Cultural Resource Protection: The ARPA Task Force
Letters

Editor:

There is much (major, minor and grammatical) to take issue with in “Realities of a Female Manager,” Kathy Smith’s workshop report from Rendezvous XVI (Ranger, Summer 1993). This letter, however, is not intended as an exhaustive critique. Rather, it calls attention to just a few matters.

Early on, Smith states that the job of a woman manager “is even more complicated” (more complicated than what? than it otherwise might be? than the job of a man manager?) because men and women have stereotypical expectations of them. Yet, her report makes reference to stereotypical expectations of men managers, as well.

Among the expectations that she cites are independence, hierarchical structuring, non-subjugation, a disdain for discussing problems, and a desire to solve problems. She does not acknowledge that many men do not manage in ways that are consistent with these stereotypical expectations. Nor does she deal with the question of whether “there is a certain level of discomfort and friction when the (man) boss doesn’t act in this expected fashion.”

If the Smith “Catch 22” thesis is correct, then it causes men to suffer as much as women do. If men managers are nurturing and caring, they, using her logic, run the risk of not being effective in view of what people (according to Smith) expect from them. If a man is what “people think of (as) the ideal manager,” he possesses “impersonal male attributes, not the caring and nurturing traits.” Applied without bias, Smith’s etiological analysis would find that these men run the risks of being just as offensive to people who are offended by women who are not nurturing and caring.

Accepting some of what Smith says causes one reasonably disagree as to whether a penchant for saying one thing while meaning another is an ideal or effective management technique.

Moreover, Smith’s description of what a man might say under the same circumstances perhaps reveals a bias of her own. Smith says that a man will say, “Close the window,” which, she says, “can be interpreted as an irritating order.” Without getting into whether or not giving an order is an accepted or an effective management technique, one wonders why Smith did not, evenhandedly, choose to have the man say, “Please close the window,” which is what she said the woman really meant when she said it was cold and drafty.

A man, even one inclined to “speak directly,” is much less likely to be seen by men or women as giving an “irritating order” if he uses the word “please.” Does Smith believe, as she implies, that women are more likely than men to use that word? Would not a woman who omits that word, while saying what she really means, also be regarded as giving an irritating order?

Finally, among the grammatical problems in the Smith report is her use of the word “androgyneous.” She obviously was thinking of the word “androgyneous.” The former refers to producing male offspring; the latter means both male and female in one entity (hermaphroditic). I don’t think Smith meant to report that the manager who produces male offspring is emerging as, and soon will be, the manager of the future.

Under the circumstances, I think it only fair that I offer my own brief interpretation of the pertinent dynamics related to the emergence of more women as managers. As has always been the case, all people are changing. As always, where there is intermingling of people from different groups, either one or more of the groups, or one or more of the differences, tend to fade over time. Things change, people change, technology changes, desires change, and so on.

Forty years ago, only women had the option to stay at home or not to. While that is still true, although to a much lesser extent than it was before, it is far more attractive today than it was 40 years ago, especially because of the vast changes in the nature of work, and far more necessary, especially in view of the changes in

(continued on page 30)
President’s Message

The Association of National Park Rangers is at a crossroads concerning our internal organizational structure.

For years the Association has depended on volunteer efforts from members to accomplish those action items we collectively have agreed to do. This work generally has been a donation of time or a financial donation in absorbing the cost of travel or work product.

ANPR no longer has the luxury of solely depending on volunteerism. In 1993 the board of directors met for first time in mid-year. This wasn’t a one-time effort to discuss our strategic plan, but will be the way we do business in 1994 and the future. Even with a mid-year board meeting, it’s difficult to effectively conduct Association business in a timely manner.

The role of the president also is changing. In the past, virtually every decision was either made or concurred by the chief executive of the Association. There are simply too many activities, too many fronts, too little time, for a volunteer president to continue to be forced to carry that work load by him/herself.

So what is the answer to this dilemma?

To me, the best solution is to redefine the role of the president so the post isn’t the sole, or maybe even primary representative of ANPR to the Congress, to the Department, to the agency, to the media, to our cooperators and interest groups.

The president, working through the board of directors, should continue to give direction to the Association. Together they should establish policy and purpose, but neither should be expected, a cappella, to conduct the day-to-day activities of the Association.

I propose to build on the strategic plan and shift the organizational structure of ANPR. The administrative responsibility would rest not with the president and board, but with an executive director.

The executive director doesn’t run the organization, but is primarily responsible for assuring that ANPR business is implemented. The president represents ANPR at various functions, but the executive director does so also. The executive director doesn’t function independently, but acts with the delegated authority of the board and the president.

Does this limit the authority and responsibility of the president? It certainly does. But it also removes many of the problems associated with vesting so much power to a volunteer, albeit elected, officer; the lack of continuity from president to president, the disenfranchisement of interested and capable members who may be too far removed from the primary place where representation is needed (Washington, D.C.) and the favorable status given members who may be in a better position to regulate and budget their time.

The establishment of an executive director for the ANPR will not happen overnight. Some interim steps are necessary, probably mandatory.

The first is to separate the functions of secretary and treasurer. Last year we added to the secretary-treasurer’s responsibilities of financial oversight and assistance to the business manager.

This position has become a full-time volunteer job. To think that the person also can continue to be responsible for all the secretarial duties required by the Association is ludicrous. There is too much work and too little time for one person to try to accomplish both diverse jobs.

I hope ANPR takes a critical look at what we are requiring from the secretary-treasurer and amends the bylaws to provide for two positions. Both would still be elected by the general membership.

The second necessary step is the recognition that there must be a logical progression to the presidency of ANPR. Most professional organizations such as ours have a formalized step-up progression ultimately leading to the presidency.

Whether or not ANPR needs to establish a series of third, second and first vice presidents I leave to debate. What is needed, however, is some logical method to ascend to the presidency.

As we are currently organized, I see the president-elect as being the vice president for communications and representation. This position, more than any other elected position in ANPR, has direct contact with the membership through regional and park representatives.

I urge you to give these thoughts careful consideration. Use them to springboard to even better ideas to improve the organizational effectiveness of ANPR as we position ourselves for the 21st century.
Association Actions

Public Lands Initiative

Early in December Rick Gale received an invitation to attend a workshop on the “crisis” facing America’s public lands being held by Rep. George Miller, chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources, and Rep. Bruce Vento, chairman of its Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands. Gale asked Bill Wade and Bill Halainen to attend on behalf of the Association.

The Dec. 17 conference was attended by about 60 people, a fairly extraordinary collection of principals from a multitude of public and private land management and outdoor recreation organizations. An abbreviated list of participating groups:


Chairman Miller hosted the three-and-a-half hour session, and was joined midway by Chairman Vento. Miller asked two people — Wade and Bob Herbst, past assistant secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks — to set the tone for the session by speaking about the problems besetting America’s public lands.

Wade said the Service’s primary problem is that the addition of too many less-than-significant new areas and too many new responsibilities has led to a dilution of our ability to manage the agency, to protect areas that meet the true test of national significance, and to adequately protect cultural and natural resources. NPS needs to get “back on the road of national significance” and refocus its priorities, he said.

Wade’s comments were a brief summation of a more detailed position paper ANPR developed earlier. The paper was also reviewed, revised somewhat, and endorsed by ANPME and FOP. This made it possible for the three organizations to jointly address issues of common concern for the first time. The full text of that position paper is printed below.

Almost everyone who attended had the opportunity to express his or her opinion on what public lands issues are of the most concern. Several were repeated frequently enough to suggest general consensus:

- Since lost resources are usually lost forever, the government still needs to make land acquisition its first priority. Polls and local referendums consistently show strong public support for land acquisition.
- We need to do a much better job of educating the public on environmental and public lands issues. Among other things, interpretation should be strengthened to attain that end.
- We need to develop “webs” of federal, state, local and trust lands in order to better protect ecosystems. Ecosystem management is a priority.
- We need to improve our use of volunteers and other potential allies.
- We need to mobilize constituencies that are our natural allies but haven’t yet been tapped.

This was the first of several meetings that will be held to determine the scope and nature of public lands policies and some of the possible solutions. The next will involve state organizations and focus on the insufficiency of state-side Land and Water Conservation Fund appropriations.

This workshop also gave us the opportunity to make a definitive statement about our concerns regarding the National Park Service and its future. The statement was reviewed and endorsed by the leadership of the Association of National Park Maintenance Employees and by the Fraternal Order of Police. That statement, since modified slightly to clarify some points, follows. Each general section is under its own heading:

Resource Protection

Although threats against park resources are manifold, they are often not immediately evident — a fact that makes them even more pernicious. We are suffering from a slow but persistent attrition that is eating away at the natural, cultural and historic resources that the American people have asked us to protect. Our ability to meet our basic mission requirement of protecting parks is being compromised.

That mandate states that we must protect “in perpetuity.” Perpetuity is a long, long time. If we allow even minor losses on a regular basis, we stand to lose much more in the long run. What will our parks look like in 100 years? 1,000 years? At present, we face numerous resource protection problems:

- Poaching — Market hunting and collecting are making serious inroads on park flora and fauna and show no sign of abating. Organized rings are poaching, among many other things, trophy animals (particularly large mammals), bears (for their allegedly medicinal parts), ginseng, mushrooms, mussels, fish, insects and palmetto fruit. Many of these species are rare, threatened or endangered. Some are found only within park boundaries. Their rarity unfortunately raises their value on the commercial and black markets. We must have more funding for enforcement — staff, equipment and training — if we are to have any chance of protecting what remains in our parks. We also need funding to dramatically increase our efforts — both inside and outside parks — to educate Americans on our wild resources, their value and their peril.

- Paleontological and Archeological Theft — There are similar rings dealing in archeological and historical artifacts and paleontological resources. The traffic in artifacts is growing with the depletion of other private and public lands. Once these resources are lost, they are gone forever. Again, we must have the people and resources to fight such crime, and must work to educate Americans on their endangered heritage.

- Environmental Crime — According to the FBI, environmental crime is rapidly becoming one this country’s most serious problems. National parks are not immune. Among the problems we face are discharges of pollutants into waterways from active and inactive oil, gas, mining and other industrial operations; improper transportation and disposal of hazardous wastes and other solid wastes; illegal landfill operations; ocean dumping of garbage and medical wastes; and emission of air pollutants which exceed permit limitations. We must have the funds, training and legal/regulatory
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tools to combat these growing problems.

➤ **Carrying Capacities** — Visitation continues to climb and shows no sign of abating. Impacts, naturally, are being felt mostly in the front country, but they are so extensive in some areas that the sense of being in a park is often all but gone. Mechanisms for determining carrying capacities and controlling access must be developed.

➤ **Incompatible Uses** — The recreation explosion of the last two decades has led to a wide variety of new types of recreational activity, many of them incompatible with park authorizing legislation and the Service’s overall mission to protect resources for future generations. Such pressures will only continue. Congress and the Administration need to provide strong support to the Service in its efforts to regulate these activities.

➤ **Encroachments** — Encroachments come in many forms: material attrition along both external and internal boundaries, visual (airshed pollution, light pollution, building constructions along boundaries), and environmental (acid rain, polluted rivers). Stronger environmental planning efforts, improved regulatory and legal tools, increased public education and more effective monitoring are required. Managers need to have a stronger protection ethic, and must have more certain management support.

➤ **Park Ecosystems; Historic/Cultural Landscapes** — Our larger national parks contain significant portions of our nation’s most pristine ecosystems. These ecosystems are under assault from a variety of external and internal sources: air and water pollution, extractive and consumptive resources manipulation, urban or suburban sprawl, other developments to provide visitor services. The same problems plague our historic and cultural parks, where large portions of their historic contexts exist outside officially designated park boundaries. The Service must be provided with appropriate legal and policy tools — and planning expertise — to enable its field managers to play significant roles in regional planning and decision-making processes. Park development should be limited to the minimum necessary for visitor understanding and appreciation.

➤ **Historic Preservation** — The Service’s ability to properly maintain and protect the historic structures and prehistoric ruins under its care is seriously compromised by lack of adequate funding for its cultural cyclic maintenance program. Historic fabric, once lost, is gone forever; it is not a renewable resource. Our nation’s architectural patrimony will increasingly be at risk if appropriate resources are not made available. We need to identify and allocate such resources.

➤ **Museum Collections** — Museum collections are the tangible records of the attempts by the many cultures that grace our nation to live, work, love and worship on the North American continent. Yet these collections are often stored in inadequate repositories with marginal or no climate controls or security systems. The Service can no longer assure the adequate protection of these collections without considerable investment in storage facilities. We must identify and allocate funds for this task.

➤ **RS 2477 Rights-of-Way** — Throughout the West and in Alaska, local governments are using the provisions of this archaic law to create new road rights-of-way through parks for non-park purposes. This is out of sync with the park protection efforts of the Service, just as the mining and mineral leasing laws were. The provisions of RS 2477 need to be reviewed and perhaps updated.

➤ **Public Inholdings** — Most park legislation prohibits the acquisition of “public” lands within the boundary in any way other than by donation. As a consequence, unconstructed but platted road rights-of-way abound in many central and eastern states and may not be extinguished through normal land acquisition processes. For example, at Indiana Dunes, many roads are on the books due to prior development plans that existed prior to the boundary of the park being established. We have no control over the construction of these roads at a future date; the roads present a network of non-federal land over which we have no legal jurisdiction for activities that are inimical to park values; and, where built, there is no incentive for the state or county to donate (or vacate) them to the federal government, in as much as the local governments are apportioned state gas taxes on the total mileage of roads within the jurisdiction — regardless of their condition or status. Consequently, we have miles of roads that go nowhere, serve no purpose and are out of our control because we cannot compensate them for such lands and the communities have no incentive to give them up.

**Internal Imbalances**

Like many other federal agencies, the National Park Service is attempting to meet modern challenges with an antiquated and anachronistic bureaucratic structure. We also suffer from an “overfull plate” — we have too many mandates to meet and too few resources to meet them without compromising our core mission. Some issues:

➤ **Restructuring** — The NPS is too top heavy. While many field areas are suffering from near record low staffing levels (in the 9.5 million acres of Northwest Alaska Areas, for example, there are no permanent positions allocated to resource protection and monitoring), Washington and regional bureaucracies grow. We do not doubt that many of these new central office positions are necessary, particularly in cases where they offer direct support to the field, but others are not. What really is needed is to get positions and people in the right places. Program managers should be moved out of Washington and into regions and parks as appropriate. In some cases, such positions should be moved from regions to parks. Extreme care must be exercised in restructuring and funding central offices. Past examples of large central office staff reductions often resulted in the wrong positions, and certainly the wrong people, being sent out to the field.

We believe that the current limitations imposed on funding for regional offices in the NPS is the wrong way to try to solve the problem. On the contrary, we would call for FULL funding for regional offices, but only after a real needs assessment has been completed. Growth of regional offices has not resulted solely from bureaucratic bloat. Such growth is more likely the result of increasing complexity of issues and
additional legal and policy requirements being laid on the Service. The Service has not been able to keep pace with these requirements, in terms of staffing and budget, at any level in the organization.

Any changes in regional office responsibilities will have their greatest impacts on the smaller park areas, with current budgets consisting of up to 95 percent personal services already. Any additional demands on these areas will be devastating. These kinds of areas must be supported by expertise located elsewhere in the organization.

The Service needs to undertake a serious evaluation of staffing needs, structural inefficiencies and FTE allocations, then move positions to where they are most needed. This needs to be done surgically, not with a meat cleaver.

**Restraint** — Many new initiatives and not a few new pieces of legislation carry requirements that oblige the Service to either add new staff, reassign current staff, or overload existing staff. Since our budgets are not growing (in real dollars), the second and third options usually apply. Every FTE moved to overhead takes an FTE away from the field. An ethic must be established whereby Congress and the Administration recognize that our mission comes before all else, and that it must take precedence over other tasks.

**Cycling Staff** — Few field people ever take the risk of a central office assignment; few central office people ever get to the field. As a result, neither group has a good understanding of what the other does. This causes significant problems in the management of the agency. The Service must adopt policies conducive to rotation of employees through central office and field assignments.

**Work Force Diversity** — Diminishing resources will perpetuate the lack of cultural and intellectual diversity in our workforce. Funded special programs at the field level, such as the cooperative education program, designed to overcome such inequities, would enable us to develop employees who can compete for vacancies created by retirements. The Service must continue to develop ways to break down the barriers to upward advancement of women and under-represented populations.

**System Integrity**

The issue of new areas of less than national significance — so-called “park barrel” sites — is of great concern to us, and we are pleased to see that a number of bills in this Congress, including several from Chairman Vento, deal with this rapidly growing problem. We have some thoughts on the matter:

- **National Significance** — The integrity of the National Park System, the world’s premier park system, is compromised with the addition of every “park barrel” site, every thinly-disguised urban renewal project, every local booster’s pet park proposal. Funding and staff must be culled from elsewhere to manage them, thereby further stressing parks with true national significance. Congress must pass legislation establishing a legal requirement for park studies prior to authorizations. The Service must revise its current thematic study to dramatically limit the number and type of areas which we deem appropriate for inclusion in the System. Alternative mechanisms at the state and local levels must be found to protect some of these areas, which are important but not of national significance.

- **Closing/Mothballing** — We must protect the best of what we’ve got in the Service through sufficient funding and staffing, then seek alternative means for managing other areas, up to and including mothballing some until resources can be found to manage them. We should also remove some from the System and consolidate others with other land management agencies. Although this will be a difficult task, DOD’s bipartisan base closing commission provides an excellent model for a park closing commission. The Service needs to have the courage to put money and people in our most important areas, then reduce services or mothball other sites. Congress should hold hearings on a park closing commission, then formulate legislation to establish it.

**Funding — Daily Operations and Backlogs**

While funding increases are necessary, if only to keep up with inflation and the rising cost of employee benefits, we believe that the Service could remedy many of its present problems by restructuring its operations and reallocating existing funds. We need to determine and focus on our true priorities; at present, there’s no coherent, Servicewide system for rank order allocation of appropriations. It is, for example, a clear and unacceptable imbalance when the 50 percent of the land base in the System located in Alaska, receives only 3 percent of the NPS operating budget. Many of these areas still lack very basic infrastructure to manage the resources. The medical term “triage” comes to mind. The dictionary definition is almost perfectly applicable: “The sorting of and allocation of treatment . . . according to a system of priorities designed to maximize the number of survivors.”

**Personnel Issues**

Although of serious consequence to our members, we have listed personnel issues as the last of the significant issues because we appear to be on the verge of making significant headway in resolving many of these problems. We strongly endorse efforts to resolve these problems, and we will continue to press for resolution should we fail to gain remedies. The agency is managed by people, and we can not make headway on system issues until we begin taking adequate care of our people.

**Employee Grades/Pay** — Serious undergrading has been a major problem in the ranks of rangers, the Service’s largest profession, for many years. Ranger Futures, a major initiative to remedy this problem, has been approved by the Department, and the requisite funding has been OK’d by both the Department and OMB. Ranger Futures is scheduled to go into effect June 1. Recent legislation lifting longstanding pay caps for maintenance employees should go a long way toward resolving maintenance pay concerns.

**Employee Housing** — The Service has expended substantial funds on housing over the past few years, and will continue to do so in the future. The Service and the Department are looking at additional sources of funding for
housing, and will be proposing legislation to provide them with the necessary authorities. Legislation to provide rental relief to employees in high cost-of-living areas and grant land management agencies the authority to use new and creative ways to support housing has been introduced in the Senate. Efforts must continue in these areas. The Service also needs to evaluate and adopt other ways of accomplishing its mission rather than through the sometimes abusive policy of required occupancy.

➤ Retirement Benefits — After a prolonged battle with OPM over the granting of 20-year retirement benefits to law enforcement rangers, that agency has now granted the Department the authority to adjudicate such claims.

➤ Temporary Benefits — Legislation has been introduced in Congress to provide health, life and retirement benefits to temporary employees. The current version of the bill, however, sets standards that would exclude virtually all NPS temporaries. The agency itself has a draft policy recommending the payment of benefits from day one of employment, and the legislation needs to authorize agencies to provide such benefits. Pending legislation to give temporaries the right to compete for permanent employment needs to be passed.

Vail Agenda: Human Resources

Last fall, Bill Schenk, head of the Vail agenda task force on human resource development, asked ANPR for comments on the issue he was developing for the Service’s Career Council. Rick Gale asked Bill Wade to reply. Here are excerpts from his letter:

"First, let me provide you with some personal observations based on my professional experience (both as a field manager and with substantial experience in the training business in the NPS). I have felt for some time that the single biggest problem we have in the NPS (internally, at least) is poor supervision, especially at the first and second levels. This is corroborated by various evaluations and 'polls.' In ANPR's economic survey of a couple of years ago, poor supervision was listed second (behind pay and advancement) as the reason employees have left, or were considering leaving the NPS.

'I believe that many of the employee 'problems' that we, as managers, hear in the NPS today (poor housing, poor pay, poor advancement, grievances, complaints, etc.) are expressions of symptoms of the greater problem of our people being treated poorly by their supervisors. I don't mean to imply that there aren't problems in the areas mentioned, but I believe that when people aren't being treated well and fairly by their bosses, they tend to express their dissatisfaction about many other conditions that wouldn't be seen as so significant to them if they felt they were being treated appropriately.

"Simply stated, the problem is that we don't give people the KSAs to perform effectively as supervisors in the NPS. Then we compound the problem. We require people to become supervisors to get ahead. Those who are master-performers in some skill (e.g. interpretation, investigation), and who would just as soon continue to do that kind of work if they could continue to earn an increasing income, are forced to look at supervisory positions as the way to increase their salaries. This is the 'double-whammy.' We lose a master-skilled employee and gain a piss-poor supervisor. (This is a system issue having to do with advancement and classification that has to be worked on simultaneously).

"Until the poor state of supervisory performance is seen as a line management (leadership) problem and issue, rather than a staff one, there is little hope that much will change. Line managers must be responsible and in control of the problem for it to be solved, rather than having the (sometimes unconscious) ability to 'cope out' and say it's a staff ('training isn't doing its job') problem.

"So, there are a number of system problems here that I believe contribute to the poor state of supervision in the organization. Some of them might be beyond the purview of your work group, but I believe if they aren't tackled, the other remedies have little possibility of helping, and I believe history bears me out.

"Broader issues (if improved, the other stuff will become easier):

• Create a way whereby employees can pursue interests and skill to high levels of pay and grade without having to switch over into the supervisory/management (arena) to be able to advance.

• Employee development should be organizationally incorporated directly into the line management functions at all levels and the staff 'training' functions eliminated.

• The Servicewide Needs Assessment Program (SNAP) needs to be brought up to date, revised to incorporate recent technology and human resource concepts, and made to be used. It can (and has in some isolated instances) reveal good information, and if used properly, as designed, can assist with placing our employee development efforts (dollars and staffing) where the needs are the greatest. Further, it can assure that those with the highest needs are, in fact, the ones who receive the developmental experiences. This can all help with the supervisory/leadership development arena.

"Immediate issues:

• The numbers of supervisory training programs must be substantially increased and their quality improved dramatically. There simply aren't enough available, high-quality programs to meet the need for the numbers of supervisors we have, much less to try to prepare employees prior to them stepping into such a position. The best model for carrying this out, in my opinion, is that developed for the interpretive skills program. It works. We need to have a consistent program in supervisory training, tailored to the needs of our supervisors, and available at least in every region. The skills team approach makes sense to meet these needs . . . Developing a program that consists of several interrelated levels that people could advance through (as in the interp skills program) makes sense.

• We need to expand on the model currently being used to develop potential"
Cultural Resource Protection in the Southwest Region
The ARPA Task Force

By Phil Young
Southwest Regional Office

These are examples of artifacts seized by the ARPA Task Force. See the legend on page 13 to identify each item.

Southwest Region's Resource Protection Unit (RPU) executed a search warrant recently at the Ohio residence of an artifact dealer and collector and seized hundreds of artifacts valued at more than $250,000.

This major case, which began in mid-January, showcases the importance of the RPU in striving to protect cultural resources. When the search warrant was executed in early February, it was the culmination of many hours of an intense undercover operation.

The RPU and park rangers from the Midwest Region found and seized more than 600 prehistoric pottery vessels and 1,000 documents and photos. Some are suspected to be from NPS, BLM, Forest Service and Navajo tribal lands.

After years of being a ranger involved with responsibilities from interpretation to protection skills, I've been actively working the past three years in a specialized and non-traditional NPS job.

I am a special agent devoted full-time to the enforcement of cultural resource laws. My objective, however, has been traditional: compliance. We work proactively, often using covert and undercover operations, to bring about compliance with the Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (ARPA) and the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

My personal interest in the protection of our non-renewable archeological resources was rooted through family heritages, stemming from an academic background in history and archeology, and blossoming from professional experiences at Little Big Horn, Tonto Fort Laramie and more. My background in "living history" has been useful on numerous occasions.

In 1989 law enforcement representatives from the National Park Service Southwest Region, the New Mexico office of the Bureau of Land Management, and Region 3 of the USDA Forest Service met in Albuquerque to discuss the formation of an interagency task force for the enforcement of ARPA.

Theft and destruction of archeological resources and sacred sites of members of the "First Nations" (Native Americans) had been identified as an extensive problem by land management agencies for a number of years.

Efforts by Congress to reduce the
destruction through the passage of legislation had done relatively little to curtail the tremendous amount of looting throughout the United States.

Though the passage of ARPA and its amendments provided for stiff punishment, the Act was doing little to reduce the actual trafficking of stolen artifacts, as law enforcement officers needed to establish specific elements of the crime, most specifically that the artifact originated on federal or Indian lands. With the exception of chance discovery, this can best be accomplished in undercover investigations where purchasers and collectors are targets of the investigations. As in narcotics trafficking, the law of supply and demand prevails.

It was noted that as long as profit was substantial, and risk of detection and punishment was minimal, collecting and trafficking would continue. Past experience in undercover operations had shown that the collector community was, and is, significant. It generates enough profit so that pot hunters, some conservators and dealers will take substantial risks in handling artifacts stolen from public lands. It reasoned that if the market were reduced with intensified enforcement efforts, there would be less emphasis on locating and looting the limited cultural sites entrusted to our care.

Proposal Submitted

After this meeting the NPS submitted a modest proposal to Sen. Bingaman, D-N.M., for $250,000 to fund agents from the three agencies and for limited operating expenses. Bingaman referred the proposal to the New Mexico BLM office, asked its opinion, and stated that the amount was insufficient to address the problem adequately. Once again we in the NPS didn’t think “big” enough, BLM resubmitted the proposal for enhanced cultural resource enforcement efforts in the Four Corners (Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico and Utah) area and received $400,000 for fiscal year 1991.

The purpose of the ARPA Task Force was to reduce the destruction of cultural sites on lands under the management of the United States by identification, prosecution and conviction of looters, dealers and collectors who trafficked in artifacts taken in violation of federal laws and regulations. This would be accomplished through interagency cooperation for overt investigations, undercover operations, computerized intelligence databases and collection of specific information.

A task force oversight committee was established with law enforcement managers from the participating agencies. The BLM New Mexico special agent-in-charge served as the chairman. NPS representatives were J.T. Reynolds and Bill Tanner. BLM New Mexico special agent Gary Olson was selected as the task force coordinator.

The ARPA task force started operating in November 1990 with BLM New Mexico contributing one full-time investigator and a clerk. USDA Forest Service (Region 3) detailed an investigator. NPS Southwest (SWRO) assigned an archeologist (Judy Miles Reed) and detailed a ranger/investigator (Al DeLaCruz) on a rotating basis with an investigator from the Rocky Mountain Region (Pat Buccello).

Many Suspects Identified

Pat Alton, a significant looter and artifact trafficker in Santa Fe, committed suicide and left hundreds of prehistoric Indian artifacts from the U.S. and Mexico, dozens of contraband feathers, and lots of names and records of his “trading” associates. Alton’s family was unsure about the proper disposition of the artifact collection, so they contacted BLM. This information resulted in numerous search warrants. Subsequent link analysis led the task force to additional suspects across the United States and Europe.

In January 1991, another suspect, Larry Martin, was found to be dealing in artifacts as an aside to his business in paleontological objects. My first “detail” to the task force was the execution of a search warrant at Martin’s residence. More than 1,500 fossils worth over $40,000 from public lands were recovered.

The goals for the task force quickly became: 1) have fun, 2) make cases, 3) don’t get the task force coordinator fired or indicted. While these were easy to accomplish, we enhanced number 2 and wanted to make cases so tight the suspects would quickly plea bargain.

Close communication with the assigned assistant U.S. attorney is essential to accomplish this. My personal goal remained to “gain compliance” with ARPA. We quickly became involved with equal opportunity enforcement, in that we equally targeted looters/diggers, traffickers/traders and collectors.

In March BLM selected the investigator, detailed by the Forest Service to the task force, to fill a BLM position permanently assigned to the task force. We also did a “reverse sting” operation in California that netted collector Kelly Briggs from Santa Barbara. Briggs had been in contact with an undercover agent from the tasks force wanting to buy artifacts, even if they were “tainted” (from a national forest). Briggs’ spouse arranged for a special surprise birthday party for

Tower Ruin at Tapia Canyon on BLM land. Canoncito Navajos consider this structure “the first hogan – the center of the world.”
him. Here he met undercover task force agents and selected prehistoric artifacts for his birthday gift.

Six months later when Briggs was served with a search warrant for the recovery of the “bait” artifacts that he purchased, he quickly talked about “the skeletons in my closet.” Since purchasing the artifacts Briggs had looted a Chumash burial site near Santa Barbara and taken the skeletal remains of at least seven Native Americans. Santa Barbara County became involved and Briggs pleaded to a felony under California’s statute for Possession of Native American Remains.

By May the SWRO had selected and assigned me full-time as a special agent to the task force. In addition to the above cases, the task force now was investigating a group of “high tech” treasure hunters looking for “lost Spanish gold.” I was assigned as the case agent.

The hunters were using electronic gear during aerial overflights, then using advanced ground detection equipment advanced and certified by the Edison Testing Lab, before digging many shafts (up to 112 feet deep) on federal and Indian lands.

Like many treasure hunters, they didn’t think they were violating ARPA. Their comments were, “We’re not looking for artifacts, we’re just looking for Spanish treasure.”

Tapia Canyon Case

Many treasure hunters think ARPA only protects Native American artifacts, so it was a good opportunity to “spread the good news” to another type of looter.

Within a short time I was assigned additional cases, ranging from the disassembly and removal of 36 tons of stone from an archeological and ceremonial area on BLM land at Tapia Canyon, to a metal-detecting “prospector” at a historic site on BLM land, and the dismantling and hauling away of a 115-year-old log cabin from BLM lands.

The “prospector” quickly pleaded to a misdemeanor under ARPA, receiving a one-year probation. He also was ordered to pay more than $1,000 restitution for the 10 holes he dug (none wider than 2 feet or deeper than 3 inches).

However, the Tapia Canyon investigation turned out to be more complex. We learned from the Canoncito Navajos after getting an indictment that the vandalized archeological structure was considered their “the first hogan — the center of the world.” It took almost two years, but the case resulted in one of the few nationwide ARPA felony convictions handed down by a jury.

In June BLM selected two more full-time investigators. Because they were new to federal service, they received training at FLETC. Plans were also under way for a longer term (18 months) undercover operation, “Operation Export.” During this operation, undercover agents heard looters talking about the diminishing returns for their efforts on Forest Service and BLM lands, and referring to artifacts in National Park areas as their “banks for the future.”

In July another “reverse,” this one in Las Vegas, Nev., resulted in a misdemeanor plea agreement for ARPA trafficking by Gary White of Cave Creek, Ariz., and San Juan Capistrano, Calif. White forfeited a Nissan Stanza wagon and more than $6,000 in cash as part of his agreement.

“Reverse Sting” Effective

“Bait” artifacts for “reverses” were becoming hard to find. We couldn’t re-use those being held as evidence in unadjudicated cases, and many collections from federal lands weren’t appropriate or available for our use. The “reverse” remained our best undercover vehicle to meet all the elements of ARPA because we control the “information flow” on the artifact being trafficked. But we had few artifacts to offer.

The NPS (SWRO and RMRO) signed a formal agreement with BLM New Mexico in August 1991, and I was selected for the deputy task force coordinator slot. The task force now consisted of four special agents and a clerk from BLM New Mexico, an agent (me) and archeologist (Judy Reed) from NPS SWRO, a ranger/part-time investigator from NPS RMRO (Pat Buccello) on detail, and part-time participation from an agent from the FBI (Albuquerque). Occasionally, the Internal Revenue Service and New Mexico attorney general agents participated.

In early 1992 the RMRO assigned Pat Buccello as its special agent for task force investigations. The FBI signed an interagency agreement as a participant, the BLM New Mexico SAC gave up his seat on the oversight committee and J.T. Reynolds (RMRO) was selected to chair the ARPA task force oversight committee.

In February I spent four weeks in Mexico, funded by an Albright grant, working with the Instituto Nacional Antropologia e Historia (INAH). On cultural resource protection efforts, the agency is somewhat a blend of NPS and the Smithsonian Institution.

In March Sen. Bingaman’s office asked for the task force’s budgetary needs for fiscal year 1993. We requested $1.88 million, wanting to broaden interagency and geographic aspects of our operations.

By April the task force had opened 73 investigations. We needed additional funding to continue. The growth and activity of the task force had been rapid, and signs of strain were starting to show.

BLM reassigned one of its investigators to “other” investigations. Due to the lack of operational support funds, efforts were under way for a grand jury and the associated felony indictments from “Operation Export.”

In May we investigated College of Santa Fe student Carl Hulan, who while on a college-sponsored outdoor recreation program trip, looted an archeological site on BLM land at Grand Gulch, Utah. Hulan had removed part of a cranium from a prehistoric burial and transported it back to Santa Fe. Working with BLM investigators in Utah, it was found that other participants of the college’s outdoor recreation program had been cited at Chaco Culture and warned by a Bandelier ranger the previous year.

Hulan pleaded guilty to a felony ARPA violation (he graduated from college, but can’t vote), the outdoor recreation program leader pleaded to a misdemeanor ARPA, and the college sponsored a workshop to develop cultural resource protection strategies for college groups.

In June BLM New Mexico decided to terminate its interagency agreements. Officials cited internal BLM politics (interstate BLM bickering over ARPA funding and case management). The following week task force employees found out the decision was reversed, but BLM reassigned an investigator (and the task force coordinator) to other duties and investigations. I became the “acting” task force leader.

Resource Protection Unit Formed

In July the NPS SWRO detailed special agent Al DeLaCruz for six months from...
the newly formed Resource Protection Unit (RPU) to help with the task force’s case load. BLM New Mexico was continuing to reorganize and reprioritize its law enforcement efforts.

At an August ARPA task force oversight committee meeting in Denver, representatives from all four of BLM’s Four Corners states participated. They agreed on the continuing interagency investigations.

Task force investigators began several investigations into the theft and sale of Native American ceremonial objects. “Operation Export” went to the grand jury and eight felony indictments were received.

A September oversight committee meeting in Albuquerque brought Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) representatives to the table. BLM announced at this meeting it would reorganize its ARPA efforts in fiscal year 1993.

Focus on Ceremonial Objects

Task force investigations focused on the theft and sale of ceremonial objects. Working with BIA and tribal authorities at Acoma, Hopi, Laguna and Zuni Pueblos, suspects were identified and objects recovered for repatriation under the Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

The typical “pipeline” of a ceremonial object went something like this:

- The object (i.e., mask, prayer sticks, etc.) was made by a tribal artisan.
- The object was blessed and used ceremonially.
- The object then was given to a custodian charged with protecting it.
- The object was stolen from the custodian’s home by someone without “right of possession,” usually a relative with a chemical dependency to support.
- The thief would sell the object to a dealer in Indian arts (often furtively).
- The Indian arts dealer would sell the object to a collector as an example of “Indian art.”

In early November the acting special agent for BLM New Mexico notified the NPS that due to BLM’s national ARPA reorganization, BLM New Mexico was withdrawing its ARPA task force contributions and canceling all ARPA agreements effective Dec. 15, 1992.

BLM reprogrammed its ARPA funds, splitting them between BLM offices in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Colorado and Oregon. This sharply reduced the funding available to BLM New Mexico.

Due to the support of NPS Regional Director John Cook, the Southwest Region had established the resource protection unit under the associate regional director of resources management. Its mandate was to continue with cultural resource investigations, as well as other resource violations, 100 percent of the time with no administrative investigation and little drug interdiction responsibilities. However, the authority, jurisdiction and funding for the NPS was/is limited.

RPU was established to help the NPS fulfill its mandate in the protection of the important resources entrusted to us for preservation. A toll-free “800” number was established for the reporting of resource violations: 1-800-2ARPA86 (business cards, rolodex cards, and crack-and-peel stickers with this “800” number are available upon request).

RPU’s ARPA program was to include overt and covert investigations, interagency efforts, intelligence systems development, a rewards system, outreach and education, consultation, training, archaeological damage assessments, SOP development and relations with Native American nations.

Our intelligence data base includes about 1,000 suspects.

The NPS and other agencies continue to believe in the value of interagency investigative efforts because it is the most effective. We need to coordinate our “individual” authorities, efforts and resources.

Interagency Cooperation Continues

We continue to work closely with BLM, Forest Service, FBI, Fish and Wildlife, and New Mexico attorney general’s office. From the experiences gained in the past three years we’ve gone into the franchise business, with interagency ARPA task force-type efforts under way elsewhere.

We have been involved with 150-plus cultural resource investigations over the past three years. Through these efforts more than 5,600 artifacts (worth $360,000) and 6,000 fossils (valued at $45,000) from public lands have been recovered.

So far 2,970 artifacts, worth an estimated $203,100, have been forfeited to the federal government. Some 24 Native American ceremonial objects, with an estimated commercial value of $175,000, have also been taken for repatriation to their proper cultural custodians upon case completion.

Approximately 50 Meso-American artifacts, valued at $27,000, have been forfeited and will be repatriated to their country of origin.

The number of cases that have been
completely adjudicated to date include five felony convictions, 13 misdemeanor convictions, and nine pre-trial diversions (with restitution required).

Additional cases submitted to the U. S. attorney’s/state attorney general’s offices total 27 criminal cases and six civil cases. Investigations to date have resulted in the seizure of four motor vehicles (two forfeited) and one motorhome. Nearly $8,200 in cash has been forfeited as “equipment” under ARPA’s forfeiture clauses. Several cases are near completion and will soon be submitted.

**Task Force Featured**

The August/September 1993 issue of *Archaeology* magazine featured an article, “Project Sting,” about the task force and the resource protection unit. The writer did a lot of research about our activities, even getting copies of undercover transcripts from Freedom of Information requests through the U. S. Attorney’s Office. After reading the article we “held our breath,” because it was far more in-depth about the covert aspects of our investigations than we wanted.

We knew the education and deterrent value was a positive aspect of the article, but we were concerned about the negative impact it might have on future operations.

To date not one looter, trafficker or collector has mentioned the article to our undercover operatives, even though “Indian Artifact Magazine” has encouraged its readers to read the article and to “be careful, Big Brother is out to get you.” There are many suspects — so many that the ARPA task force, the resource protection unit and present efforts can’t keep pace with them all. We have noticed a decline in the number of dealers carrying prehistoric artifacts.

Several looters last summer explained their lessened activity level due to concerns about hantavirus. We promoted those concerns. We’ll keep furthering our efforts to “educate” the looters, traffickers and collectors until compliance is gained.

RPU continues to work actively in an undercover capacity, seizing a motorhome from a dealer from Colorado, Peter Leon, involved with an illegal transaction, in the parking lot of the Antique Tribal Art Dealers Association (ATADA) show in Santa Fe last June. Leon, an ATADA member, wrote a strong letter of apology and pleaded guilty to a misdemeanor under ARPA.

The educational value of this operation at the ATADA show went far beyond what we normally realize, for within an hour the message of deterrence was heard throughout the show.

**Assistant U.S. Attorney**

We have worked actively with the assistant U. S. attorney’s office in an attempt to get a good test case for NAGPRA. The intent of NAGPRA’s trafficking statute (18 USC 1170) was to protect burials, burial offerings and sacred, or patrimonial, objects regardless of who owns the land they came from. In reality it falls far short of even the protection afforded by ARPA, in that legal interpretations have independently and consistently informed us that due to the adopted legislative history the above protected objects must have been taken from federal lands since November 1990, and then it is only a misdemeanor. So, in essence it only affords additional protection to ARPA for objects less than 100 years old.

A key player in all investigations is the assistant U.S. attorney assigned the case. Most are unfamiliar with cultural resource protection laws, or the need for them. Many cases are hard to prove and time consuming.

Some assistant attorneys really don’t “have the time” or interest to pursue these difficult prosecutions. Some don’t even see a need for ARPA. It’s our job to educate everyone, including the assistant U.S. attorneys, about the value of protecting these non-renewable archeological resources. We need to continue those efforts.

Spend some time with your assistant U.S. attorneys, send holiday greetings, take them on a field trip to an archeological resource or looted site and explain that in order to steal a $100 artifact, $15,000 of archeological damage will occur and scientific information will be lost forever.
We were lucky in the Tapia Canyon case because the assigned assistant U.S. attorney was new and aggressive. He decided to prosecute because of our enthusiasm for the case.

In addition to the investigation of offenses against cultural resources, RPU is actively involved with park protection programs throughout Southwest Region.

The enforcement of natural resource laws (Lacy Act, Migratory Waterfowl Act, Bald Eagle Act, etc.) and the protection of "threatened and endangered species" (plant and animal) is also a primary emphasis for the RPU.

Personnel are also available to assist with specialized training needs (i.e., ARPA, defensive tactics, firearms, surveillance, electronic monitoring, etc.).

One of the 1994 goals for the Southwest Region reads: "We will continue to investigate and prosecute those people responsible for looting our nation's archeological heritage."

I know that most of us are working toward similar goals Servicewide. Throughout task force and RPU operations, we have received outstanding assistance and support from nearby NPS areas. The BLM task force coordinator often commented on the quality and responsiveness provided by NPS rangers.

That made me proud. I know we'll continue with that tradition.

Phil Young works in the resource protection unit of the Southwest Region in Santa Fe, N.M.

*items not from southwestern U.S.
Cultural Landscape Management and Interpretation: A Dilemma

By John Andrews and D. Scott Hartwig

A visitor stands at an overlook at a Civil War battlefield and looks out at the panorama before him. The trees and woods look similar to the Matthew Brady photos taken after the battle, but the houses and wood lots don’t look right.

"Is this the way it was on the day of the battle?" he asks. The ranger beside him hesitates. "Not exactly. Those structures and the grounds around them date from the 1890s."

The visitor looks quizzical: "Then why are they there?" "Well," says the ranger, "They’re all a part of our history."

Interpretive rangers at historic parks are familiar with this paradox: As an agency, we are charged with protecting all historic sites, but what happens to a visitor’s experience when a historic truth from one era is superimposed anachronistically on the primary story that the park was created to recount?

Interpretive Premises

The fundamental premises of interpretation are twofold: historical parks are places where visitors can conceptualize parts of their past, and people visit parks to develop a better understanding of the stories parks tell.

These statements seem reasonable, straightforward, honest and logical. They intimate an understanding of visitors and parks, and the interrelationship between the two.

Ask any NPS professional what story a park is "set aside to tell." He or she will probably suggest you review the park’s enabling legislation and perhaps the statement for management and the general management plan.

It gets a little trickier when NPS professionals discuss parks as places of conceptualization. Virtually all NPS policies and practices have an important impact on the visitors’ experience and how visitors understand what the park is trying to say to them. Many assume that the interpretive function, in the person of a ranger, will satisfy most of the visitor’s needs for conceptualization.

However, a personal interpretive experience is only a segment of a total park experience. Conceptualization is affected by the impressions recorded by every human sense when a person visits a park.

The staff at Gettysburg National Military Park currently is contemplating the effects of past, present, and future management activities on the battlefield. As park professionals, we want to maintain NPS integrity for prudent management of the invaluable resources with which we have been entrusted.

The Gettysburg staff is wrestling with many significant issues stemming from previous NPS policies and practices in the fields of natural and cultural resources management, interpretation, maintenance and overall park management.

Essentially, the park must reconcile, anticipate, and understand aspects of managing the battlefield under the new draft policy NPS-28, Cultural Resources Management guidelines, and how these new guidelines will affect the park and its visitors.

Emphasis Could Change

Implementing these policies will dictate significant adjustments in the historically accepted ideas of what the park was "set aside to tell." These adjustments will significantly affect how visitors conceptualize (understand) the park and its story, and perhaps even change the emphasis of the park’s story.

"Is this what the field looked like during the battle?"

"How much has the battlefield changed?"

These questions, and others in similar vein, are frequently asked of park interpreters on the Gettysburg battlefield. It is a natural curiosity to know whether the landscape you are viewing resembles that which the participants encountered.

The battlefield landscape is perhaps the most important tool available to the interpreter to assist the visitor in making the mental leap necessary to understand and visualize the struggle that unfolded upon the now-tranquil fields.

Landscape Important

The landscape’s appearance then, and how closely it does or does not resemble the historical landscape, is extremely important in telling the story.

But no battlefield landscape is frozen in time. Life goes on. Times change. Attitudes change. The land changes. The battle itself may permanently alter the historical landscape.

This article examines questions about interpretation, cultural resources and the battlefield landscape at Gettysburg in relation to the proposed implementation of the new draft NPS-28 Cultural Resources Management guidelines.
In 1863, the Gettysburg area was a typical agricultural landscape of south-central Pennsylvania. Then the armies came.

From July 1 to July 3, 1863, nearly 160,000 soldiers waged a violent struggle that swept over the farms and homes of Gettysburg's citizens. By July 6, except for the thousands of wounded that remained in field hospitals, the armies departed and the farmers and townspeople returned to a devastated landscape.

They began restoring and rebuilding their shattered homes and farms, and in so doing, brought change to the landscape encountered by the armies only days earlier.

More changes quickly followed. Soon after the battle, a national cemetery for the Union dead was established. It was the first memorial on the battlefield and it forever altered the appearance of Cemetery Hill, a significant battlefield terrain feature.

Management Practices Created

In April 1864, the Gettysburg Battlefield Memorial Association (GBMA) was chartered. Its goal was to hold and preserve the battlegrounds of Gettysburg and its natural and artificial defenses “as they were at the time of said battle.”

Yet, during the 31-year tenure of the Memorial Association’s administration of the battlefield, much change occurred to the 1863 battlefield landscape. Avenues were constructed to allow visitors access to famous battlefield features, and hundreds of monuments were placed upon the field by battle veterans to mark battlefield positions.

In 1895, Gettysburg National Military Park was created by an act of Congress and the GBMA turned its 522 battlefield acres over to the U.S. War Department. The War Department set up a commission of three men (all veterans of the battle) to acquire land, lay out and construct avenues, accurately mark the lines of battle occupied by both armies, and preserve the monuments already existing “or which may be hereafter erected.”

By 1913, the 50th anniversary of the battle, the War Department Commission had compiled a list of remarkable achievements:

- More than 20 miles of avenues were constructed.
- Cast bronze and iron narrative tablets were erected to describe the operations of every battery, brigade, division, and corps that participated in the battle.
- More than 300 condemned cannons had been acquired to mark artillery positions.
- In excess of 17,000 trees were planted in denuded parts of the battlefield.
- More than five miles of stone walls were restored or rebuilt.
- More than 800 additional battlefield acres were acquired, and the list went on.

When the War Department turned the administration of Gettysburg NMP over to the National Park Service in 1933, the landscape no longer resembled that which the soldiers of both armies had encountered on July 1, 1863. It was now a memorial, sculpted by the work of the battle’s veterans, who were its principal administrators for the critical developmental years of the park.

Yet, these veterans had been careful to minimize disturbance to the fabric of the 1863 battlefield.

“Much work has been and is being done to restore and preserve the features of the battlefield as they existed at the time of the battle,” wrote U.S. War Department Commission Chairman John P. Nicholson in the commission’s 1900 report to the Secretary of War.

The Park Service administration brought even more change to the battlefield. Historic farm buildings deemed unsightly were removed, and a large, obtrusive visitor center was constructed on Cemetery Ridge.

In 1982, the NPS grappled with the problems of managing and interpreting this landscape with a new general management plan that called for restoring the natural landscape of the battlefield back to its 1863 appearance, and to “take all possible action to selectively restore a section of the park to its 1860s’ character, focusing on farms as the basic unit.”

However, by 1989 the Gettysburg NMP Statement for Management stated that it was impossible to restore the landscape or structures back to 1863 without resorting to large-scale reconstruction, which was not possible under present cultural resource policy.

Concept of “Memorial Landscape”

Instead, the park embraced the concept of a “Memorial Landscape,” where the landscape would be restored “to its general appearance as it was seen through the eyes of visitors in the last decade of the 19th century, those who worked to create the park, those who worked to memorialize it, and the veterans who returned to remember their service.”

What does all of this mean to the park interpreter and visitors who attempt to understand the story that the park is set aside to tell?

A look at the park’s enabling legislation from 1895 reveals one park purpose to be: “... to hold, and preserve, the battlegrounds of Gettysburg, on which were fought the actions of the first, second, and third days of July, anno Domini, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, with the natural and artificial defenses, as they were at the time of said battle, and by such perpetuation, and such memorial structures as a generous and patriotic people may aid to erect, to commemorate the heroic deeds, the struggles, and the triumphs of their brave defenders.”

Based on the previously described changes to the battlefield landscape, is it legitimate to provide an 1863 battlefield scene?

Part of the reason behind adopting the concept of a “Memorial Landscape” was to provide the visitors with an accurate, honest statement of the landscape.

Written Material Available

A profusion of primary written source material exists from the period of the battle and era of the Civil War veteran. Also, evidence gathered by the GBMA and the War Department about the battle and the field’s 1863 appearance is plentiful.

Although photographic documentation of the battlefield in 1863 is available, it isn’t complete. In contrast, strong photographic documentation is available to establish what nearly every piece of the Gettysburg battlefield looked like in the late 19th century.

Also underlying the memorial landscape concept are recent interpretations of NPS cultural resource policy, which emphasize preserving and interpreting the culturally significant layers of history within a park. These interpretations suggest that monuments, avenues, tablets and other items placed upon the battlefield are historic in their own right, and tell us something of the veterans who established and transformed the park.
Few would dispute the intrinsic historic value of these post-battle features. They are also an interpretive medium valued by interpreter and visitor alike as a tangible connection across the decades to the generation of men who fought at Gettysburg.

But should the monumentation as a landscape element and as a cultural period of the park be the primary focus of restoring the battlefield scene?

Can the visitor conceptualize/understand an 1863 battlefield landscape restored to its 1890s' appearance? Is the NPS, in its quest to present an honest statement of the Gettysburg landscape, complying with policy and, by doing so, confusing the visitor?

Here is only one example of the difficulty in meshing policy requirements with enabling legislation and the historic management of park resources.

Nicholson's Report

In his 1903 report to the Secretary of War, Chairman John P. Nicholson wrote:

"By far the larger portion of the battlefield retains its forests and cleared lands very much as they were in 1863, but a few important sections of the field have, since that date, been denuded of their forests."

To be honest and accurate to the 1890s' battlefield, the NPS should remove forests that did not exist in the 1890s, but did in the 1860s. What is the point? Who are we doing this for? What is important?

In our quest to be accurate (and honest) to the highest level of precise detail, as prescribed by recent cultural resource guidelines, are we required to present a landscape or learning environment for the visitors' conceptualization of a park story that post-dates the defining event responsible for the park's establishment?

These are the salient questions the NPS must ask itself in its struggle to determine how to manage and interpret not only Gettysburg, but other parks with similar situations.

As park professionals, are we so focused on honesty as it relates to detail that we lose sight of the broad picture? Generally, it is the observation of those who work on the Gettysburg battlefield that the visitor seeks to understand why this great clash occurred, the basic outline of how the battle developed and was fought, its place in the war, and what meaning might be derived from it today.

What they seem to expect of the landscape is that it be managed to provide them with a reasonable depiction of the landscape encountered by the players on the historic stage. The key word is reasonable.

The visitor who stands at "the angle" and gazes across the field of Pickett's Charge, wants to know if the field and woods patterns resemble 1863, if the location of buildings corresponds with their location in 1863, if the stone and rail fencing stands where it did in 1863. Interest beyond this level of specificity seems to matter mostly to NPS professionals and scholarly students of the battle.

Should we provide the most reasonably accurate scene of the 1863 battle based on all currently available evidence? Or, should we provide a battlefield scene which is accurate to the level of documentation required according to the new draft cultural resource policy guidelines, which may require presentation of the battlefield as it appeared when it was developed as a memorial park?

In striving to make our sites relevant to today's population, is it appropriate to treat the battle as merely a single patch in a quilt of history that covers the park?

At issue for the NPS manager, ranger, and visitor is what level of accuracy and detail is necessary to provide an honest environment to promote conceptualization of the park's story. Where does the visitor fit in this equation?

Is it up to the interpretive ranger, exclusive of the landscape, to provide the visitor with an understanding of the 1863 battleground? Or, is it necessary for the interpreter to focus attention on the total history of the park before and after its primary defining event?

Guidelines Objective?

More fundamentally, are NPS policy guidelines for cultural resources objective enough in their design to protect the cultural resources of the park, yet to allow implementation in an honest manner to the visitor who comes to understand the particular event or time for which a park is established?

Daniel Brown, in a paper that appeared in the George Wright Forum in 1992, wrote that "recent trends in historic preservation seem to regard buildings and landscapes as of greater importance than the event itself."

At Gettysburg, we are experiencing the increasing complexity of what we thought were fairly "cut-and-dried" issues concerning how to best manage our resources to conserve the scenery, and natural and historic objects, and to provide for the enjoyment of same while leaving them unimpaired for future generations.

A visitor interested in coming to Gettysburg, if asked what the park's focus is, might answer, "The battle, of course!" However, based on the implications of more recent NPS-28 policy guidelines for the care of cultural resources, is it still the battle?

All NPS professionals want what is right for the resource and the visitor, but in this instance, what is right?
Have you ever approached coworkers about an idea and they responded with one of these reasons? Of course you have.

What did you do? Attempt to persuade them, argue, go to their supervisor, look for another more helpful person, or did you give up on your idea?

I am convinced that a huge amount of productivity is lost, especially in the federal government, to people unwilling to take initiative. Unfortunately, in some work situations, there are forces that discourage or even punish workers who occasionally would like to try something different.

Let's take the Top Ten Reasons one at a time:

1. We have never done it that way. People usually will not express it this way. I have known people who automatically said no to almost every suggestion, no matter how trivial. Saying yes meant they had to make a decision. If their policy was to say no to everything, that meant they didn't have to make decisions. They took the lazy and safe way out.

2. NPS-99 says we can't. If you look hard enough, you can find 134 reasons in NPS manuals to not do everything. Those who are scared to make decisions can sometimes find solace in rules that someone else wrote.

Now, don’t get me wrong! I am not advocating the overthrow of the government by violating the rules! Besides, we all know that if we violate the rules it goes into our permanent record; the one they started on us in preschool.

We need to — no, we have to — follow the regulations, but we should not go to them in search of reasons not to get something done. If you look hard enough, you can find just as many regulations why you can get something done.

3. I might get in trouble, and 4. My supervisor won't let me make a decision like that. Maybe this person has a supervisor who is not secure enough to delegate authority. If you allow your people to use their abilities, you may be astounded by what they can do. A person shouldn't be crucified for making an occasional honest mistake. At times it may be appropriate to follow the old axiom: “It is easier to beg forgiveness than to ask permission.”

5. I don’t have time. Usually this is an excuse. However, if you are one of those people (like me) who want instant gratification, you may have to settle for a later completion date. But if someone constantly “doesn’t have time,” something needs to be fixed — the workload, the position description, the person's work habits, their skills or their attitude. If it is all of the above, they are in deep E. Coli.

6. We tried it 87 years ago and it didn’t work. Will this be a slightly different approach? Have conditions changed that will result in it working now? When it was tried earlier, was it done correctly? Who evaluated the results? Maybe it actually did work when it was tried earlier but someone was too resistant to change to accept the new idea.

7. We don’t have the money. Recently someone with a “can’t-do” attitude tried to torpedo an idea by producing a cost estimate 10 times more than the actual cost. Remember, sometimes you have to spend money to save money. Investing in a new idea may increase productivity.

8. The public won’t like it. The public's perception of what we do shouldn’t be downplayed, but neither should it be used as an excuse. We should do the right thing even if it is a tough choice. Will the public oppose it because they don’t understand the issue? Is a press release or public meeting appropriate? Davy Crockett said to be sure you are right, then go ahead. Taking the easy way out is not always the best stewardship of our public lands. Just be prepared with your ducks lined up.

9. I don’t know how. So find out! Don’t be afraid to ask questions. If you don’t, you won’t learn nearly as much as the person who does. Search for the person who knows. Make telephone calls; network. Keep records of people who can be used as resources. Use the trial-and-error method if it is appropriate. Don’t be afraid to make mistakes. The person who sits at a desk all day and reads magazines won’t make mistakes, but he won’t get much done either.

10. You will need to fill out a form first. Just think what would happen if everybody in the National Park Service identified only one form that could be eliminated.

When Rick Gale’s All-Risk Incident Management Team was given the delegation of authority to take over the recovery after Hurricane Andrew hit the three south Florida parks, Gale told the superintendents something like this:

“The people on this team have a can-do attitude. That’s one of the reasons they were chosen. If you present them with a problem, they will find a way to solve it. If they don’t, let me know.”

That philosophy is the only one that works in a situation like a hurricane. But do we have to wait for an emergency to adopt a “can-do” attitude? We can do it every day, every hour.

Who would you rather work with — someone who says “We can’t do that,” or the person who says, “That is an unusual challenge. Let's figure out how to do it!”

Many obstacles are holograms — you can walk right through them. Ask yourself these questions:

➤ Am I proactive or reactive?
➤ Am I a stepping stone or a stumbling block?
➤ Am I part of the solution or part of the problem? ☑

Bill Gabbert is the fire management officer at Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.
Leadership and Management Skills

By Bruce Edmonston
Craters of the Moon

"...to strengthen the professional leadership of the National Park Service; to equip its career leaders with the management and leadership skills needed to foster renewal of the Service..."

- Organization Renewal Work Group
The Vail Agenda

How many of you wondered if anything would ever come out of another study, another initiative, another needs assessment?

The Vail agenda identified a critical need for the training of entry-level managers. When I found myself sitting at Albright Training Center at the first "Leadership and Management Skills in the National Park Service" course, I marveled that this time it really worked.

Naturally, it wasn't easy putting together a new program and a new direction. First, the facility managers trainee course had to be adapted; Rick Shireman in WASO coordinated that effort.

Now the Leadership and Management course would build on the success of the facility managers course and train all disciplines. Some 36 participants representing all regions began the training in January 1993.

This was my first training that included administration, maintenance and rangers. The mix of people, skills and background was phenomenal and the energy was tremendous.

I think most of the participants felt as I did — this was the finest, most stimulating and most challenging training course I had ever attended.

So where do these new managers come from? And what training does it take to be a leader? I've always felt fortunate that a lengthy seasonal career allowed me to work in maintenance, interpretation, law enforcement and backcountry positions.

It gave me an idea of the complexities and styles of different responsibilities, but it didn't prepare me to manage them.

What does the person who has spent 10 to 15 years learning administrative skills while moving up the ladder do when the KSA asks for "ability to manage natural and cultural resources"?

Like many rangers in the visitor/resource protection field, I can claim a thousand hours of law enforcement training and another 500 hours in emergency medicine. The training and experience supervising those areas gives me a background sufficient to learn to manage them.

But this is the dilemma we all face: we learn the management of our specialized skill areas without the ability to be managers.

Like the salesperson who can sell anything, a manager can deal with all disciplines without detailed knowledge in many areas. A manager has skills in negotiation, communication, risk assessment and leadership. These are useful skills for any supervisor, but essential for a manager.

Dorothy Nelms of Nelms & Associates, Washington, D.C., told course participants the life of the manager is a "delightful ambiguity." To be a manager, that vagueness must be the prize that challenges us.

She also said we need to understand ourselves and our own values before we can deal with the challenges and changes in our organization or our society. As things get tougher and more conservative, taking risks gets more important. Finally, she asked, "What is the best possible thing that could happen?" when assessing risk in management decisions.

As a group we were taught to empower our employees, to give the responsibility and the authority to people to make decisions in their areas. This delegation is one of the elements of effective leadership. We adopted that into the mission statement we developed as a class:

"Strengthen the pride and vision of the National Park Service by empowering people through creative leadership and an interdisciplinary team approach."

Interdisciplinary evolved into another key word during the five weeks at Albright. Scenarios were presented, teams formed to find solutions, and all participants found that the mixtures of skills and backgrounds made for the most thoroughly thought-out solutions.

No longer can a manager sit making decisions alone; the complexities of what we face in the parks in the '90s requires an interdisciplinary approach.

Associate director Jack Davis connected it all together by stating that "...our mission won't change. It's withstood many years of challenge, and it's valid into the next century too. But if we don't keep up with change in our society it may compromise our mission. Question what we do. Look for better and different ways to do things."

And then the detail... four weeks of follow-up, a chance to work with managers at another park in a discipline different than the one you feel comfortable in. The detail was an opportunity to expand horizons, to learn or practice new skills, and to promote and inform others about the leadership program.

The course has my wholehearted endorsement. As a class, we created individual and group goals and left a number of recommendations. One was to expand the next course to make it truly interdisciplinary by including cultural and natural resources. That has been done.

Finally, the return home. So am I a manager? Not yet, but the knowledge, the training and the opportunity are all there to provide the background necessary to develop into a manager.

The Vail agenda rates as a success to this ranger.
Don't Bury Resource Management

By Gary Vequist, Brad Cella, Susan Mills and Ross Kavanagh
Alaska Regional Office

A recent article in Ranger entitled "Rangers in Resources — Absolutely" (Summer 1993) advocated returning to the past by placing resource management under the park's chief ranger.

In Olympic National Park's organization, the Branch of Natural Resource Management is one of seven branches, three layers below the park superintendent. This organization impedes science-based park management, while most other parks have embraced change and created separate park divisions for resource management.

In the 1970s several parks, including Sequoia/Kings Canyon, Yosemite and Everglades, organized independent resource management programs. Management review reports over the past decade, from the "State of the Parks" report (1980) to the Vail agenda, stated an urgent need for more and better trained NPS natural resource managers and better program focus.

The Natural Resource Management Trainee Program began in 1983 in response to the identified need to increase the number of professional natural resource managers and to enhance the effectiveness of the National Park Service resource management program.

Professional Parity — Perhaps the real issue is fear of disintegration of the traditional ranger position of power or influence. Yet, protection/emergency services have become so complex, it has become an arduous task for rangers just to sustain full performance level skills and maintain quality standards. Rather than pursue the futile attempt to require rangers to do everything, it is time to embrace the concept of professional parity between rangers and resource managers.

Certainly more individuals are needed who possess the knowledge and who are provided the time to contribute significantly to resource management activities. However, it is imperative that the core of individuals are dedicated full time to resource management functions to provide program direction, development, operation and evaluation. Just as technical requirements for ranger proficiency have increased, the need for educated, technically proficient and experienced resource managers to accomplish scientifically valid resource management has also increased.

Scientific Credibility — High-quality data are important for many management decisions and are critical to support controversial ones. Since the park ranger series has no science educational requirements, it lacks basic scientific credibility. Scientific credibility is necessary to effectively represent the National Park Service in complex resource management conflicts, especially when dealing with resource managers and scientists from other agencies, institutions and private industry. Yet, some managers do not consult with natural resource professionals before taking management actions. The Vail agenda stated, "Managers have little training and experience to learn the uses and needs of research outputs."

Partners in Park Management — It seems unconscionable to separate professional resource management disciplines from decision making, as park natural resources are degraded further from any semblance of ecological soundness. The integration of natural resource information into park management decisions often depends on the manner it is communicated to park managers, and the level at which such input occurs. Managerial acceptance of the value of research results can promote manager-scientist cooperation, not distrust. Science information is often too technical for managers to interpret alone and management implications may be unclear. So, natural resource professionals, as science advisers, provide the necessary knowledge for science-based park management.

Communication of Ecological Implications — The days of the chief ranger and superintendent meeting independently to make decisions are long since past. Complex social, political, environmental and ecological considerations warrant interdisciplinary consultation. The natural resource management component deserves divisional status and presence at division chief meetings to communicate specific ecological implications of management actions. It is time to accept and recognize the ascendence of natural resource professionals as science and resource management advisers to the superintendent. The depth of subject matter knowledge and expertise that professionally trained specialists bring is essential to accomplish the NPS's resource stewardship mission.

Summary — Resource management requires full-time attention; we cannot allow it to return to a collateral responsibility. We are woefully behind in our understanding of the resources that exist within many of our park units. In many instances we lack the basic knowledge of what resources occur within parks. In other instances existing resource data is lacking or insufficient to accurately determine if resource degradation is occurring. The need for this information increases as the number and extent of threats increase both internal and external to park units.

Everyone who works in a national park unit either directly or indirectly contributes to resource management. Rangers who are better educated in science will be able to contribute more; but program development, guidance and evaluation must be provided by individuals dedicated full time to those tasks and who are educated and experienced in science and resource management. Resource management is a science. ☐

— Gary Vequist, Brad Cella and Susan Mills are resource management specialists in the Alaska Regional Office. Ross Kavanagh is a fishery biologist in the same office.

---

Natural and cultural resource management specialists work together with a historic base map.
International Ranger

Rangers at Work in Panama
By Dale Thompson
Canyon de Chelly

In the aftermath of the Noriega regime and Operation Just Cause, USAID (Agency for International Development) called on the National Park Service for technical assistance in Panama. One of the facets of the AID mission is to provide training for Panama's park rangers through a special agreement.

The park system of Panama, which started 20 years ago, has grown to 14 parks and protected areas. Due to the political and economic climate of the country during the last decade, little opportunity has been afforded these areas in the direction of development and protection.

The park types include wetlands, desert, jungle, coastal island, volcanic and international. The biological diversity is extreme due to the isthmus joining two continents. It exhibits the best, and in some cases, the last remaining habitat for many species. Most of the parks are just areas roughly drawn on a map.

Lisa Myers (International Affairs) put together an orientation/protection training program course with Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales Renovables (INRENARE). It was held in the Panajungle (jungle of Panama) about a year ago.

Clyde Stonaker of Bryce Canyon was an instructor and I was a training consultant and evaluator. The successful, eight-day course proved to be a life experience for the three "gringos" involved.

These profiles on two Panamanian Park Service employees provide an interesting glimpse into their lives:

Name: Benjamín Montezuma
Profession: Guardaparque (23 years)
Employer: INRENARE, PILA (Parque International La Amistad)
Salary: $320 a month, plus food while on patrol (includes health benefits).
Job Schedule: 20 days on and 10 days off (no call when off); works eight hours daily and on call the remaining 16 hours of each day.


Personal: Age 51, married, 10 children (ages 1 to 20)

Montezuma's work primarily is in the jungle with an elevation of up to 1,800 meters. Temperatures range from 8-13 C and nearly half of his work time is in the rain.

Notable quotes:
"I like my job very much and will do it until I am unable and then will have a government retirement."

"Sometimes people who think they know the jungle, covered by clouds, try to shortcut between trails and from there is where they get lost. I had to rescue these people and was able to find them weak and without food. They were thankful for having been rescued. I have found nine people by myself."

Montezuma gave this account of an experience as a young ranger:
"When I was just starting as a park ranger and only 28 years old, I had to set up camp quickly in the cold and rain. I was new to this area and I became lost for four days. I got to the point where I was crying like a baby and was without food. I saw a puma, but it ran away. Finally I found my way out of the jungle, but I had to survive on fruits that I don’t even know the names of."

Montezuma has guided Puerto Ricans, Ecuadorians and U.S. citizens through the jungles of Panama. "They have always expressed their appreciation of my knowledge of the forest. I have even been featured in the February 1992 Audubon magazine."

Name: Marisol Dimas
Profession: National director of protected areas and wildlife
Employer: INRENARE (two years, plus one year as a volunteer)
Salary: $560 a month
Job Duties: Coordinates all environmental education courses for protected areas, coordinates training for natural resources projects to all employees (about 150), member of the commission on evaluation of environmental impacts on the development projects.

Personal: Age 31, married to a geologist

---

Omega World Travel

The Association has signed an agreement with Omega World Travel, headquartered in Falls Church, Va. Omega is one of the top travel companies in the United States and is the largest woman-owned travel agency in the world. All travel booked through Omega will directly benefit the Association in the form of travel credits for official Association missions on that portion of the trip.

Omega guarantees it will provide the lowest airfare at the time of ticketing or it will refund double the difference. Also, if a traveler is dissatisfied with any portion of a trip, Omega will refund 100 percent of its commissions on that portion of the trip.

Omega will provide ticket delivery via overnight mail, or it 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 worldwide, can be used for information or difficulties encountered during travel.

Reservations for travel may be made by calling this 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 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. M-F; 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Sat. (Eastern time)
Dimas has found some co-workers resentful because for many years they were promised changes, such as new equipment and personnel. They are seeing these promises fulfilled, but now they have more responsibility and no salary increases.

However, the parks have a better image with the public and there is less corruption. She also sees a good international image developing and she has signed agreements with France, Spain, the U.S., and Japan.

She presented this personal story of her work in Panama’s parks:

"While I was working as a volunteer in the Darien, we always had to walk everywhere. Some days we would hike for five hours to get to the next ranger station. I had never ridden on horseback, but I was tired this one time and decided to ride while the other rangers walked. We came upon a tree that had fallen across the trail. The others could walk under it, but sitting on the horse I wouldn’t have made it. So I decided I could just lean to the side and pass under it. When I leaned sideways the whole saddle shifted and I was hanging off to one side yelling, ‘Help! help!’ Before the rangers could get to me I decided I would have to fall off in case the horse took off running because then I definitely would get hurt. So I fell on my back and when the ranger got to me I told him he wasn’t a very good ranger. A good ranger would have been at my side right when I called help."

Dimas listed these female-to-male statistics for her agency: Regional and associate directors, three of 12; superintendents, four of 15; naturalists, three of 10; environmental education specialists, five of five, and park rangers, zero of 60.

Panamanian park rangers are motivated toward their work and are proud to have their jobs. Their current push is to get uniforms. For now they only have ball caps to identify themselves as park rangers.

They are faced with many challenges similar to NPS rangers, but one of their biggest problems is the lack of authority. They don’t have arrest powers and may only cite people through a complaint process.

One summer a poacher shot and killed a state police officer who was assisting a park ranger. The current policy is not to arm rangers.

Even with the problems of Panama’s parks, there are positive steps being taken to protect this Central American country’s resources.

Dale Thompson is the assistant superintendent at Canyon de Chelly.
The Professional Ranger

Interpretation

Interpretive (R)evolution — The interpretive (r)evolution continues to unfold, both at the national level and in parks around the country.

In a recent update, WASO Chief Corky Mayo reported that some of the work identified in the November “Interpretive Directions” meeting (see Ranger, Winter 1993-94) has been added to the WASO work plan. Mayo also reported that 54 Parks as Classrooms projects were funded this year for a total of $633,000.

The National Park Foundation awarded $273,000 to 21 projects during its last grant cycle. And by the time you read this, the new interpretive bulletin board, “In Touch,” should be up and running on cc:Mail.

Mayo also brought up a philosophical point worthy of consideration. I’ll quote his remarks directly:

“There was a very interesting discussion at the director’s meeting about the difference between interpretation and education. I postulated that there are three things we do:

a. Information and Orientation
b. Interpretation
c. Formal Education

“All three obviously have education components. I would begin to make clear in your own mind the differences. I think a good, balanced park program has some of each, but may have to make hard choices of what to do in tight times.”

Creative Thinking — Hard choices are entering every aspect of what we do, not just the least of which is seasonal training, but creative thinking can often soften the blow or even defer difficult choices.

At Delaware Water Gap, for example, many of the park’s 125 seasonal employees (of all disciplines) are placed in intermittent status for the winter. This enables the park to take advantage of non-traditional training opportunities during the off-season, such as Project Wild and Project Learning Tree, as well as courses such as CPR and first aid that are sometimes difficult to fit into the busy early season.

DEWA also has expanded its training capabilities by sharing with nearby parks. Seasonal interpreters travel as much as several hours one way to take advantage of training presented by the North Atlantic Region and other parks.

In addition, the park has made the difficult decision to close its visitor center for a total of five days in early summer to provide training for its seasonal interpreters. (Knowing that park staff is exploring creative answers to its training needs perhaps made this decision easier for management.)

While these ideas won’t solve every park’s training problems, they hopefully can serve as a springboard for new solutions. If interpretive evolution is to continue (and be revitalized), new employees must be trained in the skills of interpretation and philosophy of the NPS. And in these days of flat budgets, new ways of providing this must be developed.

— Barb Maynes Olympic

Emergency Services

Emergency Management — The Park Service has made great strides in the past year in all risk emergency management. We currently have Type II all risk management teams in NAR, MAR, MWR-RMR, SER and AR-WR and identified all risk resources in SWR.

These teams have been trained in emergency management and teamwork and are on call for special events, emergencies and any incident that exceeds the capability of a park to handle. They can be requested by a superintendent from the appropriate regional office with a quick response capability or they can be requested far in advance of special events to assist in the planning phase and then return for the actual event if needed.

We also have two national Type I all risk management teams that can be requested by a park or region to handle special events, emergencies or any incident that is complex enough to warrant this level of management.

Both the Type I and II teams are trained to work for the park superintendent to manage whatever that superintendent requests them to do. The only difference between the two types is the amount of experience and training of the members. Type I teams have a higher level of experience.

Efficient Use — Now that the teams have been established and trained there should be a smooth and efficient implementation of call out and use by the parks. A park superintendent will size up a special event or emergency and determine if her staff is able to manage the incident along with the rest of the park activities. If so, the park will manage the incident using its own staff and implementing the plan using the incident command system.

If the superintendent predicts the incident will exceed her resources, she can request a Type II team from her region or an adjacent region and have that team work for her to handle the incident and work with the rest of her staff to keep the park functioning. If the incident grows more complex, a Type I team can be called in to transition with the Type II team and work for the superintendent to handle the situation.

Since the parks and the teams all use the incident command system to handle incidents, the transitions should go smoothly and the training and experience gained by park staff and team members will prepare them to move up in the incident organization and provide new leadership at all levels.

The other real benefit to the NPS of this system is that it develops excellent management skills in employees. This directly applies to their everyday jobs in the NPS. For more information on these teams, contact any of the team members or your regional office.

Videos & Courses — Other items of interest include an “Avalanche Rescue” 30-minute video tape for all teams that deal with avalanches. It is available for $20 from the Colorado Avalanche Information Center, 10230 Smith Road, Denver, CO 80239.

There also are a number of emergency management, EMS and search and rescue courses offered this spring and summer, including the NASAR conference June 1-4 in San Diego. Contact NASAR at (703) 352-1349 for details.

— Bill Pierce Katmai
Resource Management

Leadership Crisis — When the idea of the National Biological Survey first originated last year, several top NPS players in the Washington natural resources office were detailed full-time to the group trying to organize the new agency. Most of those people transferred officially to the NBS in October, yet virtually none of those jobs has been re-filled with permanent Park Service staff.

Many other key WASO players also transferred at that time, including about half of the Wildlife and Vegetation Division. It sometimes seems that everybody you call in WASO is an “acting” these days, and those who are left are being stressed well past their limits. Without clear authority, very little policy is being made, and the acting leaders aren’t in a position to lead. With all the excitement and changes caused by the NBS, ecosystem management, Vail and the natural resources strategic plan, we desperately need to move ahead, but aren’t able to.

We hear that resource stewardship is one of the director’s key priorities. When are we going to see action to match the rhetoric?

The situation with the NBS is even worse: no director, no regional directors, no direction. New research in NPS areas is at a standstill, and field NBS people seem to be on their own regarding providing research services to their new “clients.” Many former NPS scientists now part of NBS fear the insidious formation of a new agency culture that looks a lot like the old Fish and Wildlife Service’s culture. Most expect a fee-for-service approach similar to what we have now with the Geological Survey: high-quality research may be available, but only at a high price.

Do I sound concerned? For good reason, I’d suggest.

Re-Inventing the Training Program — After extensive review, the decision has been made to eliminate the natural resources trainee program after six classes. While it has been a great success by some measures, many feel that this is an appropriate time to reinvigorate natural resources training by investing the training dollars differently.

Recruitment will begin soon for a person to lead a new “Natural Resources Training Academy” to be located at the Presidio in San Francisco. The goal is to have a ranger skills-type class for all new resource managers and then a curriculum of technical courses, at various levels, available for anyone who needs them in the agency, not just an elite class of trainees.

At the same time, the Service is making noises about developing a quality management and leadership curriculum, and the two programs together should be a great improvement over current development programs now available. Resource managers, like all NPS employees, need more than technical knowledge to be effective.

R-MAP is Coming — Sometime this spring, expect to see the R-MAP (Resource Management Assessment Program) questionnaires hit the parks. Refer to the workshop article in Ranger (Winter 1993-94) for details. Completing the exercise will likely be a lot of work for parks, and a lot of work for regional offices to compile and enter into the computer programs, but the resulting assessment of the Service’s true staffing needs in natural resources will be unprecedented and exciting. It may not be a good time to submit a big budget request, but the quality of the information will far exceed anything we’ve ever had before, and that should help us when the right opportunity comes.

Cultural Resources — I welcome news about cultural resource management subjects from those of you who know more about emerging issues and trends than I do. I’m open to more balance in this column, but I’ll need your help to make it happen.

— Bob Krumenaker

Protection

Resource Protection Fund — Things are alive and well with the Resource Protection Fund. Bob Martin, supervisory park ranger and president of the fund, says membership is growing at a magnificent rate.

Hopefully, if all goes well, the fund will assist parks sponsoring resource protection training not only with funding, but instructors and equipment as well.

Interest in the fund has been expressed by Outside Magazine, National Park Magazine and various large newspapers from around the country. The fund also was contacted to provide information from the television program, “Inside Edition,” about a bear-poaching segment in the works.

Other groups and publications have offered support, too. The fund has received its IRS tax-exempt status, 501 (C)(3), and its registration as a non-profit organization in Virginia.

The fund agreed to provide a free membership to any National Park Service employee. If interested contact Bob Martin toll-free at (800) 223-1173.

Archeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA) — The National Park Service has made great strides in the protection of the various archeological resources found throughout the U.S. There have been many superb cases made by the Service in 1993, and with the continued support of both Ranger Activities in WASO, park managers, and the hard work of dedicated field rangers, many more cases will be made in 1994.

Critical Incident Stress Debriefing (CISD) — CISD has come a long way in the National Park Service. Here at Delaware Water Gap, it has become a household word with any major incident. Rangers are faced with gruesome and serious incidents on a daily basis, including motor vehicle accidents, plane crashes, suicides, disorderly persons, intoxicated drivers, rapes, homicides and more.

The Service recognizes that the mental well-being of the ranger work force is as important as the physical aspect. It’s easy to see when someone has a physical problem; it’s a whole different story when someone is suffering from incident stress.

Statistics have proven that individuals who undergo CISD are healthier, more vibrant and can handle difficult incidents much better than those without debriefing. Training in peer counseling is on the rise, and although it may cost a few extra dollars to bring employees in on their day off for a diffusing, think of the morale of the ranger division, the well-being of the ranger, and the well-being of their families.

Update From the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) — According to information from Paul Henry, NPS representative at the training center, 394 students have completed numerous training courses held at the center and sponsored through FLETC nationwide this fiscal year. Such courses include 9PT,
Academy Graduates 2,000th Person

A young man who spent last summer working in Dinosaur National Monument in Utah became the 2,000th person to graduate from Santa Rosa Junior College's Ranger Training Academy in December.

John Evans, a University of California at Berkeley graduate who worked as a general contractor and waiter in the Bay area before moving to Utah last summer to work at Dinosaur, heard about SRJC's academy before moving to Utah last summer to work at Dinosaur, heard about SRJC's academy and joined the program in the spring of 1978.

Today, the academy trains rangers for the National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service and the Forest Service, as well as state and county parks.

Although there are 22 such programs nationwide, SRJC's academy still is the only one in California. Students come to Santa Rosa from as far away as New York, Alaska and Hawaii, Orr said.

Evans received his bachelor's degree in conservation and resource studies at UC Berkeley in 1989. Ever since he was in grade school he has liked the outdoors, hiking and backpacking. After spending a few years as a general contractor in the East Bay and more recently as a waiter in San Francisco, Evans decided to pursue something that would give him a chance to combine his vocation and avocation.

He applied for and got a summer job at Dinosaur. It was there that he learned from a friend about SRJC's Ranger Academy. "It is important for me to help others, and it's important to be in a place where I want to be," Evans said.

He called the seven-week, 290-hour program "intensive." Part of the training he received included the use of firearms because park rangers now are also law enforcement officers.

The academy also includes training in accident investigation, defensive driving, defensive tactics and report procedures. Students are involved in role-playing scenarios in illegal hunting, building search, campground disputes, domestic family problems, courtroom testimony, interviewing and crime scene management.

Optional weekend training is available in search and rescue and first aid. By attending the weekend classes, students in the academy can become certified in high angle and swift water search and rescue, and standard first aid and cardiopulmonary resuscitation.

The 40 students who go through each Ranger Academy at SRJC usually find jobs as seasonal rangers, Orr said. In 1984, Jennifer West of Arlington, Va., was the 1,000th person to graduate from the Ranger Academy.

For more information contact Santa Rosa Junior College's Criminal Justice Training Center at (707) 539-5210.

Seasonal Insurance

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

- A major medical plan that provides comprehensive health care benefits for you and your family, with up to $4 million maximum lifetime benefits per insured person, a choice of deductibles, affordable group rates and comprehensive benefits in and out of the hospital.
- A short-term, self-writing policy developed specifically for temporary employees. A managed health care system to ensure you and your family receive the best care possible while controlling the medical costs, featuring a $2 million lifetime benefit, freedom to select doctors and hospitals of your choice, and a choice of deductibles.
- Group term life insurance, an inexpensive way to establish financial security for your family with maximum life insurance protection up to $3 million for members and spouses, optional dependent coverage, and non-smoker discounts.

For more information about these programs, write to Seabury & Smith Associates, 1255 23rd St., N.W., Washington, DC 20037, or call 1-800-424-9883.

All plans are not available in all states. Please contact Seabury and Smith or the ANPR business manager for details.

ROAD MAP

for my heirs
upon my death

A new ANPR publication

ANPR has prepared this "Road Map" to assist family or friends in handling the many details required when a spouse or loved one dies.

The notebook contains personal information (fill-in-the-blank) forms about:

- who to notify and your desires about final arrangements
- civil service, military & Social Security benefit details
- insurance facts
- bank account, property, credit card, TSP, investment & retirement account numbers & information
- synopsis of life, obituary & family history
- list of disposition of personal items
- anatomical gift wishes
- examples of durable power of attorney for health care & finances

This "Road Map" is a must and makes for a caring, loving gift for family and friends.

The book costs $10, plus $4 for shipping and handling. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax. U.S. currency only.

Make check payable to ANPR.
Send to:
Pat Thompson
310 Carrsbrook Drive
Charlottesville, VA 22901
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 33 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>Name</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 Lauritzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Buccecco</td>
<td>Mark Tanaka-Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Swift</td>
<td>Jeff Karraker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Buccecco</td>
<td>Janice Wobenhorst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Farabee</td>
<td>Mary Kimmit Laxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Toole</td>
<td>Bruce McKeeman</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>
<tr>
<td>Vaughan Baker</td>
<td>Bruce Edmonston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Williams</td>
<td>Rick Erisman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colleen Mastrangelo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Print — “Track of the Cat”

When a review of “Track of the Cat” by Nevada Barr appeared in the Washington Post, several of us tried to get a copy. According to the Post, here was a murder mystery set in a national park whose main characters were park rangers. But the book couldn’t be found in Washington-area bookstores, so Dick Martin in WASO Ranger Activities special-ordered a copy. When it finally came my turn to read it, I didn’t put it down until I was done.

For anyone who is a fan of murder mysteries, this is a good book. For anyone who is a fan of the Desert Southwest, this is a good book. And for anyone who works for the NPS, this is a good book.

Not only did I enjoy the plot (which I won’t reveal) and the setting (Guadalupe Mountains National Park), but anyone who has worked for the Park Service will enjoy the aspects of NPS operations woven into the story. From FLETC training to jabs at the OPM hiring process, this book is, to quote author Tony Hillerman from the cover, a “real find.”

— Vaughn Baker
WASO

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
ANPR Reports

Board, committee and staff activity summaries appear in the following consolidated format. Complete reports appear separately, as noted. A directory of ANPR board members’ addresses and home phone numbers appears on the back cover of the magazine.

Business Manager

As promised, I am providing some additional information on changes brought about by the new federal tax law.

For the tax year 1994, donors cannot claim deductions for contributions of $250 or more unless they have a receipt from the Association.Canceled checks are no longer sufficient. This applies to single donations larger than the stated amount and not aggregate contributions. Please note that it is the donor’s responsibility to secure the receipt.

A second change requires the Association to provide disclosure information for “quid pro quo contributions.” ANPR must give donors a breakdown of what deductions can be claimed when a contribution of more than $75 is made in exchange for an item of value.

To date ANPR has offered such incentives to contributors on very few occasions, but will be sure to comply when future activities warrant. The IRS has also announced new threshold figures for high-income taxpayers affected by a limit on overall deductions, including those additional information on changes brought about by the new federal tax law. As promised, I am providing some additional information on changes brought about by the new federal tax law.

Investment Committee

As planned at Rendezvous XVII, the Life Membership Funds will be reinvested during February. The market has been somewhat volatile lately, but many advisors still feel that stock mutual funds will continue to gain, though not as rapidly as in the past.

Funds will be invested in a fund family money market account for dollar cost-averaging of allocations into the selected mutual funds. This means of averaging will help us work with market fluctuations and gain the most value for our investments. The funds and allocations are:

- Dreyfus Treasury Intermediate, 30 percent, $21,300
- Janus Fund, 20 percent, $14,200
- Invesco, 20 percent, $14,200
- Twentieth Century Ultra, 30 percent, $21,300

Mentoring Program

Due to holidays and travel, the bio-sketch form isn’t completed yet. Hopefully, it will be ready for committee members’ comments by mid-February. The committee will organize a data base beginning with those who responded to the request at Rendezvous XVII. Regional representatives will be asked to assist in mailing the bio-sketch forms. The committee hopes to give the program a trial run and discuss results before meeting at Rendezvous XVIII in October in Durango.

Retirement Committee

Being a small investor myself, I am always interested in the profound forecasts all the investment strategists write in the many financial magazines and newsletters for the coming year.

First, you should know, that if anyone had a crystal ball and could forecast accurately what might happen in the investment future, they would be millionaires and wouldn’t be writing in financial literature. If you hear of anyone bragging about predicting a hefty change that happened in the market, they are either lucky (once) or lying.

Anyway, after boiling down all the stuff I’ve read and determining what the general comments are, I’ll try to list the average opinion.

Remember, a lot of things could happen between now (January ’94) and when you read this. For the last two years, at least, we have been besieged by “gloom and doomers” who have stated that the market is overvalued. In other words, stocks have a high Price/Earnings ratio. A P/E ratio is determined by dividing the price of the stock by the earnings and if the answer is high (20-plus) the stock is said to be overvalued and could take a dive.

This is all true, but there are also thousands of stocks whose P/E is low and are rated as good buys, so there is still plenty of punch left in the stock market as recent daily highs in the Dow Jones have demonstrated.

Speaking of the Dow Jones, it is now above 3800 and the predictions are that it will hit 4000 or above with fluctuations between 3500 and 3900. Corrections are inevitable, so don’t panic if a sudden drop occurs. Look at it as an opportunity to buy stocks or no-load mutual funds at fire sale prices. International no-load mutual funds will be in favor this year and longer.

The economy should grow around 2 percent in 1994. Inflation should remain around 2 to 3 percent and interest rates should remain around 5.9 percent and perhaps drop to 5 percent during the year.

There is a consensus that the Standard & Poor’s 500 Index (the index that the “C” Fund in the Thrift Savings Plan follows) will remain at its 50-year average of 12 percent or slightly higher during 1994.
All in the Family

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

Send to Bill Halainen, 640 N. Harrison St., Arlington, VA 22205. Changes of address should be sent separately to Debbie Gorman, ANPR Business Manager, Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831.

Steve Anderson (GRSA 86, SAGU 86-87, DETO 87, YELL 88-90), formerly a seasonal law enforcement ranger in the NFS, is now a district wildlife officer for the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, stationed in Cimarron, N.M. Steve and Nancy (below) want old friends to know they are always welcome. Address/phone: P.O. Box 425, Cimarron, NM 87714; Home: (505) 376-2022.

Nancy J. (Hildreth) Anderson (ALFL/LAMR 83-86, DETO 87, GLCA 88, YELL 89), formerly a seasonal law enforcement ranger in the NFS, has started her own business, Buffalo Flats Photography, and is enjoying “shooting” the wilds of northern New Mexico (and elsewhere).

Karen Ball (YOSE 78-84, BOST 84-86, PEFO 86-87, SAMO 87-90, PEFO 90-91, GRSM 91-93) has transferred from Great Smokies, where she was an assistant subdistrict ranger in Cades Cove, to Lassen Volcanic, where she is the law enforcement specialist and assistant district ranger in the park’s North District. Address: Manzanita Ranger Station, P.O. Box 100, Viola, CA 96085; Home: (615) 448-9188; Work: (615) 448-2472.

Christopher H. Cessna (INDE 89-90, JEFF 90-92, GLCA 92-present) is a GS-025-7 law enforcement ranger in Glen Canyon’s Wahweap Subdistrict. Before that, he was a GS-5 law enforcement ranger at Jefferson National Expansion. Address/phone: P.O. Box 4133, Page, AZ 86040; Home: (602) 645-5743; Work: (602) 645-8424.

Rick Jones (LABE 80-84, HSTR 84-86, Lincoln NF 87-89, ELMO 89, Cibola NF 90-91, BLM’s El Malpais NCA 91-93) is the new business manager for the Fort Frederica Association at Fort Frederica National Monument on St. Simons Island, Ga. Address: 1000 Mallory St., #84, St. Simons Island, GA 31522, (912) 638-9278.


Denise Newberry (YELL 76, GRCA 80-85, ROMO 86 & 90-92), who was a GS-5 seasonal law enforcement ranger in the Fall River District at Rocky Mountain, is now a GS-7 permanent water rights specialist for the Water Resources Division in Fort Collins, Colo. She is completing her master’s in resource management/range science. Her thesis, “Liquid Treasure . . . Water Rights in the National Park Service,” will be out this summer. Address/phone: 1201 Oak Ridge Drive, Suite 250, Fort Collins, CO 80525; Home: (303) 225-3525.

Doug Paulson (GRCA, BAND, YELL, BIBE, USFS), who was a seasonal backcountry protection ranger at Bandelier, is working for the Mendoza (Argentina) Provincial Park System at Mount Aconcagua Park. Address: Doug Paulson, c/o Eduardo Enrique, Suarez 171, Maipu, Mendoza, Argentina CP 5515.

Bill Pierce and Nadine have moved to Katmai, where he is superintendent. Previously he was chief ranger at Olympic. Their new address is P.O. Box 12, King Salmon, AK 99613, (907) 246-3305.

Doug Roe (BRC 79-81 & 86, CANY 87, INDE 87-88, BIHO 88-89, BUFF 89-91, CACH 91-93) has left Canyon de Chelly, where he was the park’s GS-025-9 chief ranger, to become a GS-025-11 Valley District shift supervisor at Yosemite. Address/phone: P.O. Box 221, Yosemite NP, CA 95389; Home: (209) 372-9049; Work: (209) 372-0224.

Robert Stinson (HAFE, USPP, CHAT, CURE, COLO, BITH, EVER, GRTE) has transferred from Organ Pipe Cactus, where he was the GS-7 law enforcement ranger, to Saguaro, where he is the GS-9 district ranger in the Tucson Mountain District. Address: 2704 N. Kinney Road, Tucson, AZ 85743; Home: (602) 883-8014.

Reunions

Grand Canyon — In commemoration of the park’s 75th anniversary this year, a Grand Canyon reunion is planned for Saturday, May 28, and Sunday, May 29. The schedule includes a cookout on Saturday evening and an old-fashioned street dance. A pancake breakfast is planned for Sunday morning.

The reunion registration fee will cover costs for the cookout and the breakfast. Blocks of rooms have been reserved at various Fred Harvey lodges, the Quality Inn and the Canyon Squire. Reserve a room no later than May 1.

For a copy of the reunion and room registration forms, contact Ann Baugh at (602) 638-2691 or Dennis Hamm at (602) 638-7773.

Mesa Verde — A reunion of rangers who worked at Mesa Verde in the mid-to late-’70s is planned at the park Oct. 15-16, just prior to Rendezvous in nearby Durango. Details are being worked out. If you are interested in getting on a mailing list for more information, contact Elizabeth Mozzillo, 2512 Burdette, New Orleans, LA 70125.

Missing Persons

We’ve lost touch with the following people. If you know their whereabouts, please contact Debbie Gorman, P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831.

Ann Sartori Alexandria, VA
Brian McCullough Moab, UT
Rodney Wright Groveland, CA
ANPR heads to the mountains of Colorado for Rendezvous XVIII from Sunday, Oct. 16, through Friday, Oct. 21, at Tamarron Resort, 18 miles north of Durango. We will again meet jointly with the annual conference of the Association of National Park Maintenance Employees. This year's theme of "Parks at Crossroads" will focus on the alliances, cooperative programs and compromises the Service will have to make to meet its mission in the '90s.

**Hotel Information**

Tamarron will save ANPR a block of 140 rooms until Sept. 14. Standard rooms will rent for $66 plus tax for up to triple occupancy. Executive suites with two baths are available for four or more persons for about $22 per person per night, plus tax. The suites have full kitchens, and many of the standard rooms have kitchenettes.

Meg Weesner from Saguaro will operate a clearinghouse for those interested in sharing rooms. She will have more information on this in the next Ranger. Room registration can be made by calling Tamarron toll-free at (800) 678-1000.

Tamarron offers several amenities. Wheelchair-accessible rooms are available and all meeting rooms are accessible. The resort features a golf course, spa and health club, indoor and outdoor heated pools, hotel restaurant, babysitting service, children’s programs and tennis courts.

**Area History**

The first stake for the survey of the city of Durango was driven in 1880. It was located there, not as the result of the growth of the early settlements of pioneers in quest of gold, but by the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad, which decided to locate its railroad depot 1 1/2 miles below Animas City. Animas City was a flourishing town of 2,500 people, with its own newspaper, the Weekly Southwest.

When the news got out that a new city would be built on the Animas River, a party of capitalists tried to purchase the property. Failing to agree on a price with the owner of the homesteaded land, the property was turned over to the town company. It was incorporated Sept. 27, 1884, as the Durango Land and Coal Co., and was named after Durango, Mexico.

Prior to the founding of Durango, considerable history had been made in the San Juan Basin. Spanish prospectors visited the area in 1776. The river upon which Durango is located was already known to the Spaniards of New Mexico as the Rio de las Animas, or River of Lost Souls.

In its early years, Durango was almost entirely a box tent town, except for a few small stores and restaurants and a number of saloons and dance halls.

In December 1880 the first newspaper estimated the population, permanent and transient, as about 2,000 people. By that time, about 500 buildings had been erected, as well as many tents and dugouts that adorned the river banks.

**Travel Information**

Principal highways through Durango are U.S. 550 and 160. The city is served by the La Plata County Airport. Airline service is offered through Phoenix, Denver, and Albuquerque by United Express, Continental Express, Mesa and America West Airlines.

The resort offers a shuttle bus to and from the airport for a charge. However, ANPR is attempting to arrange shuttles for a reduced fee.
Avis, Budget, Hertz, National and Thrifty car rental companies all have outlets at the airport. Greyhound-TNM&O Bus Service can get you into the area. The Durango Lift and Opportunity Bus operates in town, Mondays through Fridays, and offers fixed public routes.

Omega World Travel is the Association’s official travel agency. Reservations may be made by calling toll-free (800) 283-3239 or (703) 818-8848. Omega guarantees the lowest fare at the time of ticketing, or it will refund double the difference.

Recreational Opportunities
Tamarron features The Cliffs, an 18-hole championship golf course. Because of the resort’s altitude of 7,600 feet, your golf ball will fly 10 percent farther than at sea level, good enough reason for golfers at sea level to attend Rendezvous this year! In addition to golf, Tamarron offers fishing and tours to local sites.

Durango has been restored to its Victorian past and is a designated National Historic District. The town offers antique shops, art galleries, factory outlet shops, boutiques selling jewelry, Indian arts and crafts, and locally produced paintings and sculptures, 65 restaurants and nightlife.

A main attraction is the authentic coal-fired, steam-operated Durango & Silverton Narrow Gauge Railroad, one of the oldest in the country. It travels through the wilderness area of the San Juan National Forest, following the Animas River Gorge to the 1874 mining town of Silverton on a 90-mile round trip.

Many museums and cultural sites are located in the Four Corners area. The Center of Southwest Studies at Fort Lewis College Museum and Archive features southwestern and Native American artifacts. The Durango Arts Center highlights local artists. The Southern Ute Cultural Center Museum contains historical artifacts, Native American jewelry, pottery and paintings.

Mesa Verde National Park is about 54 miles from the resort. The park is on a natural table rising 1,500 feet from the valley floor and features the largest collection of Native American cliff dwellings in the world.

Aztec Ruins NM is about 40 miles from Tamarron, and Canyon de Chelly, Chaco Culture, Canyonlands and Arches are within driving distance.

Agenda
Jeff Karraker and Bob Krumenaker are this year’s program coordinators. They will work with Deb Liggett, Ken Mabery, Sarah Craighead and Rick Shireman on programs and workshops. If you have program suggestions or ideas, contact Karraker at (505) 278-2565 (home); (505) 278-2201 (office), or write her at P.O. Box 57, Capulin, NM, 88414. Krumenaker can be reached at (505) 471-5693 (home); (505) 988-6713 (office), or by writing to 2940 Calle del Res, Santa Fe, NM 87505. As always, be on the lookout for creative raffle prizes during the year. The raffle is a major source of revenue for ANPR and needs your support!

— Sarah Craighead
NCRO
Letters (cont'd from page 2)

financial abilities and needs, to be out of the house and into the work force. As a result, more different groups of people are thrown together than before. But the differences between these different groups are different from the differences between them 40 years ago. Different conduct, different expectations, different ways of communicating, and different approaches — everything changes and everything is different.

It is not, therefore, surprising that many of the traits that naturally and reasonably developed at a time, say in the 1950s, when men and women were doing what they did then, are different in the 1990s, in view of what men and women are doing now. Everybody has to adapt. It is difficult for both men and women.

As there are realities of a female manager, there are also realities of a male manager. Men and women are both served and saddled by what occurred in the past and by how they were brought up. The continuing goal of the manager, however, remains the same, namely, effectively to get the job done.

Thus, I believe that Smith misses the point when she claims that management style has become androgynous because more women are becoming managers. Rather, it is that these two phenomena (men’s and women’s management style, and more women managers) share the same etiology.

— Julian Tepper
Washington, D.C.

Editor's Note

Ranger received an anonymous letter Nov. 8, 1993, from an employee in Stockton, Calif., suggesting the magazine print a letter that the person submitted to EEO and affirmative action.

We have not avoided that subject; we simply haven’t had anyone express an interest in writing about it. Since the anonymous letter was quite particular and focused on one person, we decided it was not appropriate for the magazine.

If that person or anyone else wants to write on EEO uses or abuses or any other issue relevant to our readers, we’d be happy to entertain a proposal.

Association Actions (cont’d from page 7)

maintenance managers, perhaps as a component of the supervisory/leadership skills development program. That seems to have worked quite well. There has been some discussion about appending managerial grid onto that program, now that it has been brought back into the NPS, and we would concur with that recommendation. Grid and other “off-the-shelf” programs (e.g., situational leadership, Kepner-Tragoe, etc.) are highly worthwhile programs, and could/should serve as core components to the program. We need a more concerted effort to develop instructors of these programs within the Service, and then use them in a well-designed, sustained program of supervisory/leadership development.

- We need to implement an effective system of mentoring. It’s clear that little supervisory effectiveness comes from classroom-type training. Competence comes from being directly involved and from experience. Mentoring can be a way to generate competence to some extent. There are huge pitfalls to mentoring that must be considered. A poor mentoring program is probably worse than none at all, because it can also effectively instill the wrong way to do things. Some contemporary literature on leadership, customer service and team development addresses effective programs of supervisory development using mentoring-like programs. These should be thoroughly investigated.

- Let’s not study this thing to death and wait months or years until we get it “right” to get something going. Something needs to and can get going in a matter of a couple of months. Then spend sustained time testing it and making appropriate corrections. There is no perfect program for this. We need to get on with it to show the field that the Service is serious about starting to train and be issued semi-automatic weapons. There are 12 basic classes scheduled for this fiscal year with 150 slots for NPS rangers.

— Steve Clark
Delaware Water Gap

Retirement (cont’d from page 26)

The information I have indicates that the S&P 500 hit 15.4 percent last year. Not bad! My recommendation, as usual, is that both FERS and CSRS employees should be fully invested in the Thrift Savings Plan and, unless you have five years or less before retirement, all contributions should be into the “C” fund. For the long haul, stocks outperform all other investments!

Those of you who are interested in becoming more informed about investing on your own should, above all, obtain one book. This book, “Making The Most of Your Money” by columnist Jane Bryant Quinn, is the best yet to cover most of the investment opportunities and pitfalls of the times.

On the day after the coup broke out in the former Soviet Union, Quinn gave a rundown on some of the great threats to Americans. “They are — take a breath please — high credit card interest, unscrupulous brokers, limited partnerships, rare coin schemes, underhanded telemarketers, limited partnerships, penny stocks, commission-happy financial planners, limited partnerships and real-estate scams. Did I mention limited partnerships?”

This is a book anyone can use strategically. The book is written for people in different circumstances — retirement age or after, young, divorced, widowed or married with children. Nobody cares about your money as much as you do. Who do you trust the most? It is the person looking back at you in the mirror. Read it and educate yourself. The book is $27.50 at most bookstores.
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Submission Form

Please reproduce this and pass it on to anyone you know who might be transferring, leaving the Service or getting promoted. Entries must be legible!
Send submissions to: Bill Halainen, 640 N. Harrison St., Arlington, VA 22205.

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

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

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

Address and Phone Number (provide only if you want it listed).

Other Information

Association of National Park Rangers

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

Important: Please specify
- New Membership
- Renewal
- Date:

Name (last, first, MI):
Box or Street
City: State: Zip:

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

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

Type of Membership (check one)

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

Supporting (indiv. & organizations) $100.00
Contributing (indiv. & organizations) $500.00
Subscriptions: 2 copies of each issue to organizations only $30.00

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

The person who recruited me was ____________________________

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

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

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

Name
Address
City State Zip

Name
Address
City State Zip

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

The person who recruited me was ____________________________

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

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

Vice President, Special Concerns
Bill Wade, Shenandoah
3041 Mount Heights Road, Front Royal, VA 22630

Vice President, Professional Issues
Bryan Swift, Lassen Volcanic
P.O. Box 84, Mineral, CA 96063

Vice President, Communication/Representation
Karen Wade, Wrangell-St. Elias
P.O. Box 234
Glenallen, AK 99588
(907) 822-3122

Secretary/Treasurer
Patti McAlpine, Olmstead
347 Broadway St., #2, North Attleboro, MA 02760
(508) 699-9304

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

Rocky Mountain Regional Rep
Dan Moses, Dinosaur
P.O. Box 96, Jensen, UT 84035
(801) 781-1826

Southwest Regional Rep
Judy Chetwin, SWRO
(505) 983-3854

Pacific Northwest Regional Rep
Bruce Edmonston, Craters of the Moon
P.O. Box 137, Arco, ID 83212
(208) 527-6775

Alaska Regional Rep
Rick Mossman, Wrangell-St. Elias
P.O. Box 63, Yakutat, AK 99689
(907) 784-3282

Committee Chairs

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

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

Employee Development
Gary Warshefski, Fort Stanwix
302 W. Cedar St., Rome, NY 13440
(315) 337-5176

Housing
Tom Cherry, FLETFC
1495 Wood Ave., St. Simons Island, GA 31522-3949

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

Promotional Items
Tessy Shirakawa, Alaska Regional Office
7020 Hunt Ave., Anchorage, AK 99504-1875

Retirement
Frank Bets
4560 Lark Bunting Drive, #7A
Fort Collins, CO 80526
(303) 226-0765

Seasonal Concerns
Wendy Lauritzen, Northwest Alaska Areas
P.O. Box 1029
Kotzebue, AK 99752
(907) 442-3890

Twenty-Year Retirement
Mark Harvey, Yosemite
P.O. Box 187, El Portal, CA 95318
(209) 379-2235

Staff

Editor, Ranger
Teresa Ford
26 S. Mount Vernon Club Road, Golden, CO 80401
(303) 526-1380

Business Manager
Debbie Gorman, Saratoga
P.O. Box 307, Gansevoort, NY 12831
(518) 793-3140