The ONPS Budget Revisited: Crunch Becomes Crisis
Letters
Hello to All:

I'm at the completion of my super raffle trip and having a marvelous time. First went to pre-Carnival Rio, Tijuca NP and Iguazu Falls NP (met Argentinian and Brazilian rangers), Buenos Aires, Colonia (Uruguay), Quito (Ecuador), Cotopaxi NP, and now Galapagos NP. The islands are everything you read about – the multi-colored fish, reptiles and birds you can walk right up to. Today, I swam with California sea lions and saw the giant tortoises and sea turtles.

I think we take the raffle for granted. The possibility of winning is far greater than even I imagined. I'm going to buy more raffle tickets this year so I can do this again. See everyone at the next Rendezvous!

Jeff Ohlfs
Joshua Tree

We received the above note late in February from Jeff Ohlfs, who won the super raffle at the Rendezvous in Spokane last fall. We thought you might find it interesting and useful for your sales pitches to prospective ticket purchasers.

Editor:

I am writing in regards to the Rangeroons cartoon “In and Out of Uniform” which was published in Ranger in 1986. Although I admit that this letter is not very timely in the sense that the cartoon was published six years ago, it is still relevant because I recently found a copy of the cartoon in Canyonlands National Park’s orientation manual for employees. The reason I am concerned about the cartoon is that it implies that gays are perverts, helps foster a discriminatory attitude towards homosexuals and gay men, and helps perpetuate myths about homosexuality. If this cartoon is still in one orientation manual, I expect likely it can be found in other manuals, and (that it is) other similar documents.

Although the cartoon never uses the words “homosexual” or “gay,” the parents’ response to the out-of-uniform ranger in the first scenario implies that he is gay, and is, therefore, a pervert. The father wished that Anita Bryant was present. In the 70s Anita Bryant was a national spokesperson in a reactionary campaign to limit/ take away rights of gays and lesbians. The mother calls the out-of-uniform ranger “one of them perverts” – thereby implying that he is gay and a pervert. Also, by default, the cartoon further implies that the reason the parents are upset by the contact by the out-of-uniform ranger is because he is gay and may therefore molest their son. This is especially offensive because it perpetrates the myth that gay men commonly molest children. Study after study has shown that most sexual abuse of children is done by heterosexual men.

I am very upset that this cartoon was drawn by an NPS employee and upset that ANPR published it. As a federal agency, the NPS, and employees of NPS, have a responsibility to ensure that the workplace is free from discrimination for everyone. As an agency that serves the public, we have a responsibility to treat all visitors fairly and respectfully. Approximately 10% of the population is gay. Therefore, approximately 10% of the NPS workforce is gay and 10% of our visitors are gay.

I ask you to print this letter as an efficient way to spread the word that this cartoon is unacceptable in orientation manuals, etc. I ask all NPS employees and supervisors to please check their files, orientation manuals, bulletin boards, etc. for this cartoon, and to please remove it in an effort to promote understanding and acceptance for some of the individuals in our diverse NPS family.

Allyson C. Mathis
Canyonlands

The goal of my 1986 Ranger cartoon page, “In and Out of Uniform,” was to show in a humorous way that the NPS uniform is generally considered a symbol of authority and service by the public, and when out of uniform that rangers simply do not have that cachet.

The panel that the writer found so offensive was not meant to question or in any way attack the ranger’s sexual orientation. Whether the ranger in this cartoon is gay or straight makes absolutely no difference at all. And that is just the point. What this cartoon is dealing with is the perception of the public. When the ranger is in uniform, certain behavior (i.e. friendliness, accessibility, familiarity) is expected, even encouraged; but the same friendliness and familiarity from a stranger wearing civilian clothes can be highly suspect.

Whatever the merits of the cartoon, over the year it has enjoyed modest success in the NPS (and at least one other Interior agency) as a training aid on uniforms. NPS friends and acquaintances of mine, including some who are gay, have not considered the cartoon anti-gay.

Concerning the reference to Anita Bryant: I guess I took it for granted that the bigotry of a fading fundamentalist orange-juice queen (no pun intended) would have little credibility with anyone who is capable of thinking for him/herself. I hoped that, in a wry way, it might even be humorous.

Keith Hoofnagle
ARO

Dear ANPR:

I recently attended the Rendezvous in Spokane, mostly out of curiosity to see where we were going as an agency and a profession. I was extremely invigorated by the quality of the discussions, programs and visits with old and new acquaintances. It gave me a much-needed professional boost – and made me want to help do more as a member of ANPR.

Thanks to the program organizers. Though not in a “traditional” ranger job, I consider myself part of the profession and am signing up for a life membership.

Sue Consolo Murphy
Yellowstone

Continued on page 26
President's Message

This Association can finally, and I hope fully, lay to rest once and for all the notion that ANPR is run by the "good ole boys." For the first time, as a result of the last election, there are more women members of the Board of Directors than there are men. The ratio of protectors to interpreters to resource managers on the board is roughly equal as well. So maybe we can all rise beyond functional or gender-related comments about the Association and spend all of our considerable energies on what we truly are all about — broad employee issues and resources issues.

However, even given this trend in the makeup of the Board of Directors, there is some very legitimate criticism being leveled regarding the past election. For five of the seven positions up for election, there was only one candidate. This is not a healthy way to run an organization. We simply have to find a better way of identifying people within ANPR to volunteer their time and energy to being members of the Board of Directors and to providing the leadership this Association needs and demands. Over the past several years, different mechanisms for identifying candidates for office have been tried; none have met with much success.

As you will see elsewhere in the pages of this issue of Ranger, we are proposing another attempt at pre-identifying individuals as candidates for the Board of Directors. Please read this proposal carefully and get your comments and thoughts to your regional representative so we can more intelligently deal with the issue at the next Rendezvous.

In addition to trying to fix the nomination procedures and identification of viable candidates for office, ANPR is also exploring ways of developing individuals so they will be ready to take over the reins of this organization. Hal Grovert (Delaware Water Gap) is spearheading this effort. If you have ideas, please contact Hal — or send them directly to me and I will see they get to Hal.

This is being written several weeks before we meet with Tom Steinbach of the Kennedy School of Government. Tom will deliver his preliminary findings to the Association in mid-March and some of these issues, I hope, will be included in his analysis of our organizational health and future direction. In addition, I am hopeful that Tom's report will address some of the long range needs of the organization and help us do a better job of focusing on our next five or so years — a "Toward 2000," if you will. We will keep you informed.

That the Association of National Park Rangers has much work yet to accomplish is amply demonstrated in some of the following statistics. The National Park Service average permanent employee salary was, in 1991, the second lowest in the Department of the Interior. The National Park Service, in 1991, granted 3,755 superior performance awards. This is 19 for every 100 eligible employees. In comparison, the Office of the Secretary gave 47 for every 100, the Fish and Wildlife Service 41 per 100, the Bureau of Reclamation 26 for every 100 employees. At least the NPS was ahead of the Bureau of Land Management, which granted 16 superior performance awards for each 100 employees.

Another interesting statistic is the aging of the agency. In the combined three years of 1993, 1994 and 1995, a total of almost 3,500 employees will be eligible for retirement. This represents about 35 percent of our workforce!

We all can draw our own conclusions from these factors. But what some of this says to me is that the Association needs to be on the cutting edge of employee development — of identifying future managers and supervisors at all levels of the National Park Service and doing something about seeing to their development. Two efforts begin working toward meeting that need. One is the Ranger Futures initiative. The other is the multi-disciplinary management and leadership program developed by Rick Shireman.

Both of these efforts cost money. However, neither the agency nor the resources it protects can long survive without adequately trained and experienced individuals to lead at all organizational levels. It seems to me that it is the classic case of paying now or paying later. And, as we all know, paying later is normally a geometric progression of the cost of paying now. As always, I invite your thoughts and ideas on what the Association of National Park Rangers can and should be doing in this regard.

We have our work cut out for us. With a new Administration, we can all hope some of the stridency will be gone from relationships with the Department of the Interior and other players. However, we cannot rest on our laurels. We must continue to strive for those things which will improve the conditions in which our employees work and live and which will abate and mitigate the threats to the resources we protect and interpret.
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All in the Family

All submissions must be either typed or printed and should include the author’s return address and/or phone number. There is a form for submissions on the inside back cover. 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.

Tony Bonanno, one of the founding members of ANPR, recently transferred from the chief ranger’s position at Cape Cod to become chief, Ranger Activities, Southwest Region. Tony’s new address is P.O. Box 6415, Santa Fe, NM 87502-6415 (505/988-6018).

Ellen Foppes (CACH ’81-’83, OC MU ‘84-’85, SERO ’85-’90, the “Loan Ranger” at CHAT and KEMO ’86-’88, MWRO ‘91-present) has transferred from her position as regional historian for Midwest Region to become superintendent of Hovenweep. She can be reached at Hovenweep, NM, MECMO Route, Cortez, CO 81321.

Erv Gasser (INDE, RICH) has transferred from Richmond, where he was the park’s resource management specialist, to Pacific Northwest Regional Office, where he is the natural resource specialist. He made the move after his son, Nicholas, was born on August 2, 1992. When the family was ready, Erv flew back to make the cross-country trip with them, taking almost a month to do so.

Their new address: 7305 Beach Avenue, NE, Poulsbo, WA 98370.

Alexandra Guier has left Hopewell Furnace, where she was a GS-5 interpretive ranger, to take a position as GS-7 supervisory interpretive ranger at Scotty’s Castle in Death Valley.

Jim Ireland, who was a GS-6 lead seasonal ranger in protection at Sequoia, is now a GS-5 permanent protection ranger at Jefferson National Expansion. His wife Amy left her seasonal interpretive ranger position at Sequoia and is now the education program director for an environmental education program outside St. Louis. Their new address: Wyman Center, 600 Kiwanis Drive, Eureka, MO 63025.

Rich Klima (FEHA ’77-’78, MRR ’78-’81, CACA ’81-’84, LYJO ’84-’85, TUIN ’85-’87, MALU ’87-’92) is now at Great Smokies, where he is a GS-7 working at the Oconaluftee Visitor Center on the North Carolina side. His address: 1940 East Deep Creek Road, Bryson City, NC 28713 (704/488-2154).

Neil Korsmo (THRO ’76-’82, GIS ’82-’85, HOSP ’85-’90, CARE ’90-’93) and family recently transferred from Capitol Reef to Pictured Rocks. Neil left his position as a GS-7 park ranger to become the GS-9 district ranger for the East District. Their new address is: P.O. Box 171, Grand Marais, MI 48939.

Cindy Lampley (JEFF ’87-’92) resigned from her position as park ranger/dispatcher at Jefferson National Expansion to take a position as a police and fire dispatcher with the Frontenac Police Department in suburban St. Louis. Her home address remains the same: 4265 Shenandoah Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63110 (314/994-9300).

Melinda Moses (GOGA ’88-’90, GRCA ’90, YOSE ’91, MUWO ’92-Present) finally got a permanent position after putting in her seasonal at several parks. She was promoted from GS-5 seasonal ranger to GS-7 permanent ranger at Muir Woods. Her new mailing address is Muir Woods NM, Mill Valley, CA 94941.

Jim Northup, who was the fire management officer at Grand Teton, is now the chief ranger at Big Bend.

Jan Ryan (COLM, JEFF, BICA, WUPA, SWRO, CANY, FODO, CHIR) has transferred from Chiricahua, where she was a park ranger (interpretation) in charge of the Faraway Ranch historic district, to Tonto, where she will be chief ranger. Jan’s new address is HCO2, Box 4603, Roosevelt, AZ 85545.

Jonathan Schaffer (SEKI, BOST, LAME, SAJU) has moved from Lake Mead, where he was a GS-7 park ranger, to San Juan, where he is the GS-9/11 chief of interpretation, resource management and visitor protection. His mailing address is: P.O. Box 712, San Juan, Puerto Rico 00902.

Leigh Selig (YOSE, GLBA, KATM, YUCH), a long-term seasonal ranger, has left the Service and is now a permanent special agent with the National Marine Fisheries Service at 329 Harbor Drive, Suite #210, Sitka, AK 99835.

Cat Syrbe (PEFO ’90, MIMA ’91, YELL ’91, BOST ’92, YELL ’92) has moved from Bechler at Yellowstone, where she was a GS-5 seasonal, to Old Faithful, where she is now a permanent GS-5 ranger and back country office supervisor. Her new address: Box 265, West Yellowstone, MT 59758.

Kurt Topham (GUIS ’72, GRCA ’73, HAFE ’73-’75, JOTR ’75-’77, INDU ’77-’84, HEHO ’84-’92, WHO ’92-present) accepted a transfer from chief ranger at Herbert Hoover to superintendent at William Howard Taft last August. His wife Ellie is now a CPA with a local firm, and is also teaching at Xavier University. Their new address is: 8519 Shenstone Drive, Cincinnati, OH 45225.

Missing Persons

We’ve lost touch with the following folks, most of whom have moved without providing us with a forwarding address. If you know where any of them are, please contact Debbie Gorman, Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831:

Jerry Mitchell
Keith Billingsley
Palmer Forbes
Chris Cesana
Peter Roehrs
Steve Martin
Gorden Pfister
April & Dave Ballam
Peg Pattee

Grand Canyon, AZ
Gettysburg, PA
Meherrin Co., VA
Collinsville, IL
Potomac, MD
San Francisco, CA
Renton, WA
N. Eastham, MA
Bellingham, WA

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 $4 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, 1255 23rd Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037, or call 1-800-424-9883.
Legislative Actions
Dave Simon
NPCA

Most supporters of national parks cheered the election of Bill Clinton and Al Gore. The impact of the election for parks is being felt in myriad ways; significant changes in personnel, policy, and federal spending are underway. Park aficionados should expect to witness dramatic shifts in federal lands policy, but the overall operating environment in the administration and on Capitol Hill will continue to be dictated by the tight budget climate.

Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt has signalled the tenor of the new administration in appointments such as George Frampton (former president of The Wilderness Society, nominated as Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks) and Jim Baca (highly regarded New Mexico Land Commissioner, selected as Director of BLM). While, as of this writing, the NPS Director had not been selected, Babbitt has promised "the same caliber of excellence" as his other top appointments.

The Secretary has stated his intention to have the National Park Service as "the flagship agency" at Interior and many of his first public statements focused on NPS concerns. Several years of heightened public awareness of national park problems helped Babbitt secure some $240 million for NPS projects in the President's economic stimulus package, which looks headed for passage in Congress, and NPS operating funds in FY 94 are also expected to increase. The Secretary also travelled to the Everglades Coalition Conference in February to deliver his first major speech, in which he called Everglades preservation "the ultimate test case" for the Clinton administration's new ecosystem-based policy.

The convening of the 103rd Congress in January also brought over 100 new members of Congress to Washington, D.C. However, the basic balance of partisan power in Congress as it affects national parks changed little. In the Senate, Democrats have a 57-43 advantage. Membership on the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, chaired by Sen. Bennett Johnston (D-LA), had many changes and has gotten more conservative on public lands issues. Sen. Dale Bumpers (D-AR) still chairs the Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks, and Forests, and new Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell (D-CO) was named vice-chairman. Long-time staff director Tom Williams left the subcommittee to become Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks.

The election of two new democratic California senators, Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer, is perhaps the most significant change in the Senate that will immediately affect the National Park System. Both support the California Desert bill, chances for reform of the 1872 Mining Law (S. 257/H.R. 322) have never been better. Also, for the first time in recent memory, the National Park Service itself plans to forward a legislative program to Congress. While the package has not been completely finalized, it could contain over 50 legislative items in the four issue areas that formed the structure of the "Vail Agenda" environmental leadership, park use and enjoyment, organizational renewal, and resource stewardship. Organizational renewal recommendations include proposals on employee housing (limitations on maximum base rental rate), emergency relief (authorizing NPS to accept and distribute donations for employees in disaster areas), and tax treatment of capital gains (extending the period for DOI employees to reinvest capital gains from 24 months to 8 years).

In the House, the Democratic margin dipped to 255-179. A trend with long-term consequences for the national parks is the growth in minority representation in the House. Rep. George Miller begins his second term as chairman of the renamed Committee on Natural Resources (formerly Interior and Insular Affairs) and Rep. Bruce Vento (D-MN) retains chairmanship of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Public Lands and Forests. Rep. James Hansen (R-UT) takes over as the ranking Republican on the subcommittee.

The 103rd could be a landmark Congress for parks and public lands. In addition to the California Desert bill, chances for reform of the 1872 Mining Law (S. 257/H.R. 322) have never been better. Also, for the first time in recent memory, the National Park Service itself plans to forward a legislative program to Congress. While the package has not been completely finalized, it could contain over 50 legislative items in the four issue areas that formed the structure of the "Vail Agenda" environmental leadership, park use and enjoyment, organizational renewal, and resource stewardship. Organizational renewal recommendations include proposals on employee housing (limitations on maximum base rental rate), emergency relief (authorizing NPS to accept and distribute donations for employees in disaster areas), and tax treatment of capital gains (extending the period for DOI employees to reinvest capital gains from 24 months to 8 years).

Typical first aid courses train students to provide care before an ambulance arrives. Wilderness Medical Associates provides definitive medical training for all outdoor leaders and enthusiasts, wilderness rescue team members and various environmental occupations whose emergency situations include:

- Delayed transport
- Limited equipment
- Extreme environment

Wilderness Medical Associates' courses are widely considered the most complete medical training for outdoor professionals. Our curriculum is preferred by such organizations as the National Park Service, Outward Bound, and many university outdoor programs. Courses are available throughout the United States and overseas. For course information call today.

YOU can handle backcountry emergencies with training from Wilderness Medical Associates.

The National Park Service has reviewed the NASAR Wilderness EMT program and approves and endorses the concept as well as the curriculum. The NASAR Emergency Services Coordinator Ralph K. Farabaugh, Jr. from Wilderness Medical Associates.

For further information on these or other legislative matters, please do not hesitate to contact me: Dave Simon, NPCA, 1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036 (202/223-6722).

YOU can handle backcountry emergencies with training from Wilderness Medical Associates.

Typical first aid courses train students to provide care before an ambulance arrives. Wilderness Medical Associates provides definitive medical training for all outdoor leaders and enthusiasts, wilderness rescue team members and various environmental occupations whose emergency situations include:

- Delayed transport
- Limited equipment
- Extreme environment

Wilderness Medical Associates' courses are widely considered the most complete medical training for outdoor professionals. Our curriculum is preferred by such organizations as the National Park Service, Outward Bound, and many university outdoor programs. Courses are available throughout the United States and overseas. For course information call today.

NASAR certificates issued for most courses.

WILDERNESS MEDICAL ASSOCIATES

RFD 2 Box 890
Bryant Pond, ME 04219

Training Specialists in emergency medicine and wilderness rescue.
Association Actions
NPS Legislative Program

Late in January, ANPR sent the following letter to Acting Director Herb Cables regarding the legislative package that the Service put together for the new Congress:

“We have recently reviewed the National Park Service’s proposed legislative program for the 103rd Congress, ‘The Spirit of Vail.’

As you know, the Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR) strongly supports the Vail Agenda, as well as the establishment of an active and professional legislative program that has the support of the new Administration and the respect of the Congress. The ‘Spirit of Vail’ is a good beginning for this effort, but we believe that no legislative program should go forward at this junction without a thorough review by professional NPS managers and the ‘new team’ of Department and Agency appointees.

With a new Administration and a receptive Congress, we believe that the Service once again has the opportunity to influence its own destiny. Consequently, we believe that the Service should re-examine the ‘Spirit of Vail’ in that light and develop a more proactive legislative program in concert with the new Administration.

‘While we strongly support priorities in the ‘Spirit of Vail’ such as employee housing and tax treatment of capital gains, we are concerned about such carry-over priorities as the ‘America the Beautiful Passport’ legislation. This particular piece of legislation is ill-conceived, does not reflect management realities, and would not create the positive revenue the bill intends. Our detailed views on this legislation were presented in testimony before the Congress last year.

‘We have identified four major areas that we believe the Service should actively pursue with the new Administration and the Congress. These are:

1. Operational funding – The Service needs to effectively make it’s case with the new Administration and the Congress on why more funding is needed to operate the National Park System. It is essential that they understand that while the overall budget has increased over the past several years, operational funding has stayed the same or decreased for reasons with which you are very familiar.

2. New areas – The trend of the last several years to include new areas that do not meet standards for national significance, including thinly disguised urban revitalization projects and minor historical sites, must be reversed. This is one area where the best defense is a good offense. Criteria for new sites must be tightened, and consideration should be given to deauthorization of some areas.

3. Protection of park resources – Depredations against the natural and cultural resources of the parks have increased markedly, while our ability to protect the parks has diminished. Increased funding for resource protection and legislation – such as the proposed Paleontological Resources Protection Act and renewal of the Endangered Species Act – must be forthcoming. We believe the Service should take an active role in these pieces of legislation as well as other legislation that may affect park resources.

4. Employee assistance – We welcome the Service’s support of legislation designed to improve employee housing. It was most disconcerting at last year’s hearing to have the Department testify against Senator Wallop’s bill which addressed the issues of substandard housing and employees who are paying rents well beyond the percentage of income expended by most Americans.

‘As you know, seasonal and temporary employees do not receive health insurance, life insurance or retirement benefits; some of them do not even qualify for step increases. Despite risks equivalent to or beyond those experienced by other law enforcement officers who qualify for early retirement, National Park Service rangers do not receive such benefits. These and other significant problems beset our employees and are the cause of significant morale problems.

‘We very much look forward to working with you and the new Administration to resolve these many problems over the coming months and years. We stand ready to assist. Please call on us at any time.’

Paleontological Resources

The movement to increase protection of paleontological resources on federal lands resulted in legislation (S. 3107) which was introduced into the Senate last Congress by Senator Max Baucus of Montana. The need for such legislation has been evident for some time (see Vince Santucci’s article elsewhere in this issue of Ranger). The Association sent the following letter to Senator Baucus in February regarding changes in the bill’s text prior to its reintroduction:

“Thank you for introducing S.3107, the ‘Vertebrate Paleontological Resources Protection Act’ during the 102nd Congress. The Association of National Park Rangers commends you for your concern to protect vertebrate fossils on the public lands and hopes that you will introduce similar legislation in the 103rd Congress.

‘The Association of National Park Rangers is a professional organization representing 1,600 park rangers at all grade levels and throughout the nation. The Association is concerned both with issues facing the National Park Service and the National Park System.

‘The Association would like to urge you to consider some changes in the wording as contained in S.3107 which we feel would strengthen any future proposed Legislation which might be introduced in this session of the Congress.

“We believe that the language regarding ‘significant’ and ‘not significant’ paleontological resources as it pertains to amateur collectors should contain the exception that all paleontological resources on lands administered by the National Park Service should be listed as ‘significant’ and therefore protected from removal, disturbance or destruction. This exception need not apply to educational or scientific institutions pursuant to a permit issued under existing NPS authority and regulation.

‘Secondly, an ‘amateur collector’ is defined as one who, among other things, is ‘affiliated with a suitable institution.’ While such an institution may not be engaged in commercial operations, the allowance for contracting ‘commercial excavation services’ seems unclear. We believe this section needs to be expanded somewhat, with a clear definition of what is meant by ‘commercial excavation.’

‘The illegal exploitation of natural scientific resources for commercial gain is a significant problem on all public lands, including those managed by the National Park Service. Legislation such as S.3107 will be a major step in providing necessary protection to these resources.

‘We would be pleased to work with you and your staff on any similar legislation proposed to be introduced in the 103rd Congress. If we can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to ask.

‘Again, thank you for supporting the protection of our nation’s vertebrate paleontological resources.”

Cave Protection

There was considerable discussion at the last Rendezvous regarding which of the many area-specific pieces of legislation seen each Congress ANPR should address. The consensus was that we should reserve our time and energy for those which have system-wide implications, concern major new sites, or seriously threaten existing areas. The latter pertained to Lechuguilla Cave.

Because of threats that nearby drilling posed to the cave, ANPR sent the following letter to Rep. Bruce Vento, who introduced legislation to protect the cave in February:

“The Association of National Park Rangers was very pleased to learn of HR.678, the Lechuguilla Cave Protection Act, which would provide additional protection to Lechuguilla Cave and other caves within Carlsbad Caverns National Park. We agree completely by that these caves, as well as others in the area, are world class resources which deserve all possible protection.

‘A recent panel of independent geologists indicated to the National Park Service that the agency needs to be particularly sensitive to the structural geology of the northern and eastern sections of the Capitan Reef within and adjacent to the park. To this end, the experts are preparing a report and maps indicating a boundary below which they believe no wells...
should be drilled. If wells already exist, they should be properly plugged when their production life is exhausted.

“Once again, the Association believes your proposed legislation comes at a time when some of our nation’s finest natural and cultural resources are facing possible destruction or damage from threats originating outside the boundaries of units of the National Park System. Only through the enactment and enforcement of timely and forceful environmental protection laws and regulations can we hope to strike a balance between resources preservation and appropriate energy development. Thank you for your continuing efforts to find such a balance.”

**Law Enforcement Funding**

Section 132 of S. 11, a bill to protect women from crime in their homes, the streets, and parks, contains a provision which would provide the Service with $10 million for a variety of crime reduction efforts, including increased personnel. The Association’s letter to Senator Joseph Biden, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, follows:

“The Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR), a professional organization representing 1,600 park rangers from all grade levels and areas of the National Park Service, was pleased to learn of the introduction of S.11, proposed legislation to ‘Combat Violence and Crimes Against Women on the Streets and in Homes.’

“We are particularly encouraged to learn of the grant provisions in section 132 of the legislation which would provide funding for areas of the National Park System which have the highest incidence of violent crimes and sexual assaults. Violent crimes against persons is a significant problem in our national park. In 1991, for instance, 678 violent crimes against persons were reported. This figure includes 27 homicides and 78 rapes. Incidentally, although not a part of the proposed legislation, there were also 96 assaults on federal officers (National Park Rangers) in 1991.

“We hope your committee will speedily report out this legislation. If there is anything ANPR can do to assist in seeing that S-11 is enacted, please do not hesitate to ask.”

**Letters to Congress**

The change in Administration was paralleled by some fairly significant changes in the two Congressional organizations that we most frequently deal with—the Senate’s Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the House’s Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands. There are six new members (three from each party) on the Senate committee and House subcommittee which provided some background on ANPR (for new members) and outlined the issues of concern to this Association (for all members). Although the letters varied in content, the core section in each was the same:

“As you are no doubt aware, the National Park Service has found itself in increasingly difficult straits over recent years. Although the agency’s budget increased significantly during that time, the reality is that funding for operations has decreased dramatically, partly because many marginally qualified or wholly unsuitable new areas have been added to the system without accompanying funding. At the same time, visitation to the parks and overall programmatic responsibilities have increased significantly, thereby increasing work burdens on reduced staffs and affecting employee morale.

“Last year, as part of its 75th anniversary celebration, the NPS took the time to reflect on its past, present and future. This process resulted in a document known as “The Vail Agenda,” which outlines the challenges facing the Service over its next 75 years. The document describes many of these problems and presents numerous recommendations for their resolution. ANPR fully supports implementation of these recommendations and is aggressively pressing for their implementation.

“Our Association believes that nothing less than the integrity of the National Park System and the future organizational effectiveness of the National Park Service are now at stake. Accordingly, we will be working hard in the coming year to resolve problems in a number of areas:

- **Operational funding**—Under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the Interior and Related Agencies budget must fit within the cap established by the budget resolution. A dollar budgeted to study or fund a new area or for a new construction project is therefore a dollar that is unavailable for park operations. This fiscal year, the requested funding for park operations was significantly reduced during the appropriations process, while costs continued to escalate. As a result, some areas will not even be able to hire seasonal employees this coming year, and other parks are considering partial closures to reduce costs. Shenandoah National Park’s effort to do so by temporarily closing sections of Skyline Drive and Independence National Historical Park’s closure of several historic buildings are but the first signs of a certain nationwide trend. Funding must be increased, either by redistribution of existing allocations in the Department of Interior budget or through an increase in appropriations.

- **New areas**—A number of new areas that do not meet the standards for national significance envisioned by Congress and implicit in both the act establishing the NPS and subsequent related acts have been added to or proposed for inclusion in the National Park System over the past few years, including thinly disguised urban revitalization projects and minor historical sites. Each of these bleeds off more funding and further waters down the significance of National Park System sites. Criteria for new sites must be tightened, and consideration be given to deauthorization of some areas.

- **Protection of park resources**—Depredation against the wildlife, plants and historical and cultural resources of our park shave increased markedly, while our ability to protect the parks has diminished. In Alaska, where we have approximately one ranger to patrol each million acres of park land, poaching of trophy animals is on the upswing. International trade in illegally-taken animal parts and some plants has lead to an epidemic of poaching in the parks that is reaching alarming proportions. Archeological artifacts and paleontological resources are being stolen from parks throughout the West. Funding increases and legislation to further protect our parks are urgently needed.

- **Employee assistance**—Employees who are required to reside in park housing in a number of areas are paying rents well beyond the percentage of take home income expended by most Americans; many others live in substandard housing. Seasonal and temporary employees in the National Park Service do not receive health insurance, life insurance or retirement benefits; some of them do not even qualify for step increases. Despite risks equivalent to or beyond those experienced by other law enforcement officers who qualify for early retirement, National Park Service rangers do not receive such benefits. These and other significant problems beset our employees and are the cause of significant morale problems. These problems must be resolved by funding or, in many cases, legislation.

“We very much look forward to working with you to resolve these many problems over coming months and years. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if we can assist you in any way in any of these areas, or on other concerns regarding the NPS and its employees.”

**Campfire Message to Secretary Babbitt**

On January 27th, one of his first days in office, Secretary Babbitt spoke to Department of Interior employees in the auditorium on the building’s first floor. As you have no doubt heard (or seen), his speech was eloquent and truly inspiring. During his presentation, the Secretary said that some of the best ideas in land management had come from discussions around campfires, and told employees that they could send their ideas directly to him in a one-page memo in a blue envelope marked ‘Campfire.’ The next day, an envelope with a
letter from President Rick Gale was hand de­
levered to Secretary Babbitt’s office — among
the first he received. Here’s what we had to
say:

“Our sincere thanks to you for the oppor­
tunity to speak to you directly through the
“Campfire” process. We in the Association of
National Park Rangers (ANPR) were extreme­
ly pleased to hear of your appointment, and the
‘Campfire’ idea sets precisely the tone we
expected from your office.

“Let me briefly introduce the association to
you. ANPR, which was formed in 1977, is a
professional organization comprised of ap­
proximately 1,600 National Park Service
rangers and other employees from all regions,
grades and specialties — including many of the
top managers in the NPS. It’s neither a union
nor a bargaining unit, but rather is an organi­
zation formed to advance the ranger profes­
sion and support the National Park System
and National Park Service.

“Your comments regarding the Service and
its problems were highly encouraging and we
very much look forward to working on issues
with you and the persons you select as NPS
Director and Assistant Secretary for Fish and
Wildlife and Parks. These are some of the is­
sues that we have addressed in the past and/or
will be addressing in coming months:

• NPS Director — We wrote to you at your
Phoenix office late in December with our
thoughts regarding a new Director. We recom­
mended that you consider as next
Director an individual who knows the Na­
tional Park System, who is familiar with the
personalities of the agency, who under­
stands field operations, who can work
within the federal process without requir­
ing a long learning curve, and who, most
importantly, demonstrates the ability to
provide leadership of the agency with the
Department and the Congress. We also
asked that you consider selecting a profes­
sional Director and Deputy Director.

• Operational Funding — Funding cuts to
field areas have had a dramatic impact on
park operations. Our members tell us that
they are in a crisis situation where they
can’t even fund basic operations. This is
an issue which must be addressed as soon
as possible.

• New Areas — Many areas of less than na­
tional significance have been added to the
NPS over the past few years, including
thinely disguised urban revitalization pro­
jects and minor historical sites. Each of
these bleeds off more funding and further
waters down the significance of National
Park System sites. Criteria for new sites
must be tightened and consideration be
given to deauthorization of some areas.

• Resource Protection — Depredations
against the wildlife, plants and historical
and cultural resources of our parks have
increased markedly, while our ability to
protect the parks has diminished. Increased
funds and protective legislation are badly
needed.

• Employee Assistance — Employees who
are required to reside in park housing in a
number of areas are paying rents well be­
ond the percentage of take home income
expended by most Americans; many other
live in substandard housing. Seasonal and
temporary employees in the National Park
Service do not receive health insurance,
life insurance or retirement benefits; some of
them do not even qualify for step in­
creases. Despite risks equivalent to or to­
warded by other law enforce­
ment officers who qualify for early
retirement, National Park Service rangers
do not receive such benefits. These and
other significant problems beset our em­
ployees and are the cause of significant
morale problems. These problems must be
resolved by legislation and funding.

“Again, thank you for the chance to com­
ment on these issues. There are others of con­
cern to us, but space constraints preclude their
inclusion. We would be happy to provide you
with more information if you so request. We
will soon be inviting you to our annual meet­
ing, which is attended by about 300 NPS pro­
fessionals and will be held in Virginia Beach
from November 10th to the 14th. Two days —
November 13th and 14th — will be in conjunc­
tion with ANPME, the NPS maintenance em­
pLOYEE association. We hope you can attend.

Kennedy School Presentation

Tom Steinbach and Margaret Alkon of the
John F. Kennedy School of Government trav­
elled to Washington early in March to make a
presentation to area members on the draft of
the analysis and strategic plan that Tom is
preparing on the Association. Although a
room was rented, several board members
were scheduled to fly in, and area members
had been invited to attend, a small event known as
the “Blizzard of ’93” intervened.

Tom was nonetheless able to make an ini­tial
presentation to those folks who had access to
efour-wheel-drive vehicles and didn’t have
trees down across their driveways. The full re­
port will be done by April 13th and will be
shared with all members within this magazine
or through direct mailing.

Tom outlined several options regarding the
Association’s future direction, then presented
his recommendation — that ANPR combine
advocacy with a social/community building
strategy. Although this is the direction in
which ANPR is already moving, Tom noted
that the association’s internal capacity must be
increased for successful implementation of
these objectives. He presented a number of
thought-provoking ideas based on the follow­ing
points; probable future actions follow each
point:

• Work proactively with members to define
goals and a professional ranger creed — A
consensus building process will be initiat­
ed shortly by regional and park reps.

• Increase funding through grants, endow­
ments and public support — Tom will pro­
vide particulars on sources for such fund­ing.

• Formalize and “quicken” communications
— ANPR will engage in more direct mail­
ings and face-to-face meetings with mem­
bers in park and regional settings.

• Advertise achievements — Several mem­
bers who are PIOs will be asked to coordi­
nate an aggressive public educational cam­
paign.

• Document leadership and membership ex­
pectations — ANPR objectives will be de­
veloped through a consensus process and
explicitly stated.

• Institute a leadership development pro­
gram — This process is already underway
and will be accelerated.

• Increase staff on advocacy issues — A plan
for a functional reorganization is being de­
volved and circulated within the board.

Specific details will follow as soon as pos­
sible.

Housing Legislation

On March 2nd, Senator Malcolm Wallop rein­
introduced housing legislation in the Senate.
The purpose of the bill, which is numbered S.
472, is “to improve the administration and
management of public lands, national forests,
units of the National Park System, and related
areas, by improving the availability of ade­
quate, appropriate, affordable and cost-effec­tive
housing for employees needed to effec­tively
manage the public lands.” The text is essen­tially the same as found in S. 1704,
which passed the Senate last Congress.

Here are the comments Senator Wallop
made in the Senate when the bill was intro­
duced:

“Mr. President, today I am introducing the
Land Management Agency Housing Improve­
ment Act of 1993. This legislation addresses a
serious problem facing various public land
management agencies. Land management
agencies provide rental housing to their em­
ployees because of the remote situations
where they work. Uncle Sam has been a negli­
gent landlord — almost a slum lord — as this
rental housing has deteriorated to an alarming
degree. The housing stock is aging and in­
creasingly costly to maintain. The abominable
condition of many of the units is creating seri­
ous recruitment, retention, and morale prob­
lems for the agencies — affecting their ability
to perform their mission. This legislation is
similar to the measure that passed the Senate
in the waning days of the last Congress.

“Of the 19,096 Government housing units
inventoried by the Bureau of Reclamation,
5,262 are owned by the U.S. Forest Service,
5,171 are owned by the National Park Service,
and 4,564 are owned by the Bureau of Indian
Affairs — the remainder are owned by several
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different agencies. The National Park Service (NPS) estimates the cost of bringing their housing stock up to acceptable levels is $546,081,000. The NPS has spent $34 million over the last 4 years attempting to correct this situation. At that rate, correcting the problem would take over 60 years.

Similar problems exist in all of the major land management agencies. Insufficient and inappropriate housing is an identified problem for the Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere. The Forest Service estimates a need for $175,539,000 to meet their housing needs. Escalating maintenance costs plague the Bureau of Indian Affairs. They estimate a $40 million need. Aging housing stock and the associated increasing maintenance costs are a recurring theme throughout the agencies.

"A problem which affects all agencies, but the National Park Service in particular, is an increasingly serious recruitment and retention problem in those areas of the country with high costs of living. While the term national park brings to mind western visions of Yellowstone and Yosemite to most people, the fact is that the majority of the NPS units and employees are located in the East. The high cost of housing available in these areas and the relatively low grade, and therefore salary levels, of most of the employees assigned there, have created extreme situations of near poverty.

"A study conducted by the Association of National Park Rangers in 1988-89 revealed that employees were living in automobiles or sharing substandard housing with several others in high crime areas just to have roofs over their heads. Others are reporting spending over 60 percent of their salary for housing. A significant number are choosing to leave the Service rather than endure marginal living conditions or exhaust their savings in an effort to survive. It is conceivable that if present trends continue, we may be faced with a dwindling number of individuals trained and qualified to protect and explain our priceless natural and cultural resources.

"The Forest Service reports employees having to live in 30-year-old trailers with leaking roofs, up to 10 employees of both sexes sharing a single shower, sleeping in pickups parked in old horse bams, walling off corners of warehouses and basements to provide bunkhouse space, and requests to use the attics of office buildings as crew quarters. The Forest Service's desire to increase utilization of

can be seen in the National Park Service's desire to increase utilization of
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or appeal, and the anguish of having to decide whether or not to continue a career in our nation’s parks and forests or give it up because they couldn’t afford to continue, should compel us to take note, and act.

"The employees who protect and manage our nation’s resources know they’ll never get rich doing it. They generally don’t even mind being required, as a precondition for having a job at all, to rent their home from their employer at a reasonable rate.

"But they do mind when their housing is so substandard that it endangers their family, and they do mind when the rent charged by their employer is so high that they can’t afford to continue a career in public service.

"I would like to quote from just a few of the letters the committee received:

- It is with deep sense of personal loss that I cannot select the best candidates in part because of the lack of affordable housing. More often than not, I cannot even muster a register with more than a handful of poorly qualified applicants. (A supervisory ranger from Virginia.)

- I have chosen to sacrifice many things to pursue this (NPS) career. The horrid tales of Park Service housing were breaking my spirit. I only ask for simplicity at a fair price. (A ranger from Arizona.)

- ...much of our housing has been abominable. In the Tetons we lived in a 3 room log cabin (700 sq. ft.) which had not been winterized. After several months of -20 degree weather in which we struggled with freezing pipes and a draft across the living room floor, we wrapped the entire building in lathing and clear plastic to stay warm... in Rocky Mountain National Park... we were charged for fire and police protection as part of our rent for housing when we ourselves would be both victim and responder because we were the only residents in that part of the park! (A husband and wife supervisory ranger couple from California with over 40 years of combined service.)

- Sequoia has seasonal rangers housed in “cabin” with bare cement floors and bathroom facilities housed outside in a central cabin. Migrant farm workers in California have stricter laws protecting them against such inadequate housing! (Another husband and wife supervisory ranger couple from Utah.)

- These situations are combining to rip the heart out of the National Park Service, the morale, the esprit de corps and the professionalism of the National Park Ranger. I see it in the staff I supervise and in the new recruits we must hire to fill in behind those rangers leaving the Service for a more humanistic way of life. We need help. (A supervisory park ranger from New Jersey.)

"Yes, Mr. President, they need help. The Forest Service has about 5,262 housing units which include single family units and crew quarters. The National Park Service has about 5,171 units, most of which are single-family or apartment units. The remaining land management agencies have several hundred each. The estimates for bringing all this housing up to standard runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

"The National Park Service estimates its cost at over $500 million. The Forest Service estimates about $176 million. This is not a problem that will be fixed overnight. However, if this bill is enacted, the agencies will be able to better use the scarce funds available to them to improve housing by involving the private sector to a much greater degree. It will also put an end to inflating rents because of so-called regional comparability where the renter’s salary is set nationally.

"It is necessary for a variety of reasons. In many cases, Government housing is the only housing available; there just isn’t any town or even any private land for miles in any direction. In other cases, the around-the-clock protection of historic structures can only be assured if someone actually lives in them. In still other cases, required occupants are necessary to protect Government assets from vandalism, fire, and the like, or to respond to law enforcement, medical, fire and search and rescue emergencies.

"The list of reasons for housing is long, and the fact is inescapable that requiring employees to live in government housing in certain locations is absolutely essential for the agencies to do their jobs.

"Since housing for government land management agencies is necessary, it then becomes simply a question of what kind of housing, where, and at what rental rate. I know that many of the visitors to our parks and forests think that rangers get their housing rent-free. They don’t and shouldn’t. The plain truth is that government has a bunch of company towns scattered all over the country. These people are required to live there and are required to pay whatever the company says. Many of them are occupying housing that ranges from tents to ocean freight cargo container boxes to disintegrating trailers to ramshackle cabins. They are not living there by choice. The only choice they have is to live in their assigned housing or quit their careers. Some choice. I quote again from an NPS employee: I only ask for simplicity at a fair price.

"The proposed rental rate increases for the North Atlantic Regional Rental Area would have placed some of these employees in the position of either paying over 60 percent of their salary to their employer in rent or quitting. The National Average of Rents for Renters, which is published by the Census Bureau, is 27 percent of household income and that includes the cost of utilities. Government employees still pay utilities on top of their rent.

"Mr. President, this bill would cap the rents paid in the company town to no greater than the national average. That’s not any kind of a subsidy, that’s simple fairness. This legislation would authorize a variety of public-private cooperative ventures for the construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance of housing for land management agencies. These are the same kinds of authorities that the military currently uses so well.

"The studies that I have indicate that while these authorities will not appreciably save the taxpayer money in the long run, they do provide the vehicle to fix more housing faster with the available money. The agencies have programs to upgrade and improve housing and have appropriations for that purpose, but at the current level of appropriating, all the work in-house, it will take over 60 years to correct the problems. These authorities will allow what amounts to leveraging of the available funds to do more work sooner.

"This bill is important to us all. Without adequate housing at an affordable price, our national parks, forests, refuges, and public lands will not be able to recruit and retain the quality of people necessary to do the increasingly complex job of managing them. The caliber of caretakers dictates the quality of care. It is our responsibility to take care of the caretakers.

"Thank you, Mr. President, and I urge the Senate to act expeditiously on this legislation. I would ask that the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks."
The ONPS Budget: Crunch Becomes Crisis

Back in the fall of 1989, there was a feature article in Ranger entitled “The Budget Crunch” in which a dozen superintendents and a number of other managers spoke candidly about the budget problems besetting the National Park Service. That issue was widely read and attracted considerable attention in many quarters.

Unfortunately, it didn’t have much effect on operational budgets, which have in most cases continued to decline despite overall NPS budget increases. Many people now feel that we are headed for a fiscal crisis of unprecedented proportions – at least in the post-World War II NPS.

The time therefore seemed right for revisiting this issue. Accordingly, a questionnaire on budget issues was formulated by a number of members conversant with fiscal management and sent to an array of park and regional managers, almost all of them Association members. About half responded; most of the rest said that they would have if time had permitted.

The respondents, in alphabetical order, were:

- Bob Amdor, Superintendent, San Antonio Mission
- Larry Bell, Superintendent, Chaco Culture
- Don Castleberry, Regional Director, Midwest Regional Office
- John Click, Regional Director, Southwest Regional Office
- Walt Dabney, Superintendent, Canyonlands
- Dennis Dimman, Superintendent, White Sands
- Butch Farabee, Superintendent, Padre Island
- Maureen Finnerty, Superintendent, Olympic
- Hal Grovert, Acting Superintendent, Delaware Water Gap
- Pete Hart, Superintendent, Theodore Roosevelt
- Mary Jeff Karraker, Superintendent, Capulin Volcano
- Cynthia MacLeod, Superintendent, Richmond and Maggie Walker
- David Morris, Superintendent, Crater Lake
- Noel Poe, Superintendent, Arches
- Rick Smith, Associate Regional Director, Resource Management, Southwest Regional Office
- Bill Wade, Superintendent, Shenandoah
- Karen Wade, Superintendent, Wrangell-St. Elias
- Melody Webb, Assistant Superintendent, Grand Teton

Their answers to the questionnaire follow. As always, Ranger is interested in any comments you might have regarding their opinions. Responses will be printed in future issues of the magazine.

K. Wade: Wrangell-St. Elias came into the system as one of the units added in 1980 by the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). The original $17 million budget requested for operation of the 44 million acres of new additions in Alaska was whittled down to $3.05 million per year – a figure which established the base for succeeding years.

Thirteen years after ANILCA, the anticipated ONPS base plus soft funds for the park will amount to about $1.9 million, or about six percent of the region’s total 1993 operating budget. That’s for the management of 25 percent of the acreage of the entire region. The budget includes a 25 percent COLA for every employee and high aircraft support costs. The taxpayer pays about 14 cents an acre per year to run a field operation for the nation’s largest national park.

Are we doing the job with that much money? Far from it, and it’s a national disgrace indicative of the fundamental problems of the entire system of budgeting for operations in the Park Service. Before talking about my park specifically, let me make some general comments that pertain to all Alaska parks regarding how badly we are affected by poor budgeting decisions.

The permanent increases that came to the system in FY 89 and FY 90 – largely for routine maintenance and to “enhance park operations” – benefited the Alaska parks only minimally. In both categories, the increased funding was distributed essentially proportionately to each park’s base budget, which meant that Wrangells received very little. And the end result for all Alaska parks combined was a total increase of $1.63 million, which was less than what many of the individual parks elsewhere in the system received. Even with the increase in Alaska Region’s base funding, base funding is still three percent of the total NPS operating budget, just as it was in 1980. Remember, too, that we manage 62 percent of the land area in the system and have not gained even a percentage point in base funding since we started with the artificially low ceiling in 1980. Management of the national parks in Alaska would have been extremely difficult at best with a $17 million base plus increases; without increases over and above inflation, it has become nearly intolerable at the field level.

Increases to the base over the past three years for the parks in Alaska have been specific to special initiatives, i.e. science, resource management, subsistence, maintenance, drug enforcement. They were largely for increased responsibilities did not have in the park before. These increases did not benefit already established programs which were drastically underfunded to begin with. Not understanding the costs associated with doing work in the vast areas we manage in Alaska, these initiatives provided a fixed sum of money to pay salaries, but little to no support monies from which the positions could accomplish projects in the field. I guess the assumption was that we already had support services in place to provide for these program activities as well. Wrong! We have even had to construct buildings with day labor in order that these special initiative people have a place to work.

The Painted Canyon Visitor Center at Theodore Roosevelt – closed during the winter months due to budget constraints. Theodore Roosevelt NP photo.
local management, who, in truth, might have of the unwillingness of program managers at the Washington level to give up control to local management, who, in truth, might have needed some of that money for higher priorities.

Fifty-six percent of Alaska Region's operating budget ($18.8 million) is managed at the field level by 16 units. The remaining 44 percent supports programs managed out of the regional office, of which field units receive a portion of soft monies. Ordinarily, Wrangell gets approximately 30 to 35 percent of its budget each year from soft monies requested from regional programs. Most of the time, such money is disbursed in February or March, the first time the park gets a real clue as to its entire budget picture for the fiscal year and always limiting our ability to most effectively manage money.

Budget formulas are often (usually? always?) based on visitation levels. Needless to say, we don't have huge numbers of park visitors. What we do have is the most extensive consumptive uses, via the most extraordinary means of access, in the national park system. Where else does the Service manage sport hunting on over 20 million acres, extensive subsistence hunting over 30 to 40 million acres, and the most complex patchwork of mixed public and private ownership in the system? As one friend recently stated, "In Alaska parks, we have existing use and potential for abuse out the yin-yang, and the rest of the country thinks of the parks as pristine wilderness."

Keep in mind, too, that the new parks in Alaska by and large still do not have NPS-provided housing and that the majority of the administrative facilities are "make-do" until the day when construction funding becomes available. Most of us don't believe that the day will come during our tenures when anything but "make-do" meets our needs in the majority of the areas in Alaska. The end result is that we are spending a lot of money on "make-do" which should instead be utilized for patrols, interpretation, administration and other functions.

These impacts can be seen specifically in Wrangells. All costs absorbed out of our fixed base are being absorbed from a base that was never adequate to begin with, and that base primarily funds ranger activities and administration. Everyone knows that administration has to get done regardless, so the cuts have come almost totally from ranger activities. The end result is that we can afford each year - seven seasonal rangers in 1992 and the equivalent of two in 1993. What they accomplished with limited resources in 1992 follows: Approximately 239 cases were logged. Approximately 134 law enforcement incidents or observations were noted. A total of 24 violation notices and 281 access permits were issued. Four poaching cases were turned over to the state for prosecution. Twenty wildlife investigations were conducted. These rangers accomplished 47 aerial patrols, 30 multi-day backcountry patrols, and three river and kayak patrols.

It's true that there aren't enough rangers in the world to force compliance with the laws meant to protect the resources within the national parklands of Alaska. We should have enough in the field, however, to provide effective eyes and ears. And we certainly ought to be doing something to educate ever-increasing numbers of people (neighbors and tourists) to the values of this magnificent area. In 1992, we had a 46 percent increase in visitation at our headquarters visitor center. In 1993, we'll be lucky if we can keep it open five days a week. And we are talking about extending the furloughs of the one interpretive specialist in the park to four months.

Castleberry: The regional budget, like the parks', has seen small, incremental increases which, unfortunately, do not keep up with inflation, special program costs, FERS, etc. Further, much of the funding is directed by Congress or WASO into special programs (external), new area studies, or construction projects which do not benefit operations or on-going parks.

Constraints on selected central office programs (administration, etc.) leave no source for funds to carry out necessary responsibilities. The result is an increase in the infrastructure backlog, reduction of public service, reduced resource protection, poor morale, etc.

Finnerty: The budgetary picture at Olympic is borderline disastrous. It was bleak before the hammer fell in FY 93. We are feeling the pinch across the board.

This nearly million acre park has 600 miles of trails, 158 miles of roads, 465 buildings (half of which are historic), and 1,000 campgrounds.

There is one permanent interpreter on the west side of the park, responsible for 500,000 acres and five subdistricts. Before this year, the park had no interpretive programs in five areas; this year we added two more to the "sorry, no programs this summer" list. The visitor centers, aside from three months in the summer, are staffed with volunteers. The backcountry, which is 95 percent of Olympic, is run largely by SCAs and volunteers. Administration is overworked, understaffed and constantly dealing with new regulations, mandates and deadlines.

Olympic is one of the most diverse parks in the system, with incredible resources from a pristine wilderness coastline to temperate rain forest to fragile subalpine communities. This is the only park outside of Alaska that is home to all five species of Pacific salmon. Thirteen rivers have headwaters in the park, yet we have just one fisheries biologist. He is dealing with seven tribes who have fisheries biologists for every watershed. We know nothing at all about most of the resources in this park.

I could go on and on, but you get the picture.

Amador: Continual absorption of pay increases over several years, additional assessments to base for unfunded programs, and the absence of increases to base commensurate with cost increases of goods and services have placed our current budgetary situation in about a million dollar deficit.

We are most feeling the pinch in our ability to fund positions to maintain and interpret the resource and to manage and protect the resource from further deterioration.

The ranger activities division is suffering a slow death by strangulation in terms of the budget. While we have experienced a decrease in personnel, we have experienced a dramatic increase in visitation and ever-increasing expectations from the public, as well as the agency.

Increased demands on an already stretched staff make for a difficult challenge. As everyone attempts to do more with less, field areas ultimately bear the brunt. WASO, region and the training centers call upon field areas to provide various levels of support for special programs and details.

Karrender: Because of budget shortfalls, we received approval to close the park road from January 1st through March 15th and the visitor center on several holidays. Over the past several years, our ONPS budget has not increased to meet inflation of operating costs, pay raises, personal benefits, FERS, or, more recently, the FY 1993 uniform allowance increase. Since we have no control over inflation or the mandated benefit increases, our ONPS budget has been slowly eroded until it will no longer cover the most basic requirements. Our shortfall is now so severe that any cutbacks of services offer no savings, since most of our costs are in personal services.

Example: The implementation of FERS brought no supplemental funding to the parks, even though the FERS employees’ benefits at Capulin Volcano amount to an average of 34 percent above base salary. Compare this to the 16 percent average for CSRS employees. We have five CSRS and six FERS employees.

Farabee: Padre Island, like most parks in the system, works on "smoke and mirrors" and is also affected by Washington and regional imposition of "smoke and mirrors." In theory, the park reaped about a one percent increase in actual ONPS money. Then region assessed a smidgen more than that. With pay increases to approximately 50 FTEs, the park has suffered significantly. My priority was to "pro-
lect" permanents and keep as many seasonal as possible. We ended up cutting about seven seasonal and six YCC kids. We did a significant belt-tightening exercise and have cut down close to the muscle now. The park is not healthy, but it’s crippled. Since I don’t have that many people who are transferring around, the majority will stay here, thereby leaving me with little lapse money.

Hart: At Theodore Roosevelt, we are spending less and doing less. Seasonal positions have been cut to 50 percent from FY 91 levels and only a prolonged delay in the filling of several key permanent positions permitted even the limited seasonal program planned for this summer. Visitor center hours are being reduced, and the Painted Canyon Rest Area and Visitor Center along I-94 will remain closed until late spring. Utility and maintenance costs for the new North Unit Visitor Center are high, and a commitment to the local community to keep the building open has not been met. Only one patrol ranger will be hired parkwide, with the slack taken up on an as-needed basis by permanent employees.

We are relying to a great extent on SCAs, volunteers, YCCs, cooperating association employees and even a Forest Service person to fill gaps in the interpretive, resource management and maintenance programs. Interpretive programs have been cut, custodial service in the headquarters building has been reduced, and patrols will be conducted incidentally to other functions, with night coverage reduced to two days a week during the season.

The spray crew for exotic leafy spurge which also controls other exotics, has been eliminated; exotic control will be accomplished as possible by other employees. Fee collection has been relegated to visitor centers during the shoulder months, and the fee collection staff has been cut in half during the summer season. Permanent employees will spell fee collectors in the booths.

One new sedan has been purchased in the last three years and several vehicles have logged over 100,000 miles. The vehicle replacement backlog stands at $290,000. Yet with all these reductions, it is doubtful that the average park visitor arriving during the summer will yet notice the decline in service or be aware of the effects on park resources.

B. Wade: The biggest pinch at Shenandoah is that the "discretionary" portion of the annual allotment continues to decline in constant dollars or buying power, resulting in reductions in seasonal hiring, longer furloughs for STFs, less supplies and material, etc.

Grovert: For the FY 93 budget calls, Mid-Atlantic Region requested a two-phase approach — phase one was the level that the park was operating at in July of 1992 and phase two was a more fully funded program. When we received our final numbers, we had to make up approximately $350,000 from what we said we were operating at in phase one in July.

Certainly, we are not the only park in which this has happened. Visitation to the park has been approximately seven million visitors per year for the last several years, with approximately two and a half to three million of those being recreational visits. Visitation is not dropping. The park has received small increases in funding over the last several years, but not enough to keep pace with inflation due to higher costs of doing business, pay increases, FERS, etc. What is happening is the loss of any flexibility within the park to take on new programs, expand existing programs, or respond to emergencies such as fires, road repairs, snow removal, etc.

We have been in the process over the last few years of building the parks resource management program. Most recently, the Delaware River Basin Commission approved significant new regulations relating to water quality in the Delaware River that will have a major impact upon the park's monitoring and land use programs. There is nothing in the budget to pay for the program that will have to be developed to monitor these nationally significant regulations. There is no question that the present budget situation will impact our ability to preserve and monitor our resources, both cultural and natural.

Webb: Over the past five years, park budgets have not kept up with inflation and built-in cost increases, such as pay raises and continually escalating FERS benefits on new hires. The trend toward the latter has increased approximately five percent over the past five years to the current average of 35 to 40 percent of salary (new hires or hires of employees who converted to FERS). There was a one-time increase to bases to cover this cost shortly after the program was implemented, but it has not been addressed as a separate increase since.

Another factor affecting park bases are Washington office and regional office assessments that have taken away the ability to cover inflation and costs described above. These offices have had even fewer increases to base accounts and cannot provide service to the parks without these assessments. Without these assessments, however, parks could essentially have kept pace through the past five years. The uniform assessment alone jumped 50 percent from FY 92 and FY 93. As it is, any current increases are offset by assessments, leaving the park the requirement to fund all or portions of pay raise costs.

The budget crunch affects all aspects of park operations. As programs were put in place in the last five years to maintain facilities and provide visitor information and protection, the funds to cover them have dwindled. FY 93 could be the benchmark of this finally coming home to roost. There are possibilities that lesser used or unnecessary services will have to be eliminated for the sake of mandatory requirements parkwide.

Poe: This is the toughest year I have had with managing available funds. Over the past few years, Arches’ operational program has had to rely on “soft” money. Because of the budget shortfall, the amount of soft money available to field areas has been substantially reduced. After a lot of soul-searching, budget juggling and consulting, the division chiefs and I recommended that we close the park’s campground for a year to meet our budget shortfall. This recommendation was made after eliminating seven seasonal, substantially reducing travel and supplies, and eliminating equipment purchases and other non-fixed expenses. The regional director, however, was able to redirect some funds to the park to cover half of the FY 93 shortfall for operating the campground. We will consider establishing a concession to manage the 53-site campground for the ’94 season.

MacLeod: Richmond NBP has been under-funded for years relative to the services the public expects and the protection our policies require for resources.

Increased costs of employees, energy, and equipment (computers and peripherals are more expensive than typewriters) have consumed all and more of the increased allocations. Interpretive services and maintenance have suffered the most. We estimate that we contact only about ten percent of the 500,000 annual visitors to the park. I therefore think that interpretation has suffered the pinch the most. But it’s a close contest.

Maggie Walker NHS has a maintenance problem — the cost of caring for eight historic buildings that need massive amounts of stabi-

---

1992 World Congress

This critical resource book draws together the latest information in the rapidly-evolving field of adventure travel and eco-tourism. From the effects of tourism on wildlife and human cultures, to natural resource management and techniques for developing sustainable tourism, this must-have collection will be a valuable addition to your library. Cost $40.00. Contact: The Adventure Travel Society, 6551 S. Revere Parkway, Suite 160, Englewood, CO, 80111, (303) 649-9016, (303) 649-9017-fax.
Belli: This year we are just getting by. (Budget shortfalls) generally impact park operations and visitor services, but the most insidious ones, such as lack of ruins preservation and the delay of our archive project, impact primary resources preservation...

The biggest pinch I have is that there are no discretionary funds this year. I'm relying on project funding and hoped-for year-end funding to supplement the park budget for things like supplies and materials and for benefitting account employee development. I'm not planning on any equipment replacement funds at all this year. If a computer goes down, it can't be replaced.

Administrative costs we charge ourselves, such as increased uniform allowances and background checks, and upgraded equipment and services (like Chaco's new telephone system), add substantially to overall operating expenses and to the pinch. The amount deducted from the park base for uniforms doubled this year from $5,000 to $10,000. That increase is roughly the equivalent of a three-month summer seasonal interpreter. While I know and support the need for the increase, these are the kinds of things we have been absorbing without operational increases and are killing us.

Another prime example is the park telephone system, which not only serves the public and staff with voice service but also connects us to the outside world through fax and computer modems and electronic mail. We are able to work in a more efficient and timely manner, but at great (for Chaco) cost financially — $20,000 per year. We need significant operating increases just to cover these kinds of expenses.

Morris: Crater Lake is on a trajectory to reduce its seasonal visitor services — especially in interpretation and protection — to the lowest point since World War II. Another assessment, as rumored, will get us closer.

As with most parks, we will feel the pinch most visibly with seasonal interpreters, park protection rangers and resource management technicians. It's too early to assess the maintenance impact. We are looking at eliminating or closing entire programs and facilities and doing NPS standards work elsewhere.

Our communication center, for example, is being eliminated (which will have) across the board impact and reduce response to visitor needs. Also likely to feel the axe this year is one of our two campgrounds (by far the smaller), interpretive programs and routine maintenance.

Ditmanson: The current budget situation at White Sands can best be described as allowing for "caretaker" status and little else. For FY 93, we will not be required to reduce programs from the FY 92 level, but that fact is little comfort when you consider the "bare minimum" programs that were available in the first place. We will not be reducing patrols, for example, but that's not necessarily a positive step since there are already long periods of time when protection is simply not available.

At present levels, the majority of our visitor services never encounter a National Park Service employee during their stay other than the person in the entrance station. Likewise, most never attend an interpretive program. Until FY 92, the park had no resource management program, and only has one now because of what amounts to a regional office subsidy. The eight structures in the headquarters area make up a National Register historic district, but we are unable to stretch the maintenance dollars to adequately deal with these structures as cultural resources.

Dabney: Visitation to Canyonlands is increasing by about 15 percent each year and is now 400,000. Backcountry usage has increased by 100 percent in four years and is now over 43,000 nights each year. The visitor season is lengthening each year and many of our visitors are coming from other countries. The first permanent facilities since the park was established in 1964 are now being completed.

Staff needed to provide for visitor use and enjoyment and to take care of the resources and park facilities, especially seasonal employees, are getting fewer in number while demands (visitation) on the resources and park personnel increases.

The maintenance division no longer can afford seasonal employees and must utilize higher-graded heavy equipment or motor vehicle operators or maintenance workers to accomplish trash collection and restroom cleaning, which must be done for much of the year on at least a daily basis, at the expense of needed road, trail, and facility maintenance projects.

Interpretative programs other than operating visitor information centers would be virtually non-existent if not for volunteers from the Student Conservation Association. In 1992, 43 evening programs in one district were cancelled because of a lack of personnel to keep the visitor center open during normal hours. In 1993, the visitor centers will be open and limited numbers of short talks and evening programs will be given, but all guided walks have been eliminated.

Ranger operations have been seriously reduced through the years, which has primarily affected seasonal ranger presence in the backcountry and on the rivers. This has reduced concession evaluations for river companies and protection for the park's natural and cultural resources throughout the park. Without ARPA funding, backcountry ranger presence would be virtually non-existent.

Ranger: What programs and/or operations will be reduced in FY 93? Why?

Castleberry: Cutbacks will include reductions, personnel freezes, and delays in filling needed positions. Equipment purchases will be deferred or eliminated, visitor hours to select public facilities will be reduced, and seasonal hiring will be reduced.

Bell: The ruins preservation crew will not be getting any park ONPS support this year and instead will rely on project funding and working for other agencies in order to maintain operations. However, with project funding cut significantly and with funding tight in our sister agencies, we expect a significantly shortened season for this crew. Our concern is to keep the crew together. These are highly-trained and experienced specialists who on the average have over two decades of experience each. It would take a long time and be very expensive to rebuild the crew. We're also delaying the ruins preservation apprenticeship program due to the loss of project funding.

The chief ranger's position, which has already been vacant for about a year, will be left vacant. One seasonal interpreter position was cut from the park budget — one-fourth of the visitor service seasonal's the park usually hires. The real need, however, is for three seasonal interpreters (in addition to the one lapsed) and one seasonal maintenance position to meet the needs of increasing visitation and a lengthening season of use.

The budget for park travel, training and supplies will have a significant shortfall — about $19,000 — this year.

Karraker: As noted above, the main park road will be closed for three months. No seasonal interpretive or maintenance employees will be hired. Visitor center hours will be cut back in both the morning and evening; because the interpretive division has only 1.8 personnel, it will be necessary to close the building on occasion of illness or mandatory training. Some mandatory training will be deferred and travel to region will be severely restricted. Only basic services will be covered for park equipment. And there will be serious shortages in allocations for supplies and materials.

Dabney: Canyonlands received a net base increase of $17,700 in FY 93; this, however, was not adequate to cover pay cost increases of $61,600, other pay cost increases (promotions, new radio tech position) of $65,500, and new service contract (pump vault toilets) costs of $35,800. In order to maintain the same level of operations provided in FY 92, even though some functions were below standard, the park needed an increase of $180,100. To meet the shortfall of $162,400, the following reductions have been implemented:

Ranger activities lost 1.6 seasonal FTEs, resulting in one less seasonal in the River, Needles and Island in the Sky districts. Concessions evaluations will be reduced from three to two, and river patrols will be reduced by 25 percent. Assistance at the Needles and Island District visitor centers will be reduced. White Rim patrols will be reduced from seven to five days. Frontcountry patrols will be conducted during business hours only; Needles backcountry vehicle patrols will be reduced by 20 percent.
The appointment for the biological technician has been reduced by seven pay periods. This employee supervises the long-term monitoring program, analyzes the data, handles collecting and research permits, and assists the research biologist with field studies. Analysis of data will not be completed, reports will not be written, and processing of collecting permits will be delayed.

There will be no seasonal positions in maintenance to perform the lower-graded work. WG-10 and WG-8 permanent employees will be required to pick up trash and clean toilets; roads and facilities maintenance will be neglected.

The one-time opportunity to census the Maze bighorn sheep has been lost; the remaining cost of the count in FY 93 will be covered by research initiative funds. If money for the bighorn count is not restored in future years, the loss of information will be significant. Radio transmitters attached to sheep in 1992 will cease to transmit within 1.5 years. Laboratory analysis of natural and cultural material has been eliminated. This loss will seriously handicap the archaeologist and research biologist, who cannot complete their work without laboratory analysis.

During a recent maintenance reorganization, the WS-10 general foreman position was recognized as excess and was therefore abolished after the incumbent transferred in December. The vehicle used by the person in that position has been returned to GSA. If the funding for the position had not been cut, it could have been utilized to hire a maintenance seasonal and fill a WG-8 maintenance worker position in the Needles district. That position has been vacant for almost two years due to lack of funds. During that time, significant additional facilities were added, and more are coming.

The GS-13 assistant superintendent position has also been eliminated.

Farabee: There'll be a general, all-around belt tightening. The one "complete" program being cut is our six-week YCC program with six kids and a supervisor.

K. Wade: Five of six seasonal field rangers (law enforcement and general) will be eliminated this summer season. ONPS funding shortfalls have steadily eliminated seasonal rangers since 1982, when there were 12 in the park. The summer interpretive program has been funded in the past by using lapses from permanent positions. With current funding and no lapses anticipated, The headquarters visitor center will only be open five days a week during July and August. This will be possible only by extending the two month furlough of the interpretive specialist to four months. The park’s environmental education and outreach programs, which she was doing in the off-months, will be eliminated.

B. Wade: One campground (185 sites) will remain closed all year. One campground (228 sites) will be delayed in opening from March
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**Shenandoah National Park**

**MMS Identified Maintenance Backlog**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Deferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equipment Replacement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seasonal Employment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Seasonal Employees</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to Memorial Day weekend. The Camp Hoover conference center will remain closed all year. Visitor centers and interpretive programs will be scaled back by about ten percent. There will be delays in responding to accidents, problems and emergencies due to reduced staffing. Only about 25 percent of needed trails maintenance will be completed.

Ditmanson: For now, we are not planning any significant modifications beyond the potential for reductions in litter pickup, minor maintenance, patrols, etc. In an attempt to analyze our ability to deal with present levels of visitation — one means of determining our effectiveness — I compared all the NPS areas in New Mexico. This exercise showed that White Sands was going to receive only $1.92 per visitor at proposed 1993 funding levels, lowest in the state and about a third of the next highest figure. Likewise, the ratio of FTEs to visitors was 32,500 visitors per FTE at White Sands, as compared to 9,500 to one at the next closest park. These ratios serve to highlight the fallacy that we can somehow make things better by “reducing services.” In most cases, there are no existing services to reduce.

Amidor: We have practically eliminated regularly scheduled interpretive programs. Only four of the twelve cultural sites within the park are staffed on a daily basis. We have to occasionally close these for lunch breaks, training, meetings, etc. Regularly scheduled interpretive programs are provided at only one site — Mission San Jose.

Flumerty: In FY 93, Olympic’s net budget allocation was increased $91,000, yet our personal service costs alone increased by approximately $450,000. This, combined with increases to overhead costs, put this park $500,000 behind as we began the new fiscal year. That forced us to further slash our already depleted seasonal work force and make other cuts in programming. Olympic was forced to take the following drastic measures to balance the budget:

- five campgrounds will open from July 1st to September 12th only;
- Hurricane Ridge will open only three days per week during the winter season, and all attendant services and interpretation will be curtailed;
- trail crews are reduced from 17 pay periods to 10, trail openings will be delayed, and fewer than 100 miles of trails will be given routine maintenance;
- no interpretive programs will be given at Soleduck and Fairholm campgrounds during open season;
- seasonal visitor protection staff will be reduced, thereby negatively impacting our response time to emergencies and provision of other visitor services;
- fee collection will be reduced from last year’s levels; and
- air quality monitoring will be scaled back.

Poe: No high school summer aides will be hired to assist the maintenance crew with litter, roadside maintenance and janitorial services. There will be no interpreters assigned to interpretive patrols, attended stations, step-on tours, or special interpretive programs. With only three protection rangers for the park, there will be reduced backcountry patrols, monitoring of archeological sites, boundary patrols, and time for resource management projects. Permanent maintenance staff will be assigned more routine cleaning, trash pick-up and custodial services; routine preventive maintenance on buildings, utilities, trails and roads will be deferred.

Grovert: Programs related to resource protection and visitor enjoyment will be reduced. Programs related to trails, social science and historic preservation will be eliminated, assistance with the museum collection will be eliminated, and some basic maintenance work will not be accomplished. These programs were eliminated strictly because of funding.

Webb: As of this writing, we are unclear if there will be any specific programs cut for FY 93. While we have not programmed as many seasonal employees as last year, these do not necessarily represent specific programs, rather a diminishing of many.

MacLeod: Earthworks maintenance will be reduced because there is no money to pay for seasonal.

Ranger: What programs and/or operations will be increased in FY 93? Why? How will the increases be funded?

Poe: Outside of the scheduled FY 93 cyclic/rehab projects, we are not planning any new program increases.

Morrise: There will be no increases in anything in FY 93. We are in the process of breaking out a separate resource management division and I’d hoped to give this new program a little shot in the arm. That isn’t going to happen. The infant division will barely limp along with salaries, soft money and a prayer.

Grovert: The only program we are anticipating an increase in is in the HUDAT program, which is a Servicewide initiative.

Bell: We are not now planning to increase any park operations this year. We were planning to start a park archive in partnership with the University of New Mexico, but that is on hold pending available funding. We are, however, continuing with the staff work to complete the formal agreement. I have been trying for the last two years to increase the park interpretation program, but with no discretionary funds and no additional funds that has been impossible.

MacLeod: Nothing.

Budget Survey

The superintendents who responded to the budget questionnaire were asked to provide some figures to indicate their overall operational budgetary situation. Most replied, but some either did not have the time to complete the table or lacked the requisite information. Others provided what figures they could although they were unable to fill in all the blanks. The numbers provided by those who did respond appear on the opposite page. Footnotes appear below the table.

The categories and their meanings are as follows:

- **Total ONPS** — Total base and soft funds appropriated for the park.
- **Dedicated Funds** — Total soft funds; that is, funds dedicated for a particular purpose that the superintendent can not reallocate elsewhere, such as cyclic maintenance, repair and rehab, drug interdiction, inventory and monitoring, etc.
- **Fixed Costs** — Funds which are committed for services, salaries, utilities and other fixed expenditures.
- **Legal/Mandatory Costs** — Funds which must be expended to meet obligations required by law or policy.
- **Discretionary** — Those funds remaining after dedicated funds, mandatory costs, and fixed costs are subtracted from total ONPS.
- **ONPS Required** — The minimum amount that the superintendent feels is required for ONPS in the park.
- **Difference** — The difference — shortfall or excess — between total ONPS and ONPS required.

All figures are in thousands. Not all calculations add up, because figures were rounded. In some cases, superintendents had varying interpretations of individual categories and calculated figures in slightly different manners. The key figures — “discretionary” funds and ONPS required — are in all cases comparable, however.

Continued on page 18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$6,196</td>
<td>$6,764</td>
<td>$6,999</td>
<td>Arches</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$872</td>
<td>$1,511</td>
<td>$1,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>6,416</td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>337*</td>
<td>348*</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONPS Required**</td>
<td>7,557</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,537</td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>-1,451</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-1,361</td>
<td>-1,486</td>
<td>-1,538</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>-301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$1,448</td>
<td>$1,698</td>
<td>$1,434</td>
<td>Wrangell-St. Elias</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$8,700</td>
<td>$8,603</td>
<td>$7,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>1,698</td>
<td>1,434</td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-2,970</td>
<td>-2,622</td>
<td>-2,716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Sands</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$635</td>
<td>$643</td>
<td>Grand Teton</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$8,077</td>
<td>$8,603</td>
<td>$7,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>2,641</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>4,821</td>
<td>4,760</td>
<td>4,850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,110^</td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-467</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1,023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$6,047</td>
<td>$7,149</td>
<td>$6,912</td>
<td>Chaco</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$1,051</td>
<td>$988</td>
<td>$1,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Gap</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>1,707</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>150±</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>3,861</td>
<td>4,309</td>
<td>4,891</td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,042</td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2,130**</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capulin</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$313</td>
<td>$354</td>
<td>$359‡</td>
<td>Crater Lake</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$2,538</td>
<td>$2,887</td>
<td>$2,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volcano</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>2,538</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-51</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$1,394</td>
<td>$1,551</td>
<td>$1,769</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Total ONPS</td>
<td>$792</td>
<td>$1,123</td>
<td>$1,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>Dedicated Funds</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>Fixed Costs</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mandatory Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>1,573</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>ONPS Required</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-179</td>
<td>-195</td>
<td>-283</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**These figures are $311K and $296K respectively in 1991 dollars, less 3.7% pay increase and 4% inflation each year.

** Figures does not include deferred maintenance, equipment replacement backlog, etc.

^ This figure was derived as a result of the FY 94 budget proposal exercise along with some local staff estimates. It is not the result of any formal planning exercise.

^^ This is the minimum needed with the level of programs that are currently in progress. Another $1.5 million would be needed to make us relatively whole.

‡ We are about $20,000 short right now and have no money for interpretation or maintenance seasonals. Personal services run to 95%. Pay and uniform increases cost $11,000, but we received only a $5,000 increase.

† It's almost impossible to redefine past year dollars as to legal/mandatory.

We've included in fixed costs those items that must be paid, such as utilities, salaries, operational supplies. These are ball park figures. They are extracted from 10-561 data which represents the beginning of the year program estimates. It would not be appropriate to call the balances listed under the fifth item “Discretionary”, as these represent a large list of items, such as travel, optional supplies, needed equipment, and GSA vehicle rentals—all of which could be defined as discretionary only if severe cuts forced us to pay only personal services and utilities.

$x We do not yet know what we will be getting this year.
Webs: There are a couple of programs being considered for increases based on identified needs. These include increased visitor services at visitor centers and various contact points throughout the park. This emphasis is based on an identified need to provide the visitor a first-hand information and an orientation to the park.

B. Wade: The natural resources and sciences division will receive an additional increase of $78,000 as the second increment of the inventory and monitoring program base increase (Shenandoah is one of the four pilot I&M program parks). An initial increment base increase of $290,000 was received in FY 92. No other increases are planned.

The other need identified for increase is the establishment of a cultural resource specialist position to deal with a vast resource of cultural and historic features in the park. This position will serve an identified need to catalog, inventory, begin maintenance on and complete documentation of park resources, and perform monitoring and compliance tasks associated with park projects.

Funds for these activities are being taken from current lapses and various program elements in the park identified as lesser priorities.

K. Wade: No programs will be increased in FY 93.

Ditmanson: No programs or other functions will be increased this year.

Farabee: We have a marine debris monitoring program that will increase in '93. We have shown to WASO and EPA that our method of surveying is far more accurate and beneficial to the effort than those which other parks have done. Because we have such a serious, almost mountainous, problem with garbage washing ashore, Padre Island has taken it much more seriously than others. We have also gotten EPA's ear.

Hart: Except for projects funded out of other than ONPS with "soft" money, we will not be increasing any programs at Theodore Roosevelt this year.

Amador: There will be an increase in some activities as a result of park development strategies. Resource protection operations are increasing as a result of increased vandalism in the park, primarily due to increased gang activity. We have experienced a 100% increase in vandalism to government-owned property... Maintenance operations will see a dramatic increase (because) a recently completed MOU with the Federal Bureau of Prisons will result in significant inmate labor available for the park...

All programs and/or operational workload increases for FY 93 will be funded at the expense of other programs, as no base increase was allotted in FY 93.

Ranger: What Servicewide budgeting strategies would help to resolve operational problems?

Castelberry: We simply need more funding. Extreme measures might be to consider closing or reducing some central office functions or offices, but savings would not be realized for several years.

Finnerty: The National Park Service needs to have a well orchestrated and agreed upon budget strategy — from the top down.

Our Servicewide operating base has got to be increased. There has to be a commitment to stop playing the "line item/park barrel" game — everyone in competition instead of pulling together for the good of the system and the Service.

Special initiative money is great, but it is only part of the equation — and these special pots of money which come down each year make it very difficult to effectively manage on a program basis. The administration is to be congratulated, however, for pushing the infrastructure initiative, which ties park needs to jobs and economic stimulus. And if park bases are increased, it will enable parks to more effectively use special initiative money totally for the purposes for which they are intended.

Central offices (WASO and the regions) have got to be adequately funded or consolidated and downsized. They also need to adhere to a fixed budget rather than assess parks for their shortfalls. Parks cut seasonal employees, permanently lapse positions, close facilities, curtail seasons, and defer maintenance in order to make ends meet. We're at the bottom of the barrel, and can't turn to anyone else to bail us out.

Repair/rehab, cyclic, and equipment replacement funds have got to be substantially increased, then used for the purposes for which they are appropriated. These pots of money are continually violated to pay for central offices, other shortfalls and emergencies. The result is that the field falls farther behind.

Pay increases, the complete cost of FERS, and administrative costs associated with new requirements (mandatory training of all descriptions, new requirements for law enforcement, hazardous materials, etc.) need to be included in all budget requests. A percentage for "program administration" must be part of all special monies requested -- none of these programs are "free rides." Implementation requires that park personnel, procurement, and budget offices be stretched to the limit. Equipment is wearing out and must be replaced. Even the most dedicated employees will (and do) suffer morale problems under such working conditions.

At Olympic, we have initiated a strategic planning process; all budget needs and allocations will be tied to it. The NPS would be well served by a strategic plan which is linked to budget requirements and needs.

B. Wade: We need a better system for setting priorities among all operational programs in the NPS so that the higher Servicewide priorities get funded each year. The "base plus" rationale and justification process results in inequity in allocations among parks in terms of comparative importance of priority. Additionally, the process of setting priorities for construction funding must be improved to reflect true priorities for construction and the priority for construction in relation to operational funding.

I also believe we would be more effective if we had the authority to charge actual costs of collecting fees to a fee account separate from ONPS. This would eliminate the "dissincentive" to collect fees when those expenses have to compete with other operational priorities for a more and more limited discretionary budget.

Webb: Park budgets need to be earmarked for park operations. All pay increases should be funded. Otherwise, erosion occurs that is never made up. Regional and Washington offices need to receive their own increases and dispense with assessing parks.

The law enacting supplemental fee appropriations needs to be reviewed to restore additional funds to park bases, based on the formulas originally devised. These funds would have more than provided the opportunity for parks to continue programs implemented and possibly allowed for periodic improvements to infrastructure needs and other programs.

MacLeod: There are several strategies:

- Fewer pots of money or a better accounting system. When I fund FTEs with soft money, it is difficult to obtain a whole park budget picture.
- Exercises similar to this to make parks and regions see the problem and be accountable themselves.
- Ability to reprogram portions of large construction project dollars.
- More knowledgeable regional and WASO staff to discern wheat from chaff in all budget proposals.

Amador: Perhaps the best strategy would be to establish clear priorities and identify the consequences of meeting those priorities. The public and Congressional delegations would need to be educated as to what effect budget allocations have on the Service's ability to provide for resource protection and visitor services.

Poe: The establishment of new parks without increases in appropriations is a major drain on the parks. Every time the NPS or our friends respond to new park legislation or expansion proposals, we need to submit a chart to Congress on how much it will cost to bring the park up to Service standards with new development and rehab of existing facilities, how much to staff the park, and the amount of "other" funds that are necessary for vehicle

Continued on page 20
The Budget Dilemma: Two Regional Perspectives

Two respondents to the questionnaire offered regional perspectives on the Service’s budget problems—John Cook, the regional director from the Southwest Region, who wrote the first of the following pieces, and Rick Smith, the associate regional director for resource management in the Southwest, who wrote the second.

The Challenge of Change

On November 3, 1992, the American people spoke, and the message was change. Are we in the National Park Service really capable of change? I hope so!

As we watched the Chinese dragon dance in the Wall Street trading pit, the savings and loan debacle and the ever-rising national debt, even the thickest of heads had to realize that change was coming.

Interestingly enough, NPS managers have been writing and talking about budget shortfalls, strategies, even even and doom, ever since the beginning. Boss Pinkley, the general superintendent of the Southwest monuments, complained slightly in 1936 when his budget was “assessed” to create the position he now occupies, but Pinkley also admonished his troops to be innovative and to realize that the new entity in the Southwest called a regional office would serve not only to help all the regional parks but also serve as a buffer between Washington demands and the superintendents.

When I was asked to pen a few words regarding the budget situation, I had to think what message I really wanted to get across. I looked at the questionnaire and figured that, with the candid answers you would get from Rick Smith, Larry Belli and others in the Southwest, readers would get a pretty clear picture of our financial predicaments.

So let me pen three short thoughts:

• Regional offices are essential—too little understood, but essential.

• The Service desperately needs to come together as a team and develop a real budget strategy.

• We must support that strategy and campaign for change.

First, the issue of regional offices. We all know that regional offices are not sexy subjects. There are no resources to protect or interpret, no ribbons to cut, and, with only a couple of exceptions, they are not located to be “inspirational.”

Friends, the lion’s share of the units of the system are “postage stamp” sized in terms of budgets and FTEs, particularly when compared to the giants such as Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, Yosemite and Great Smoky Mountains. It takes central offices to provide the technical and professional support that even five or six of these small areas together could not afford—engineers, architects, historians, biologists, etc. Ask Superintendent Reed Detring of El Morro if he needs regional office support.

And, believe it or not, regional offices serve as buffers for ever-increasing information and data demands. Rick Smith once told me that as a superintendent he really did appreciate the buffering provided by the region. That also leads me to the point that part of the fiscal plight of regional offices comes from the fact that they have had to absorb more and more “add-on” programs without funding, and, generally speaking, have attempted to do so without impacting or minimally impacting the parks.

Regional offices exist to help parks. And they do! They are also staffed with people every bit as much committed to the mission as park-based employees.

We must come together and develop a strategy. But the first desperate need is to quit sniping at one another! Lord, how we carry on, poor mouthing the Washington office, regions, non-traditional units, etc. We are often our own worst enemy.

I’ve been climbing the budget mountain for years. I not only want to get to the top, I want to see the other side.

If we were a private corporation trading openly in the market place, would we be paying dividends or would we be seeking Chapter 11? Ask yourselves and answer honestly.

As I listened to Mike Finley, Dick Ring and Dave Mihalic talking to Director Rideour last December in Santa Fe, I heard a commonality of problems and a plea to come together and solve them.

I guess my final message is that we do know there are real budget shortfalls. The question is this: Are we courageous enough to shed our selfish, protective-of-our-pet-program shells, and develop an honest answer to our political leadership and constituents? If so, can we then change, come together, and sell those needs as one National Park System, rather than 360 plus?

I think so!

The Crisis in Regional Offices

While many ANPR members recognize the budget problems facing our parks, few are aware of the crisis that exists in regional and other central offices. Let’s look at the Southwest Region as an example of a place where steps have been taken to ward off financial disaster.

On October 1st, we began lapsing vacant positions not specifically tied to a project for six months. This six-month lapse applies to all positions in the regional office, including associate regional directors and division chiefs. When the six-month period is up, each position will be scrutinized by the position management review board to determine whether filling it best accomplishes regional goals and objectives, or whether the FTE should be allocated elsewhere.

In addition, those who do not have access to project dollars are limited to three percent above our salaries and other fixed costs for travel. This is already one of our most difficult challenges. As of January, my three percent was essentially gone, and I’m going to have to do most of my coordination with parks and my colleagues in other regions by phone and fax. Many regional office personnel will likely have to do the same.

We also made recommendations to the regional director that we adopt the following:

• Institute the six-month lapse procedure and adhere to it. If this is a normal year, we could have a six-percent lapse rate. This money will not be returned to the division in which the lapse occurs, but will instead aggregate in the comptroller’s office for use for regional purposes.

• Assess parks with budgets of from $1 million to $2 million one percent, and parks with budgets over $2 million two percent to cover additional shortages.

• Institute an eight percent facilitating fee to cover the cost of administering funds that come from various program offices in Washington or elsewhere.

Staving off financial disaster does not imply that we fixed the problems that are causing our budget woes. I see the genesis of our fiscal problems in the regional office in four areas.

The first pertains to funding. It is common knowledge that the Congress and our executive branch leaders are not very sympathetic to central office functions. It has been some time since regional offices have been allowed to seek base funding increases. The increases that we have received have come through program/project funding, such as NASI, the collections initiative, LCS (Listing of Classified Structures) updates, and the I&M initiative. Obviously, we cannot do what we are required to do without hiring people to do the work. When a project ends, we are left with highly trained employees, many of whom we would like to keep. This brings us to the next issue.

We have converted too many people to permanent positions without base funds to support their salaries. I attribute this in part to a certain lack of discipline on our parts. It also is the result of an ever-expanding workload. Take the LCS project. Even though the funding of the project will end, our responsibilities for the care and feeding of the structure will not. Moreover, the very people and institutions unsympathetic to funding regional offices do not hesitate to add to our responsibilities. They pass laws, issue policy guidelines and develop regulations, all of which put pressure on the regions to hire additional people.

A third issue concerns support to parks. Southwest Region is unique in the sense that we have many small parks in which it would be fiscally irresponsible to place highly trained specialists to carry out the planning and natural and cultural resource management activities that such parks require. In our region, we place such specialists in the regional office so that we can serve all these parks. This fact tends to put upward pressure on the staffing in the regional offices.

Continued on page 38
rental, supplies, utilities, administration, etc.
The questions must be asked again and again:
"Can we afford this park?", and, "Where will
the operating dollars come from?"

Hart: As we look at the staggering deficit and
the almost certain further downsizing of gov-
ernment over the next few years, I think that
would at least be on the right track. Con-
SIDER the vicious circle created by regional
assessments to create a pool of funds to address
park crises created by regional assessments.

Most of all, we need to keep all but the
most significant areas out of the system.

Ditmanson: Short of restructuring the entire
federal budget, it seems to me that if the cen-
tral offices - WASO and the regions - were
forced to live within established budget limits,
then ending the various "assessments," etc.,
we would at least be on the right track. Con-
SIDER the vicious circle created by regional
assessments to create a pool of funds to address
park crises created by regional assessments.

Bell: This is a tough one. I don't think more
publicity on the financial plight of the parks
will help. While it shouldn't stop, it's been
done a lot and won't provide much additional
benefit in getting things done. Stopping it,
however, could hurt by giving the impression
that the issue has gone away. I guess my first
suggestion would be to continue the press
coverage at its current level, but don't count
on it to get the job done.

I'll bet the Administration, and, to a lesser
extent, Congress will have a vested interest in
using the normal budget process more to end
gridlock and make the government work.
We should get in front of that curve.

The biggest thing to help would be to have
the new Director sell key members of the Ad-
ministration and Congressional leadership, es-
pecially the Democratic leadership, on the
need to change the way they do business with
the National Park Service.

The new way of doing business should be
strong support for the formal budget process
and to pay as you go for add-ons. The Service,
or, better yet, the Secretary, should state a pol-
cy that new studies and authorized new units
will not be brought on line - i.e., not spend
any discretionary funds or do any kind of
start-up - without line item funds attached.

During this emergency, the Service policy,
supported by resolve and action, should be to
use discretionary funds only on core functions
and to review operations and restructure for
more efficiency - better productivity, getting
rid of some in-house requirements that hurt us
financially, and get rid of operations that
aren't tied to the mission of the Service and/or
don't produce benefits in relation to the costs
incurred. Kind of sounds like the Vail agenda,
although that may no longer be a politically
correct term.

In addition to selling this program outside the
Service, there has to be a large, in-house
program to reimplement the budget process.
One step would be to not countenance anyone
going around the system by taking severe ad-
ministrative action against any park manager
going around the system for any add-ons. It
would only take a few heads rolling and/or re-
taliation in curtailing soft funds to get the
message across. We should also sell it by
using all discretionary funds to begin making the
system work to show people it is working,
beginning by funding projects on long forgot-
ten and ignored priority lists. We should make
the system start working again.

An environmental group like NPCA could
also reinstitute the Golden Fleece award given by
Senator Proxmire to highlight frivolous,
destructive or meaningless add-ons in order to
bring public ridicule on the heads of Con-
gressmen and park managers who don't play
the game.

If the concept of making the budget process
work doesn't fly - i.e., if Congress doesn't re-
ALIZE they need to change the way they do
business - we should consider taking whole
parks off-line. Implement the concept of doing
some things well, while letting some things
wait for the future when adequate resources
are available and preserving all park resources
for the future. Don't bring new parks on-line
until they are adequately funded without im-
pacting other parks in the system. Since most
of our costs relate to visitor services, we could
"mothball" parks by leaving a skeleton care-
taker crew at the site to preserve resources and
existing facilities, but provide neither visitor
services nor open them to the public.

I doubt this would fly, but it sure would get
attention. Moreover, mothballing some places
like Steamtown could lead to some large dollar
savings. This is of course a high-risk scenario.

Karraker: We need to educate Congress that
we do not get fee monies back. It's a big
paper exercise for us to put it in budgets and
then have it assessed back out.

K. Wade: First of all, there is a basic truth:
We can not continue to do the job with an
overall NPS operating base pie that is inade-
quate. The size of the pie has to be increased
or we simply must stop doing some of the
things that we are currently trying to do. The
leadership should be proactive in assisting
park management in determining what we
simply cannot afford to do any longer.

Secondly, we cannot continue to base our
budgets on special initiative funding which
creates inflexibilities that keep the park man-
ger from treating his or her highest priorities.
We have got to do bottom-up budgeting based
on clear direction of what we are trying to
achieve overall. The "theme of the year" ap-
proach is not working. Some themes do not
address the important needs of some parks.
Theme emphasis, if control is held in Wash-
ington or region, can throw park programs out
of balance and ultimately off course. There
are shortfalls everywhere. Using the initiative
approach is creating a system of "have" and
"have not" parks,

I happen to believe that we should all be
one big team to figure out what is best for the
system as a whole. What we have turned into is
a system of piranhas and the food source is
supporting fewer and fewer fish. "Me, me,
me" is the theme of the day, instead of "us, us,
us." What incentive is there for a manager to
try to reallocate resources for the highest and
best good when it is very unlikely that anyone
else will agree to do the same within a system
which is seriously flawed?

Thirdly, Servicewide funding as a source of
park funding is a mixed blessing, and should
be looked at closely. It may be doing more
harm than good.

Program managers at the Washington level
control very large pots of money which they
do not have strings attached in order to
control. It is control of how that money gets
spent. At the same time, parks are going broke
because they have no money to manage. In
our organization, money is power. The power
is now mostly at the Washington or regional
level. What these people strive for is control,
which they can never truly have. What they
don't seem to realize is that there are effective
ways to assure wise use of funding without
completely tying local managers hands. They
either don't have effective systems to analyze
what is happening with the money, or they
don't know how to use those system.

If they are reviewing budget documents,
they may not realize that centralized account-
ing is not always indicative of where money is
really being spent. Appropriate accounting
systems at the local level may not be adequate
at some other level to assure adequate over-
sight. Current accounting practices also do not
allow for a complete understanding of the
Washington/regional level of why money was
spent in a particular way at field level. These
levels also may be so far removed that they do
not recognize or understand that when opera-
tional budgets are tight, budget priorities have
to at a minimum assure resource protection

Lastly, there is no comprehensive budget
and finance training in the National Park Ser-
vice. What there is is mostly in the classic ap-
proach, which is obviously not working. That
classic approach is a top-down approach in
which the top dictates what happens at the
bottom. How can we ever expect creative, ef-
fective management and cost savings to occur
in such a system?
Grovert: Every dollar that does not go directly to parks should be evaluated as to the purpose for which it is being spent, how much direct good for parks it is doing, and whether or not it is directly related to keeping parks in good condition. In a park, no program is safe from reduction. All programs, offices, etc., that are not in parks or directly related to parks should be looked at first for reduction before budgets are cut back in parks.

Another fallacy that should be looked at is the assumption that parks can fiscally absorb the effects of changes in policy, regulations and so forth with no effect to their programs. Any change in the workload for parks costs money. Although they are needed, two examples are the changes brought about by the new physical fitness guidelines and background investigations. Background investigations for this park alone can now run over $120,000. We will have to absorb this at the cost of cutting patrols, positions, equipment, etc. There are similar examples on every division in the park that is faced with changes in regulations or policy.

Let's be honest about the fee program and accept the fact that it's a paperwork exercise that essentially lowers your base ONPS level. Without a substantial increase in funding, which doesn't appear on the horizon, the NPS is going to have to start prioritizing the funding for parks, and determine if we're going to fund all parks at the same level. We are no longer able to give equal consideration to all areas within the system. We are going to have to start looking at visitation, incidents, resource degradation and similar criteria and set some standards for true national significance within the agency.

There's no question in my mind that we are going to have to take a hard look at money that we are spending on other areas that are not NPS areas.

Ranger: Under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the Interior and Related Agencies budget must fit within the cap established by the budget resolution. A dollar budgeted for construction or a study of potential new areas is therefore a dollar that is unavailable for ONPS. Under the provisions of the same act, Congress must vote to suspend the act before they can approve any non-emergency supplemental. That makes future supplementals highly unlikely. Within the Service's total budget, then, what expenditures would you prefer to eliminate to increase operational funds?

Finnerty: I think we need to take a look at all the non-park based programs. I recognize that NPS has many mandates that require us to work outside of park boundaries, so we can't eliminate all external thrusts. But we are also mandated to protect park resources and serve the visitor, and these requirements are getting tremendously short changed.

We also need to look at the cost of overhead to the organization. Corporations nationwide are downsizing and eliminating upper and middle management positions. Do we need every position in the Washington Office, which is bigger now than it was ten years ago? Do we really need ten regions, or a Denver Service Center with nearly 700 employees? Parks, too, need to look at upper management and division level organizations.

Morris: We all understand the Budget Enforcement Act of '90. Unfortunately, until there is a collective understanding in DOI and [among] the budget people on the Hill, each park will continue to fight for a bigger share of the pie. If we don't make our pitches, someone else will. And, of course, there is the "thinning of the blood" problem... Hopefully, our new leadership in the Secretary's office will recognize and more forcefully address these issues. We are in very deep trouble if they don't.

We all see things best from the seat we currently sit in. I am reluctant to complain that we spend too much in regions, WASO, the Denver Service Center, etc. The folks that I know personally, especially in PNR, are acutely aware of our problems in the field and supportive of our efforts. I don't see a lot of fat, at least in the Pacific Northwest Region.

Belli: I don't know enough details about the NPS budget to give any strong opinions. The obvious areas to cut, areas where we could reap enough money to make a difference, like western Pennsylvania or Steamtown, are very political, as are most of the special studies and construction projects. In the present climate, cutting these is not realistic. What we are going to have to do is get our "benefactors" to give us these funds through another source, such as a Defense Department allocation or another agency with a higher ceiling. I'll be surprised if Congress and the Administration bust the budget ceilings any time soon.

K. Wade: Most programs we carry out in the Park Service are very valuable. But with a pie that is not big enough to go around, the leadership of the agency has got to, at a minimum, assure that basic operations in the parks are being carried out. After all, the business we are in is the business of managing units of the national park system.

We seem to have lost sight of the big picture. Perhaps it is because we have selected people for management positions with high credentials who do not have that big picture. It isn't the technically competent who can overhaul the current mess - it's people who have leadership qualities who can help us set a credible, defensible agenda and establish priorities in a time of crisis. It's a partnership between leaders from administration and leaders from management that will help us find the light. I want the alliance to be the top priority of the next Director and Secretary of Interior.

B. Wade: I don't think the issue is so much one of eliminating expenditures as it is one of needing a better process of priority-setting. I don't think we should approach it with the idea of eliminating some total activity, or some portion of one. We just need to be better able to set priorities and to communicate them to Congress. We need to manage priorities, not budgets.

Grovert: Develop a sense of what we really are and eliminate those that do not contribute to the national mission (Kennedy Center, Heritage Corridors and Commissions). Construction should come off the Service's priority list as long as the Service stays with the priorities that have been placed. As soon as the Service changes priorities, it leaves itself open for others to make the changes for it. New area studies should only be done on those areas that the Service has identified as being worthy for inclusion in the system.

Omega World Travel

The Association has signed an agreement with Omega World Travel, headquartered in Falls Church, Virginia. Omega is one of the top travel companies in the United States and is the largest woman-owned travel agency in the world. All travel booked through Omega will directly benefit the Association, in the form of travel credits for official Association travel or cash rebates to the Association.

Any personal travel (including transportation, car rentals, hotels, cruises, package tours, etc.) by members or their families, friends or acquaintances qualifies under the program.

Reservations for travel, may be made by calling the following Omega branch office:

Omega World Travel
12711 Shops Lane
Fairfax, VA 22033-3834
703/818-8848
800-283-3239
703/818-8822

Hours: 8:30 - 5:30 M-F; 10:00 - 2:00 Sat.

Omega guarantees that they will provide the lowest fare at the time of ticketing, or they will refund double the difference. Further, if a traveler is dissatisfied with any portion of a trip, they will refund 100% of their commissions on that portion of the trip.

Omega will provide ticket delivery via overnight mail, or can provide pre-paid tickets to any airport or airline ticket office. In addition, Omega's 24-hour number (800-Us-Omega), accessible nation- and world-wide, can be used for information or difficulties encountered during travel.
Ditmanson: To be perfectly frank, I'm not sure I understand the total budget package well enough to answer this. It appears that so much of the budget is already earmarked that a really meaningful adjustment is not possible. New area studies and new areas entering the system without accompanying operating dollars are a problem, but one we are apparently going to have to live with. Seems to me it's time to quit fooling the public -- and ourselves -- and to be up front about our inability to keep up at present funding levels. Closing facilities that can no longer be maintained or even closing parks at which services cannot be provided might seem a "scare" tactic to some, but it also seems to me to be an honest approach to meeting the problem.

Amdor: Construction and new areas should not have priority of existing resources under our administrative control. It is questionable to build new facilities or acquire new areas when we can't operate and protect existing resources.

Farabee: We need to get Congress to stop "park barreling" us to death. Let's get rid of some questionable areas. Get operations like Denver Service Center to work on their own appropriations and not assess us 75 to 100 percent surcharges on construction projects. Reduce new area studies.

Webb: If indeed construction dollars and/or new area studies are being traded for ONPS dollars, and these are last minute amendments to provide local constituencies with an influx of dollars as opposed to maintaining what is, then a close look could be made. There are legitimate construction needs to rebuild infrastructure which should take a much higher priority than new construction.

Poe: The thrust for FY 94 and future years must be basic increases for park operations. Increases for park operations are not as "jazzy" as construction projects or new park studies. If parks are going to survive and the resources adequately protected, money must be moved from construction and studies to basic operations. For example, if the extra $92 million that Congress appropriated for new construction above the Administration's request was equally divided among the 367 parks, each would receive $251,000 for operations.

MacLeod: Denver Service Center. I've worked with some of the staff and think they are not worth the cost and that they are not budget conscious at all. The expertise should be in the region, which is more responsive and knowledgeable. However, we should also look at combining some regional offices. There's too much overhead in the NFS. WASO could use some trimming, too, particularly in the external cultural programs.

Hart: ONPS needs the bulk of the funding. When we can't take care of what we've got, it would seem that new area studies and all but critical construction projects should be delayed to support park operations.

Ranger: How much fee money -- recreation fees, special park use fees, other fees -- did you collect in FY 92? How much did it cost to collect those fees? How much money got returned to your park through the budget process or remained in your park in a reimbursable or credited account?

Belli: We programmed $40,700 for fee collection in FY 93 and get back $96,000 in fee funds. These figures have remained roughly the same for the three years I've been at Chaco. This is not a money-making proposition for us, since no matter how you try to describe it for legal purposes, the amount we get in fees is deducted from our ONPS allocation. This is also not as big a hit for Chaco as it may seem. We've streamlined our fee collection practices and incorporated them into our operation so that the only time dedicated strictly to fees is the one day per week when two people are needed to do the remittance and take the money into town. Having the fee accounts allows us to be more efficient money managers and get more real benefit from allocated funds, since these are no-year accounts.

Morr: What really continues to grate us is the fee collection game. We will hit that hard this year -- again. Many people will not pay entrance fees because we can't afford to collect them and not see any benefit accrue to us... the present way of doing business discourages fee collection.

Webb: In FY 92 the park collected a total of $2.4 million in entrance and user fees. It cost approximately $172,000 in FY 92 to collect fees at entrance stations, campgrounds and permit desks. There is no way to tell how much of the fees collected were returned to the park through the budget process. Our understanding of the fee money distribution is that these funds are used in conjunction with regular appropriations and it would be impossible to tell exactly how much actually returns to the park.

The park has managed over the last few years to use fee enhancement accounts to "save" unobligated dollars. Rather than spend these dollars at year's end, which has been the case in the past, expenditures have been journal entered from fee enhancement accounts back to ONPS accounts where balances may have been available.

Ditmanson: Fees collected in FY 92 include $220,122 in entrance fees and $9,686 in special use fees, primarily associated with commercial filming. The cost of collection for entrance fees was $32,900 and $135,000 was returned to the FY 93 budget. All of the special use fees are available locally, but most are used to cover costs of dealing with various permits.

K. Wade: We collected $13,815.71 in special park use fees, none of which was returned to the park. These fees are collected in conjunction with concessions permits to big game guides who operate within the boundaries of the preserve. There are currently 20 guide areas. The costs of operating this program are approximately $30,000 per year. The work is currently being done as a collateral duty assignment of the park's management assistant.

Grover: We collected $321,807. It cost us $228,000 to collect it. The amount remaining in the park was $321,807.

By legislation, the money collected for commercial traffic through the park stays in the park to fund the fee collection operation and maintenance on Route 209. In FY 92, the park supplemented the fee collection and maintenance operation for Route 209 by approximately $200,000, since the money collected covers only the salaries of fee collectors. Money for supervisors, supplies and materials, and maintenance has to come from ONPS funds. There's not enough money collected to pay for what was intended, and the park is required by the legislation to collect the fees.

Poe: We collected $403,000 in fees in FY 92. Our fee enhancement allotment is $251,000 for FY 93.

The American public must learn that our operating budget is not directly tied to the fees we collect. The net sum authorized for Arches for FY 93 is $684,500. The fee enhancement amount is $251,000. This amount is subtracted from $684,500 and our new ONPS operating budget becomes $433,500. Had we collected $600,000 in fees instead of $403,000, our base budget would still remain at $684,500.

Ranger: Members of the appropriations subcommittees often ask a critical question of the NPS: "Over the past few years we have increased your overall budget dramatically; although you continue to tell us that you need still more money, you often can't tell us where previous allocations were spent. Why should we give you more money when you can't tell us what you did with what we gave you?" How would you answer this question if it was posed to you?

Castleberry: This is really not a fair question. We can tell them exactly where the funds were spent. Further, they have not dramatically increased budgets when mitigating factors are considered.

MacLeod: Part of the problem is with us. Our accounting system is terrible. But we can tally the increased personnel costs from FERS, step increases, position upgrades, COLAs, and high-cost area designations. We can describe the more advanced technology required. We can describe the infrastructure life cycle. And we can point out the new projects (parks and otherwise) that we have been asked to assume.

Ditmanson: I share the frustration felt by appropriations committee because I couldn't say
where the money went either. New parks, new programs, this year's "special emphasis", somebody's pet project, hazardous waste, asbestos, etc. – add 'em up and we're still short.

From my perspective, looking at two military neighbors whose budgets are much smaller and somewhat near half of the entire NPS, the problem is that the parks have not been taken seriously enough in the past, and we've not been candid (or perhaps been allowed to) about the real depth of the problem.

Our situation at White Sands could be taken as a microcosm of the entire system in that we have simply not kept up with the growth of visitation and the challenge of really knowing and managing this resource. Our facilities are outdated and undersized. We are understaffed as well as improperly staffed in that the match of the expertise to resource does not reflect our needs. Where is the park archeologist, for instance? Or the geologist, the historic building specialist, the fee collection supervisor, the procurement clerk, the second protection ranger on duty after dark, or the interpreter on roving visitor contact?

Our military neighbors are building block fences to hide chain-link fences and we are unable to complete the boundary fence around the park to protect against trespass livestock, exotic African antelopes, and wayward GI's.

Bell: I wouldn't agree with either premise in that statement. Yes, Congress has given us more funding, but they were making up for large, long-backlogged deficits in basic operating programs which continue to have increasing costs due to inflation and of the legal and administrative requirements that are outstripping the increases they have given us. At the same time, they are also requiring us to use that money in ways not asked for, like absorbing annual pay raises with no reimbursement. Moreover, they do not have their own house in order, and add on too many costly, non-essential programs. We should make a point of saying we are taking steps to reduce all unnecessary administrative costs, then do it.

We need to do a better job of how we explain our budget. We get more bang for our buck and are more efficient because we are decentralized and can move funds around in a park to address the most immediate need of that unit. Each unit can or should be able to say, as closely as any other government agency, how much was spent on specific programs and describe what was accomplished with those funds. I would challenge other agency managers with specific line item program funding to justify that all those funds were spent to benefit a specific program in a way that isn't wasteful.

The implicit aim of those who claim we can't exactly say where the funds go seems to me to be program managers and others who want earmarked funds to go to their pet specific projects and do away with the general ONPS funding process. I would oppose that concept and see it as a step backwards. It even goes against the current business management and governmental trends from private industry and other countries who are decentralizing and giving more authority to line managers at lower and lower levels.

In the present budget climate, some programs would be fat and others would go begging under the program funding concept. The politically connected managers would win, and those that aren't would lose. This would not at all be related to the Service's fulfillment of its mission.

K. Wade: We can account for all budget increases at the park level and tell any member of Congress specifically what we did with every cent.

Hart: We can tell them what we did with what was given. However, it often is not a clean and simplistic answer. We get an operational increase for a partial fix to a situation and at the same time have to cover part of the pay increase and the percentage of FERS employees' increases, thereby wiping out part of the overall increase. If we use the increase as intended, something else has to go. It is often easier to lose that which you do not yet have than to cut something else that is essential and has been in place for some time.

Webb: First, it would have to be identified where these funds were actually allocated. Discussing expenditures at gross national level would be an impossibility to respond at the field level. It is probably true that we cannot tell where money was spent. It has never been required to provide a "year-end" review and compare that to what was been asked for. Obviously, if we bring this up, it will mean more accountability from all quarters and obviously worth more in tracking.

B. Wade: This is not an issue in Shenandoah. We can tell them where our expenditures have gone, where we need more and why.

Farahbe: For my park, I can tell them where our money was spent. The Service answer has to be that our "product," like that of many government agencies, can't be measured accurately or quantified. How do you measure the worth of a kid seeing his first grizzly or deer? How do you replace or capture the pride you have when you stand at the Statue of Liberty?

Finnerty: Speaking as the superintendent of Olympic National Park, I can account for every dollar appropriated to the park. Although the dollar amount for Olympic has increased over the last several years, I would not call it "dramatically." I can also state, unequivocally, the amount that has actually reached us has not been sufficient to cover basic operational needs. NPS leadership has not adequately addressed the need of field operations, and park managers have not been properly schooled to analyze and articulate their requirements or effectively expend their dollars. Nor have we been held accountable for our budget actions.

Some examples of the erosion to park budgets are as follows: inadequate dollars to cover pay increases; inadequate dollars to cover FERS costs; no money appropriated to cover new mandatory training requirements; regional and Washington Office assessments, which effect both "base dollars" and special accounts.

An example of the latter: In FY 92, a permanent two percent regional assessment equaling $150,000 was imposed. Olympic usually receives over $200,000 in annual repair/rehab; in FY 93, we received nothing. While no new assessments were leveled on this park by region this fiscal year, the zeroing out of repair/rehab was certainly an assessment.

Amidor: It is difficult to believe that the Service cannot clearly show how previous operational increases have been spent. The budget increases that have been received for ranger activities at San Antonio Mission have been consumed by reallocation to higher priorities in the park, absorption of annual classified pay increases, and increases due to more FERS vs. CSRS employees.

Grovert: It is my job to be able to tell the regional director where we are spending our money. At Delaware Water Gap, we have very specific yearly goals that quantify our day-to-day operations in all divisions. Each division has structured goals, as well as projects that they will be trying to accomplish. These goals are translated into personnel needs, equipment and supply needs, travel and training needs, and so forth. I'm then able to go over these goals at any time to determine the level of completion, or to set different priorities should it be necessary. I'm also able to describe why something was not completed, and what the money was used for if it went somewhere else.

What I can't tell you right off is what it costs to run an effective patrol operation, or an anti-poaching operation, but we are working on the specifics of that. The other thing I can't tell you is what our successes are worth. How many poaching cases do we prevent? How many cases of vandalism or arson do we prevent? How many children do we impart the value of their national heritage to? What is it worth for a canoeist to be able to canoe down one of the cleanest rivers in the Northwest?

Poe: This is a good question, and the NPS will always suffer until each park and office can simply state what they spent their ONPS dollars on and how much they need to do an adequate job of protecting the resources and providing public services.

The three parks in the Southeast Utah Group – Arches, Natural Bridges and Canyonlands – have developed basic operations plans (BOP) for each division within the parks.

Continued on page 38
New Methods In Wildlife Law Enforcement

Clayton Jordan
Shenandoah

Working in today’s NPS budgetary environment as enforcement program managers, we are forced to carry out our wildlife enforcement efforts with fewer dollars, a reality that usually translates to smaller patrol staffs. At Shenandoah, not unlike many other park areas, park visitors and neighbors have noted a significant decline in the presence of rangers in both frontcountry and backcountry areas. Few would argue that this lack of deterrence will increase an already significant level of illegal hunting activity in our parks.

Though nothing can replace the effectiveness of more patrol rangers—and we should therefore remain energetic in our attempts to improve our numbers—we need to constantly seek ways to improve the effectiveness of each patrol ranger engaged in protecting our resources and to share this information amongst ourselves. The purpose of this article is to share a few ideas which have been recently implemented at Shenandoah and are perhaps known to rangers elsewhere.

These methods are supplementing our list of more conventional (and often more labor-intensive) wildlife enforcement techniques, including vehicle checkpoints, use of taxidermal decoys, regular and plain clothes foot and vehicle patrols and stakeouts, and intelligence gathering through the use of CB scanners, informants, and so forth. The methods and concepts described here pertain to the use of remote surveillance equipment, the development of a custom-designed criminal intelligence database, the use of robotic decoys, and employing “Operation Triggerlock” to assist us with our wildlife cases.

Remote Surveillance Equipment

Traditionally, boundary patrols leading to the apprehension of violators more often than not are a result of rangers fortunately being in the right place at the right time. Although poaching violations in our parks may be relatively common, setting out at any given time to find a poacher during a patrol of a small section of boundary somewhat resembles setting out to find a particular cougar which has not been sighted since last year. Clearly, with fewer rangers to conduct patrols of our boundaries, chance encounters will occur less frequently. We should accordingly expect an increase in illegal activity.

Thanks largely to funding made available through special drug and ARPA accounts, many parks have been purchasing remote surveillance cameras to add to their caches of enforcement tools. When used for drug enforcement operations, these systems are typically used during the marijuana growing season. This presents an opportunity to use this equipment for other purposes during the remainder of the year. For many park areas, wildlife law enforcement is one application well-suited for this equipment. Remote surveillance systems, comprised of video or 35mm cameras activated by passive infra-red sensors, can effectively stakeout a trail while we vegetate in the office, trying to get our latest ADP program to work right.

Besides providing the means for painless 24-hour stakeouts of selected sites, remote surveillance systems yield a couple of distinct advantages over personal encounters with violators in the field. A single occurrence of a suspect documented on tape may be sufficient for a successful hunting prosecution, but the case need not close there.

Additional photographic evidence can be gathered, since hunting activity in the area has not been disturbed by our actions. Additional cases may therefore be developed on other suspects working the same area. Footage of a defendant hunting in the park on multiple occasions will also take the wind out of his sails at sentencing when he cries out to the judge that he only accidentally stumbled across the boundary one time.

The biggest trick in setting up a remote surveillance operation is deciding where to install the equipment. A major limiting factor in using these systems, we have learned, is the cameras’ restricted fields of view. For us to catch a suspect on film with an image large enough to make an identification, it’s necessary to know exactly where the suspect is likely to stand or walk. After selecting our general targeted area, such as a section of the boundary, we need to don our boots and closely survey the area in an attempt to identify the exact route that poachers would most likely use to access the area.

Whether it’s a foot trail, an abandoned roadbed, or a game trail, we should examine each trail which crosses the boundary line (or enters the targeted area). Such clues as amount of wear, litter and other signcutting evidence, or the presence of drag tails can indicate its frequent use. Evaluate the likelihood of its use by known suspects, then set the camera on the most likely access trail. Admittedly, poachers can (and do) access areas without using such trails, so there’s no guarantee of success.

Nevertheless, hunters are typically attracted to these trails. If you target deer or elk poaching during hunting seasons, post-season surveys of these trails for significant presence of hair from these animals, indicative of drag trails, may assist you in identifying specific sites for the following season.

Clayton Jordan has been a law enforcement ranger for eight years and is currently a supervisory park ranger at Shenandoah, where he’s been active in coordinating a wildlife law enforcement program.

Identifying suspects caught on film can be done through at least a couple of methods. The most obvious, of course, is showing photographs to co-workers, local agency personnel, informants and others. The other method is by developing a photo file. Long-term photo files can be established by routinely photographing suspects charged with resource violations and by clipping hunting trophy pictures out of the local newspapers. After all, skeptics will suggest, many of those trophy bucks and bears were killed in your park anyway...

The camera systems are particularly well-suited to specifically identified illegal hunting sites, such as tree stands, blinds, and bait sites. In such locations, where your targeted suspects may be sitting in one place, staring out into space all morning, it’s vital to pay particular attention to camouflaging your equipment to protect your investment. If you prefer to catch the poacher on the spot, reaching for the cookie jar, surveillance equipment can also activate an alarm, broadcast over the park radio frequency, or can even transmit a live picture of what your camera sees.

One contra-indication for the use of surveillance equipment: snow covered terrain. Failing to possess the ability walk on water, I have not yet found a way to install a camera system without leaving footprints in the snow. These systems can still be useful if installed, for example, at an entrance station, monitoring what kind of traffic is entering and exiting the park while you are asleep in bed, dreaming of a place with palm trees.

When word of a successful prosecution, made through high-tech equipment hits the local tramps and check stations, rumors will likely spread of your park boundary being wired like the front lawn of the White House. Of course, not all wild rumors are worth our time dispelling...

Resource Protection Criminal Database

At Shenandoah, we identified a need for a criminal investigation database to assist us in tracking information concerning resource protection violations and suspects. We found, however, that applying commercially available generic criminal databases to a resource protection application seemed an exercise in pounding round pegs into square holes. So we rolled up our sleeves and set out to design a database system specific to our needs. The end product of this effort was RIF: the Resource Investigation File. This database program is proving to be a valuable asset to our resource protection program.

The main purpose of RIF is to gather information from patrol rangers and investigators on resource violations and suspect individuals and vehicles, and to circulate this compiled information through periodically updated printouts. These violations are cataloged by subject: animals, plants (ginseng poaching, wildland arson, timber theft, etc.), fish, cultural (ARPA), and other headings. Through RIF, the collective knowledge of its users is dis-
Robotic Decoys

Just after midnight one evening last November, the latest addition to Shenandoah's staff was standing alert near Rt. 33, making his debut performance as a white-tailed deer, when he was briefly caught in the beam of a high-powered spotlight. The source of the light, a sedan, continued its slow cruise down the mountain without stopping. Before exiting the park, though, the Ford made a sharp U-turn and returned to the brushy hollow where the buck was still standing. A .22 magnum rifle protruded from the passenger window. If there was any momentary doubt in the mind of Dewayne Shifflett as he centered the deer in his scope, it was removed by a quick flick of its tail, radio-controlled by ranger Ray O'Neil from his safe vantage point across the road. Though the round lodged squarely in its neck, the deer did not shudder. The poachers knew they had been "had."

Wildlife decoys have been long-regarded as an effective method for combating roadside hunting in rural areas. The well-known use of these decoys by wildlife enforcement officers nationwide, however, is forcing many of us to escalate our techniques in order to persuade the more astute poachers to squeeze their triggers in our presence. Robotic decoys have found their way into the arsenals of an increasing number of NPS areas. Though they utilize some high-technology components, they are rather cost-effective and simple to construct and repair.

Remote controlled robotic decoys can be quite elaborate, as any visitor to Disney World can attest, but they do not need to be. An officer setting out to build one begins with the decoy itself. Though an expensive taxidermal model certainly makes the best decoy (especially for daylight operations), several parks have reported success with the use of simpler, cheaper, archery targets made of self-healing Elasta Form (e.g. McKenzie Targets).

Once acquired, the decoy is modified to provide for movement. Heads and tails are probably the most common parts given life, but you are limited only by your imagination (okay, and perhaps also your budget). Decoys can also be rigged to fall down upon your command. By getting the shooter out of his or her vehicle, the potential for vehicle pursuits is also reduced. Movement is facilitated by small battery powered servos – the same electric motors which control model airplanes, cars, and boats. The servos are wired to a receiver about the size of a match box, which can be mounted, along with the battery, out of harm's way at the base of the decoy with commercial, available extension wires.

A radio controller/transmitter held in the hands of the operator sends movement instructions to the servos, via the receiver. Each

(emitted in a variety of formats designed to be useful in the hands of rangers in the field as well as the investigators and managers in the office. This information may alert rangers on patrol of potential illegal activity in their vicinity, thus increasing the odds of regularly tapping into information developed by other officers. By analyzing such available data as incident type, location, time of day, and frequency, managers can identify patterns and focus enforcement efforts accordingly.

RIF is a network; its information is collected, entered, analyzed, and distributed via computer terminals located in several administrative "districts." Though these districts may occur within a single park, they can extend beyond the boundaries. RIF can network several parks together (e.g. the Virginia battlefields), or, for that matter, more than one agency. Information can be shared with any agencies or parks that may potentially come in contact with the same identified suspects. RIF is managed flexibly at the individual "district" level to accommodate only their identified needs; this way, we try to assure that the dog wags its tail instead of the reverse.

An important feature of RIF is that it encourages the entry of sketchy information. It enables us to file information even if all we have is a suspect's nickname or CB handle, or a partial vehicle description. Information "blanks" are often filled as the result of knowledge being pooled together throughout the network, or through additional information developed at a later time. RIF also allows the entry of more possible suspects. It categorizes suspicion levels on a range from "known violators" down through "informant information" and to "JDLR's" (Just-Don't-Look-Right). By sharing observations on lower-suspicion individuals, patterns are sometimes identified which, over time, may increase investigators' suspicions. Additionally, RIF accommodates the input of information on individuals of "no suspicion." These are individuals and vehicles who may be inaccurately perceived by other rangers as being suspicious. By saving coworkers and successors from hours of staking out such vehicles parked at odd locations, patrol efficiency is improved.

Through the use of field entry forms, rangers enter prescribed information into the database. For categorizing purposes, data is collected on incident type, location, date, suspect suspicion level, etc. Known identifying information is collected on suspect vehicles and individuals. Known aliases, nicknames, and personal associations are also entered, and often prove valuable during subsequent investigations. Finally, the ranger's brief observation is entered, and a base incident number is referenced (if any) for additional information. If the information is considered particularly sensitive, its dissemination can be limited to select investigators. These restricted records do not appear on any printouts distributed for field use.

The information contained within RIF is distributed to field rangers via accountable printouts, sorted alphabetically by suspect and by vehicle tag. Investigators and managers with the necessary passwords, however, can specify myriad search conditions in order to produce customized reports for analysis and other identified purposes.

Though still in its infancy, we are excited about what RIF can do for us in our future resource protection efforts. Additionally, we are currently working to develop a version which can be easily installed and used by other parks, as requested. But RIF, of course, is only one design which may be useful in many

NPS settings. All that is needed to establish a similar database is a team comprised of one programmer and your field personnel; after all, they know what they need.)
sers and a two-channel transmitter. Model systems are available for around $50. A four-channel system, which includes room for growth (in case some point down the road you feel you need to escalate your techniques further) retail for about $125. A total expenditure of under $150 can buy you your entire "robo-deer." Some archery target models allow you to replace individual parts at only a fraction of the cost of replacing the entire animal.

As with any decoy operation, much care should go into developing guidelines aimed at assuring proper safety and identifying any legal issues. Site inspections to determine safe locations for placement of the decoy and the contact and observation officers should be made in daylight. Though I am not familiar with any federal case law which has limited NPS use of decoys, some interesting state-level decisions have, in some cases, linked decoy use to entrapment. In response to these decisions, many, if not most, state wildlife enforcement agencies have established guidelines restricting the use of decoys to documented problem areas, and some further restrict the use of antlers without a specific documented trophy hunting problem. It is also advised to only place decoys in locations where they will not be readily observed by Mr. and Mrs. Picnicker, with 2.2 kids in the backseat.

Clearly, the use of decoys, especially remote controlled ones, can add significantly to a cost-effective wildlife law enforcement program. If this is not reward enough, be sure to note the expressions of embarrassment on poachers' faces when you contact them for shooting at your foam facsimile.

**Operation Triggerlock**

Operation Triggerlock is a fairly recent Justice Department program focused on locking up convicted felons in possession of firearms. Although the statue on which this program is based — the Federal Gun Control Act of 1968 (revised in 1988) — has been around for quite some time, enforcement of its provisions have received a real boost from this program. The U.S. Attorney's Office, in cooperation with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms and other agencies, such as the NPS, is committed to prosecuting felons who violate the act.

When rangers come in contact with an armed hunter with a felony record, we now have the opportunity to charge the hunter with a felony. The sentencing guidelines associated with these acts are specific and rather complex, based upon the felon's criminal history and the current offense being committed, if any, while in possession of a firearm. Sentencing ranges from probation to a mandatory forty years if your poacher happens to be an armed career felon hunting with a machine gun. The bottom line is that the poacher will likely be kept busy for quite some time stamping out license plates.

Many NPS investigators routinely make these federal laws work for them. The ability to charge certain violators with felony offenses gives us great bargaining power. Even if we decide to charge a suspect with the felony, a government motion for "substantial assistance" for the defendant — a recommendation for a lighter sentence — gives the suspect great incentive to cooperate with us. Cornered wildlife protection suspects can often supply us with valuable information, and, in best case scenarios, can assist in developing felony Lacey Act cases. As an effective plea bargaining tool, tricky court cases may not go to trial, and sentences for misdemeanor hunting offenses may be more severe than usual, giving more punch to press releases aimed at deterrence.

Bargaining authority, of course, has come from the U.S. Attorney's Office, so an open line of communication is important. Furthermore, prosecutions of violations of the federal gun control acts, by policy, require the investigative involvement of ATF. Keeping your local ATF office advised of the onset of your case is therefore generally beneficial.

**Conclusion**

The Nineties are proving to be an exciting time for resource protection as we continue to learn how to use high-technology equipment to improve the efficiency of our resource protection programs. And through innovative funding sources such as wildlife replacement funds (see ranger Bob Martin’s article in Ranger, Summer 1992), we can get the poachers to help pay for the very programs which led to their demise.

If you'd like additional information on any of the techniques described within this article, the author can be contacted at Route 3, Box 311, Elkton, VA 22837 804/985-7293.
Hepatitis B: A Case Study

Jay Liggett
Everglades

The first paragraph of the letter from the American Red Cross began with these words: "Thank you for your recent blood donation... Let me assure you, THIS IS NOT A LETTER ABOUT AIDS." Now that the good news was out of the way, the second paragraph revealed that I had tested positive for hepatitis B antibodies.

Hepatitis B is a viral inflammation of the liver. It's a highly contagious disease that infects an estimated 300,000 people in the United States each year. Half of those infected develop acute hepatitis with symptoms ranging from a mild fever to liver failure and death; more than 5,000 people die each year. Approximately five percent of the population is infected and free of any symptoms. This is not a "black and white" disease — there are a lot of gray areas, and there is no easy cure. A combination of drugs and rest comprise the only relatively effective treatment.

Like AIDS, hepatitis B is spread through bodily fluids contact. One important difference is that hepatitis B is more contagious than AIDS. The hepatitis B virus is a determined character. You can get it just as easily cleaning up after an EMS incident as you can by being bled upon during the incident.

The Red Cross letter explained that a positive test result for antibodies meant that I had contracted hepatitis B and had recovered. I never realized that I was sick, but I could narrow down the dates of my exposure because a previous blood donation had not revealed exposure to the disease.

I contacted my physician, who arranged for two additional tests. The first confirmed the Red Cross finding that I was positive for antibodies; the second determined that no liver damage had occurred. At the prompting of my chief ranger, the physician recommended a final test several months down the line just to make sure that the disease was not an incubation stage and giving a false antibody reading. Because of my exposure, my spouse also had to be tested, so Debbie soon began the recommended three-part vaccination series.

After receiving the Red Cross letter, I began a futile attempt to claim the illness through Workmen's Compensation (OWCP). I filed and the claim was denied. OWCP will not recognize a claim like this unless you have a specific time and date when the "injury" occurred. I compiled a list of EMS incidents, complete with specific times and dates, in which I had potentially been in contact with blood or bodily fluids. But I had no one specific time and date, so my claim was denied.

OWCP puts the burden of proof on the employee. My only alternative was to write all my EMS or law enforcement contacts and ask them if they had hepatitis B. Theoretically, when one of them went out and tested positive for the disease, that person would obligingly write back and say that he or she had given it to me. In reality, the letter would have been an open invitation for a personal liability lawsuit.

At this point, with the thought of potential liability looming overhead, I was beginning to wonder if I would have been smarter to have remained silent. Although the government has deeper pockets than I do and would have borne the brunt of a suit, I had no desire to make litigation my personal hobby for the next several years.

I found park management at Everglades to be supportive of my case and concerned about the liability issue. During my research, I came across a copy of 29 CFR 1910, which is the OSHA regulation on hepatitis B and other blood-borne pathogens. This document provides a realistic approach to the issue, recognizes the infeasibility of contacting all the potential hepatitis B "source individuals," and provides a mechanism for the park to pay medical expenses, thus assuming responsibility.

The park assumed responsibility in my case and paid the medical expenses. The draft guideline on blood-borne pathogens which the Service recently circulated is based on this document. Heightened awareness of hepatitis B lead to vaccinations for employees who had significant EMS and law enforcement responsibilities. The money came out of end-of-year funds.

Since I had already contracted hepatitis B and had antibodies in my system, I was assured that I was immune. I triple-checked this with a second medical opinion, then took the final test to reconfirm the earlier ones and assure that the disease was not lurking in the incubation stage.

I received good news and bad news. The good news was that I was still in the you-had-it-but-you're-recovered stage of the disease; the bad news was that my antibodies, which should have come back positive, now came back as only borderline. I no longer had a definitive immunity, so I, too, began the vaccination series.

Economics is the only reason that hepatitis B still exists. The three-part vaccination series, which costs $150, can prevent the disease. In my particular case, I nearly tripled the expense with other medical tests. If just one employee contracts the disease, it could easily cost more than the entire vaccination process for a park.

The tort possibilities are endless. The personal loss could be tragic.

Editor's Note: Late in March, Jay received a letter from OWCP denying his appeal of the initial decision, stating that "negative presumption that exposure must have occurred at work, since there was no other means of contagion, was not feasible."
Managing Paleontological Resources

Vincent L. Santucci
Petrified Forest

Most federal managers are familiar with the "Thief of Time" campaign, which has focused attention and energy on the theft of archeological resources from public lands, but few realize that a rapidly expanding commercial market for fossils has recently redirected the attention of the "thieves of time" to fossil-rich deposits on federal lands. Extensive deposits have been identified which possess significant paleontological richness. Over one hundred National Park Service units have been identified which possess significant paleontological richness. Collectively, they represent a historical record of life extending back over one billion years. They range in diversity from the Miocene bear-dog dens at Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, through the Pleistocene condor remains in coves at Grand Canyon National Park, to dinosaur tracks preserved at Zion National Park. And there are hints that a wealth of fossils, how can these non-renewable resources be protected anywhere?

Over one hundred National Park Service units have been identified which possess significant fossil resources. Collectively, they represent a historical record of life extending back over one billion years. They range in diversity from the Miocene bear-dog dens at Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, through the Pleistocene condor remains in coves at Grand Canyon National Park, to dinosaur tracks preserved at Zion National Park. And there are hints that a wealth of fossil-rich deposits exist in the relatively unexplored Alaskan parks.

The interpretive and research opportunities associated with fossils in national parks is unrivaled. Although a visit to a natural history museum to view a mounted specimen of a dinosaur may be exciting, it is much more intriguing to the intellect to stand before the fossil quarry face at Dinosaur National Monument. Here the visitor can relate fossils, which are in a more natural state, to the sediments which entomb them. Visitors can attempt to revisit the ancient floodplain and experience the raging river as it covers the remains of the dinosaur beneath sediments. Professional paleontologists view national parks as pristine research areas where a more complete view of the fossil record can be studied than elsewhere since uncontrolled collecting is prohibited.

Most of what is to be learned about the history of life still lies buried within the earth. From the first moments that a fossil becomes exposed, it is threatened, and protection efforts must begin with that emergence, since wind, rain, ice, and other erosional forces constantly attack fossils, breaking them down and washing them away. The important fossil deposits located within national parks should be managed to ensure their protection from these erosional cycles.

Several other steps must be taken. Comprehensive inventory and monitoring programs should be established and supported by an established paleontological research agenda. In the case involving a National Park Service unit called Fossil Cycad National Monument, the site was deauthorized due to improper management of the fossil resource. The fossilized cycads, petrified plants for which the site was named, were removed faster than erosion could expose them. Reports indicate that educational institutions and employees of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) were carting away many fossils. Eventually, the site was so depleted that not even one specimen was obtainable for display. One cycad specimen was later borrowed from a private collector on a temporary loan. This specimen also disappeared while under park care, and the Park Service was forced to pay the owner.

The need for an increased awareness regarding paleontological resource issues extends throughout the various land managing agencies. The growing controversy surrounding the management of fossils on federal lands and the introduction of new paleontological protection legislation has made the issue of fossil management more political. The National Park Service needs to maintain an informed individual in Washington to represent the agency on fossil resource concerns and to communicate with outside agencies. The Service also needs a champion to fight for funding and to recognize the specific demands for managing fossil resources. Program guidance from Washington can help to assist parks with fossils that cannot afford to hire staff paleontologists.

Vincent L. Santucci is a paleontologist at Petrified Forest National Park. He has been active in efforts to formulate and pass the Paleontological Resources Protection Act (see "Association Actions").
The National Park Service paleontology program may get a boost if the proposed Vertebrate Paleontological Resources Protection Act is passed. The bill was introduced by Senator Max Baucus of Montana last summer, and will be revised and reintroduced in this Congress (see “Association Actions” for ANPR’s letter to Senator Baucus regarding this bill).

The need for greater protective legislation for fossils has been realized for well over a decade. Originally, fossils were to be included within the Archeological Resources Protection Act, but were eventually dropped to preserve the intent of protecting archeological resources. The Baucus legislation has been heavily scrutinized and has undergone considerable revision.

It is not surprising to find that a vocal group of commercial fossil collectors has come forth in opposition to the Baucus bill. They argue in support of opening federal land to unregulated collection of fossils without permits. This argument is in direct opposition to the management goals of the National Park Service.

Paleontological collecting in national parks and on lands administered by other agencies must be conducted through a permit process. A permit is not merely a tool to control the collection of specimens in the field, it also serves as an important educational tool. The individual who desires to collect fossils must be aware that the fossils may occur in areas where other sensitive resources are present. The fossils may be adjacent to the nesting area of an endangered species or overlap a significant archeological site. Furthermore, the permit should be designed to inform the permittee of other regulations or laws that need to be complied with during any field work (i.e., no vehicles in wilderness areas; explosives prohibited in public campgrounds; etc.).

An important ethical question pertaining to the regulation of fossils on federal lands concerns the impact of commercial collecting on the science of paleontology. The widespread collecting of fossils for sale as art objects, curios or personal possessions in private collections dramatically diminishes this limited, non-renewable resource, and impedes our understanding of the record of past life. The inflated prices for fossils place them out of reach of most scientists and museums.

Since the principles of supply and demand apply to the fossil market, the rarer specimens tend to yield the higher market values. Unfortunately, the rarer specimens also tend to be the most important to science. If the ultimate fate of a fossil is based upon the highest bidder, then science will certainly loose out. In our attempts to find the few “needles in the haystack” and understand the history of life on earth, we need to establish more specific protective resource legislation, such as the Baucus bill.

Some of the important features of the Baucus bill are:

- recognition that the current legislation is inadequate;
- recognition that fossils are non-renewable resources that have scientific and educational value and are threatened;
- a clear statement that commercial collecting on federal land is prohibited;
- provision of legal authority for vertebrate fossil permitting;
- a recommendation that federal agencies recognize paleontological resources separately from cultural resources;
- a recommendation that paleontological collection on federal land is prohibited; and
- increased penalties and fines for illegal collecting, which will provide a greater deterrent to the escalating commercial fossil market.

If a “wish list” was developed for the National Park Service paleontology program, it would include the following:

- the development of a paleontological resource management training program;
- the establishment of paleontological theft investigation training similar to the ARPA training course provided through FLETC;
- the establishment and funding of a paleontological resource theft task force and the development of a database to support investigations;
- the strengthening of interagency cooperation regarding paleontological resource issues;
- the creation of regional office and Washington Office paleontologist positions;
- a commitment to continue to support the biannual fossil resource conference; and

Since the first fossil conference held at Dinosaur National Monument in 1986, the National Park Service paleontology program has grown dramatically. The most notable achievement has been the recognition and support received from the regional offices to ensure responsible stewardship for fossils in national parks. The Park Service has also assembled a team of dedicated individuals to help develop new resource management strategies and policies, to help educate and assist other park units with fossil related issues, and to fight for greater protective legislation.

Together, these efforts ensure that both the scientific community and the public will continue to have the opportunity to peek through the window into the past.
Looking Back

The Department of Interior’s Valor Award

Butch Farabee
Padre Island

In 1955, the Department of the Interior Valor Award was created and then bestowed for the first time at the 15th Honors Convocation on April 16th of that year. The criteria for nomination for the award is simple: The candidate must “demonstrate unusual courage involving a high degree of personal risk in the face of danger” and “be an employee of the Department of the Interior.”

Since 1956, when seasonal rangers Frank Betts, Bob Frauson, Jerry Hammond and Norm Nesbit became the first NPS employees to earn the award, the gold, engraved medal and accompanying citation signed by the Secretary of the Interior have been bestowed only some 140 times Service-wide. They have been earned by maintenance people, administrators, protection rangers, interpreters, resource management specialists, and Park Police officers.

Fortunately (knock on wood) for search and rescue, the Valor Award has been given posthumously to only three other NPS employees since Grand Teton’s Gail Wilcox died trying to save fellow ranger John Fonda in 1960 (see last fall’s Ranger). On May 21, 1966 at Fire Island, the second and third posthumous Valor Awards were tragically “earned.”

While on his very first day of employment, 23-year-old seasonal interpreter William Shaner, together with 37-year-old maintenance man Ashley N. Smith, drowned during a rescue effort. Their citations, signed by Secretary Udall, read in part as follows:

“...The two men responded to a call to assist two swimmers in danger of drowning... in the heavy surf. They initiated the rescue attempt on a fifteen foot surfboard, and, when it was wrestled from them by heavy surf action, valiantly and heroically continued their rescue efforts. The exertion and subsequent exhaustion proved to be more than they could physically withstand...”

In a very moving, graceful letter to the wife of the third but non-NPS rescuer who drowned that day, Mrs. Judith Shaner wrote:

This is the final in a series of articles on the Valor Award which Butch has written for Ranger. They all will appear in a history he is writing on search and rescue in the National Park Service.

“The men who give their lives serving others do not always make the headlines, and unfortunately are not always remembered or even recognized by the general public. But we will remember them always. We will remember their courage and we'll preserve the memory of these gallant men for our own children in generations to come.”

The Valor Award has been granted twice to an NPS group rather than an individual. The first instance occurred at Rocky Mountain National Park.

A flash flood on the last day of July in 1976 devastated the Big Thompson Canyon west of Denver — later described as the greatest natural calamity to ever hit Colorado. By 9:30 that night, a freak thunderstorm had dropped 11 inches of rain on the surrounding mountains and turned a normally gentle river into a tidal wave of death. It was estimated that five million tons of water roared through the narrow canyon. With little warning, nearly 2,000 people were trapped at the bottom of the winding thirty-mile-long gorge; at least 139 people, some who have never been found, lost their lives.

That night, 29 NPS employees worked their way down into Big Thompson Canyon and a total of 54 saw service along the swollen river during the next 36 hours. According to one report, “The park threw every available piece of machinery and every seasoned man they could spare into the desperate effort to save lives and property.” Their mountain rescue experience paid off when rangers lifted hundreds of victims across the raging torrent with life-saving ropes. More than a dozen helicopters airlifted over 1,000 persons from the nightmare.

In August of 1980, Grand Teton’s Jenny Lake rescue team became the second NPS group to win the Valor Award. The citation, signed by Secretary of the Interior James Watt, reads in part:

“...two mountain climbers... had attempted to climb the treacherous North Face route but were caught in a snowstorm which left the mountain covered with ice and snow, making any movement on the face impossible. The rescue team made a precarious landing from a hovering helicopter onto a knife-edge ridge half-way around the mountain... High winds precluded any further assistance from the helicopter. The team climbed the treacherous icy covered rock to the top of the North face in near impossible conditions. Black ice and nightfall made descent... too dangerous that evening... The next morning, at first light, one of the team members was lowered 500 feet to the victims... Using ropes and a small hand winch, the team winched the men up the face inch by inch... Blizzard conditions and constant lightning strikes caused frequent delays making it an all-day ordeal... (and forcing them) to spend another night out...”

Two people have received the DOI Valor Award twice. U.S. Park Policeman John Farrell received one for a law enforcement act of heroism in 1983, then, five years later, for assisting in saving a drunk who was burned by a gas pump that burst into flames.
Ranger Pete Dalton earned the second of his two awards in 1986 at Lake Mead. Along with ranger and fellow award recipient Bill Briggs, the two rescued a 16-year-old who had become trapped on a one-foot wide ledge 600 feet above the Colorado River.

Rather than risk their whole team, Dalton and Briggs decided to climb on alone after darkness settled in. As the two moved up the steep face, the rock grew even looser. Chunks pulled out when grabbed; flakes wobbled when stepped on. They inched upward smoothly and cautiously.
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The Professional Ranger

Emergency Services

Now that I am back from Hurricane Andrew, I hope to do better on getting these updates in Ranger. If you have information for this column, please contact me at 206/452-0324. Here's what's new:

- The NPS has made the commitment to form a second national all risk incident management team. Applications have been solicited and selections. This will give us the flexibility and depth we need to have a viable national overhead team response capability.

- A number of the regions have made the commitment to develop regional Type II all risk management teams and have supported them with training, equipment, and dispatch. Rocky Mountain and Midwest Regions now have two teams, as does Mid-Atlantic. Southwest Region has implemented ICS on a number of occasions.

- FEMA has assumed a much greater responsibility role in disasters and has formed 31 disaster response teams around the country. These teams are multi-disciplinary task forces made up of volunteers and local, state, and federal agencies. Please call Chuck Mills (703/352-1349) for more information.

- OPM has issued a bulletin (FPM 300-106) requesting all departments to notify their employees of a volunteer registration program they have established to register skilled federal employees for possible dispatch to disasters. The agency management must approve any registration by their employees so that their availability is authorized. Under the current guidelines, FEMA will pay the cost of travel, per diem and overtime of any employee called to an incident. The minimum availability is two weeks, maximum is four. For more details on this program, you can call OPM's Staffing Policy Division at 202/606-0960, or, if your organization approves your participation, it can register names at 912/744-2264.

- A team of NPS representatives and others met in Seattle in February to review the SAR functions in the NPS and recommend policy updates and standards for this area of responsibility. Contact Butch Farabee or myself for more information; he's at 512/937-2621, and I can be reached at 206/452-0324.

- The NPS held a Type II all risk team training session in Denver in March for NPS and other agency teams as part of the continuing all risk development program. Please contact Rick Gale for more information (208/334-9541).

Bill Pierce
Olympic

Resource Management

- The Park Service’s response to the National Academy of Sciences report (see the fall issue of Ranger) has been a flurry of activity by task forces and working groups involving people from all over the agency. Rhetorically, at least, former Director Ridnour came out as a strong supporter of strengthening the NPS research program. A group met at the end of January to discuss the pros and cons of requiring that all research scientists report to regions or CPSUs, per the Western Region model. It looks likely that that will happen. A “National Parks Research Act” has been drafted and went out for comment at the end of January. It would clarify and augment existing authorities for conducting research in the parks, yet wisely doesn’t fool with the Organic Act. It’s too early to guess when (or if) the bill will be introduced into the Congress; that will presumably depend on the interests of the new Director and the Administration.

- A relatively minor feature of that bill could end up creating the most significant change, since the Service already has all the authority it needs to develop a strong research program. The early draft of the bill contains language clearly authorizing the NPS to enter into cooperative agreements to facilitate research in the parks. As I indicated in a column last year, it’s getting harder to get these agreements through the hoops established by our arcane contracting process (and a new revision to NPS 20 — now undergoing review — will make it even more difficult in the near future).

- Budget woes are affecting the entire Service this fiscal year, as you are already aware. Uncertainty over how to make up the shortfalls has delayed the transfer of funds for natural and cultural resource programs even longer than usual. Since these programs affect resources, not more visible operational programs, they are vulnerable. As of this writing, it looks likely that Servicewide resource management program funding will take a ten percent across the board hit.

- ANPR was invited by the George Wright Foundation to send a representative to their last board meeting, which was held in conjunction with the Conference on Science in the National Parks last November in Florida. Kathy Jope attended, and reports that the Society is interested in the possibility of having the next conference, which would be in the fall of 1997, concurrent with a Rendezvous. They are also interested in having joint meetings with other professional societies, such as the Society for Conservation Biology. Kathy was able to provide some insight into how ANPR organizes and manages a Rendezvous, since she was fresh from her experience in Spokane as site coordinator. She reports that the conference sessions were stimulating, as always.

- The first-ever meeting of Servicewide and regional natural and cultural resource management plan coordinators was scheduled for early March. Four years have passed since WACO issued new RMP guidelines in draft, a new software program, and a target of March, 1993 for completion of new-format RMPs for all parks. A large percentage of parks and regions haven’t met the deadline, but WACO also never finalized the instructions or provided guidance on what the non-computerized sections of the RMP ought to look like. It promises to be a contentious meeting; my reading is that there is strong support from the field for the RMP and there’s a desire for strong leadership and commitment to strengthen the process. If there’s any move to significantly change the format of the RMPs, I expect a revolt.

Bob Krumenaker
SWRO

Interpretation

Despite the recent and profound budget disappointments, the overwhelming feeling at this January’s “Developing NPS Education Programs” course was upbeat, positive and very energized. The course’s thirty participants included NPS interpreters and education specialists, as well as a US Fish and Wildlife employee and a sixth grade teacher. Throughout the eight-day class, many ideas and innovations were shared and discussed by the participants. The diversity and creativity of education programs across the 28 parks represented was truly impressive.

Rocky Mountain National Park has made a major commitment to its education program, hiring a new GS-7/9 education specialist and reducing their traditional summer program to more fully support education. Rocky has also recently published a curriculum guide with substantial funding from the “Parks as Classrooms” program and the local cooperating association. A recent $5,000 grant from the National Park Foundation will be used to establish a transportation fund for area schools to visit the park. Mark DeGregorio at Rocky Mountain can provide more information about these programs.

The Seattle unit of Klondike Gold Rush has explored and used a variety of creative donation sources to improve their education program, which features curriculum-based school programs and educational kits for off-site use. All kit containers were donated by the Rubermaid Corporation. Seattle-based REI has also pitched in for the kits, donating modern outdoor equipment for students to contrast with historic gold rush era packs and supplies. Klondike’s educational kits are available to teachers for $10 plus a $15 deposit for each two-week period. In an effort to solicit educator feedback, teachers can use the kits free of charge if they return a completed evaluation
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form. Contact Marianne Mills for more information on the park’s program.

Other parks are also using grant monies to improve or begin education programs. With a $3,000 donation from the local cooperating association, Devils Tower will start its education program by establishing a teacher’s advisory panel (with stipends for each teacher) and a teacher’s information and pre-visit packet. The park’s ed program will also benefit from a new permanent GS-5 interpretive position to be filled this spring through OPM. Jim Schlinkmann can provide more information on this position and the education programs.

Olympic is also using non-NPS money to forward its education program. With several critical resource management and public relations issues facing the park, the time is ripe for increasing contacts with local schools. The park has employed funding from their cooperating association, “Parks as Classrooms,” and a recent $10,000 grant from NPS to establish a new curriculum guide, assemble three educational kits for use in the classroom, and fund a series of teacher workshops for the coming year.

Robin White, education specialist at Petroglyph, sees her park as a therapy center for Albuquerque’s youth. In her view, local students must first learn to work together and accept each other’s diverse backgrounds before they can learn about the park’s resources. Petroglyph, which is located within the city of Albuquerque, offers an education program which reaches out to students from many cultures and backgrounds. Robin has worked on curriculum development with educators from Hispanic, African America, white and Native American communities, and has presented workshops on dealing with culturally diverse groups and youth at risk to the New Mexico National Guard, the park’s law enforcement rangers, and area teachers. A major part of the park’s school program is focused on understanding and accepting other cultures.

Other parks, such as Lowell, Salem Maritime and El Malpais, have formed a variety of innovative partnerships. Those at Lowell and Salem are more formal, involving universities, businesses, state governments and other entities. At both parks, educational and other programs have flourished through joint planning and funding.

El Malpais has taken a different approach—the park has joined forces with a local teacher who has taken the initiative in developing a joint school/park education program. Through this effort, the park has gained the expertise of an experienced teacher and the teacher has secured her own grant funding for developing a park/school education program.

With this year’s bleak budget picture, it was heartening to get a glimpse of the energy and creativity that people have put into developing park education programs. The variety of non-traditional funding sources, donations and partnerships gave class participants a new feeling of hope. While everyone agreed that parks should not have to go “outside” for education funds, everyone also agreed that current realities dictate new solutions. For many things, donations and grant money work just as well as traditional NPS funding.

If you have an interpretive program or accomplishment that you are proud of in your park or region, get in touch with me. If you think it’s a good idea, chances are that someone else will find it valuable, too.

Barb Maynes
Olympic

Guide to Becoming a Ranger

At last! A guide to the byzantine process—or, more correctly processes—whereby one becomes a permanent NPS ranger. A must for aspiring rangers, at least until the Service gets its act together on establishing an intake system. Price: $3.00 each for 1-5 copies; $2.75 each for 6-30; $2.50 each for more than 30. Shipping and handling included. Send orders to Debbie Gorman, Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831.
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 home phone numbers appears on the back cover of the magazine.

Board Members

North Atlantic Regional Rep

As we move toward the summer season, I would like the word "recruiting" to be on everyone's lips. At Spokane, the NAR caucus strongly endorsed the Association's efforts at increasing membership and took on the challenge of increasing regional membership by 25% during 1993. With that goal in mind, I have mailed two copies of the ANPR brochure to all members within the region; each park in the region should also have received at least one of the Association's new recruiting posters. I believe that both will be of help inconvincing non-members to join, particularly if they're brought out at a strategic point in a conversation about any of the issues ANPR is currently working on or are made available to new employees during seasonal training sessions.

In other regional recruiting news, Ed Rizzotto of Gateway has taken on a personal challenge in the form of a friendly competition with other Association members of dubious repute to see who can recruit the greatest number of new members prior to this year's Rendezvous at Virginia Beach. Let's all wish Ed luck and hope he can do NAR proud in this competition.

I want to put together a package of literature, brochures, posters and other appropriate items for display at regional and park training courses and conferences. I would like the package to be small, yet contain some provocative items to get non-members to notice the brochures and recruiting posters. If you have any suggestions about what should go into such a package, I'd appreciate hearing from you.

Jim McKay
Statue of Liberty

National Capital Regional Rep

I'm both proud and excited to have been elected as NCR representative. Thanks to regional ANPR members for your support and to Will Morris for doing a great job for the last two years. I'll need the help of all regional members to bring the folks in this region together for social events and to work on concerns facing us. I'm looking forward to working with each of you and will be contacting members in the coming weeks for your help with recruitment, member involvement, and other concerns and issues facing rangers in this region and throughout the Service.

Sarah Craighead
NCR

Western Regional Rep

I'm beginning to receive some input (via mail, telephone and the regional caucus at Spokane) on the types of projects which the membership would like me to spend my time on. Although the Adopt-A-Ranger program was thought to have some merit, members felt it was not something the Association should support at this time. I am therefore focusing my energies elsewhere.

The idea which members have shown most interest in pertains to collecting oral and written histories from the membership in order to document the growth and experiences of ANPR. Although the initial proposal was to interview the founders of the organization, there seems to be a larger interest in obtaining information from all members - seasonal and permanent - regarding experiences with the Rendezvous, Rendezvous mishaps, organizational growth, reasons for joining, and so forth.

I plan on proceeding with this project, though I'm not sure what the end product will be. As we are in the very initial stages of formulating our plan of attack for this project, I will for the moment focus on collecting essays or reports of any experiences or events which members from all regions would like to submit. They should be sent to me or to Nancy Hadlock, who will be coordinating volunteers for the project once we get started. She's located at Great Basin NP, Baker, NV 89311. If you're inclined to send disks, you can use either 5.25 or 3.5-inch disks in Word Perfect 5.1. This, however, is not a requirement.

We'll be formulating a questionnaire which can be used as a guideline by members who have expressed an interest in participating in this project by conducting interviews or taking oral histories. We'll use the documents sent to us to target individuals who can provide oral histories or expand on other stories submitted to us. These histories may be taken over a beer at the next Rendezvous or at a regional mini-rendezvous.

At a minimum, all personal histories will be placed on my computer for data retrieval at a later date. Depending on the degree of participation, funding, willingness of members to participate, and editorial support, we will try to develop a history of ANPR for either the 20th or 25th anniversary. If members from other regions would like to act as regional coordinators for this project, they should contact me or Nancy Hadlock.

Some members have been appointed de facto park reps due to lack of objection to participation in such capacities. I presume everyone wants to participate unless I hear otherwise. In my spring newsletter, I'll be discussing what I expect of park reps and their role in ANPR. I'd also like to hear from anyone who is interested in being a park rep "trainee" program.

Wendy Lauritzen
Great Basin

Alaska Regional Rep

A regional ANPR meeting was held in February during the annual law enforcement refresher training in Anchorage. It was a good meeting, particularly because president Rick Gale was able to join us. During the meeting, a great deal of emphasis was placed on recruiting and a number of new ideas were brought up. Alaska Region is determined to increase membership by at least 50% this year.

Rick Mossman
Wrangell-St. Elias

Business Manager

Your recruitment efforts are paying off! Over the first four months of FY 1993, 128 new members joined the Association - nearly a 60% increase over the same period last year. If continued, the total for the year could reflect this same increase. That objective is feasible only if we continue recruiting at the same rate.

I am busily recording the endeavors of members making serious recruitment efforts. Be sure to give yourself credit for any members you recruit by making a note on the membership application. Keep up the good work - the energy you invest will benefit ANPR for many years to come.

The Forest Service has approached ANPR for information on seasonal health insurance. Seasonal Forest Service employees are not unlike their NPS counterparts in that they also need insurance and run up against the same problems. Information has accordingly been routed throughout the Forest Service via their electronic mail system. Requests for information have been impressive, and many are joining as associate members. It's particularly satisfying to know that a program ANPR has worked so hard to develop and maintain has such broad significance. Sharing our resources is a great means for executing the Association's mission.

Debbie Gorman
Saratoga

Committee Chairs

International Committee

The Association has expressed its desire to expand its original purpose to promote and enhance the park ranger profession and its spirit to include park and protected area professionals in other nations of the world. An international committee was accordingly established in Spokane to organize efforts already in place.

High on the committee's agenda are continued efforts on behalf of the International Ranger Federation (IRF). ANPR is one of the charter members of the Federation and will be active in recruiting associations from other countries. It's anticipated that we may be called upon to assist fellow rangers in forming...
Associations in their own countries, since membership in IRF is only open to ranger associations. The committee will also begin working on establishing a home host network throughout the United States. Interested individuals will agree to host foreign rangers and park professionals in their homes and share their experiences as NPS employees. These will be visits of an informal nature and not part of the official government-to-government program that is run by the Service. As the IRF flourishes, it’s expected that similar home host networks will be established in other countries. Country contacts will be listed in future ANPR and IRF publications.

Individuals interested in participating should write to me at my home address (see back cover). Detailed guidelines and a questionnaire will be forthcoming.

Barbara Goodman

WASO

Preparations are underway for the first world ranger congress, which will be held in Zakopane, Poland, in May of 1995. The congress is being sponsored by the International Ranger Federation (IRF), co-founded by ANPR, England’s Association of Countryside Rangers, and the Scottish Countryside Ranger Association.

Gordon Miller, chairperson of IRF, will be going over to Zakopane this spring to work out the final dates for the week-long meeting. As soon as dates and prices are firmed up, they will appear in Ranger. A draft program has been prepared which establishes the broad themes and structure of the meeting:

- Day 1 – A “scene-setting” day with keynote speakers outlining key issues that affect the management of protected areas and those who visit them.
- Day 2 – The theme for the day would be resource management, with groups divided according to the habitats they manage and visits to local areas representative of these habitats.
- Day 3 – The theme would be human management. Five or six groups would be convened to discuss visitor management and involvement with local communities.
- Day 4 – The theme would be “keeping the balance” and would deal with topics pertaining to balancing visitation with resource protection.

If you have any thoughts or comments or additional ideas regarding the program, please contact either Barbara Goodman or Bill Halainen.

Meanwhile, headway is being made in organizing the IRF. A logo and letterhead have been designed, and Gordon is in the process of drafting a letter for distribution to rangers worldwide. The letter will invite rangers to form national organizations which can then affiliate with IRF, and will provide information on Zakopane. If you have addresses for rangers or park managers anywhere in the world, please forward them to either Bill or Barbara so that we can send them copies of this letter.

Gordon advises that two new national ranger organizations have formed since he visited with us in Spokane — the Northern Ireland Countryside Staff Association, and Portugal’s interestingly named Association of National Park Guards and Vigilantes. Other associations are on the verge of formation. Those interested in joining IRF must come in through the sponsorship of one of the founding associations.

Bill Halainen

WASO

Employee Development

As reported in an earlier edition of Ranger, ANPR has worked out an agreement with the chief of the Division of Employee Development to bring the Managerial Grid training course back to the NPS. Considered one of the premiere management development courses in the Service in the 1970’s, it was dropped from the program in 1978. Since then, the developers of the course, Scientific Methods, Inc., have further refined the program and updated the materials to again make it a strong program.

Managerial Grid is a six-part organizational development program. Phase I, which ANPR is now sponsoring, is designed as a self-learning seminar. Following is a brief description of the Phase I program:

Most managers accept the idea that a person can study and learn something relevant to organizational effectiveness and put it to practical use. We know that when people do this, they also enjoy a feeling of gratification from having contributed to the organization. The Managerial Grid (Phase I) Seminar provides the opportunity for this to happen using optimal learning conditions - the scientific method model of learning. This model begins with a dilemma. The seminar activities create situations of interaction that require resolution by the managers facing them. Participants use the scientific method model of learning to apply theory, action, critique and generalization to the dilemmas facing them. At the completion of the seminar, participants will:

- Strengthen their personal management skills by learning the grid framework, increase their personal objectivity in dealing with others, and gain insights into their grid styles.
- Increase their team effectiveness by studying conflict solving, use of candor, the meaning of team synergy and how it can be achieved, and practicing uses of critique.
- Increase their ability to manage intergroup conflict by studying competition and cooperation.
- Increase their knowledge of the existing back-home organization culture and how to improve that culture.

Following successful completion of one course in Tampa in August, ANPR scheduled another for Denver in January. That one didn’t draw enough applicants. Another is scheduled for Tucson in April, to be followed by a fourth, somewhere in the east, probably in August. ANPR will continue to offer the program until the NPS determines that it wants to take it back into its regular training program. Seminar managers for ANPR are Ann Baugh, Rick Smith and Bill Wade. Instructor preparation seminars (prerequisite completion of the Phase I program) will be offered concurrently with the Phase I seminars to develop additional seminar managers.

Attendance at the Grid is not limited to supervisors or managers. It can be a valuable individual development program for anyone who wishes to learn more about management development and about his or her own management “style” and interpersonal behavior.

ANPR will continue to look for other training programs that it can offer to its members to supplement the NPS employee development program and meet the recommendations of the Vail Agenda. If you have suggestions, please let us know.

Bill Wade

Shenandoah
Rendezvous XVII

ANPR will make a return trip to the Atlantic Coast for Rendezvous XVII, which will be held from Wednesday, November 10th through Sunday, November 14th, at the Cavalier Hotel in Virginia Beach. Bill Wade from Shenandoah National Park is the Rendezvous site coordinator and Cindy MacLeod from Richmond Battlefield is the program chair. We will again join with the annual meeting of the Association of National Park Maintenance Employees, who will meet from Friday, November 12th through Tuesday, November 16th.

Hotel Information

The Cavalier is saving us a block of 250 rooms. These rooms will be held until October 9th, after which rooms may only be obtained on a space available basis. The room rate will be $49 per night plus tax (9.5%) for an ocean view room, either single or double occupancy. Ocean front rooms are $65. Each additional adult will cost $15 per night. Children under 18 are free if staying with parents. Advanced registration, which requires the first night’s deposit, can be made by calling the Cavalier at 1-800-446-8199. There will also be a registration form and more information in the special Rendezvous mailing this summer.

The Cavalier, located at 42nd Street and Atlantic Avenue, offers several special amenities. Wheelchair accessible rooms are available and all meeting rooms are accessible. There is a 1,500 square foot health club, a putting green, a 20-station aerobic fitness center, a 1,500 square foot health club, and basketball and volleyball courts. No pets are permitted in the hotel.

Area History

Virginia Beach is one of the major destinations in Virginia because of its variety of attractions and temperate climate. The first British settlers to set foot in America did so at Cape Henry at the northern tip of the city. These same pioneers, led by John Smith, then moved inland, up the James River, to Jamestown.

Cape Henry, where the Chesapeake Bay opens to the Atlantic Ocean, soon became a pathway for British merchant ships calling on America. In 1720, Virginia’s governor called for a lighthouse to be built there to ease passage through the treacherous pass, but the King of England refused until 1774. The Revolutionary War halted construction; it wasn’t until 1774. The Revolutionary War halted construction; it wasn’t completed until 1791. This tower became Virginia Beach’s official symbol in 1962.

Meanwhile, Cape Henry played a critical role in the American Revolution. It was here that the French fleet, led by Admiral Compte De Grasse, stopped the British fleet.

It wasn’t until the 19th century that Virginia Beach got a reputation as a vacation spot. The area became more accessible with the building of a railroad from the busy port city of Norfolk to the ocean front. The grande dame hotel of the day was the Princess Anne Hotel, a self-contained paradise occupying two ocean front blocks. It had railroad trunks running almost into the lobby so steamers could be unloaded. Timid visitors soaked in salt and fresh water baths, but hardier souls took to the ocean’s waves, where lifelines were strung out into the surf to protect bathers.

Recreational Opportunities

The recreational opportunities in the city include nine golf courses, tennis, deep-sea fishing, freshwater fishing, three shopping malls, bowling, and of course, plenty of water sports. The air temperature in November averages 52 degrees and water temperatures are about 60 degrees.

Travel Information

Virginia Beach is part of a seven-city metro area known as Hampton Roads. The city is approximately 200 miles from Washington, D.C., 350 miles from Charlotte, North Carolina, and 100 miles from Richmond, Virginia. Principle highways to the city are Interstate 64, 85 or 95, US 460, 13, 17, and 58. The city is served by Norfolk International Airport, a 20-minute drive to Virginia Beach. Airline service is offered by American, Continental, Delta, Northwest, TWA, United, and USAir in addition to several commuter airlines. An Airport Shuttle Bus to the hotel is available for $15.50 per person. Taxis may also be hired at the airport for $25 and can accommodate up to five passengers. Avis, Budget, Hertz, National, and Thrifty car rental companies all have outlets at the airport. Amtrak and Greyhound-Trailways services can get you into the area. Tidewater Regional Transit, taxis, and the North Seashore Park Trolley are available for local transportation.

Omega World Travel is the Association’s official travel agency. All travel booked through Omega will directly benefit the Association. Reservations may be made by calling 1-800/283-3239, 703/818-8848, or 703/818-8822. Ask for Liz or Bunny. Omega guarantees the lowest airfare at the time of ticketing, or they will refund double the difference.

Cape Henry lighthouse (above) and the ocean front at Virginia Beach.
The region provides several great opportunities for exploring the ecology of a coastal environment. Seashore State Park provides nature trails, biking paths, and boating opportunities.

Many museums and historic homes are located in the area. The Virginia Marine Science Museum and Virginia Beach Center for the Arts are located in Virginia Beach. Other Hampton Roads attractions include the War Memorial Museum of Virginia, Virginia Air and Space Center, the MacArthur Memorial, Army Transportation Museum, and the Naval Museum. Several historic homes grace the area, some dating back to the 17th century.

Colonial Williamsburg and Busch Gardens are only 60 miles from Virginia Beach. There are 250 restaurants in the city, and they offer every kind of food imaginable, although, of course, seafood is the king! Evening entertainment includes comedy, concerts, theater, opera, symphony and movies. Call 1-800-VA-Beach for additional information about entertainment opportunities.

Colonial National Historical Park is the closest NPS unit to Virginia Beach and is made up of Jamestown (75 miles north) and Yorktown (about 50 miles north). Richmond Battlefield (100 miles north), Petersburg (70 miles west), Fredericksburg (150 miles north) and Assateague Island National Seashore (200 miles north) all provide great opportunities for a busman's holiday. To reach Assateague, you must pass through the Chesapeake Bay Bridge-Tunnel, which requires a $10 toll each way.

Ideas, Anyone?
Cindy is still working on workshop topics and keynote speakers for the Rendezvous. You can write her with your suggestions at 2525 Cedar Cone Drive, Richmond, VA 23233, or give her a call at 804/747-3622.

Bill is looking for anyone with an idea for the official Rendezvous T-shirt and any other suggestions you may have for activities and events. He may be reached at 3041 Mt. Heights Road, Front Royal, VA 22630, or at 703/635-8809.

Be on the lookout for creative raffle prizes during your travels this year. The raffle is a major source of revenue for ANPR. It will only work with the help of your innovative contributions.

Program, pre-registration, and reservation information will be sent out in the special Rendezvous mailing. If you would like specific information about the area that I haven't included, feel free to call me at 703/330-1387.

Sarah Craighead
NCRO

More Scenes from Rendezvous XVI

Kathy Jope, Rendezvous XVI program coordinator (top). Climber Lou Whittaker talks with past Director Ridenour (center). Members at the Naturist Society exhibit outside the exhibit hall (bottom). Photos by Jim Capra/Rhonda Coston.
Sundry Notices

Changes in Board Nominating Process

ANPR has grown over the years into a mature, professional organization with the proven ability to gain respectful recognition by influential public interest groups, upper management, and the Congress. To ensure that the best of interested, qualified, and committed candidates are identified and nominated to serve as elected members of the Board of Directors, a proposal will be presented at the 1993 Rendezvous to revise the nomination process.

The elected members of the Board of Directors are the President, two Vice Presidents, and the Secretary-Treasurer (the officers), and the ten Regional Representatives. Each member is elected for a term of two years and may serve two terms, with elections being held in alternate years for no more than eight board members. At the 1993 Rendezvous in Virginia Beach, there are two officers up for election, in addition to five Regional Representatives. These are the Vice President for Professional Issues and the Vice President for Representation and Communications.

To initiate an interim nomination process prior to the 1993 Rendezvous, any ANPR members interested in running for either one of the Vice President positions (the “applicant”) is encouraged to send a brief resume to President Rick Gale for information on the office. The President or his representative will then contact the applicant regarding the position. Resumes or other statements by applicants will be published in the fall issue of Ranger prior to the Rendezvous. Incumbents interested in running for re-election may also submit any status report or article about their continued interest in the office for publishing in Ranger.

This initial process will not require any changes in the by-laws and does not change the nominating process. All applicants must still be publicly nominated at the Rendezvous. Any other member who is interested, but who did not apply by the above procedure, may still be nominated on the floor at the Rendezvous.

Board Position Openings

ANPR is actively seeking candidates for several offices which will open on January 1, 1994. We’re seeking dedicated, energetic and task-oriented candidates who are willing to devote time and energy to accomplishing the Association’s objectives. All terms are for two years.

These are the positions that will be open.

- Vice President, Professional Issues
- Vice President, Communications and Representation
- Mid-Atlantic Regional Rep
- Pacific Northwest Regional Rep
- West Regional Rep
- Southwest Regional Rep
- Southeast Regional Rep

If you’ve been looking for a chance to get involved, here’s your opportunity. Go for it!

Win an Arnberger Carving

The member who sells the most memberships between Rendezvous XVI and Rendezvous XVII will be presented with a very special award in Virginia Beach. Ron Arnberger of Big Bend has agreed that his 1993 carving will be this year’s official trophy. Now it’s up to you to get out there and work! Be sure that any membership applications submitted include your name as the recruiter. By the way, Rob’s not disclosing the subject matter for this year’s effort, but he did say it would be something special. Perhaps the subject for future covers of Ranger?

Rendezvous Reporters Wanted

Here’s your opportunity to contribute to a future issue of Ranger. We’re seeking volunteers to report on Rendezvous workshops, meetings, events and other activities during this year’s gathering in Virginia Beach. The assignments are not difficult or terribly time-consuming, and provide you with the chance to do something to benefit your Association.

If you’d like to help out, send your name, park and home phone number to Bill Halilnen, the editor of Ranger, at 640 North Harrison Street, Arlington, VA 22205. If you know what days you’ll be attending the Rendezvous, please let him know.

Membership Expiring?

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

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

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

USA Today Article

On February 3rd, there was a major piece in USA Today on the NPS entitled “Parks In Peril” which reported on the budget crisis now hitting the parks. It talked about operational budget shortfalls and listed some of the impacts that these shortfalls will have on the parks. Several authorities on the parks were also quoted:

- Rick Gale, president of this Association: “The new administration ought to go back and ask for reprogramming of money out of construction and into operations, with resource protection being the number one priority. The parks need some care, feeding and nurturing. These are the resources we’re dedicated to protecting.”
- Past Director James Ridenour: “We’re at skin and bones... It’s a matter of how far you can eat away before you really begin to cause some damage. The blood of the Park Service is being thinned.”
- James Richards, Interior’s inspector general, speaking at a House Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee hearing: “The Park Service failed to request the true amount of funding needed for its mission: the operation and maintenance of the national park system.”

Regional Perspectives continued

Finally, there’s the issue of new areas. Part of the way we define success in this region is by being aggressive about adding new units to the system, adding to existing sites, or undertaking planning efforts to assist local and state governments in conserving open space for public purposes. This is in line with preserving and protecting important segments of our national heritage. The obvious downside, of course, is that such efforts add to our regional workload, requiring the addition of skilled people in the regional office to do the work.

Budget Crunch continued

Right now, on page one, I can show where Arches’ ONPS money is spent, how much we need to make the park “whole,” and what our priorities are for base increases. If the reader wants to know more, he or she can find the statement of work, operational standards and resources summary for each division within the 28 pages of the BOP. The reader can also find the list of major unfunded projects, an unfunded equipment list, the annual work plan for each division, and our reduction scenario for meeting a variety of budget shortfalls — important in the FY 93 budget situation. This reduction scenario was approved on July 25, 1992. The BOP is not perfect, but I challenge anyone to show us a better system that is currently in place that explains a park’s operations.
All In The Family
Submission Form

Please reproduce this and pass it on to anyone you know you might be transferring, leaving the Service or getting promoted. Entries must be legible!

Name: _____________________________

Past Parks: Please use four-letter acronym and years at the park (MIMA '80-'85, YOSE '86-'93). No more than six parks please:

__________________________________________

Old Position: Please give park, district, series, grade and title: ____________________________

New Position: Please give park, district, series, grade and title: ____________________________

Address and Phone Number: Provide only if you want it listed:

__________________________________________

Other Information: ________________________________________________________________

Association of National Park Rangers

Membership fees may be deductible as business expenses. Contact your IRS office for details.

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

Name (last, first, MI): _____________________________ Title: ____________________________

Box or Street: _____________________________ Division: ____________________________

City: _____________________________ State: ____________ Zip: ____________

NPS Employees: Park four-letter code (i.e., YELL) __________ Region: (i.e., RMR; WASO use NCR) __________

Type of Membership (Check One)

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

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: ____________________________

Do you have friends who’d like to learn more about ANPR?

□ NPS □ Other

Name _____________________________

Address _____________________________

City _____________________________ State ____________ Zip ____________

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 _____________________________

*Life members may pay in five installments of $75.00 (for individuals) or $100.00 (for joint memberships) over a 24-month period.

Return to: Association of National Park Rangers, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831

□ NPS □ Other

Name _____________________________

Address _____________________________

City _____________________________ State ____________ Zip ____________

Return to: Association of National Park Rangers, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831

□ NPS □ Other

Name _____________________________

Address _____________________________

City _____________________________ State ____________ Zip ____________

Return to: Association of National Park Rangers, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831

□ NPS □ Other

Name _____________________________

Address _____________________________

City _____________________________ State ____________ Zip ____________
Directory of ANPR Board Members, Committee Chairs & Staff

Board of Directors
President
Rick Gale, Branch of Fire and Aviation, Boise
4074 S. Iriondo Way, Boise, ID 83706
(208) 343-2412

Vice President, Special Concerns
Bill Wade, Shenandoah
3041 Mount. Heights Rd., Front Royal, VA 22630
(703) 635-8809

Vice President, Professional Issues
Bryan Swift, Lassen Volcanic
Address and phone number not yet available.

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
9 West 26th Street, Bayonne, NJ 07002
(201) 437-2528

National Capital Regional Rep
Sarah Craighead, NCRO
9336 King George Drive, Manassas, VA 22110
(703) 330-1387

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

Southeast Regional Rep
Debbie Litt, Everglades
P.O. Box 279, Homestead, FL 33030
(813) 695-3676

Midwest Regional Rep
Judy Winkelman, Lincoln Home
Sugarcreek Estate, RR 1, Box 654, Glenarm, IL 62536

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

Southwest Regional Rep
Cindy Ott-Jones, El Malpais
604 Gunnison Avenue, Grants, NM 87020
(505) 287-5011

Western Regional Rep
Wendy Latorenza, Great Basin
P.O. Box 54, Baker, NV 89311
(702) 234-7278

Pacific Northwest Regional Rep
Bruce Edmundson, Craters of the Moon
P.O. Box 29, Arco, ID 83212
(208) 527-3775

Alaska Regional Rep
Rick Momsman, Wrangell-St. Elias
P.O. Box 137, Yakutat, AK 99689
(907) 784-3382

Committee Chairs

Budget and Finance
Patti Dienna, Mid-Atlantic Regional Office
48 Iroquois Court, Wayne, PA 19087
(215) 296-8334

Dual Careers
Sheila Cooke-Kayser, Salem Maritime
4 Pickering Court, Danvers, MA 01923
(617) 242-5688

Employee Development
Rick Moses, Mid-Atlantic Regional Office
4 Iroquois Court, Wayne, PA 19087
(215) 296-8334

Housing
Tom Cherry, FLETs
1495 Wood Avenue, St. Simon's Island, GA 31522-3949

International Affairs
Barbara Goodman, WASO
11648 Ivystone Court, Reston, VA 22091
(703) 476-6218

Marketing
Tessa Shinkawa, Alaskan Regional Office
Alaska Regional Office
7020 Hunt Avenue, Anchorage, AK 99504-1875

Recruitment
Scott McElveen, Anzaagulset Island
Rt. 1, Box 688, Williams, MD 21874
(410) 835-3121

Retirement
Frank Betts
513 Spinnaker Cove, Pt. Collins, CO 80525
(303) 226-7065

Seasonal Concerns
Barb Maynes, Olympic
29 Tamarrack Lane, Port Angeles, WA 98362
(202) 457-7536

Twenty Year Retirement
Mark Harvey, Yosemite
P.O. Box 577, Yosemite National Park, CA 95389
(209) 379-2235

Staff

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

Business Manager
Debbie Gorman, Saratoga
P.O. Box 307, 960 North Harrison St., Arlington, VA 22205
(703) 522-4756

Address Correction Requested

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