



What is a super's job?



Superintendent Thomas F. Norris, Jr., on the job at Assateague Island National Seashore . . . observes blue crab picked up by youngsters on the beach . . .



. . . demonstrates floatation device for exhausted swimmers . . .

By Art Miller
Public Affairs Officer, MAR

You need a variety of talents to qualify as a superintendent in the park system. A "super" must be a super-ranger, executive, public speaker, personnel counselor, biologist, engineer, psychologist, ecologist, administrator, budget analyst, congressional liaison expert, lawyer, public relations practitioner—and an inspirational leader. Above all, he must be a good manager. He directs a staff of experts who handle the day-to-day operations of the park. Superintendent Thomas F. Norris, Jr., of Assateague Island National Seashore, is no exception.

To him such variety is challenging. "Not knowing exactly what's going to happen tomorrow keeps the job interesting," he says.

In the course of a midsummer's day in the park recently, for example, Tom Norris handled the following situations:

- Watched his chief ranger demonstrate a new all-terrain motor tricycle and determined that its low-pressure tires would do little harm to Assateague's broad beaches.
- Conferred with J.C. Appel, manager of the nearby Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, on the extent of swamp fever among the famous Chincoteague wild ponies.
- Evaluated the performance of a naturalist who had transferred to Assateague from another park.
- Checked to see how seashore campers had weathered a week of drenching downpour.
- Made a note to talk with his maintenance supervisor about a low spot in a dune line that could permit ocean water under storm conditions to sweep into one of the park's campgrounds.
- Sprayed the spark plugs and distributor cap of his carryall engine with paint thinner to evaporate water that had splashed up and stalled out the vehicle; engine started on the first try.
- Convincingly presented to a doubtful visitor the park's position that an area now used for overnight camping should become a day-use area.
- Arranged to send a condolence card to the wife of an ill employee.
- Complimented a park technician on his handling of last year's campsite reservation system.
- Evaluated the safety of a deteriorating boardwalk.
- Muddled over how to convert a former U.S. Coast Guard boat-house into an interpretive instruction center.
- Took an informal public opinion survey among visitors taking a canoe trip, a new park interpretive activity.
- Made an on-the-spot investigation of a beach area to evaluate a complaint that park rangers were not enforcing a regulation.
- Discussed a suggestion by his chief of interpretation that Assateague seek funds to buy several small sailboats and institute a new park activity.
- Checked progress on installation of air conditioning in a visitor center.
- While his chief lifeguard conducted, he observed a lifesaving drill.

"You might say that all of my past experience in the Park Service comes into use in this job," he mused. "It all adds up."

Every superintendent gets some tough questions," he concluded. "He needs to have the right answers."



... inspects a Chincoteague pony for insect bites ...



... adds paint-thinner to spark drowned engine ...



... replaces a slat in the fence to maintain sand dunes ...



... shares a moment with campers behind the dunes ...



... talks with ranger Malcolm Ross, Jr., on three-wheel motorcycle ...



... discusses channel-erosion with Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge Manager J.C. Appel

Preservationists Caucus

By Marcella Sherfy
Historian
Park Historic Preservation, WASO

A week after the April Bicentennial extravaganza in Concord, National Park Service historic preservationists convened in one of Boston's less reputable and aging hotels. However coincidental, there was a strange significance in that setting and in that timing.

The tasks that the preservationists came to discuss hold little of the public glamour of parades, presidents, and reenactments. And the issues involved in good preservation often seem as distasteful and complex as the management of a decrepit hotel. But the spirit of the meeting was neither disappointment nor defeat. Its success and accomplishment lay with a group of participants willing to labor over vital if unglamorous decisions, to treat with hope the involved and enormous task confronting them, and to undertake some strenuous self evaluation.

The 70 historians, architects, archeologists, and administrators who came to

Boston wrestled for 3 days with two basic issues: (1) How can those who are committed to preservation put their skills and programs to more efficient use, and (2) How can the Service more effectively recognize and meet its responsibilities for historic preservation. Individual speakers and panels led discussions on the purpose of research reports, the application of preservation policy and law, maintenance and preservation, the effects of park planning on preservation, and the best uses of professional skills available at the Denver Service Center. Several superintendents identified their preservation needs and suggested changes in existing programs. Representatives from the Southeast and Midwest Regions gave slide shows illustrating the magnitude of structural preservation problems in their areas.

Participants disagreed heatedly at times. The discussions revealed even more complex questions than those raised at first. But a shared sense of urgency drew from the group several strands of consensus. After explaining

and illustrating the emergency nature of preservation needs and the institutional biases that appear to work against solutions, the group proposed the creation of regional interdisciplinary preservation teams to render immediate help to parks with endangered historic structures. This proposed solution to short-term needs was balanced with a discussion of issues that will affect long-term success, including training, personnel regulations, activity standards, the distribution of responsibility, and the manner of planning and research. The group intends to come to specific terms with these additional issues in a second meeting next year that will be held at the invitation of the Southwest Regional Director in Santa Fe.

If a preservation meeting and preservation concerns took a backseat to pomp and pageantry this year, preservationists make a strong case for a reversal of those priorities in the future. Without the houses, monuments, forts, and artifacts they protect, the ceremonies have neither setting nor purpose.

They tell old stories and stay young



There have been licensed guides for hire at Gettysburg National Military Park, Pa. since 1915 and Ralph Butt, 77, left, is the only one remaining of the certified guide force established by the War Department in those days. Guy Wolf, right, a perky, 92, has been guiding visitors around the battlefield every summer since 1924. Guy still conducts automobile tours on a daily basis, and Ralph, says his bad hip slows him down hardly at all and his aluminum cane adds a touch of dignity. Ralph and Guy explain to Susan Shirar, 10, of Gratersford, Pa. and her sister, Michelle, 9, about one of the cannon located at Little Round Top at Gettysburg NMP.

Visitors glimpse pioneer life



Visitors to the Pioneer Yosemite History Center can catch glimpses of the early pioneer life of Yosemite National Park. In the late '50's and early '60's, nine historically significant structures were relocated from their original settings throughout the park to the center at Wawona. The structures represent important eras in the development of the national park idea at Yosemite. Among the structures are the old jail, a covered bridge, the Wells Fargo building, Crane Flat Ranger Cabin, a homesteader's cabin, and the old schoolhouse. Now living-history demonstrations are conducted at the center and visitors can ride a stage coach, watch a blacksmith ply his trade, or talk over the "current events" of 1914 with a ranger's wife. Turn-of-the-century artists and photographers also play an important role in portraying the wonders of Yosemite to visitors.

Getting your pay to the bank the easiest, safest way

By Herman Nelson
Systems Accountant
Division of Finance, WASO

A recent memo to NPS employees stirred indignation among many not familiar with "composite checking." The intent of this article is to fully explain this method, and alternate methods, of handling your paycheck.

Recent developments make the composite option more attractive than before. But, of course, the decision remains with each employee as to how his or her check is delivered.

Ten years have elapsed since the law gave Government personnel the option of receiving net pay by direct credit to accounts in banks or other financial institutions. The extent of NPS participation has been relatively minor, most Service employees preferring to use the older methods of designating agents or having checks mailed to their homes.

Now a relatively new dimension, a "guarantee provision," gives those participating in composite checking assurance that their accounts will be credited on payday, without fail, regardless of what might happen to the composite check. This, if it is understood, should motivate greater voluntary participation.

How does composite checking work? When an employee has a checking account, and elects (simply by submitting a completed SF-1189 to his payroll office) to have net pay credited to his or her account, the pay is combined with that of all other NPS employees with checking accounts at the same financial institution into a single "composite" check. Prior to receiving this from Treasury, the financial institution has received a summary listing which details deposits to be made by name, account number, and net pay, and which totals

the amount of the composite check. The listing and the composite check are mailed from different places at different times. Loss or delay of either one does not stop pay being credited.

How does the guarantee provision work? Each financial institution has entered into an agreement with Treasury, guaranteeing that the accounts of all participating personnel will be credited on the established payday, regardless of what may happen to the composite check. In the event the summary listing is misplaced, the institution calls the sender to determine deposits to be made.

Optional Methods

Paychecks mailed to employee's home address. The ever-present hazards of receiving checks by the mails are well known. They include late delivery, incorrect addresses, and checks lost or stolen before or after you get them.

Paychecks distributed by a designated agent. This method of distributing pay is becoming so impractical that many agencies no longer make it available. Individual checks must be sent by Treasury to designated agents in regional or field payroll offices. If the mail is on time and if the check is mailed to the right office, the designated agent must then find the employee and deliver the check. Employees out on payday must make arrangements for depositing, holding or otherwise disposing of their checks.

Questions Frequently Asked

There are many misconceptions about having your pay sent directly to the bank. Some of them are:

Fiction. Some employees feel composite checking is an attempt to "totally automate their lives."

Fact. The paycheck they receive directly from Treasury is also automated; it arrives "untouched by human hands,"

but without the safety features of composite checking.

Fiction. The often-heard cry from many employees on any new program has been heard on composite checking "Another threatening edict from WASO, coercing me against my will."

Fact. All three options for receiving net pay remain available for free choice.

Fiction. Employees "want to know where their money is," and "want to have operating cash."

Fact. Composite checking assures the employee where his money is, and cash may be drawn from an account at any time.

Fiction. Employees avoid composite checking "because I need to know the amount of my paycheck on payday."

Fact. A participant who anticipates a significant change in net pay and has not received the earnings statement by payday can always contact the regional DIPS Office or the bank to determine the amount deposited.

Advantages Are Substantial

Restated in brief, some advantages of composite checking are:

1. Net pay, under the guarantee provision, is *always* available to the employee on payday.
2. The participating employee draws cash, transfers funds to savings, etc. at his or her convenience. Standing in line, rain or shine, every payday, is not necessary.
3. The savings (in material and time) to the Government and to participants are significant.
4. The possibility of paycheck loss or theft is eliminated.

Ask your fellow employees who use composite checking how they like it. Then, if you are convinced, pick up an SF-1189 and proceed in your own self-interest.

Dialogue on recreational area category

Congressman's query; Director's response



Point Reyes NS, California

Recently, Congressman Philip E. Ruppe of Michigan wrote Assistant Secretary Reed about the categorization of all NPS areas as natural, historical and recreational, especially expressing concern about the effect of the recreational designation on natural values. To apprise Service personnel of current thinking on this significant subject, the Newsletter is printing Mr. Ruppe's letter and Director Everhardt's reply.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This letter is to follow up on a matter briefly discussed at the hearings of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation on the proposed expansion of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore held on May 9, 1975.

The subject of concern is that of the categorization for management purposes of all areas of the national park system as either natural, historical or recreational. You mentioned that you, too, are concerned about the current propriety of this approach, and that the matter is under review. It is my understanding that this concern has been fairly widely discussed for some time, and I therefore hope that its disposition might be resolved reasonably soon.

I have several observations and questions which I would appreciate your comments on. This letter and your response will be made a part of the hearing record.

1. Under what legal authority have you developed or implemented this categorization of all units of the national park system (I note that the definitions for these categories are published in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 36, Part 1, Section 1.2)? What is the date of the implementation of this concept?

2. I can appreciate the logic of this categorization if there is sufficient common denominator of legislative and management directive to so warrant. In the recreational category particularly, however, it appears that some of the natural value preservation mandates in the authorizing legislation of various park units often override the recreational mandates to such degree as to prompt strong questioning of the propriety of the recreational designation. The natural features at many of the lakeshores and seashores were primary reasons for the areas' identification and establishment, and while recreational use may be recognized as a strongly important complementary use, the nature of the resources at these areas often cannot support massive recreational impact and development. Places like Cumberland Island, Point Reyes, Cape Lookout, and even parts of Indiana Dunes are examples. On the other hand, parts of many recreation areas and nearly all of some others—particularly the water impoundment areas—can and were apparently intended to support and be dedicated to relatively high volume recreational use as a principal activity.

It concerns me however, to see that automatically, by *advance* administrative determination as directed through the Code of Federal Regulations definitions, all areas already and hereafter established as national seashores, national lakeshores, national scenic riverways, national *wild* rivers, and national recreation areas, may quite categorically be managed in such way as to put emphasis primarily on recreation at the possible expense of jeopardy to natural values.

The language of the laws authorizing such areas as Canaveral National Seashore, Big Cypress National Preserve, Big Thicket National Preserve and Cape Lookout National Seashore (as amended), seems implicitly clear that these areas, if categorized, should fall into the natural category. Yet the Code definitions would not permit this in the case of the seashores, and it is not clear as to where the new item of national preserve would fit into the Code definitions. Why should all newly authorized park system units which are located on seashores and lakeshores be seemingly automatically categorized for management purposes as recreational areas? Will you please comment on all of this, and specifically advise the Subcommittee as to the current administrative categorization for the last four areas mentioned.

3. As units of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System may be added to the national park system for management in the future, would a river segment designated as *wild* (as contrasted to the

alternatives of scenic or recreational) be thrown into the recreational management category as the Code definitions state? If so, what is the rationale?

4. I note that your newly drafted proposed National Park Service Administrative Policies de-emphasize the differences in these three categories somewhat, yet the distinctions among the three are still there, as are the Code definitions, and at times remain quite important in governing the management of the areas. The policies for such activities related to consumptive resource use, grazing, hunting, fishing, disposition of exotic life forms, special recreational events, and utility rights-of-way, for example, could become mischievous, confusing and outright conflicting when applied to many of the park units now categorized as recreational areas. Again, if the general applicability of these policies to the areas is not generally dependable, it would raise the question as to the value of such categorization. Have you reviewed the laws and legislative histories of all the areas currently embraced by the recreation area category to compare the congruence of the category and its management policies with the legislative mandates for the specific areas?

5. What process do you have in mind or underway for the review of this situation? Will public input be solicited? When will the review be completed and your recommendations be made available?

I recognize that there are detailed considerations that must be appraised in the review of this matter, and therefore I am not requesting or expecting that you supply any final answers in response to this inquiry. To the extent which you can, however, I would appreciate your comments on the points I have raised in this letter.

I am sure that the members of this Subcommittee will be interested in the final resolution that you may propose on this matter, since it impinges so directly upon the legislative actions of this Committee in the authorization of new units of the national park system. In that regard, in your response to this letter I would appreciate your identification of a target date by which time the Subcommittee might expect to receive the results of the review which you stated is now underway.

Sincerely,

PHILIP E. RUPPE
Member of Congress

Dear Mr. Ruppe:

On behalf of Assistant Secretary Reed, thank you for your letter regarding the recreation category of units of the National Park System. We can respond to many of the concerns you posed in the second item of your letter by saying



Cumberland Island NS, Georgia



Cape Lookout NS, North Carolina

that we share them. We would like to discuss with you how the management categories came into being and what we have done about them recently. In so doing, we will respond to your questions in the sequence in which you posed them.

1. *Legal Authority for the Category*

There is no explicit legal categorization of parks as recreational, except the 10 areas that have been officially named as national recreation areas by the Congress. There are, however, implications that may be drawn from the legislative record by which one can deduce that three categories exist. This is, in fact, how the categories were developed in 1963 when the Recreation Advisory Council issued its Circular No. 1 defining the "recreation area" category (copy enclosed).

On July 10, 1964, former Secretary Udall sent a memorandum to the Director of the National Park Service which officially set up the three categories within the National Park System (copy enclosed). Over the next few years, this directive was followed by

separate policy books for each category. The Information then published in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) defined the contents of each category.

2. *The Common Denominator*

Item 1 above lists the record of the official documents treating the subject. It does not, however, provide adequate background to understand how the recreation area category came into being to begin with. To understand this requires a brief historical perspective on the legislation for the recreation category.

Legislatively, the term "recreational area" appears in the Park, Parkway and Recreation Area Act of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1894). This act authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive study of the park, parkway, and recreational area programs of the United States to provide data helpful in developing a nationwide plan for coordinated and adequate public park, parkway, and recreational area facilities.

The first National Park System area to carry the words "recreational area" in its title was Cape Hatteras. The Act



Big Cypress National Preserve, Florida



Indiana Dunes NLS, Indiana

of August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 669), authorized the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. However, the Act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 702), amended the Act of August 17, 1937, by changing the name to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area and provided for hunting within the boundaries of the seashore.

The Cape Hatteras Act, as amended, provides the precedent for legislation regarding many, but not all, areas now included in the recreation area category. This pattern relates to the legislatively sanctioned continuation of certain special uses within the boundaries of the area, uses that are generally inappropriate to a natural area or national park. The Cape Hatteras legislation specifically allows:

- a number of villages to remain within the exterior boundaries free of acquisition,
- commercial fishing in seashore waters by residents of these villages,

- hunting on the sound within the seashore boundaries and on not more than 2,000 acres of land.

However, the ambiguity that has plagued the recreation category is apparent in Section 4 of the Cape Hatteras authorizing legislation. It states:

"Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreation uses*** which shall be developed for such uses as needed, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and no development*** for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in this area***."

Finally, the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge was included within the exterior boundaries of the seashore and administered for recreational uses not inconsistent with refuge purposes of wildlife management and protection.

These several provisions of the Cape

Hatteras legislation established a precedent that was to appear in one form or another in most national seashore, lakeshore, and recreation area legislation.

In reality, these provisions have very little to do with recreation. Rather, they permit—in modified form—the continuation of certain special uses that were well established before the land, which was usually privately owned, was acquired for park and recreation purposes. These were uses the Service did not wish to permit in natural areas. Hence, in effect, the recreation area category was established to include those areas with uses generally inappropriate in natural areas. However, most legislation for parks in the recreation area category contains provisions which protect natural and historic features as fully as if they were in the natural or historical category.

For your further information, we are enclosing a table developed from legislation for parks in the recreation area category that reflects various kinds of special uses mentioned above for Cape Hatteras, as well as those provisions specifying recreation and the protection of natural or historic values.

There is no doubt that the natural features of the national seashores and national lakeshores were a primary reason for their identification and establishment. It is also true that many reservoir recreation areas have important natural (and historic) features that should be protected. It is fair to say again at this juncture that it is the special uses contained in the legislation that set recreation areas aside from most natural areas, not the somewhat inappropriate term "recreation area category." We intend to amend out of existence statements such as those in the CFR, 1.2.(1), which state that parks in the recreation area category are "administered primarily for the purpose of public recreation." The statement is no more true of many parks in this category than for parks in the natural and historical areas.

Not all newly authorized areas in the System located on seashores and lakeshores need to be designated by the Congress as national lakeshores, national seashores, or natural recreation areas. Biscayne National Monument (1968) is an example of one that was not so classified, nor were the Virgin Islands National Park (1956), and Buck Island Reef National Monument (1961).

Cape Canaveral and Cape Lookout National Seashores are in the recreation area category, while Big Thicket and Big Cypress National Preserves are classified as natural areas. There is an obvious inconsistency here as it relates to hunting, which is allowed in the preserves, and certain other special resource uses such as exploration and extraction of oil and gas and other minerals, grazing, and agriculture, uses which are not ordinarily allowed in natural areas. Nonetheless, these areas were established to preserve significant ecosystems and not primarily to meet "recreation needs." However, this is an obvious case of an existing categoriza-



Big Thicket National Preserve, Texas

tion not adequately fitting evolving concepts of land use.

3. *Wild Rivers*

Changes in the CFR will make it clear that wild rivers will not be in the recreation area category. At present, the Service does not administer any wild rivers.

4. *Management Policies and Legislative Review*

We are enclosing those portions of the Service's revised management policies dealing with the recreation category. These policies were prepared with many of the same concerns in mind that are contained in your letter.

Through land use zoning and consistent with area legislation, lands and waters in all units of the System are classified and managed to perpetuate the inherent qualities of the resources and to provide for appropriate uses. Through land classification, developed as part of the planning process for each park, we can identify and provide ade-

quate protection to the natural and historic values of all parks. Thus land classification is, in many instances, tied directly to policy, requiring managers to manage parklands in a consistent and unified manner throughout the System, regardless of management category. We believe that the specific policies you mention relating to special uses in the recreation area category have been carefully worded to avoid inappropriate application to any unit in the recreation area category. These policies are consistent with the laws for these areas, which were reviewed during the process of revising the policies.

5. *Review of the Situation*

We believe that we have made an adequate review of the situation during the process of revising the management policies for the National Park Service. This policy review provided for public input. While not a perfect solution, we believe the present approach meets the major objections that have been voiced

from time to time by:

- having one policy book for all units of the National Park System;
- classifying all parklands for management purposes through the planning process (which includes public involvement); and
- revising policies extensively to play down the categories while recognizing the special uses inherent in the recreation area category.

We believe the approach we are now using has clarified the matter and should relieve most of the past problems with the category. We appreciate having had the opportunity to discuss this important matter with you and welcome further comments on the subject.

Sincerely yours,

GARY EVERHARDT
Director

Who's minding your P's and Q's?

By Jane Nettle Harvey
Writer-Editor
Southwest Regional Office

Scattered into the far reaches and ensconced in the most unlikely corners of the National Park Service is a coterie of rather obscure verbal specialists known variously as "writer-editor," "editor," "editor-writer," and by just about any other bureaucratic title you might name.

Perhaps you've noticed that knitted-browed, preoccupied soul over in the corner, barely visible above stacks of dictionaries, thesauruses, and manuscripts, anxiously eating blue pencils. That's probably one of us. We're not flashy. We mostly work behind the scenes, involving ourselves in the business of making your good words better. Direct kudos are not our destiny. We rarely get bylines. An occasional memo routed down the line saying something like "Thanks to the person who wrote . . .," or "Whoever prepared this plan deserves . . .," keeps us sparking. Our rewards are mostly interior and personal—but nonetheless satisfying to the soul.

How do we writer-editors fit into the grand scheme of the National Park Service? It seems to me that the days when American people knew the National Park Service solely through direct and personal contact at campfire talks and nature walks are gone. More and more, the Service is known by, and increasingly visible to, all of America—more and more we are spotlighted in the Nation's press and on television—more and more we are the focus of Congressional hearings and public meetings—

and more and more we are known by, and evaluated on the basis of, what we say, and how we say it on paper. This is where we writer-editors fit in.

It is our business to help the voice of the National Park Service—the voice of our parks, our park planning, our historical preservation, our public information, our scientific research, our management concerns, our preservation goals, our public involvement—come through loud and clear, and as comprehensibly and effectively as possible. Plain and simple: Words, well chosen and well used, expedite the accomplishment of our preservation and use goals as nothing else can.

To be more specific: It is our peculiar preoccupation to ensure that every National Park Service manuscript that crosses our desks (be it park master plan, press release, management statement, archeological report, environmental statement, historic structures report, park minifolder) is carefully and sensitively adjusted (on both substantive and mechanical levels) to achieve the highest possible level of comprehensibility, conciseness, and effectiveness, as well as mechanical correctness and consistency. And, underlying these objectives, our unspoken code of ethics insists that we dedicate ourselves to preserving at all times the integrity of your—the author's—ideas and personal writing style.

I'm a writer-editor, to be found lurking about the various offices of the Division of Professional Services of the Southwest Regional Office in Santa Fe. (You probably know similar types in various WASO offices, at HEC, at DSC, at other regional offices, at the science center, and in the parks.) I've been associated

with several offices during my 8-year NPS career, and I find writing-editing at the regional-office level to be particularly diverse and challenging. Here at SWRO, I function primarily as an editor—but sometimes (which I fancy to be my finest moments) I am called upon to write from scratch. One day you might find me integrating changes from everywhere into the Bandelier master plan; another, breathing continuity into a technical underwater-archeology manuscript; another, listening hard at a public workshop at Alibates to responses to a management statement I had written; another, shortening and snappifying a handout for Attwater Prairie Chicken National Wildlife Refuge; and yet another, compiling and organizing the regional director's annual report to the Director.

How do Park people arrive at writing-editing? After all, there's no academic preparation for the field. Indeed, the paths are numerous—and often strange. I've personally known professional writer-editors emanating from professions and vocations as unlikely-sounding as theology, history, architecture, land management, archeology, musicology, and real estate. Mostly, writer-editors wander in from professional specializations (mine was archeology), after discovering a long the way that the wide world of words interests them more than other fields. We are usually in it because we love words.

Words fascinate! We believe in their power. We understand the importance of their correct and effective presentation. We derive a very special satisfaction and joy from choosing and fashioning words so that they *work*.

Standing room only

There's standing-room only on the Grand Canyon National Park tram system which carried 432,697 passengers during the month of June. Introduced last year, the propane-powered trams have significantly reduced traffic and pollution around the crowded West Rim Drive, Grand Canyon Village and the East Rim feeder route. The system employs a total of 12 mini-buses with a seating capacity of 28 persons and 17 trailers designed to seat 33. With visits up 50 percent since last year, the system is carrying 70 percent more riders, according to park transportation services officer, Marty Anderson. Grand Canyon is one of 13 park areas providing some sort of alternative transportation system.



Songs for sore feet



Visitors to the Nation's Capital, especially in the hot summer months, have to wait in many lines to see such sights as the White House, Washington Monument, and the U.S. Capitol. They get hot, tired, and bored. Now, they are being entertained while they wait. The Strolling Troubadours, an ensemble of professional artists, use song, dance, mime and improvisation and Early American music, reflecting history and heritage, folklore and historic characters of the U.S., to help the weary visitor forget about his tired feet. The program is sponsored by NPS and the National Endowment for the Arts. Come Bicentennial time, the troubadours should have a huge, appreciative and captive audience.

Mayor transfers land



Some 91.5 acres of choice ocean-front property in San Francisco was recently transferred to the Park Service in part of the Federal land acquisition program to make Golden Gate National Recreation Area. Mayor Joseph Alioto, right, transferred the land to Golden Gate Superintendent Bill Whalen. This was the first of several city land transfers to the Government. Golden Gate will encompass more than 34,000 acres of park, beaches and open space acquired from State, city, military and private holdings.

Changes for training booklet

The following corrections should be made in the FY'76 Training Opportunities Booklet:

- 1) On page 25—**ECOLOGICAL FACTORS IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**, the dates **should be** September 22-26, at Rocky Mountain National Park, and April 19-23, at a park to be announced.
- 2) On page 28—**BASIC SCUBA AND DIVE MASTERS**, the course date **should be only** September 8-19. Delete the January course.
- 3) On page 33—**ROAD MAINTENANCE**, the Albright session **should be** January 26-30.
- 4) The Albright Training Center telephone number **should be** (602) 638-2691.
- 5) On page 15—the program code for **ADMINISTRATION:INTRODUCTION** **should be** 4816.
- 6) On page 44—add Jim Simon, Training Officer, WASO Personnel, Room 2320, Main Interior, (202) 343-2301.

PEOPLE ON THE MOVE

New Faces:

ALLEN, Thomas E., to Park Aid, LBJ, NHS
 AULL, Nancy A., to Clerk-Typist, Fort McHenry NM & HS
 CLARKE, Catherine, to Occupational Health Nurse, Kennedy Center Support Group
 GODFREY, William R., to Accountant, Imm Off Assoc Reg Dir Admin, SERO
 HIPPS, Joseph G., to Assist Program Mgr, YCC, WASO
 HUGHES, Debra A., to Payroll Clerk, Finance Div, PNRO
 JOHNSTON, Linda K., to Clerk, Yellowstone NP
 ROSEN, Aileen L., to Program Review Assist, Finance Div, MARO

New Places:

BARCLAY, Virginia F., Clerk, Imm Off Chief Lands, NARO, to Sec, Big Cypress Lands Office
 BELLAK, Jo Ann M., Realty Spec, Assoc Dir Coop Act, NCP, to Same, Land Acquisition Div, WASO
 BIBBO, John L., Appraiser, Imm Off Chief Lands, NARO, to Same, Big Cypress Lands Office
 BROWN, William E., Supv Historian, Assoc Reg Dir Prof Serv, SWRO, to Historian, Alasa State Director
 BURCHARD, Duncan R., Supv Park Ranger, Colorado West Group, to Park Ranger, Colorado West Group
 BURCHILL, John J., Legal Assist, Imm Office Chief Lands, NARO, to Same, Big Cypress Lands Office
 CASTELLINA, Anne D., Park Ranger, De Soto NM, to Same, Gulf Islands NS
 CLEARY, Raymond J., Appraiser, Imm Office Chief Lands, NARO, to Supv Appraiser, Big Cypress Lands Office
 DAUGHERTY, Rex E., Appraiser, Assoc Reg Dir Prof Serv, PNRO, to Same, Big Cypress Lands Office
 DAVIDSON, George E., Jr., Park Ranger, Herbert Hoover NHS, to Public Info Spec, SERO
 EVISON, Quincy B., Park Mgr, Branch Training & Devel, WASO, to Same, Great Smoky Mountains NP
 FARRELL, Daniel J., Realty Spec, Minute Man Lands Office, to Supv Realty Spec, Big Cypress Lands Office
 FLEEGLER, Charles R., Realty Spec, Land Acquisition Ofc, Frederick, to Same, Imm Off Assoc Reg Dir Prof Serv, SERO
 FOREMAN, William C. Jr., Supv Park Ranger, Zion NP, to Same, Yellowstone NP
 HARMAN, Michael M., Park Tech, Area One, NCP, to Same, Div Visitor Services, NCP

HARTMAN, David C., Maintenance Worker, Metro Dist, NCP, to Same, Div Maintenance, NCP
 HASTINGS, Philip B., Supv Park Ranger, Mammoth Cave NP, to Same, Shenandoah NP
 HENDERSON, Warren D., Landscape Architect, Southern Arizona Group, to Same, Assoc Reg Dir Prof Services, WRO
 JACKSON, Leonard D., Admin Office, Branch Roads & Trails, NCP, to EEO Spec, NCP
 JOHNSON, Charles R., Realty Spec, Duluth Lands Ofc, to Same, Indiana Dunes Lands Ofc
 KEELER, Marilyn A., Admin Office, Redwood NP, to Same, Petrified Forest NP
 LANDSDALE, John E., Realty Spec, Yosemite NP, to Same, Big Cypress Lands Office
 LEISHMAN, Wesley D., Park Ranger, Grand Canyon NP, to Supv Park Ranger, Virgin Islands NP
 LEUTERMAN, Arthur J., Legal Assist, Imm Off Chief Lands, NARO, to Supv Legal Assist, Big Cypress Lands Ofc
 LOTT, Carolyn L., Park Tech, Div Interp Rec & Resource Mgt, NCP, to EEO Spec, NCP
 MACK, Barbara L., Sec, Land Acquisition Div, WASO, to Program Clerk, Land Acquisition Div, WASO
 MARTIN, Ronald Leroy, Maintenance, Lake Mead NRA, to Park Tech, Glen Canyon NRA
 McCLARNON, Gerald T., Admin Clerk, Glacier NP, to Same, Yellowstone NP
 NEWMAN, T. Stell, Historian, Deputy Assoc Mgr, DSC, to Same, Alaska State Director
 RICHTER, Janice M., Sec, Minute Man NHP, to Same, NARO
 ROOT, Ralph R., Geologist, Deputy Assoc Mgr, DSC, to Park Ranger, Alaska State Director
 SANBORN, Roy M., Supv Park Ranger, Sequoia NP, to Park Ranger, Alaska State Director
 SMITH, Patricia S., Admin Serv Assist, Gulf Islands NS, to Same, Canaveral NS
 SMITH, Samuel O., Motor Vehicle Oper, Grand Canyon, to Maintenance, Lake Mead NRA
 SOPER, G. Gilbert, Supv Park Ranger, Hawaii Volcanoes NP, to Training Instructor, Assoc Reg Dir Admin, NARO
 STONDALL, Edward N., Civil Engineer, Branch Prof Serv Contracts, DSC, to Same, Alaska State Dir
 THODE, Ralph H. Jr., Sergeant, Special Operations Force, NCP, to Same, US Park Police
 TRUESDELL, William G., Supv Park Ranger, Dinosaur NM, to Same, Mount McKinley NP
 WOOD, Robert J., Park Tech, NCP, to Same, Zion NP

Out of the Traces:

ALSOP, Alexander M., Private, US Park Police

BARG, Calvin A., Private, US Park Police
 BARNARD, Lawrence C., Civil Engineer Tech, Natchez Trace Pkwy
 BOYD, Gayleen M., Clerk-Typist, Div Museum Services
 BRITO, Patrick R., Legal Assist, Assoc Reg Dir Prof Serv, PNRO
 BROWN, Wesley A., III, Laborer, Sitka NHP
 CARE, Marie A., Janitor, Hopewell Village NHS
 CAULDER, Ann, Accounting Tech, Finance, MARO
 CRACK, Richard N., Construction Representative, Assoc Dir Coop Act, NCP
 CRIST, James B. Jr., Gardener, Area II, NCP
 DUNN, Dawn E., Prop Mgmt Assist, WRO
 ELLIS, Vincent, Park Mgr, Great Smokies NP
 GENTILE, Janet T., Personnel Clerk, Personnel, MARO
 HAWKINS, Bruce A., Park Tech, Everglades NP
 HOLOAWAY, Darrell C., Maintenance Helper, Golden Gate NRA
 HOUGH, Floyd Paul, Program & Budget Ofc, NCP
 JONES, Donald C., Supply Clerk, Redwood NP
 KALBACHER, Frank A., Private, US Park Police
 LARSON, Lesley A., Clerk-Typist, NARO
 LILES, Granville B., Park Mgr, Blue Ridge Pkwy
 LOGSDON, Louie A., Park Tech, Mammoth Cave NP
 NEISWANDER, Bonnie A., Sec, Yellowstone NP
 O'CONNOR, Patrick T., Heavy Mobile Equipm't Mechanic, Mount McKinley NP
 PETERSON, Susan J., Sec, Surveys Div, DSC
 PHILLIPS, Barbara A., Realty-Clerk, Assoc Reg Dir Park System Mgmt, MWRO
 PIERCE, Barbara D., Clerk-Typist, US Park Police
 PRESCOTT, Irene G., Park Aid, Capulin Mountain NM
 PROULX, Donald J., Assoc Dir, Admin, NCP
 RAY, Richard G., Buildings & Utilities Maintenance Foreman, Mount McKinley NP
 ROBINSON, Claude S., Maintenance Worker Foreman, Blue Ridge Pkwy
 RUNDBERG, Per E., Architect, Prof Support Div, DSC
 SCHMITT, John H., Private, US Park Police
 SILBERHOLZ, Joseph C., Engineering Tech, Independence NHP
 SILVERS, Bette Lou, Clerk, Colonial NHP
 VOLZ, J. Leonard, Park Mgr, Midwest Region
 WATSON, Arlene S., Clerk, PNRO
 WOOD, Paul W., Maintenance Worker, Natchez Trace Pkwy
 YAMBOR, Ellen L., Program Analyst, Program & Budget, MWRO
 ZBEL, Eva G., Sec, Div Maintenance, NCP

New Places:

BANKS, Fred, Jr., Park Tech, Area I, NCP, to Same, C&O Canal NHP
 BASYE, F. Melina, Clerk-Typist, Fort Vancouver NHS to Clerk-Steno, Grand Teton NP
 BRUGGE, David M., Anthropologist, Navajo Lands Group, to Same, Assoc Reg Dir Park System Mgmt, SWRO
 BUSTILLOS, Pamela M., Personnel Clerk, Grand Canyon NP, to Personnel Assist, Mesa Verde NP
 CARRICO, James W., Park Mgr, Great Sand Dunes NM, to Park Ranger, Branch Personnel Operations, WASO
 COLEMAN, James Jr., Park Mgr, Morristown NHP, to Supv Park Ranger, Branch Training & Devel, WASO
 CROSSE, Juin A., Procurem't & Prop Sec, WASO, to Admin Ofc, Redwood NP
 DESKINS, Robert L., Park Mgr, Mammoth Cave NP, to Same, Chickamauga & Chattanooga NMP
 DUGAN, John J., Park Tech, Morristown NHP, to Same, Fort Sumter NM
 ELIAS, Elodia H., Park Tech, Fort Caroline NM, to Personnel Clerk, Big Bend NP
 FOLLOWS, Donald S., Interpretive Planner, Deputy Assoc Mgr, DSC, to Park Ranger, Alaska State Director
 GRAY, William G., Park Mgr, Saugus Iron Works NHS, to Same, Saratoga NHP
 GUITON, Donald K., Park Mgr, Chickamauga & Chattanooga NMP, to Same, Canaveral NS
 HAKEL, Larry L., Park Mgr, Petersburg NB, to Supv Park Ranger, Shenandoah NP
 HALL, William H., Clerk, Blue Ridge Pkwy, to Park Tech, Blue Ridge Pkwy
 HANSEN, Thomas O., Park Tech, Dinosaur NM, to Park Ranger, Glen Canyon NRA
 HARVELL, Allen R., Account Tech, Finance Div, MARO, to Procurem't Agent, MARO
 HIGHBARGER, Evelyn L., Admin Clerk, Land Acquisition Office, NCP, to Purchasing Agent, Chesapeake & Ohio Canal NHP
 HORTON, Joy T., Sec, Dinosaur NM, to Same, Big Bend NP
 HUNT, Larry W., Motor Vehicle Oper, Grand Canyon NP, to Maintenance Worker, Lake Mead NRA
 JARBOE, Grance R., Park Tech, Colorado West Group, to Admin Tech, Tumacacori NM
 JOLLY, Lonnie N., Gardener Leader White House, to Same, Assoc Dir Prof Serv, NCP
 KIRKLAND, Zachary T., Jr., Supv Park Ranger, Great Smoky Mountains NP, to Same, Cumberland Island NS
 KORNBLUM, William S., Research Sociologist, Zion NP, to Sociologist, Imm Off Assoc Reg Dir Prof Serv, NARO
 KRAMBRINK, John A., Park Ranger, Lava Beds NM, to Same, Sequoia NP
 LUPSON, Daniel, Park Tech, Glacier Bay NM, to Same, Sitka NHP

MARTIN, James F., Supv Park Ranger, Saguaro NM, to Same, C&O Canal NHP
 MATHEWS, Fleming W., US Park Police, to Supv Park Tech, Assoc Dir Coop Act, NCP
 MCGINNIS, Terrence J., Admin Assist, Program & Budget, MWRO, to Procurem't Agent, Rocky Mountain NP
 McSWAIN, Betty I., Supv Park Ranger, Independence NHP, to Park Ranger, Pipestone NM
 McFADDEN, Thomas, Park Mgr, Area I, NCP, to Same, Catocin Mtn Park & Balto-Wash Pkwy Group
 McSWAIN, Conrad D., Park Aid, George Washington Carver NM, to Park Aid, Wilson's Creek NB
 NELSON, Wayne Laurence, Photographer, MW Archeological Center, to Same, San Francisco Archeological Office
 PITTMAN, Bryan D., Supv Park Tech, Area I, to Park Ranger, Natchez Trace Pkwy
 RICHARD, Ellis E., Park Tech, Fort Vancouver NHS, to Park Ranger, JNEM MHS
 ROSS, Karen P., Clerk, Historic & Architectural Surveys Div, WASO, to Clerical Assist, Concessions Div, WASO
 SHORT, Margaret I., Supv Park Ranger, Mesa Verde NP, to Same, Colorado West Group
 STEELE, Peter C., Museum Curator, New York Group, to Same, Sagamore Hill NHS
 STRONG, Gene D., Park Tech, Area II, NCP, to Same, Assoc Dir Park System Mgmt, NCP
 THIESSEN, Thomas D., Archeologist, MW Archeological Center, to Same, Zion NP
 THOMPSON, Paul R., Park Tech, Grand Canyon NP, to Supv Park Tech, Coronado NM
 TROTTER, William C., Procurem't & Prop Mgmt Ofc, Rocky Mountain NP, to Procurem't Ofc, Imm Off Assoc Ret Dir Admin, SERO
 WALDEN, Carl W. Jr., Maintenance Foreman, Cumberland Island NS, to Maintenance Worker Foreman, Everglades NP
 WEAVER, Roy W., Supv Park Ranger, Glen Canyon NRA, to Park Mgr, Roger Williams NM

WEST, Jo Ann M., Legis Assist, Legis Div, to Program Assist, International Park Affairs Div, WASO
 WILLIAMS, John J., Program & Budget Analyst, Program & Budget, WRO, to Financial Program Spec, Yellowstone NP
 WILSON, Ronald A., Supv Park Ranger, Div Interp Rec & Resource Mgmt, NCP, to Supv Park Ranger, LBJ NHS
 WILT, Shirley A., Sec, Div Audio Visual Arts, HFC, to Audiovisual Production Spec, Div Audiovisual Arts, HFC
 WRIGHT, R. Gerald Jr., Ecologist, Deputy Assoc Mgr, DSC, to Same, Alaska State Director

Out of the Traces:

BASSETT, Gerald E., Maintenance Worker, Olympic NP
 BROOKS, Julie N., Clerk-Typist, Amistad RA
 COIL, John, Painter, Independence NHP
 DORE, Lyford W., Pipefitter, Yellowstone NP
 IWAI, Cathy K., Personnel Mgmt Spec, Golden Gate NRA
 JARRETT, Neil S., Jr., Computer Spec, Systems Design Div, SERO
 LEE, Sally A., Clerk-Typist, Imm Off Assoc Reg Dir Prof Serv, SERO
 McBRIDE, Joseph L., Demo Farmer, Lincoln Boyhood NS
 SELLARS, Eunice G., Clerk-Steno, Imm Off Assoc Reg Dir Park System Mgt, SERO
 SHOBE, John E., Sr., Roads Maintenance Foreman, Branch Roads & Trails, NCP
 SMITH, Rickey G., Private, US Park Police
 SPARKS, Elias, Engineering Equip't Operator, Branch Roads & Trails, NCP
 SPRUCE, Judson R., Laborer, Point Reyes NS
 TRAMMELL, Janis A., Sec, Assoc Dir Coop Act, NCP
 UPSHAW, Jessyna M., Park Tech, NCP-East
 WILLIAMSON, George W., Tractor Operator, Area I, NCP
 WOOD, Paul W., Maintenance Worker, Natchez Trace Pwy



U.S. Department of the Interior

National Park Service
 Director Gary Everhardt



Issued biweekly for Service employees through the Office of the Director.
 Edited and published by the Office of Public Affairs.

Charles C. Keely, Jr.
 Assistant to the Director,
 Public Affairs

Grant W. Midgley
 Chief,
 Publications and Public Inquiries

Naomi L. Hunt
 Daniel S. Hughes
 Ronnie Spiewak
 Glenn Snyder

Editor
 Assistant Editor
 Staff Writer
 Art Editor

Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Wash., D.C. 20240
 Tel. (202) 343-4481