



RD LO

8/15 (9)

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:

AUG 14 1979

Memorandum

To: All Regional Directors

From: Associate Director, Management and Operations

Subject: Summary of the 1978 Search and Rescue Questionnaire

Enclosed is a summary of approximately 190 search and rescue questionnaires that were completed last year. Please forward the summary to your regional search and rescue coordinator and to those regional personnel who are responsible for search and rescue coordination and training. We have extracted a portion of the narrative comments for your information. They do not necessarily reflect the total spectrum of responses from those who completed the questionnaire.

The questionnaire summary provides a useful insight into ranger search and rescue (SAR) concerns. We will use the questionnaire results to establish SAR project priorities for the Division of Ranger Activities and Protection, WASO. The summary indicates that parks need SAR guidelines which we hope to complete in 1980. In addition, H.M. Albright Training Center will use training information contained in the summary to establish priorities for SAR training.

We appreciate the interest and effort that the respondents took in completing the questionnaire.

Enclosures



SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

SEARCH AND RESCUE
QUESTIONNAIRE
1978

INSTRUCTIONS

Please indicate, by placing a check in the appropriate boxes, your appraisal of the need for clarification or instructions as they relate to your park.

MANAGEMENT

Is there a need for policy directives that define the actions that park management can take as they relate to the following activities:

	<u>A*</u>		<u>B</u>		<u>C</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Charging for rescue?	17	7	58	16	65	21	140	44
2. Developing mutual aid agreements with adjacent local, state, and/or Federal agencies? (This includes volunteer organizations.)	17	6	39	35	55	27	111	68
3. Liability for nonfederal personnel?	20	3	50	23	70	13	140	39

A - Denotes that the person completing the questionnaire was an assistant superintendent, superintendent, or regional SAR coordinator.

B - Denotes that the person completing the questionnaire was a district ranger, assistant chief ranger, or chief ranger.

C - Denotes that the person completing the questionnaire was a seasonal ranger/technician, permanent ranger/technician, area ranger, or subdistrict ranger.

TRAINING

	<u>A</u>		<u>B</u>		<u>C</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Is SAR skill training adequately provided by WASO (including H.M. within your geographic region?)	5	21	28	49	16	68	49	138
2. Should SAR skill training be provided by the above (number 1)?	23	2	57	14	78	8	158	24
3. Is coordination or assistance by WASO and/or the regional offices needed to provide training?	22	2	65	19	68	13	155	34
4. If Servicewide training is needed, please indicate the training <u>needed</u> in the following skills for personnel employed within your park.								
snow and ice rescue -	6		21		40		67	
rock rescue -	9		39		60		108	
white water source -	7		10		32		49	
air rescue -	8		32		46		86	
avalanche rescue -			10		23		33	
search technique -	18		58		71		147	
rescue coordination -	21		59		61		141	
SCUBA rescue/recovery -	5		15		33		53	
boat rescue -	9		21		28		58	

REPORTING SYSTEM

	<u>A</u>		<u>B</u>		<u>C</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Does the present "Servicewide Incident Reporting System" and your existing SAR record system (utilizing the present Servicewide SAR forms) provide you with necessary and useful SAR data?	20	2	58	17	62	17	140	36
2. Do the SAR forms need to be revised to fit your area needs? If your answer is yes, please submit your recommendations or correct the enclosed SAR forms as needed.	5	16	19	58	27	47	51	121

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Are there adequate means available to keep current on the latest SAR equipment, technique, training, NPS policies, etc. that affect your area?	8	15	26	46	34	50	68	111
2. Would a periodic publication on Servicewide SAR developments be helpful?	24		66	5	76	7	166	12

COMMENTS - Management

I don't believe that the first question applies to Yosemite in the context of the overall question above. The policy spells it out, no charging; however, there is a need to charge.

We do not perform enough searches or rescues to keep up with policies, so a manual would help keep us within guidelines when such actions do occur.

If nothing more than to clarify our position.

Liability for nonfederal personnel--particularly for emergency employees and volunteers. Policy on charging seems variable. I favor charging at least direct equipment costs; i.e., helicopter, fixed wing (non-military) and emergency contract and hired help.

A Servicewide policy to establish charges to rescued parties is needed. Too often expenses are charged to NPS which are related to inadequate preparation, equipment, etc. of rescued party.

I would suggest some Servicewide guidelines defining the roles and responsibilities of the National Park Service and state agencies in areas of proprietary jurisdiction.

Number 1 above is very important to MOMC as charging for rescues is a perennial topic of discussion. The fact that it is handled differently in different parks makes some discussions difficult. Also, MOMC has been charged for costs by military outfits in the past. Is this done anywhere else?

Are we to continue to rely heavily upon local cooperating agencies who receive no compensation for services rendered, or possibly develop SAR teams or at least qualified park personnel to respond to emergencies?

I feel that even in emergency situations to which we have to respond, the parties involved should be required to reimburse the park or respective agency for services rendered. I realize that we cannot

COMMENTS - Management (Continued)

question one's ability to pay or not before we render services. However, if they can afford to, they should be expected to compensate for it even if only a certain \$. For those incidents/services for which one is unable to pay because of income level (although how can they afford certain types of recreation?), this charge should be absorbed by an emergency fund.

We need to develop a park policy by which cooperating agencies (fire/rescue) are reimbursed for each individual service rendered. This park relies heavily upon local units for assistance, many of whom arrive on the scene before we do. In addition, Harpers Ferry units assist us with a majority of river rescues which may occur on the Potomac River from the Maryland side.

To date, no agency has received payment for services rendered, not even a token annual amount. This is bad public relations. They require our support financially as well as personnel wise.

Question #3 should be answered by the Solicitors.

We believe there is a very definite need for Servicewide guidelines that will assist in not only developing mutual aid agreements with outside SAR organizations, but in developing contractual type of agreements whereby an NPS area is authorized to pay for services rendered by SAR organizations. In many cases, mutual aid agreements are not practical nor possible because trained NPS-SAR manpower is not available to assist other organizations when they call upon us. A better PR effort and more control over external SAR groups could be maintained if we paid for their services.

We also believe that in extreme cases, where high risk and cost are involved in the rescue of visitors, that same should be charged for rescue services, especially in those cases where posted regulations and procedures have been willfully violated.

Policy directives are considered necessary primarily in the rescue function. There appears to be a trend whereby less and less Park Service personnel are being trained in the technical rescue function. Consequently, more and more, the rescue responsibility is being turned over to non-employed, skilled individuals with consistently less involvement by Park Service personnel.

COMMENTS - Management (Continued)

It appalls me that it appears that consistently fewer of our Rangers are willing to develop the skills necessary or to take leadership in rescue responsibilities that are most certainly those of the National Park Service.

#1 There isn't an equitable way to charge for rescues. NPS isn't in a position to deviate from accepted practice in the United States of cost-free rescue service; i.e., military, coast guard, State and local protection programs, etc.

#2 These work best when developed and implemented on a local basis.

#3 High risk operations have in the past attracted many "volunteers." Clearly, there needs to be a procedure for putting to work those who are competent--(VIPs, emergency firefighters, Civil Air Patrol), while considering all aspects of liability.

I believe that policy directives are needed in all the above categories. I also believe they already exist in some form in Items 2 and 3.

Often, NPS is reactive. Why wait for tort claims, etc., resulting from SAR activity? Let's get guidelines (like NPS-9) for SAR.

#3 Compensation and liability for the seasonal personnel involved with SAR?

People with genuine interest in working in parks with SAR problems are often not in those positions while people without SAR in their background, and without the interest to be good in the field, are in jobs in parks with active SAR problems.

Need overhead teams for emergencies which train together.

The National Park Service needs to sit down and decide what they want the park ranger to do or be. I can now envision someone coming out with a required 40 hours of training for search and rescue. Then we will have a full month of training required for law enforcement.

COMMENTS: Training

- #2 Funds should be provided to SAR parks for training
- #3 Financial and announcements

I would like to see formal SAR training provided at Albright Training Center at least once annually. Minimum of a 40 hour course.

I feel general SAR training should be done on a regional level or at the Training Centers. Specialized and local problems pertaining to individual parks should be done at the local level or grouped with other parks with similar problems.

Training is only part of the problem. There needs to be servicewide standards for SAR if we are to maintain our leadership position nationally. These need to be similar to fire and law enforcement standards - not like out EMT standards, which are too low and left up to individual parks.

Separate overhead teams for search/rescue and training for them. Use simulated problems. SAR training should receive some of the enthusiasm from WASO that law enforcement does. Parks that have SAR problems provide needed training, and as rangers transfer, this training experience is passed to other parks. Regional training opportunities may assist in filling gaps. In-park training/practice would provide higher benefits.

Servicewide training is not as important as servicewide guidelines which would provide consistent training nationwide, regardless of who gave class. This instructor cadre idea should take care of this problem.

This form seems to ignore the fact that SAR and EMS are closely related and its difficult to have one without the other. EMT and Park Medic Training needs must also be addressed. We seem to have lost our push and opportunity in leadership-EMS training.

COMMENTS: Training (continued)

Most scuba work involves white water. Avalanche should be involved with snow and ice, with some specialization in avalanche condition identification. Building general skills related to winter mountaineering is also needed.

Diverse SAR conditions dictate that parks provide individual SAR training designed to meet local needs. This assures adequate training and local instructors. Exceptions include: scuba (Scripps program - excellent) and possibly coordination and avalanche rescue.

- #1 Not by WASO or HOAL, some done locally (in parks).
 - #2 Best provided on a regional level for rescue skills training. Search skills can be done by WASO or HOAL.
 - #3 Regional offices - yes; WASO - not necessary.
-

The best overall training for our park SAR men is to have as many as possible take part in a search mission. They soon learn about search patterns that can be put into operation and how each has a part in the performance of the operation. This year, team members as a group contributed a total of 215 hours on the job training in all kinds of weather day or night.

We work closely with Carlsbad Caverns SAR team; our key men, particularly the technical rock climbers should be on duty on the weekends. Most problems seem to occur during this period.

We should set up to work as a unit with Big Bend National Park, if they needed an additional team. It is no problem to drive a group down into that country from this park. They should be able to respond to our needs with a team to help in search operation.

At the present time, we work very well with the Carlsbad Caverns National Park team when a search becomes critical or the area becomes too large for operations.

COMMENTS: Training (continued)

I still would like the parks to take care of their own SAR needs when it comes to training for this type of operation. I fear that WASO and Regional Offices would make the whole operation so cumbersome with necessary training and methods to be used that we couldn't respond quickly to put a search pattern out. I would also believe that the upper levels would want everyone CARDED for SAR teamwork. This again would make training a mad scramble for everyone involved. Then the bad feelings, when this one or that one does not have it on his list of skills. This would become an obsession like the law enforcement, fire fighting and first aid, CPR, etc. Get CARDED or you will never advance, you will be condemned to get nowhere.

SAR is like most other emergency disciplines, new technology and techniques occur regularly. To send an employee to a 1-week school, and then 10 years later expect that person to be fully up-to-date, is impossible. Periodic refresher training is needed, principally in basic and advanced "skills" and not in philosophy and organization.

- #1 Search training - yes; Rescue training - no.
- #2 If we want any consistency of method and exchanges of ideas.
- #3 Won't be initiated by individual parks, otherwise.

Training session should be an opportunity to demonstrate equipment and techniques that work. A session that would produce the opportunity to exchange ideas.

Recently SAR training has taken an irrelevant tack nationally with increasing emphasis on "coordination." Park personnel must be physically skilled and capable to perform any and all rescues within their area. As long as competent personnel are transferred in and out, training is a constant demand.

- #2 To be conducted by traveling cadre in regions and to supplement the expertise already available in the field.

There is a need for training opportunities for more people or additional sessions.

COMMENTS: Training (continued)

There should be more servicewide and/or regional offerings of SAR skill training utilizing the facilities of both Albright and Mather Training Centers and/or using the Regional concept of sharing SAR trainers and conducting training on a regional basis, tailoring such training to meet regional needs. There is a responsibility for WASO and the regions to annually promote and update such training so that field personnel are kept abreast of developments in the SAR field. SAR training for ground search techniques, white water rescue, rescue coordination, and rock rescue is very much needed at NCR. We solicit the assistance of WASO and other Eastern Regional instructors to conduct such training.

In order to reverse trends observed in my comments on page 1, I feel that a much greater emphasis in skills training and technical rescue, whether it be snow and ice, rock, water, etc., should be initiated by WASO and the regions.

As I indicated in an earlier portion of this study, I have done several cliff evacuation and one cave evacuation seminars for SW Region parks, and one in the Rocky Mountain Region area (Mesa Verde).

The seminar lasts three to five days and involves not only training in the field, but also a practical problem session for the park team to solve. In doing these sessions, I have received good feedback from the areas in all cases, pointing to several aspects I feel are definite benefits: 1) the park group gets to work as a team and develop team spirit and understanding of each other's capabilities and reactions; 2) the team gets to work with their own terrain - be it good rock or rotten sandstone such as at Chaco Canyon - and to understand its particular problems; 3) a motivation and system for regular practice gets started; 4) the park gets familiar with its equipment and the instructor can go over park gear to discuss needs or pieces of equipment on hand which should be discarded or evaluated closely - this also allows the instructor to leave the park team with a suggested listing of needed purchases, if the park team is new to such situations; 5) the instructor can follow-up to park management with a summary of team strengths and weaknesses, and any suggestions; and 6) the park is developing a team as a unit, yet not stripping its needed strength to handle arising problems by sending people to a training center - costwise, it gets more people trained for less money.

COMMENTS: Training (continued)

This is an area where the training centers could help by sending out instructors, or by developing instructors for each region, as they are setting out to do for the management of the Search Function course. Such training could be offered for other skills besides cliff evacuation, such as how to set up search patterns in various types of terrain, and their execution. By going to a park area, it might allow the park a chance to invite a local volunteer group to attend the training, learn something about a skill and also develop some good relationships for the park when future assistance from these groups might be required.

The time allotted for skill training in SAR in the Intro to Park Operations course is not sufficient at present. As much as the skill of technical rigging for cliff evacuation, the real skill of developing "hasty" searches and full-scale search plans based on knowledge of the terrain and personnel involved is a skill which requires extensive training. The course in Mgt. of the Search Function is useful, but some assistance to the parks in training for basis SAR would be helpful. I have been conducting a week long course in cliff evacuation and cave evacuation techniques at different SW Region areas for several years and have found the ability to work with a park team as a unit on their own ground to be very helpful to the park. This type of training could be greatly assisted by the Training Center in terms of training instructors to work with individual parks or clusters, or by offering the instructors from the center to go out to areas.

#1 Additional training funds should be made available and earmarked for Regional use to carry out annual SAR training designed to meet specific SAR (Regional) needs.

Most skills training should be done on a park or regional basis. Specialized training beyond the capability of areas to conduct ought to be coordinated through the training centers. Those marked on #4 are some that come to mind.

Avalanche rescue, search technique and rescue coordination should all be handled geographically with WASO or Regional support.

COMMENTS: Training (continued)

We are most concerned with the establishment of training and proficiency standards and testing for search and rescue. We feel that the Search and Rescue functions are at least as critical as Fire, Life Guarding and Small Boat functions, all of which have standard courses and proficiency requirements.

I think a major, if not the major area of concern regarding search and rescue training among field personnel is a general tendency of management to ignore the need in the face of limited budgets and time. So much other training is now required by law or decree (law enforcement, supervisory, EEO, safety, etc.) that S&R training seems to get lost in the shuffle. Most of the S&R training in which I have participated over the last 20 years has been encouraged and conducted through the enthusiasm of the participants rather than the support of management. Managers seem too often to react with the attitude that "The Rangers are out playing games again!"

SAR training is much lacking in most parks (especially small ones). Park training money seems to only cover "required" training such as law enforcement, safety, supv. mgt., etc., with none left over for other training needs such as SAR. SAR in-park training is usually impractical, having to call on outside expertise (small parks). Parks with a demonstrated need for SAR activities should have outside funding available for training. Otherwise the training is just not received! Being able to send a select few to "Managing the Search Function" and quite a few to local (Regional) SAR field training annually would make a big difference.

It is my opinion that inexperienced personnel cannot realistically be trained beyond the support level. Historically and currently, highly skilled technical SAR personnel come into the NPS with a climbing/mountaineering background with few exceptions. Technical rock climbing or snow/ice is not a skill that can be aquired in several in-service training sessions. The psychological and physical demands are too severe to maintain a safe proficiency level unless one is an active participant in the activity.

As with all skills training, there is not enough SAR training at any level introductory or advanced. Skills training within NPS seems to be on the decline (EMT training is gone; law enforcement training has been greatly reduced; SAR or OJT training is hit-or-miss; skiing, boating, etc., are very difficult to obtain.

COMMENTS: Training (continued)

It seems to me that instead of reducing the Albright Training Center sessions (Intro) to 5 weeks of philosophy, NPS should be concentrating its efforts to provide the skills training needed for the field to do its job. The Albright Training Center is ideally located for the instruction of many skills, including SAR, rafting, EMT (perhaps hospital not near, only a clinic), resource management, firefighting, physical fitness, etc. The Intro course should be expanded to introduce these skills to new employees.

#2 Not skills training but training for trainers and "management" type should be.

#3 Mostly monetary assistance would be needed here, now.

We need more competence in white water source and air rescue, but not necessarily thru servicewide training.

The technical areas of rock climbing, scuba, air rescue (helicopter techniques), snow/ice and avalanche work, cave rescue, and the basic emergency medical care skills all need constant attention to maintain proficiency. Basic physical conditioning is probably our biggest problem area. None of the above skills are maintained by sitting at a desk sliding papers from the left hand to the right hand. To be in shape for skiing, one has to ski, etc., etc., etc.

The only well qualified SAR people we have are those who take their own time to stay technically and physically competent. Management yields to other pressures and current technical and physical skills are a "balls to the wall" fight to maintain

Training is needed on a unit level. Training is requested each year, yet no one is selected to attend. Parks are not too well informed on training opportunities servicewide.

I think that HOAL should only touch upon the subject making new people aware that this is one of the jobs that Rangers do. Once in the field, the ranger can learn the skills needed for the area. Regions should be providing support to the parks so that once or twice a year training sessions could be made available to rangers in smaller parks with less activity but have an interest. The regional offices have failed badly in this area. This also includes fire training.

Coordination between WASO/Regions/Parks is badly needed. It seems to me that we never know where we are headed or where we have been.

COMMENTS: Training (continued)

#4 To ask if training is needed, I believe to be a dumb question. Training is always needed, it is just that someone has to set priorities on what type. Rock rescue training is needed, but is provided from within. Air rescue training is also needed, but is also provided from within. White water rescue is needed, but is learned by OJT.

The necessary SAR training is probably provided somewhere in the geographic area of my Park. The fact that it is not identified or provided by the NPS or other Federal agencies is the question. If an individual or Park "beats the bushes" for this type of training, he or it will probably find it. This is an unnecessary effort. The only real SAR training provided is the Managing the Search Function. This is only in existence due to its being a "pet project" of a few people.

I wouldn't trust the people in WASO or Regional offices to know or be able to identify good training opportunities for the people in the field since many of those doing this sort of thing are pretty well removed. There are exceptions. I think that in a place like the Western Region, there should be a SAR coordinator much as there is a Regional Diving Officer. Yosemite is a natural for this.

Other Recommended Training:

Surf 1
Medevac 1
Flash Floods 1
Canoe 1
Fire Fighting 1
Law Enforcement 1
Emergency Vehicle Driving Course 1
Overland Transportation of Injured Victims 1
Auto extrication 8
EMT 5
Park Medic 2
Mining and Abandon Well Rescue 1
Cave Rescue 5 (Mines - 10)
Interrogation of witness and family members 1
Handling diswrought relatives 1
Surf and Ocean Rescue 1
Use of outside groups, volunteers 1
Arctic Survival 2
Arctic Rescue 2
Desert Operations 1
Management of Emergencies (overhead) 1
Winter Rescue 2
Earthquakes 1
Seacliff 1
Mountains 1
Minor and Major Emergency Operations, Coordination, Flood, Earth Quake,
etc. 4
Servicewide SAR Policy 1
Structural Fire 1
Elevator Extraction 1
Rigging Techniques for Monuments (Statue of Liberty, Gateway, Arches) 1
Oversnow vehicle rescue 1
Instructor for SAR 1

COMMENTS: Reporting System

We should be able to retrieve all necessary information from the 343 and do away with the 10-199b.

SAR forms are a duplication of information available from incident reports.

For our needs, do away with the SAR forms. We know what our rescues were, the problems, the needs and the costs. The case incident record documents rescues and documents the cost. We can also recover the information via computer printout. SAR forms are an unnecessary duplication.

Service-wide SAR forms could probably be improved, but they are usable. I prefer to continue using the forms and expanding on them as needed to suit our own particular needs.

Adopt nationally the A.A.C. mountaineering accident form format to encourage widespread publication of accidents - that climbers, skiers, boaters, divers and flyers may be optionally informed of the misfortunes of each other.

This division advocated this year, that NCR parks record their SAR incidents directly onto 10-199b, utilizing the 10-343 to record the details of the incident. Just how and if these two forms will correlate for an annual report is unknown. We suspect that some SAR reporting is lost for the following reasons:

- (1) 10-343 forms are not always correctly coded for SAR activities, as some are coded for other types of incidents. Also, 10-343 codes for SAR do not cover all the SAR incidents listed on the 10-199b. This allows a gap in recording and reporting all SAR incidents correctly.
- (2) The 10-343 is basically a law enforcement form and does not correlate in its design with information required on the 10-199b.
- (3) There is no distinct category for lost person searches that occur beyond developed areas but really are not in what is termed "Wilderness or Backcountry." Many of the NCR ground searches occur beyond developed areas but they do not occur in what is commonly called "backcountry." If backcountry is to include all searches beyond developed areas, then the instructions on the reverse of

COMMENTS: Reporting System (continued)

10-199b should so state. Right now, they are ambiguous. Also, the instructions seem to indicate to record only those incidents resulting in injury or death, or when it requires backcountry emergency action or technical climbing. What about all the other types of SAR activities that do not fit these categories? Is such data to be lost, especially the record for cost charges and time expended? i.e. - What about false search expenditures?

If SAR activities are to be accurately and completely recorded, we recommend a complete overhaul of the 10-199b, making it the only form upon which SAR activities are to be reported, computerizing such a form with implicit instructions. This would mean that the 10-343 would no longer be used for recording SAR activities unless it was used as a supplemental form for subsequent law enforcement action relative to an SAR incident.

Basically, both systems have the capability of providing necessary and useful data. It is doubtful, however, that they are being utilized to the extent possible, therefore, giving the Service a less than full picture of the extent of SAR activity actually engaged in, as well as costs incurred. The need for good reporting and recording needs to be stressed at all levels (WASO, Region and Park). It is possible that some revision may be needed to one or both mentioned systems and/or forms. This you can better assess from the comments submitted by the field areas.

One report to completely replace the four or five now in use would be helpful. For the Incident Reporting System to work, it needs to be revamped. Also, specific guidelines are needed as to what is and isn't reportable -- i.e., those involving overtime or added cost for equipment, personal injury, expected tort claims, etc.

Present system gives us very little useful data. The annual SAR report provides totals, but for what? The codes for the Incident Reporting System (as pertaining to SAR) are useless.

The whole objective of a reporting system should be to give you information that can be used to improve the situation. Our existing system is not oriented toward prevention at all. Nor is it possible to get any accurate reflection of costs.

COMMENTS: Reporting System (continued)

If SAR forms are the annual summary, then it needs to be revised. We do locally by including more detailed location and injury description.

Basic data is provided, but the form does not remind one to include certain details helpful in accident analysis. In reviewing the 10-343, I have sometimes found the cause of the accident not recorded.

How in the hell could a form made up in Washington, mostly by the Park Police, serve any useful purpose for SAR data?

I know how to fill out the form we now use in Yosemite, but I haven't been here long enough to determine if the data on the form can be easily recalled and put to good use.

Yosemite has maybe 130 operations a year. Some of them big, some of them small. What we consider small now would probably be big in many other areas. To do the Servicewide Incident Report Form, a DI-134 (when necessary) and the SAR form is way too much paper for a minor carry out for a minor injury, etc. Having utilized the Incident Report before to gather information about vehicle accidents and seeing that it was off by over 20%, I don't believe the Incident form is of too much value. I would be curious to see the Servicewide SAR forms. We have been using, unfortunately, the AAC Mtn. Rescue form which is of course totally inadequate or not useable for what we need.

The Yosemite form, which seems to be somewhat adequate for our needs, is presently being reworked.

COMMENTS: Communications

Because the incidence of SAR actions are so few, it would help to hear what SAR training and actions, as well as new theories and ideas, are recurring in other areas.

Really, what is needed is a Service "Ranger" periodical covering all aspects of protection work, ie. SAR, Law Enforcement, EMT, Backcountry Management, etc. Similar to the Interpreters periodical. If there is general agreement, I would be willing to volunteer to get something like this going on a semi-annual or quarterly basis.

Local SAR people should be evaluated by NPS for future use. Remaining current is difficult in a large land mass area with a low incidence rate. It is difficult to keep abreast of new developments unless there is deep interest and recreational use.

- #1 Except possibly NPS policies on certain details.
- #2 Somewhat, but probably not worth the expense.

I would like to see available resources directed to specific areas and individuals in need of information and skill building rather than a broadcast dissemination of information.

For people who are deeply interested and climb for their own interest and recreation, there are probably publications, seminars, etc., that do the job. For those of us who are not recreational climbers, do not live in a climbing park and may only be involved in one or two SAR incidents a year, it is difficult to stay abreast of new developments.

- #1 The means are probably available, but the time to take advantage of them is limited.
 - #2 Even better would be local (regional?) SAR conferences or training sessions to get more interpark interactions.
-

COMMENTS: Communications (continued)

#2 would have been a good idea 10 years ago, but there is not alot of commercial data published periodically in trade and sports magazines.

#2 Perhaps; however, we are already overloaded with things to read - it is impossible to keep up with the load now.

All NCR parks should subscribe to the NASAR publications and then become involved in local SAR organizations, making an effort to keep themselves current. If parks would identify SAR skill areas where training is needed, such could be pursued on a regional basis. WASO and regional offices should mutually share their knowledge of new SAR techniques, equipment, and training opportunities. Perhaps the best way to do this is through a Servicewide SAR publication, and this we fully support.

I do not believe that adequate means for keeping current in the latest SAR equipment, techniques, or training is available. I believe that one training session should be developed annually for the leaders of rescue efforts in the National Park Service.

I think that any information on new techniques, developments, or ways of doing things developed by people in SAR situations should be communicated to the field. Rescues come in all shapes and sizes, in all kinds of weather, and on all types of terrain. Getting information around can be useful. But it shouldn't be limited to Servicewide developments only. There are many, many volunteer groups nationwide involved in some serious rescues and they have some very useful information. If there could also be a way to contact them on a periodic basis through their magazines, etc. to glean new ideas it could be helpful.

In order to save paper and printing it might be best to publish such items to the field only on an annual basis. Areas could have a submission deadline and a general newsletter or memo could be put together for dissemination.

COMMENTS: Communications (continued)

#2 An annual publication not only addresssing SAR developments, but listing new publications, techniques, etc., would be useful and I'm sure well received by persons responsible for and engaged in SAR activities. This idea certainly has possibilities and deserves consideration.

Keeping current is, for the most part, being actively involved. Also needed, are the means to achieve full team capabilities. This calls for sharing of techniques and experience.

I feel we need some type of publication to communicate RM and VP information. Something similar to "In Touch." I don't believe it needs to be done by the "government" - perhaps it could be successful if done by "Ranger Association" - on a subscription basis. Anyhow, something is needed to provide a forum and a means of sharing information, in an "un" or "semi-official" way.

#1 Definitely not. I have never heard of any effort being made to keep all SAR people informed as to new techniques or new equipment. Because of our need for this information and the lack of in-service communications, I recently used personal funds and annual leave time to visit Yosemite, Grand Teton, and Rocky Mountain National Parks to talk with their rescue personnel and acquaint myself with the rescue techniques which they are using. It was a highly profitable trip. Speaking from experience, I can say that there is much to be gained from this kind of communication. After I returned, I wrote to Jim Brady, Training Specialist, and suggested that the Albright Training Center sponsor an annual workshop for SAR specialists (a copy of the letter attached).

#2 Not only would a periodic publication be helpful, but there is also a need for an up-to-date SAR manual designed around the needs of the Park Ranger. There is much information in this field, but it is widely scattered. In response to this need, I began, last spring, preperation of a manuscript entitled "Search and Rescue for Park Rangers." When completed, I intend it to be the most complete, authoritative, and up-to-date publication on the market.

Item #2 would be very helpful for Servicewide activity information. There is a wealth of information within the Service which could be cross-communicated.

COMMENTS: Communications (continued)

We have mini-sessions (mostly hanging out and talking) that help me keep up on what's changing and what's new.

A good publication that wouldn't die out after the first six months would be good. Maybe this could be part of the coordination from WASO and the regions.

I believe that with the multitude of organizations, publications, magazines, meetings, etc., that now exist throughout the nation, that another periodic publication on Servicewide SAR developments would not be useful. Only a few of the most interested people participate or read the articles now existing.

There is a need for the Service to realize that SAR, in many Parks, is the most visible of activities and one of the better P.R. things that we have. The 10-15 larger or more active service areas should develop or coordinate some technical mountain, rock, snow and ice training. Each area tends to become very defensive about what they do and how they do it with development coming from within. This is understandable but not necessarily healthy.

I believe it would be very interesting to WASO and Regional personnel just how dedicated the field people are in "digging" into the training opportunities, most of which they are not reimbursed for or have to get by methods not completely "Hoyle."

COMMENTS: Additional Areas of Concern

People with genuine interest in working in parks with SAR problems are often not in those positions while people without SAR in their background, and without the interest to be good in the field, are in jobs in parks with active SAR problems.

We need overhead teams for emergencies which train together.

The National Park Service needs to sit down and decide what they want the park ranger to do or be. I can now envision someone coming out with a required 40 hours of training for search and rescue. Then we will have a full month of training required for law enforcement, SAR, fire control, and safety. Add any additional recommended for improved report writing, SCUBA training, and you are soon out of time to do any work. All of this training is good and much of it is needed to keep sharp. But how much? It would appear that we could combine some of this and still have adequately trained crews. If the function is important, the person in Region and/or Washington will not have to depend upon defending his job with a 40-hour training course.

I believe that NCR has to establish itself as an area with SAR problems. Too often, we are the last people to get the training. Although we do not have the large land mass areas that they have out West, the people that visit our parks are much less equipped both mentally and physically to handle themselves. The possibility for injury and death is great. Therefore, we should be as well trained and equipped as the larger parks.

It would be beneficial if the cost of SAR activities could be covered much in the same way that fire costs are covered under special accounts with no cost to park operating funds. These special accounts would also provide funds from which external SAR organizations could be reimbursed for services rendered. If this requires legislative action, then it would be worthy of NPS pursuit, for it is a service that directly benefits the taxpayer, much in the same way that forest fire suppression aids the public. Of course, most SAR activities are more personalized in that it is special treatment required for certain people under exacting circumstances. Nevertheless, provision could be made for billing and securing payment from those individuals who willfully and knowingly violate park regulations, resulting in extensive and expensive SAR activities. Perhaps a monetary amount could be established (say \$1,000 or \$5,000), and if SAR costs exceeded this amount, then either the entire cost or that part above the stipulated amount would be charged to the offender. We believe this is a matter worthy of further discussion.

COMMENTS: Additional Areas of Concern (continued)

We were not aware that Form 10-199 was still in use. In a memo from WASO dated December 13, 1977 from Associate Director, Management and Operations, it was stated that forms 10-199, 10-199a, and 10-199b were being deleted. However, we still use 10-199b but no other forms. It would be helpful if WASO would clearly identify just what forms are to be used for report requirements in the future.

Although I have not actively participated in rescues for several years, I was, for a period of time, deeply involved in the technical rock rescue field. I was concerned at that time that there was no method for exchanging information on techniques and methods from area to area.

I do not believe that the situation is any better today; moreover, there has always been a percentage of our Rangers that have been reluctant to or have avoided opportunities to develop technical rescue skills. It appears that the percentage is increasing.

I have heard over the years from Rangers, "My interests are in this or that duty or skill, but not this or that duty or skill." My belief is that a Ranger should develop a degree of competency in every skill that he may be required to possess to the best of his ability, and should then not hesitate to utilize that skill.

Like so many other programs engaged in by the Service, the emphasis on SAR fluctuates considerably from one year to the next, particularly at the Washington and Regional levels. What is a hot item this year may not be a hot item next year. SAR is too much an important program to allow this to occur. When we are dealing with human safety and life, as we are on a daily basis in our parks, the SAR program deserves the Service's full support and commitment on a continuous year-in, year-out basis at all levels. There are few, if any, programs that can provide us the rewards this program is capable of doing.

Regarding the data sheet on costs, it is suggested that a line item be included to show the cost per hour of fixed wing aircraft. Also the cost of boat operation per hour.

COMMENTS: Additional Areas of Concern (continued)

I think a standardized SAR report form might have some value. Presently, we use the servicewide case-incident reporting system which is not of too much use in SAR incidents, plus the American Alpine Club accident report which is a fair report but a poor format. A duplication of effort may be avoided by coming up with a standard accident report form.
