANPR solved problems and made things work. My thanks to all of you who worked so hard to make it happen, and also to all of you who attended. I thought it was great; let's do it again!

One of the other things I've been working on has been the establishment of the finance committee (see "Committee Reports"). I think it's finally off and rolling.

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).

Business Manager

Business Manager Debbie Gorman, Saratoga. Address: P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831. Phone: (518) 793-3140 (work/home).

Over the last several weeks, I've been preoccupied with income reporting statements, first quarter statements and 990 Form tax-exempt corporation reports to the IRS. There are a few new IRS regs that you need to be aware of.

It is ANPR's responsibility to ensure that anyone purchasing raffle tickets is advised that this expense is not considered tax deductible as a charitable contribution. Although ANPR is a charitable organization, a disclosure statement to this effect must appear on all raffle material. The good news is that these expenses can be claimed as gambling losses to the extent of gambling winnings. This may or may not be of any help at tax time, depending on how much you play the lottery or win at the casinos in Las Vegas.

All donated gifts to be used for raffle purposes are considered charitable contributions and may be claimed as such. ANPR is obligated to make reference to these donations as income. It will be extremely helpful to me if anyone making a donation to the regular raffle includes a note with the following information — your name and address, a brief description of the item, and its fair market value (including those items which are hand made). Receipts for these items will be issued upon request. In a similar vein, dues paid for membership in ANPR are not deductible as a charitable contribution, but you may deduct dues as a business expense.

If this brings about any confusion, please feel free to contact me or the IRS.

North Atlantic Regional Rep

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

Mid-Atlantic Regional Rep

Representative Brian Fitzgerald, Assateague. Address: 1287 Ocean Pines, Berlin, MD 21811. Phone: (301) 641-7568 and (301) 641-1446 (work).

The Eastern area rendezvous in Williamsburg was a huge success, as you'll see from other reports in this issue. One significant piece of news which came from it was MAR Regional Director Jim Coleman's suggestion that the region provide employee development funds for one or two persons to attend the next Rendezvous in Las Vegas.

This suggestion was sparked by the usual observation that lower-graded (GS-7 and below) employees are usually in a minority at Rendezvous due to a lack of adequate finances. We also discussed the possibility of using some of the funds generated by the gathering in Williamsburg to offset some of the expenses for a couple of lower-graded members so that they could get to Las Vegas. I am currently checking into this possibility and would appreciate any comments you might have on this proposal.

I've also been involved in a couple of other projects. I've been working to get at least five MAR members working on our "Towards 1993" initiatives. As of this writing, we have two on board — one working on housing initiatives and the other on professional issues. I've also recently sent out a copy of an earlier ANPR update to all park reps in this region. The update covers the 1993 initiatives, and I've asked each of the park reps to actively recruit volunteers to work on them. The list of accomplishments in the last issue of RANGER should generate a renewed interest in working to achieve the 1993 goals.

National Capital Regional Rep

Representative Mike Barnhart, Antietam. Address: Route 2, Box 377, Smithburg, MD 21783. Phone: (301) 824-3931 (home) and (301) 432-5124 (work).

In the spring, I met with National Capital Regional Director Bob Stanton. He was interested in the Association's concerns regarding rangers, and said that he was greatly concerned about the economic hardship survey that I had sent him. He has sent a copy of that report to all the department heads at NCR for their comments. The comment form will be compiled and shared with ANPR when they are finished.

Mr. Stanton has high hopes that FY 91 will be a better year for the NPS and for park rangers. He said that every year it gets harder and harder to hire qualified personnel because of the salaries rangers are paid.

This will be my last report as ANPR's NCR representative. With my new assignment and other personal work (i.e. Boy Scouts and the National Ski Patrol), I have not been representing your needs. I am therefore resigning as NCR representative.

Bruce McKeeman of Great Falls (GWMP) will take over the job. Bruce's address is 226 Willow Terrace, Sterling, VA 22170; his phone numbers are (703) 430-3510 (home) and (703) 285-2966 (work).

Please give Bruce your support, as he needs your comments and input in order to...
Rendezvous in Williamsburg

Roberta D’Amico
MARO

The skeptics said it couldn’t be done, but they were wrong! The Eastern Area Rendezvous held in Williamsburg, Virginia, in March was a huge success. A total of 86 people attended, including attendees from MAR (the host region), NCR, SER, NAR, MWR, WR, and some distinguished individuals from the Washington Office (the Director, among others). And our very own president, Rick Gale, was in attendance.

There was some hesitancy to inquire about the grades levels of those attending, but our ANPR investigators are pleased to report that representation was across the board. Members in the GS 4-7 ranks said that one of the factors which determined their presence was the fact that costs were reduced by attending a local event.

The workshops were well attended and received. The situational leadership course presented prior to the Rendezvous itself had 26 participants. The focus of the Rendezvous was the employee. Many of the participants remarked on how valuable the sessions were for both their daily job duties and their own personal development.

“Leaving the National Park Service” was a workshop that presented some heart-breaking realities about the personal and professional conflicts of departing from the career NPS ranks. The session generated much discussion among those attending. Among the gratifying realities of the Rendezvous was the open forum of this and other sessions, and the presence of the WASO Chief of Personnel, Mario Fraire. It has been suggested that this session be presented at the national Rendezvous in October.

There has always been a looming controversy over the funds expended on Rendezvous. To reiterate an overplayed point, membership moneys are not spent on the Rendezvous. The organizing committee of the Eastern Area Rendezvous was proud to remit almost $1,500 of hard-earned profit to the Association. This did not include the funds collected in fines, a sum of $150 which was donated to the ranger museum, or the total collected from ANPR sales items. The raffle was a tremendous success for a "small" event. Thanks to all who generously donated those wonderful winning items.

The success of such an undertaking is well worth the effort. All of those involved strongly encourage anyone interested in the career NPS ranks. The session

Many thanks to all who were involved, and especially to those who braved their own
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sonals. I also sent seasonal insurance information to each park rep. If anyone else in the region wants information on Ranger or other ANPR information, give me a call.

I've been working at Rick Gale's request on a project concerning the costs and tax consequences of official transfers, which has involved trying to understand the government's obscure rules, and determining whether or not we're being treated worse than employees in other agencies. If you've got a particular horror story, give me a call; I'll provide a sympathetic shoulder to cry on.

Rocky Mountain Regional Rep
Representative Dan Moses, Dinosaur.
Address: P.O. Box 96, Jensen, UT 84035.
Phone: (801) 781-0826 (home) and (801) 789-2115 (work).

I would like to propose a challenge to all ANPR members in Rocky Mountain region — to recruit at least one new member during this summer. With the increase in work forces within the parks for the summer season, we have an excellent pool of possible candidates for membership. At present, we are second to Western region in membership. Let's set a goal of being number one by Rendezvous XIV.

Dedicated recruitment and retention efforts by current members are imperative to the continued success of ANPR. I have copies of past issues of Ranger which I'd be happy to provide for recruitment endeavors. Remember that a new dues structure went into effect in March. The last page of the spring issue provides a new membership application which can be duplicated for distribution. I can also provide additional copies of membership applications.

The spring issue of Ranger should lay to rest any comments or concerns about what ANPR has or has not done over the past 13 years. Those of you who still harbor doubts as to what ANPR can do should reread the issue. It provides an excellent historical perspective and should serves as a good recruitment tool.

Within these pages, you'll find an account of the testimony given at the House hearing on "endangered rangers." This hearing came about largely through the efforts of ANPR. The testimony from NPCA and other organizations supported our testimony that there are some serious problems in the ranger ranks.

Also within this issue is the registration form for Rendezvous XIV in Las Vegas. Rendezvous VII, held at the same location in 1985, was one of the best-attended Rendezvous to date. Let's have a large regional attendance. This is your chance to get involved, meet other ANPR members face to face, and discuss issues of concern to the NPS and yourself.

See you there!

Southwest Regional Rep
Representative Cindy Ott-Jones, El Malpais. Address: 604 Gunnison Avenue, Grants, NM 87020. Phone: (505) 287-5011 and (505) 285-4641.

Ranger Rendezvous XIV is just around the corner. If you can not make it to Las Vegas and have concerns or issues that you would like me to address, could I please hear from you? I need to hear from you so that my votes will represent the whole region, not just an individual from our region.

At the regional caucus in Las Vegas, I would like to address two special activities that our region might become involved in — a Southwest regional rendezvous and a regional "March for Parks" for March 1991 to raise funds for the ranger museum. The regional rendezvous would depend on your interest; we currently have 130 members in the region, but how many would attend?

Please be thinking about these activities and let me know your thoughts.

West Regional Rep
Representative Dan Mason, Sequoia.
Address: Ash Mountain, Box 63, Three Rivers, CA 93271. Phone: (209) 565-3647 (home) and (209) 565-3341 ext. 711 (work).

I'd like to begin by saying that I'm looking forward to the new and exciting challenge of serving as Western regional rep. This will be a great opportunity and learning experience.

As most of you know, Rick Gale has requested that each regional rep focus on recruitment for 1990. Your individual support is needed to make this recruitment effort successful. If anyone has an effective recruiting program or has any ideas, please get in touch with me. Here's one idea that I've tried at SEKI.

Just after being elected in February, I solicited comments about ANPR from both members and non-members in SEKI. Many of them didn't know what issues the Association was presently addressing. Knowing that the spring issue of Ranger was coming out with a lengthy list of ANPR accomplishments, I scheduled two recruiting/ANPR update workshops in the park. The first one was held in June and
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RANGER: SUMMER 1990
was a success. The second one is scheduled for the fall. I’ve also sent out letters to regional members asking them to do the same in their respective areas.

The one advantage I did have at SEKI was having Superintendent Tom Ritter talk at the spring get-together. Tom spent many years in WASO before coming to SEKI, and his comments on the effectiveness of ANPR at the Washington level were very enlightening for all of us.

One of the biggest concerns that came out of the spring workshop was the lack of ANPR information getting out to the field. As I shared with them then and will share with all of you now, ask if you don’t know what’s going on. The spring Ranger issue was very informative and has helped alleviate some of this problem. It is obvious that this type of issue should come out more often.

As a new person to this world, I’m asking for help from anyone who’s willing to share their ideas on how to maintain effective communications with the field. If you have a formal park rep system going, please get in contact with me.

Pacific Northwest Regional Rep
Representative Barbara Maynes, Olympic. Address: 1620 W. 5th Street, Port Angeles, WA 98362.

Since my letter in April, most of my ANPR time has been spent putting the new membership brochure for the Association into its final form. It should have gone to the printers at the end of May, and I hope to have it out about the same time as this copy of Ranger.

In the spring Ranger, Rick Gale challenged each member to recruit at least one new person to the organization this year. If you're at all like me, a hard sell (even a soft sell!) does not come easily. But I encourage each of you to see the use of the new brochure. Keep a few on hand and think of why you’re a member of the Association. Even the most soft-spoken among us can handle giving someone a brochure along with a few words about why we belong to ANPR. Goals important to each of us will be easier to reach with more people working toward them.

I’ve also been working on contacting each of the superintendents in the region with a letter and a copy of the spring Ranger. I’d like to increase awareness of what ANPR is all about — and increase folks’ desire to be part of it. I’ll also be making contact with each of the current park reps and recruiting reps in those areas without them.

As we get into the frenzy of The Season, don’t forget to tell the new people you meet about ANPR. And have a great summer!

Alaska Regional Rep
Representative Mary "Jeff" Karraker, Yukon-Charley. Address: c/o Yukon-Charley Rivers NP, P.O. Box 64, Eagle, AK 99778. Phone: (907) 547-2233 (work).

During the annual regional law enforcement refresher in February, 32 members and friends attended a mini-rendevous at the Anchorage Hilton. A discussion of employee and Association concerns was held. Tessy Shirakawa presented information about sales items, and there was a general discussion on possible fund raising. A challenge was given to members to contribute to their life membership before the March 1st deadline. Long-time holdout Dick Martin (can you believe it?) agreed to join up if regional rep Karraker would perform her rendition of "I've Been Working On The Railroad" in the lounge of the Hilton. Much to the dismay of the non-ANPR customers, the challenge was met. (Does anyone remember that same song from the Rendezvous at Jackson?) Several others, perhaps fearing another song, also agreed to upgrade their memberships, and, at last count, there were five new life members in Alaska.

With the last update of the membership list, the Alaska region gained the following members through transfer or new application — Susan Morton and Jeff Mow (ARO), Mickey Hellickson (SITK), Ed Forner (GAAR), Mary Beth Cook and Tim Duncan (WRST), Alan Barton (KATM), Beth Elliot (DENA), and Charlotte Craig (ANC). We hope to quickly regain some of the 20 members we lost last year. The two mini-rendezvous were well attended this past winter, and we hope to repeat them next year. We'd particularly like to reach out and address concerns held by other agencies similar to us, such as FWS, BLM and Alaska state parks.

Committee Reports

Sales
Chair: Tessy Shirakawa, Alaska Regional Office. Address: 2525 Gambell Street, Anchorage, AK 99503.

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

Rendezvous Site Selection
Chair: Dennis Burnett, Cape Cod. Address: Cape Cod National Seashore, South Wellfleet, MA 02663. Phone: (508) 349-1754 (home) and (508) 349-3785 (work).

Housing
Chair: Tom Cherry, Cuyahoga. Address: 449 Wyoga Lake Boulevard, Stow, OH 44224. Phone: (216) 929-4995 (home) and (216) 657-2793.

Dual Careers
Co-chair: Barb Stewart, Shenandoah. Address: P.O. Box 1700, Front Royal, VA 22630. Phone: (804) 823-6765 (summer) and (703) 999-2243 (winter).

Chair: Rick Jones, El Malpais. Address: 604 Gunnison Avenue, Grants, NM 87020.

Rick Jones has kindly volunteered to be co-chair of this committee and serve as another good person to contact for information on the dual career front.

Limited interest and many questions about the usefulness of a new edition of the dual career directory has put that project on the shelf.

What can you do regarding dual careers? Here's a list of things you can begin with:
- Read and learn the Service's spouse placement assistance policy.
- Offer to talk with or send information to people who are interested in jobs in your park.
- Become your park's Federal Woman's Program coordinator and develop a list of other federal agencies near your park so you can help your fellow employees.
- Develop the list even if you aren't the FWP coordinator.
- Ask nearby agencies what they're doing and borrow their best ideas.
- Talk or correspond with at least one other pair of people in a similar situation to yours — that's called networking.
- Send your ideas to that park or to Rick or Barb or Courier or Ranger or Time.
- Learn and use existing personnel rules; become an expert.
Seasonal Interests
Chair: Bill Dwyer, Memphis State University/Acadia. Address: 2717 Flowering Tree, Bartlett, TN 38134.

The committee is pursuing two ideas.
The first is to put together a brochure for prospective permanents which will contain relevant information about permanent employment, including the new drug testing program and some demographics on new hires over the past five years. A questionnaire went out to about 150 park areas asking them for information about their recent permanent hires. A summary of the replies will be presented at the Rendezvous.

The second project is a supervisor evaluation form, which would be completed by seasonals to provide their supervisors feedback about their supervisory abilities.

Finance
Chair: Hal Grovert, Fort McHenry. Address: Fort McHenry National Monument, East Fort Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21230-5393. Phone: (301) 962-4290 (work) and (301) 539-4658 (home).

After receiving suggestions from a wide variety of members, we came up with the idea of putting together a small committee of three in a geographic location in which the members could easily meet face to face one or two times before the Rendezvous. The original members were Linda Toms, Bruce McKeeman, and Patti Dienna, with Linda serving as chairperson. Linda, however, has recently transferred to Alaska, so Patti has become the chair and Marcia Blaszak was added to the committee. Patti is planning a meeting in Baltimore some time in June.

Training
Chair: Laurie Coughlan, Eisenhower/Gettysburg. Address: P.O. Box 3342, Gettysburg, PA 17325. Phone: (717) 334-0716 (home) and (717) 334-1124 (work).

Are you a certified instructor in any skill or subject matter? Are you interested in sharing your knowledge with other members of ANPR? If so, you may wish to place yourself on the new ANPR instructor roster. This roster will list the individual, subject matter or skill, the certifying agency or organization, and the instructor’s anticipated availability. For example:

- Randy Ranger, Interpretive Skills, NPS, 5 days/week
- Robin Ranger, Search and Rescue, NASAR, 2 days/year
- Pat Personnel, Position Management, NPS, 1 week/year

The roster, organized by subject matter, will be consulted when ANPR needs instructors for Rendezvous or other ANPR activities. If the roster is a success, ANPR should be able to offer more training opportunities throughout the year using these instructors. In addition to providing training for members and experience for instructors, a more active training program with higher tuition for non-members could provide income for ANPR.

If you’d like to be included on the roster, please send your listing information to me at the above address. Be sure to include your address and telephone numbers, as well as any comments on your availability for courses.

75th Anniversary
Chair: Roberta D’Amico, MARO. Address: 143 S. Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19106. Phone: (215) 597-3679 (work) or (609) 429-4268 (home).

---

Association of National Park Rangers

Important: Please specify □ New Membership □ Renewal

Name (last, first, MI):______________________________

Box or Street:__________________________________________

City:________________________State:_________Zip:_________

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

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

Type of Membership (Check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active (all NPS employees) Permanent</td>
<td>□ $30.00</td>
<td>□ $40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal</td>
<td>□ $20.00</td>
<td>□ $27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>□ $20.00</td>
<td>□ $27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life (open to all individuals)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active (NPS employees)</td>
<td>□ $375.00</td>
<td>□ $500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>□ $375.00</td>
<td>□ $500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associate (individuals other than NPS employees)</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>□ $30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>□ $20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting (individuals and organizations)</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>□ $100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>□ $100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing (individuals and organizations)</td>
<td>□ $500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions: 2 copies of each issue available only to organizations</td>
<td>□ $30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Voluntary contribution to the Ranger Museum: ____________

*Life payments may be made in five installments of $75.00 individual, or $100.00 joint, each within a 12 month period.

Important Notice

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

Administrative Use

Date: ________________________________

Rec’d $______ Check #______

By: ________________________________

Return to: Association of National Park Rangers, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831
There are some exciting things which will be happening during the Service’s 75th anniversary in 1991. This committee is working to determine what ANPR can do to complement the Service’s activities while simultaneously advocating our own purpose. If you have some answers, please let me hear them — and sooner rather than later. ANPR needs to have a plan in final form by the Rendezvous.

This committee is in its infancy and will be put on a rapid growth diet for about two years. There’s a lot which can be contributed under the auspices of ANPR. I know there are some great ideas out there — call me with them!

Ranger Museum
Chair: Maureen Finnerty, Olympic.
Address: 702 S. Cherry St., Port Angeles, WA 98362.

Plans for the ranger museum are progressing. Harpers Ferry Center has agreed to do exhibit planning and design. The intent is to design exhibit space which will be flexible and able to be changed periodical­ly. The Williamsport Preservation Center is developing drawings of the structure.

ANPR is still committed to raising the $250,000 needed for exhibit production. The plan is to have the museum opened for the Service’s 75th anniversary in August of 1991.

A request recently went out from Yellowstone for artifacts for the museum. Anyone interested in donating items, please contact George Robinson, Chief of Interpretation at Yellowstone, as soon as possible.

SAR continued
The men of the 10th live on as national heroes. Almost one thousand made the supreme sacrifice. Epitomized by PFC John Magrath, their single Medal of Honor winner, they all “displayed conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty.”

Their legacy — an American doctrine of mountain climbing and rescue — lives on as well. They refined techniques and developed equipment, they skiied and climbed, and they passed their skills on so others might live.

Every time a lost child is reunited with a terrified mother or a careless climber is given a second chance, the shadow of the 10th is there.

Expanding?
A not uncommon problem experienced by members of ANPR is that of inadvertently (at least we hope its inadvertent) allowing memberships to lapse. Considering the amount of mail most of us receive and the number of distractions we have in our lives, that’s not surprising. But the remedy is easy. All you have to do is look at the MAILING LABEL on the back cover of this magazine.

See the four-digit number with the slash in the middle just above your name? That tells you the year and month when you’re membership is due to run out. The number and letters beside that (i.e. 1-MEM) tell you what membership category you’re in. So all you have to do is turn the issue over NOW and look and see if your number is about to come up...

Getting close? How about renewing now, while you’re thinking about it?

ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL PARK RANGERS
Rendezvous XIV Pre-Registration
(Use this form ONLY before 9/21/90)

Name (please print) ____________________________

Address _______________________________________
________________________________________________
________________________________________________
____________________________ Zip________

Park or Area ____________________________

Please check if you are attending your first Rendezvous □

Registration Fee
Four day package (before 9/21/90)
$30.00 members $__________
$40.00 non-members $__________
If spouse will accompany and plans even minimal participation:
Spouse Fee (before 9/21/90)
$15.00 members $__________
$20.00 non-members $__________

T-Shirt Total $__________

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED $__________

We need an approximate head count, so if you think you will be participating in any of the following please check the appropriate spot.

□ Golf Tournament □ Pistol Shoot □ Canoe Trip □ Boat Ride

Final registration for these events will take place at the Rendezvous registration desk when you arrive.

Please make checks payable to ANPR. Return to: Kathy Loux, 7310 Canino Mirlo, Tucson, AZ 85747 (602) 647-3824.

Pre-registration ends 9/21/90. After that date you will register at the Rendezvous and the package will be $40.00 for members, and $50.00 for non-members. Refunds will be given for cancellations received before 9/30/90. There will be NO refunds for cancellations received after that date.
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$30.00 members $__________
$40.00 non-members $__________
If spouse will accompany and plans even minimal participation:
Spouse Fee (before 9/21/90)
$15.00 members $__________
$20.00 non-members $__________

T-Shirt Total $__________

TOTAL AMOUNT ENCLOSED $__________

We need an approximate head count, so if you think you will be participating in any of the following please check the appropriate spot.

□ Golf Tournament □ Pistol Shoot □ Canoe Trip □ Boat Ride

Final registration for these events will take place at the Rendezvous registration desk when you arrive.

Please make checks payable to ANPR. Return to: Kathy Loux, 7310 Canino Mirlo, Tucson, AZ 85747 (602) 647-3824.

Pre-registration ends 9/21/90. After that date you will register at the Rendezvous and the package will be $40.00 for members, and $50.00 for non-members. Refunds will be given for cancellations received before 9/30/90. There will be NO refunds for cancellations received after that date.
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