

The Protection Ranger

WWW.RANGERFOP.COM

The Newsletter of the U.S. Park Rangers Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police

Vol. XVI • No. 5 • 2006



President's Message

Greg Johnston

We come to the end of another busy summer season. There are still many issues facing Park Rangers. Retirement, as always, is still causing major problems for some rangers as they try to get FLERT claims settled. The Ranger Lodge is developing a game plan to try to assist those with denied claims, in addition to working on solidifying and protecting our status as LEO's under 6(c). We are hoping that once the elections craze is over we can begin working hard at the national level to get our voice heard on this issue. There will be more to follow on this in the next issue.

With the death of No Net Loss, we are continuing to move backwards on many of the reforms that were initiated several years ago. This is going to be another thin budget year and the parks are going to have a green light to lapse LE positions. We need to keep tabs on LE Ranger staffing levels. Please keep forwarding your observations in regard to lapsed positions. I am hoping that the new GL series will make it easier to track staffing levels in the service and keep a more accurate number of commissioned field Rangers.

Inside This Issue:

TOD Study in Carnivores	2
IMARS	3
TASER Safety & Effectiveness	4
Secretary's Message	6

The Ranger Lodge welcomes the national TASER policy, which will allow more parks to develop a TASER program with a national standard and agency support. Within 30 hours of receiving my TASER, I utilized it on a drug dealer who led us on a vehicle pursuit and foot chase.

If your park is not yet getting Tasers for LE, it's time to pressure your administration to get them.

In the 2003 Northern Arizona University study of assaults on rangers, investigators found that, too often, rangers did not deploy secondary weapons (e.g. OC spray or a baton) before an assault from a suspect occurred. The implication is that we do not react quickly or aggressively enough to control potentially dangerous situations to ourselves. As the Force Science Research Center report on Tasers later in this issue indicates, this is a secondary weapon that, under appropriate circumstances, appears to be more reliable than OC or a baton. The study shows that both officer and suspect injuries go down significantly when Tasers are available and used.

If your park is not yet getting Tasers for LE, it's time to pressure your administration to get them. The Force Science Research Center article speaks to some of the objections voiced about Tasers and cites studies showing it to be a safe secondary weapon when properly used. This is a valuable tool that provides us with another option in the field.

As always, the Lodge is looking for the future leaders of the NPS to step forward to participate in the Lodge Board. As a board member you will have the opportunity to work with like-minded rangers seeking to change or influence NPS policy or to help your fellow rangers. You will gain valuable experience on the inner workings of the NPS and leadership experience in establishing Lodge goals and seeing them to fruition. When a member has a problem with an adverse personnel action such as a medical waiver denied, required occupancy etc., it is our Board members who help that ranger. Often it is a case of the park or WASO not following clear NPS and OPM guidelines and just making it up as they go.

Board members also decide if a ranger's case might require an initial consultation with Passman and Kaplan when our knowledge is not sufficient.

Don't be shy! Your FOP needs assertive and self-motivated individuals to take these leadership roles and help your fellow rangers. If you are interested, please email George Durkee (foplodge@sonic.net) or me (GregJ1258@aol.com) for more information.

Finally, we continue to conduct conference calls with Cam Sholly in the WASO office and he is always interested with issues in the field that affect us at a national level. Please send us information on the issues that are important to you and can be presented to Cam and his office.

As always: Stay Safe!

Greg

Expanding the Use of Time of Death Determination Parameters to Carnivores: A Two Part Project

Carleen Gonder

Introduction

Crime scene investigation has long been a prominent field with various law enforcement agencies, but is only recently gaining recognition in wildlife management as a distinct function. A research project is currently underway that focuses on one aspect of a crime scene: time of death (TOD) or postmortem interval (PMI). The objective is to provide standardized investigative methods to wildlife law enforcement officials to aid in their investigations of crimes against wildlife. The practical research involved in this project will provide baseline data on short term postmortem changes (Part One) and long term decomposition (Part Two) in order to develop standards for use in the field by federal and state wildlife law enforcement officials.

Time of Death Determinations for Carnivores

Illegal take of wildlife has gained in sophistication and volume. This requires the development of standardized and highly specialized methods for wildlife crime scene investigation. A major component of investigations is determining when that animal was killed. Determining time of death (TOD) during the first 24-48 hours postmortem is a technique long used for traditional game species such as deer and elk. TOD is crucial as court accepted circumstantial evidence with applicability in two situations:

1. Determine if that animal was taken by a hunter during legal hunting hours.
2. Fix the TOD with a point in time matching the presence of a suspect at an illegal take scene.

TOD is often more readily determined at the scene, rather than in a lab. Based on systematic documentation of both short term postmortem changes and long term decomposition, a project is now underway to develop TOD standards for two federally protected species (grizzly bears and wolves) and two game species (mountain lions and black bears). With states assuming more management of wolves, and with states' partial involvement in grizzly bear and wholly with lion and black bear management, there is a need for more data that can assist in law enforcement field investigations, such as determining TOD specific to those species .

There is a need for more data that can assist in law enforcement field investigations, such as determining TOD specific to those species.

Part One: Initial Postmortem Interval

During the first 24-48 hours postmortem, carcasses undergo a number of measurable physiological changes. Four of those changes are notable at the gross level, have been standardized for field investigations, and have a history of being court accepted evidence of violations committed against wildlife. They include:

- Loss of body heat.
- Muscular response to electrical stimuli.
- Rigor mortis.
- Physiological changes in the eye.

There are three notable points with TOD considerations. TOD determination procedures are best performed in the field rather than in a lab; thus, it will be the responsibility of the field investigator to learn the techniques well and maintain detailed documentation. Several of the parameters, rather than just one, should be attempted. And the most reliable parameters are temperature

measurements and muscular response to electrical stimulus.

Data on the immediate postmortem period will be acquired via one of the following:

- TOD data will be gathered at an agency management action site for a 48-hour period postmortem.
- By establishing a network of people with various state and provincial agencies, personnel will gather TOD data as a management action for one-time data collection; not the full 48 hours.

Part Two: Long Term Decomposition

An issue when investigating illegal take of many federally protected species is the discovery of carcasses in advanced stages of decomposition with little information about time since death. Using a controlled outdoor setting that allows for natural decomposition processes to occur, data on changes in the immediate postmortem period, gross changes to soft tissue related to the passage of time and climatic variation, and the succession of insects that visit and inhabit the carcass can be collected and analyzed for the purpose of developing standards for determining TOD. Upon receipt of already euthanized animals, carcasses are being placed in a controlled outdoor research site similar to the Outdoor Research Facility (ORF) developed by the University of Tennessee's Forensic Anthropology Center for studying patterns of human decomposition.

Carcasses have been placed at various times of the year to determine seasonal variations such as over-winter effects while insects are dormant. Scavenging by small mammals and birds is allowed to mimic a natural setting. Nevertheless, for this project, larger scavengers are deterred by electrified enclosures. One enclosure or "pen" measures 16'x16'x4", is fully topped with ½" wire mesh and electrified by a solar energizer. A second pen is comprised of twelve 12'x6' portable chain link panels and measures 12'x60'. It, too, is fully topped with wire mesh

and 3 electrified strands attached around the outside are powered by the same solar energizer.

Since deer and elk are often poached for their antlers with the remainder of the carcass left to rot, one of each will be added to the decomposition site in late November, 2006.

Long term decomposition will be monitored and stages documented until carcasses have reached the "remains" (skeletal) stage, with data collection occurring at a minimum of once daily at the onset (increased or decreased frequency to be determined by level of insect and other notable activity). Criteria included:

- Insects, to be analyzed at Montana State University in a separate but concurrent study.
- Weather, general plus micro-climate (carcass, soil and ambient air temperatures, etc.).
- Desiccation (fresh, intermediate, dry, mummified).
- Odor (normal, faint, mild, moderate, strong, moderate, mild, faint, none)
- Disarticulation (sequence, if observable).
- General appearance, including scavenging effects.
- Rate or duration of various processes and stages (stages: fresh, bloat, active decay, advanced decay, dry, remains).
- Soil pH (tentative) and temperatures
- Extensive/daily photo documentation through all stages.

For more information about this pioneering project, please contact Carleen Gonder via e-mail or telephone: carleen_montana@yahoo.com or (406) 244-0007.

Oates, D.W., J.L. Coggin, F.E. Hartman and G.I. Hoilien. 1984. A Guide to Time of Death in Selected Wildlife Species. Nebraska Technical Series No 14. Nebraska Game and Parks Commission.

Stroud, DVM, R.D. Unknown date. Wildlife Field Forensic Techniques. US Fish and Wildlife Service National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Lab.

Eicher, T. and J. Kropp. 2005. Personal communication on separate occasions. Autumn 2005.

Journal of Forensic Sciences and other relevant scientific literature and practices: Methods derived from previously published decomposition studies.

IMARS

Greg Johnston

I was one of several people selected to represent the NPS field for the Incident Management Analysis and Reporting System (IMARS). I attended the Business Workflow meeting in Washington, D.C. the last week of October and was in the company of numerous Interior employees from the field, supervision, management, and various occupations related to Law Enforcement.

We got a preview of the COTS (Commercial Off-the-Shelf) version of the programs awarded the IMARS contract. The purpose of the meeting was to begin configuring the data fields of the programs, determining the workflow of reporting systems, and collection of agency procedures to identify standardization potential.

The system consists primarily of three separate components: the FBR (Field Based Reporting), RMS (Report Management System), and DIG (Digital Information Gateway).

Field Based Reporting

The FBR is the main field entry tool. Data can be entered into this system on or off line and can operate in a wireless environment – if the DOI and NPS can ever develop an approved wireless program. It has the capability to capture Computer Aided Design (CAD) and other data to auto-fill certain fields.

It is difficult to describe how this program looks, but the best way would be that for every incident you would pick from a set of computer fill-in

forms, depending on what type of incident, then fill in the data fields on the screen. The data is pulled from these fields and stored in the RMS once the data is transmitted. It uses a "Package" concept. An Accident Package, for instance, might include an evidence form, a supplemental narrative, and a citation. You would choose the forms you require and fill them in, then submit the package for supervisory approval, and then the data would be available for Department-wide searching on the RMS.

This program will also have a violation notice data entry, an incident short form, and a field interview form.

Report Managing System

The RMS is a web-based program that is the core of the IMARS program. It is the central repository for all Department Incident Data. There are many more expanded functions that can only be accomplished through the RMS data entry portal.

The RMS data entry is navigated from a series of drop down menus and an Incident entry screen which utilizes a tab system to open data modules to enter the information into the system. I know this might sound intimidating but, rest assured, it looks easier than CIRS, for those who used that system.

A short list of functions of this program include attaching files like photos or video clips, scanning documents like citations or fingerprints, case management, property management, and evidence management.

Digital Information Gateway

The final, but probably the most exciting component of the system is the Digital Information Gateway. It is best described as a "Google" type search engine for the data that populates the RMS system. You can view previews of this program at: visualanalytics.com/products/dig.

This engine searches all fields of the data and can even search attachments. For parks that have current data systems, DIG can be configured to

search practically any record management system, they just have to be plugged into it.

DIG can also be set up to do alerts on data. You can set an alert for someone searching a name that you identify or someone entering a serial number of a gun you are looking for. DIG can also do "fuzzy," phonetic, and synonym searches.

The important thing to remember is that the program is not finished; the hardest and most important work is just beginning. The 6 month pilot program (probably the most important process), will a rough compilation of the program for the field to test, evaluate, and provide feedback on how the final product should work and look. The pilot parks will have an important role in the IMARS program and their work will influence the final look and feel of the program.

The business process meetings that I will be attending are the stepping stones to overcome agency differences and find commonalities in the way we conduct business. Agreeing on a department wide standard procedure is not simple, but it seems to be going well so far. You can also check-in at the IMARS information site:

InsideNPS > WASO > Visitor and Resource Protection > IMARS.

If anyone has comments, questions, or ideas; please log into either the FOP discussion board or the NPS "Calling all Cars" and I will continue to get information out to the field with regard to this program. I will be in D.C. again the last week of this month for another series of meetings.

New Reports Stress Taser's Safety & Effectiveness, Yet ACLU Demands Greater Restriction on Deployment

Force Science News #31
November 4, 2005

The Force Science News is provided by The Force Science Research Center, a non-profit institution based at Minnesota State University, Mankato. Subscriptions are free and sent via e-mail. To register for your free, direct-delivery subscription, please visit forcesciencenews.com and click on the registration button. For reprint clearance, please e-mail: info@forcesciencenews.com.

Part 1 of a 2-Part Series

(Part 2 can be found at: www.forcesciencenews.com/home/detail.html?serial=32)

Just as recent reports from a major sheriff's department and a large insurer of law enforcement agencies are describing the Taser as one of the safest and most effective subject-control tools in the street cop's arsenal, police use of the device is coming under renewed attack by civil liberties activists.

In a 1-2 assault, the ACLU chapter in the San Francisco Bay area has issued a scathing 25-page report calling for a legislative ban on Taser use "except as a last alternative to firing a gun," while lawyers working with the ACLU in Nevada have filed a multimillion-dollar federal wrongful death suit against the Las Vegas Metropolitan P.D. and the Taser's manufacturer in what the ACLU claims was the Taser-related death of a handcuffed suspect.

These moves come on the heels of other recent demands for tightly restricted Taser use or negative appraisals of police Taser policies by ACLU chapters in Hawaii, Texas, Massachusetts and Wisconsin, to name just a few. (As

you'll recall from a previous Force Science News edition [see Transmissions #8, sent 12/10/04], the activist organization Amnesty International has also been highly vocal in alleging the Taser to be an "inhumane" and potentially deadly device, campaigning avidly for a moratorium on its use.)

Taser "has resulted in a considerable reduction of arrest-related injuries to both officers and subjects."

Meanwhile, a detailed study of Taser applications and effectiveness in actual field experience by the Orange County (FL) S.O. concludes that despite certain limitations the Taser "appears [to] offer police officers a 'magic bullet' solution when dealing with many confrontations." And a "risk management memo" issued by the League of Minnesota Cities Insurance Trust, a prominent liability insurer, includes reassurance to L.E. agencies that Tasers "provide police officers with a safe and effective tool for controlling dangerous behavior and overcoming resistance."

In stark contrast to the activists' doom-crying, the Trust says that use of the Taser "has resulted in a considerable reduction of arrest-related injuries to both officers and subjects." And the sheriff's study reports that in a single year in Orange County less-lethal Tasers were deployed in 18 incidents where deadly force was fully justified, leading to arrests rather than serious injury or death for the offenders involved.

In this 2-part series, we'll take an in-depth look at these 2 positive reports, beginning with the analysis of actual street deployment of Tasers in Orange County.

[For a fuller background on the ACLU's insistence on legislative intervention, you can read its complete report, "Stun Gun Fallacy: How the

Lack of Taser Regulation Endangers Lives,” at: http://aclunc.org/police/051006-taser_report.pdf].

Street Facts from Orange County

The Sheriff's Office study focuses on 400 cases randomly drawn from some 1,200 force confrontations across a 3-year period. Researchers analyzed the nature of resistance by suspects, the responses used by officers and the outcomes of the events in an effort to determine “the effectiveness of less-lethal weapons systems at the officer level,” a subject rarely examined by the academic community.

The research team was led by Dr. Charlie Mesloh, director of the Weapons and Equipment Research Institute at Florida Gulf Coast University, and included Capt. Steven Houglund of the Orange County Sheriff's Office in Orlando, FL.

The findings, reported in the September [2005] issue of the journal “Law Enforcement Executive Forum”, published by the Executive Institute of the Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board, include the following:

1. Taser was by far “the most frequently used less-lethal weapon” employed in use-of-force incidents.
- In this study, it was relied upon to stop suspect resistance in 73% of confrontations, compared to chemical agents at 18%, defensive tactics 6% and impact weapons 3%.
- Bean bag rounds were used only once, in an encounter involving SWAT.

Interestingly, none of the impact weapon applications involved use of a baton, the researchers discovered. Instead, in each case, “a flashlight was utilized in this function as an improvised impact weapon.”

In assessing the relative unpopularity of less-lethal options other than Taser, the researchers observe:

- Officers commonly feel that DT techniques taught by their agency are “ineffective against aggressive subjects.” Officers who study martial arts on their own--particularly grappling techniques--seem most likely to apply those skills against resistant subjects.
- OC, considered “the cutting edge less-lethal weapon of its time,” is plagued by “issues regarding cross-contamination of back-up officers and a growing number of reports that suspects were able to fight through the burning pain.”

“A drawback to the Taser is that while the cartridges have an advertised range of 21 feet, it is not feasible to properly deploy the weapon at that distance and expect a successful outcome...”

- Baton configuration has changed in recent years, with “high-visibility nightsticks and side-handled batons” having “gone out of style” and been replaced with collapsible straight batons which, in effect, are “little more than a metal club to be used for striking and blocking....[M]any of the advanced control techniques ... possible with the PR-24” are now “difficult if not impossible.”
- 2. “[I]n all cases in which deadly force would have been sanctioned and a less-lethal weapon was used, Taser was the only weapon selected by officers.” The researchers conclude that “it is clear that a substantial number of suspects' lives were spared as a result of Taser deployments.”

The research data did not reveal, however, “whether officers made a conscious decision to take a more humane approach” (in avoiding deadly force) or the Taser “was already in hand and the time required to transition [to a gun] was too great.” Regardless, the outcome was strongly to the suspects' benefit.

3. Officers perceived that Taser is the “only [less-lethal] tool available that has the ability to prevent escape.” Overall, “Taser was used to stop fleeing suspects...84% of the time.” Other less-lethal options, “such as chemical agents and impact weapons, are generally ineffective at stopping a fleeing suspect” due to distance considerations.

Narcotics offenses are the ones most likely to escalate into use-of-force encounters, the study shows, and 63% of narcotics suspects “originally resisted by taking flight.” Across all categories of suspects, “flight was the most common type of resistance” and was encountered nearly one-third of the time.

In terms of active resistance, suspects most often wrestled with or struck officers (27% and 13.5% of resistance respectively). Less than 5% of resistance involved armed suspects threatening or using weapons against officers. Taser was the most frequent less-lethal option used in response to offenders with weapons.

4. A single application of a Taser could not be relied upon to be successful unfailingly. Indeed, Taser was “ineffective” 23% of the time from a single application. However, the researchers point out, “Taser training stresses the use of multiple applications in order to bring a suspect under control.”

When deployed a second time, Taser's “ineffectiveness dropped to less than 3%.” Then, it was deployed a third time or the officer switched to a different less-lethal option or the suspect escaped, with officers “unprepared to engage in a foot pursuit.”

The study notes that successful escape “occurred more frequently” after a Taser failure, “as officers were accustomed to immediate compliance on the part of the suspect and it is extremely difficult to run with a weapon and drag 21 feet of wire and probes.”

5. Missing when firing a Taser is the greatest cause of failure.

Analyzing 50 cases of Taser failure, the researchers found that missing the subject with both probes accounted for 38% and baggy clothing worn by the suspect caused 32%. Other factors included: probe coming loose, 28%; suspect grabbing the Taser, 2%; unit malfunction, 4%; cartridge fell off, 2%. (Recent Taser improvements have addressed some of the failure problems, the researchers note.)

“A drawback to the Taser is that while the cartridges have an advertised range of 21 feet, it is not feasible to properly deploy the weapon at that distance and expect a successful outcome,” the researchers report. At 18 feet, an average probe spread of about 30 inches is experienced, “which is too great to assume that both probes will hit their target as required for the Taser to be effective.”

Ineffective deployments are “more related to distance factors than the suspect's ability to fight through electricity,” the study found.

Even with its shortcomings, Taser can be deployed at greater ranges than other less-lethal weapons, which “require the suspect to be in close proximity to the officer.”

In their report, the researchers take note of the action-reaction time lag that often places officers at a disadvantage in responding effectively to suspects' aggressive behavior. This disadvantage has been well documented in numerous experiments conducted by the Force Science Research Center at Minnesota State University-Mankato.

“Training and experience may reduce reaction times,” the researchers point out, by “inherently cue[ing] officers to furtive movements and pre-assault indicators.” In the Orange County Sheriff's Office, such cues are considered a level of resistance that allows “officers to deploy the Taser earlier in the confrontation, thereby deescalating the encounter before it matures.”

In summary, the report concludes that “[b]ased on officer interviews and the data, it appears that the Taser offers police officers a 'magic bullet' solution when dealing with many confrontations.” And it predicts that with improvements “it is likely that Taser will continue to dominate in less-lethal weapon deployments.”

Regarding the Orange County report, Dr. Bill Lewinski, executive director of the Force Science Research Center at Minnesota State University-Mankato, says: “This study confirms the general law enforcement experience that the Taser is the most versatile and effective force instrument available to law enforcement to date. It also supports the law enforcement claim that without the Taser officers would be using lethal force more frequently.”

For a full copy of the Law Enforcement Executive Forum article on the Orange County study, contact:

Illinois Law Enforcement Training and Standards Board
Executive Institute
1 University Circle
Macomb, IL 61455
(309) 298-2646

The article, entitled “Taser and Less Lethal Weapons: An Exploratory Analysis of Deployments and Effectiveness,” is available in pdf format for \$4 and in a hard copy for \$10.

[Thanks to Wayne Schmidt, executive director of Americans for Effective Law Enforcement, for bringing the Orange County study to our attention.]

(c) 2005: Force Science Research Center, www.forcescience.org. Reprints allowed by request. For reprint clearance, please e-mail: info@forcesciencenews.com.

FORCE SCIENCE is a registered trademark of The Force Science Research Center, a non-profit organization based at Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Secretary's Message

George Durkee

Membership

The good news is the Grand Lodge seems to finally have their database back on track and membership cards are being issued accurately and on time. Paige Meier, our new Business Manager, has just gone through the entire Grand Lodge list of members and found several people who were missing from their list but were on our list as paid. We had clear records that those names had been properly submitted and have no idea how they were dropped at the national level. In any event, we think everything is straightened out. Check your renewal date on the address label. If you think it's in error, contact us and we'll correct it.

Long ago, the Ranger Lodge gave up the attempt to correct address information in the Grand Lodge database. Rangers move too often and it was just one of those paperwork nightmares that was too difficult to keep up with and still maintain a life and a job (remember, all this stuff is being done by people with day jobs...). Your current address is, though, maintained on our own database. As long as you tell us, we make the change there and you get the Protection Ranger, your membership card, Lodge sticker and any other Ranger Lodge mailings.

We really appreciate it when you tell us you're moving rather than having newsletters returned because of no forwarding address. What this means, is that we make every effort to find out where you are for purposes of the newsletter and getting your membership card to you. However, if you've moved since joining, the National and VA Lodge mailings likely haven't gotten to you.

As many of you may know, the Grand Lodge now offers the ability to make address or other changes to your membership record on their web site:

www.grandlodgefop.org. You can access your membership information and submit changes by logging in to your account and going to "Update My Information" under "My Tools" on the right. If you don't yet have a login and password with the Grand Lodge web page, choose "Member Login" and "New User Registration." You'll need your FOP card number which, if you don't have it immediately handy, you can get by writing us at foplodge@sonic.net. Remember to enter Virginia as the state and 060 as the Lodge number.

After you make a change, it is then sent to us to approve. When we approve it, it then goes to the VA Lodge Secretary to approve. A bit klunky, but that's the way it is. Unfortunately, that means that it might take a couple of weeks for the change to be reflected in the Grand Lodge database. The Ranger Lodge will make the change immediately. So, if you want to make sure you receive the VA and Grand Lodge mailings, go to their web site, check your address and change it if necessary. If those publications aren't especially important to you, don't worry about it. Just remember to go to the Ranger Lodge website (foplodge@sonic.net) and you can submit address changes directly to us from there. **Changing the address on the Grand Lodge web page will also mean we'll change it here. However, if you *only* change it on the Ranger Lodge web page, it will *only* be changed within the Ranger Lodge – not the Grand Lodge.** Hope that makes sense...

Also, we did make a number of changes several weeks ago that are not yet reflected on the Grand Lodge database. If you sent us new information or recently joined, it has been submitted and is just awaiting their approval.

Renewals

If you've recently received a letter reminding you to renew, please do so as soon as possible or it might delay getting your membership card to you (if you're past due).

Suspended Members

Check your mailing label on this issue. If it says "Suspend" then we have not yet received your dues and this is your last issue of *The Protection Ranger*. We already have, or soon will, suspend you from the Grand Lodge database. Oh Woe!! The Grand Lodge prints out a batch of cards for the coming year based on who we've paid the per capita fee for. If you're not paid, we change you to "inactive" and no card will be issued for 2007

We need your support and you need our tireless advocacy for law enforcement rangers as well as having someone to help when you're in trouble. So please send us your dues or renew online: www.rangerfop.com

Newsletter

Long time member Carleen Gonder generously submitted a write-up of her thesis study that will ultimately benefit how we do poaching investigations. These are the articles the Lodge looks forward to publishing: information by rangers and for rangers. If you're working on something that other rangers would benefit from, write it up and send it in. If your park has started doing something – training techniques or different ways of patrolling etc. – that seems to help solve a problem, send us an article.

Web Discussion Board

A reminder for people to check out the Lodge web site occasionally. Webmaster Duane Buck has been doing an excellent job of maintaining one of the best web sites of any LE member's organization. We post updates on news and critical issues there. There's also the discussion forum where you can take part in lively discussions with your colleagues.

Finally, as Lodge President Greg Johnston wrote in his message, we hope rangers will step forward and join the Lodge Board to participate in continuing to improve our profession and helping your fellow rangers work safely and effectively. Write or call to participate.

Please Renew Your Membership

If you have recently received a notice of renewal (*check your mailing label on the newsletter for your expiration date!*), please send your dues in soon. You may renew using the envelope provided or go to our web site:

www.rangerfop.com/join.htm

We now offer the option of signing up for yearly automatic renewals with your credit card.

If your mail label says "suspend" please renew right away. This is your last issue of *The Protection Ranger!* If our information is in error, write and we'll correct it.

If you've moved, please send us an email at foplodge@sonic.net and tell us your new address.

Member support is always available by email or phone: 800-407-8295.

Call *only* between 10AM and 8PM Eastern Time.

Many thanks for your continued support.

George Durkee
Executive Director

Lodge Website

The Lodge website is updated with notices and links to other sites that we think are interesting and/or helpful to resource based law enforcement officers. Visit it often between issues of the Protection Ranger to keep current on things that affect you and your job. Our address is www.rangerfop.com

Application for Membership

You may also join, renew and pay your dues online: www.rangerfop.com/join.htm

I, the undersigned, a full-time regularly employed law enforcement officer, do hereby make application for active membership in the U.S. Park Rangers Lodge, FOP. If my membership should be revoked or discontinued for any cause other than retirement while in good standing, I do hereby agree to return to the Lodge my membership card and other material bearing the FOP emblem.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

City: _____

State: _____ Zip: _____

DOB: _____ E-Mail: _____

Permanent Rangers: \$60/year

Seasonals and Retired Active Members: \$40/year

Associate (non-Commissioned) Membership (Newsletter only): \$35/year

Renewals: You do not need to send in this form to renew. Enclose a copy of your Commission (new members only).

Agency and Work Unit: _____

Mail to: FOP Lodge, POB 1481, Twain Harte, CA 95383

Phone: 1-800-407-8295 10am-7pm Eastern Time or email

foplodge@sonic.net



**National Park Rangers Lodge
POB 1481
Twain Harte, CA 95383**

