Special Edition: The Kennedy School Report on ANPR
Letters

ANPR:

I wish to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to ANPR for its support and financial contribution toward my recent MSPB appeal involving enhanced annuity retirement. The combined resources of the National Park Rangers Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police and the Association of National Park Rangers provided the $5,000 in attorney fees required to obtain legal representation for my appeal and hearing.

While my appeal has received a favorable decision, the significance of legal representation cannot be overemphasized at this stage in our fight for 6c retirement.

Thanks again for your support and best of luck to those of you with pending claims!

Tim Sorber
Gettysburg, PA

Editor:

While perusing the Spring (1993) issue of Ranger, and in particular, the responses to the questions posed on budget issues, I was disappointed to see several inaccurate statements related to the construction program and the Denver Service Center (DSC).

I can understand misconceptions from National Park Service (NPS) employees who have little contact with DSC, but I am particularly bothered when superintendents apparently do not understand the construction program formulation and budget.

Rather than trying to discuss these issues in this forum, I would recommend that those who wish to know more about the construction program take the course, “Management of Park Development Projects,” given by Denis Galvin, Bill Locke and Dick Falb. This two-day course is given two to three times per year at various locations and always receives outstanding ratings from those attending. The next course will be offered in Falls Church, Va., on September 22-23, 1993.

Conversely, I know that many DSC people do not understand the funding issues facing parks. We all need to do our part to work together to accomplish the mission of the NPS.

Caleb G. Cooper
Acting Assistant Director, Design and Construction
Denver Service Center

ANPR’s Second Century Club

Phil Ward, an early life member of ANPR, has offered an idea to increase life members’ support. He suggested that ANPR make available a secondary level of life membership for those who paid the original life membership fee of $125. E&AA has used similar levels to rally financial support from its life members. Using Phil’s zeal and E&AA’s example, the Second Century Club was formed.

The club now has 28 members. Realizing life membership in ANPR is still a bargain at any price, each member has paid an additional $125, matching his or her original life membership fee. The additional contribution will expand the principal contained within the life account, thereby producing increased investment potential.

Membership in the Second Century Club is available to all original life members. If you are eligible to join, ANPR encourages your support to help stem the escalating costs of providing life member benefits. To join, simply send a check for $125 to Debbie Gorman, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831. As always, payment schedules may be arranged.

Second Century Club Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phil Ward</td>
<td>Andy Ferguson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Broyles</td>
<td>Cliff Chetwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Wade</td>
<td>Rick Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Moses</td>
<td>Wendy Laurizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Buccello</td>
<td>Mark Tanaka-Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Swift</td>
<td>Jeff Karraker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Buccello</td>
<td>Janice Webbenhorst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Farabee</td>
<td>Mary Kimmitt Laxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Tolle</td>
<td>Bruce McKeeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Bean</td>
<td>Jean Swearingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Carroll</td>
<td>Ron Konklin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Young</td>
<td>Jim Brady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod Broyles</td>
<td>Dale Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pierce</td>
<td>Jack Morehead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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President’s Message

This special edition of Ranger has two purposes — to look back over the past five years and measure our accomplishments against the goals we set for ourselves in 1988 and to look forward through the window provided by the Kennedy School report to determine our objectives for the future and our strategy for getting there.

This Association has changed greatly since 1988. We have become much more knowledgeable about the process of change and the significant effort it takes to resolve long-standing problems. We have increased our credibility by providing sound, informed responses to Congressional inquiries. We’ve greatly widened our contacts, both at home and abroad, and have taken a leadership role in the international ranger movement. We’ve gotten better at communicating within the organization, better at planning and follow-up, better at delegating tasks.

But, as the Kennedy School report shows, there’s still much to be done. We need clear, attainable, measurable and flexible goals. We need even better communications. We need to increase funding. And we need to get more people involved in the management of ANPR.

I strongly encourage you to look closely at the report, think about our objectives and how to attain them, and think about what you want to do to bring them to fruition.

The last point is critical. The tired cliche about ANPR’s board being just an old boy network is no more than that; not only are there few “old boys” on it, but the majority of the voting members (9-6) are now women. There are only two founding members still active anywhere within the leadership of the organization, including the board, committee chairs, staff, work project leaders, and sundry other positions occupied by untitled hard chargers.

Many of those currently in key positions in the organization are members of the “second generation” of ANPR leaders; that is, those who joined the organization in the early to mid-’80s. A large proportion of the rest are part of a “third generation” of leaders — members, many of them women, who’ve been in ANPR for a while, but have only become active in recent years.

In any case, it’s important to understand that we are on the edge of another significant change. Several of us first- and second-generation graybeards are able, willing and ready to step down from leadership positions, and we’re looking for others to replace us. But not just anyone: We’re seeking a few good women and men who are prepared to make serious commitments of time and energy to the organization, who have shown the ability to lead and/or work hard, and — most importantly — who have a strong sense of the mission of the NPS, the importance of its resources, and the good of its employees.

Literally hundreds of members have volunteered to do ANPR work over the 16 years of this organization’s existence. Although the Association has never been able to provide volunteers with a lot of money to accomplish objectives, it’s given something far more important, particularly in a bureaucracy — the opportunity to take the initiative and run with it as far as hard work, good intentions and a few bucks can take you.

Volunteers are also given tremendous latitude to succeed or fail. Many people have proven themselves; others have lacked the energy, enterprise or staying power to succeed. We are sometimes criticized for being clubby; that is, that members only hire other members for openings in their parks or offices. Although that’s neither fair nor correct, there’s an aspect of that misconception that has some truth to it, which is that ANPR serves as a proving ground for new talent.

Anyone who’s had to process a certificate of eligibles and make a selection for a position is familiar with the pattern: A few people who are unknowns, several who’ve heard something about but don’t know well, and, if you’re lucky, one or two top-notch, wel­regarded employees with proven track records. It’s inevitable that those in the latter category are going to stand a much better chance of selection. ANPR provides an arena in which you can demonstrate your talent and energy and simultaneously accomplish — or, at least, take your best shot at accomplishing — worthwhile tasks that further the Service’s mission or the lot of your fellow employees. That kind of recognition is invaluable when it comes to moving up in the NPS.

I can tick off the names of a dozen people who’ve walked into this organization cold, taken the initiative on one task or another, then gone like blazes toward their objectives. The irony is that many of these people are now said to be part of the “good ol’ boy network”, though the truth is that few of them were known to any of ANPR’s founders when they volunteered and that, as was noted above, many are women. None was “pre-selected” for an Association position.

What I’m getting at is simply this: ANPR is a proving ground for the hard chargers of this agency, and you have the chance to step in and join the ranks and do something worthwhile in the process.

Formal processes for recruiting, mentoring and identifying talented resources will be set up over coming months. Make yourself known. This is your Association, and it’s your turn to run it.

Think about it — and do something about it.
Strategic Plan for the Association of National Park Rangers

This Policy Analysis Exercise was prepared for the Association of National Park Rangers by Thomas E. Steinbach, a Master in Public Policy degree candidate at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, April 13, 1993. Project Advisers, Peter Zimmerman, Henry Lee and Joe Kalt, John F. Kennedy School of Government.

Executive Summary

Over the next decade, the Association of National Park Rangers should pursue a strategy that combines advocacy on one or two member-identified issues with a focus on rebuilding the bonds between National Park Service rangers. The Association’s skills, operating environment and culture leave it well suited to create value for the ranger profession by pursuing these goals. In the process of defining and spreading a ranger ethic, ANPR will generate pride and renewed fellowship across ranger disciplines. Similarly, advocacy limited to the most pressing ranger issues will help to unite members and create positive change in NPS policy.

In order to achieve this strategy, ANPR must set specific short-, middle- and long-term goals. A phased implementation approach will ensure that the Association will not do as it has often done in the past by identifying several voids in NPS policy and expecting to effect change in each area simultaneously. While admirable, this approach exceeds ANPR’s ability to provide effective input and can lead to confusion over the Association’s mission.

Short-term goals should focus on prioritizing member interests. ANPR already has a long-range plan that identifies the full range of actionable members would like the Association to pursue. The next step is to utilize park and regional representatives to gather more input on which issues are a priority. With this information, ANPR can begin to develop a few specific objectives and determine which issues are important across ranger disciplines. By articulating a limited list of goals, ANPR will begin to eliminate existing confusion over whom the Association wants as members and what it has to offer.

In the two- to five-year or mid-term horizon, ANPR must begin efforts to unite the ranger profession. This should be approached through three avenues. First, in order to strengthen existing bonds between rangers, ANPR could work with current and potential members to develop a ranger creed that specifies the values and perspectives that define what it means to be an NPS ranger. Second, to reinforce the Association’s dedication to ranger interests, an advocacy action plan should be designed that focuses only on high priority issues. Implementation of this plan must include frequent progress updates and specific guidelines for member involvement. Finally, the Association should work to improve its internal capacity through formalized communication procedures, increased funding and leadership development. These capabilities are essential to the overall success of the strategy.

Further improvements in internal capacity should be the focus of ANPR’s long-term objectives. Among appropriate goals are hiring an executive director, sponsoring additional ANPR board meetings, and developing stronger relationships with other associations. Each of these steps will improve ANPR’s ability to continue with its community-building and advocacy activities and to develop a more pro-active approach to meeting rangers’ needs.

Achieving this strategy will be challenging for ANPR and will take time. But the Association’s external environment, internal capacity and expectations combine to make this approach both valuable and achievable. The combined community-building and advocacy aspects build on ANPR’s action orientation and strong devotion to the ranger profession. This strategy also addresses the existing challenges resulting from ANPR’s historically broad mission by focusing the organization on a few specific objectives.

Section I: Introduction

Overview

This report details a strategic plan for the Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR). It develops a framework for identifying appropriate and achievable goals for ANPR and suggests organizational changes to facilitate successful implementation of Association goals.

Its purpose is to assess ANPR’s skills and setting and recommend an appropriate strategy. The framework, options and implementation guidelines included here establish a foundation from which ANPR can adjust its strategy in response to conditions it faces today and those it confronts tomorrow. However, this document does not represent the completion of ANPR’s strategic planning process. Instead, it may be most useful as a starting point for continued discussion and planning. Ideally, readers will use the information in this report to spark discussion and critical thought about the appropriate niche for the organization.

The document is constructed in three sections. Each chapter addresses different aspects of the strategic considerations confronting ANPR.

Section I:

Summarizes Association successes and outlines the strategic challenges currently faced by ANPR. Potential missions for the Association are reviewed in order to provide a context for understanding the strategic analysis presented in Section II.

Section II:

Outlines a framework for evaluating ANPR’s strategic options. This framework is described in general terms and then applied to the current setting faced by ANPR.

Section III:

Employs the information provided in Sections I and II to develop an appropriate strategic plan. Implementation guidelines are presented.

Appendix A supplements the information provided in the body of this report by detailing three strategic options that differ from the strategy recommended in Section III. Taken together, these options define the range of approaches pursued by organizations like ANPR. An analysis of ANPR’s strengths and weaknesses under each approach is provided, as well as rationale for not directly adopting these options.

Research Methodology

The analysis included in this report is based on feedback from more than 60 interviews with Association members, potential members, strategic planning experts, and staff from other associations. In addition, the observations made here rely on an in-depth investigation of ANPR’s financial statements and publications. This information combined with research on strategic planning in non-profit associations and comparisons with similar organizations is the basis for the presented recommendations.

Background on ANPR

The Association was founded in 1977 in Grand Teton National Park with primarily a social focus. In the intervening 16 years, ANPR has grown from 30 members to more than 1,500, and significantly increased its range of activities. Today, ANPR’s programs include training, professional development, and advocacy on issues of interest to National Park Service rangers. Throughout its development, the Association has served as a forum for discussion of issues that concern park rangers and it remains the only association focused solely on National Park Service rangers.

The organization centers around a 16-member board of directors presided over by a president and three vice presidents. Each board member represents one geographic region and all officers except the vice president for special concerns are elected by the general membership. Terms of service are two years and are unpaid.

ANPR employs two part-time staff. These are the business manager and editor for the quarterly Ranger magazine. Wages for the part-time staff and program expenditures are generated almost completely through dues and other fundraising from members. Typically, this creates an annual budget of approximately $80,000.
ANPR Successes

Despite being a relatively young organization, ANPR has achieved a number of important successes, many of which have partially filled a void in current NPS programming. One of ANPR's greatest successes has been its ability to maintain steady membership and remain operative in a time when many similar organizations have closed their doors. This suggests that ANPR is providing a service to its membership that is valuable enough to persist despite economic challenges.

In the area of advocacy, ANPR has provided leadership on issues such as fair housing and health benefits for National Park Service (NPS) rangers. The Association's interaction with relevant legislative committees, combined with its ability to mobilize members to participate in letter-writing campaigns, has contributed to the submission of separate legislation for improved ranger housing and health benefits for seasonal employees. Given the volunteer nature of ANPR and its limited resources, the Association’s contributions on these issues are commendable.

ANPR's professional development programming includes management training, transitioning from seasonal to full-time employment, and seminars in disciplines such as interpretation, resource management, and law enforcement. Many members noted that they believe that these activities increase the professionalism among rangers and provide an opportunity to learn about disciplines outside their particular specialty.

In addition to pursuing advocacy and professional development, ANPR has maintained an ethic that encourages camaraderie. This is best displayed at the annual Ranger Rendezvous conference, which serves both as a forum for professional development and as a mechanism for building a sense of community among rangers. It provides an opportunity for members to debate and commiserate in a relaxed setting, free from the formalized structure of the workplace.

It is ANPR's success in providing a wide variety of programming that has led to its survival and growth. However, the Association is not free of problems. Its leaders and regular members generally rate ANPR's performance as adequate, but not outstanding. They note concerns ranging from difficulty completing day-to-day activities to the overall direction of the organization.

Challenges Faced by ANPR

The challenges currently confronted by ANPR exist on two levels. On the surface are operational frustrations experienced by Association leaders and other active members. The most commonly cited in member interviews include no growth in membership, financial constraints, and difficulty completing tasks due to a shortage of volunteer time. While these conditions represent real constraints, they are more manifestations of underlying problems than the source of the challenges facing the Association.

Aggravating these day-to-day frustrations are two underlying concerns. First, many current members do not have a clear understanding of the specific goals ANPR is currently trying to achieve and do not feel like owners of the Association's strategy. While most members agree that the overall mission of ANPR is to advance and promote the ranger profession, they give widely different interpretations of exactly what this means and how it should be achieved. ANPR's current mission statement and stated goals are so broad that both current and potential members often cannot easily interpret ANPR's priorities.

Second, non-member rangers are not aware of ANPR's mission or the progress the Association has made on issues affecting professional rangers, such as housing, health benefits, training, and professional development. Without shared understanding of ANPR's mission, awareness of priorities, and inclusion in determining Association goals, members and potential members may remain unwilling to volunteer their scarce time and money.

This confusion results from the ongoing change within ANPR. When the Association was founded in 1977, its focus was mainly social. Annual Association meetings provided a place for rangers to gather and exchange stories among individuals who shared the pride, perspective, and, at times, frustration of being an NPS ranger. As years passed and the Association grew, members began to view ANPR as a social activity and a forum for identifying problems confronting park rangers. According to a number of interviewees, ANPR began to try to fill some voids in programming and policy resulting from poor leadership at the highest levels of the National Park Service. This shift in focus led to the creation of a mission statement and objectives broad enough to permit activity to address every difficulty encountered on the job.

As ANPR has undergone an increase in membership, sophistication and activity, it has managed to develop a relatively broad set of goals to guide its actions. While this allowed maximum latitude for ANPR's leaders to develop programs on a wide range of relevant causes, it has created a situation where ANPR is attempting to address too many issues and provide programming in too many areas at once. This, in turn, leads to confusion over the focus of the group. Some members and potential members cannot readily determine which issues and activities the Association will embrace and which it will not. Additionally, members have not been included in the development of strategy and prioritization of goals, so they often do not feel strong commitment to ensuring their achievement.

Potential Strategies

Before assessing ANPR's organizational effectiveness, determining objectives, and specifying a strategy, it may be helpful to understand the range of strategic options the Association might pursue. The following sub-section summarizes three options that represent different approaches ANPR can take. The options reviewed here were selected based on research comparing the strategies of similar organizations. No single option is intended to represent the best one for ANPR, but each may include components that ANPR members believe should be included in a specific strategy for the Association.

Community-Building Focus: Under this option ANPR would concentrate on improving the sense of family or community that has traditionally been part of what it means to be an NPS ranger. The central goals of this approach are to restore and reinvigorate the pride and sense of purpose in current employees, and impart these values to new rangers. Priorities would include: developing a ranger creed or vision which transcends professional specialty, region and government service grade; providing a social forum where NPS rangers can meet and commissurate; and increasing the understanding among rangers from different regions and disciplines for the variety of tasks and interests pursued by others in their profession. Successful implementation of this approach would be measured by creation of a more tightly knit community among the part-time and full-time staff.
Expansion and Merger: In adopting this strategy, ANPR would work to broaden its appeal to non-ranger employees within NPS as well as park professionals from state, county and local park and recreation areas. The goal here would be to define a mission and strategy with very broad appeal so that an NPS employee doing administrative work in Washington, D.C., feels the same impetus to join as a park ranger working for Lackawanna County Department of Parks and Recreation in northeastern Pennsylvania. With this strategy ANPR would strive to identify and merge with other organizations established to represent subgroups of its potential membership. In essence, the Association would function as an umbrella group striving to unite park system-oriented organizations.

Successful implementation of this approach would be measured by a large increase in membership, addition of several full-time staff providing programming in a broad set of topic areas, and creation of regional and local offices as well as organizational chapters for different ranger disciplines. Examples of organizations pursuing this approach include the National Recreation and Parks Association and the Fraternal Order of Police.

Strong Advocacy Focus: This strategy would lead ANPR to select a few issues of high importance to NPS rangers and pursue changes in policy and public awareness in order to advance ranger interests on these issues. The majority of the Association’s resources and expertise would be spent lobbying Congress and the upper management of NPS in order to achieve desired policy changes. Part of this effort would include building constituencies of support for ANPR initiatives among park employees and the public. Successful implementation would be measured by the amount of progress ANPR is able to generate on its selected issues and by the size of the constituency the Association maintains. The Association of Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics (AFSEE) is an example of one organization pursuing this approach.

Section I Summary

ANPR has enjoyed a relatively successful 16-year history characterized by increased activity and sophistication. While current programming in the areas of advocacy and professional development have increased in priority, these have not shut out the sense of camaraderie and fun around which the Association was founded. Along with ANPR’s success and growth have come a number of challenges. These often surface as frustration over limited time and resources.

The root of the challenge facing ANPR is a sense of confusion among members and potential members over the goals and priorities of the Association. Because the current mission is so broadly defined, it provides only rough guidance on ANPR’s intended role. In order to address this problem, the current leadership of ANPR has begun an organizational assessment process with the intention of identifying and making the changes necessary to improve its responsiveness and effectiveness.

This document is one component of ANPR’s organizational assessment. It identifies the range of options available to the organization, assesses the Association’s strengths and weaknesses using an analytical framework that helps illustrate opportunities and roadblocks in a clear fashion, and suggests a recommended strategy for the future.

Among similar organizations, the range of strategies pursued fall roughly into three categories: community-building, expansion and merger, and strong advocacy. While most organizations employ some mixture of two or more of these approaches, individually, they represent the extremes available to ANPR. An understanding of each approach provides context and a basis for evaluation of ANPR’s capabilities in the strategic assessment presented in Section II.

Section II: ANPR Strategic Assessment

Overview

This section outlines a framework for evaluating ANPR’s strategic position. This framework is first described in general terms and is then applied to the current setting faced by the Association. Specific points which support or diminish ANPR’s ability to achieve any one of the strategic options defined in Section I are noted. This section is summarized by briefly reviewing the strengths and weaknesses identified in the strategic assessment and suggesting how these impact the strategic options available to ANPR.

Strategic Assessment Framework

In order to identify the appropriate strategy for ANPR, it is helpful to use a framework that details the strengths, weaknesses and influences impacting the Association. An assessment framework establishes consistent criteria that permit:

- comprehensive investigation of an organization
- comparisons with other organizations
- identification of achievable strategies

In addition, the framework described below is a particularly useful analytical tool that Association members may wish to employ in the future to identify emerging opportunities. Its main benefit is that it provides a clear, comprehensive and concise method for understanding the full range of influences on any organization.

The framework employed here is represented by three overlapping circles (Figure 1 below). Each symbolizes a distinct factor affecting the ability of ANPR to successfully pursue a chosen strategy. These include ANPR’s external environment, internal capacity, and the expectations of internal and external actors. In combination they comprise the full set of influences on the organization at any point in time.

External Environment: The external environment is given by an organization’s operational setting. It includes factors such as laws, customs, location and culture.

Internal Capacity: Includes the skills and resources embodied in an organization such as funding, staff, leadership and communication mechanisms.

Expectations: The expectations of the role to be filled by an organization by both external and internal players affect the range of activities available to that organization. For example, if NPS managers and ANPR members both expect the Association to provide management training to rangers, both parties are likely to look to the Association rather than other vehicles to provide this service.

The shaded area in the center of the diagram where all three circles overlap represents the range of goals that can be achieved by an organization with a given external environment, internal capacity and expectations. This shaded area is not static. It can change as any one or combination of the influencing factors change. For example, imagine that NPS established a new park unit designation focused solely on the preservation of American Indian lands and staffed primarily with rangers trained in anthropology. This change in ANPR’s external environment would mean that strategic plans for membership growth might need to include recruitment efforts and programming to meet the needs of rangers interested in American Indian issues while previously this was not a consideration.

It is also possible for ANPR to influence each of the factors in this framework in order to make a desired strategy more achievable. This is the equivalent of working to shift one of the circles in Figure 1 so that the shaded area expands to include a desired strategic approach. Imagine that ANPR decides it wants to shift its mission to focus solely on education and training. Currently, the Association has neither the funds nor the administrative expertise to initiate and achieve this strategy. However, by working to change expectations and
internal capacity, the Association might be able to expand its options to include a strategy of this type.

Strategic Assessment of ANPR

The following analysis applies the general framework presented above to the current strategic situation faced by ANPR. Each of the influences affecting ANPR’s role is explored in detail and their impact on potential strategies is described.

ANPR’s External Environment

ANPR clearly does not operate in a vacuum. The external conditions it faces partially define the range of effective roles that it can assume. The following analysis serves to identify the main external influences on ANPR in order to establish the setting in which strategic decisions unfold. These have been broadly grouped into the following categories:

• NPS structure
• NPS culture
• Ranger working conditions
• Public support for NPS mission

NPS Structure

In order to understand the external influences on ANPR it is helpful to examine the salient structural features of the National Park Service. These provide insight into the opportunities and constraints an organization like ANPR will encounter.

• NPS has a large, multilayered organizational structure: The sheer size and complexity of the NPS bureaucracy results in the variety of perspectives and problems sensed by different ANPR members. For example, an entry level ranger may believe pay and working conditions are the most important issues to address while a middle manager may see budget allocations and park unit additions as paramount. Consequently, if ANPR pursues a strong advocacy strategy it will need to work with members to prioritize and select the issues of greatest importance to the majority of members.

• NPS is geographically dispersed: In addition to making fast, frequent communication and personal contact difficult, the dispersion of park units throughout the United States means that employees in different locations may perceive problems differently and have different abilities to participate in their solution. As a result, under any strategy, ANPR will have to make a concerted effort to ensure that communication procedures are adopted which can send and receive information from all parts of the country.

• NPS is under direct supervision of the Department of Interior: As a result NPS is subject to the strategies and political agendas established by the Secretary of the Interior and approved by the President. Consequently, the priorities established for the park system may fluctuate with changes in political administrations. Additionally, all decisions made at the top of NPS are subject to political considerations and concerns.

• U.S. Congress provides oversight and budgetary approval to NPS: Congress is essentially a watchdog over the actions and programs of the National Park Service. It maintains the power to increase or decrease budgets and to legislate new responsibilities or remove existing programs. Because Congress maintains considerable decision-making power over NPS, ANPR must understand the personalities and committee structures on both sides of the Capitol if it wants to represent the views of the ranger profession in national park policy-making. The Association’s interaction with Congress to date has been to provide a form of professional testimony and expert opinion.

• Superintendents have significant power: Over time, the job of park unit superintendent has evolved to include considerable influence over the policies enacted in park units. While the organizational structure of NPS dictates that the headquarters office develop and pass along policies to regional offices which then oversee implementation in individual park units, this mechanism is often effectively short-circuited by superintendents.

Today, it is not uncommon for a superintendent of a large or more well-known unit to circumvent the regional and headquarters offices and directly influence policy formation at the congressional level through public testimony or individual contacts with the congressional representative from their area. Although a superintendent’s influence varies depending on the individual and the perceived significance of their park unit, if ANPR wants to pursue an advocacy approach, effort should be made to attract superintendents as members and to utilize their influence to bring attention to key issues.

• Specialization of duties has been the trend for NPS employees: When NPS was founded in 1916, rangers performed the majority of tasks in existing park units. As the system has grown and added new park unit designations, the variety of tasks to be performed have also increased. This trend creates specialized NPS employees both within the ranger profession and outside it. Today rangers specialize in interpretation, resource management and law enforcement, to name only a few. In addition, other non-ranger staff perform maintenance, manage policy development and provide administrative support.

This specialization shapes the way NPS employees view the problems within the Park Service and the expectations they have for the appropriate role of ANPR. A number of interviewees noted that rangers today do not share one common vision of the role of an NPS ranger. One of the purposes behind the community-building option would be to build a common mission in order to unite the ranger profession.

NPS Culture

In order to define an appropriate strategy for ANPR it is important to understand the culture in which it operates. The characteristics embodied in this culture help to illustrate the priorities, outlooks and preferences of members and potential members.

The issue of increased specialization noted above is one of many issues which affects the culture within the Park Service. The attitudes, perceptions and motivations of rangers have developed over time into a distinct organizational culture which affects how the Service perceives and achieves its mission. Because the vast majority of ANPR members are also NPS employees, ranger culture also affects the way that ANPR perceives its role.

While the culture within NPS is never constant, there are a few characteristics that have remained relatively unchanged. As the System has grown and increased its range of goals, these characteristics have persisted and helped to define what it means to be a National Park Service ranger.

• Green Blood: Like many of us who share common experiences and perspectives, park rangers have developed strong bonds with one another and to what it means to be an NPS ranger. A number of interviewees referred to this sense of community as “thick green blood” which flows through anyone who has joined the ranger ranks. These bonds pulled the founding ANPR members together in 1977 and motivated much of the growth in membership over the last 15 years. The strength of this bond is an asset which helps unite ANPR and create an atmosphere of teamwork. However, with increased specialization and less movement among park units, rangers have noticed a weakening of this bond particularly among newer NPS employees. A community-building approach for the Association would focus on maintaining the green blood bonds.

• Devotion to the ideals embodied in the National Park System: Few organizations share the sense of passion and devotion exhibited by many NPS rangers. Those who join the Service do not join for the pay or personal reward of being a park ranger, but are out of a sense of commitment to the ideals captured in the National Park System. For ANPR this means that members may be willing to make personal sacrifice in order to better the Service, but that the Association will need to show results that enhance NPS ideals.

• Independence: For many rangers the attraction to the job is the prospect of working outdoors or in a peaceful setting that is at least somewhat removed from the hectic pace of urban life. The park environment provides independence and a connection with nature and history that do not exist in many jobs. This character feeds into the culture within ANPR and defines interactions and activities.
• Distrust of regional and headquarters office: The idealism and independence of many rangers contribute to a general distrust of the political and bureaucratic decision-making process within NPS. This distrust has been reinforced by the practical experience of rangers in dealing with the upper levels of management in the Park Service as they have witnessed inaction on issues such as budget appropriation, personnel reform and training. The result has been the creation of a “don’t play the political game” attitude among many. If ANPR continues to press for change within NPS it will be necessary to both understand the political game and be very adept at operating within it. This does not mean that ANPR must embrace the way in which decisions are made, but that it needs to be aware of many members’ reluctance to become involved in a process they do not trust.

• Many full-time rangers spend their entire career working for NPS: Unlike many careers, once an individual becomes a full-time ranger they often never leave the Park Service. This signifies a high level of dedication to the organization’s mission and contributes to the sense of family perceived by employees. This longevity also gives many rangers more institutional memory and sense of organizational history than is held by NPS leaders who are often appointed from outside the Park Service. Because these same rangers represent the membership pool for ANPR, the Association can contribute historical and organizational perspective in NPS policy discussions.

**Ranger Working Conditions**

There are a wide variety of working environments for NPS rangers. One need only imagine the differences in atmosphere from Glacier National Park in northwest Montana to the Statue of Liberty National Monument in New York Harbor to get a sense for the variety of settings in which rangers are employed. Nonetheless, there are common issues that affect all rangers regardless of their physical setting. These shared conditions illustrate some of the issues the Association might pursue under an advocacy strategy.

• **Low Pay:** When compared to other federal employees with similar responsibilities, the salaries of full- and part-time park rangers are significantly lower than those of their counterparts in other agencies. This is the result of the government service grade classification scheme used by the Park Service which makes shifts from one classification series to another very difficult. As a result, NPS employees cannot easily take advantage of career opportunities in new areas and often get stuck in a low- or mid-level grade. The difficulty advancing and resulting low pay despite many years of service has obvious implications for the amount of resources ANPR can expect to generate through individual dues or contributions. In addition, pay and advancement remain an issue area the Association could address under an advocacy strategy.

• **Budget Cuts:** Many park units have experienced a steady decline in budgets over the last several years. For example, in the period from 1985 to 1990 the total funds available for NPS operations increased an average of only 3.5 percent while inflation over the same period averaged 3.9 percent. This decline in real purchasing power is the result of two forces. First, federal concern over the budget deficit and focus on other programmatic priorities have translated into cuts in funding of some NPS programs. Second, the growing number of park areas means that the same amount of money does not go as far as it once did. Consequently, rangers are having to try to do more with less in their park units. This leads to frustration and anger as worthwhile activities are cut back or eliminated. In many cases rangers may turn to ANPR as one vehicle for resolving budget problems.

• **Detachment from the policy-making process:** Across the board, field service rangers tend to feel out of touch with the NPS policy-making process. They are not often asked for their opinions on policies and do not have direct access to decision-makers. Consequently, these lower grade rangers may look to ANPR as a mechanism for input on issues such as housing, pay and health benefits.

• **Seasonal employees comprise almost half of the total ranger workforce:** These part-time workers often spend one or two summers working in a park unit and then move on to pursue other careers or to become full-time NPS rangers. The interests and concerns of seasonal rangers are often different from full-time staff. As ANPR has discovered, their concerns center around pay, housing, health benefits and becoming full-time employees. If the Association wants to attract seasonal members it must be responsive to these interests. One as yet untapped source of membership is former seasonal rangers who often maintain a very positive memory of their work for the Park Service and may continue to share a concern for the ranger profession.

**Public Support for NPS Mission**

More than most federal agencies, the Park Service can honestly report a high level of public support for its goals and ideals. Park visitors routinely express a sense of awe and satisfaction over the beauty, accessibility and resources of individual park units. Moreover, many citizens have respect for the work done by NPS rangers.

This high level of public appreciation and support for NPS goals and the tasks performed by NPS rangers is a strong asset for ANPR. By increasing public awareness and mobilizing the existing support on specific issues, ANPR may be able to build the broad constituencies needed to inspire change within the park system.

**Implications of this External Environment on ANPR’s Strategy Selection**

The environment in which ANPR operates partially defines the range of achievable strategies. The size, working conditions, compartmentalization and political involvement that describe the structure of the National Park Service suggest that a variety of issues will interest rangers at any one point in time. This provides ANPR with an opportunity to have input in NPS policy debates, but also means that there will always be more problems and concerns than there are Association resources to address them.

The implications for ANPR resulting from this abundance of issues are twofold. First, an expansion and merger strategy will only add issues to an already large stack, so if the Association truly wants to address the concerns of NPS rangers, the expansion approach may make this more difficult. Second, adopting an advocacy strategy will require ANPR to work with members to identify and focus on only a few issues because the Association does not have the administrative capacity, staff support or financial resources to follow and provide valuable input on every salient issue.

The proud, dedicated and independent qualities that define NPS ranger culture support adoption of an advocacy or community-building strategy over an expansion and merger approach. The shared concern for achieving the Park Service mission makes rangers a potentially formidable constituency if their energy can be effectively targeted. If the Association were to expand or merge to include non-NPS employees, the care and concern for NPS ranger issues would be diluted. Under a community-building or advocacy approach the Association can tap into the strong ranger culture to work on enhancing and passing along the current professional bonds or to address ranger-specific interests.

**ANPR’s Internal Capacity**

The internal capacity of ANPR includes the resources, skills and standard operating procedures of the Association. Of the three components in this framework, ANPR has the most ability to directly effect changes in internal capacity because these do not require external support or approval and are bounded only by the laws governing non-profit organizations.

The capacity issues raised below should not be viewed as flaws in the organization, but as assessments of the way in which ANPR conducts its business. For most of the points made below there is both a positive and negative connotation that depends primarily on the situation or activity ANPR is confronting.

• **Most activities performed by volunteers:** With the exception of the business manager and editor of the *Ranger* magazine, all tasks undertaken by ANPR are accomplished by volunteers. The majority of these volunteers hold full- or part-time jobs that limit the time available to donate to ANPR activities. Conse-
Consequently, the pace at which tasks are completed is often slow. In addition, the Association must rely primarily on intangible mechanisms such as praise and recognition to reward its members for dedicated service.

- **Financial resources are small**: At $30 per year for regular membership, the Association's dues are very low compared to those of similar organizations. For example, the National Parks and Recreation Association and the Society of American Foresters both charge in excess of $90 per year for a full membership. ANPR's relatively low dues represents the main source of revenue for the Association, which typically maintains an annual budget of less than $80,000. As a result, ANPR must focus on activities that do not require much money and must adopt policies with keen attention to their costs. However, the low dues rates make membership more affordable for rangers who in many cases do not have sufficient income to afford more.

- **Organizational structure mirrors functions**: The structure of ANPR is established around its current functional activities. Leadership positions are defined and committees set up to perform specific tasks such as communication, marketing, leadership nominations, membership retention and recruitment. This eliminates redundancy and allows Association leaders to monitor activities in any of the functional categories. In addition, members can easily identify the appropriate contact person if they have interest in a particular activity. The functional organization, however, does promote concentration on existing functional areas and diminishes expansion into new areas or onto new issues that do not fit readily into existing functional categories. ANPR's relatively low dues represents the main source of revenue for the Association, which typically maintains an annual budget of less than $80,000. As a result, ANPR must focus on activities that do not require much money and must adopt policies with keen attention to their costs. However, the low dues rates make membership more affordable for rangers who in many cases do not have sufficient income to afford more.

- **Board decisions are normally made once per year**: Mainly the result of distance, time and money constraints, face-to-face board meetings occur only once per year at the annual Ranger Rendezvous. All planning for the coming year is accomplished at this time and all votes on new Association policy are taken here except in special circumstances when telephone voting is used. Issues that arise during the year are generally handled directly by the Association president rather than by caucusing the board. This means that considerable discretion on the operations of the Association is left to ANPR's president.

- **Communication is often slow**: The pace of communication from leadership to membership and back again is slow, often a number of months. This is the result of dispersed membership, limited resources and time constraints. Consequently, in situations where the Association needs to act quickly it is normally difficult to reach the entire membership to solicit support or opinions. This often leads to actions taken at the discretion of Association leaders and contributes to member sentiment that they have little say in ANPR decision making.

- **ANPR leadership is action oriented**: The current board and officers of the Association are very action oriented. They do not hesitate to move forward on an issue or make policy decisions without knowing all the potential consequences of action. They are not careless, but are willing to accept limited risks in order to move the Association forward.

- **The majority of tasks are performed by a small core of active members**: Approximately 30% of the Association's 1,500 members are responsible for most of the activity within ANPR. Active members are often committee chairs or members of the board of directors and are willing to commit considerable time to Association business. While this is typical of the level of participation achieved by most associations, the active core has not changed significantly in recent years. Despite efforts to encourage more membership involvement, the same members who are participating heavily today are those who have been active in the past. Because the current load of Association activities consumes the time available from these active members, addition of new programs requires growth in the active core and efforts to improve the efficiency of currently active members.

**Implications of ANPR's Internal Capacity on Strategy Selection**

ANPR's internal capacity is the element that most limits its ability to achieve different strategies. The Association's organization along functional lines and its action-oriented leadership predispose it to a strategy which involves some level of advocacy. However, the limited budget, small core of active members and slow pace of communication suggest that the less resource intensive community-building approach might be the most achievable option. Should the Association decide to adopt an advocacy approach, careful planning would need to be undertaken to prioritize and limit the number of issues to be addressed. Similarly, under an expansion and merger strategy, ANPR would have to focus on pacing its efforts over the long term so that it does not set more goals than it has the capacity to achieve.

**Expectations of ANPR**

Expectations develop both internally and externally. They constitute the range of activities, philosophies and commitments that members, potential members and others believe ANPR embraces. They may emerge as requests for activities, opinions, complaints and praise. The clearer and more frequently communicated the mission and goals of the Association, the more likely it is that the membership and external players will share common expectations of ANPR. Similarly, the past actions taken by the Association establish expectations for the future.

The points made below represent the array of expectations voiced during face-to-face and telephone interviews with ANPR members and non-members. The list is not comprehensive, but provides an overview of the common themes across interviews. Readers should note that, in general, expectations of ANPR were not uniform. While common views exist, they are not universally held. One exception to this pattern were expectations of ANPR voiced by Association leaders and highly active members. This group generally shared a common view of ANPR's role.

**Internal Expectations**

- **Forum for change in NPS**: Because of the demonstrated ability of ANPR to represent ranger interests on issues like housing, health benefits and NPS appropriations as well as frustration with the lack of leadership at the upper levels of the Park Service, ANPR members are increasingly looking to the Association as a mechanism to overcome the problems encountered on the job. The range of issues different members believe ANPR should address is not uniform, but there is a universal belief that ANPR should be pressing for improvements in park policy.

- **Fun**: ANPR's strategy has always included an element of fun. Most members stressed that providing a social forum where rangers can meet and share stories over a beer or some food should remain a goal even as ANPR increases its role as an advocate and educator. Associated with this belief was the expectation that social activities hosted by ANPR would provide an opportunity to network with park unit and regional managers.

- **Low dues**: Members are accustomed to having low annual dues requirements. This is mainly the result of past dues charges which are held intentionally low in order to reduce barriers to joining. While many members interviewed believed that current dues revenues restrict the activities of the Association, they felt that any significant increase without express approval of the membership would likely lead to decreased renewal.

- **Moderate time commitment**: Members are also accustomed to providing relatively small amounts of time to Association activities. With the exception of the active core, most members take only a few hours to read through Ranger magazine and any other association communications and to write letters when ANPR puts out a call for a show of support for legislation. This limited amount of time, in addition to attending park or regional meetings and the annual Ranger Rendezvous is the level of effort most members expect to provide toward ANPR activities each year. Consequently, the Association is always likely to have an active core of members performing most tasks and a less active majority.

- **Limited activism**: While members do view ANPR as a forum for change within the Park Service, there is an expectation that the Association will not become too activist in its...
approach to creating this change. Many members stressed that ANPR should pick its battles carefully and where possible should work with NPS to achieve solutions rather than as an antagonist. This view complements the guidelines established for legislative involvement in ANPR’s bylaws and suggests that ANPR may want to pursue a role as an advocate that provides professional opinion and testimony rather than a more activist stance.

**External Expectations**

External expectations are those held by any non-member. This includes rangers and other NPS employees, congressional staff and representatives, other associations and the public. Their views are often based as much on perception and small bits of information as they are on the past activities of ANPR.

- **Credibly deliver the views of field staff to policy-makers:** Among external players in Congress and the media there is a general perception that ANPR is a strong source of opinions and information from the field. These outsiders believe that ANPR is more in tune with the real situation in individual park units than are the directors of the Park Service. ANPR’s credibility for providing professional opinions to Congress and the media is high and its reputation as the voice of the field ranger is growing.

- **Represent views of all NPS professions:** Most outsiders do not distinguish between NPS rangers and other Park Service employees. For many, a ranger is anyone who works in a park unit or in the NPS system. Therefore, outsiders often expect ANPR to represent the views of individuals who are not normally considered rangers by those in the profession.

- **Work within NPS system:** Outside actors believe that ANPR will first attempt to resolve problems by working with the Park Service before taking its concerns to Congress or the media. ANPR is viewed generally as a “critical friend” to the Park Service.

**Implications of these Expectations on ANPR’s Strategy Selection**

Internal and external expectations are that ANPR will represent the views and interests of NPS rangers. As a result the Association would need to significantly change these expectations if it were to successfully adopt an expansion and merger approach. However, a strategy that includes advocacy on a few issues and is achieved where possible, without hostility toward the Park Service, meets expectations of members and non-members.

Internal views that ANPR should push for change while maintaining low dues and an ethic of fun suggests that a community-building approach combined with work on a few ranger issues may be the most acceptable strategy. This approach allows the Association to continue to be a forum for change without continually antagonizing NPS leaders.

**Section II Summary**

Taken together, the external environment, internal capacity, and expectations of ANPR define the range of achievable strategies. The intersection of these components suggests that the Association may be best equipped to adopt a strategy that allows it to address the most pressing policy concerns held by rangers, but limits these to include only a few goals so that the organization does not become overwhelmed and ultimately unable to achieve any of its objectives.

The external environment is characterized primarily by a very dedicated, idealistic and independent culture among rangers and an organization with unusually high public support but no shortage of challenges to its ability to achieve its mission.

To this environment ANPR brings a set of skills and limitations that speak to the need to balance representation of the profession in policy debates with activities that will unite and inspire rangers from all specialties. Limited time and money coupled with expectations that the organization will tackle the few most salient problems make ANPR well-suited to consider strategies that combine parts of the community-building approach with advocacy work on a limited number of issues.

Although challenging, a combined approach of this type is achievable without changes in ANPR’s external environment or expectations. The amount of increase in internal capacity necessary to successfully achieve a mixed approach depends on the specific goals established. Section III suggests a specific approach and corresponding implementation guidelines which would build internal capacity.

**Section III: Recommended Strategy**

**Overview**

This section recommends a specific strategy for ANPR and provides implementation guidelines for achieving this approach. Short-term, mid-term and long-term objectives are presented. Established goals are intentionally broad to allow focus to be added based on member feedback.

This plan may serve best as a template or benchmark from which the Association develops ANPR’s reputation and puts weight behind their “expert testimony.”

Expectations of ANPR, both internal and external, support combining elements of community-building and advocacy. Internal expectations focus on two priorities. The first is that ANPR work hard to ensure that the women and men entrusted with protecting the National Park System and park rangers bolsters ANPR’s position and puts weight behind their expertise.

Expectations of the Association support adoption of a strategy that develops ANPR’s reputation as a “critical friend” of NPS and incorporates efforts to unite rangers.

When compared to expectations and external environment, ANPR’s internal capacity is the weak link for successful implementation of this strategy. However, of these three factors, the Association maintains the greatest ability to change its internal capabilities. Current skills and resources are adequate to begin pursuing a mixed community-building and limited advocacy approach, but will require some changes to ensure success in the long-term. In the short-run if ANPR is careful to limit advocacy activities to one or two issues and not attempt to fill every void in programming left by the Park Service, the Association is likely to be successful.

**Implementation Objectives**

- **Short-term Objectives (this year)**

- **Work with membership to prioritize goals:** For members to become active in the Association they must feel ownership of the goals and strategy adopted by ANPR. Before the leadership changes course or establishes a new direction, considerable time should be spent talking with members, seeking their input and incorporating it into the specific approach embraced by the Association. Members who believe that part of ANPR belongs to them will be more willing to commit time and energy to Association activities. ANPR began this process with its Toward 1993 Task Force.
but stopped short of translating the wide variety of views expressed by members into a set of five or six objectives that the membership can latch onto.

The Association should pick up where it left off with the Toward 1993 Task Force by distilling the long list of tasks in the final task force report into a few specific objectives that will guide the activities of ANPR. In order to accomplish this, ANPR should direct regional and park representatives to begin conducting regularly scheduled park unit meetings where issues to be discussed are posted and routed through park mail. These meetings should occur at least quarterly and more frequently in areas where travel distance is not very long. Members and potential members should be personally encouraged to attend.

Prior to these meetings ANPR board members should convene (in person, by telephone or in writing) in order to develop a common agenda and a prioritized list of ANPR’s goals that members can give feedback on. This established agenda should be circulated to park representatives with explicit instructions on how to conduct the meetings. Among things to be discussed are what does it mean to be an NPS ranger, what can ANPR best contribute to the profession, and what goals shouldn’t ANPR pursue.

The information discussed in park meetings should be transmitted from park to regional representatives where it is refined and taken back to the individual park units for ranger commentary. This approach is nearly costless and permits face-to-face communication between members and potential members which builds ANPR’s credibility. The main challenge to performing this task is identifying appropriate times to conduct park meetings. ANPR representatives may need to be creative in their approach by holding meetings after training sessions, during different shifts and in different locations.

* Increase funding: While the recommended strategy does not require large increases in Association resources, additional funding will allow ANPR to pursue its goals. In the short-term, ANPR should specify increased funding as a goal without an expectation of realizing additional resources for two or three years. After identifying a desired amount of money to be raised, the business manager should be tasked with investigating funding alternatives. Appropriate resources to begin this research are listed in the Funding section of the bibliography.

* Maintain visible support for ranger interests: In order to encourage interest from members and non-members alike, ANPR leadership must illustrate a high level of commitment to improving the situation for rangers at all levels and disciplines within NPS. For those who attend the Ranger Rendezvous or read Ranger magazine, this message is already fairly clear. However, other mechanisms are available for getting this message out to a broader audience. In particular, personal contact by board members or Association officers with small groups after work or over lunch will impress upon non-members the dedication held by ANPR. Similarly, a prioritized set of goals which looks beyond one year indicates ANPR’s intention to continue to provide activities that will enhance the profession.

* Advertise achievements: ANPR has represented ranger interests in policy debates on issues like housing, health benefits and NPS budgeting. Unfortunately, ANPR’s role in these debates is not well known. The Association needs to increase its efforts at advertising its accomplishments. Ranger magazine is one avenue for this message, but not the only one ANPR should use. In addition to the magazine, promotional posters should be developed that detail ANPR accomplishments for potential and current members. New rangers should be given a brief resume of ANPR’s achievements as well as a membership application during their training and orientation. Regional and park representatives should provide frequent updates on activities.

The more ways members and potential members can find out about how ANPR is working to unite rangers and to address the issues they care about, the more likely they are to become active. Another effective promotional technique is to establish benchmarks for each goal pursued by the organization and celebrate their successful achievement in newsletters, Ranger magazine and at Association meetings.

* Increase intrinsic awards for active members: ANPR is constantly in need of more effort from its membership, and an expanded effort to do more advertising and to conduct park meetings will increase this need. ANPR leaders can inspire increased activity from members by providing more intrinsic awards for good service. Specific efforts might include a conscious effort to thank and recognize members who have been active, and to give positive feedback to individuals whose efforts have helped the Association accomplish goals. Additional awards could be developed and given out at the Ranger Rendezvous, and Ranger magazine could highlight different members who have provided valuable service. It is essential that these rewards be targeted as much at volunteers whose input is mostly at the park level as they are toward ANPR’s nationally active leaders.

* Implement leadership development/training: To successfully enhance the sense of community among rangers and provide advocacy on selected issues, ANPR must develop leaders that are both in tune with the issues rangers care about and capable of speaking for the profession. ANPR currently has officers who possess these skills; however, little is being done to ensure that new leaders are being prepared to replace existing personnel.

The recent addition of a nominating committee is a positive step toward ensuring a smooth transition from current to future leadership. To make the committee more effective, guidelines should be established that identify the skills needed in the various leadership positions. Priorities should also be established for...
increasing representation of seasonal and entry
level rangers within the leadership structure of
ANPR. Perhaps specific advisory positions
could be created on the board for seasonal and
low-grade rangers.

ANPR should consider a mentoring system
whereby newly elected board members attend
an orientation or actual board meeting before
assuming their position. This orientation could
be conducted at the annual Ranger Rendezvous
one day before the board convenes. Its purpose
would be to detail the expectations and
responsibilities that are part of sitting on
ANPR's Board of Directors. Currently, new
board members are essentially left to deter-
mine these duties on their own, so there is
often no consistency in how different members
approach their job.

- Increase funding: In this two- to five-
year horizon ANPR should begin concrete
action toward raising additional funds from
endowments or grants. Based on initial informa-
tion researched by the business manager,
ANPR should specify funding requirements
and consider hiring a development consultant
to design and carry out a specific funding strat-
agy. While hiring an outside professional will
require a financial investment, the higher
return and reduced frustration of having an ex-
pert raise additional funds is worth the fees
charged. A fund-raising consultant also brings
expertise to this vast subject area that often is
essential for a successful result.

In addition to targeting endowments and
grants, ANPR may want to seek advice on how
to tap into the high level of public support for
parks and rangers. Perhaps there is a mechanism
through which the Association could raise
money from public gifts, donations and bequests.

- Formalize Communication Proce-
dures: To be an effective representative of the
ranger profession, ANPR must have well func-
tioning lines of communication. These need to
operate in all directions:

1) from the leadership to the membership
2) from the membership to the leadership
3) from committee to committee
4) from region to region

The current communication mechanisms are
not well established and are used infrequently.
This inhibits the ability of members to remain
informed about Association activities and pre-
vents leaders from keeping abreast of ranger
sentiment. ANPR has surmounted the most dif-
ficult part of effective communication by cre-
atng an organizational structure around function-
ality. This permits a clear understanding of
where to turn for specific information.

The next step for the Association is to es-
ablish communication requirements that force
information up, down and across. *Ranger*
magazine and first-class mailings are good ex-
isting channels for communication from lead-
ership to membership. However, channels
need to be opened from the bottom to the top.
This can be accomplished by using regional
and park representatives to reach out to rangers
where they work and encourage feedback
which is then summarized and passed to the
board of directors who take action. This loop
must always be open and should be forced into
use. Face-to-face communication is particu-
larly effective for establishing a reputation
of care and concern for field level members.

In general, questionnaires and surveys
should be avoided as ways of getting feedback
unless they are accompanied with some form
of personal contact either in person or over the
telephone. Without a voice or human context
to connect to a survey form, many members
will not take the time to respond.

The Association should also improve
communication between the various individuals
and committees carrying out daily activities. It
is essential that each subgroup have knowl-
edge of the work done by other subgroups in
order to share information on effective and
instrumental programs and to inspire coordination
where possible. For example, if regional repre-
sentatives were required to update one another
about Association business, activities and con-
cerns every other month, they would feel less
isolated and more inclined to experiment with
activities that have been successful elsewhere.

Specific communication guidelines could
be drawn up by the vice president for commu-
nications and presented to the board of direc-
tors for approval. Adopted guidelines should
be specific but not so cumbersome that ANPR
volunteers end up spending all their time meet-
ing communication expectations without ful-
filling their other responsibilities. Nonetheless,
the communication guidelines will do no good
unless the president and vice presidents en-
force their use.

**Mid-term Costs**

The only significant cost associated with
these mid-term objectives are the fees for a
fund-raising consultant. While charges vary
depending on the level of effort and amount
raised, the Association should anticipate
charges in the range of $7,000 to $10,000. Part
of the business manager’s task in researching
funding alternatives should be to thoroughly
investigate different types of fund-raising con-
sultant services and their relative costs.

**Long-term Objectives (next 10 years)**

- More frequent board meetings: The
pace of decision-making and flexibility to
make strategic adjustments is currently limited
by the long time (a full year) between board
meetings. In order to better coordinate activi-
ties and improve communication between re-

regions and committees, ANPR should strive to
hold two to four board meetings per year. Be-
cause ANPR officers currently must pay travel
expenses, board meetings more than once per
year are not feasible. However, as funds are
increased some resources should be reserved for
paying the costs of bringing the board of direc-
tors together more frequently.

- Hire an executive director: The current
array of responsibilities attended to by
ANPR's president leaves him with little time
to develop strategy or pursue new program
ideas. Instead, he devotes much of his time to
simply keeping up with ANPR's day-to-day
business. By hiring an executive director, the
president and other officers would spend less
time on administrative issues and more time
devoted to the substance of ANPR’s mission.

Before beginning a search for a potential
director, the board must define the responsibil-
ities of the position and the level of time com-
mitment they would like. Issues to be decided
include: full- or part-time status, level of famil-
arity with NPS, previous interaction with
ANPR, and the acceptability of a split-time
arrangement permitting work for other associ-
atations, such as the Association of National
Park Maintenance Employees.

- Develop relationships with other asso-
ciations: A number of existing associations
share common interests with ANPR and would
serve as valuable allies or partners for achiev-
ing some goals. For example, if ANPR selects
professional advancement in NPS as a focus
issue, organizations such as ANPME or the
National Parks and Conservation Foundation
may be willing to form a working alliance in
order to pool resources and constituencies.
This is beneficial both because it brings greater
resources to the joint activity and provides
ANPR insight into how other organizations
define and achieve their goals.

In order to foster joint activity ANPR could
assign the vice president of special concerns or
professional issues the task of identifying
groups that share some common interests with
ANPR. Ideally, the Association would identify
a contact person in each of the other associ-
atations and begin to exchange information and
ideas on a regular basis.

- Recruitment of former rangers: One
untapped source of membership support for
ANPR are former rangers. These individuals
might be retired career service NPS employees
or former seasonals who have moved on to
other careers. In any case, many of these indi-
viduals continue to feel very proud about their
NPS service and may value the opportunity to
reconnect with the ranger culture and commu-
nity. In order to attract these members ANPR
would need to actively encourage their mem-
bership by designing promotional materials
and making face-to-face contact that delivers
this message.

**Long-term Costs**

The costly long-term recommendations are
hiring an executive director and paying for
travel and lodging for more frequent board
meetings. These costs vary considerably de-
pending on the number of meetings added and
on the amount of time the executive director
spends on Association business. A rough es-
imate is that each added board meeting will

Appendix A: Strategic Options for ANPR

Overview

This appendix provides analysis of the three strategic options outlined in Section I. The strategies presented highlight the full set of possibilities confronting the Association. However, for reasons explained below, none of these approaches are completely appropriate for ANPR. Instead, the strategy recommended in Section III, which is outlined in each option that ANPR can successfully achieve given the current external environment, internal capacity and expectations. In exploring the options presented below, readers should strive to identify components of different strategies that they believe should be pursued by ANPR and those that the Association should avoid. To facilitate this process, specific benefits, drawbacks and necessary changes are identified for each option. These three approaches represent benchmarks from which ANPR can develop its own specialized strategy. As described under the Potential Strategies sub-heading in Section I, these options include:

• Community-building focus
• Expansion and merger with other park-focused groups
• Strong advocacy focus

Each option was defined thoroughly in Section I. These descriptions have been repeated here and are followed with an assessment of ANPR’s relative strengths and weaknesses under each option.

Option I: Community-Building Focus

Under this option ANPR would concentrate on increasing the tradition of care and community in the Park Service, rarely would time pressure require quick decisions or decisive action by the membership to achieve a specified goal. All activities could be performed at a pace set solely by the Association, not by external forces.

• Not resource intensive: ANPR currently possesses the skills and organizational structure needed to implement a community-building strategy, so no additional capacity would be required. In addition, the activities and programs involved in this approach do not require large amounts of money or volunteer preparation time. The current revenues and level of commitment by Association members would be sufficient.

Drawbacks

• Does not meet member expectations: Current expectations of ANPR are that it will increase pressure for change on ranger issues. Adapting this strategy would clearly move away from that goal. The desire and energy many members have for working to resolve the problems they see in the Park Service would not be used to make constructive change, so frustration would build inside ANPR.

• Reputation as voice of NPS ranger will deteriorate: Without actively seeking out opportunities to comment and participate in policy debates, ANPR may lose the credibility it has generated among external forces as a credible and interested representative of the ranger profession.

Necessary Changes

This strategy would require a scaling back in the range of activities currently pursued by ANPR and strong efforts to change the internal expectations for the Association. Increased emphasis would have to be placed on communicating with membership and developing social activities. The organizational structure of the Association could be simplified to include fewer functional areas and greater responsibility could be transferred to regional and park unit representatives for enacting programs and providing information.

In general, ANPR is over-qualified for a strict community-building strategy and would have little difficulty performing the administrative and planning requirements of this approach. The major change that would need to occur is the adjustment of expectations toward ANPR’s new strategy. This could be accomplished through communication about ANPR’s changed mission and by demonstrative commitment to this strategy.

Option 2: Expansion and Merger

In adopting this strategy, ANPR would work to broaden its appeal to non-ranger employees within NPS as well as park profession-
• Lose NPS ranger bond: Part of the current appeal of ANPR to NPS rangers is the strong sense of family within the Association. By adopting an expansion strategy, the small, tightly knit community atmosphere of ANPR would fade as members join who do not share the same experiences.

• Competitors: Although some members have left ANPR to join other associations, it essentially has no direct competitors. No other association is focused solely on professional rangers working in the National Park System. If ANPR adopts an expanded mission it will begin to compete head-on with existing organizations such as the National Recreation and Parks Association, National Association of County Park and Recreation Officials, and National Association of State Park Employees.

Necessary Changes

Adopting this strategy would be a big jump for ANPR. In addition to defining a much more expansive set of goals, significant changes would have to be made to the expectations of current members and organizational capacity of the Association.

• Reorganization around professional duties: The wide range of professional backgrounds of new members under this strategy requires creation of subgroups around type of park unit and job duties. This allows members to identify their particular area of interest in the Association and participate in activities that are relevant for their park area and their specific discipline.

• Creation of regional offices: The size and scope of this strategy would require that a large portion of decision making and programming occur at the regional and local level. The strong centralized structure currently employed by ANPR could not handle the volume or range of issues arising on a daily basis. By delegating many of the regular operations to regional or local offices, ANPR leaders could address the big-picture strategy issues.

• Increase in staff: In order to adequately service a much larger and more diverse membership, ANPR would need to hire a number of full-time staff. These workers would follow the daily business of the Association on tasks ranging from financing to publicity. Without permanent staff, ANPR would become overwhelmed with simply completing business.

• Increased awareness of state and local park issues: In order to attract membership from park and recreation departments at every level of government, ANPR would need to increase its awareness of the concerns facing state and local employees. In addition, the Association would have to build knowledge of the external environments in which different park units operate. Outside influences would no longer include only NPS, Congress and the public, but state and local agencies and legislative bodies as well.

• Formalized communication network: ANPR’s current communication network is relatively informal and centers on the president. With an expanded set of interests and bigger membership, communication between different levels within the organization would need to be formalized in order to minimize duplication of effort and to make best use of Association resources. Without specific communication procedures, ANPR would suffer from lack of coordination because one area of the Association would not know what was happening in another. In addition, well established and utilized lines of communication are one means of changing expectations about ANPR’s role.

• Name Change: With this new mission the name ANPR would no longer apply to the full range of issues and interests of Association members. The Association would need to consider changing its name in order to provide a signal to potential members that they are welcome and will be represented. One option might be to shuffle the existing name to become the National Association of Park Rangers.

Option 3: Strong Advocacy Focus

This strategy would lead ANPR to select a few issues of high importance to NPS rangers and pursue changes in policy and public awareness in order to advance ranger interests on these issues. The majority of the Association’s resources and expertise would be spent lobbying Congress and the upper management of NPS in order to achieve desired policy changes. Part of this effort would include building constituencies of support for ANPR initiatives among park employees and the public. Successful implementation would be measured by the amount of progress ANPR is able to generate on its selected issues and by the size of the constituency the Association maintains. The Association of Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics (AFSEE) is an example of one organization pursuing this approach.

Benefits

• Generate change on issues affecting NPS rangers: The reason that ANPR performs some advocacy in its current role is that members are interested in working to achieve solutions to NPS problems. In particular, they are passionate about problems confronting rangers in the field. By assuming a strong advocacy position ANPR would meet and even exceed the expectations of much of the membership by working to find solutions to problems that have remained unresolved for years.

• Gain recognition as voice for change in NPS: By becoming more active in legislative and other policy arenas, ANPR would build its reputation as an agent of change in NPS. Current leadership in the Park Service is not recognized for its proactive or forward thinking attitude, so the more ANPR demonstrates capacity to address problems and eliminate roadblocks, the more external players will recognize the Association as a strong advocate for change.

• Relieve frustration of many NPS rangers: Currently there is a high level of frustration among many rangers over the reactive stance of NPS. If ANPR established its willingness to challenge NPS strategies, ANPR could channel this frustration into a willingness to participate in creating solutions. The implications of providing a vent for ranger frustration are increased membership, increased activity among current members, and a sense of unity around a cause.

Drawbacks

• Alienate threaten upper management of NPS: By assuming a strong advocacy stance ANPR is likely to repeatedly challenge the directors of NPS to enact change and provide vision. This role would often put the Association in direct confrontation with NPS policy-makers. The result could be to alienate NPS leaders and lead them to refuse to work in conjunction with ANPR to identify problems and create solutions.

• Increase professional risk by challenging NPS policies: For ANPR members still advancing within the Park Service, an advocacy approach which threatens NPS status quo may present too great a risk of retribution from upper management. Members may want to avoid confrontation altogether in order to ensure that superiors know they are supportive and committed to Park Service goals.

• Activist stance may scare off some members: Many members currently do not support a completely activist role for the Association and would prefer that the focus include some professional development and community-building goals. These individuals may discontinue their membership if ANPR pursues a strong advocacy strategy.

• Change tax-exempt status: ANPR currently enjoys tax-exempt status under a 501(c)(3) designation. If the Association chooses to become focused on policy advocacy, federal law requires that it forfeit its current tax exemption. New policies are emerging regarding lobbyist designations, but current regulations may allow another form of tax exemption should ANPR choose this strategy.

Necessary Changes

The switch to an advocacy organization is a reach for ANPR. The Association’s external environment and expectations favor a “professional testimony” form of advocacy on a few issues, so considerable change would need to occur in these areas. In addition, big changes would need to be made to boost ANPR’s internal capacity. Considerable effort would need
to be given to developing additional skill in working within the national policy arena and to developing the financial resources to administer this strategy.

- **Build capacity to identify concerns and mobilize support** To be an effective advocate ANPR needs to improve its ability to gather information and opinions from individual rangers working in park units across the country, synthesize it, and articulate common issues that emerge. By implementing a more proactive communication strategy that seeks out opinions and problem areas, ANPR will build a reputation for listening to the problems of the regular ranger.

In addition to working to identify common problems, ANPR must use increased communication to provide information on the steps members and non-members can take to participate in policy decisions. An ability to get the word out and mobilize support quickly will allow ANPR to capitalize on policy development opportunities as they arise.

- **Reorganize around selected issue areas** ANPR’s current organizational structure along functional lines is a strong foundation for adoption of an advocacy strategy. However, in order to ensure that the Association is effective as an advocate, policy area committees should be added for each of the issues ANPR identifies as a priority. For example, the president could convene committees to track a limited number of specific issues such as labor, conservation, budget and park unit resources. By focusing the organizational structure partially along issue areas, the board and general membership could more easily stay on top of policy developments.

- **Expand presence in Washington, D.C.** Currently ANPR headquarters is wherever the president resides. In order to succeed with an advocacy strategy, the Association would need to increase its presence and reputation where policy decisions are made. Given that Congress and NPS headquarters are both in Washington, D.C., ANPR might consider establishing a headquarters office there.

- **Modify existing expectations** Most current members support some advocacy activity for ANPR, but their expectations would need modification under a strong advocacy strategy. ANPR leadership would need to develop expectations of increased activism through communication and action on ranger issues. External players expect some advocacy activities on the part of ANPR. However, Congress and policy-makers at the top of NPS and the Department of Interior do not currently view advocacy as ANPR’s focus. Again, ANPR leaders would need to consciously build this expectation by solidifying congressional and agency contacts, preparing briefing materials and position papers, and using the media to draw attention to policy areas.

---
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1 This represents approximately 50% of the 
full-time National Park Service Rangers.

2 While it is not unusual for more than 200 
members not to renew each year, ANPR 
has consistently managed to attract enough 
new members to maintain a total membership 
of 1,500.

3 For more in-depth analysis of each poten­
tial strategy see Appendix A.

4 This model, although slightly modified 
here, is attributable to Professor Dutch 
Leonard at the John F. Kennedy School of 
Government.

5 For more in-depth information on pay and 
advancement in the National Park Service 
see National Parks for the 21st Century, 
The Vail Agenda.
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A partial list includes: Association of For­
est Service Employees for Environmental 
Ethics, Fraternal Order of Police, National 
park Foundation, National Recreation and 
Parks Association and National Society of 
Interpreters. 

Seasonal Insurance

The Association has arranged an insur­
ance program which for the first time 
makes health insurance available at rea­
sonable rates to permanent and non-per­
manent employees who are ANPR mem­
bers. 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 de­
ductibles, affordable group rates and 
comprehensive benefits in and out of 
the hospital.

- A short-term, self-writing policy de­
veloped 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, featur­
ing a $2 million lifetime benefit, free­
dom to select doctors and hospitals of 
your choice, and a choice of de­
ductibles.

- Group term life insurance, an inex­
pensive way to establish financial se­
curity for your family with maximum 
life insurance protection up to $3 mil­
lion for members and spouses, op­
tional 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.
All In the Family

All submissions must be either typed or printed and should include the author’s return address and/or phone number. The form on the inside back cover should be used when possible. Entries need not be limited to career moves; any notable event or personal update is acceptable.

Please send your submissions to Bill Halinen, 640 North Harrison St., Arlington, VA 22205. Changes of address should be sent separately to Debbie Gorman, ANPR Business Manager, Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831.

Scot Bowen has moved from Yosemite, where he was a GS-5 seasonal park ranger, to Rocky Mountain, where he is now a GS-7 permanent supervisory park ranger. His new address: 32072 Moraine Route, Estes Park, CO 80517, (303) 586-0137.

Mary Kline (Liu) (GRTE 84-87, PEFO 87-88, SEKI 89-91), formerly the GS-9 chief of interpretation at John Muir, is now a GS-260-7/9/11 lead EO counselor in the equal opportunity office in Western Region.

Martin O'Toole (GATE, STLI, MASi) has moved from Castle Clinton at Manhattan Sites to Perry's Victory on South Bass Island at Put-in-Bay in Ohio. He's a GS-5/7 lead park ranger there (a promotion from MASi) and supervises the interpretive, fee collection and Eastern National programs. He writes that “everyone should try island life for a while” and adds that “friends are invited to visit for a free trial run!” His address: General Delivery, Put-in-Bay, OH 43456, (419) 285-4404.

Paul Zaenger (PEVI, VAFO, MORU, GLCA, DEVA) has transferred from Death Valley, where he was the GS-9 district interpreter in the park's North District, to Black Canyon of the Gunnison, where he’s a GS-9 supervisory park ranger. His wife, Nancy Firth Zaenger (CURE, COLM, CANY, DINO, GLCA, ARCH, DEVA) is currently working as a GS-5 seasonal patrol ranger at Colorado NM and will join him in Montrose in October. Their new address: P.O. Box 1172, Montrose, CO 81402.

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:

- William Paleck, Mount Vernon, WA
- Glen Frey, Applegate, CA
- Ben Hensel III, Boynton Beach, FL
- James McIntosh, Breckenridge, CO
- Wayne Rose, College Park, MD
- Angela Petit, Ketchikan, AK

Not Just A Bunch of Crock

Proceedings from the 1993 World Congress on Adventure Travel and Eco-tourism, held in Manaus, Brazil, are now available. This extraordinary volume adds to the already timeless information and empirical case studies found in the 1991 and 1992 Congress Proceedings. Order your copy now, and gain critical knowledge about:

- the profitability of eco-tourism
- marketing nature-based tourism
- environmental sustainability, and
- protecting indigenous cultures.

This is a must-have resource book for professionals in the environmental and tourism fields. Cost: $40.00. For more information, or to order your copy of the 1993, as well as copies of the 1991 and 1992 World Congress Proceedings, contact: The Adventure Travel Society, (383) 649-9016; fax (383) 649-9017.

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

All outdoor professionals may find themselves in situations where help is more than a phone call away. Typical first aid courses train students to provide care before an ambulance arrives. Wilderness Medical Associates specializes in practical medical training for areas where help is miles away and dialing 911 is not an option.

Our method is experiential and our courses are tough, with emphasis on practical sessions and video taped simulations using made-up victims. Preferred by Outward Bound, The National Park Service, and many universities. Spend your next vacation on one of our Wilderness First Responder or Wilderness EMT courses and experience the highest quality training available.

“The National Park Service has reviewed [this] Wilderness EMT program and approves and applauds the concept as well as the curriculum.”

- Charles R. “Butch” Farabee, Jr. Emergency Services Coordinator National Park Service

WILDERNESS MEDICAL ASSOCIATES
24 HOUR MESSAGES
1-800-742-2931
RFD 2 Box 890
Bryant Pond, ME 04219
(207) 665-2707
“Toward 1993” –

The Plan Revisited

In the summer of 1988, an Association work group headed by Karen Wade drafted a five-year action plan, entitled “Toward 1993,” which summarized all the actions the Association’s members wanted to undertake in coming years. The plan was based on the verbal and written recommendations that scores of members had submitted to the work group during the previous few months. The plan was further discussed and finalized at the Rendezvous in Snowbird that year, then put into effect.

Although the plan served to focus the previously inchoate thoughts and ideas of members, it’s clear in retrospect that we could have done better in organizing the plan, assigning tasks, establishing due dates, and tracking accomplishments. As an organization, we didn’t have a good understanding of the importance of a systematic approach to problem-solving, from establishment of objectives, strategy and tactics through rigorous follow-up and critique.

Still, the plan had many good ideas, and has served as a useful informal guide and blueprint for Association actions over the past five years. As we prepare to set out new long-range goals, it is worthwhile to review the accomplishments and failures of the past five years, both on their own merits and to critique the overall framework of the “Toward 1993” plan.

Each of the plan’s five objectives are listed below and are followed by goals in bold type and accomplishments in regular type. This survey will of necessity be somewhat cursory; details on any of these matters can be found in back issues of Ranger. See particularly “ANPR: The Record” in the spring, 1990, issue.

Objective One: ANPR will propose solutions and seek administrative relief for the following issues.

Since many of the goals under this objective touch on the interlinked issues of ranger intake, training, careers, pay, and benefits, preliminary comments are in order regarding ANPR’s efforts in this arena.

Ever since the Association’s first meeting in Jackson Hole in 1977, ANPR has worked to improve the lot of rangers within the Service. Many of the initial efforts proved fruitless because of bureaucratic inertia and the general indifference of the Reagan administration, but headway was eventually made through repeated publicity in Ranger, meetings with congressional staff, contacts with the media, and the efforts of members who have moved up in management.

The latter was and is most crucial of all. That we are closer to attaining these objectives now than we have been in years is largely through the work of several well-placed members, all of whom have aggressively pressed for changes on these and other ranger personnel matters. It has been almost entirely through their perseverance that we have made any headway at all in this area.

1. Develop a plan for a ranger intake program that addresses selection, training, intake parks and related matters.

ANPR has sought the establishment of a coherent, integrated career management plan for rangers which would begin with a clear, understandable, workable intake program. We have advanced that position in a number of forums, including the “endangered ranger” hearing and the Vail Agenda hearings.

We also developed and published a guide to gaining admission to the National Park Service which is now being used by rangers and personnel staff throughout the System to explain the current Byzantine hiring practices to the uninitiated.

Status: Although we still do not have a good intake program, we may be close to gaining one with the implementation of the Ranger Futures initiative.

2. Review and redraft the 025 standards and submit them to the Service.

ANPR has aggressively pressed for revisions to the 025 series for years. Several members were part of the work group that attacked the problem unsuccessfully in the early 1980s, and we again focused on the problem as part of the “Toward 1993” Initiative. As with the intake issue, we focused most closely on this issue in the “endangered ranger” hearing and in our continued pressure on the agency to implement the Vail Agenda. Here’s a comment from our testimony on Vail:

“Particular efforts need to be made to resolve long-standing problems concerning entry requirements, training, professional standards, and career ladders for park rangers. Several attempts have been made within the last dozen years to remedy these problems. Some successes have been realized, but the core problems persist and much work remains to be done...”

“We therefore recommend that the Service convene a work group to fully examine the scope and nature of the problem, define what the park ranger profession should be, come to a consensus on how the ranger work force should be configured, then work with the Office of Personnel Management to find the means to develop such a work force.”

Status: The National Park Service has established the Ranger Futures work group to meet the objectives of this recommendation. The work group’s report has been reviewed and will soon be implemented.

3. Pursue efforts to establish special pay rates in areas where recruitment and retention problems exist.

ANPR led all others in its efforts to force the National Park Service to focus on issues of ranger pay and retention.

The initial effort was on focusing attention on those problems. The first article on the subject was a candid survey of reasons why people left the NPS which appeared in the Summer 1985 Ranger. This was followed by Hugh Dougher’s definitive article in the Summer 1988 Ranger on the history of ranger pay and its decline, and, in the summer of 1989, by the lengthy article summarizing the results of our ground-breaking and pivotal economic hardship study. That article, which we reprinted as a special report and distributed widely, sparked a wave of media interest in ranger pay problems, provided source material on ranger pay deficiencies which is still quoted today, and led directly to the “endangered ranger” hearing in the House in the summer of 1990.

More importantly, it led to action by the NPS to improve pay in those areas where recruitment and retention problems could be documented. Because of our efforts, rangers in six metropolitan areas — Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Los Angeles and San Francisco — now have higher salaries. The report has also provided documentation for the Ranger Futures work group in its efforts to remedy ranger pay issues.

Status: Increases in ranger pay are contingent on changes in grade, since special pay increases are unlikely. Grades, which have increased in recent years through the use of proper position management techniques, will increase even more with the implementation of the Ranger Futures plan.

4. Define the park ranger occupation to the degree that specific educational requirements can be established for new hires.

ANPR has pressed for a positive education requirement that would make possession of certain degrees in natural or cultural science disciplines mandatory for admission into the 025 series.

Status: Academic criteria for entrance into the park ranger profession are part of the Ranger Futures package.

5. Develop an initiative to enhance seasonal recruitment efforts.

Although little headway was made in this area, ANPR has made a singular contribution to the NPS by publishing comprehensive Service-wide winter and summer seasonal hiring surveys in the pages of Ranger. These have been widely used by seasonalss attempting to determine which parks are likely to have openings.

Status: No action at present.

6. Monitor the housing initiative and ensure that it reflects member concerns on equitable rent and other issues, and actively seek resolution of housing concerns until funding is achieved.

The Association has probably invested more time and energy on this issue than any other during the past five years. Housing issues, par-
particularly excessive rental rates and the poor quality of many government quarters, have been of concern to ANPR since its inception, but it's only been in recent years that we've made an aggressive effort to resolve these problems outside the bounds of the National Park Service and the Office of Management and Budget's restrictive housing guidelines.

Through the efforts of several members who served on details to the House and the Senate and the expertise of others who've been intimately involved with housing issues, we have been able to actively support and participate in the formulation of legislation that has appeared in both the 102nd and 103rd Congress. We have testified at several hearings, have organized national letter writing campaigns, and have worked with Congressional staff to press for the passage of housing legislation. Although we have been successful in the Senate, housing legislation has yet to make any headway in the House. Efforts nonetheless continue.

**Status:** A hearing on S.472, Senator Wallop's housing bill, will be held this fall. ANPR will be testifying. A GAO audit of NPS housing requested by Bruce Vento, chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, is about to completed, and will likely be followed by housing legislation and hearings in the House. Director Kennedy supports Senator Wallop's bill and will testify in favor of it.

7 - Track the reduced (twenty-year) retirement issue, keep the membership informed on developments, and assure that affected members have a voice in the resolution of the issue within the agency.

ANPR has been closely and directly involved in the effort to attain 6(c) benefits for commissioned rangers since 1988, when we began working with a law firm in Idaho on a lawsuit challenging OPM's interpretation of legislative language specifying who qualifies for 6(c) retirement benefits. Although the lawsuit failed in federal court, two significant benefits came of it - the preparation and distribution of a package guiding commissioned rangers on the completion of their claims for back credit for 6(c) work, and the attainment of extensions for submitting 6(c) claims.

Since that time, we have pressed the Department to support 6(c) status for rangers, have written Congressmen asking for their support in gaining legislative relief, and have supported ranger Tim Sorber's successful MSPB challenge of OPM's denial of his claim for past credit.

As with Ranger Futures, however, the most important development in ANPR's fight for 6(c) has been the advancement of several members into important management positions. Significant headway has been made on this issue in the Service, Department and OPM because of their continuing stubborn persistence in fighting for such benefits.

**Status:** Developments are occurring on several fronts. Tim Sorber and others have won battles to gain credit for past service; the Service has come out in favor of 6(c) benefits for commissioned rangers, and it appears likely the Department will follow; and Ranger Futures contains provisions which would authorize such benefits.

8 - Develop, recommend and support a fair, realistic and reasonable Servicewide system or procedures for seasonals to apply for permanent entry-level positions.

In Congressional hearings in Montana in 1992, in letters to Congressmen on Civil Service committees, and in the Vail Agenda testimony, ANPR has pressed the NPS to seek delegated examining authority from OPM so that we can establish our own registers, thereby making it possible to accept seasonal applications for permanent positions without testing or other qualification procedures.

**Status:** Little headway has been made in this area, but not for lack of effort. Efforts to push the agency to seek such authority will continue.

9 - Recommend a better system for applying for permanent position vacancies.

The central issue pertaining to permanent position applications in 1988 was the proliferation of KSA's and the need to constantly develop new ones to meet slightly varied KSA requests.

**Status:** Although the problem persists, no one within the Association ever stepped forward to work on this project. No volunteers, no progress.

10 - Closely monitor the liability issue and develop an action plan if legislative relief is not forthcoming during the 1988 session of Congress.

Liability insurance for rangers engaged in law enforcement was also a hot issue in 1988, but has since dropped from sight, at least within ANPR.

**Status:** An initial evaluation of the cost of liability insurance was conducted in 1988, but there was no follow-up.

11 - Develop tangible means for recognizing seasonals for extended service.

The original motive was to develop awards or other means for recognizing long-term seasonals. The idea has not been mentioned since Snowbird in 1988.

**Status:** No volunteers, no developments.

12 - Develop suggested personnel demonstration projects that the agency could present to OPM for approval; examples include pay banding, manager classification, recruitment strategies and special pay rates.

This idea arose during the period when the Navy was initiating experiments with various new personnel management concepts at their China Lake base in California and elsewhere. Although various aspects of the proposal, particularly special pay rates, have since been discussed, no coordinated personnel management project has been conceived or advanced within the NPS.

**Status:** No volunteers, no developments.

13 - Support efforts to increase park operating budgets as the best long-term solution to Service funding problems.

The Association has been a strong advocate for increasing operational budgets in the National Park Service. Two issues of Ranger - Fall 1989 and Spring 1993 - focused almost exclusively on budgetary shortfalls in the parks. In each case, park superintendents, almost all of them ANPR members, spoke with considerable candor about the problems they faced and about possible solutions. These articles have been widely quoted, and copies of the latter were distributed throughout Congress and the Department. The Association has also testified before Congress and at the Vail Agenda hearings on the insufficiency of NPS operational budgets, and has written individual letters to every member of the Senate and House authorizing and appropriating committees on this problem.

**Status:** The Service's operations budget will likely increase in FY 94 despite the country's serious fiscal problems. Much of this, of course, is due to the change in administrations, but the publicity which ANPR has brought to the budget issue have indisputably created a climate for change.

14 - Continue the initiative for enhancing dual career opportunities and resolving dual career problems.

Although we have made slow and small headway on improving dual career problems in the NPS, we are the only National Park Service organization that has addressed this issue with any degree of consistency over the past five years. The Association has just sent a letter to the 10 regional directors asking them to explain their regional policies and the steps they've taken to improve career situations for dual career couples.

**Status:** Much the same as in 1988, though there's been some increase in the listing of dual career opportunities.

* * *

Objective Two: Serve as forum for the discussion and analysis of policy-related issues regarding park resources, the National Park System, and the world community of parks. Develop position papers and position on selected issues and effectively present them.
1 - Develop amiable ties with identified media and provide information on individual professions, professionals and issues affecting the Service.

Over the past five years, the Service has made major strides forward in establishing links with the media and providing them with information on issues of concern to rangers. Among the print media that have interviewed and quoted members of the Association on these issues are the Gannett newspapers (particularly USA Today), the Federal Times, the Denver Post, the Christian Science Monitor, the Kansas City Star, the Los Angeles Times, and the Washington Post. Members have also been interviewed on National Public Radio and on local television and radio stations.

Status: A great deal of work still needs to be done to develop a media strategy and coordinate media contacts. The Association is also seeking a volunteer information officer to work on these and related projects.

2 - Present ANPR's case to Congress either directly or through friendly alliances when circumstances warrant such action.

ANPR has moved aggressively in establishing regular contacts with Congress and in promoting our positions with them. We have now testified in hearings on "endangered rangers," temporary benefits, housing, the Vail agenda and the NPS budget. We have helped draft legislation. We have submitted written testimony in several other hearings (and had it introduced into the record), and have written numerous letters to congressmen and women on issues of consequence to the Association and the Service. We have met directly with congressional staff on numerous occasions to discuss issues and provide background. We have developed regular contacts with members of both parties of the staffs of all subcommittees and committees dealing with NPS issues. And we recently sponsored a well-received and attended dinner for congressional staff.

Status: Efforts to improve communications, cooperation and coordination with congressional staff continue.

3 - Comment on actions taken by other federal agencies or by private organizations which impact either the ranger profession or the National Park System.

ANPR has prepared and written letters to and/or met directly with representatives from the Department, OMB, OPM, GAO, and other governmental organizations on issues ranging from housing to 6(c) benefits to the creation of parks of less than national significance. We've worked actively on both resource and personnel issues on many instances with a number of non-governmental organizations, including NPCA, the Wilderness Society, ANPME, the George Wright Society, NFFE, PEER, FOP, and FWOA.

Status: We've been successful in recent years in forging alliances with kindred groups and with establishing credibility with federal agencies. Efforts will continue.

4 - Continue to establish contacts and nurture good will with rangers and park systems throughout the world.

A major step in this direction was taken when ANPR joined England's ACR and Scotland's SCRA in founding the International Ranger Federation. Relations with those two ranger organizations have deepened over the last year with exchange visits by presidents and officers of the organizations, and are at a very high level.

Status: Invitations to join IRF are currently being evaluated by ANPR members. ANPR and the International Ranger Federation are planning to submit issues of concern to the board for consideration.

ANPR issued its first "advocacy plan" last year. The plan, which appeared in *Ranger* and was later reprinted in a special brochure, coalesced many separate initiatives on issues into a single, comprehensive statement. More input from members in formulating this annual plan will be sought in coming years.

Status: The advocacy plan will be broadened and refined to provide an update on the Association's advocacy plan this coming fall.

5 - Identify subject-matter specialists who will poll the membership on key issues, get a "sense of the Association," and draft position papers for board review; print an annual appeal in *Ranger* for the membership to submit issues of concern to the board for consideration.

ANPR issued its first advocacy plan last year. The plan, which appeared in *Ranger* and was later reprinted in a special brochure, coalesced many separate initiatives on issues into a single, comprehensive statement. More input from members in formulating this annual plan will be sought in coming years.

Status: The advocacy plan will be broadened and refined to provide an update on the Association's advocacy plan this coming fall.

6 - Formalize a procedure for determining ANPR positions in which the president and board formulate positions which are consistent with the statement of purpose, comprehensive surveys and by-laws.

Status: See above.

7 - Continue annual Rendezvous, but also increase the number of annual issues of *Ranger*.

Status: All these efforts (except for increasing the number of annual issues of *Ranger*) will be continued and will be augmented by electronic mail in the near future.

8 - Determine the feasibility and methods of securing low cost liability insurance for NPS employees (depending on the outcome of the liability issue).

Status: No action on this issue since 1988.

9 - Develop instructions to assist NPS firefighters and law enforcement officers in preparing documentation needed to secure reduced service (20 year) retirements.

Status: Comprehensive and authoritative instructional packages were prepared and sold to members and proved highly useful in the preparation of claims for past 6(c) coverage.

10 - Continue annual Rendezvous, but also enhance positive social (mostly outdoor) activities in keeping with common interests of rangers, i.e. hikes, boat/canoe trips, tours, skills workshops, softball games, etc.

Status: One of the Kennedy School recommendations is to increase activities at the local level. This will be discussed at the Rendezvous this fall.

11 - Select Rendezvous locations which are inexpensive and good draws as vacation locations that members would like to visit.

Concerted (and successful) efforts have been made to keep room rates down at Rendezvous, most of which have been held at popular locations, though sometimes the objectives of having low-cost lodging at desir-
able vacation spots prove to be mutually exclusive room rates still hover around $45, single or double occupancy.

Status: Efforts in both of these areas will continue. We will meet in Durango, Colo., near Mesa Verde next year, then will look to the Midwest and Southwest for good sites in the following two years.

7 – Develop stronger park organizations and lines of communication; encourage regional reps to look at ways to piggy-back ANPR gatherings onto regional training courses or other get-togethers.

Some parks have formed chapters, but most have not. Those that exist are generally loosely knit. Regionwide communications have improved greatly in most areas since 1988 through the use of park reps and regional newsletters.

Status: The Kennedy School report specifically recommends that we put much more effort into the development of active local organizations. We need to move aggressively to implement this recommendation.

8 – Promote the development of the park as the fundamental unit of the Association, and encourage members to develop functioning park chapters to organize social gatherings, discuss issues and foster other activities.

Status: See above.

9 – Encourage members to volunteer for committees and seek leadership positions on the board. Assign individuals with subject-matter expertise and/or interest to work on committees for the benefit of ANPR membership.

Members with subject-matter expertise are now overseeing a number of committees and several advocacy projects. More volunteers are needed (see “President’s Message” in this issue).

Status: Procedures for recruiting members to Association positions and to mentor them once they come on board have been developed and will be brought up for implementation through bylaw amendment this fall.

10 – In order to induce change and support the camaraderie of members working for common goals, ANPR should develop an aggressive recruitment initiative to double the active membership of ANPR over the next five years.

Much work has been done on recruitment over the past two years, including the development of excellent brochures and posters, and a significant initiative to increase membership is underway this year.

Status: ANPR membership, which has been at a plateau for some years, has increased substantially this year and membership is now at a record high level. The Kennedy School has also done a study of recruitment within ANPR; that report will be discussed this fall in the context of the larger Association strategy.

11 – Work toward increased member involvement in ANPR activities.

Status: See above and the Kennedy School recommendations elsewhere in this issue.

* * *

Objective Four: Support educational opportunities for members; develop standards of professionalism; foster communications on professional topics.

1 – Develop voluntary standards, such as physical fitness standards, that will serve as ideals for the professions supporting the Park Service’s mission.

This idea was discussed at the Rendezvous in 1988 when the “Toward 1993” plan was discussed, but completely disappeared thereafter.

Status: No action.

2 – Establish a training agenda in conjunction with the Rendezvous and work with the Service’s training division to determine ways in which ANPR can assist in putting on or otherwise supporting NPS training.

ANPR has sponsored training courses in conjunction with Rendezvous every year since the 1993 plan was implemented. More importantly, we’ve reinstated the highly regarded Management Grid training course that the Service once sponsored but dropped about a decade ago. Management Grid remains one of the only effective management training courses offered to NPS employees. Three classes have been given so far, and upwards of 100 potential NPS managers have graduated from the course.

Status: No action has been taken in this area.

3 – Establish cross-training programs with other professional organizations with compatible training offerings, such as the National Association of Search and Rescue.

Status: No action has been taken in this area.

4 – Continue to offer 171 workshops and related career counseling type assistance.

The Association continues to offer 171 workshops at each Rendezvous, and has published guidance on how to best fill out the forms in several issues of Ranger, including the Summer 1993 issue.

5 – Develop a program whereby an established member could be paired with a new member to provide the member with direction, guidance and support.

There was some interest in this project at the Rendezvous in 1988, but little since. A few tentative efforts have been made, but have been unsuccessful.

Status: A plan for mentoring new members interested in becoming active in the Association was presented and discussed at the July board meeting and will be actively pursued over the coming year.

6 – Print more technical and professional papers, position papers, field news and historical articles in Ranger.

Ranger has aggressively sought and published articles of this nature over the past few years.

Status: Publication of such papers and articles will continue.

7 – Develop a publications program proposal which would evaluate the costs and benefits of having ANPR publish books on professional topics, professional papers, and proceedings of seminars and Rendezvous.

Since 1988, ANPR has published an alternative training sources guide, a guide on how to get into the NPS, and sundry brochures and other promotional publications. An effort has been under way over the past year to start a formal Association publications program. A half dozen good titles have been identified.

Status: A volunteer coordinator and volunteer editor have been found, and permission to reprint several papers has been obtained.

8 – Explore the possibility of developing an ANPR “bookstore” which would sell books and article reprints on subjects of interest to members.

Headway has been slow due to a lack of volunteers, but several tentative steps have been taken.

Status: No action has been taken on this project due to a lack of volunteers.

9 – Reproduce, updating annually, a set of Ranger article reprints that address the goal of permanent NPS employment and make them available to members and others.

Status: No action has been taken on this project due to a lack of volunteers.

10 – Explore the possibility of developing an ANPR operation or function which will allow the purchasing of outdoor equipment at the reduced rates allowed professionals.

Status: No action has been taken on this project due to a lack of volunteers.

11 – Develop and publish effective position management strategies, to include position classification, annual work plans and supervision. Identify and publish strategies that are currently working in the NPS.
Status: No action has been taken on this project due to a lack of volunteers.

12 - Designate a committee to gather information about alternative training sources. Develop and maintain a course catalogue for the benefit of ANPR members and other employees of the NPS.

An alternative training sources catalog was developed by members from Southwest Region and has been distributed to members through regional representatives.

Status: Further updates and printings are planned.

* * *

Objective Five: Identify a few special projects which would enhance the image of ANPR.

1 - Develop an agenda for ANPR support of the Service’s celebration of its 75th anniversary.

Although the Association developed a well-received poster, our greatest contribution was in the major time and effort we put into supporting and advancing – against not inconceivable resistance – the Vail Agenda.

Status: Efforts to get the Agenda implemented will continue ceaselessly.

2 - Seek corporate financing to develop exhibits for the NPS ranger museum at Yellowstone.

Members of ANPR contributed more money to the development of the ranger museum than any other group, and the Association was instrumental in finding a donor to fund the museum.

Status: The museum has been completed and is now open to the public.

3 - Explore the possibility of developing an ANPR program for recognizing citizen support for the parks through a national award equivalent to the Mather or Tilden awards.

Status: No action has been taken on this project due to a lack of volunteers.

4 - Promote and participate as an association in special events and projects that involve special populations, such as disabled groups, children’s groups, senior citizens and hospital wards.

Status: No action has been taken on this project due to a lack of volunteers.

SCA. volunteers protect our natural resources.

Now, through the CFC, you can help Student Conservation Association volunteers

- build trails
- assist visitors
- conserve wildlife
- restore impacted sites
- gain a lifelong commitment to our environment

SCA and the National Park Service work together as partners for the protection of our country’s natural resources for future generations.

By designating your gift to the Student Conservation Association in the Combined Federal Campaign, you will be giving more young people the chance to become stewards of our natural heritage.

And at the same time, build their self-esteem, confidence, and respect for others and the environment. For many, SCA is the first stepping stone to a career in conservation.

Support the Student Conservation Association through the CFC, and help link young volunteers with the conservation of our public lands.

Please mark #1227 on your CFC form.

Thank you.
The Professional Ranger

Law Enforcement

First off, I would like to express how much I am looking forward to writing this column for Ranger. My name is Steve Clark, an area ranger at Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. I am looking forward to keeping all divisions informed with the latest, most accurate information possible. If you are interested in contacting me for any reason, I can be reached at (908) 496-4856. I'm new at this, so any help would be appreciated.

I know ANPR is trying to reach out and get more rangers involved in the organization by writing articles, supplying information, participating in writing campaigns, and one of the most important factors, recruiting. If there are new rangers in your park, inform them about ANPR, supply them with information about the organization, and give them an application. Let's get as many rangers as we can supporting change and making it happen.

There are some exciting changes in the works for rangers working in the protection division. Better pay, better retirement benefits, better housing and better working conditions are all coming about. It's going to take some time, but with top management support and memorandums generated by new NPS Director Roger Kennedy, this administration means business.

I would like to quote a memo from June 1993 to NPS Director Kennedy to the assistant secretary of policy, management and budget:

"National Park Service (NPS) law enforcement rangers are presently not afforded appropriate pay and retirement benefits for their law enforcement duties. Virtually every other agency with major criminal investigative responsibilities, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) within the Department of Interior, has obtained these compensation benefits for their law enforcement workforce. This has resulted in significant recruitment, retention and morale problems that adversely impacts the Service's ability to manage and direct the Ranger workforce and fulfill the NPS mission."

The memo further states, "As a core occupation the NPS ranger is among the lowest paid and most poorly compensated member of the federal workforce."

Finally, Director Kennedy concludes with, "I would like the opportunity to meet with you in order that my staff can explain the urgency of this matter."

Please understand that for the rangers who have been hearing these changes will come about for the last 15 years, there has never been, until recently, a National Park Service administration that took an organizational position that actively sought this type of compensation for its rangers.

That's why I feel this time it will change; it's not just lip service, because the top manager in our agency is saying it, writing it, and truly doing his best to make sure it happens.

6(c) Enhanced annuity retirement—Ranger

Tim Sorber from Gettysburg recently won his appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB). The Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR) and the National Park Rangers Lodges of the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) paid the attorney fees ($5,000) for the preparation and presentation of the case. Quite some time ago, OPM denied his request for past credit for enhanced annuity-early retirement coverage basically stating that he did not perform enough law enforcement and investigation to warrant enhanced retirement.

With the aid of Dick Martin from Ranger Activities in Washington, and other NPS rangers testifying on Tim's behalf, Judge Fishman overturned Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) ruling and granted Tim retirement benefits. This is a major step toward protecting the benefits rangers should have been receiving all along.

A special thanks to Dick Martin for making the trip to Harrisburg and testifying on Tim's behalf.

Journeyman level 9s, 10s?, 11s?—Jim Brady, chief ranger for the NPS, is working hard in Washington trying to come up with position descriptions to ensure they will be graded out at the highest level possible. He feels confident that GS-9 will be definite, but if you know Jim, he is not going to stop there. He understands that rangers have been underpaid for years and is trying to improve that dramatically.

Keep looking for that SF-50 change, and thanks so much to Jim and his staff, we really appreciate it!

Resource Protection Fund—Bob Martin, supervisory ranger at Shenandoah, and I recently traveled to Washington D.C., to meet with Jim Brady and Dick Martin regarding ranger issues and to brief them on the Resource Protection Fund. Bob Martin has worked hard on this idea, and hopefully it will come to fruition shortly. This is an example of how rangers in the field aren't waiting complacent to management that they don't have enough money to get the job done, but are actually taking an active part in the solution. This is an exciting new concept, so look for more on the "Fund" in the months to come. If OK'd by the NPS, we could start resource protection training as early as late fall. Any questions, feel free to contact Bob at (703) 999-3202.

News from the Federal Law Enforcement Training (FLETC)—I spoke with the (at that time) National Park Service acting agency representative at FLETC, Tom Cherry, who reported there will be many changes in the curriculum effective Jan. 1, 1994, for the land management students. Probably the biggest change will be extending the 9.5-week course for land management agencies to 11.2 weeks.

For the students attending FLETC now and in the near future, the NPS representatives at FLETC tried to get this new curriculum changed as soon as possible. However, with the complexity of the center and the number of changes on the horizon, Jan. 1, 1994, was the earliest date possible.

Some of the changes are:

• Agency specific training will be conducted during the 11.2-week training period, probably from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., instead of the 3 1/2 days after graduation.

• Incorporating physical training (PT) into the eight-hour training day, instead of after hours. This constitutes an increase of 36 hours in the course curriculum. Please note, however, that there will still be a number of exercises and labs conducted after hours.

In addition, other changes include:

• added time for night driving
• adding an exam (up to 5)
• added time given for training on cultural diversity
• clandestine labs
• hazardous materials
• car clouting
• crowd control
• surveillance labs at night
• environmental activist
• motorhome search lab
• bombs/explosives/bobby traps
• video photography
• more time for legal review

These are just a few of the changes that will take place at FLETC starting next year. Further, FLETC plans on training about 100 to 120 national park rangers in 1994.

My thanks to Tom Cherry for providing me this information. Congratulations to Paul Henry, the NPS's newest agency representative.

Please help Brittany—Brittany Kross, the 6-year-old daughter of Chris and Lisa Kross, recently was diagnosed with leukemia. Chris is a park ranger at Delaware Water Gap NRA and is in need of your help. Brittany will be undergoing comprehensive chemotherapy at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia during the next two years.

While the family has medical insurance, it still will cost them thousands of dollars. A fund has been set up at a local bank in Brittany's name to take donations to offset the high medical costs. Please take a few minutes and help make this situation a little easier on the family.

Make checks payable to the Brittany Kross Fund and mail them to PNC Bank, 60 Washington St., East Stroudsburg, PA 18301, c/o Brittany Kross Fund. If you have any questions, please call Steve Clark, (908) 496-4856. Thanks so much for your help and kindness.

Finally, on a personal note, my wife Tracey I would like to extend many thanks to all of our friends from around the country for your thoughts, cards, phone calls and prayers after the passing of Tracey's mother. I've been in this agency only eight years, and all along I've heard how the National Park Ser-

(continued on page 27)
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Board, committee and staff activity summaries now appear in the following consolidated format. Complete reports appear separately, as noted. A directory of ANPR addresses and home phone numbers appears on the back cover of the magazine.

Business Manager

With the recently approved Clinton budget, deductions on contributions and payments to charities have changed. Sufficient information wasn’t available at press time, but it will be researched and reported in the next issue of Ranger. Check with your IRS agent to define the appropriate deductions. 

Debbie Gorman
Saratoga

Twenty-Year Retirement Committee

Sorber vs. OPM

In March 1993, Timothy Sorber filed an appeal from OPM’s final decision which denied his claim for 6(c) credit for his 13 years of service as a law enforcement park ranger at Gettysburg NMP. Sorber’s claim had been forwarded to OPM with a favorable recommendation by DOI. Sorber was represented by Edward H. Passman of Passman & Kaplan who practice in Washington, D.C.

In July 1993, an administrative judge (AJ) of the MSPB ruled in favor of Sorber’s appeal and reversed OPM’s decision. The AJ’s initial decision became final on Aug. 6, 1993. Following are some important highlights of the AJ’s decision.

OPM testified that Sorber’s position descriptions did not show that law enforcement duties constituted his primary duties. Sorber claimed that the PDs were inaccurate, and he presented documentation and testimony to support his law enforcement duties. The AJ found that it was improper for OPM to rely solely upon the official position descriptions of record. He also assigned little probative value to Sorber’s PDs, which he found to be inaccurate based on the testimony of the witnesses and documentation describing Sorber’s actual job duties.

Richard Martin, Chief of Resources and Visitor Protection, testified for almost 45 minutes at the appeal hearing. The AJ found his testimony (among others) to be credible and entitled to more weight than Sorber’s PDs relied upon by OPM. As noted by the AJ in his decision, Martin testified that the “primary duty of park rangers is to do law enforcement work, and that this compromises 65 to 70 percent of a park ranger’s duties,” and that a “park ranger has four law-type functions: to make arrests, issue warrants, carry firearms, and make arrests.” Martin commented that Sorber’s “position descriptions were not accurate since the primary duty of a park ranger is not patrol and monitor but to do law enforce-

ment work, including performing investigations.” He said that “the agency is in the process of updating position descriptions of park rangers to accurately reflect their duties.”

The AJ noted Martin’s testimony regarding the Assimilative Crimes Acts (18 U.S.C. section 13), which incorporates the criminal laws of states into the federal statute, and he noted that an NPS Office of the Solicitor’s memorandum corroborated that point.

Tim Sorber has offered to provide information on the appeals process to anyone needing assistance. You may contact him at (W) 717-334-0909 or (H) 717-334-0203.

Cost Sharing

ANPR agreed with the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) to share the cost of funding Sorber’s appeal. Both organizations viewed this case as a potentially precedent setting case for other individuals 6(c) claims that may be appealed. The favorable decision by MSPB supports that view. Both ANPR and FOP contributed $2,500 dollars each toward the cost. This cost will not be borne by ANPR as a whole. Association members with a vested interest in the outcome of 6(c) claims should support this action. Please send a check for your contribution to Debbie Gorman as soon as possible.

Jerry Hammond vs. OPM

In March 1993, Jerry Hammond filed an appeal from OPM’s final decision which denied his claim for 6(c) credit for his 33.5 years of service as a firefighter and/or law enforcement park ranger. Based on the NPS recommendation, Hammond’s claim had been forwarded to OPM with a favorable recommendation by DOI for a period of service totaling more than 29 years. Hammond was represented by Craig James of Skinner, Fawcett & Mauk who practice in Boise, ID.

In July 1993, an Administrative Judge (AJ) of the MSPB ruled in favor of Hammond’s appeal and reversed OPM’s final decision. The AJ’s initial decision was to become final on Aug. 18, 1993, unless OPM petitions for a review of the decision by the MSPB. Following are some of the important highlights of the AJ’s decision.

The AJ noted that, “The law is clear that eligibility for an enhanced annuity is controlled by the duties that the individual actually performed, not by the official position description.” As with the Sorber case, the AJ found that OPM was incorrect to rely solely on the official position description, but should instead have relied upon the actual duties performed in the position.

A unique issue in this case was that of hybrid service. Hammond maintained that he was primarily a firefighter and is entitled to 6(c) coverage based on that alone. But he also argued that he performed law enforcement duties as well and that he is also entitled to 6(c) coverage based on the aggregate of firefighting and law enforcement duties. The relevant statute, 5 U.S.C. section 8336(c)(1) refers to “20 years of service as a law enforcement officer or firefighter, or any combination of such service.”

OPM maintained that such hybrid service was not creditable. They acknowledged that sequential periods of firefighter and law enforcement service are creditable, but that an individual may not qualify for coverage where both types of duties combined constitute the primary part of one’s position but where neither duty alone is primary. The AJ disagreed and found that “the words ‘any combination’ must be given their plain meaning. Their plain meaning encompasses firefighting and law enforcement duties, which are performed simultaneously, i.e., ‘hybrid’ duties. There is no indication to the contrary from the purpose or the history of the legislation.”

For several of Hammond’s periods of service, OPM denied credit based on the fact that he only performed actual firefighting duties for a limited amount of the period, and that his periods of service were direct firefighting duties. He noted that, “Firefighter – whether with the NPS or a large municipality – only fights fires when fires break out. And it is the occurrence of fires which occasions many of a firefighter’s other duties, such as clean-up and replenishment for instance. The fact that well-trained and experienced firefighters sometimes wait at the station (as do municipal firefighters), or perform non-fire-related duties (as do NPS park rangers), does not mean they are not firefighters.”

In his conclusion, the AJ found that based on Hammond’s actual duties that he was entitled to 6(c) credit for his periods of service as a firefighter. The AJ also found that, “In each of these periods, appellant had a significant number of duties in the area of law enforcement. Therefore, even if appellant had not qualified for an enhanced annuity based on his firefighting duties alone, I would find that he qualified based on the aggregate of his firefighting and law enforcement duties.”

MSPB Appeals Process

The following information is excerpted from an article by Tim Sorber that appeared in the May/June issue of The Protection Ranger, published by FOP:

MSPB Appeals Process: Now, let’s review what happens when OPM issues an unfavorable decision regarding an individual employee’s claim for past coverage 6(c) credit. OPM will either issue an Initial Decision (which means the employee will have “re-consideration right”) or Final Decision (which means the employee will have “appeal right”). An “Initial Decision” grants the claimant an opportunity to provide additional information or evidence in support of his/her claim, which will then be reviewed by OPM. A “Final Decision”
means the employee may appeal OPM’s findings to the MSPB.

When a “Final Decision” is issued by OPM, an appeal notice must be filed within 25 calendar days of the date on OPM’s decision letter. Appeal forms and instructions are included in the OPM decision letter. The phases of the process are: Appeal to MSPB; MSPB Acknowledgement; MSPB Order and Notice of Hearing and Pre-Conference; Pre-Hearing Submission; Pre-Hearing Conference; and MSPB Hearing.

MSPB Acknowledgement: MSPB will send the appellant a letter acknowledging receipt of the appeal notice. This acknowledgment will identify the Administrative Judge (AJ) assigned to your case and will further stipulate conditions and requirements for both the appellant (you) and the Agency (OPM). The main requirement of this order is to provide each side and the AJ with the necessary information about an individual case (i.e., agency file, discovery requests, notice of presentation). Time limits are specified in this order.

Order and Notice of Hearing and Pre-Hearing Conference: If you request a hearing, a letter will be sent establishing a date, time and location for Pre-Hearing Conference. The AJ will issue an Order and Notice of Hearing and Pre-Hearing Conference that orders the appellant and OPM to file a Pre-Hearing Submission and arrange a date and time for a Pre-Hearing Conference.

Pre-Hearing Submission: The Pre-Hearing Submission is your statement of the facts and issues of your case, list of witnesses and a copy of any documents and/or exhibits which will be presented at the hearing. Note that, in presenting evidence at the hearing, you are limited to your pre-hearing submission (facts/issues, witnesses, evidence, etc.). The Pre-Hearing Conference is usually scheduled two weeks before the final MSPB Hearing.

MSPB Hearing: This is the actual hearing. Hearings are usually scheduled within 60-75 days of the initial appeal to the MSPB.

Administrative Judge Ruling: Within 45 days, the Administrative Judge issues a decision. This decision can be appealed to the entire MSPB.

MSPB Ruling: The entire MSPB will review the case and then issue a decision. If the 25 calendar days of the Administrative Judge’s decision, this is usually done within three months. If the MSPB reverses or amends the Administrative Judge’s decision, this usually takes from six months to a year to get a final decision.

Mark Harvey
Yosemite

Retirement Committee
The following article appeared in The Wall Street Journal, issue of March 26, 1993.

The Talk You Must Have With Your Parents
By Lynn Asinof
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

Your parents are getting on in years. To some people, that means they may soon come into their inheritance. But most people are more concerned about what will get are their parents’ problems and bills, or even the parents themselves.

Advisers say it is never too soon for adult children to start talking with their parents about the “what ifs,” planning for what could happen. But with the children trying to avoid looking greedy and parents not wanting to give up control, broaching the subject can be an emotional minefield.

“It is a loaded psychological issue,” says Sharon Rich, a Belmont, Mass., financial planner. “You are dealing with two of our culture’s three big taboos – death and money.”

Nonetheless, children who don’t take that step may get a rude awakening. They may find themselves scavenging for a will, insurance policies and bank statements after their parents die. Or worse, they may find that they lack the basic tools to protect their parents’ interest if they become seriously ill or incompetent.

Role Reversal May Help
A good first step is to put yourself in your parents’ shoes, says Karen Spero, a Cleveland-based financial planner. That means recognizing that what is best for the parent isn’t always best for the child. “You must try to understand what the parent fears and what it really costs the parent to live,” she says.

One real fear is often that the children want the money for themselves. “Everyone is afraid of outliving their money”, says Spero. “In their concern about not having enough, they become somewhat suspicious about other people.”

Take that into consideration and it may be easier to move on to the four things financial and legal advisers generally agree children and their aging parents should address: a will, a durable power of attorney, a health-care proxy and a list of assets.

Alexander Bove Jr., a Boston estate attorney, says preparing a durable power of attorney is the most important step. The document, which should be drafted with the help of a good lawyer, would allow a child to do such things as sign tax returns, transfer assets into a trust and make financial decisions for a parent if he or she should become incompetent. If worded properly, it could even allow a child to establish trusts and make gifts for a parent, Bove says.

“I would actually do the power of attorney before the will,” he says, noting that a will is of no help whatsoever in dealing with the problems that can arise if parents become unable to conduct their own affairs, possibly years before they die.

Abuse of Power Feared
Many parents don’t want to give such power too soon for fear the kids will abuse it, spending the money or making foolish decisions. One solution, says Bove, is to execute the durable power of attorney, but leave it with a lawyer to be delivered to the child when necessary.

But a durable power of attorney doesn’t replace a will. For one thing, its power lapses upon death. And in the absence of a will, or the appropriate trusts, the state will impose its own formula on distribution of the estate.

In a second marriage, for instance, that means that the new spouse could get some of the share intended for the children. “In a case like that, for sure, we don’t want to downplay the importance of a will,” says Bove.

The third critical item is a health-care proxy. With this document, the parent would delegate the right to make health-care decisions, such as whether to undergo an operation. Rules vary from state to state, but often a living will is incorporated into the document, outlining specifically what measures would be acceptable to prolong life.

While on the topic of health care, children may also want to tackle funeral arrangements. “This may be harder for the kids to deal with than the parents,” says Spero. But it is important to find out if the parents have already bought burial plots or made arrangements with a specific funeral home.

The fourth area is the list of assets where they can be found. That means listing not only bank accounts and stock certificates, but also pension plans, insurance policies and individual retirement accounts. Don’t forget things like money due, such as a loan made to a sister but never openly discussed. Even the mortgage coupon book should be on the list.

Avoiding a Nightmare
Parents may not like telling all to their children. But consider the alternative of trying to reconstruct an estate with no guidelines. “It can really be a nightmare and often is,” says Max Gutierrez, a partner at the law firm of Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison in San Francisco.

He tells of children finding stock certificates in the attic years after their parents’ deaths. In one case, missing jewelry “had people crying one another suspiciously” until it was eventually found behind a loose board in a closet. And in at least one case, the children were trying to reconstruct the assets from the parents’ tax returns - “only to find that they hadn’t filed taxes for years,” he says.

When making the list, it’s a good idea to record the date of purchase and the purchase price. This provides a basis price for tax purposes in case assets have to be sold as the parents get older. Also remember that some as-
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**Rendezvous XVII**

**Challenge the Future! Agenda for Change**

Rendezvous XVII is almost here. It is scheduled for Wednesday, Nov. 10 through Sunday, Nov. 14, at the Cavalier Hotel in Virginia Beach. We will again meet jointly with the annual conference of the Association of National Park Maintenance Employees.

The Cavalier is located at 42nd Street and Atlantic Avenue. The room rate is $49 per night plus tax (9.5 percent), for an ocean view room, either single or double occupancy. These rooms have a view of the ocean although the view may be limited. Rooms facing the ocean are $65. Children are free. Advance registration, which requires the first night's deposit, can be made by calling the Cavalier at 1-800-446-8199. You must make reservations immediately! This rate will only be offered until Oct. 9. No pets are permitted in the hotel.

Bill Wade from Shenandoah National Park is the Rendezvous site coordinator and will reach him at 3041 Mt. Heights Rd., Front Royal, VA 22630, (703) 635-8809. Cindy MacLeod from Richmond Battlefield is the program chair and may be contacted at 2525 Cedar Cone Dr., Richmond, VA, 23233, (804) 747-3622.

**Pre-Registration**

If you haven’t received the Rendezvous pre-registration form already, you will have it soon. Please pre-register for the Rendezvous. The information you give when pre-registering is absolutely vital for planning the program and events. Don’t put it off, pre-register now!

The Rendezvous T-Shirt is being designed by Keith Hoofnagle again this year. We have made arrangements to have the shirts produced by a company that offers shirts of 100 percent recycled plastic! The shirts are soft and durable. We strongly encourage you to order a shirt when you pre-register since there will be a limited supply available at Rendezvous and no opportunity to order additional shirts later.

Disposable beverage cups will not be provided this year in order to eliminate waste. You may either bring a mug or purchase an ANPR mug at the Rendezvous.

**Agenda**

**Invited Guests** - Vice President Al Gore; Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt; Director of the National Park Service Roger Kennedy; Deputy Director John Reynolds; Mid-Atlantic Regional Director B.J. Griffin; Congressman Bruce Vento, Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands; and singer Hank Williams Jr.

**Tracks** - Sessions will run in two “tracks.” Some meetings are aimed at basic or technical skills and others will focus on management topics. Anyone can go to any meeting, but the intent is to offer topics that will interest a wider variety of participants.

**Sessions**

- Maria Burks, Superintendent, Fredericksburg National Military Park, will present a program on Ranger Futures. Alec Gould, Superintendent, Colonial National Historical Park, and Robert Hicks, Director, Virginia Conservation and Recreation Association, will present the opening and welcome.
- Thom Alcoze, Center for Native Education and Cultural Diversity, Northern Arizona University, will speak on Appreciating Parks.
- Executive Director of ANPR, Carsten Karraker, P.O. Box 57, Capulin, NM 88414, (505) 278-2656, suggested ideas and suggestions to Cindy as soon as possible on sessions that interest you.

**Special Interest Groups** - This year we have designed a new program to allow folks with a common interest a chance to get together in an available meeting room to informally discuss the topic. The rooms and topics will be advertised and the rest is up to whoever wants to schedule and run the meeting. Topics scheduled to date include: Search and Rescue, International Ranger Federation, How to Select Boots, Climbing, Civil War, and ANPR/FOP Relationships. Anyone interested in scheduling/facilitating a topic should notify Cindy.

**Social activities** - We will again sponsor the yearly “fun” run and golf tournament. The exhibitor’s reception will be on Friday night, a dinner and DJ dance on Saturday night, and the hotel reception and dance with live band is planned for Sunday night. All of these will be joint activities between ANPR and ANPME.

**Exhibitors** - More than 20 exhibitors are expected to display products, equipment, and material of interest to park rangers, resource management, and maintenance operations from Thursday, Nov. 11 through noon, Saturday, Nov. 13.

**Pre-Rendezvous Training** - “Leadership for the Future,” a course dealing with situational leadership, will be offered for the two days before Rendezvous (Nov. 8 and 9) at the Cavalier Hotel. The instructor is Sean Joyce, president of Omega, Consultants to Management.

**Truck Tours** - Tony Wright from Cape Henry Lighthouse near Virginia Beach.

**Travel**

Omega World Travel is the Association’s official travel agency and all travel booked through them directly benefits the Association. Reservations may be made by calling 1-800-283-3239 or (703) 818-8848. Ask for Liz or Bunny. The official airline carrier this year is United Airlines. They are offering a 5 percent discount on their non-refundable fares to ANPR members. Contact Omega for reservations. The official car rental agency is Avis. You may contact Avis directly at 1-800-525-7537 or make the reservations through Omega. If calling Avis directly give the Avis agent the Avis “Worldwide Discount Number” Y-555-149 to receive the best discount. Both United and Avis service Norfolk, Va., and Washington, D.C. An airport shuttle bus from the Norfolk Airport to the hotel is available for $15.50 per person. Taxis may also be hired at the airport for about $25 and can accommodate up to 5 passengers.

**Child Care**

Although babysitting services are offered by the hotel, Barbara Goodman is organizing some children’s activities beyond basic
babysitting. Please pre-register your kids for activities when you pre-register yourself for the Rendezvous.

Raffle Prizes

Remember to search for creative raffle prizes. If you can’t bring your donation with you, you can mail it to Jane Anderson at 8374 Glastonbury Ct., Annandale, VA 22003, or call her at (703) 641-8393. If you can’t get your items to Jane by Nov. 5 you can send them directly to the Cavalier Hotel, Oceanfront at 42nd Street, Virginia Beach, VA 23451, marked as a raffle item for ANPR. Also, if you know the whereabouts of the raffle ticket barrels, contact Jane!

The Super-Raffle first prize is a seven-day trip for two on the Delta Queen Riverboat from New Orleans to Memphis including airfare. Second prize is a ski trip for two to Colorado, Utah or California. Get out and sell those raffle tickets!

We will have a special drawing for four free nights in the hotel for those people attending their first Rendezvous.

Special Trips

Plans are being made for Saturday’s free afternoon for group trips to Williamsburg and to the Virginia Marine Science Museum. Transportation will be provided to Williamsburg and will include a tour of building exteriors. The cost will be approximately $10 per person. Virginia Marine Science Museum will cost $4.15 for adults and $3.50 for kids. Please indicate your interest on the pre-registration brochure so we know how many folks are interested. Call 1-800-VA-Beach for additional information about entertainment opportunities. ✫

Sarah Craighead
NCRO

The Professional Ranger
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vice is a tight-knit group and fosters special friendships. Through the tough times, it sure gives one a warm feeling to know there truly are great friends that care about you, and the friendships one develops are indeed special. Again, thanks for making life a little easier during a difficult time. ✫

Steve Clark
DEWA

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 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.

Omega guarantees that they will provide the lowest airfare 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 the 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.

Reservations for travel may be made by calling the 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.

ANPR Reports

(continued from page 25)

sets, like brokerage accounts, may require special powers of attorney, since some financial institutions don’t honor a durable power of attorney.

Having tackled the basics, children may find it easier to begin discussing financial planning with their parents. Sometimes, the most important financial assistance given an aging parent may be as simple as helping to open the mail and pay the bills. Or it may require some reallocation of assets.

But children must be careful not to trample their parents’ security in a search for higher yield, warns Spero. Money socked away in 3 percent certificates of deposit, for example, may seem a less-than-optimum investment today, but that doesn’t mean the child should push to put that money into a riskier, higher-yielding investment.

“You can’t disrupt someone that much,” she says, noting that the CDs may make the parent feel secure.

Indeed, advisers say that it often helps to bring in a third party if big changes are needed. That tends to make it easier for the parent to accept the advice, since it can no longer be either judgmental or self-serving on the part of the child.


Please note: In response to a number of requests, ANPR plans to hold one four-hour workshop on “Investing Fundamentals” during the 1993 Rendezvous. This probably will be held on either a “free” afternoon or some evening. ✫

Frank Betts
Retirement
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