Collective Bargaining: Our Quest Continues
by George Durkee, Chair, Collective Bargaining Committee

Things always take longer to do than we hope. So it has proved with forming a collective bargaining unit. Members at our Las Vegas meeting last March voted to have a show of interest vote held by the end of last year. Because the National FOP is apparently not interested in absorbing another federal union into their organization in the near future, the Ranger Lodge has discussed alternatives. We can form our own independent bargaining unit or we can seek another existing organization to represent us. Discussions between Board members and attorneys with Passman and Kaplan indicated that an independent course would be very expensive, likely prohibitively so. We then talked to representatives of several unions who we felt might be interested in representing us and who had experience with law enforcement officers.

On 2/16/94 Chris Cruz and I held a conference call with Ralph Pfister, President of the Police Association of the District of Columbia (PADC). He was joined by two of their Board members. The purpose of the call was to determine the structure of PADC and how park rangers would fit into that structure; whether it would be mutually beneficial to each; and the logistics of organizing with PADC.

PADC was founded in 1903 and has about 2,000 members representing mostly US Park Police but also including D.C Metro Police, Metro Transit Police and the U.S. Secret Service Uniformed Division.

Our conversation brought out several advantages in joining with PADC: they seem to think we can set up with them at a much lower cost than the FOP Labor Council has estimated; we could work more closely with USPP to smooth out our occasional differences (we talked about this briefly with Pfister) and; they’re familiar with parks and rangers. Most important, though, is that we would have incredible bargaining power--teamed up with the US Park Police, we would form the majority of LE officers within Interior. 

See QUEST p. 2

6(c) UPDATE
by Dan Kirschner

The Ranger Lodges have been very active on the 6c issue during January and February. We have been in contact with OPM, USDI and WASO on numerous occasions by phone and fax. The overall outlook is bright, but there are still some major hurdles. FOP acknowledges that our members are discouraged by the delays in resolving the 6(c) issue. Would collective bargaining have been a better method for resolving the 6(c) issue? Until resolved, 6(c) is still our top priority.

The outlook is bright because more rangers have been granted 6 (c) past coverage by OPM: all rangers who have been granted 6(c) past coverage by OPM, or won coverage through MSPB appeal, please call 800-407-8295 and leave the following information so we can put together a database: name; current duty station; phone number; and current grade/step.

We are also encouraged because OPM is in the process of delegating 6(c) program management authority to agency heads. On December 7, 1993 OPM issued interim regulations that may result in USDI administering the 6(c) program for CSRS employees. The interim rules are written such that OPM would retain oversight of the 6(c) program, and department (USDI in case of NPS and BLM) level agency heads would become the 6(c) program managers. The Lodge comments/response to the interim regulations are reprinted, in part, below.

At the beginning of February, we also contacted USDI’s Assistant Director for Policy, Management, & Budget. We voiced our concerns about how OPM was promulgating 6(c) rules and expressed the need to suspend further MSPB actions on all 6(c) past coverage claims that were denied by OPM that are now undergoing the MSPB appeals process. WASO has told us our letters, faxes and phone calls on this have been extremely effective.

A reminder: keep updating your individual claims. Do not miss any OPM or MSPB appeal due dates. Keep your Lodge informed on the status of your individual case. We have been told that all CSRS 6(c) past coverage claims have cleared NPS and are at Interior. All FERS 6(c) past coverage claims are still in the NPS regional offices. 

See 6(c) p. 2

MOVING?
Write or call OUR NEW 800#
1-800-407-8295 with your new address.
As important as our combined bargaining power, their membership system allows us a way to include both supervisors and non-supervisors in an equitable way. As a number of you may remember from earlier articles, under U.S. code and FLRA regulations supervisors cannot be members of a bargaining unit. Since as many as 70% of permanent rangers could be defined as supervisors, we have been looking for a way to include both in any bargaining unit we form. PACD provides for this: dues are $7.25/pp for members of the bargaining unit and $6.00/pp for supervisors.

Although bargaining unit members would be the only ones directly covered by any contract negotiated, such a contract would necessarily benefit ALL field rangers-supervisors and non-supervisors alike. This dues structure allows everyone to contribute to the costs of negotiating such contracts as well as giving them a voice in the process. In a grievance the union can usually only represent the non-supervisor (thus the slightly higher dues for them), there are some exceptions where supervisors can also be represented. In addition, dues would also cover legal liability (criminal, civil and administrative) insurance for all members (currently $135 through FOP). The PACD also puts out an excellent monthly newspaper covering labor and law enforcement topics.

The Lodge Board were encouraged by what we heard in our conversation. We recognize, though, that this is a major step for our organization. A recent poll taken by Randall for the Eastern Lodge still showed strong support for forming a bargaining unit (over 70%, with over 65% supporting dues of $100-$200/year). We realize that support is softening somewhat and a significant number of members have basic questions about what a union will do for us in the first place.

As important, what would a shift to PACD mean to us as an organization? We have made incredible progress under the FOP banner and I, at least, have been extremely reluctant to make such a move without compelling reasons. Not only has the National FOP been reluctant to support our goal of collective bargaining, but they also have not been responsive in our attempts to become a national (combined ranger) Lodge. Their state-oriented structure has made it sometimes difficult to operate as effectively as we should. In addition, and unlike PACD, FOP has no experience dealing with the Federal Labor Relations Authority. Finally, they would not agree to fund an organizing effort. As such, I have slowly become convinced of the necessity, as far as collective bargaining goes, of choosing another organization.

The other Ranger Lodge Board members agree. We will send a letter to the PACD asking that they approve having National Park Rangers as a part of their organization, to represent our interests with the Park Service and Interior. IF (!) the PACD Board votes to accept us, we will send out a special issue of the Protection Ranger explaining the advantages and requirements of such a move and putting the question to a vote of our membership. Because we've added a couple of hundred members since our last detailed explanation of the advantages of collective bargaining, we'll also include an updated review of the reasons park rangers should form a bargaining unit. If the PACD votes not to include us, we will continue talks with other unions or look more closely at an independent bargaining unit. We'll keep you informed, and encourage your comments on this subject.

On a related note, the Lodge has been told by several members that some parks are getting increasingly aggressive about charging rangers for damaging or losing government property while performing their duties. At least one park is going back through several years of records to bring rangers before a review board in an effort to collect damages. We don't necessarily object where a ranger can be shown to have been grossly (!) negligent. However we strongly oppose charging rangers who might have only made a minor contributory mistake--often under stressful conditions or in extreme weather. To find out the extent of this problem, we'd like all rangers who have either been charged for damaged property or notified that they will be to call our 800 number. Leave your name and phone number and we'll get back to you to get details. We are considering obtaining legal help to advise us and perhaps offer direct help to rangers on this problem, if it's extensive enough. It will certainly be the subject of any contract negotiated if collective bargaining comes to pass. (It's policies like this, and those described by Paul Williams elsewhere in this issue, that essentially guarantee the formation of unions...).

We are also concerned with the upcoming RIF proposals, about 1300 over the next three years. Although these are supposed to affect only administrative positions, we can easily see many of those duties passed on to rangers under "other duties as assigned." Eternal vigilance, and a binding contract, are a necessity to the modern ranger.

Virtually all uniformed federal law enforcement officers are represented by unions. Collective bargaining will ensure that individual rangers have access to professional representation in disputes with supervisors or the Service. It is the next logical step to guarantee that we have a method of bringing our concerns to the attention of WASO and, as important, are consulted where changes are proposed in our working conditions. We hope you will also call or write us with any preliminary thoughts or questions you might have on our possible association with the PACD.
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Copy of FAX TO OPM:

Dear Assistant Director Jones [Reginald M. Jones Jr., Assistant Director for Retirement and Insurance Policy, Retirement and Insurance Group]:

On Tuesday, December 7, 1993 OPM promulgated and published Interim Regulations, in the Federal Register [64366Vol. 58, No. 233 / Tuesday, December 7, 1993 / Rules and Regulations, delegating 6(c) program management from OPM, to agency heads. The comment period is listed as being open until 02/07/94.

The Western and Eastern National Park Rangers Lodges, Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) represents almost 1,000 law enforcement and fire control U. S. Park Rangers stationed in the almost 400 National Park Service units of the United States of America. On behalf of the membership thank you, in advance, for taking the time to consider comments from our Eastern and Western Lodges.

COMMENT 1 - OPM says they are delegating 6(c) program management authority, but it only appears to be a delegation of reviewing authority. OPM should delegate complete authority because, as OPM says in the interim rules, the agency has, "personnel management interest in them [6(c) determinations]." If the delegation of management is not complete, there appears to be no real substantive change in how 6(c) determinations are made.

COMMENT 2 - OPM fails to state that law enforcement and firefighting qualifying service can be combined. Public Law 93-350 clearly states, "An employee who is separated from the service after becoming 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service as a law enforcement officer or firefighter, or any combination of such service totaling at least 20 years, is
entitled to an annuity," PL 93-350 specifically states, "any combination." To comply with PL 93-350, as codified in applicable Title 5 sections, OPM should insert the wording, above, which is found in PL 93-350 into the applicable part(s) of 5 CFR 831 - Retirement Regulations.

COMMENT 3 - Remove all definitions of law enforcement officer from section 831.902 that are not found in PL 93-350. OPM's "clarifying" definitions only serve to confuse since they contradict the PL 93-350 definitions. Congress did not intend to exclude front line law enforcement officers from 6(c) coverage. To comply with applicable Title 5 sections, simply delete the sentence which starts with the wording, "The definition does not include..." This is an OPM INTERPRETATION of the words law enforcement, and this interpretation does not conform to the common definition of the words law enforcement, and more importantly, contradicts Congressional Intent for the passage of 6(c).

COMMENT 4 - The Regulations state that an agency head may reopen cases that were adjudicated by OPM if the agency determines that there is, "...new and material evidence..." What constitutes new and material evidence? Who makes this determination? Wording for this section should read, "Agency heads are authorized, within the scope of the this delegated 6(c) program management authority, to reopen past coverage decisions, going back to 1973, that were not decided in the interest of proper agency personnel management." 1973 is selected because this is the date PL 93-350 was passed and amended the early retirement and enhanced annuity law for federal law enforcement and firefighting personnel.

It is laudable that OPM is working toward a fair and equitable implementation of PL 93-350 through improved 6(c) program management. Hopefully, the transfer of 6(c) program administration from OPM to the agency heads, should result in more efficient and effective program management.

If you have need of further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the interim regulations. I look forward to your response.

CHAPTER UPDATE

We have grown to such a size that it is no longer feasible for us to call each chapter for chapter updates. Please send your chapter updates (news - reports) to us on computer disc or via Compuserve. Entries can be mailed to Durkee @ 23807 Quaker Lane; Twain Harte, CA 95383 or Kirschner @ POB 101, Bushkill, PA 18324. On Compuserve: Durkee (72610,1135) or Kirschner (71673,3432). WP6.0, 5.1, or 5.0, ASCII, are the best formats.

Pondering Administrative Leave
(No Byline to protect the innocent...)

Have you ever worked the day before 12/24/any year and/or 12/31/any year and witnessed non-essential personnel being sent home, on ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE, before normal close of business? Have you ever seen non-essential personnel sent home, on ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE, during inclement weather? Have you ever considered whether essential personnel should be earning OVERTIME, COMP TIME, or HAZARDOUS DUTY PAY for working when other employees have been sent home? Would a collective bargaining agreement be able to address this inequity? Just a thought.

(From the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, August 1993)

Lead Poisoning: A Firearms Safety Hazard
By Amelia Newberry Martinez

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) classifies lead as a highly toxic heavy metal with no beneficial biological use in the body. When a person inhales or ingests lead, it is absorbed into the bloodstream. Once in the body, it becomes very difficult to remove. Continued exposure results in the accumulation of lead in the body, and measurable amounts of lead indicate cumulative exposure over a lifetime.

The EPA has determined that lead poses a serious health hazard to everyone. Unfortunately, individuals working with and around firearms often overlook the harmful effects of lead. Therefore, firearms range personnel must take precautions to control all unnecessary exposure to this toxic element. For firearms range personnel, knowing the hazards of lead is a primary responsibility; taking the necessary precautions to minimize exposure is a duty.

Effects of Lead on the Body
Approximately 6 percent of all lead ingested or inhaled is deposited in the blood or soft body tissues, such as the kidneys, brain, or other vital organs. The remaining 94 percent is deposited in bone. Because the body mistakes lead for calcium, it presumes that, once deposited, the lead needs to be stored.

The body does, however, break down lead so that it can be removed. The time required for this process is measured by the term "half-life," which means the amount of time the body needs to excrete one-half of the lead dose.

Lead in the bloodstream and in soft body tissue has a half-life of approximately 30-40 days and is excreted through urine, bile, sweat, hair, and nails. However, lead deposited in bone has a half-life of approximately 20 years. That is, one-half of the lead dosage absorbed by the body through only one exposure and deposited in the bone would still be present after 20 years.

Health Concerns
For decades, the presence of lead in the environment has been widespread, beginning with smelting factories and continuing with the manufacture of glazed pottery, batteries, and leaded gasoline. Only recently has it been acknowledged as a serious threat to public health that warranted government control.

In 1971, the EPA began enforcing the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, which restricts the amount of lead used in paints. Seven years later, the agency set the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, which served as the primary mechanism to reduce lead in gasoline. However, even with these standards and other controls, the residue of lead in food, water, and dirt can elevate the lead level in a person's blood.

Firearms and Exposure to Lead
The exposure to lead on the firing line occurs as soon as the shooter pulls the trigger and the hammer falls. This action causes the primer of the cartridge in the chamber to explode, which ignites the main powder charge. At this point, a breathable cloud of lead particles is expelled into the air, with lead dust spraying the shooter's hands.

Lead particles also shear off as the bullet travels through the barrel. When the bullet leaves the barrel, a second cloud of contaminants, in the form of the muzzle blast, bursts into the air.

Continued on next page
Then, as the bullet strikes the impact area, another contaminated cloud rises.

When shooters inhale these clouds of contaminants, lead particles go directly into their lungs and are quickly absorbed into the bloodstream. The blood then transfers the lead to soft body tissue and bone. Heat from smoking, sweating, or physical activity accelerates this process.

Lead can also settle on the skin and hair, and in turn, be absorbed through the pores of the skin. If lead particles reach the mouth, they can be ingested into the digestive system.

Exposure increases at cleanup time, because handling empty casings can result in lead being transferred to the skin. The cleaning process also removes much of the remaining lead in the barrel and transfers it to the cleaner's hands. Oils and solvents used to clean and lubricate weapons cause the natural oils in the skin to evaporate, leaving dry skin and open pores through which the lead can pass.

**Symptoms of Lead Poisoning**

The numerous symptoms of lead poisoning mimic various diseases, often making diagnosis difficult. Most commonly, individuals experience abdominal pain, fatigue, nausea, subtle mood changes, headaches, constipation, irritability, and depression. Muscle pain, muscle weakness, weight loss, impotence, convulsions, anemia, and renal failure may also occur with increased lead levels in the body.

**Testing for Lead**

Testing for lead can be performed in several ways. The blood lead level (BLL) test detects recent exposure to lead but does not provide information regarding long-term or past exposure. The BLL measures the quantity of lead in micrograms per deciliter of blood, written as ug/100 mL, that is, micrograms of lead per 100 deciliters of blood.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards state that the median blood levels for adults should be about 15 ug/100 mL; children and pregnant women should have blood levels below 10 ug/100 mL. For reproductive health, the blood level should stay below 30 ug/100 mL. OSHA recommends removal from the workplace of any employee whose BLL measures 40 ug/100 mL or higher.

The zinc protoporphyrin (ZPP) test can be performed in conjunction with the BLL to determine longer exposure. Lead interferes with the absorption of iron into the blood, which is needed to transport oxygen, thereby allowing zinc to replace the iron. The ZPP measures the amount of zinc in the blood, which remains elevated longer than the BLL. The normal range for the ZPP is 0-100 ug/100 mL. An elevated ZPP indicates concentration in the bone marrow.

The only effective test used for bone lead levels is the disodium edetate (EDTA) chelating agent test. EDTA, a solution administered intravenously, bonds with the lead in bone and clears it from body compartments so that it is excreted through the urine. EDTA both tests and treats an individual, but medical personnel use it only in extreme cases of lead poisoning because of potentially harmful side effects.

**Special Risks**

In males, high levels of lead can decrease the sex drive and cause sterility. Lead can also alter the structure of sperm cells, thereby causing birth defects.

Pregnant women are vulnerable to rapid absorption of lead, along with calcium, from the blood into the bone. This mobilization occurs due to hormonal changes caused by pregnancy. In pregnant women, lead passes unimpeded through the placenta to the fetus, potentially causing miscarriages of the fetus and birth defects.

Children are more vulnerable to lead toxicity than adults. Children exposed to lead may manifest slow learning, mental drifts, slight retardation in development, hypertension, and behavioral problems, while excessive blood lead levels can seriously and irreversibly damage a child's brain and nervous system. Because the symptoms mirror those of various childhood diseases, many doctors do not test for lead.

**Precautions on the Range**

Precautions can be taken both on and off the range to protect shooters, instructors, and their families from lead poisoning. Administrative controls and good hygiene are two necessary tools. In addition, all shooters and instructors should practice the following "do's and don'ts" of range safety.

Don't smoke on the range. Smoking any type of tobacco products on the range should be prohibited to prevent acceleration of inhaled lead into the bloodstream and ingestion of lead transferred from hands to the cigarette, cigar, etc.

Don't eat on the range. Lead dust on hands and face can be ingested through contact with food. Airborne lead expelled from the weapon can also contaminate food.

Don't collect fired brass in baseball caps. Many shooters use their baseball caps to collect spent brass; this contaminates the cap with lead particles. When the cap is placed back on the head, the lead is deposited into the hair and absorbed into the skin. Providing boxes for the brass prevents this practice.

Do be aware that face, arms, and hands are covered with lead. Shooters and instructors should wash thoroughly with cold water and plenty of soap. Cold water is preferred because warm water enhances the absorption of lead by opening the pores of the skin. If no water is available, shooters should consider carrying a bottle of cold water and a washcloth for this purpose.

Do be aware that hair and clothes are still contaminated. Shooters and firearms instructors should wear an outer garment, such as a jumpsuit or coveralls, or change clothes before going home. Contaminated clothes should not be cleaned by blowing, shaking, or other means that disperse lead into the air. To prevent cross-contamination, range clothes should be washed separately from the family's regular laundry. Families with infants should be particularly careful, since infants are most vulnerable to lead contamination. Changing to clean clothing before leaving the range prevents recontamination of the hands and any contamination of the family vehicle.

Do change shoes before entering residence. Shoes can also transport lead into the home. Shoes should be left at the door to prevent tracking lead onto floors and carpets. As an alternative, disposable shoe coverlets can be used while firing and cleaning, then discarded when leaving the range. Ordinary vacuuming does not remove lead from the home, but redistributes it by blowing it into the air to be inhaled and/or resedimented onto the carpet.

Do avoid physical contact with family members until after a shower, shampoo, and change of clothes. Lead can be transferred by casual contact. Family and friends should not be hugged or kissed until after a shower and a change of clothes. Any physical contact should be avoided while the shooter is still in range clothing.

Do participate in lead safety training programs. Shooters and instructors should attend all training programs provided by the department or agency to ensure awareness of the hazards of lead.
Indoor Ranges
Most indoor ranges have a greater lead dust problem than outdoor ranges. However, range personnel can institute several controls to lower the amount of lead dust in these facilities.

The choice of ammunition is one such control. Nonjacketed ammunition produces the most lead dust and fumes; jacketed ammunition, the least. Shotgun shells produce more airborne lead dust than any handgun round. Currently, many ammunition manufacturers are trying to develop lead-free ammunition.

Indoor ranges should not be carpeted, since lead dust settles and contaminates the rugs. A high-efficiency particulate (HEPA) vacuum, which has a 3-stage particulate air filter, is the best air vacuum to use for lead.

Because water cannot be treated for lead contamination, personnel should use water sparingly to remove lead when cleaning ranges. If water is used for lead removal, minimizing the amount of water used will result in less pollution. Range maintenance employees should wear disposable coveralls and air purifying masks while cleaning and/or repairing indoor ranges.

Recommendations
Departments should conform to OSHA's lead standards, which became law in 1978. The air supply to ranges should be monitored for lead, and employees should be informed of the results. Medical monitoring, such as BLL testing of employees, should be conducted and funded by the department or agency. In addition, air purifying masks should be provided to employees who request them.

Washrooms and/or showers should be provided to ensure proper cleanup, and eating areas must be separate from lead-contaminated areas. A lead abatement training program should be instituted for all employees who may be exposed to lead.

Departments should place warning signs on the range and weapon cleaning areas that read: "Warning, lead work area--poison, no smoking or eating." In the gun cleaning area, an additional sign should be placed stating: "Wash hands with cold soapy water."

Conclusion
During the early years of firearms training, neither eye protection nor ear protection was provided or encouraged on the range. Today, most departments now require both types of protection on the line.

Currently, another health hazard--lead poisoning--threatens the physical well-being of shooters and instructors in firearms ranges. However, through administrative controls and education, departments can reduce the on-the-job exposure of employees and their families to lead.

Firearms training helps to keep officers safe while performing their duties. Now the time has come for departments to ensure officer safety from a serious health hazard during this training.

References:
(2) One microgram is one millionth of a gram, and one deciliter equals 100 milliliters.
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National Park Ranger Resource Protector T-Shirt
The Eastern Lodge is now offering the Ranger Protection Fund Logo with the words: "National Park Ranger" and "National Resource Protectors" at the top and bottom of the logo. The artwork was done by Shenandoah Ranger Steve Bair. The shirts are light tan and come in all sizes. The price is $14.00, with profits going to the Eastern Lodge. Order from:
FOP T's, POB 243, Point Marion, PA 15474-0243

The Protection Ranger
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Application For Membership
I, the undersigned, a full-time regularly employed law enforcement officer, do hereby make application for active membership in the National 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 (required): ________________

Associate membership (non commissioned) [ ]

Please enclose a check for one year membership. (Western lodge $27, Eastern Lodge $20)

Renewal (check here) [ ]

Enclose a copy of your commission.

NPS Area: ________________________

Mail to:
FOP Lodge
P.O. Box 151
Fancy Gap, VA 24328
FOP-ANPR Relationships
by Bruce Bytnar, Trustee, and Bob Martin, VP Eastern Lodge

At the Spring Board of Directors Meeting for the Eastern Lodge, we discussed the relationship between our two organizations. In a nearly unanimous vote, it was decided that we should pursue some sort of a relationship between the FOP and the ANPR. This need was reinforced at several FOP gatherings around the mid-Atlantic Region, where nearly all of the FOP members indicated they were also ANPR members. In discussions with several aides on Capitol Hill, it was recommended that we coordinate better with ANPR so we can come to the Hill knowing to what their stand is on issues.

Bruce Bytnar of the Blue Ridge Parkway took the lead for the Lodge and contacted ANPR. He was successful in getting a meeting with the ANPR’s full Board on the 9th of November. Bob Martin attended the meeting along with Bruce and we feel things went well. The general consensus was that we should explore issues we can work together on, and improve and formalize communications between the two organizations. Bruce has volunteered to serve as our Lodge’s Liaison Officer. Scott McElveen of Assateague will likely serve as ANPR’s Liaison to the FOP. Scott is also a member of the Eastern Lodge. If you have any questions about this matter please contact Bruce or Scott directly.

It should be noted that the ANPR gave the FOP time at the Rendezvous for a Special Interest Group meeting on FOP/ANPR relations which Bruce led on Friday, November 12th. They also provided us with a meeting room and listed the event on their agenda. The meeting was well-attended and numerous ideas of mutual concern were discussed. ANPR also gave Bob two separate break-out sessions on their official agenda to discuss the Resource Protection Fund. While Bob was only able to lead one of the scheduled sessions due to losing his voice, he received several good ideas for possible use in the Fund’s plans. Throughout the five days of the Rendezvous, we received words of encouragement about the Fund and our Resource Protection Initiative.

Bruce and Bob would like to thank the ANPR for accommodating us, agreeing to improve communications between the two outfits, and making us feel welcome during our stay. Although we both are long-time members of the ANPR, it was understood, and I believe appreciated, that we were willing to come to the Rendezvous to discuss these important topics.

The Resource Protection Ranger
by Bob Martin, Ranger Lodge’s Resource Protection Coordinator and President, NPRRF, Inc.

An Update on the National Park Ranger Resource Protection Fund

To say things are hopping at the Fund would be an understatement. Here’s a recap:

Liaison with Other Groups

The Fund continues to receive support from other organizations, the latest of which came from the Association of National Park Rangers. They did an article about the Fund in their journal RANGER; afforded me two separate workshops at their Rendezvous at Virginia Beach in November; wrote up a complimentary summary of the workshop in the Winter issue of RANGER; and their President, Dick Gale, has pledged to work with the Fund. In a letter dated January 7, 1994, Rick writes, “Since we share the same interests and aims, we would like to explore ways in which we could combine our energies, abilities and efforts... to protect the national parks and their resources.” This relationship has already gone to the next level, as Bill Halainen and I have begun to prepare strategies to deal with Congress, collaborate on pending legislation, as well as explore the possibilities of ANPR, NPRRF, FOP, NAWEOA, CLEO, and the Federal Wildlife Officer’s Association (FWOA) participating in a summit to prepare for the many challenges which lie before us. ANPR and NPRRF also collaborated on a synopsis of critical resource protection issues which ANPR will distribute throughout the Congress, in an attempt to raise their awareness of the crisis which our resources are in.

On other matters, the Fund continues to be solicited for opinions on pending legislation from a variety of national conservation groups on such critical issues as the Crime Bill, the California Desert Protection Act, the National Parks and Landmarks Conservation Act, the Black Bear Protection Act, etc.

Communications with Congress

The NPRRF sent letters to key members of the House’s Natural Resource Committee for consideration in their Public Lands Summit which was held in mid-December of last year. Congressman Don Young (AK), the Ranking Republican Member of the Committee, sent a letter back to us which said, in part:

"Thank you for your recent letter highlighting your concerns about resource protection issues, the national parks and your proposals for addressing those issues. Your efforts to date reflect the strong dedication that employees have to carrying out the National Park Service mission, which is commendable."

Congressman Young went on to express numerous concerns he has about the NPS enforcement program. It is exciting to receive correspondence from such a key House Member, who has tremendous power over our NPS operations in Alaska and throughout the System. I will working on a response to him and will try to keep the dialogue moving, with the hope of garnering his support for some of our Initiatives.

The Fund Sprouts Wings

The NPRRF has initiated the first of hopefully many efforts to support resource protection training across the nation. With a gracious cash advance from our fundraisers, Jack and Kathy Byron of B&B Presentations, we will facilitate the Wildlife Law Enforcement Course being offered for the Mid-Atlantic Region, at Delaware Water Gap in March of this year.

Continued on next page
The Fund plans to help with many more of these courses on a park, region-wide and national basis. We will probably not be able to help with another such course until the summer quarter, as we have many bills which will consume our first guaranteed $15,000 quarterly payment from B&B. These bills include over $5,500 in attorney's fees, start-up costs for fundraising and membership drives, office costs to handle the myriad responsibilities I handle (mailings, press relation packets, decals, membership, office supplies, and other administrivia...). We also are seeking a group membership for all NPS Protection Rangers to the North American Wildlife Enforcement Officers Association.

Free Memberships
We had originally intended to offer free membership in the Fund to all NPS employees, but cost factors (mostly envelopes and postage) have proven prohibitive. Because of the great support that FOP has lent the Fund, as the NPRRPF moved from idea to implementation, we have decided to offer all FOP members a free 1994 membership. Because of the aforementioned (but temporary) financial shortfall, anyone out there who would like to receive a membership card, two window decals, and some information about the RPF please send an empty stamped, self-addressed envelope to me: NPRRPF, Route 3, Box 314, Elkton, VA 22827. We'll get your membership information out as quickly as possible upon receipt of your request, but please remember to enclose that SASE!

The Media
The media has really taken an interest in the Fund and the resource protection crisis in our National Parks. The Fund has played a critical part in responding to a seemingly endless stream of requests for information. The Kansas City Star, the Denver Post, the Billings Gazette, the San Diego Union-Tribune all have published major stories on the situation. OUTDOOR and NPRPF's NATIONAL PARKS are currently working on major articles, and I have an interview with the Disney syndicated program "THE CRUSADERS" next week.

Memorandum of Agreement with the NPS
Still no word on the status of this MOA. Jim Brady, who has been very supportive of the Fund, reports it is in the review phase, but Jim is running with so many other projects of equal or more importance, such as Ranger Futures, 20-year retirement, and the reorganization of WASO and the NPS, that I'm sure it will be finalized in due course.

In closing, I think we are moving along well, gaining more exposure and respect with each passing month. I have never heard the words "RESOURCE PROTECTION" used so much in my 13-year career. I think this is the highest compliment possible and it speaks highly of the dedication of the FOP, the NPRRPF, and others for exposing the crisis we face in protecting our National Parks. Hang in there, keep your ideas coming, and speak up and speak out often for the parks, their resources and their guardians: Rangers. Lastly, my thanks to all those who have given me their support and words of encouragement along the way. I couldn't be doing this without you!

Developing a Resource Protection Program in Your Park
I have received numerous calls and letters from folks out there who want to do more in the line of protecting their park's resources but don't know where to start. The following article, which Norm Simons prepared on Wildlife Law Enforcement, is filled with many of the "nuts and bolts" needed to make a proactive resource enforcement program work.

Norm and I go back a ways, where we served together in Alaska--Norm in Denali, and I in Northwest Alaska Areas. We first met when Norm came to Kotzebue to help take down several rogue guide operations in and around the Area's three parks, Noatak National Preserve, Kobuk Valley National Park and Cape Krusenstern National Monument. We worked with USFWS personnel and Alaska Wildlife Protection Officers and Troopers executing warrants, seizing evidence at the guide's camp just outside of Noatak National Preserve, and even performed a traffic stop near the Alaska Super Cub as it landed at Kotzebue's airstrip. Norm has a considerable background in resource protection and a desire to share it with others. I hope this will be the first of many installments in which he shares his expertise in developing or enhancing the resource protection efforts in your park.

NPS Wildlife Law Enforcement
By Norm Simons Golden Gate National Recreation Area
National Parks have experienced ever increasing pressures from visitors converging on our Parks to unwind and view the magnificent scenery and wildlife. Little do they realize the menaces to wildlife: eroding habitats and a shrinking gene pool.

We are faced with myriad environmental concerns which include industrial or population encroachment on park boundaries (many of which are unmarked, complicating prosecutions); poisoning of our waterways and forests; contamination of backcountry soils by overuse; and poorly managed concession operations. On the plus side, environmental concerns and media attention have allowed NPS management to obtain budgetary and other sources of funding for resource management, and is enabling the NPS to slowly move to rectify some of these concerns. However, another unresolved problem exists.

Wildlife law enforcement continues to be a problem in many of our national parks. While some parks have the manpower, equipment and budgets to pursue "wildlife bandits," the majority of parks do an inadequate job of wildlife enforcement because of inadequate budgets, lack of proper training, and lack of support from upper management. A Chief Ranger at an eastern Park recently said: "Poaching is at an acceptable level." This is an unacceptable attitude. Poor interagency cooperation further complicates the picture. Many managers are afraid of interagency involvement, because of turf concerns, ego, or fear of loss of professional face. Further, many of the new Criminal Investigator positions are funded by Drug Enforcement money and aimed at high profile crimes against persons, while few are designated for wildlife protection.

Our seasonal academies and FLETC, also constrained by budgets, provide inadequate wildlife law enforcement training to Rangers. The new expanded FLETC program for Land Management agencies has no new curriculum for wildlife law enforcement. Having been to both the basic FLETC academy and 8 weeks of LMITP and PITP (Criminal Investigator School), I was very disappointed in the lack of overall training in the areas of Drug Enforcement, ARPA, and especially Wildlife Law Enforcement. Some parks, such as Shenandoah, Yellowstone, and the Alaskan parks have developed special training programs and/or funding sources for wildlife law enforcement and public awareness programs.

Intelligence sharing is one of the easiest means to develop interagency cooperation. Developing a shared data base on suspects, vehicles, M.O.'s, poaching techniques (which are ever changing) can lead to an inexpensive source of interagency training materials. Many managers are unaware of the effects of trophy hunting on many species. Magazines, such as Sports Afield, Hunters Digest and others (with supporting documentation by many state game management agencies)
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indicate that many species of game animals such as Bighorn and Desert Bighorn Sheep, Dall Sheep, Moose, Grizzly, Wolf, Black Bear, and other trophy game animals, are experiencing depleted gene pools, leaving inferior breeding animals for propagation. This is substantiated by the Boone and Crockett Club, which in recent years has had to reduce the point system to allow other animals into the record books. Park managers in Alaska, Yellowstone, Glacier, and several eastern parks have noted increases in both illegal hunting and guided hunts into national parks for trophy animals—animals that are extremely rare outside the parks.

In Alaska, many guides have developed an elaborate system for screening their hunters in order to detect enforcement agents. A guided hunt for a wealthy client seeking a trophy animal can cost $30,000. This offsets the costs of penalties if the guide is convicted of any game violations. Guides nationwide employ various techniques, including the use of scanners and radios to hunt; pirated radio-collar frequencies and telemetry system to hunt trophy or rare animals; infra-red scanning equipment and weapon systems; and the use of homemade silencers to hunt in inhabited or routinely patrolled areas. In California, some of the Asian communities are using multiple cars for road-hunting deer. The lead car kills a deer by shooting or running it over, the 2nd vehicle picks it up, while a third keeps watch. If stopped, the vehicle with the deer can only be charged with illegal possession. Some of these bandits sell to restaurants, which is a growing nationwide enterprise.

More funding is needed for training and investigations. For those NPS areas that are unable to fund or provide training, other agencies are often able to provide training at little or no cost to cooperating agencies. The use of training videos, many that have been on television, could be used for basic instruction. Paladin Press out of Colorado (P.O. Box 1307, Boulder, Co. 80306) publishes books on homemade silencers, bombs, poisons, hi-tech poaching techniques and other subjects related to poaching activity. Membership in wildlife protection organizations, and/or magazines, and personal/professional relationships with State and Federal Fish and Game Officers are other methods of obtaining information or soliciting training opportunities.

But even the best training is no substitute for initiative and tenacity. Poaching techniques change, so it is a good idea to have other sources to contact for current information. It is also important to analyze every piece of information for what it may represent. I once used information from the National Weather Service and my knowledge of Super Cubs to determine that it would have been impossible for an individual to have flown into an area in wintertime, landed, shot, skinned animals, and returned to a specific location in one day. This, along with information from a state game biologist on wildlife populations in that area indicated the number of animals taken by the hunter was false which led to search warrants against the hunter. Often it is equally important to determine what the suspect didn't do, as well as what he/she did do. Also, women are playing a larger role in poaching, not only as hunters, but as lookouts, concealing evidence, providing information, or using/concealing weapons.

A clear understanding of wildlife and poaching techniques will be extremely important in presenting your case to a US Attorney who may have little or no knowledge of wildlife law enforcement. Basic information such as how poachers operate, how long it takes to skin an animal and how to clean the cuts may reflect the M.O. and skill of the violator. It must all be reflected in your warrant information and in your court testimony.

A 1988 NPS/Alaska State Trooper poaching case led to the conviction of a notorious poacher for aerial wolf hunting in and around Denali National Park. This case significantly improved interagency relations with several enforcement agencies, provided public education, improved NPS morale within the Region, and to date has resulted in cessation of aerial poaching in that area where it had been an annual problem. The cost of the training, investigation, and prosecution of that case was insignificant when compared against the benefits gained by a successful investigation and conviction.

The future of NPS wildlife is in our hands. It is one thing to manage wildlife but often quite another to protect it. The bandits are spending more money to prevent convictions. We need to improve our skills and technology to track and convict the perpetrators. This means an increase in funding for training, investigations, equipment, and the prosecution of the cases.

**Required Occupancy Dispute At Great Smoky Mountains National Park**

By Paul H. Williams

On January 10, 1993, I was administratively transferred from the Oconaluftee Ranger Station to Big Creek Ranger Station located in the northeastern section of the park. At the time of my move, no quarters were available due to the complete rehabilitation of the residential quarters. From January 1993, to May 1993, I commuted to Big Creek from my private residence located 18 miles away in the Cosby, TN area. During this 5 month period, the government did not pay any temporary subsistence payments for food or lodging. I received absolutely no complaints from our park managers during this period.

From January 1993, to May 1993, several rangers had been released from the required occupancy stipulation of their job requirements. Prior to my reassignment to Big Creek, our Chief Ranger made the statement that if one of our rangers won his case in Region, there would not be any more required occupancy in the park. Based on these conversations, the precedent set at region, government housing still not available, and no problems having resulted from the commute to my station, I submitted my request to be released from required housing on April 20, 1993.

I adhered to all of the guidelines established by the Housing Management Guideline, NPS-36. In this document on Page 1 of Chapter 10, it clearly states, "The head of an agency may not require an employee of a uniformed service to occupy quarters on a rental basis unless the agency head determines that necessary service cannot be rendered or that property of the Government cannot adequately be protected otherwise." Superintendents must have the justifications to make housing required. Most areas use form 10-383 which should be attached to your housing agreement forms. The justifications for making the Big Creek position required were not accurate or even valid. In my release letter I addressed all the elements used in determining required occupancy and the possible alternatives: duties performed outside normal working hours, frequency of overtime and standby duty, distance to nearest community, response time, and staggering work of the staff. Also addressed were several personal reasons for my release request.

I was informed by our park management that if I did not move into the quarters at Big Creek, I would be reassigned back to the Oconaluftee area. I advised management that NPS 36 clearly states that an employee has the right to appeal required occupancy. I never received the chance to appeal the housing requirement. It's interesting to note that my letter requesting release from housing was answered by our Chief Ranger and not our Superintendent. Housing Management Guidelines state in
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Chapter 10, page 2, that a determination of required occupancy must be made on a position-by-position basis. Each such determination will be based upon the recommendation of the Park Superintendent, subject to final approval of the Regional Director. The recommendation for required housing determination cannot be otherwise delegated.

I never refused to move into the required quarters at Big Creek. I did request that my letter for release be forwarded to the Regional Director for a determination. On May 24, 1993, I informed our Assistant Chief Ranger that I would definitely move into the required quarters. On June 3, 1993, I received a memo from our Chief Ranger which informed me that I was going to be reassigned back to Oconaluftee with an effective date of June 13, 1993. On June 7, 1993, I made my oral request for an informal grievance to my supervisor. My supervisor stated in a letter that he received a sealed envelope, dated May 27, 1993 from the Assistant Chief Ranger, in North Carolina instructing him to fill the Big Creek position filled immediately after my forced reassignment to Oconaluftee.

During this same time period, Eastern Lodge President Randall Kendrick intervened by writing several letters to attempt to resolve this matter. It was obvious that Randall took a great interest in trying to help a fellow ranger. He contacted Regional Director Coleman, Associate Director Davis, and Congressman James H. Quillen. I believe that Randall's help made a big difference. The Big Creek position was put on hold and never refilled after my reassignment. I approached our Personnel Management Specialist on June 1, 1993 and asked, "How do I fight this reassignment?" The response was that they are park management and must side with park management. In my opinion if they truly wanted to assist me they could have given a more supportive response. But what can an individual ranger expect when it is the same personnel department who is managing the forced reassignment? The personnel specialist also sent a letter to the Superintendent requesting that I be given a 5 day suspension for making a false statement in my formal grievance. In Departmental Manual, Part 370 DM, Chapter 771 Employee Grievances it states under section 3.1 that employees are free to use this procedure without restraint, interference, coercion, discrimination, or reprisal of any kind by any management level.

An attorney was secured to represent my interests and he had advised me to report to Oconaluftee. So on June 29, 1993, I reported to work at Oconaluftee Ranger Station. I stayed in temporary lodging for a period of 30 days. The Superintendent wrote a letter stating that I should be denied any additional extension on the temporary subsistence. I commuted from Cosby, TN to Oconaluftee which is approximately an hour and half trip one way. This 3 hour per day commute meant less time with my family--a 3 year old needs a father around. Our park management showed absolutely no concern for the welfare of my family. For this sole reason, I will never trust any management person at any level again.

My attorney negotiated 2 settlement agreements with the Regional Director and the park Superintendent. I agreed to move back to Big Creek and live in required housing for a period of 3 years before seeking a release from required housing. Presently, 8 other Great Smoky Mtn. rangers have been released from required housing. So far, I am the only ranger who has been denied release. During this stressful grievance procedure, Randall Kendrick and Dan Kirschner (of the Western FOP), have been in contact with attorney Passman who represented Tim Sorber in his case. Mr. Passman said that our grievance process is basically worthless. How can the agency that writes the policies like NPS 36 Management Guidelines also be the officials who ultimately determine the outcome of a formally submitted grievance?! Mr. Passman made it clear that what rangers desperately need within our agency is a bargaining unit.

Administrative grievances, such as the one I filed, are most commonly used by non-bargaining unit employees because bargaining unit employees generally are covered by a union contract that has a separate grievance system for them. Additionally, matters like required occupancy and changes in duty station can be specifically covered in a contract negotiated between rangers and management.

Your Job Rights, the Federal Employees Guide to Appeals and Grievances by Don Mace and Eric Yoder, lists the types of actions that may be grieved. The most common examples of administrative grievances include unwanted reassignments, challenges to performance ratings, challenges to the application of the agency's staffing policies, denial of training requests, and disciplinary matters not appealable under other systems. It also states that important exceptions to grievance coverage are: the content of established agency regulations and policy--in my case NPS 36 Housing Management Guidelines; a matter on which the employee is entitled to file a grievance under a negotiated grievance procedure or an appeal to the Merit System Protection Board, Office of Personnel Management, Federal Labor Relations Authority, or Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. In my case, the attorney entered into a negotiated settlement agreement with the Southeastern Regional Director and the park Superintendent.

I believe that in my particular case 2 separate grievances actually existed. One was the unwanted reassignment and the second the denial to answer my right to appeal an agency established policy, NPS-36 Housing Management Guidelines, by seeking a release from required Housing.

Our Chief Ranger made the statement in a letter dated June 28, 1993, that my request to be released from required occupancy status would not be processed through the procedural channels discussed in NPS-36 as I would no longer be in the required occupancy position. It became obvious that management was hiding behind the veil of management rights to reassign, thus negating my right to seek an appeal for release. I believe management may have overlooked one important issue: Prohibited Personnel Practices. This falls under the 1978 Civil Service Reform Act. Prohibited personnel practices include: taking or failing to take, or threatening to take or fail to take, a personnel action because of an individuals exercising any appeal, complaint, or grievance right.

I have been employed by the Great Smoky Mountains National Park for the past 13 years. I dedicated my life to protecting our natural resources. Field rangers should be able to devote their time to protecting our Parks, not fighting with our own management personnel. For some reason, our management seems to be resistant to change. It is beyond my comprehension that they can't seem to grasp the simple concept of lowering housing rental rates in order to retain qualified personnel in their housing units.

Again I would like to thank Randall Kendrick, Dan Kirschner and the FOP Ranger Lodge for their continuing support. My attorney made the statement, "Paul, what are you doing taking on the entire National Park Service." I remarked, "As long as we have to fight these cases as individuals, we will have a hard row to plow." We are no longer standing alone. With the support of our FOP brothers and sisters, we can begin to make greater strides toward enhancing the rights of all employees.

CORRECTION: In the November/December Protection Ranger, we did not give the correct authors for Child I.D. Day. They are Linda Alick and Brian McDonnell. Our apologies and thanks!
GS 9 Seasonals!!
How Close the Millennium?
by George Durkee

There is good news and, as always, bad news. WASO has announced that the new Position Descriptions for law enforcement rangers are scheduled to be implemented in ALL parks by the first pay period in July. Alas, seasonals are not scheduled to be included until early fall. Still, the millennium seems at hand. Below is an excerpt from the February Clear Text outlining the planned implementation:

"In April, superintendents will begin position management reviews of all GS-025 positions within their areas in accord with conversion implementation instructions. Parks will be required to have comprehensive Ranger Future implementation plans with supporting personnel documentation completed by mid-June. The plan will include upgrades, reclassification to other series, and cost estimates for FY 94 and FY 95.

The final step will be to complete SF-52s and have them in effect in the first full pay period in July (PP 16).

All of these actions will apply to permanent rangers. The next conversion in this sequence is for seasonal rangers and is currently in the works. This plan may be completed by the end of the summer, but more likely will be finished some time during the fall. At the same time, we will be developing a comprehensive plan for management of ranger careers; our intent is to complete this document and other supporting paperwork by year's end."

Also of interest is a statement from Director Kennedy in a taped talk about "streamlining the park service (2/15/94):"

"We have gone forward and will continue to go forward with a program to do right by the people of the National Park Service to get adequate pay for adequate work. And there's a chunk of money in this year's budget as there will be in succeeding years budgets to [do] that...to be sure that the classification process works. There is legislation going in and there will be more to pay seasonals and temporarys who are really permanent, and to have an adequate benefits and retirement package for those folks. We're going forward as well with our intentions to take care of our national parks."

Jim Brady commented that their goal is to "value full performance [seasonal] work the same as permanent rangers." He went on to say that they are still working on plans to convert qualifying seasonals to some sort of permanent, less than full time appointment, likely by next year. He had no idea, though, what "qualifying" is, but did say that it is also likely that even those not converted would be eligible for benefits. Finally, under Ranger Futures, their goal is to place formal value on seasonal time for the purposes of getting a permanent ranger job. On the whole, Jim said he was optimistic about all of this happening.

For seasonals, there appears to be bad news concerning conversion and issuing of the new Sig weapons. The 9mm Sigs will be issued first to permanent until ALL permanent have them. Depending on the speed it takes to convert permanent to Sigs, it will likely take a couple of years to get to seasonals. In addition, even if a seasonal personally owns a Sig s/he will not be allowed to use it on duty. At the moment only Level I commissioned rangers will be able to use them. Needless to say, this is absurd and we strongly oppose it. The reasons for upgrading to auto loaders--officer safety and replacing old and often defective revolvers--apply no less to seasonals than to permanents. Yet another issue for a collective bargaining agreement!

BLM Field Ranger Training
By Tom Biller, BLM Ranger
California Desert Conservation Area

The California Desert District has implemented a Field Training Officer program to better prepare newly hired Rangers for the wide variety of incidents and problems they will encounter during their patrols. The goal of the program is to enhance the trainee's prior training and experience as soon as possible upon completion of the Basic Police School course and, under the guidance of an experienced FTO, to assist the new ranger to become an effective, efficient, safety-conscious member of the Bureau of Land Management.

Due to the complexity and depth of the BLM Ranger's position it will not be possible to cover all aspects of the job during this field training period. As the BLM Ranger's primary function is protection of natural and cultural resources, and the safety of the public, those aspects of the job that relate to compliance, enforcement, and officer and public safety will receive primary consideration.

An integral part of the program will be the Field Training Officer (FTO). An FTO should be a BLM Ranger with a number of years of experience and who has completed an approved FTO Training Course. The goal of the program will be to have at least one FTO in each BLM District.

For the program to function efficiently it will be important that the following apply:

- The FTO must remain only a "neutral" training officer; the FTO cannot be the trainee's supervisor.
- There cannot be any "fraternization" between the FTO and the trainee.
- To add credibility to the program the FTO should have a higher grade than the trainee and should be designated and recognizable in the field as an FTO.
- The time allotted to the training must be adhered to; short cuts will cause gaps in the training and may result in increased liability to the FTO, supervisors, and the agency.
- The program will be used to "screen-in" a trainee; rather than to "screen-out" the trainee.
- The FTO will only teach and judge performance; the Chief Area Ranger and the Area Manager will decide what to do with the results of the program.

This program uses a number of different methods to get the trainee to the level needed to function as a single unit patrol officer. The program will consist of three phases.

1. The first phase will consist of the trainee riding with the FTO and primarily observing contacts and performing simple tasks.
2. The second phase will have the trainee performing more independently and solving problems with less assistance.
3. The third, and final, phase has the trainee performing as a "single" unit; the FTO only observes. During the final phase the trainee is expected to demonstrate proficiency and/or knowledge of all critical tasks.

Phase Training Lengths

This FTO program is designed for a 6-week period and requires a full 240 hours of training time. A trainee's time not spent in the
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FTO program during the training period will not be considered training time:

- Phase I 1 week (40 hr)
- Phase II 2-1/2 weeks (100 hr)
- Phase III 2-1/2 weeks (100 hr)

This program was developed by Jerry Bronson and Tom Biller to fill a real need to increase the professionalism and provide for a greater degree of officer safety in the new Rangers.

After attending a P.O.S.T. certified Field Training Officers course in March 1993 we developed the training plan using materials provided in the course and from examples provided by numerous police and sheriff's departments throughout the state. Of course, the materials had to be adapted somewhat to fill the BLM Ranger's particular needs. The program has been implemented for testing in a few Area Offices. By the end of January we should have our first successful graduate of the program.

As one of the few FTO's implementing the program I have been astounded by the level of experience and abilities the present trainees have gained in the weeks the program has been in effect. (It took many of us a number of seasons, in the "school of hard knocks," to get to the levels of expertise the trainees gain in a couple of months.) Along with a qualified FTO it is also important that, as Bob Martin noted in his article in The Protection Ranger (12/93), the trainee be assigned to the program shortly after completion of FLETC and the program be implemented in a high use area that will maximize the number of public safety contacts.

If you are interested in finding out more about our new program, which could easily be adapted to NPS needs, call me at (619) 564-6237.

Beep Me = Pay Me
(From the November 1993 PADC Police Association News):

The Federal Service Impasses Panel ordered the U.S. Marine Corps and the American Federation of Government Employees to adopt the union's proposal on employees who carry beepers. AFGE had proposed that employees be placed in a pay status when they were required to carry beepers after regular working hours. The FLRA and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit upheld the negotiability of the union's proposal. As the FLRA and the court pointed out, the proposal dealt with paying the employees to carry a beeper, which the agency could do by placing the employees in a standby status, and not with whether the employees would have to carry beepers.

In its presentation to the Panel, the agency argued that if it had to adopt the union proposal and place the employees in a paid standby status, it would likely have to discontinue the use of the beepers altogether because of the added cost. [Editor's Note: Oh well!].

AFGE maintained that employees who had to carry beepers were restricted in the use of their off-duty time. They had to refrain from drinking alcoholic beverages and otherwise remain fit for duty if they were called back to work. The union offered data on at least 31 public and private sector organizations that have negotiated contract provisions on compensation to workers for carrying beepers after their normal hours of work.

In FSIP's view, the practices of nonfederal employers constituted an acknowledgment that the use of beepers was an infringement on employees personal time and warranted additional compensation.

Eastern Lodge Election Results
Bruce W. Bytnar, Trustee at Large

As directed by the Eastern Lodge President, I have received the ballots for the 1994 Lodge Election of Officers. The results of these ballots are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Randall Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Tim Woosley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Janet Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Randall Kendrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President Internal Affairs</td>
<td>Steve Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President External Affairs</td>
<td>Dan Kirschner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>Billy McCraw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the ballots I also received several comments on the lack of candidates for each office. I would hope that as we move toward the future and our organization matures more people will be interested in holding office in our Lodge. I charge the membership to start now in identifying those individuals with the interest and skills to run for office in our next election.

President's Report Eastern Lodge
By Randall Kendrick

EASTERN LODGE POLL RESULTS

Here are the results of the first 300 poll cards received. I want to thank all of those Brothers and Sisters who took the time to answer the poll. Not everyone answered every question and "No Answer" was only tabulated for the Collective Bargaining question.

**Bargaining Unit:**
- Would pay $100: 126; $200: 38; $300: 19
- Don't want bargaining unit: 39; No Answer: 80

**Receiving Hepatitis B Immunization?**
- Yes: 261; No: 32

**Equipped with Body Armor?**
- Yes: 285; No: 7

**FOP Service & Periodicals:**
- Excellent: 77; Good: 186; Fair: 27; Poor: 3
- Miss an issue of Protection Ranger? Yes: 21; No: 209

**Favor a separate federal law enforcement pay system?**
- Yes: 261; No: 18

**Consider buying a Sig Sauer automatic at NPS price?**
- Yes: 210; No: 77

**Priority GS-9 as base ranger grade?**
- Yes: 288; No: 5. High priority: 243; Medium: 36; Low: 0

**Favor a Ranger Protection Fund?**
- Yes: 242; No: 36. Pay for it with a separate charge: 110; Voluntary contribution: 117

Our FOP Lodge is trying to be able to distribute the new Sig Sauer automatic pistols to commissioned rangers who wish to purchase one. The Brothers and Sisters of the Shendandoa...
Chapter are working with WASO on this deal. Your answering this poll question has shown the interest among Lodge members in buying a Sig Sauer and is very helpful. We should know by next issue if we can do this or not.

After studying a federal pay system for law enforcement officers, the Office of Personnel Management turned around and came out against it. The FOP believes that this LE pay system will benefit officers in general and rangers in particular and will lobby for its coming into existence. Brother Chris Cruz, the Western Lodge President, is a constituent of House Speaker Foley and has been told by an aide that adoption this year is unlikely due to potential cost. We hope and expect Ranger Futures to be implemented, and we are strong supporters of the excellent work Jim Brady and the Ranger Activities division has done. But since other "ranger friendly" programs have died at management levels above R.A.D., we think it prudent to try all available avenues to raise pay and improve working conditions.

The Lodge has assisted five members with significant problems with management and/or housing in 1993. Officer time, and to a lesser extent, Lodge funds were obligated to members in need. This is what we should do and will continue to do. I think, however, it is prudent to adopt a budget for these expenditures and to formulate a policy on how money can be raised and spent. Your answers to a question about a "Ranger Protection Fund" tell us you want and support this project. I would like the Fraternal Order of Police to be the ranger protection organization, and to the extent of our finances and abilities, we will support Brothers and Sisters in need. In the interests of prudence and fairness, I feel we need guidelines and an evaluation system.

I think your answers to the hepatitis B question are very satisfying. The FOP in early 1990 adopted the position that free immunizations against this threat to law enforcement officers and EMTs should be offered to all commissioned rangers. In most cases, management proved willing to listen, and the majority of us got immunized well before OSHA required it. We are safer today because of the FOP's aggressive stance.

The answers you provided to resource management questions are helping the National Park Rangers Resource Protection Fund.

GET YOUR YOSEMITE T-SHIRT NOW! Half Dome with Rangers on Horseback in Foreground $12.00 + $2.00 shipping. Call Keith McAuliffe at (209) 372-9982.

Establish priorities to give money to protect park resources. Brother Bob Martin has the poll answers and thanks you all for helping him.

**Eastern Lodge Elections:** Elsewhere in this issue, Lodge Trustee Bruce Bytnar, Blue Ridge, reports on our election results. We have two new officers this term: Brother Tim Woosley, Shenendoah, will serve as Lodge Director and Brother Dan Kirschner of Delaware Water Gap will serve as Vice President for External Affairs.

The Director represents us on the Board of Directors of the VA Lodge. Brother Tim will help determine the FOP's future, at the state level. Tim will also continue heading up the T-shirt sales.

The Vice President for External Affairs will represent the Lodge in our dealings with NPS management, Congress, and other organizations. Brother Dan held a similar position with the Western Lodge and also worked effectively with the Grand Canyon Public Safety Officer's Association.

The Lodge is very appreciative of the outstanding work Bob Martin did as Director and Vice President for External Affairs. He contributed over 1000 hours per year to our cause and our FOP Lodge is strong today in large measure due to his hard and effective work. Exciting things are happening with the Resource Protection Fund under Brother Bob's leadership, and it is poised to take off in 1994. Many thanks for an awesome job, Bob!

We would like to have more candidates for Lodge office and we will work with any member who is interested in serving. Please contact an officer or the Lodge. Members can get excellent work experience, and perform needed tasks in park chapters and are urged to do so. Chapters are making a positive difference at the park level and deserve the help and support of all members.

**Late Breaking News:** On February 23 Shenandoah Ranger Skip Wissinger won his 6(c) MSPB case in Roanoke and on February 24 Janet Bachman of Blue Ridge Parkway won her case in front of the MSPB. To date ten 6(c) cases have been won without losing any to MSPB.

**Eastern Lodge Members:** If you have not paid your 1994 dues, please do so right away. They were due January 1, 1994.