Editor’s Notes

Last summer and fall, a vacancy announcement appeared in these pages which solicited applications for the position of editor of Ranger. Several inquiries and one or two VITAs were received, but the applicants either lacked the necessary experience or weren’t sure that they were prepared yet to commit the time and energy required to edit the magazine.

Because of this, I agreed to continue as editor while the search continued for candidates. This interim arrangement, however, appears to have been misconstrued as a decision to continue on indefinitely, which it wasn’t. We are still looking for qualified applicants for the position, and hope to find someone who can begin with the spring, 1993, issue.

I will remain available to assist the new editor in planning issues, finding authors for feature articles, and producing the magazine.

The following vacancy announcement provides specifics. If you’re interested, please send a short personal resume to me, not just a card or letter saying you’re interested.

General Responsibilities

The editor is responsible for writing, editing and publishing Ranger, a 28- to 40-page quarterly magazine published by the Association of National Park Rangers. An assistant editor provides help in formulating issue plans, editing text and proofreading copy.

Description of Duties

• Issue planning - Plans each quarterly issue of Ranger, a task which entails meeting or talking with members and friends of ANPR and key people within the NPS to determine appropriate topics for future issues. Contacts regular contributors and feature writers and arranges length, scope and focus of articles. Contacts illustrators and arranges for timely submissions of photos and other art. Prepares annual issue plans for the president’s review and concurrence.

• Editing - Reads all articles submitted and makes corrections for syntax, grammar, style and accuracy. Composes headlines and specifications for text. Works with contributors on articles requiring extensive revision. Copymarks all material for typesetter.

• Writing - Writing assignments include the following:
  • Taking minutes of meetings and preparing summaries for publication.
  • Attending workshops, speeches and other presentations, taking notes and writing accounts of events.
  • Taking reports by phone or notes submitted through the mail and preparing articles from them.
  • Researching and writing feature articles.

On occasion, the editor also prepares contracts, bid sheets, annual reports, issue reports and member surveys, and corresponds frequently with prospective contributors and others who write to the magazine.

• Production - Proofreads and corrects galleys returned by the typesetter. Prepares dummy of issue for designer, a task which includes preliminary layout planning, overall design, cutting and copyfitting, and selecting, sizing and placing illustrations. Oversees the preparation of and gives final approval to mechanicals and blue lines, and works closely with designer and production manager on all aspects of production to assure issue quality.

• Administration - Administers a $25,000 budget, including printing, postal and impression accounts. Performs all routine administrative duties, including correspondence, general mailings to board members and others, responses to phone inquiries, filing, acquisition of supplies, and related duties. Coordinates work performed by contracted assistant editor, advertising representatives and mailing service.

Contract

• The contract is for a one-year period, renewable annually.

• The contract amount is $4,800 per year, payable in arrears at a rate of $1,200 per issue after each issue is mailed. The editor is a contracted employee who must pay self-employment taxes.

• Expenses such as telephone, postage and office supplies are reimbursed. Travel is not reimbursed.

• The editor is provided with an IBM-compatible, 40 MB hard disk computer with a 5 1/2 inch floppy drive and monochrome monitor; DOS, WordPerfect, and Aldus software; and a NEC P7 printer.

Supervision

• The editor works under the supervision of the president, although almost all work is performed independently.

Requirements

The applicant should have:

• Knowledge of ANPR purposes, structure and operations.

• Experience and skill in editing and producing a magazine or other publication employing camera-ready art and typeset copy.

• Writing abilities.

• A working knowledge of ranger operations, including interpretation, law enforcement, resource protection, resource management, and emergency operations.

• Knowledge and understanding of the history, structure and operations of the National Park Service.

• The ability to use word processing software and computers.

• An ability and willingness to meet deadlines and assure that the magazine will be published and distributed at regular quarterly intervals.
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President’s Message

I find that this quarterly message to the membership is somewhat difficult to write. This is not because there is not a lot of activity going on involving the Association of National Park Rangers. Quite the contrary. It is because, through our series of direct, first class mailings to each member and the monthly updates to the Board of Directors produced by Vice President Karen Wade, most of the information has gone to you in a much more timely fashion than is possible given the lead time required to get issues of Ranger into your hands.

Which is a roundabout way of leading into my first point for this pre-Rendezvous issue. We have tried to increase our direct lines of communication with each and every member through periodic first class mailings. For the size of membership we currently enjoy (small through that may be), each mailing costs the Association roughly $800 for paper, printing and postage—the labor involved is donated. So far this year we have made three such mailings, which is not an inconsequential item in the Association’s annual budget.

The Board recently agreed to set aside up to one half of the net proceeds from super raffle ticket sales to fund these mailings. Based on the average proceeds of the past two years, this would fund about five mailings annually. So, at least for the present, we are covered in this endeavor to provide better and more timely communications.

However, I am sure there are other potential, high priority uses for these funds. The Board needs to hear from you regarding the effectiveness of these first class mailings. Are you getting the information you need? Is this something that the Association should continue to pursue and produce? What is the value of the information to you compared to the cost and effort to produce these first class mailings? Should all or more of these mailings be funded or fewer? What criteria should be used to determine when such a mailing is produced? What are alternative funding sources for these mailings if/when we exceed the amount estimated to be available from super raffle funds?

I will be canvassing the Board for your thoughts and ideas on this and other forms of communication at Rendezvous XVI. Of course, if someone actually reads this column and is so inclined to communicate directly with me on this subject, then I would probably see my way clear to spring for a beer or soda at the Rendezvous.

In the June 1992 special mailing to all members, we raised the question of how ANPR can get a sense of direction on issues with which we have an interest, particularly on System (i.e., resource) issues.

As was mentioned in that June mailing, we received very few responses to our several questionnaires regarding significant resource issues, which has made it extremely difficult to get a feeling of the membership on these issues. Because from this small response, it is also practically impossible to determine which Association members have the specific knowledge and understanding to provide good guidance regarding the sundry ramifications of any particular issue.

That the resolution of this concern is becoming more important each year is best illustrated by the following statistics. From 1988 through 1991, the annual average number of letters we wrote to the Washington Office, the Department and independent agencies remained roughly the same. In 1992, we met those annual averages by the end of May.

In 1988, we wrote one letter to the Congress. In 1989, this increased to two, in 1990 to five, and in 1991 to eight letters to the Congress. Through May 30th of this year, we have written to the Congress on fourteen separate occasions. We gave our first testimony before a Congressional subcommittee in 1989 (this was written testimony only—none of us were sure of the potential ramifications of direct testimonies). Our first personal testimony before the Congress was in 1990 at the “Endangered Ranger” hearings. In the six months since Rendezvous XV, we have presented testimony before Congress on four occasions.

This level of interaction is not going to diminish in coming years. We will continue to be asked to comment on issues before the Congress. We need to determine how best to arrive at an Association viewpoint, given the lack of time normally available to us to prepare and respond to any such requests.

The obvious answer would appear to be through the Board of Directors. I would point out that this mechanism is not particularly precise or responsive. It takes, getting the best possible response, a minimum of one week to merely make contact with all 16 members of the Board. Should we need to respond to any such requests.

I believe this situation is one which we simply cannot afford to ignore. We have to determine some mechanism to allow us to obtain a sense of the membership on issues while at the same time being responsive to the time frames imposed on us by others.

It occurs to me that perhaps the most viable approach maybe one of pre-determining broad points of view within which we can arrive at a specific position on any particular issue. Whatever the answers may be, we need to obtain some resolution of this at Rendezvous XVI. Accordingly, I am asking that the Vice President for Professional Issues (Bryan Swift) gather ideas and thoughts and lead the presentation on Association positions during the Rendezvous. Please communicate your concerns and ideas for resolving how we can be responsive when asked to comment on various issues facing the National Park Service and System directly to Bryan.
Association Actions

Over the past few months, you’ve received several direct mailings which have apprised you of current developments on issues of interest to the Association, including housing, seasonal/temporary benefits, twenty-year retirement, and introduction of new areas to the system. We will continue to keep you informed of important Association actions through such letters, which are more effective because of their timeliness, rather than this section of the magazine. Issues of consequence which are less time-critical will appear in these pages.

OMB Circular A-45

The Association submitted its comments on the proposed revisions to OMB Circular A-45 to OMB’s Office of Federal Procurement Policy in January. Through an oversight, the text of that letter was not included in the spring issue of the magazine:

The Association of National Park Rangers, a 1,600 member professional park ranger association, welcomes the opportunity to once again comment on a draft revision of Office of Management and Budget Circular A-45. We hope that these comments receive reasonable consideration as none of our recommendations to the revision of Circular A-45 in May, 1988 were incorporated into the final circular.

Fairness and consistency cannot exist until it is recognized that the employer-employee relationship which exists between the National Park Service and its employees is not comparable to the normal landlord-tenant relationship. We believe that OMB is not giving consideration to the fact that when a government employee is required to occupy government quarters as a condition of employment, comparison with what an individual in the private sector pays, who enjoys the right to choose his/her housing, is not legitimate. We believe this factor alone is sufficient justification to re-implement the ceiling on the amount an employee would be required to pay for government housing. The former ceiling was 20% of gross pay; we suggest a reintroduced ceiling of 25%.

We oppose reducing the current 30 mile limitation for isolation to 20 miles while at the same time reducing the amount of adjustment for isolation to almost one third of the current value to the employee. We agree that employees living within the 20 to 30 mile range should also receive an isolation adjustment; however, those employees living 31 plus miles should continue to receive the full amount currently authorized by the existing formula.

Definition of the “nearest established community” should continue to require that the community have minimal essential medical facilities. We do not believe that it is unreasonable to require that the community provide full time medical care to be considered as an established community. We take issue with the premise that it would be an “exceptional community” of 1,500 permanent residents that did not provide all the services mentioned in the draft Circular A-45. We could cite numerous communities of 1,500 or more which do not provide the amenities described in your example. The issue should be the amenities provided, not an arbitrary population limit.

While the availability of flood insurance is considered, we believe that availability of flood insurance should also be considered. The National Park Service maintains numerous housing units which are located in flood plains; we think employees living in these situations should also be given consideration.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions to OMB Circular A-45. The Association of National Park Rangers is firmly on record that relief from the current housing situation is mandatory. We believe that proposed revisions will only make a bad situation intolerable.

75th Anniversary Symposium

On May 15th, Director Ridenour wrote to President Rick Gale regarding the establishment of the Office of Strategic Planning, implementation of the 75th anniversary symposium recommendations, and ANPR’s involvement in the implementation process:

I consider your organization one of the National Park Service’s major cooperators and someone who can contribute valuable information and support to our new strategic planning effort. I created the Office of Strategic Planning in January as one of the first initiatives for following through with the recommendations of the Service’s 75th Anniversary Symposium. The more than 200 recommendations that came out of the symposium indicated to me that the National Park Service was overdue for some basic changes needed to successfully carry our mission into the 21st century and beyond. Our mission is constant, but we need to become more adaptable to changing world conditions if we want to remain successful. I believe that the Office of Strategic Planning will help us do that.

The office has developed a process, illustrated in the enclosed brochure, that will involve all segments of the National Park Service and its cooperators — both public and private — in its work of projecting trends, analyzing issues, developing alternative strategies, and determining the potential impacts of change on the National Park Service and others. The process recognizes the critical importance of integrating Service operations with other public programs, national conservation and education initiatives, the management strategies of neighboring landowners, and other related activities.

As the strategic planning agenda develops, the Office of Strategic Planning will keep you informed of its activities through periodic newsletters, and it may call on you to participate on a panel, respond to a questionnaire, or provide information in some other way. I hope you will be able to participate in this process and that it will strengthen our partnership in achieving our shared priorities.

On May 15th, Rick wrote to Gerald Patten, director of the Office of Strategic Planning, regarding the strategic planning process:

The Association of National Park Rangers offers the following comments on the overview of the strategic planning process proposed to be used to implement the recommendations of the 75th Anniversary Symposium.

First, some general thoughts. One thing that struck many of us was what we perceive as a lack of passion in the document. Finding the best fit between aspirations and realities no doubt is the ultimate fallback position in this politically driven world within which we operate. We think, however, that the service should start with the high ground and then fight rearguard actions as necessary to achieve our goals. To put it another way, the document has its feet on the ground, but we do not think it provides enough stars in the eyes.

Secondly, we do not understand how strategic planning can be an annual process. We need consistency and commitment for many years, not something geared to a relatively short cycle of time, revision, and varying levels of energy. Borrowing from incident management theory, the process should be one of purpose, direction, objectives, strategy and tactics: first, the purpose, which is well stated as the need to revitalize the Service and the System; next, the direction, which in this case would be the recommendations; then, the objectives, which, broadly, are the commitments by the Director (and others) to actively seek change. Then comes your role — which would be the development of a long range and long term strategic plan which sets the framework for action accomplishment. Finally, on an annual basis and subject to revision, are the tactical implementations which are quite specific, contain measurement and accomplishment checkpoints, and assign accountability.

Strategy is the method of accomplishment, tactics are the means of accomplishment. Again, what we do not see in the draft document is a clear role and definition of the overall objectives that lead to specific accomplishments and assignments. The objectives of the strategic plan should not change much, if any, over time.

Thirdly, every ANPR reviewer who commented made the same point about involvement of ALL employees in the Service, not just the regional directors and the superintendents. If the rank and file are not made a part of the process, are not kept informed and involved, the implementation of the plan is going to be very difficult because folks are going to view it as “your plan”, not as “our plan.”

Finally, the Association of National Park Rangers is concerned that the current makeup...
of the Office of Strategic Planning is composed solely of planners. While planners are vital to the process, we believe that if the best thinking and product are to occur, a healthy mix of planners and field experienced implementers is mandatory. We assume that much of the work of the Office of Strategic Planning will be done by the use of people on temporary details. We fervently hope, as you select those detailees, that you get some folks who work where the rubber meets the road. Visitor managers, resources protectors, interpreters and educators – in other words program managers – need to bring their unique (and current) viewpoints to the strategic and tactical planning process.

We also have a few specific comments regarding the strategic planning process document. We suggest that item 3 be rewritten to state that the leader charts the course, defines the mission. That responsibility of the leader is fundamental. Also, we see no real purpose in annually reporting perceived similarities and differences by others; hasn’t the Vail Symposium already accomplished items 4, 5 and 6, at least in large part? Again, an annual review/update of the strategic plan, as indicated in item 8, leads inevitably to the potential for changing policies, political whipsawing, internal inconsistencies, and ill-formed ideas. The strategic plan should be based on the foundations of the Service and the System. Implementation tactics can be periodically examined and changed, but the long term strategic plan should remain constant.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the draft strategic planning document and process. The Association is available to assist you in whatever way you deem appropriate...
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 North Harrison Street, 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.

Mar Aguilar-Schmitz (BIBE, CHAM, GRBA) has moved from Angeles National Forest, where she was a GS-57 recreation specialist, to Petrified Forest, where she's a GS-5 ranger (interpretation). Mar can be reached at HC 30, Box 450, Concho, AZ 85924.

Scott Bowen has moved from Yosemite to Acadia, continuing as a seasonal protection ranger. His new address and phone: P.O. Box 472, Bar Harbor, ME 04609 (207/288-4862).

Bob Cherry (PAIS '85-88, KKKO '88-89, WHIS '89-'92) has transferred from Whiskeytown, where he was a GS-7 ranger/resource management specialist, to Blue Ridge's Bluffs District, where he's doing the same thing as a GS-9.

Anne R. Coupland has transferred from Guadalupe Mountains, where she was a general park ranger, to Bering Land Bridge, where she is the park's resource management specialist. Her new address is P.O. Box 1346, Nome, AK 99762.

Ken Davis has transferred within Great Smoky Mountains from Twenty Mile Ranger Station (NC), where he was a GS-7 park ranger, to Cades Cove (TN), where he is now a GS-7 supervisory park ranger. The Davis family's new address is Cades Cove Ranger Station, Townsend, TN 37882.

High Dougher (DEWA, YOSE, VOYA) has been promoted from GS-9 district ranger in Petrified Forest's Painted Desert District to GS-11 district ranger in the Wilderness District in North Cascades.

John R Earnst (BLRI, GRSM, BADL, GETT) is retiring as superintendent of North Cascades and plans on becoming a flight instructor in Fort Collins, CO. Spouse Sue Hackett (MIMA, COLO, FOME, FOMC) has just graduated from Western Washington University with a master's in history and hopes to do contract research as well as hiking and cross-country skiing in the Rockies.

Robert Finkelstein, who was a GS-9 ranger at Gila Cliff Dwellings, has left the Service to take a position as a GS-11 interpretive specialist at the Forest Service's Flaming Gorge NRA.

Maryann Gerbauckas (STLII, ACAD, FIIII, ASIS, COLO, WHIO) has moved from William Howard Taft, where she was superintendant, to Thomas Edison, where she holds the same position.

Shirley Hoh (SUCR '82-'88, HOME '88-'90, THRO '90-'92) has transferred from district naturalist in the North Unit of Theodore Roosevelt to natural resource specialist at San Juan Island. Her new address is P.O. Box 429, Friday Harbor, WA 98250.

Tim Manka, a life member of ANPR who's worked as a seasonal ranger/naturalist in eight national parks since 1967, has been selected by his former students for inclusion in Who's Who Among America's Teachers. Only students who have been cited for academic excellence themselves are invited to submit nominations. Tim currently teaches science at Shaler Area Schools in Pittsburgh, PA.

Patricia McAlpine (LOWE '84-'87, NARO '87-89, ACAD '89-'92) has moved from Acadia, where she was a GS-7 budget assistant, to Blackstone River Valley, where she's now a GS-303-7 administrative tech. Her new address: P.O. Box 1245, E. Douglas, MA 01516.

Reed and Marlene McCluskey (SAMO '80-'81, CHIS '81-'86, GRCA '86-'91) are still at Petroglyph, but they are at a new address. Moreover, the ranger staff recently vacated its offices in Albuquerque's city hall in favor of adobe houses in the park. Reed would therefore like to advise friends that his new office address and phone number are 4735 Atrisco Drive NW, Albuquerque, NM 87120 (515/839-4429), and his home address and phone are 6230 Cuesta Place NW, Albuquerque, NM 87120 (505/899-0940). "Remember, guest accommodations are available for our friends passing through."

Jim McKay (LOWE '81-'89, SAGA '89-'92) reports that he's "excited to be transferring down to the Big Apple to take up duels as a supervisory park ranger at the Statue of Liberty/Ellis Island" and that he'll be doing his best as a "steadfast Red Sox and Patriots fan" to defend them from fans of the "hated Yankees and Jets."

Dick Newgren (CARE '76-84, FOIE '84-'87, CUIBS '87-'91) recently transferred from Cumberland Island, where he was the park's chief ranger, to FLET, where he's the Service's permanent detailed firearms instructor. His work and home addresses are respectively: FLET, Building 141, Glynco, GA 31524 (912/267-2733) and P.O. Box 1623, St. Marys, GA 31558 (912/882-6677).

Aida Parkinson (CACA '80-'81, SOAR '86, NABR '85-'87, DSC '88-'92) has moved from Denver Service Center, where she was a natural resource specialist, to Redwood's Arcata office, where she is now serving as the park's environmental specialist. "I think my husband (from the tall tree country around Lassen Volcanic) insulted the 20-foot-tall pinion pines in southeast Utah by referring to them as bushes, and (they) conspired to have us go where there are truly tall trees. And the ocean is real, as opposed to some Peruvian sea."

Janice Pauley moved last March from Sunset Crater to Shenandoah, where she's now a park ranger and attending class to become a park medic. Janice's mailing address: Rt. 3, Box 319, Elkin, NC 28247.

Pete and Debbie Reinhardt and family recently transferred from Glen Canyon to Crater Lake. Pete left his position as a GS-7 area ranger to become the GS-9 district ranger for Annie Springs District. Pete's comment: "There's life after Bullfrog...". Their new address/phone is: P.O. Box 118, Crater Lake, OR 97604 (503/594-2211).

Wayne W. Rose (GREE '89, WASO '89-'90, PRT '90-'92) has transferred from Greenbelt, where he was a GS-7 ranger, to take a ranger position at the same grade at Catoctin.

Rose Rumbull-Petre (Stout) and her husband Ted Stout have moved to Santa Monica Mountains. Rose, who was a secretary at Golden Gate, then on detail to WRO as a biological technician, is now a GS-7 resource management specialist. Ted left his position as permanent park ranger at Golden Gate to become a seasonal at Santa Monica. They're living at 509 Gainsborough Road, Apartment #103, Thousand Oaks, CA 91360. Rose's work number is 818/597-1036, Ext. 239.

Jim, Colette and Tensleep Schlinkmann (DENA '86, JOTR '87-'89, ROMO '89-'92) have transferred from Rocky Mountain to Devils Tower. Jim was the GS-7 Fall River patrol supervisor at Rocky, and is now the GS-9 chief ranger at Devils Tower; Colette was GS-5 fire program clerk at Rocky and is now a GS-3 maintenance clerk. They can be reached at P.OB 29, Devils Tower, WY 82714.

Tom Teaford (WHIS, KLSE, DEVA, CODA) has left his position as subdistrict ranger for Coulee Dam's Fort Spokane Subdistrict to become a drug enforcement ranger with BLM in Phoenix, AZ. His new work address and phone number: c/o BLM, Phoenix District Office, 2015 West Deer Valley Road, Phoenix, AZ 85027 (602/863-4464).

Anne-Berry (AB) Wade (GRSM, ACAD, BICY, FRSP, PRWI), who was a GS-9 outdoor recreation planner in the Recreation Grants Division in WASO, has left the NPS to take a position as a GS-11 writer/editor in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Division of Law Enforcement, Branch of Investigations, in Arlington, VA. She can be reached at 10625 Creekwood Court, Frederickburg, VA 22407 (work: 703/358-1949; home: 703/898-3660).
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Have you ever wondered how a flock of birds, flying in perfect synchrony with no apparent leader, can change direction simultaneously without causing a colossal collision? Has a dipper’s seemingly pointless dance brought an unexpected smile to your face? Did you ever stop to think how much damage the beloved story of Bambi might have done to the public perception of wildlife in our country?

If you find yourself wondering these same things, then Paul Schullery’s collection of natural history essays is the perfect book for you. Pregnant Bears & Crawdad Eyes takes the reader on a journey through life in this world in a wide-eyed exploration of life, death, and everything in between. The book is organized as a series of essays that probe such perplexing questions as why crawfish (or crawdads, depending upon your geographic origins) swim backwards and how chickadees stay warm and survive harsh winters in the mountains.

The book opens with an eloquent quote from Henry Deacon that sums up the general theme of the essays. It expresses the simple belief that all things on this planet have an equal right to just “be.” That if simply left alone, life in all its forms will carry on in the chaotic, sometimes catastrophic, but somehow balanced way it is continually working out for itself. This message also reminds us that our role in all this need only be to study and learn, to appreciate and respect, and that intervention can only disturb intricate systems we haven’t yet begun to understand. We must look and truly see what surrounds us in order to understand the role even the smallest players have in making this grand production run.

The essays are organized into three sections. The first, “Staying Alive,” deals with matters of survival and the adaptations creatures have made to accomplish that end. One piece is about delayed implantation of embryos in pregnant bears and the theories of possible evolutionary reasons. Another examines the truly profound effects our country roads have on the corridors of nature through awareness, experiencing and appreciation of the “outer landscape.”

As soon as I began reading Open Spaces, I was hooked because it deals with a good part of my life and some 250 pages talking about things like rivers, wolves, the north country—wild country. Places I have been, places I would like to go to visit or work. Here is a guy I can empathize with, one who likes to scrutinize maps during long sub-zero winter nights, and then, when possible, fill in the blank spaces in his mind by going there after spring break-up.

In the introduction, Vickery artfully relates the concept Barry Lopez discusses in his work, the charting of our “inner landscape” through awareness, experiencing and appreciation of the “outer landscape.” Perhaps, like Vickery, public lands were important to you as a kid. Places where you could go and wander in our national parks and forests. His words ring true: “Landscapes affect people—they enlarge vision—they build strength.”

Open Spaces is a collection of essays derived from experiences set down over the years in what seem to be journal entries. The first two chapters draw a philosophical sketch of the author, from which we get a picture of this Thoreau-like saunterer. They set the stage for sharing adventures with him over the years. Within the flow of subjects, several themes run true. Water, in the form of lakes and rivers is one theme; the relationship between humankind and other life forms and the land is another. He calls his travels a quest for “trails of power.” For him, those trails run far and wide.

Open Spaces is written in easy-to-read, conversational style, as if Vickery was sitting with you there in front of the fireplace or in the sauna talking about his wanderings. Throughout the book he refers to and receives sustenance from many of the great naturalists and regional ethnologists, past and present. He conjures up the thoughts of Thoreau, Sigurd Olson, Barry Lopez, Loren Eiseley, John McPhee, Ruth Landes, and Selwyn Dewdney in defining and commenting on the landscape.

Open Spaces, by Jim Dale Vickery. NorthWord Press, Minoqua, WI.

Many of us have had an opportunity to wander in open spaces, either while growing up or during our adult careers. A few of us have been lucky enough to visit and perhaps work in a variety of settings where the mark of humans has been fleeting in time and on the landscape. Fewer still have developed innate skills in contemplating the personal meaning of open spaces and then writing well crafted literature about it. In Open Spaces, Jim Dale Vickery has shown a high level of accomplishment in each of these endeavors.

As soon as I began reading Open Spaces, I was hooked because it deals with a good part of my life and some 250 pages talking about things like rivers, wolves, the north country—wild country. Places I have been, places I would like to go to visit or work. Here is a guy I can empathize with, one who likes to scrutinize maps during long sub-zero winter nights, and then, when possible, fill in the blank spaces in his mind by going there after spring break-up.

In the introduction, Vickery artfully relates the concept Barry Lopez discusses in his work, the charting of our “inner landscape” through awareness, experiencing and appreciation of the “outer landscape.” Perhaps, like Vickery, public lands were important to you as a kid. Places where you could go and wander in our national parks and forests. His words ring true: “Landscapes affect people—they enlarge vision—they build strength.”

Open Spaces is a collection of essays derived from experiences set down over the years in what seem to be journal entries. The first two chapters draw a philosophical sketch of the author, from which we get a picture of this Thoreau-like saunterer. They set the stage for sharing adventures with him over the years. Within the flow of subjects, several themes run true. Water, in the form of lakes and rivers is one theme; the relationship between humankind and other life forms and the land is another. He calls his travels a quest for “trails of power.” For him, those trails run far and wide.

Open Spaces is written in easy-to-read, conversational style, as if Vickery was sitting with you there in front of the fireplace or in the sauna talking about his wanderings. Throughout the book he refers to and receives sustenance from many of the great naturalists and regional ethnologists, past and present. He conjures up the thoughts of Thoreau, Sigurd Olson, Barry Lopez, Loren Eiseley, John McPhee, Ruth Landes, and Selwyn Dewdney in defining and commenting on the landscape.

One story tells about searching for Indian artifacts on an island near his boyhood home. The similarities between his experience in Minnesota and one I had in my thoughtless youth, searching for an Indian grave on my grandfather’s 40 acres in southwest Missouri, were compelling and a bit eerie:

“Part of me wanted to back away and forget the island, to isolate and dispel the urge that had brought me there, but it was too late. Some innocence stayed behind. It wasn’t necessary to have found something tangible. It was the looking that mattered most: the dawning gall to glance at mortality, to enter the haunted house in the chain of natural being.”

Continued on page 26.
Levels of Interpretive Operations

Despite recent increases in the National Park Service's budget, evidence continues to mount that these funds are not always making it out to rangers in the field, whether in protection, resource management, emergency services or interpretation. A study of interpretive services recently prepared for Congress underscores this fact. Most of the following is either summarized or taken directly from that report.

At the request of Congress, the Service, through the Division of Interpretation in WASO, polled individual park interpretive divisions last January on levels of interpretive operations in their areas. Each division was asked to list the following for the decade from 1980 to 1990:

- its interpretive budget;
- its permanent workforce in terms of FTEs;
- its temporary workforce (seasonal interpreters) in terms of FTEs;
- its yearly visitation statistics; and
- whether or not the park's interpretive operations are presently functioning at or below the minimum level of service defined in NPS-6.

Responses were prepared and submitted by 275 park interpretive divisions. Although there are about 360 official NPS areas, the 275 responses represent 95% of all the significant interpretive operations across the Service. Sixteen NPS areas with significant interpretive operations failed to respond to the survey, largely because of time constraints or lack of records. All but two of them were small areas.

For a variety of reasons, including the changing number of parks each year, it is difficult to compare trends over a decade-long period. The following numbers therefore are based on averages per parks reporting in the years indicated. Using an average for each given year is the only way to produce a fair sense of what has happened from year to year over the last decade. Although the numbers are not absolutely accurate, they provide a broad picture of operational trends in interpretation during that period.

The following information was gleaned from the responses:

- The average park interpretive operations budget increased 17% per reporting park over the decade, but GNP inflation for the same period increased 53%.
- The average number of park visitors per reporting park increased 36% from 1980 to 1990.
- The average park interpretive FTE allotment for permanent employees during the period decreased 17% per reporting park; for seasonals, it decreased by 29%.
- Of the 275 responding parks, 62% reported that their interpretive operations are present­ly below the minimum level defined in NPS-6, and another 27% said that they are operating at minimum levels.

The chart which appears below graphically illustrates the first three of these points. It clearly shows that visitation to parks grew rapidly over the past decade, but that staffing and funding did not keep pace with this growth.

Before discussing the last point, it's important to clarify just what NPS policy says about minimal interpretive operations:

"The purpose of interpretation in the National Park System is: (1) to foster public understanding and appreciation of national parks and their significant cultural, natural and recreational resources, and, through this understanding, support for preserving them; (2) to encourage and facilitate appropriate, safe, minimum impact use of the parks; and (3) to promote public understanding and support of the Park Service's policies and programs."

"A park's minimum interpretive operation consists of those essential interpretive services without which it could not accomplish these three basic purposes."

"The first priority of a park's interpretive program must be to provide the park's identified minimum interpretive operation. All other services, however desirable, are secondary."

The nearly two-thirds of the parks that reported that they couldn't meet such minimal responsibilities include almost all large parks within the system. Those parks which report they are meeting the minimum responsibilities are almost entirely small parks with small visitation.

There is no way to compare the question about changes in minimum interpretive activities between 1980 and now because the question was not asked then. Throughout the system, however, the belief is prevalent that NPS interpretive operations were doing the best job of meeting minimum standards during the few years following the Bicentennial (1976-1980) due to the large infusions of personnel and funding during those years.

Interpretive operations, to be sure, were not perfect in 1980 in terms of quantity, quality, staffing or funding. But the cases which appear below show that many parks once ran a minimum interpretive operations and in some instances actually exceeded this requirement.

The overall quality of interpretive operations over the past decade is infinitely more difficult to assess than changes in quantitative figures. No attempt was made to do so due to the subjective nature of measuring. Individual park studies completed by the University of Idaho's Visitor Services Project, however, indicate that visitors rate the quality of individual interpretive services quite highly.

Most interpretive supervisors report that quality of interpretive services suffers most due to insufficient staffs and to the lack of time available for training interpreters and for preparing, auditing and critiquing programs.

Each of the ten regional chiefs of interpretation was also asked to submit from two to four case studies from his or her region profiling park interpretive operations in terms of levels of service to the public over the past 15 years. Two dozen were submitted. They reveal various trends that park interpretive operations have experienced since 1977, including:

- increased visitation;
- growing visitation by senior citizens and international visitors;
- minimal interpretive operations:
  - Of the 275 responding parks, 62% reported that their interpretive operations are present­ly below the minimum level defined in NPS-6, and another 27% said that they are operating at minimum levels.

The chart which appears below graphically illustrates the first three of these points. It clearly shows that visitation to parks grew rapidly over the past decade, but that staffing and funding did not keep pace with this growth.

Before discussing the last point, it's important to clarify just what NPS policy says about minimal interpretive operations:

"The purpose of interpretation in the National Park System is: (1) to foster public understanding and appreciation of national parks and their significant cultural, natural and recreational resources, and, through this understanding, support for preserving them; (2) to encourage and facilitate appropriate, safe, minimum impact use of the parks; and (3) to promote public understanding and support of the Park Service's policies and programs."

"A park's minimum interpretive operation consists of those essential interpretive services without which it could not accomplish these three basic purposes."

"The first priority of a park's interpretive program must be to provide the park's identified minimum interpretive operation. All other services, however desirable, are secondary."

The nearly two-thirds of the parks that reported that they couldn't meet such minimal responsibilities include almost all large parks within the system. Those parks which report they are meeting the minimum responsibilities are almost entirely small parks with small visitation.

There is no way to compare the question about changes in minimum interpretive activities between 1980 and now because the question was not asked then. Throughout the system, however, the belief is prevalent that NPS interpretive operations were doing the best job of meeting minimum standards during the few years following the Bicentennial (1976-1980) due to the large infusions of personnel and funding during those years.

Interpretive operations, to be sure, were not perfect in 1980 in terms of quantity, quality, staffing or funding. But the cases which appear below show that many parks once ran a minimum interpretive operations and in some instances actually exceeded this requirement.

The overall quality of interpretive operations over the past decade is infinitely more difficult to assess than changes in quantitative figures. No attempt was made to do so due to the subjective nature of measuring. Individual park studies completed by the University of Idaho's Visitor Services Project, however, indicate that visitors rate the quality of individual interpretive services quite highly.

Most interpretive supervisors report that quality of interpretive services suffers most due to insufficient staffs and to the lack of time available for training interpreters and for preparing, auditing and critiquing programs.

Each of the ten regional chiefs of interpretation was also asked to submit from two to four case studies from his or her region profiling park interpretive operations in terms of levels of service to the public over the past 15 years. Two dozen were submitted. They reveal various trends that park interpretive operations have experienced since 1977, including:

- increased visitation;
- growing visitation by senior citizens and international visitors;
• extended visitation into “shoulder seasons’’;
• increased themes and resources to interpret
  without reduction of other responsibilities;
• increased demand for education and outreach
  programs by schools and educators;
• population increases around park boundaries;
• increased sophistication by visitors regarding
  park resources and problems which require
  more complex interpretive presentations; and
• creation of new duties for park interpretive
  operations, such as library and curatorial re-
  sponsibilities.

Following are summaries of a number of these case studies.

Denali

The peak year for interpretive staffing was 1979 when there were three full-time perma-

ments and 23 seasonals; in 1991 there were 2.8 perma-

ments and 18 seasonals.

While staffing has remained about the same over the last 15 years, visitation has increased by over 325%. With increased numbers of visitors have come demands for special ser-

vices, such as needs by foreigners and differ-

ently-abled visitors.

The park relies upon Volunteers In Parks and Student Conservation Association volun-

teers to provide basic interpretive services. In 1991, volunteers provided 27% of the inter-

pretation in the east district and 17% in the west district.

Glacier Bay

The ONPS interpretive budget at Glacier Bay increased at an annual rate of 3.8% from $101,500 to $172,344 in the fifteen years be-

tween 1977 and 1991. Since salary increases for GS employees have also averaged 3.8% annually, the interpretation and visitor ser-

vices budget is essentially at the same level now as in 1977.

During this period, visitation has doubled, backcountry use has tripled, and, as has been the case with many parks in Alaska, visitor fa-

cilities have been considerably expanded.

The outreach program has a once-yearly contact by the park staff in nearby communi-

ties rather than a former regular and sustained program. Residents of these communities use the park for commercial fishing, subsistence, and tourism; most of the contact between the park staff and residents of these communities is now confined to formal public hearings.

Sitka

In FY87, the park’s funding support for the operation of the Southeast Alaska Indian Cul-

tural Center, which is drawn from the park’s interpretive budget, was reduced 50%, from $80,800 to $40,000. The Center plays a criti-

cal role in the interpretation and perpetuation of the Tlingit arts and culture. As a result of this shortage, the center’s program was re-

duced from a year-round operation to a four-

month operation.

Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania

Fredericksburg has experienced both dra-

matic increases in visitation and a marked ex-

pansion of the primary use period beyond the summer months in “shoulder” seasonal peri-

ods in the spring and fall. At the same time, the available interpretive staff has declined steadily. The combination has resulted in staff-to-visitor ratios that have declined by a factor of about three.

The shoulder season period is of recent vint-

age. The 1991 weekend visitation for the rel-

atively minor Columbus Day holiday exceeded the Fourth of July weekend for 1986. The extended season has not yet been recognized in staffing and funding.

Four district battlefields, well separated from each other and fought in different years, comprise discrete units of the park. Two of them seldom have any uniformed staff on duty to deal with visitors, even at periods of peak visitation. Raising the flag on the de-

tached battlefields (which include some 2,000 acres each) at Wilderness and Spotsylvania has been adjudged part of any minimal-level interpretive program in various management documents, yet it is beyond the park’s power to accomplish at this time.

Independence

In 1976, Independence had an infusion of funds and staffing (permanent FTEs) which recog-

nized the Bicentennial of the Declaration of Independence and the new interpretive fa-

cilities [six buildings].

Between 1977 and 1991, the budget in-

creased just under 100%. The average in-

crease was 4.8% per year. Pay increases amounted to $337,139 within the Interpreta-

tion and Visitor Services (I&VS) budget dur-

ing that period, half of which the division’s budget absorbed.

In FY85, FERS began affecting the budget. Impact was very rapid in I&VS at Independence because approximately one-half of the 50 permanent line-ranger positions were new hires each year and thus subject to FERS ben-

efits, which are approximately 30% per year per person instead of the roughly 12% per per-

son under CSRS. In 1991, FERS benefits cost the division $124,800 more than if those em-

ployees were all under CSRS. In those same years, the division absorbed the special pay rates for GS-3 through GS-9 park rangers [Philadelphia area].


Ozark

Although the overall total budget allocation for interpretation has increased from $126,900 in 1977 to $264,700 in 1991, there has been a decrease in interpretive programs (-19.8% erosion in just the last four years).

An appropriated base (1977) was estab-

lished 50% below what was needed when the interpretive operation was established - although funding has increased by 200%, it is still underfunded by 50%.

The addition of the riverways’ cultural re-

source management responsibilities and other non-interpretive support activities to the Divi-

sion of Interpretation have increased logarithmically during the last two years; in FY91, approximately 38% of the division budget was spent on non-interpretive activities.

Voyageurs

Interpretive facilities and visitor contacts have increased dramatically in the past ten years. Visitiation at the visitor center has in-

creased 248%. Interpretive planning needs mushroomed during the 1980s: two new visitor centers were designed, but neither has ex-

hibits; an environmental education program

Interpreter and visitors at Golden Gate. Photo by Richard Frear.
was begun; public affairs programs have also been expanded to build community support for park management.

Funding and staffing for the Division of Interpretation have decreased over the past ten years even though the park as a whole has seen funding and staffing increases. Meanwhile, visitor use, facilities to be staffed, and programs to be implemented have all increased. Compared with standards set in the statement for Interpretation, the three visitor centers are operating below standard, and the number of naturalist-guided activities offered do not meet standards. At Crane Lake, one of the main entrances to the park, no interpretive services are available. One major visitor center is without exhibits and another visitor center is operated totally by volunteers.

National Mall

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, interpretive staffing consisted largely of 30-40 permanent GS-4 and GS-5 line rangers divided among the Washington Monument and Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials. There were two eight-hour shifts, each with five rangers assigned to assist with the summer visitors. Five kiosks were staffed. During this period, interpretive talks of 20 minutes were conducted at the memorials on the half hour, both shifts, and there were seasonal roving assignments to the Tulip Library, Hains Point, and the Tidal Basin. Rangers regularly monitored the interpretive talks given by the tourmobile concession operation. Outreach programs were provided whenever requests were made.

In the mid-1980s, visitation increased, but interpretive staffing remained static despite overall park increases in staffing. Requests for outreach programs increased and two interpreters were assigned to provide them on- and off-site. Requests began for interpreters to provide special VIP tours. It was necessary to use interpreters from the sites, which resulted in reduced site coverage and the reduction or elimination of talks.

In its first year (1984), the Vietnam Veterans Memorial had almost four million visitors and plus a high level of visitation has continued. The park received no additional staffing. Staffing for this memorial was taken from the other sites and interpretation throughout Mall operations declined. Only one kiosk was operated.

In the fall of 1988, the staffing level was 16 permanent rangers, which included six management and supervisory staff and ten interpreters, and 18 temporary full-year rangers. There were 19 summer seasonals to handle the summer crowds, but not enough staff for the off-season. To correct this problem, 12 summer seasonal positions were realigned to make six temporary full-year appointments to handle the year-round visitation. As a result, summer interpretation was reduced.

In spite of an operating increase which brought in six seasonal rangers in 1990, Mall operations staff remains below the level necessary to provide a minimum standard of visitor service.

Antietam

Since 1977, Antietam visitation has increased 435%. In the last six years, visitation has increased 255%. Conversely, the interpretive staff has decreased. In 1977, the park had one FTE to provide services for every 15,226 people who visited the park. Today that same one FTE must provide services to 52,741 visitors, an increase of 246%.

Beginning in 1986, all interpretive programs given by uniformed rangers were abolished. Funding for seasonal positions was eliminated. The old programs given by rangers seven years ago have not been restored to date. From 1975-1983, there were sufficient seasonals to conduct cannon firing demonstrations twice every weekend in the summer. In an effort to sustain basic, quality interpretive programs, the battlefield now relies on volunteers.

Formerly, most visitors came Memorial Day through Labor Day. Now more are coming in the spring and fall. The six months of May through October now have over 75% of Antietam's visitation. Visitations in the winter months have also quadrupled.

Another aspect of the program that has increased are the requests by school, military, historical and civic groups for special tours and on- and off-site orientation programs. In 1991, Antietam received more than 300 requests and was only able to adequately fulfill less than 30%.

Cape Cod

In 1977, 26 different topics were presented each week for a combined offering of 78 programs weekly during the summer season. Between 1977 and 1979 (primarily utilizing urban initiative funds), the park was able to continue to expand its interpretive offerings, specifically to accommodate day-visit educational groups.

In subsequent years, interpretive staff and support funds diminished. Between 1985 and 1991, seasonal interpretive FTE levels dropped from 5.0 positions to 3.7.

In FY88, enhanced park operations funds made possible the purchase of canoes and other equipment for water-resources interpretation and provided additional seasonal staff for experimental programs in this important subject area. Regular interpretive programs and services have not been enhanced.

As the base continued to diminish due to negligible budget increases offset by inflationary costs (e.g., 14% dollar increase between 1985 and 1991, offset by 21% CPI increases), interpretive services had to be decreased. The length of the summer season was reduced from 13 weeks to 10 weeks and uniformed interpretive services were reduced from 74 offerings per week to 57 offerings per week.

As funding and staffing have eroded, the geographical range of the park's two interpretive districts has shrunk. Out of the four towns in the main portion of the park's boundaries, two now receive minimal interpretive services. Meanwhile, Cape Cod's year-round population has continued to grow. School and community groups routinely call to request off-site interpretive services, only to be told services cannot be offered during peak seasons.

Acadia

The widening gap between the number of interpretive rangers and the demand for interpretive services has been bridged by reliance on volunteers and an increasingly higher ratio of visitors to interpreters. The number of work years of interpretive staff has dropped; while numbers of visitors continue to climb.

Hours and seasons of operation of contact stations have been reduced, although the visitor eight areas are Indian tribes to facilitate the major pulse of visitors in July and August, over-popular programs are routinely cancelled, renamed, or moved when attendance exceeds a safe number.

Coulee Dam

Under the terms of the 1990 cooperative management agreement, the NPS is directed to provide information and interpretation on Lake Roosevelt and local Native American culture at the Bureau of Reclamation Visitor Center (VAC). Currently the Park Service cannot staff the VAC from October to Memorial Day, and can staff it only part-time during the summer months.

There has been no interpretive staff in the North District to provide interpretive services since 1989.

Olympic

Olympic was presenting 143 conducted activities each week in 1976 (56 walks, 26 talks, 17 demonstrations or special activities). In addition, it helped fund the Ozette excavation and presented 21 talks per week in association with that activity. In 1992, with expected budgets and personnel, the park will present 29 walks, 38 talks, and no special programs for a total of 67 programs per week.

The park no longer has a cultural program. The park's interpretive prospectus recommends such a program to build goodwill with the eight area Indian tribes, to facilitate the park's EO program, and to aid in cooperative efforts to protect park resources.

Badlands

Shoulder-season visitation to the park has increased dramatically. In FY91, 466,049 visitors (30% of the year's total) visited the Badlands in the spring (April-May) and fall (September-October). These shoulder season visitors receive very little in the way of interpretive services.

During the late 1980s and early 1990s, interpretation's ability to serve park visitors did not keep pace with visitation increases. In FY85, park visitation was 962,242, and interpretation was funded for 5.1 FTEs, or 188,675 visitors per FTE. By FY91, park visitation had grown to 1,532,923 while interpretation had increased to 4.7 FTEs, or 326,849 visitors per FTE. Visitations have increased 73% since 1985 in relation to FTEs devoted to interpretation.
40% of the total seasonal FTEs for interpreters annually by the year 2000. Unforeseen growth in visitation to a peak of 500,000 visitors in September visitors without adequate interpretive services. Currently, Badlands receives many requests from schools in the surrounding counties for a variety of educational services. Most of these requests are received in the spring before any seasonal staff are on duty, and when the permanent staff is heavily involved with hiring and preparing for the summer season. As a result, some requests for programs have to be declined and those that are accepted are often hastily prepared.

Glen Canyon

In the 1950s, a study was done for this future recreation area. The study predicted slow growth in visitation to a peak of 500,000 visitors annually by the year 2000. Unforeseen was the rapid population explosion throughout the Southwest, which completely invalidated the suppositions reached by the study. In reality, the park's visitation surpassed 500,000 in 1968, before the park was established, and has exceeded three million visitors annually since 1988.

Glen Canyon is still a developing park. Funding and staffing for the provision of even minimum interpretive services has not kept pace with park visitation. Glen Canyon cannot, like other, longer-established parks, show a need for positions based on positions lost. At Glen Canyon, positions that are needed to provide minimum interpretive services have not been established.

Glacier

The number of seasonal interpreters available for front-line duty has decreased from a 1977 high of 40 to a present staffing level of 34. Both district interpreter positions were downgraded from GS-11 to GS-9 even though responsibilities continued to increase.

Park visitation has increased in the past five years by 25%, and participation in interpretive activities and visitor services increased by 29%. However, interpretive and visitor information staffing has not kept pace. 1990 and 1991 staffing levels are lower than those of 1987 and 1988. Projected 1992 programming does not permit any increase in seasonal staff.

Shoulder-season visitation has increased. Park visits in September now equal those in June. The park interpretive program traditionally ended Labor Day and visitor centers reduced hours. This practice has left open 280,000 September visitors without adequate interpretive services.

In the 1991 interpretive prospectus, park management identified a year-round program of community outreach and environmental education programs as one of Glacier's minimum level interpretive services. Currently, Glacier meets only 25% of the demand for environmental education and outreach programs.

Grand Teton and John D. Rockefeller

Since 1950, the park has enjoyed increasing popularity, peaking with record visitation of 4.15 million visits in 1978. Since that year, visitation has fallen to 2.4 million in 1985, but increased again with a contemporary high of 3.2 million in 1991. This figure is the high for the last nine years. The last nine years have also seen steady increases in off-season travel, particularly in the spring (April-May) since 1985 and the fall (September-October) since 1986. This trend can be expected to continue as national trends and local promotions begin to fill the off-season periods, due to relative crowding in all western parks during the prime summer season.

These contemporary increases in visitation and associated visitor expectations have been accompanied by decreases in interpretive services, hours of operation of facilities, availability of uniformed personnel, program quality, training, and employee development. The decreases in general interpretive offerings and lack of professionalism have been directly caused by a decreasing budget base, as increases in park funds have been allocated to higher priority projects and services.

With decreases in seasonal staffing, seasonal supervisory staff and permanent supervisors have stepped into the regular schedule to try to maintain services, while minimizing time allotted to quality control and program development. The result has been a drop in the quality of the programs offered by the seasonal staff. Seasonal employees have not received the normal number of audits or critiques of programs, nor assistance in developing or improving program content or organization. Seasonal training has been decreased from 80 hours to 40 hours.

The interpretive program at Rockefeller Memorial Parkway was funded by the Visitor Protection Division in 1990-1991 on an experimental basis, featuring regular information services and scheduled nature walks and evening programs. Funding is not provided in FY92, so visitor services at this southern gateway to Yellowstone have been cancelled. The lack of interpretive services in 1992 will be distressing, as a major year-round concession facility and visitor information station is scheduled to open and operate in the summer of 1992 and winter of 1992-1993.

Great Smokey Mountains

The interpretive budget has remained reasonably consistent during the years since the Gramm-Rudman Act. During the period between 1987 and 1991, the budget grew from a budget of $452,000 to $585,000. This growth of $133,000 reflects a real growth of approximately $63,000 after consideration of the effects of inflation during this period. During the same period of time, the overall park program decreased by approximately $130,000 after considering effects of inflation.

Great Smokey Mountains has approximately 8.2 million overall visits and almost 2 million visitors annually at three major visitor centers. Of the total visits, the park contacts only 3% for personal services interpretation.

Cultural heritage interpretation for school groups is limited. Volunteers and cooperating association personnel have replaced NPS employees. The association pays the salaries of 17 employees who work in the visitor centers in sales, plus one librarian, six millers, one publications person, and one demonstrator. Using the NPS formula that half of their time is devoted to interpretation, the park is lacking 12 or more interpretive rangers in this one area of operations.

Fort Pulaski

The percentage of the total park budget devoted to interpretation has remained relatively constant over the past ten years. One of the most notable changes in the program has occurred in staffing. Due to visitation increasing spread more evenly throughout the year, it was...
decided in 1990 to cut the summer seasonal staff by two in order to hire a temporary, not-to-exceed one-year seasonal in interpretation.

The park increasingly relies on non-personal rather than personal interpretive services. Though the quantity of personal services has decreased, overall quality has remained high.

**Big Bend**

From FY83 to FY92 at Big Bend, visitation increased 57%; funding increased 37%; the number of NPS positions decreased 41%; FTEs decreased 34% from a high of 15.39 in FY88 to a low of 10.14 in FY92.

In the last five years, fewer visitor services have been offered: on-site interpretive programs were cut over 50%; two visitor centers were closed and hours were reduced at the three remaining ones; off-site outreach programs were reduced or eliminated completely; roving patrols and contacts were almost eliminated.

With fewer visitor contacts, the park has experienced an increase in the number of illegal activities, including cactus poaching, vandalism, littering, resource damage and destruction, and illegal camping.

**Bandelier**

Although Bandelier feels its interpretation has fared fairly well over the years (15.6% of its total ONPS 1991 funds were devoted to the interpretive program), it has felt the effects of pay increases, upgrades of positions, and the reliance on funds from lapsed positions.

In 1991, volunteers presented 48% of all the basic interpretive activities offered to the public.

Due to funding constraints, one of the four permanent positions in the division has remained vacant since July 1990.

**Yosemite**

In 1977, visitation to Yosemite totalled 2.54 million; in 1991, it exceeded 3.54 million, an increase of almost 40%. Most of that growth has been in non-summer travel. The nine non-summer months registered 1.9 million visits (53.7%) in 1991. The traditional tide of summer visitors has not diminished, however - visitation in August 1991 reached a single-month record of 608,830. International visitors are now accounted for an estimated 25%-30% of annual park travel.

As visitor use and concomitant impacts on park resources have escalated and visitation patterns have evolved, the need to address these and related issues through a broad mix of both proactive and responsive interpretive services and media has intensified. Yet, the gap between the need and demand for these functions and Yosemite’s capacity to provide them has steadily widened. Budget constraints within the park and the Western Region, inflation, and offsets of increased administrative costs (pay increases, FERS contributions, housing for VIPs) have all affected the financial base in relation to operating costs. Concurrently, adding to those costs have been a number of new initiatives, workload factors, equipment acquisition (principally computers), and operations functions that had to be absorbed. Additional permanent personnel have been required to meet these growing needs, usually at the expense of seasonal staffing. The park information office was established under interpretation in 1982 to respond to the 35,000 telephone and 15,000 written information requests annually, as well as 2,000+ media contacts each year.

New operations and expanded functions warranted by year-round demands have necessitated additional permanent positions - a total of 29 in 1991 from nine to 1977. New positions have been established for interpretive and information services, public affairs, and the park information office, audiovisual production and systems maintenance, and collections/library management. Yosemite has reduced the level of seasonal staffing and operations to absorb those increased costs. In 1977, the division had 57 other-than-permanent positions, most of them summer seasonal; in 1991, it had 32 temporary positions, only 24 of which were summer interpreters.

Since the early 1980s, summer staffing at Glacier Point has been cut by one-third and at Tuolumne Meadows and White Wolf by about one-half. In Yosemite Valley, the total summer staffing level in 1991 was 19; in 1977, it was 23. The summer schedule of conducted walks, evening programs, and demonstrations has been progressively trimmed, from 314 per week in 1976 to 192 weekly in 1991. Environmental education and school-group programs have been all but eliminated.

**Lake Mead**

Lake Mead is a year-round park. The interpretive program in the recreation area has never been staffed adequately, perhaps due in part to the overall attitude that interpretation could not be effective in a recreation area because visitors do not come to attend programs - they come to fish, boat, or swim. Staffing in the past seemed to be dependent on providing the more traditional forms of interpretation - evening programs, walks, talks, and staffing visitor centers.

In 1978, interpreters began to do more roving interpretation, meeting the visitor out in the park, on the lake in boats, at beach camps and in the marinas. Visitors reacted favorably to this program and interpretation began to help improve the image of the NPS in the recreation area. In 1980, those programs were eliminated.

Staffing levels throughout the 1980s remained static. In 1977, there were ten permanent positions, compared to 1982, when there were seven positions. From that time until the present, the numbers have remained about the same, averaging between six and seven positions.

In the late 1970s, park visitation increased to more than 6 million. After the energy crisis years of 1980-1981, the numbers of visitors has steadily grown, until in 1990, 8.9 million people visited Lake Mead.

In order to alleviate many of these problems, the Service requested significant increases for seasonal employees and for “Parks as Classrooms” interpretive programs for FY94. The budget request included increases of $8 million and 350 FTEs for seasonal interpreters, and 3 million and 14 FTEs for “Parks as Classrooms.”

This request would be the first step in a five-year interpretive initiative which would upgrade and improve the quality of NPS interpretive operations. The initiative, which can be found in the Interpretive Challenge (1988) and the related Implementation Strategies (1988), would double the seasonal interpretive workforce and increase the permanent interpretive work force by 25%. A companion initiative would increase the quantity and quality of media interpretation in the parks.

As we went to press, however, early word had come back on the House subcommittee’s mark-up of the FY94 budget request. The subcommittee cut $6 million of the requested $8 million for seasonal interpretation, and cut half - about $1.5 million - from the “Parks as Classrooms” initiative. Language in the bill would also require 50% cost sharing with school districts for transportation of children associated with the program.

---
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Lofty Peaks, Simple Goal

Malinee Crapsey
Sequoia/Kings Canyon

The nine-member team, gathered from various parts of California and Wyoming, brought diverse backgrounds with them—park ranger, physician, public relations specialist, and photographer, to name a few. Their ages spanned thirty years, from 29 to 59. What they held in common was a commitment to national parks, the wilderness preserved therein, and the conservation ethics needed to protect them.

As they had planned their adventure over two years’ time, they had established goals for the team: setting an example of minimum impact mountaineering, sharing conservation information with others, and climbing the 22,494-foot Ama Dablam in Nepal.

The 1991 American Ama Dablam Expedition Team consisted entirely of National Park Service employees and close associates from several locations. From Sequoia and Kings Canyon came Mike Murray, Kings Canyon District Ranger, and Colin Smith, trailhead ranger in Sequoia’s subalpine Mineral King Valley (he has since moved to lower elevations at Western Regional Office). Mallory Smith had only recently left Yosemite for the Western Region’s Public Affairs Office when she departed for Nepal. Now a member of the Resources Management Division, Mark Butler was in a maintenance position in Yosemite when he left on the expedition. Brent and Tory Finley, climbing rangers at Grand Teton in the summer, left their jobs as Yosemite’s Tuolumne Meadows winter rangers to make the climb. (Tory, part of the group up to the last minute, was grounded in the States by health problems). Another Teton climbing ranger, Susie Harrington, also joined the group.

Three team members were not NPS employees, but have extremely close ties with the parks. The team doctor, Ben Schiffin, had worked closely with Sequoia and Kings Canyon as a medical advisor on in-park emergency medical services. Senior member Dick Stark, vintner and marketing consultant, has mountaineered in the Sierra for 50 years. Evans Smith, the group’s leader, is a professional photographer who served previously as SAR technician and park photographer in Yosemite.

Each member experienced his or her own individual mix of feelings: anticipation, hope, and concern. Mike, for example, approached the trip with some inner trepidation. An experienced mountaineer, he had been on expeditions to Nepal and South America before, and had been incapacitated by altitude and intestinal illnesses. He wanted to give it another try, but knew that, despite his best efforts, the result might be the same.

Colin decided to set a personal goal other than the peak, aiming instead for 20,000 feet. “I also wanted the chance to work as a team, with no distractions, on a project I could believe in.”

The group set off from the airport in San Francisco in early March, hoping to sneak through a window of good climbing weather in the Khumbu region of Nepal. After several days of travel and a week of organization and negotiation in Katmandu, they began their two-week trek to the base of Ama Dablam.

En route to the mountain the team applied conservation techniques. They brought only what they needed, packaged efficiently, and extended to their human relationships. From the start, everyone decided to respect Sherpa customs as much as possible. Upon the team’s arrival at the 15,000-foot base camp, an elevation higher than Sequoia’s Mount Whitney, the Sherpas planned a “puja” ceremony. Their prerequisite to work on a mountain, this ritual offering to the peak becomes a gesture of humility in the face of nature’s immensity. Tuesdays, however, are inauspicious for puja ceremonies; the group decided to postpone climbing for a day and instead busied themselves with chores at base camp. As a juniper bough was burned and colorful prayer flags flapped in the next day’s breeze, spirits soared with the white smoke toward the summit. The true climb had begun.

In between six separate snowstorms the group spent three weeks backpacking equipment up to a series of encampments above base. High winds sent tents flying more than once, and the team watched a succession of ominous storm clouds advance to blanket their peak. Seven weeks had passed since the group left home, and the highest elevation the weather had permitted any of them to reach was 21,000 feet. The wait for clear skies had simply run out of time.

Despite their failure to reach the top, they met an important set of personal goals that was agreed to by all. “We wanted everyone to come back safely, with all our fingers and toes, and with our friendships intact,” says Colin. Remembering his experiences as a search and rescue officer in Yosemite and other parks, Mike agrees. It is too easy to focus exclusively on a destination, losing track of your personal safety and other priorities.

Colin hit his target, standing at 20,000 feet and “feeling tired but thinking about going higher.” The twinges of altitude sickness that had worried Mike at base camp disappeared, leaving him strong and quietly exuberant.

As they moved off the mountain, the cleaning effort began. They removed not only their own gear, but trash and equipment left behind by other expeditions. The 100-plus pounds of body weight lost by team members was supplemented by the 25 pounds of plastic and 165 pounds of glass and metal they carried back to Katmandu for recycling.

“We planned to bring the plastic back to the States until we discovered that the Nepalese are already recycling it,” Mike explained. “They turn it into drainpipes and other items for local use.”

Looking back now from the vantage point of home, the members have had a chance to reflect on their efforts. Mike: “This type of experience changes you, but you put yourself in the position because you want to change, to grow.” Colin adds, “Now we know how easy it is, relatively, to have a great adventure without imposing yourself on a culture or an environment. There’s no excuse for not doing it.”
Protecting the Parks: New Approaches In Law Enforcement

"The primary responsibility of the National Park Service must be protection of park resources. The mission of preserving and protecting the national treasures that belong in the National Park System can only be met if the Park Service can confront the threats to park resources and has the means of dealing with those threats..."

National Park Service rangers are beset these days by a wider spectrum of law enforcement problems and more complex and serious challenges than ever before, including drug smuggling, significant crimes against both people and property, management of major incidents, depredations against archaeological and cultural resources, and environmental crimes.

Of these, environmental crimes are in many ways the most difficult to enforce and have the most direct impact on park resources. Some of them, such as marine, air and water pollution enforcement, require close cooperative efforts among agencies and federal attorneys, new approaches to making cases, and understanding of federal laws not commonly used at the park level.

The following articles from a number of parks talk about some of the efforts which have been made to check environmental crimes in the field or creatively fund future enforcement efforts. We hope to print many more such articles in the future. If you’ve come up with a new idea or approach to resource protection, please drop a line to the editor of this magazine.

Marine Dumping and MARPOL
Dennis Burnett
Delaware Water Gap

During the afternoon of August 24, 1991, large quantities of trash and garbage began washing ashore on Cape Cod National Seashore beaches. The refuse was initially found at Head of the Meadow Beach in Truro, but eventually came ashore from Marconi Beach in Wellfleet on the south to Race Point Beach in Provincetown on the north, a distance of approximately 18 miles. Most of the refuse was loose and not bagged, although 10-15 bags of trash were also recovered. The garbage consisted of beverage cans, food remnants, a wide variety of plastics and paper products including plates, bowls and cups, photographs, milk and cream containers and straws and swizzle sticks. For the next ten days, over 40 bags of garbage and refuse were removed by hand from seashore beaches.

This act of dumping was in violation of a new law known as “MARPOL Annex V”.

What is MARPOL and what does it mean? MARPOL is short for marine pollution and was enacted to prohibit the dumping of any plastics in the world’s oceans. The law is a result of the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987 (MPPRCA, 33 USC 1901). It carries civil penalties up to $25,000, fines up to $50,000 and/or imprisonment up to five years for each violation.

With an estimated 50 billion tons of plastic produced annually, MARPOL, ratified by the United States along with over 30 other countries, is a first step in dealing with the vast amount of non-degradable plastics that contribute to the nation’s huge environmental pollution problem. The U.S. Coast Guard is the lead agency responsible for carrying out the mandates of the law.

Our marine environment is increasingly threatened by the garbage we dump into it. According to the results of a National Academy of Sciences survey in the early 1970’s, an estimated 6.4 million tons of litter is discarded in the world’s oceans annually. However, increasing litter on our coasts indicates an ever greater problem. In earlier times, throwing garbage overboard may have been relatively harmless, as most of it sank and degraded within a short period of time. But the composition of garbage has changed.

Worldwide plastic production has doubled in less than ten years. Plastic packaging, plastic containers, synthetic ropes, nets and traps and similar plastic items are proliferating. Unlike garbage from earlier times, most plastics and synthetic items, once discarded, float on the water’s surface and decompose very slowly. Researchers estimate that some plastics take as long as 400 years to break down.

Until now, there have been only limited laws restricting the dumping of garbage in the ocean. As more is learned about the nature of plastics and the harm they cause to marine and human life, it has become clear that plastic products must be kept out of the ocean. With this in mind, MARPOL Annex V now prohibits any dumping of plastics in the ocean.

Effective January 1, 1989, it became illegal to dump plastics from all marine craft of any size and type, including small recreational boats, commercial fishing vessels and large ocean going ships. The regulations also cover all fixed, floating or submersible vessels and platforms, and require that every shipping terminal, marina, fish processing plant or port supply adequate means of accepting plastic refuse along with all other garbage. The disposal needs of every private boat and commercial ship utilizing a port or terminal for commercial transactions must be met by these facilities.

MARPOL was implemented for several reasons. The most important of these is to help save the millions of animals who die needlessly through ingesting or becoming entangled in plastics. An estimated one million birds, 50,000 northern fur seals and 100,000 other marine mammals and sea turtles die each year from plastics. Most of them die from ingesting plastic pellets or plastic bags or by getting entangled in drifting plastic such as monofilament line, fishing nets, rope, packing bands or six-pack yokes. Second, the illegal dumping of plastics will now be met with stiff penalties when violators are caught. Third, the U.S. Coast Guard may deny ships entry into those ports and terminals that have not provided adequate means of waste disposal.

Trash receptacles at dock areas tend to be a problem on Cape Cod and were a contributing factor in the dumping incident. Every land fill is scheduled to be closed within three years and the cost of hauling refuse off the Cape is quite high. When large cruise ships visit ports of call on Cape Cod, the cost of off-loading refuse can be prohibitive and therefore not always utilized.

The party responsible for the dumping incident on Cape Cod was easily identified as the “Enchanted Isle,” a cruise ship operated by Commodore Cruise Lines. The vessel had spent the night of August 23, 1991 in Provincetown harbor and had left the morning of August 24, 1991. The problem with this case was in linking identifiable refuse from the “Enchanted Isle” to a plastic product, container or bag. Since general ocean dumping of refuse other than plastic items is still allowed (see below), rangers were required to spend several days scouring the beaches and sifting through the garbage. Once the link was established, the case quickly moved forward.

Among the items MARPOL Annex V prohibits from being discharged into the sea are:

- Food wrapping
- Personal hygiene products
- Packaging such as bottles, containers, liners
While we have been very successful in U.S. magistrate and district courts in obtaining maximum fines of $5,000 against the violators, we also have an interest in acquiring the market value of the fish found in the violator's possession. Since the violator is often apprehended while the net is still in the water, rangers will end up processing the catch. This involves removing the fish from the gill net, placing them on ice and trucking them 25 miles to a fish house near Naples, Florida. Local Everglades City fish houses will not buy the fish from the NPS.

After the catch is sorted, graded and weighed, we are paid the market price per pound. A check is made payable to the National Park Service by the fish house and is held by us pending trial. In January, one such case resulted in a check in the amount of $3,025 for a catch of roe mullet in excess of 3,500 pounds.

In past years, our interest in obtaining a true dollar value was to enable us to access the provisions of the Lacey Act, which in turn resulted in defendants being much more willing to plea to a maximum fine and forfeit boats, motors, nets, radios, and other gear rather than face the stiffer penalties provided for in Lacey. The value of the catch was also forfeited, but ended up going to the U.S. Treasury, not back into the park due to prohibitions against supplementing appropriations.

Lately, however, after having spent countless hours in the fish processing business but not reaping the rewards, we decided to pursue any avenue that would allow this to happen.

After conferring with the administrative officer and detailing the situation, we were advised that a donation account could be established for us to draw upon for operational needs if the money were somehow donated to the park by the defendant at the time of trial. This could include reimbursement for overtime expenses during the processing of the case, equipment purchases, vehicle and vessel maintenance and so on. The fishermen that we deal with are already used to the fact that, when convicted, the value of the catch is going to be forfeited to the government, at least in the Middle and Southern Districts of Florida. We now had to convince them that it would be in their best interests to specifically "donate" the value of the catch to Everglades National Park.

Towards that end, we have two things going for us. First of all, we have several good assistant U.S. attorneys (AUSA's) who believe in our mission and are willing to work closely with us. Secondly, in addition to Lacey, we have access to Public Law 101-337, which became law in January of 1990 and is commonly referred to as the National Park Service Marine Resources Protection Act.

The AUSA that we work with agreed that we could, if necessary, apply the provisions of this law to commercial fishermen who choose not to cooperate and take advantage of the plea bargain process. Our goal is for the plea bargain to include the defendant agreeing to "donate" the value of the catch to Everglades National Park. If the defendant chooses not to cooperate, the AUSA will then file an information under P.L. 101-337 and we would proceed with trial in U.S. district court.

It is important to note that amounts recovered under any federal and state law as a result of damage to any federal resource within a unit of the National Park System may be retained and used for response costs, damage assessments, restoration and replacements. In this regard, the law is not limited to marine or aquatic resources. Note also that the liability for damages to marine or aquatic resources created under this act is in addition to any other liability which may arise under federal or state law.

When faced with the prospects of this, we, along with the AUSA, feel that the defendant is likely to cooperate. We have been successful in the one instance that this option was pursued, and are presently spending the $3,025 on much-needed equipment. Obviously, if the circumstances of any particular case warrant it, we will utilize Lacey, P.L. 101-337 or any other pertinent law and seek prosecution to the fullest extent.

**Boat patrol in the Everglades.**

---

**Marine Resource Protection and Operational Funding**

Kevin Fitzgerald

**Everglades**

Within Everglades National Park and specifically the Gulf Coast Subdistrict, rangers routinely contact and apprehend commercial gill net fishermen in violation of NPS regulations prohibiting commercial fishing. Black mullet, which is typically used as a bait fish for the blue crab, stone crab and fish trap industry, sharply increases in value during December and January when it is in roe. As a bait fish, mullet might fetch $0.15 to $2.00 per pound, and commercial fishermen can realize incomes of from $5,000 to $15,000 a day.
Developing an Environmental Crimes Program

Chris Schrader
New River Gorge

Southern West Virginia, like many other areas of the United States, has a long history of environmental problems dating back to the industrial revolution. At New River Gorge National River, Bluestone Scenic River and Gauley National Recreational Area, environmental problems associated with coal mining, logging and inadequate sewer systems are very evident.

The acts that created these areas clearly spelled out that the National Park Service would "preserve as a free-flowing stream an important segment of the New River in West Virginia for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations."

In the spring of 1991, Michael Carey, the U.S. attorney in Charleston, made it a priority of his office to make New River Gorge a positive environmental example for the rest of the state.

With the wording of the act in mind, and the support of the court, New River Gorge's protection division has started an environmental enforcement program which includes litter control. In 1989, there were 25 open dumps in the Sandstone District alone, control of timber theft, medical waste dumping, and water resources violations.

Prosecution of the water resources cases in other areas normally is done by the EPA or state agencies, but New River has found that working with other federal agencies that normally do not handle these kinds of cases has been a great help in bringing our water pollution cases to conclusion. The park has even assisted the FBI with a case just outside of the park boundary that has resulted in the owner of a strip mine being sentenced to five years in prison.

One of the successful cases involves a coal preparation plant that is shut down but is still licensed to operate if the owner wants to. In 1988 the park first documented a problem with the water flowing from the plants coal tailings into a small pond and then flowing into the New River. The pond was described at that time as being milky blue in color and having three containers of sodium hydroxide (a chemical used to treat acid mine drainage) floating in it. The state of West Virginia's Department of Natural Resources was called and the chemical containers were removed, but the pond continued to be a problem.

In May of 1991, a criminal case was opened into the problems at the pond and monitoring of the pond and the stream was stepped up. The Department of Interior's Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement was contacted and an inspection of the site was conducted which led to the owner of the plant being cited by the West Virginia Department of Energy for failing to maintain their drainage system. This violation resulted in a $750 per day fine until the problem was corrected. The owner did work on the land, but water problems are still occurring. At the time of this writing, the park has presented its investigative findings to the United States attorney for presentation to the grand jury for indictments under the Clean Water Act. Although this case is far from being resolved, the cooperation between the involved agencies has already produced positive results. Though the water problem is still occurring, the work the company has done has already mitigated some of the pollution.

One of the lessons that New River has learned about environmental crimes cases is that they are very time consuming. Several of the cases that we've have run a year or more and have involved the work of several rangers and investigators. But the commitment has paid off in a cleaner river and a more environmentally aware public in and around the park.

At the time this article was written, the park had fifteen open environmental crimes cases. Some of these cases will not pan out, but others will. Our hope is that this type of program will help the entire river ecosystem.

If you have questions or comments about these programs, please give me a call at 304/763-4635.

Establishing A Resource Replacement Fund

Bob Martin
Shenandoah

Late on the evening of December 14, 1988, a call came into the Central District Ranger's Office. An informant relayed word that three or four local residents had poached a bear that their dogs had treed inside the park. A lengthy investigation ensued, lead by ranger Tim Alley, which resulted in the discovery of numerous items of evidence at the kill site. Other incriminating evidence was found at the suspect's residence, including a bear hide and boots.

Three local residents were formally charged and arrested on various counts, including the park's 16 USC "Hunting Act," the Lacey Act, and various misdemeanor charges. On June 6, 1990, the lead suspect, Timmy Meadows, was found guilty in magistrate's court and was sentenced to 70 days in incarceration, fined $500 and placed on probation for two years. He also lost his state hunting privileges during the period of probation, and was ordered to pay for the replacement of the bear, a sum which was established by the State of Virginia at $500.

But this replacement cost did not go into the Treasury's General Fund. Instead, it went into a non-government account called the Shenandoah National Park Wildlife Protection Fund, which is maintained by the park's cooperating association - the Shenandoah Natural History Association (SNHA). In these days of less than austere budgets, at least for most of our national parks, we need to get creative.

The concept was the brainchild of the park's criminal investigator, Glen Knight, who, after consultation with many others, created this fund in 1990. In the past two years, the park has received over $2,600 through the fund, and has used the money, among other things, to pay informants for information, process photos, ship evidence to the USFWS laboratory in Ashland, Oregon, and procure various technical investigation equipment.

In establishing the program, we first obtained information about replacement costs from the Commonwealth of Virginia's Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, then approached the U.S. attorney's office and requested that they include replacement costs in park resource protection cases. They in turn contacted the U.S. district court and advised them of this request. The head of the Shenandoah Natural History Association was contacted and asked if SNHA could create a special fund in which replacement funds could be placed. Greta Miller, the association's executive director, presented this to the SNHA board at their next meeting, and the board unanimously supported it. The Wildlife Protection Fund was also included in SNHA's periodic requests for donations, which are sent out to the association's members. The fund has become one of SNHA's most popular programs. This money is placed into a special account and is jointly administered by the park and SNHA.

Items procured with the fund go through a review process similar to that for a DI-1. A field ranger who needs an item to further a resource protection effort generates a memo and routes it through his or her supervisor along with a justification and information on costs and shipping. The request is forwarded through the CRO, where it is reviewed against criteria and prioritized. If an item is urgently needed, the steps can be shortened, and the item can often be procured the same day.

Here's how the money actually gets into the fund. All enforcement rangers in the park are aware of the wildlife replacement fund; when their wildlife or other resource protection cases come to trial, they remind the assistant U.S. attorney to request replacement for the cost of the resource that the subject removed from or killed in the park. This addition is either added on to any plea agreements worked out by the defendant and the government prior to trial or added on by the district judge or the magistrate judge at the time of sentencing. The defendant makes a check payable to the Shenandoah National Park Wildlife Protection Fund and mails it to the clerk of the local district court. The court clerk then sends the check to SNHA.

A suspect can also be pursued civilly to recoup the cost of an investigation. Obviously,
it must first be determined if the suspect can actually pay restitution, and the U.S. attorney's office or Interior's solicitor must agree to pursue this lengthy process. The park must prepare a detailed cost analysis of the case showing all costs associated with the investigation, including personnel, transportation, equipment and evidence shipping, handling, and evaluation costs. As a condition of the settlement, the costs could be placed in a special fund also administered by your cooperating association. It is presented here merely as fruit for thought.

Assessing replacement costs for our natural resources and creating a non-government account through our cooperating association have proven beneficial here at Shenandoah and other areas which use such funds. Similar special funds can be easily established in your park with your cooperating associations for protection of natural, cultural and archaeological resources. While discussing this with your association's business manager, also ask if the association would seek donations into this fund from its members. With a little leg work, you can realize a whole new dimension to funding your resource protection efforts.

If you are considering establishing such a resource protection fund, feel free to contact Glen Knight or me by writing Shenandoah National Park, Rt. 4, Box 348, Luray, VA 22835 or by calling Glen at 703/999-3403 or me at 999-3202. If your cooperating association business manager has any questions, he or she can contact Gretta Miller by writing to SNHA at the park address given above or by phoning 703/999-3581.

Controlling Low Level Overflights

Bob Thomas
Assateague Island

Shortly after receipt of an interagency agreement between the National Park Service and the FAA in 1985, Gulf Islands National Seashore initiated contacts with local FAA representatives regarding enforcement of low-flying aircraft regulations over the park. The state office had no knowledge of the agreement, but demonstrated a willingness to assist the seashore control of low level overflights by privately owned aircraft. Unfortunately, the FAA has no control over military aircraft, and local military commanders have not demonstrated the cooperative eagerness of FAA administrators.
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Changing Values, Changing Laws:
The Endangered Species Act and the Integrity of Park Ecosystems

Katherine L. Jope
Pacific Northwest Regional Office

This year, the Endangered Species Act comes up before Congress for renewal. As employees of one of only a few governmental organizations charged specifically with the conservation of species, it is imperative that we understand the history behind the act’s passage and the issues which are involved, then take a stand on the legislation as an association.

Our ultimate objective in the National Park Service is to carry out the mandate of the Organic Act to conserve park resources for future generations. We rely on a variety of laws to help us do this. Yet, as the prevailing values of society evolve, these laws change. Let’s take a brief look at the evolution of these values, and its effect on the legal framework within which we work.

Following World War II, feelings of patriotism pervaded society, and people trusted the government like a good old “uncle.” With the baby boom, the phenomenon of suburban sprawl appeared, and a trend toward declining open space became apparent. There was an explosion in use of the national parks as families visited in increasing numbers. Trampling and other types of resource damage became evident. Within this cultural context, Congress passed the Wilderness Act in 1964. Such legislation was needed, Congress stated, to “assure that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas, ... leaving no lands designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition” [16 USC 1131]. Through this law, wilderness areas were designated to provide expanses of land where the imprint of modern civilization is unnoticeable, where there are outstanding opportunities for solitude and for recreation of a primitive and unconfined nature.

Another landmark event occurred in 1962. Rachel Carson’s book, Silent Spring, brought public attention to the insidious accumulation of pesticides in the environment. If this trend continued, Carson warned, we could, one day, have a setting without songbirds—a silent spring. She warned us that the pesticides threatening the birds posed a threat to people as well.

In 1969, people landed on the moon. The astronauts’ photographs of the Earth, showing a blue planet against a background of stark emptiness, led to a new perspective—the concept of “Spaceship Earth”—and a realization that the only hospitable planet, is a very small, finite island.

Through the decade of the 1960s, protests against the Vietnam War grew more fervent. In contrast to the patriotism and public trust in government of the 1950s, the 1960s saw the development of a “credibility gap.” More and more people began to view the government as deceptive.

Frustration and anger toward the government and concern for the environment came together in the battle over the Alaska pipeline. This conflict was one of the key factors that led to passage of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in 1969. NEPA has two key points: It requires that the environmental effects of any federal action be explicitly considered. It also requires federal agencies to provide opportunities for the public to participate in the decision-making process on projects that may affect the environment. No longer could agencies make key decisions on environmental issues behind closed doors.

NEPA was followed by a succession of additional environmental laws. The Clean Water Act passed in 1972, and four years later, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which called for the Environmental Protection Agency to define substances, such as certain pesticides, solvents, and other materials, that are “hazardous.” RCRA also required cradle-to-grave tracking and proper disposal of these hazardous materials, while legislating a community’s “right-to-know” when hazardous materials were being transported through its area. Under the Clean Air Act, first passed in 1955, nationwide air quality standards were adopted in 1951. The Clean Air Act amendments of 1977 defined Class I, II, and III areas for air quality and established mechanisms to prevent significant deterioration.

The first law explicitly intended to prevent the loss of species was the Endangered Species Preservation Act, passed in 1966. It afforded limited protection only to native animal species. In 1969, the year of the moon landing, Congress passed the Endangered Species Conservation Act, extending protection to species in danger of worldwide extinction by prohibiting their importation and sale in the U.S.

Protection of vulnerable species was further strengthened when Congress passed, virtually without opposition, the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The Endangered Species Act extends the umbrella of protection to plants as well as insects and other invertebrates. It provides for species in danger of extinction to be listed as “endangered,” while species that are likely to become endangered if current trends continue are to be listed as “threatened.” Federal agencies are required to undertake affirmative steps toward the recovery of listed species, and are prohibited from carrying out, or supporting, any activity that will jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or habitat deemed critical to the species. "Taking" of an endangered species, by anyone, is prohibited.

Each of these laws protected resources that have no economic value—often referred to as "the commons"—clean air, clean water, an environment free from toxic substances, and the diversity of life. Ironically, although these resources have no value in a market economy, they are critical to human well-being and ultimately to human survival.

Competing Interests

At least since the establishment of Yellowstone, maximizing immediate economic returns, through depletion of renewable resources and non-renewable resources, has vied with the existence of “the commons” and the idea of foregoing profit for the long-term well-being of society. Corporations exist to maximize profits. They weigh the alternative returns from various uses of their assets. For example, if the trees in a corporate-owned forest are adding less than 5% to its volume per year, the corporation may decide that it is more profitable to liquidate this asset and invest the capital in an area that will yield a higher rate of return.

On the other side of the balance sheet, the corporation wants to minimize costs or to shift costs elsewhere. In a recent issue of Sierra magazine, Michael McCluskey and Carl Pope stated that, “A corporation is a ‘person’ under U.S. law, but it is a short-sighted, self-centered one, shifting the costs of its activities to others whenever possible.” The true costs to society are rarely reflected in corporate accounting or product pricing. Until recently, “the commons” lacked economic value. They could be freely used, and freely degraded. But using and degrading them were not free of cost. These costs were simply postponed, and thus magnified. Witness the enormous costs we now face in cleaning up old toxic waste sites; the cost of air pollution in terms of chronic disease and environmental damage; the costs of removing toxic sediments that have accumulated in bays, harbors, shellfish, and bottom-feeding fish; and the costs incurred by flooding and siltation following the destruction of upstream wetlands.

Ultimately, the legitimate role of government is the protection of the future. Said another way, it is the proper role of government to restrain the short-term profit orientation of individuals and corporations to ensure that the long-term public interest is not impaired. Orientation toward the future was reflected in laws such as the Wilderness Act, the NPS Organic Act, and others.

Struggle Over Endangered Species

In 1973, a previously unknown type of minnow, the snail darter, was discovered in a stretch of the Little Tennessee River sched-
The Supreme Court upheld this decision.

In 1976, suits were filed charging that the Tellico Dam project violated the Endangered Species Act, the 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals halted the project. The Supreme Court upheld this decision. The court's May 1978 opinion ruled to be inundated by TVA's proposed $119 million Tellico Dam project. In 1975 the snail darter was listed as endangered. Following a suit charging that the Tellico Dam project violated the Endangered Species Act, the 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals halted the project. The Supreme Court upheld this decision.

In 1976, suits were filed charging that the $50 million Grayrocks Dam and Reservoir project in Wyoming jeopardized the endangered whooping crane. A federal district court issued an injunction that stopped the project.

Congress stepped in during 1978 with one of the most significant amendments since the Endangered Species Act was first enacted. This amendment created a cabinet-level endangered species committee (often referred to as "the God Squad"). The committee is composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, and Army; the Administrators of EPA and NOAA; the Chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisors; and a person from the affected state. The committee is empowered to determine that economic considerations or other "public benefits" warrant the loss of a species, and to allow an action that is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the species.

In its first actions, the committee reviewed the Grayrocks and Tellico projects. It decided that the Grayrocks project could proceed on the condition that a $7.5 million trust fund for the Grayrocks project be created and other mitigation measures be taken. The committee rejected the request to exempt the Tellico project, ruling in favor of the snail darter. However, Congress later overrode the committee's determination, exempting the project in a rider to an appropriations bill.

Authorization of spending to carry out the Endangered Species Act expires on September 30, 1992. (The last time the act was up for renewal, the process took three years. In the interim, programs were funded through continuing resolutions.) The debate over reauthorization of the act reflects the increasing intensity of competition for declining resources. While increasing scarcity of resources indicates that past attention to protection of society's long-term interests has not been adequate, this scarcity has, at the same time, intensified a fundamental struggle in values that is occurring, within the government and in society, between short-term private economic interests and long-term public interests.

Over the past few months, as the deadline for reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act has approached, the cost of conserving endangered species has received considerable publicity. In its January 27, 1992, issue, Time magazine referred to the condor as a $25 million bird. After only four sockeye salmon completed their journey up the Columbia and Snake rivers to spawn in their namesake Redfish Lake in Idaho in 1991, Washington State ratepayers were put on notice that their electrical rates would increase as hydroelectric power-generating dams took steps to save the salmon from extinction. Actions likely to be needed to perpetuate the delta smelt worry farmers who rely on irrigation in California's central valley agricultural lands. Timber-dependent communities in Oregon and Washington are in an uproar over the predicted loss of jobs attributed to managing the long-term survival of the northern spotted owl.

In contrast, hardly a whisper has been voiced about the true cost to society of not conserving endangered species. Each endangered species reflects an endangered ecosystem - and we are part of that ecosystem. According to Chris Morgenroth, a leader of the Quileute Tribe on the west side of the Olympic Peninsula in Washington, extensive clearcutting of old-growth forests in the Quileute River watershed has resulted in severe erosion, sedimentation of the river, and irreversible loss of salmon spawning habitat. This impact, along with commercial harvest, has decimated the salmon runs, which were formerly a tremendous renewable resource. Shellfish and flounder at the river mouth are nearly gone. The sediment also has smothered off-shore kelp beds. No longer do storms wash kelp up onto the beaches, providing food for fish and other invertebrates which, in turn, fed a diverse variety of shorebirds.

Many songbirds, as well as other birds such as the turkey vulture, are declining due to loss of their winter habitat. What would the loss of half of its songbirds do to the integrity of a park ecosystem? Will there be a silent spring due to a cause other than pesticides?

Frogs, salamanders, and other amphibians are continuing their inexorable decline. In some areas, they have virtually disappeared, and scientists are at a loss to explain why. Could it be that an ecological link - one that we never even knew existed - has been severed?

In May 1992, the endangered species committee exempted 1,700 acres of ancient forest in Oregon, allowing timber sales to proceed. The committee determined that the social and economic costs of preserving this forest warranted placing the long-term survival of the spotted owl on shaky ground.

Before long, 1,700 acres will be cut; timber workers will again be facing the loss of their jobs; another area of ancient forest and the life forms it harbors will be lost forever - and the process will start all over again on the next 1,700 acres.

To risk the permanent loss of a species in return for a short-term profit is incredibly arrogant. We know very little about the workings of our environment - the biosphere on which we depend. If, after losing a species, we discover that it formed a critical link, there will be nothing we can do to repair the damage. More likely, though, links will be cut and we simply will be left wondering why the Earth's systems seem to be ever more degraded and hostile to our survival. We need to again realize that we are facing the very real possibility of a silent spring.

So what can we do? We have the power to make other, better choices. If we are to conserve park ecosystems with any semblance of integrity, it is essential that the public understand and value the conservation of species and the ecosystems of which they are a part. I challenge interpreters to develop interpretive programs on the value, the necessity, of conserving vulnerable species. I challenge each of us, in every field, to reach out to the public and convey an understanding that protecting species is not simply a luxury of little real benefit to an economically based society, but that it is imperative, for the parks and for us. We must work toward developing a tide of support for conserving the diversity of life with which we share this planet.

Continued on page 26
Looking Back

The History of NPS Awards for Heroism
Butch Farabee
Padre Island

[Editor's note: This is the third in a series of articles on valor awards. The first appeared in the summer, 1991, issue of Ranger; the second was in the spring, 1992, issue.]

It was not long after Mr. Rainier's Bill Butler received the Department of Interior's Distinguished Service Award that the collective efforts of park rescue teams came to be recognized as well.

The first unit award for a rescue was given in 1953 to the Sequoia-Kings Canyon rescue team for its efforts in an incident which had occurred in May of 1951. The text of the unit citation, which was presented by Secretary Douglas McKay, provides the specifics:

"In response to an emergency call from... a fishing party who... had swept into an inaccessible canyon below a waterfall in the Kaweah River, a rescue team of eleven Sequoia employees and a contract physician (Dr. Raymond Manchester) was organized. Three employees and the doctor lowered... by ropes down 130 feet of vertical wall and traversed... upstream over the face of the vertical cliff, (through) slippery rocks and darkness... to the sloping rock ledge. Medical aid was administered to both men, but Mr. Crawford died soon after the rescue party arrived. At daybreak, Mr. Brazil and the body... were evacuated. In recognition of the teamwork and courage displayed by members of the rescue party in accomplishing this difficult feat under conditions that were personally hazardous, the Department's Unit Award for Meritorious Service is hereby granted."

Those specifically cited for their participation in this rescue were Jeff Adams, Jack Anderson, Bob Branges, Dick Boyer, Bruce Black, Joe Davis, "Corky" Johnson, John Rutter, Hank Schmidt, Lee Stiltz, Ted Thompson, and Charley Wallace.

In the 41 years since Sequoia earned the first SAR unit award, the Department has bestowed unit citations on 26 occasions. Recipients have included teams from Fort Jefferson, Glacier, Grand Canyon, Grand Teton, the Great Falls unit of George Washington Memorial Parkway, Hawaii Volcanoes, Joshua Tree, Lake Mead, Mammoth Cave, Mount Rainier, Olympic, Rocky Mountain, Shenandoah, Sleeping Bear Dunes, Whiskeytown, Yosemite, Zion and the United States Park Police.

Just over a year after Secretary McKay honored Sequoia, the Department's second unit award was given to Grand Teton's mountain rescue team - the first of the five it has received to date. The team, which was lead by now-retired ranger Doug McLaren, was cited for "courageous rescue efforts involving personal risk." The six men named in the citation responded:

"... to the scene of a mountain climbing accident at dusk on August 16, 1952. (They found that) James B. Ayer had fallen 250 feet to his death and that his companion... was stranded on a ledge 400 feet above. Night came before (he) could be lowered by a series of rope belays to a point of safety, necessitating that operations during the 150 feet of cliff be carried out after dark."

Less than a year later, the Grand Teton team won its second unit award. This time the incident would take 27 rescuers over 36 hours to complete; for one of them, Doug McLaren, it would be one of the most satisfying efforts in his 40 years in the NPS. It was also the first time that rangers used drugs on a rescue in this park.

The victim, a 22-year-old woman, fell at 13,000 feet on the Grand, landed in a sitting position, and broke her back. Her thank you letter to the team expresses her feelings on their efforts in rescuing her:

"... although I can quote the doctor on the good condition you kept me in, I can't quite tell you how grateful I am for both the good handling (and) your cheerful and uncomplaining attitudes... How I admire the character and the individual and collective skills that made the whole rescue such a darned good job."

The third unit award for meritorious service, which went to the Grand Canyon rescue team, beautifully exemplifies how far we have come in search and rescue. Retired ranger Dan Davis recalls the incident:

"Some of the toughest search and rescue operations while I was at Grand Canyon were generally small and got very little publicity. One of the toughest was for a seasonal ranger who fell off a cliff while hiking alone down the Tanner Trail in July of 1954. "Al Maxie and I made the initial search, and, after tracking and back-tracking, found where he fell off the cliff. We then cut our way under the cliff and found the body. By then it was dark, so we dry-camped there. We had no radio at the time, so got the message out by morse code with a flashlight to someone at the Desert View watch tower."

The next day, two more rangers and a trail crowner were able to get a mule down the Tanner to where the body was. The Tanner at that time was virtually impassable for stock and they put a crew on the trail fixing the bad spots so we could get back out with the body. This particular trip we were out of water. Maxie and I were showing symptoms of ten-percent dehydration and were in pretty bad shape.

"The park, again by signalling, was aware of our predicament and dropped cakes of ice from a fixed-wing aircraft; no one on the staff knew how to air-drop by parachute. The ice very probably saved our lives, even though one cake landed on one ranger's glasses and another crunched one of our three canteens, putting us at a disadvantage at getting out."

"At that time, the park did not own one body bag. By then the body was five days out, temperatures well over 100 degrees, and all we had was a mante (a canvas tarp for mule packing) to wrap it in so it was pretty bad. Again, I mention this only to give an idea as to the problems we encountered before helicopters. I might add that, immediately after this, I wrote my first booklet on inner-canyon hiking and water needs."

On May 30, 1956, a long and wonderful tradition in NPS SAR began when Rocky Mountain rangers Frank Beits, Robert Frauson, Jerry Hammon and Norman Nesbit became the first Park Service employees to earn the Department's prestigious Valor Award.

On that afternoon, a 17-year-old park visitor fell when his rappel rope slipped as he was descending the rugged, sheer face of Hallet Peak. The young man fell for almost 200 feet, landed on a snowfield, then slid about...
200 feet further before he hit a tree on a ledge less than three feet wide. That ledge prevented him falling over a higher cliff to almost certain death.

Ranger Nesbit, who was in the area with another climbing group, witnessed the accident, sent someone 11 miles to report it, then climbed to aid the victim and await help. Bets, Frauson and Hammond arrived about three hours later. The rescue, which was conducted in darkness and spring snow which made footing difficult, took more than four hours and required ten separate delays. At one point, Bets crashed through a snowbridge covering a crevasse and was saved only by a sling tied to the litter. The team did not reach the trailhead until after midnight.

The first two Valor Awards given to any DOI employee were given at the Department's Fifteenth Honors Convocation in 1955, but it wasn't until the Eighteenth Honors Convocation in 1987 that the four rangers from Rocky Mountain received their awards. Sharing the stage that day was seasonal ranger Jack W. Cahoon from Cape Hatteras, who received the Valor Award from Assistant Secretary Hatfield Chisolm for saving a drowning man from turbulent surf. Chisolm was from Frauson's home town in Colorado, and amused the assembled audience when he remarked about having watched the young Frauson steal apples from the neighborhood yards when they both lived there.

Over the next several years, several heroic efforts by NPS employees were recognized with Valor Awards. William Manuey of Castillo de San Marcos got one for saving a small child and her mother from drowning. Cliff Senne, the assistant chief ranger at Everglades, was recognized for diving into an alligator slough just as a four-year-old girl went under. And Donald Dayton received the award for shooting an attacking grizzly bear who was badly mauing a man in Glacier.

**The Professional Ranger**

**Resource Management**

- The Department of the Interior Inspector General has just completed an audit of NPS resource management programs. It cites the lack of basic resource data available and used in major decisions, the lack of accountability for resource management funds (does anybody else remember "fee" money that was used in maintenance but justified as a resource preservation project?), and the small number of qualified professionals in the field. These criticisms will be delivered to the Secretary and the report might help garner some support for resource management.

- Anyone who has ever written a cooperative agreement for research or resource management projects knows that there are an inordinate number of hoops to jump through, not the least of which is a time-consuming review by the Solicitor's Office of every agreement or amendment. One reason for this is that really there is no clear authorization for us to use agreements for research purposes, so we have to justify them on all sorts of tenuous grounds. If that goes well, that should change in the near future. Pending Congressional legislation will explicitly authorize the use of cooperative agreements for NPS research and establish cooperative park studies units at universities.

- The NPS Global Climate Change (GCC) program, despite its critics, has impressed both Interior and OMB. It is the only DOI GCC program slated for a base increase in FY93. Perhaps the very competitive funding system (speaking of hoops!) makes it look like we're lean and mean, especially as compared to the relatively fat (and much larger) USGS program, proposed for a significant cut.

- Jon Jarvis, new superintendent of Craters of the Moon, has written an excellent article in one of the 1991 issues of the *George Wright Forum* (Volume 8, Number 3). It's called "Principles and Practices of a Research and Resource Management Program" and is basically a bullet list of good ideas about relations with researchers and building a program and constituency for resource management in a park. I recently heard Jon talk on the subject and both the talk and article were right on the mark.

- The next George Wright Society (GWS) NPS Science conference will be held the week of November 16, 1992, in Jacksonville, Florida. While these meetings have been held every two years since 1986, after 1992 they will return to being every three years. As the GWS grows stronger (they've received a significant donation from George Wright's daughter), they are now publishing the *Forum* six times per year.

Bob Krumenaker
SWRO

**Interpretation**

- Interpreters around the Service continue to look forward to the proposed $8 million and 350 FTE increase for interpretation in FY '93. This increase is intended to restore and enhance front-line interpretive services that have been eroded through budget cutbacks. In addition to that base increase, a proposal for $3 million and 14 FTE for the "National Parks as Classrooms" program was included. (This figure is up from $7.75 million in FY '92.) If the $3 million comes through, each region will be able to hire a regional education specialist, and two cooperative park education units will be established. (Editor's Note: The first version of the House appropriation bill, which came out as we went to press, cut the initiative drastically.)

- The Mid-Atlantic Regional Office has just released *Living History*, a 44-page booklet on the development and presentation of living history programs. Write to Ron Thomson at MARO, 143 South 3rd, Philadelphia, PA 19106 for a copy of this book.

- Another "Instructor's Workshop in Interpretive Skills" was held at Harpers Ferry in late January. There are now 80 active trainers on the nationwide skills team. Participants in this session completed major revisions of many individual lesson plans, as well as overall course curricula for Skills I through III-B.

- Videotaped interviews with each of the past ten national Tilden award winners have been sent to each park's interpretive division. In these interviews, the past decade's Tilden award recipients discuss their personal philosophies and views of the role of interpretation. These tapes should prove to be useful for a variety of training purposes and should be interesting to all park employees, no matter what their disciplines.

- The National Park Foundation continues to fund interpretive and educational projects by awarding $100,000 in grant money every three months. The last round of grant recipients was announced in mid-May.

- Mike Watson has taken over as superintendent at the Mather Employee Development Center. We'll miss Mike's leadership and support in WASO and wish him well at Mather.

- The most noteworthy event in my life since the last issue of *Ranger* was my marriage to Jeff Bohman on May 9th. (Not quite an interpretive program, but still cause for some last-minute stage fright!) With wedding plans out of the way, I'll be better able to focus on gathering information about interpretive happenings and will include a wider variety of news from the field. Please help me in this task by contacting me with your success stories about projects, programs and any other interpretive notes. You can contact me at 206/452-4501 or ext. 236 (work) or 206/457-7536 (home) or at 29 Tamarack Lane, Port Angeles, WA 98362.

Barb Maynes
Olympic
ANPR Reports

Board, committee and staff activity summaries now appear in the following consolidated format. Completed reports appear separately, as noted. A directory of ANPR addresses and phone numbers appears on the inside back cover of the magazine.

Board Members

Back in May, North Atlantic Regional Rep Jim McKay presented the Student Conservation Association with a complimentary membership in ANPR at their headquarters in Charlestown, New Hampshire (see sidebar). As Jim notes, most membership "knows what a fine organization SCA is - either you have had the pleasure of working with or supervising SCAs or you have been an SCA yourself." Their complimentary membership symbolizes the congenial feelings we have toward SCA.

Jim thanks regional members for their good response to the NAR directory questionnaire which was sent out during the spring. According to Bill Merrill in Lowell, who is preparing the directory database, about 65% of regional members responded. Regional members who didn't reply should have received a second mailing. The objective is to have the directory printed and distributed by the end of August to all NAR members, ANPR officers and board members, and NAR superintendents.

Jim also reports that several members have had problems in dealing with Seabury and Smith, the company which provides ANPR with seasonal health insurance, but that the problems have been easily rectified. Recurring problems should be brought to his attention so that they can be resolved at the source. Regional members should also bring any other concerns to his attention that he might be able to assist with.

National Capital Rep Will Morris writes: "Summer is probably hot and heavy for all of us NCR members. Things are almost certainly busy at your park or office, but by the same token, you probably are in contact with a lot of members and potential members of ANPR. Recruitment and retention of members is an important topic for our organization. As Rick Gale always reminds us, it doesn't happen unless we each take responsibility. Do your part and bring in one new member!"

New Mid-Atlantic Rep Deanne Adams thanks members for voting for her, and adds that "Brion Fitzgerald has given me a thorough briefing and gleefully left a box full of ANPR stuff with her. Brion is continuing his formal involvement by serving as a park rep at Assateague Island.

There are now park reps in about half of MAR parks. If you're interested in being a rep, give Deanne a call - preferably on weekends, but you can also leave a message on her answering machine and she'll call you back promptly.

Award to Student Conservation Association

On May 6th, North Atlantic Regional Rep Jim McKay presented an award to Scott Izzo, president of the Student Conservation Association, recognizing that organizations contributions to the national park system. The citation reads as follows:

Dear Scott:

It brings me sincere pleasure to inform you, on behalf of the Association of National Park Rangers, that the Student Conservation Association has been nominated and confirmed as a complimentary member of our organization. The ANPR, formed in 1977, is a professional organization comprised of approximately 1,600 National Park Service Rangers and other employees. The Association seeks to advance the ranger profession and to support management of the National Park Service and the National Park System. ANPR is recognizing the kinship, organizational and personal, which exists between our two associations and hopes you will accept this membership as a sign of our mutual goals and friendship.

Deanne notes that the participants in the regional caucus at Myrtle Beach postponed the region's mini-rendezvous to the spring of 1993, and that this date is fast approaching. She'll need help pulling together sessions, working out logistics and publicity, etc., and would like a hand. Any takers?

Southeast Rep Debbie Liggett also thanks regional members for voting for her and her predecessor, Ken Garvin, for his help in "getting me up and running." She points out that the phone numbers listed for her on the inside back cover are correct and not typos; the Liggett's home phone currently comes through the Flamingo Lodge, but they'll be getting a new number soon.

Deb asks that you send her a postcard or call her with your home and work phone numbers so that she can compile a directory of regional members. She talked to several members while trying to get letters sent to specific legislators on the housing legislation, but adds that she was frustrated by not having home phone numbers.

By her count, there are now 163 members in Southeast Region - a number which could be doubled if each person recruited a new member. You can get ANPR membership brochures from her or from Barb Maynes at Olympic.

She asks regional members to consider which tasks ANPR should take on - both in general and within the region - from those 22
listed in the action plan for implementation of the 75th anniversary symposium recommendations. Please let her know your choices.

Midwest Rep Ray Brende has left the Service. At press time, Rick Gale was still looking for a MWR member to fill out Ray’s term.

Western Rep Wendy Lauritzen sent 300 regional newsletters to regional members in April. She reports that she had received a number of responses by mid-May, and that she was “expecting additional letters to come flooding in any day now (hint, hint).” A letter to Martin Johnson was returned as undeliverable; she’d like to hear from anyone knowing his whereabouts.

Respondents included everyone from seasonals to superintendents to retired NPS personnel. Half of the respondents said they have a background in interpretation. Members were involved in planning for the annual meeting, and he reports that the event was “very successful.” As a regional rep, she provides input on subjects and materials to Rick Gale and various task groups. Since she doesn’t have the time or money to get membership response on each subject as it comes up, she feels she has a better understanding of those she’s representing through these letters.

She hopes to see many regional members in Spokane in November. The agenda, as noted elsewhere in this issue, covers a variety of subjects. Wendy will be involved in the SPG-171 workshop, which will be targeted towards new permanent and seasonal personnel facing competition with other permanent staff. The intent of the workshop will also be to discuss how the rules of the rating game have changed from what they used to be. Anyone who’d like to assist in the workshop should contact her.

The Rendezvous this fall is in the backyard of Pacific Northwest Rep Bruce Edmonston, and he’s been involved in planning for it. Spokane, he says, has been very receptive to the annual meeting, and he reports that the Sheraton looks great. Bruce will be putting together a challenging Fun Run through and around Riverfront Park and asks if anyone would like to volunteer to help him. Bruce also notes that the schedule has some great speakers (see the Rendezvous report for details).

ANPR will be attempting to coordinate a variety of training courses to be held in conjunction with the Rendezvous, and Bruce has information on a street survival course which will be held immediately prior to the meeting. If you’re interested, call or write him and he’ll send you an application.

Alaska Rep Rick Mosman spent the later winter and early spring in Georgia attending FLETC, which, he says, made for a warmer than normal winter for him. He and Southwest Rep Cindy Ott-Jones helped organize a joint ANPR-FOP barbecue for land management course students while there (see sidebar) and signed up a number of new members.

The Alaska Region is planning on sending a relatively large contingent to the Rendezvous in Spokane, and plans on sponsoring a workshop on “working for the NPS in Alaska.”

Committee Chairs

Although he’s more or less a committee of one, Retirement Committee Chair Frank Betts makes up for numbers with quality of reporting. Frank says that he learned the hard way about failing to plan for retirement, and believes strongly that all members should be considering retirement now, no matter where they are in their careers. His article appears on page 24 in this magazine.

International Committee Chair Bill Halainen has been working on the draft agreement for the new International Ranger Federation (IRF) with opposite numbers in Scotland’s Countryside Ranger Association and England’s Association of Countryside Rangers. He and Rick Gale travelled to Manchester, England, the last week of July to sign the accord and to begin work on the international ranger meeting which is planned for Poland in 1994. A full report on the trip and the IRF will appear in the fall Ranger.

Meanwhile, committee member Einar Olsen has been working diligently to collect addresses of ranger contacts throughout the world, and has been corresponding with a number of folks overseas. If you have any contacts with rangers in other countries and/or would like to join this committee, please contact either Bill or Einar.

Committee member Rick Smith has just completed an extended trip to Costa Rica, where he worked with that country’s rangers and park system managers. Rick came across an article in one of their publications entitled “Park Rangers: An Endangered Species”; because of its interest to rangers in the U.S., Rick translated it and sent it along for publication in the magazine. See page 26 for the text.

Association Staff

Business Manager Debbie Gorman has passed on a few items of interest “from the business end of the Association.” The current timetable for renewal reminders provides notification 60 days prior to expiration. While some members prefer to renew this far in advance, she’s found that those who do not either forget or are often unsettled because of a transfer. After a 30-day grace period, those not renewing their memberships are removed from the roster and receive another notice encouraging renewal. Effective this past April, a second notice is now being sent 30 days prior to expiration in addition to the 60-day reminder. The objective is to provide as much opportunity as possible for timely renewal. This will become procedure if the added reminders prove effective.

ANPR has made additional health insurance available to seasonal employees. This is a self-writing term policy developed specifically for temporary employees. In May, Seabury and Smith distributed a poster with brochures to every park along with a letter of explanation from them and from ANPR. It was sent to your administrative office with a request that it be displayed in all employee areas. If you haven’t seen the poster and would like further information, call her at 518/793-3140, or Seabury and Smith at...
Seasonal Insurance

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

- A major medical plan which provides comprehensive health care benefits for you and your family, with up to $5 million maximum lifetime benefits per insured person, a choice of deductibles, affordable group rates and comprehensive benefits in and out of the hospital.
- A short-term, self-writing policy developed specifically for temporary employees. A managed health care system to ensure you and your family receive the best care possible while controlling the medical costs, featuring a $2 million lifetime benefit, freedom to select doctors and hospitals of your choice, and a choice of deductibles.
- Group term life insurance, an inexpensive way to establish financial security for your family with maximum life insurance protection up to $3 million for members and spouses, optional dependent coverage, and non-smoker discounts.

If you'd like more information on these programs, write to Seabury & Smith Associates, P.O. Box 7157, San Francisco, CA 94120, or call 1-800-227-4316 (1-800-982-8080 in California).

Retirement Expectations

Almost everyone has expectations about retirement, particularly about how they hope to spend what could be a third of their lives. Federal employees often take retirement for granted, knowing that the Federal retirement programs are in place, with Social Security being another source of income for some.

But will these income sources alone be enough? I recently read a survey (Merrill Lynch Retirement Planning Survey, 1990) of pre-retirees' perceptions vs the reality of retirement income. The question was: "What one source do you feel will be the most important source of income you will live on after you have retired from the work force?" The response was:

- social security - 39%
- employer's pension plan - 20%
- government pension (other than S.S.) - 9%
- other saving/investments now on hand - 5%
- earned income from part-time job - 4%

However, Treasury Department numbers (1990) using "head of household, age 65+, and $20,000 income," indicate the ACTUAL percent of annual income from various sources was as follows:

- social security - 20%
- pensions - 15%
- savings & investments - 39%
- earnings - 23%
- other - 3%

These figures may not be indicative of your particular situation, but they should at least make you curious. Upon retirement, where will your income come from? Get out your calculator, read and understand your retirement program, whether CSC or FERS. Talk to your personnel specialist and find out what you can expect at retirement time. Will the income you receive be enough? Don't forget to calculate for 4% to 5% annual inflation. At 5%, you must double the needed amount every 15 years.

What should you do now to lessen the possibility of not having enough to enjoy retirement?

Well, first invest the maximum in the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP). You have heard this from me before, and you may tire of my nagging. But the TSP is the easiest, most convenient way to save. The contributions you make come out of your salary before you even see your paycheck.

Another advantage is that the TSP is 100% tax deductible. Your "taxable income" is reduced dollar for dollar of your contributions to the TSP. Why pay more in taxes when you can keep it, allow it to grow, and have more when you retire? All earnings are also tax deferred.

My suggestion for those of you who wish some time before retirement is to choose the "C" Fund in the TSP and leave it there. If the fund has a bad year like 1990 (-3.4%), don't panic. This fund mirrors the Standard & Poor's stock index, which over the last ten years (1982-1991) averaged 17.6%. In 1991 the S&P index was up 30.4%. This is not to say the other funds in the TSP are not good. Their earnings, although lower, are more predictable. But when inflation is considered, the modest gains from the "G" and "F" are not sufficient to build on over the long haul. Save through the "C" Fund for 20 years or more and then, just a few years before retirement, start moving your profits into the other TSP funds to protect these gains.

After you are fully invested in the TSP (always do this first), seriously consider an IRA. I am not talking a bank IRA or some insurance product where the marketers make more interest on your money than you do, but a good, moderately aggressive, no-load mutual fund with at least a five-year history of superior performance. Dig out a copy of the February issue of Money magazine. They rate over 1,100 funds and recommend a number of them for the long haul. Don't forget that the earnings within an IRA are always tax deferred and, in most cases, that the IRA contributions are tax deductible.

Next, I recently sent for and received a retirement planning kit from T. Rowe Price, a no-load mutual fund company. Anyone who is concerned about retirement income should send for this publication. I found it to be an excellent planning guide. Of course, they are selling mutual funds, but there is no obligation on your part. Just call 1-800-541-5760 to order one. They also have a retirement planning kit for your IBM PC. This floppy disk is $15. I have sent for one of these also and will report on it in the next issue of Ranger.

Frank Betts
Rendezvous XVI: ANPR and the Vail Agenda

The planning is well underway for Rendezvous XVI, which will be held Friday, October 30th, through Tuesday, November 3rd, at the Sheraton Spokane Hotel in Washington. (See the spring issue of Ranger for information on points of interest in the Spokane area.)

The Sheraton Spokane Hotel, known for its parkside elegance and downtown convenience, offers a year-round swimming pool, fitness room, gift shop, beauty salon, valet parking, coffee shop, restaurant, piano bar, roof top lounge, and electronic room access. The hotel’s 1881 dining room is reputedly one of the West Coast’s finest restaurants. The room rate will be $52 per night plus tax (10%), single or double occupancy. Advanced registration, which requires one night’s deposit, can be made by calling the Sheraton at 1-800-325-3535. October 8th is the deadline for reservations at this special rate. Cancellations must be received by 4 p.m. on the date of arrival to stop billing and refund deposit.

Pre-Registration

You will receive the Rendezvous special mailing with the pre-registration form and latest on the agenda in early September. This year the registration form will have a joint fee for anyone wishing to attend both the ANPR and ANPME sessions. The fee will be $40.00 via pre-registration and $50.00 at the door. Those who wish to attend should indicate that on the pre-registration form and pay the appropriate fee. Please pre-register! It makes Kathy Loux’s job much easier than a mass registration on the Rendezvous’ first day. If you have registration problems, write Kathy at 7310 Camino Mirlo, Tucson, AZ 85747.

Agenda

Maureen Finnerty of Olympic, the Rendezvous program coordinator, has set the theme of this Rendezvous as “ANPR and the Vail Agenda.” The Rendezvous site coordinator is Kathy Jope from Pacific Northwest Regional Office. We will again be meeting jointly with the Association of National Park Maintenance Employees.

The full agenda will appear in this special mailing. The schedule will look tight, but Maureen says you will have plenty of time to get business and social happenings in. Here are some high points:

- Keynote speakers include the Honorable Daniel J. Evans, former representative from and governor for Washington state; Jeff DeBonis, President of the Association of Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics; Mike Hayden, Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks; Fred Young, retired financial executive and now a money management consultant; Don Knowles, Associate Deputy Secretary; Gerald Patten, Director of Strategic Planning for NPS; and Director Ri-denour. Tom Foley, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, will also be in town and plans to stop by and say hello.
- Panel Discussions: “What is Good Interpretation?,” all risk management, the Service’s role in international affairs, maintenance issues for other disciplines, and the Vail Agenda.
- Social activities: A “fun run” pistol match; golf tournament; the first ranger rendezvous reception on Friday evening; joint ANPME/ANPR dinner on Monday evening; and a free afternoon on Monday.
- Added extras: Visits from Bob Reid of the Scottish Countryside Ranger Association and Gordon Miller of England’s Association of Countryside Rangers; Harper’s Ferry Center’s “Heritage and Horizons” slide show on the Vail Symposium; and Lou Whittaker, President, Rainier Mountain, Inc., with a slide show on “Mountain Ascents: The Himalayas to Mount Rainier”.

Raffle

I hope everyone is stocking up on raffle prizes. The raffle is a highlight of every Rendezvous and is not a success without everyone’s support. If you can’t bring your donation with you, you can mail or UPS it to Barb Maynes (Olympic), 29 Tamarack Lane, Port Angeles, WA 98362, or call her at 206/452-4501 to make arrangements for the hotel to receive it directly.

Babysitting

A list of local sitters and their fees will be available upon your arrival.

Climate

Spokane is situated between the Rocky and Cascade mountain ranges, and is protected from damp coastal weather and continental-type winters. Temperature in November averages 35.0 F.

Elections

The Rendezvous will be held over Election Day ’92. Everyone attending the Rendezvous should vote by mail prior to leaving.

Help

The list of 1991 Rendezvous raffle winners of the Thunderbear subscription has been misplaced. If you were a winner, please contact PJ Ryan at 301/933-6931.

This will be my last year compiling the Rendezvous information for Ranger. We need someone to take over this duty. If you are interested, please contact Bill Halainen at 703/522-4756 or call me at 619/367-3523. See you on the Riverfront!

Jeff Ohlfs
Joshua Tree
In another chapter, Vickery takes you on a hunt with camera for grizzly bears in a soon-to-be national park (Wrangell-St. Elias), describing the local townsfolk in scenes reminiscent of scenes from "Northern Exposure". Further on, the author canoes portions of Thoreau's Concord River, the Kam-dog route over the height of land into the Quetico and Boundary Waters Canoe Wilderness, and a large blank space on the Ontario map that just missed being fully preserved as a large wilderness area:

"Perhaps this - the crystalline clarity of flowing water, the solidity and security of ancient bedrock, silence, solitude, a flickering campfire, a star-rimmed moon, and thoughts of wending toward wordlessness - maybe this is what the Kopka River and other trails of power are all about. You stuck phone, job, debts, politics and stand exposed to primordial time. You become a synthesis of prehistoric and modern man on a wild shore, truly ecumenical, catholic in its most universal sense. Paddle at hand, you have walked the evolutionary path. You have followed the meltdown of glacial ice in a renewed land, sniffing its cool till edge, tracking sign, and sensing the long road, our organic heritage, up which people of all races have come."

The "Ranger Zone" chapter provides a brief overview of rangering in the NPS, from the Stoneman's Meadow incident through recent budget cuts and the long lasting impact on the ranger image brought about by the General Authorities Act and the changing face of national park visitation. Through interviews with rangers and Vickery's own seasonal ranger stints staking out marijuana at Redwoods, as well as taking on administrative duties, Vickery takes you on a hunt with camera for grizzly bears in a soon-to-be national park (Wrangell-St. Elias), describing the local townsfolk in scenes reminiscent of scenes from "Northern Exposure". Further on, the author canoes portions of Thoreau's Concord River, the Kam-dog route over the height of land into the Quetico and Boundary Waters Canoe Wilderness, and a large blank space on the Ontario map that just missed being fully preserved as a large wilderness area:

"Perhaps this - the crystalline clarity of flowing water, the solidity and security of ancient bedrock, silence, solitude, a flickering campfire, a star-rimmed moon, and thoughts of wending toward wordlessness - maybe this is what the Kopka River and other trails of power are all about. You stuck phone, job, debts, politics and stand exposed to primordial time. You become a synthesis of prehistoric and modern man on a wild shore, truly ecumenical, catholic in its most universal sense. Paddle at hand, you have walked the evolutionary path. You have followed the meltdown of glacial ice in a renewed land, sniffing its cool till edge, tracking sign, and sensing the long road, our organic heritage, up which people of all races have come."

The "Ranger Zone" chapter provides a brief overview of rangering in the NPS, from the Stoneman's Meadow incident through recent budget cuts and the long lasting impact on the ranger image brought about by the General Authorities Act and the changing face of national park visitation. Through interviews with rangers and Vickery's own seasonal ranger stints staking out marijuana at Redwoods, assisting sailboaters on high-running seas at Apostle Islands, and on the 1988 Red Bench Fire in Wyoming, he distills the pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, stress and enchantment of being a park ranger these days. These experiences have provided him with an additional lens through which he surveys the landscape:

"I had to crawl from Hepner's NPS Osprey into a fishing boat, and then, with hip waders, into the lake which was deeper near shore than I expected. The waters filled with May-cold water. Once on shore I guided the family of four, including two-year-old Matthew in my arms, along the tops of low cliffs with waves crashing below to a boat-boarding sandstone ledge in the lee of York." The book begins and ends with wolves, which is only fitting, for within the timeless hours of reading I have, like a wolf, sniffed and wandered, played tag with time, and scent posted in my way across the continent with Vickery. We have accompanied him scratching out his "trails of power" in the duff of experience in what is left of our nations "Open Spaces."

"Where there are dreams and adventures, I reminded myself, there is power. Where there is power, there are trails leading into light."

Read this book, and then go out and wander.

Gregg L. Bruff
Pictured Rocks

Editor's Notes continued

How to Apply

• Address each of the requirements briefly and provide examples where appropriate.
• Provide a short personal resume.
• Submit your application directly to Bill Haldane, 640 North Harrison Street, Arlington, VA 22205.

All in the Family continued

Mike Watson, who has been the chief of interpretation in WASO for the past five years, has transferred to Mather Employee Development Center as its new superintendent. He served as an instructor at Mather from 1981 to 1987. He can be reached at Mather EDC, P.O. Box 77, Harpers Ferry, WV 25425 (304/523-6215).

Lois Winter, public affairs/publication specialist at Mammoth Cave, has accepted a transfer to Minute Man and a promotion to chief of interpretation for that park.

Changing Values continued

But if we focus solely on protecting individual species, there will always be another imperiled species facing us. We must define and address the fundamental reasons why so very many life forms are declining and disappearing. Only a process that effectively saves other species over the long term will ultimately save us.

Our generation inherited an invaluable legacy, with tremendous options and choices. What kind of legacy, and options for the future, will we pass on to the next generation? As the arguments and debate over the Endangered Species Act drag on, species after species - one by one by one - are winking out. Forever.
### Directory of ANPR Board Members, Committee Chairs & Staff

**Board of Directors**

- **President**
  - Rick Gale, Branch of Fire and Aviation, Boise
  - 4074 S. Irondo Way, Boise, ID 83706  (208) 343-2412
- **Vice President, Special Concerns**
  - Bill Wade, Shenandoah
  - 3041 Mountain Heights Rd., Front Royal, VA 22630  (703) 635-8809
- **Vice President, Professional Issues**
  - Bryan Swift, Saguaro
  - 7310 Camino Mirlo, Tucson, AZ 85747  (602) 647-3824
- **Vice President, Communications/Representation**
  - Karen Wade, Wrangell-St. Elias
  - P.O. Box 234, Glenallen, AK 99588  (907) 822-3122
- **Secretary/Treasurer**
  - Pat Tolle, Everglades
  - P.O. Box 279, Everglades NP, Homestead, FL 33030  (305) 248-7830

**North Atlantic Regional Rep**

- Jim McKay, Statue of Liberty
  - In transit

**Mid-Atlantic Regional Rep**

- Deanne Adams, Shenandoah
  - 8400 Thompson Road, Annandale, VA 22003  (703) 207-9746

**Southeast Regional Rep**

- Debbie Liggett, Everglades
  - P.O. Box 279, Homestead, FL 33030  (305) 253-2241 ext. 279

**Midwest Regional Rep**

- (Vacant)

**Rocky Mountain Regional Rep**

- Dan Moses, Dinosaur
  - P.O. Box 96, Jensen, UT 84035  (801) 781-0826

**Southwest Regional Rep**

- Cindy Oli-Jone, El Malpais
  - 604 Gannon Avenue, Grants, NM 87020  (505) 287-5011

**Western Regional Rep**

- Wendy Ludmita, Great Basin
  - P.O. Box 29, Arco, ID 83212  (208) 227-3775

**Alaska Regional Rep**

- Rick Mossman, Wrangell-St. Elias
  - P.O. Box 137, Yakutat, AK 99689  (907) 784-3282

**Committee Chairs**

- **Budget and Finance**
  - Patti Dienna, MARO
    - 48 Iroquois Court, Wayne, PA 19087  (215) 296-8334

- **Dual Careers**
  - Barb Stewart, Shenandoah
    - P.O. Box 1700, Front Royal, VA 22630  (804) 823-4675 (summer) &  (703) 999-2243 (winter)

- **Employee Development**
  - Jeff Karraker, CAMO
    - P.O. Box 57, Capulin, NM 88414  (505) 278-2565

- **Housing**
  - Tom Cherry, CUYA
    - 449 Wyoga Lake Blvd., Stow, OH 44224  (216) 926-4995

- **International Affairs**
  - Bill Halainen, WASO
    - 640 N. Harrison St., Arlington, VA 22205  (703) 522-4756

- **Marketing**
  - Pat Thompson, Shenandoah
    - 310 Carraway Drive, Charlottesville, VA 22901  (804) 932-4459

- **Recruitment**
  - Scott McElveen, PIRO
    - P.O. Box 395, Grand Marais, MI 49836  (906) 494-2325

- **Seasonal Concerns**
  - Bill Dwyer, ACAD & Memphis State
    - 2517 Flowering Tree Dr., Bartletts, TN 38134  (901) 572-7163

- **Twenty Year Retirement**
  - Mark Harvey, YOSE
    - P.O. Box 577, Yosemite National Park, CA 95389  (209) 372-0265

**Staff**

- **Editor, Ranger**
  - Bill Halainen, WASO
    - 640 North Harrison St., Arlington, VA 22205  (703) 522-4756

**Business Manager**

- Debbie Gorman, Saratoga
  - Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831  (518) 793-3140

---

### 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>Active</th>
<th>Joint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>$30.00</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Life*           | Active (NPS Employees) $375.00 | $500.00                     |
| Associate       | $375.00                        | $375.00                     |

| Supporting (indiv. & organizations) $100.00 |
| Contributing (indiv. & organizations) $500.00 |

| Subscriptions: 2 copies of each issue to organizations only $30.00 |

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

The person who recruited me was

- □ NPS
- □ Other

**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

---

Do you have friends who’d like to learn more about ANPR?
- □ NPS
- □ Other

Name:

Address:

City  State  Zip:

---

**Important Notice**

Supporting (indiv. & organizations) $100.00

Contributing (indiv. & organizations) $500.00

Subscriptions: 2 copies of each issue to organizations only $30.00

To help even more, I am enclosing an extra contribution: $10  $25  $50  $100  Other
Times Have Changed: Advance Your Conservation Career

Earth Work Magazine is new and just for you! At last those who protect the land, wildlife and environment are creating a career network including federal agency, nonprofit, educational, and corporate professionals. You’ll find fresh opportunities and insights when Earth Work brings you:

- Interviews with agency heads, personality profiles of people at all levels of NPS and other organizations, news about your colleagues and all kinds of “conservation connections”
- The latest employment listings for all types of conservation jobs—entry level through CEO/supergrade
- Career trends and issues
- Annual salary surveys

ACT NOW--MAIL THIS COUPON TODAY & SAVE UP TO $42