



# RANGER ACTIVITIES INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Volume 7, Number 2

May/June, 1991

## Chief Ranger's Comments

I once said that I would never come east of the Mississippi during my career, and certainly never to Everglades or to the Washington Office except on a detail. Now as we pack up to leave for southern Utah after nearly five and a half years in Washington - following three plus years in Everglades - I am extremely thankful for the opportunities and adventures we've enjoyed east of "the big river." There is no feeling of having "escaped Washington."

Rather than go through a list of the things we've been messing with back here, it'd be easier to just say that we have tried to get involved with and influence operational and policy direction on any issues affecting ranger operations. While some of the initiatives have in some instances caused philosophical and emotional discomfort for some folks, the intent has always been to try to improve things. My true feeling is that there is not a single program or initiative that we have undertaken that in hindsight I wish we hadn't tackled.

We have a new sign at the end of our hall here in Interior thanks to the excellent work of Steve Essen and the crew at the Yosemite sign shop. The standard, brown park sign has an NPS arrowhead in one corner and reads, "Ranger Activities Division: What Have We Done For Parks Today"? The sign looks really good and captures the feelings of those here as to their purpose for being in WASO. Virtually the entire staff has extensive park experience, and all share the feeling that they are here to try to bring that experience to bear in a positive manner in dealing with issues that affect park operations.

Long range career goals for most of the staff include life again in the field. To date, those goals have generally been attained, as the pace of the turnover of positions in the division has been about right and those who have left have gone on to positions in the parks or higher management. It is critical that we keep people with field experience coming through central and regional office assignments. It's good for the Service, and it's good for the individual. The perspective gained by looking at many different issues and in a broader context is important in an employee's development and valuable in managing park operations at a higher level. There are realities in life - politically and otherwise - that I personally did not appreciate until getting dumped in the middle of them in this position.

WASO and regional office assignments are unquestionably not for all. Those looking to manage parks in the future, however, would certainly benefit from the experience, as would those who want to change things on a large scale, to have more opportunity to influence the outcome of issues, or to initiate change in positions where policy and direction is formulated.

Another aspect of working in WASO or a region is that you can't always make decisions that fit every situation or park operation perfectly. Something that makes perfect sense as policy in one park may make no sense in another; what might make sense to us at first look might look ridiculous when applied systemwide. We are constantly challenging everything we do to try to insure we are not beginning something that won't work, isn't fiscally or physically possible, isn't clearly understood, isn't necessary, or won't be used.

When we have had to ask for information, it has been only that information we cannot acquire without asking you directly. In some cases, such as with wildland fire management, drug enforcement, and archeological resources protection, the information you provided us resulted in significant increases in funds and FTEs - most of which has gone to parks or to direct support of parks. The folks working in here know what the paper mill is like in parks and have no interest in adding to it unnecessarily.

Insuring consistency in the implementation of policies is one of the primary functions of this and any other policy level office. In doing so, we do not intend to unnecessarily restrict discretion. If we do not have common Servicewide policies, guidance and regulations for various types of visitor uses, any inconsistencies will be skillfully used against us by specific advocacy groups. A couple of examples of this problem, both of which we are currently addressing, are climbing and mountain bike usage. If we allow mountain bike use on some or all trails in one area, it is very difficult to say no to the same kind of use in another. If the prohibition on power equipment use in non-developed areas is not enforced uniformly, the lack of enforcement appears to some to be de facto approval. In every project that we have initiated to address these types of issues, we have included representatives from field units on work groups, and have tried to insure adequate opportunity for review of working drafts.

One such project has been the health and fitness program, which has been with us since 1980 (I was on the original task group) and has gone through draft after draft - all with field participation.

As currently formulated, the program will have both voluntary and mandatory components. The voluntary program will be available to all employees; the mandatory component will apply to those individuals who are responsible for emergency services functions, including structural fire, wildland fire, law enforcement, search and rescue, EMS, and diving. The purpose of the mandatory aspect of the program is to provide some assurance that the persons being placed in positions where they are expected to perform strenuous physical tasks can safely and effectively accomplish those tasks. This would seem to be a reasonable expectation for both the agency and the public. We also depend on one another to be fit enough to take care of ourselves in physically strenuous situations and to be able to help our partners if they get in trouble.

There's no way of knowing for sure how many times people have failed to perform job-related tasks because of physical inability to complete them. We have not documented these failures, and there would be a tendency in any case not to report such failures. I can remember rescue situations, for example, where individuals who were expected to perform rescue operations could not physically hike into the location and were picked up on the way out, could not carry their

part of an occupied litter, or had to have someone help them in other ways - and these were non-technical operations. There are plenty of anecdotal stories of this type associated with various required duties.

The purpose of the program is intended to be positive and to provide people with prescribed fitness training to assure that they can meet and maintain a minimal fitness-for-duty level. Federal personnel management regulations place a responsibility on managers to assure that persons have the physical and medical capability to perform assigned duties. The proposed standards are based directly on the job tasks that we are expected to perform, as identified by a number of our peers. It is time to get the program out for testing and evaluation. At the end of the review period, we will reexamine all aspects of the program to ensure the validity of both the standards and the test. During the proposed testing period, the test would be mandatory and the gathering of test information would be required.

When you read the draft, you will find that the one task common to every emergency function we perform is moving an unconscious partner or other victim out of harms way and to safety by ourselves. This task has nothing to do with age, sex, elevation or anything else. Can you do it? The argument that you probably won't ever have to move someone in such a fashion is about as valid as the argument against wearing a firearm which asks how many times you've had to use it lately.

Another project which is rolling right along is position management. Lots of folks are doing solid things to get people with the right backgrounds into positions in which we need people with specific credentials. The more we know about organization of work, recruitment of the right persons for the variety of jobs we have to accomplish, and the personnel options available, the better the programs will be and the higher the morale. Learn all you can about the system within which you must work. It's not all that bad.

One project that I feel is particularly important and has now been virtually completed for the entire division is our program planning effort. We had in place a number of years ago an annual work planning process. One day Bill Halainen made the comment that, while our annual projects seemed fine, there was no clear understanding of where we were really heading. The question is an excellent one. It is not unlike Regional Director Bob Baker's comment: "It's not whether we are doing things right, but whether we are doing the right things." With limited funds and staff, are we doing the most important things first? How do we know that we are?

Whoever comes in here next is going to be able to pick up a couple of notebooks and look at the 30 plus program areas in Ranger Activities - including wilderness management, fee collection, regulations, grazing, law enforcement, and aviation - and look at the blueprint for where we've thought these programs should be going. Each program has been defined, the management objectives of the program have been listed, the way the program is administered has been described, and all projects which need to be completed in the foreseeable future have been identified. The plans are in loose leaf notebooks; although they are intended to be dynamic documents which will be updated and revised as needed, they will first and foremost provide a planned approach to program management.

Well, Halainen said to do my "swan song". This will be it at least for the Exchange unless my successor overturns our own internal prohibition on guest editorials in the newsletter. So this is the last sermon.

It has been a kick, mostly. I have enjoyed working and talking with many of you, representing ranger interests, and putting together the staffs at Washington and Boise - staffs that I think you are as proud of as I am. It has been an adventure, an opportunity, and a challenge that I will truly miss. Thanks to all of you. I'll see you in the "briar patch".

#### Investigators Appointed

Two GS-1811 criminal investigators were recently hired by Southwest Region's Division of Ranger Activities to deal with a pair of problems that have become significant both in the Southwest and Servicewide - archeological resource protection and drug interdiction.

Joel Wright, formerly of Jefferson National Expansion, was hired as the NPS representative to Operation Alliance, the organization charged with coordinating drug enforcement efforts along our border with Mexico. Joel is duty stationed in El Paso, Texas, and is responsible for ensuring that NPS interests are protected, for assisting parks within Operation Alliance's jurisdiction in obtaining equipment, and for coordinating assistance to the parks from Joint Task Force 6 (JTF-6), the military unit assigned to work with Operation Alliance. Since Joel began work two months ago, he has coordinated 20 requests for assistance from parks in Southwest and Western regions.

Phil Young has been reassigned from his position as staff park ranger in SWRO to a position as criminal investigator with the multi-agency ARPA task force working out of Santa Fe. He will serve as the lead investigator on those ARPA investigations which involve NPS lands and will assist on other agency investigations. Judy Reed Miles, an NPS archeologist, has also been assigned to the task force, and Al DeLaCruz of Bandelier and Pat Buccello of Zion will be detailed to the group for short periods of time.

#### Valor Awards

Each year, the Department of Interior presents valor awards to employees in the department "who have demonstrated unusual courage involving a high degree of personal risk in the face of danger." Recipients need not have performed the act while on official duty or at their official duty station. This year, seven park rangers and four U.S. Park Police officers received valor awards. Because of the importance of the awards, we herein present the full citations for each of the seven ranger recipients.

#### **Daniel K. Horner - Yosemite**

"At approximately 11:56 a.m. on October 13, 1989, park rangers received a telephone report that a climbing accident had occurred on El Capitan. El Capitan is the world's largest unbroken granite wall. This massive, sheer, imposing rock rises approximately 3,300 feet above the valley floor. The 26-year-old injured climber was having difficulty breathing and was spitting up blood. He was lying on a narrow three to five foot ledge approximately 1,000

feet above the valley floor. There was no doubt that he required immediate emergency medical attention from what was feared to be life threatening injuries. Ranger Horner and a colleague flew from El Capitan meadow in a contract helicopter to make an aerial surveillance of the victim and to assess the feasibility of removing the victim by a helicopter hauling system. Their experience led them to believe that a "short haul" had a reasonably good chance of success. Although an expert in conducting and participating in emergency operations, Ranger Horner is not an expert in technical rock rescue. Putting himself at great risk, Ranger Horner rappelled 200 feet down the granite face of El Capitan, carrying a litter and medical supplies. Carefully working on the narrow ledge for about two hours with helicopter blades whirling within 20 feet of the rock wall, Ranger Horner assessed the victim's condition, gave him emergency first aid, affixed a Kendrick Extrication Device, and placed him in a litter. The victim was then safely removed from the ledge and lowered to the valley floor."

#### **Terry G. Swift - Golden Gate**

"On the afternoon of April 10, 1990, Park Ranger Swift was performing routine administrative duties in the lifeguard tower at Stinson Beach when his attention was called to a swimmer several hundred feet off shore in immediate danger of drowning. Aware that no lifeguards were available, Ranger Swift raced to the aquatic rescue cache, donned a wetsuit, grabbed fins and a rescue tube, and ran over a hundred yards to the water's edge. After re-checking the victim's location, he plunged into the icy Pacific and swam out through six foot surf. Without regard for his own safety, Ranger Swift entered the same rip current in which the victim was caught and swam through the breaking waves, reaching the victim just as his struggles to stay afloat had weakened to the point that, as each wave passed by, he slipped beneath the water. Placing the rescue tube around the victim, Ranger Swift then towed him out of the rip current and over two hundred yards back through pounding surf to the beach, where he was transferred to medical personnel and transported to the hospital."

#### **Mark J. Maciha, Dale J. Antonich and Terry L. Harris - Death Valley**

"On July 16, 1990, at 11:50 p.m., Chief Ranger Dale Antonich and Park Rangers Mark Maciha and Terry Harris received an emergency call reporting two visitors stranded on a rock face near Badwater within Death Valley National Monument. At the time of the report, a heavy thunderstorm was developing to the north of the area and was moving in rapidly. The rangers responded and interviewed the reporting party, a companion of the stranded men, all of whom were German and spoke little English. The two men had last eaten at 7:00 a.m., consumed little water, and decided at 6:00 p.m. to descend from Dante's View Overlook to Badwater, a steep 5,300 foot descent, wearing only shorts, T-shirts, and tennis shoes. The companion heard them yelling when they became stranded in a notch 500 feet above the valley floor. Rangers Antonich, Harris, and Maciha gathered necessary rescue gear and responded to the scene. Due to the hazardous location, extent of time of exposure, fright of the victims, and the fact that a major storm was starting, immediate action was necessary. The three-person team responded to the cliff area using only headlamps and the flashes of lightning to locate a route. Finding an acceptable route was exceedingly difficult and attempts were hampered by winds of up to 70 mph, a heavy downpour of rain, and increased local lightning. The ascent was done by alternating

lead positions, with Ranger Maciha taking the first lead and Ranger Harris taking the second lead up a very difficult pitch. This route was unsuccessful. Conditions were worsening to the point of being life threatening for the rangers. However, Ranger Antonich wanted to make one more attempt. This time on belay Ranger Antonich reached the victims and got them in a harness to prepare for the lift out. Then a large piece of rock (one by two feet) broke loose from the belay point and fell toward the victims. Ranger Antonich was able to shield the victims from the rock with his body while sustaining a large bruise. Ranger Antonich continued to shield the victims from falling rocks throughout the ascent. Rescue efforts were hampered by loose rock, rain, high winds and the fact that only one subject spoke a little English. However, after three hours on the steep slope, the rescue team belayed the victims to safety. The probability of survival of the two individuals had the team not successfully completed the rescue that night was extremely low. Flooding would have washed them from the cliff area to their deaths or dehydration or exposure might have taken its toll. All three rangers placed their lives on the line that night under dangerous environmental conditions and in very rugged terrain to make a successful rescue."

#### **Iaian "Al" C. Brown and Carolyn P. Brown - Fort Jefferson**

"On the morning of April 29, 1990, Park Rangers Al Brown and Carolyn Brown responded to a radio distress call from a vessel with three persons on board. The vessel was taking on water quickly through a large hole in its hull and was in danger of sinking. To reach the sinking vessel, the rangers set out directly into the full force of 20 - 25 knot winds. Ranger Al Brown was at the helm and realized that any false move could bring down upon them the full and certain wrath of the 10-foot seas towering above their 18-foot patrol boat. Being washed overboard or capsized by the violent breaking waves provided a clear threat to their own survival. The likelihood of being found and rescued in this kind of sea condition was not reassuring. The rangers reached the vessel just as it was about to go down. In violent, breaking seas, Ranger Carolyn Brown pulled the three men from the water into the patrol boat. Ranger Al Brown then skillfully maneuvered to allow a Coast Guard helicopter to lower a rescue basket to evacuate one of the men who was suffering a heart attack."

(Note: The NPS Alpine Interagency Hotshot Crew received the Department of Agriculture's Valor Award this spring. Their citation will appear in the next Exchange).

#### Aircraft Overflight Research

A park visitor survey form, sampling strategies and analysis plans are being developed for the National Park Service as part of the aircraft overflight research program. The purpose of the visitor survey form will be to determine:

- the percentage of national park visitors who are affected by aircraft overflights and associated noise;
- visitors' normative standards regarding aircraft overflights and associated noise;
- the importance of natural quiet to visitors; and
- the attitudes of visitors toward alternative aircraft management policies for NPS areas.

The responses to the recent request from this office for regions to establish priorities for parks with aircraft overflight problems will play an important role in setting a sampling strategy. Studies will start when approval is given to a task directive for the entire project and the Office of Management and Budget clears the survey form. If all goes well, the study could begin as early as August and continue into next fiscal year. Parks will be contacted as soon as the selection of participating parks has been completed.

Measurement of noise associated with overflights in conjunction with simultaneous visitor surveys - known as dose-response studies - will also begin in late summer or fall, with more work being done in FY 92. Survey forms will also be designed for interviewing air tour passengers and park staffs and superintendents. These studies will be done in 1992.

Initial studies conducted in the Grand Canyon to address the Congressional question of whether or not natural quiet has been restored to that park will be published by the end of this fiscal year. Results of overflight research in Forest Service wilderness areas will be published at the same time.

### Wildlife Protection

The poaching of wildlife in the parks has been increasing during the past decade as markets for wildlife parts have burgeoned and the trade in wildlife parts has flourished. Several cases involving the killing of three to four hundred animals of the same species in a single park over a relatively short period of time have also come to light during the past few years.

Accordingly, a wildlife protection needs assessment was sent to the field this spring in an effort to identify the magnitude of the wildlife protection problem in the parks and to more clearly define what the parks need in order to curtail the loss of wildlife from this activity. The responses which you provided were then used as the basis for developing a proposal which was submitted for the FY 93 budget in an effort to obtain funding and FTEs to assist the parks in addressing this problem.

The needs assessment showed that the number of poaching-related incidents has been steadily increasing each year for the past three years. These incidents have involved the poaching of 105 different species of wildlife in 153 units of the National Park System. Poaching is a suspected factor in the decline of at least 29 species; for 19 of them, the end result may be the extirpation of the species from the parks. The assessment also showed that twelve species which are federally listed as threatened or endangered are being killed within 24 units of the system.

Black bears were most frequently reported as the species whose decline is probably most closely linked to poaching. The poaching of black bears has been increasing dramatically in recent years due to the market for bear gall bladders in the oriental wildlife parts trade. The gall bladders, as well as bear paws, are sought for medicinal purposes. Twenty-six parks reported the poaching of black bears, with nine parks reporting that poaching was suspected to be a factor in the decline of black bear populations. Another 11 parks reported the poaching of grizzly (brown) bears, which are listed as threatened in the 48 conterminous states.

Five parks reported poaching as causing a decline in wolf populations, with four of those parks reporting poaching as possibly leading to the extirpation of wolves. Two of those parks also reported the decline of wolverines due to illegal harvesting, with possible extirpation of the wolverine from one of the parks. Other mammals being removed from park ecosystems by illegal means to the extent that poaching may be a possible factor in their decline in some parks include moose, bobcat, fisher, marten, mink, bighorn sheep, and the threatened Steller sea lion.

In addition to mammals, twenty-seven species of birds were reportedly being poached. Two endangered species, the peregrine falcon and bald eagle, were the second and third most reported of the birds being illegally taken. Although not reported by as many parks, other important poached species include the spotted owl, which is listed as threatened, and the California brown pelican, which is endangered. The reptiles and amphibians reported included the desert tortoise, the green sea turtle, and the loggerhead sea turtle, all of which are listed as threatened, and the hawksbill sea turtle, which is listed as endangered. Only one invertebrate, the endangered Schaus swallowtail butterfly, was reported being poached.

The needs assessment also looked at the current wildlife protection program. Although most poachers are charged with violations of 36 CFR, other laws used in 1990 - in descending order from most to least used - were state game laws, 16 U.S.C., the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and the Lacey Act. Also used, but in only a few cases, were the Bald Eagle Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act. Property was forfeited in connection with poaching in approximately half the parks which reported arrests for poaching. Approximately one fourth of the parks which responded to the assessment reported that they have used covert operations in connection with poaching cases. And approximately half of the parks reported some type of public information program on poaching.

We are asking for \$1.5 million and 23 FTEs for FY 1993 to combat these activities, but it is not yet certain how much money or how many positions we'll actually receive.

#### National All-Risk Incident Management Team

The NPS has successfully used incident management teams to run numerous incidents during the past ten years, including such events as the Queen of England's visit to Yosemite and the Exxon Valdez oil spill response. They've also handled searches, floods, hazardous material spills, wildland and structural fires, and marijuana eradication operations.

By all accounts, NIIMS has been a success. Most park staffs have received training in the implementation of NIIMS (National Interagency Incident Management System), and two regions have established regional incident management teams. Many states are now or will soon be implementing NIIMS for all-risk emergency operations management, and a number of cooperating agencies and organizations, including the FBI, Coast Guard and NASAR, are either using or are considering using the system.

Because of the expanded uses of this system, the Service is in the process of establishing a national, Type I, all-risk incident management team (IMT). This team will be comprised of an incident commander and planning, logistics, operations and finance section chiefs. While most incidents will not require the use of this highly-skilled team, it will be available for activation on short notice to manage those few emergencies and events which exceed park and regional response capabilities. Once called out, the team will order whatever additional overhead or support resources - such as a public information officer or external liaison - they need.

Rick Gale of the Branch of Fire and Aviation has been designated as the incident commander, and we will soon begin recruiting for the four general staff positions. In order to avoid conflicts and preclude any possible impacts on individuals or areas, the team will not include any individual who is currently obligated to a regional or national fire, special event or administrative payment team. Assignments to the IMT will be for three years, and will require approval by the applicant's supervisor. After three years are up, we will reassess the effectiveness of the program. Although we believe that the IMT will be called out only infrequently, we may look at establishing a second team at that time if circumstances warrant.

The IMT will provide us with an important tool in our emergency response capability. The team will provide managers with a tool to help accomplish their park's mission, and its use will be strongly encouraged.

#### Semi-Automatic Weapon Evaluation

In August of 1990, the Associate Director for Operations authorized a testing and evaluation program to determine the feasibility of arming rangers with semi-automatic handguns. Rangers at Joshua Tree, Death Valley and FLETC were given the task of running the program and obtaining the data needed to make a sound decision on acceptable weapons for a possible Servicewide conversion to semi-automatics. Six criteria were established for test candidates. The weapons had to:

- be semi-automatic, magazine fed, double-action only;
- fire a nine millimeter round or larger;
- have a side (thumb) magazine release;
- have a magazine capable of holding ten or more rounds;
- have internal safeties so that they could be carried safely with a round in the chamber; and
- not have a magazine disconnect.

The evaluators sent letters of inquiry and made numerous phone calls to company sales representatives to secure models for testing. Four companies - Glock, Ruger, Sig Sauer and Smith & Wesson - responded before the stated deadline. During the testing period, which ran from October, 1990, to May, 1991, over 200 NPS rangers from five regions fired and evaluated each weapon. The rangers shot 50 rounds per weapon; a total of 60,000 rounds were fired during the program with no accidental discharges or misfires. The rangers then filled out an evaluation form for each pistol fired. Criteria included such attributes as accuracy, magazine insertion and release effort, trigger pull effort and sight character.

At the same time, 30 Joshua Tree and Death Valley rangers shifted from revolvers to semi-automatics so that data could be gathered regarding the daily carrying of pistols in the field. Criteria for evaluation included visitor comments, number of accidental discharges, malfunction rates, and the amount of practice ammunition needed to make an effective switch from revolvers. The field test group shot over 30,000 rounds of ammunition. These rangers were not allowed to participate in the other half of the evaluation program so that the data gathered would be unbiased.

An initial, draft internal report on the tests has been prepared and sent to Ranger Activities for review. Further action will depend on Congressional funding. If the money we've requested for weapons is allocated, then the test results will be utilized to establish the criteria for the type of semi-automatic we will be seeking.

#### OPM Review of Protection/Enforcement Occupations

Early in April, the Office of Personnel Management published a notice in the Federal Register asking for comments on meeting the Pay Reform Act requirement to develop a legislative proposal for a new classification, pay and benefits system for federal law enforcement and protective occupations by January, 1993. Ranger Activities and Personnel got together and drafted a reply for the National Park Service. The majority of the work was done by two people - Len Emerson, classification specialist, WASO, and Hal Grovert, chief ranger at Delaware Water Gap, who came into RAD on a week-long detail. They prepared a lengthy memorandum which addressed the five questions posed by OPM. The memo was reviewed internally and subsequently sent to that agency. Copies of all the comments received from field areas were also attached and submitted to OPM. The OPM questions and the Service's answers - with a few minor deletions - follow:

**1. What do you consider the most serious classification and pay problems which must be addressed in these studies?**

Pay comparability is the most immediate problem affecting Federal law enforcement and protective occupations. Our ability to recruit and retain qualified law enforcement officials and protection personnel has been hindered by our inability to compensate those individuals comparably to state, county and municipal sectors. There has been increasing recognition on the state and local levels of the continuously growing complexity of law enforcement work. This is evidenced by the salary increases which have occurred, and in movements by some police organizations to require higher education for police officers.

Within the National Park Service, the Park Ranger Series is the largest single occupational category with 3,200 employees. Approximately half of those hold Federal law enforcement commissions. This particular occupation has an extremely diverse grouping of job responsibilities that includes anything from the Superintendent of a large park, to an interpreter, a fee collector, to a protection Ranger. The duties that a Park Ranger performs are varied, and may include, but are not limited to, law enforcement, search and rescue, emergency medical services, structural and wildland firefighting, scuba diving, interpretation, resource management and park management, to name a few.

The National Park Service has hired a few specialists in law enforcement, search and rescue, emergency medicine and firefighting, but usually employs generalist Rangers who may perform all of these functions. Many Rangers are required by traditional job duties and agency practice to be highly skilled in all of these areas. These are often hazardous and very stressful functional areas to work in, and they require a young and physically fit individual to adequately and safely work in these areas. Rangers are required to meet national level standards in law enforcement training and background. They function within the national fire qualification standards, and, in most areas, meet national emergency medical technician standards. They also function within the National Interagency Incident Management standards.

To attempt to work within the 025 classification series, with the wide variety of individual positions contained as well as the number of different functional areas, is very difficult. Park Ranger standards do not accurately reflect the skills needed, educational background, and multiple skill areas that need constant maintenance to perform the duties required. The National Park Service has been trying for years to adequately compensate protection Park Rangers through the GS-025 Park Ranger Series cross-referenced to the GS-083 Police Officer Series. This effort has met with some success. However, protection Park Rangers are still compensated well below the level of criminal investigators, U.S. Park Police officers, and many other law enforcement agencies.

The United States Park Police receive pay raises in much the same manner that most Federal employees receive pay raises. It has been the practice of Congress to periodically review the pay levels of the Park Police and make specific adjustments as deemed appropriate. There are some definite deficiencies in Federal law enforcement pay rates not adequately addressed by the current pay system. The cost-of-living raises and occasional supplemental raises do not keep pace with the true inflation rate, nor with the salaries received by police departments adjacent to the jurisdictions of the Park Police (Washington, D.C., Metropolitan Area, Gateway National Recreation Area in New York, and Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco). This affects not only morale, but it also makes it difficult to recruit and retain high quality employees...

**2. Which occupations in the Federal Government should be grouped within the definitions of "law enforcement" or "protective" occupational series for purposes of these studies?**

Positions which should be grouped within the definitions for classification and pay purposes are:

- a. All positions, regardless of series, whose primary duties require a Federal law enforcement commission as a condition of employment, in order to accomplish on a regular and recurring basis, all of the following: the enforcement of Federal laws, the investigation of violations, the authority to arrest violators, custody and transportation of prisoners, and the wearing of firearms and other protective equipment.
- b. All positions, regardless of series, whose primary duties involve the prevention and suppression of structural or wildland fires.

- c. All positions, regardless of series, whose primary duties involve technical rescue work, when such work is based on a substantial amount of training in such techniques as climbing, swift water rescue, use of rigging and hauling systems, and use of helicopters.
- d. All positions, regardless of series, whose primary duties involve emergency medical services beyond the level of basic first aid.
- e. All positions, which, on a regular and recurring basis, perform any combination of the protection functions as described above.
- f. All positions which provide direct or indirect technical and administrative supervision over, and constitute a natural line of progression with respect to any such positions.

**3. Is the current classification system adequate for evaluating the law enforcement and protective occupations?**

There are several problems in applying traditional classification principles and standards to these types of positions. Because the most difficult and, therefore, grade controlling duties of these jobs are performed on a reactive basis, the traditional "percentage of time" principles simply do not apply. The structure of the Factor Evaluation System (FES), specifically the manner in which the factors are weighted, also does not work well, particularly in the law enforcement area. The last four factors, "contacts, their purpose, physical demands, and work environment," are relatively low weighted in FES, yet are the factors which arguably are the best measurement of the level of difficulty in law enforcement and protective type work. The supervisory controls and guideline factors do not adequately credit, under the current standards, the on-the-spot judgments, often under stressful or dangerous situations, that law enforcement work often demands. The FES force fits this work into measurement patterns designed for work where the first five factors, because of their influence on "white collar" work, virtually set the grade level, and the last four influence borderline situations.

Another problem that exists is the measurement of relative difficulty of different law enforcement, firefighting, or other such protective situations. Classification criteria tends not to measure potential so much as actual circumstances and typical assignments in specific positions over a given work cycle. This can create a dilemma in protective operations, many of which have significant preventative aspects. A situation may exist where an operation may do such an effective job on the "prevention" side, that credit for the complexity of the "reactive" side of the work situation in individual positions may suffer. The emphasis in the standards on things such as the types of crimes encountered and investigated, or the types of fires suppressed, or rescues accomplished, while being a legitimate measure of progressive difficulty, may fail to reward to the same degree, successful prevention efforts in environments where this is a significant accomplishment.

Most agencies will use a single classification series to evaluate their positions. Park Rangers generally do not work in any single particular function, and the current 025 series does not adequately spell out what they actually do. A Ranger may be expected to function and perform independently as a structural or wildland fire fighter, an emergency medical technician, a law enforcement officer, or a search and rescue specialist, depending upon what incident is occurring within their park and who is available to respond.

The current definition employed by OPM to define a law enforcement officer in regards to 5 USC 8336 (c) retirement causes problems. The way OPM defines a law enforcement officer is out of step with the way that most local and state agencies throughout the country define a law enforcement officer. Most local and state agencies say that a law enforcement officer is an individual who has the training and authority to investigate, apprehend or detain law breakers, and to protect life and property.

The Park Police are exempt from the classification provisions of 5 USC. The Park Police and the Uniformed Division of the Secret Service are compensated under 4 DC 4-406. This classification system has proven adequate for the needs of the Park Police...

**4. To what extent, if at all, are law enforcement classification and pay systems used in local and State governments transferable to the Federal Government?**

There are very few examples that we know of in State and local governments where combinations of the protection functions performed by Park Rangers - law enforcement, fire, search and rescue, and EMT work - are performed in one position, or even in one department....The closest approximation (with one or two exceptions) is the Sheriff's Departments. Most of these do traditional law enforcement work and some are also involved in search and rescue work. However, other agencies within the same organization are generally tasked to do emergency medical services and firefighting. Many state and local law enforcement agencies already have a classification system similar to that of the Park Police. Additionally, state and local pay scales should be reviewed periodically to ensure that Federal law enforcement pay scales are comparable with their state and local counterparts.

**5. What procedures or mechanisms should OPM employ to promote effective consultation with Federal agencies, unions, and other employee organizations in conducting these studies?**

It is recommended that (the) field, subject-matter experts, and Park Service personnelists be involved while OPM conducts its studies to represent the unique involvement that the agency has in the law enforcement and protection occupations. Employee organizations such as the Association of National Park Rangers should be consulted. This organization has already collected considerable data on pay of non-Federal protection positions. Any unions that represent Federal employees involved in law enforcement and protection functions should be consulted, in particular the National Federation of Federal Employees, with whom we have a national consultation agreement.

As you can readily see from the above information, the National Park Service has a particularly complex situation relative to this study. In addition to all of the above, you...need to know that the Park Ranger Series is our "mainstream" occupation in the Bureau. Most of our top management positions are occupied by employees who have spent their careers as Park Rangers and Park Managers. Clearly, this study has the potential of segregating the law enforcement and protection functions of the Park Ranger occupation into a separate pay and classification system. We somehow need to account for the career pattern of the Service, as well as for the equitable treatment of our employees, vis-a-vis pay and classification, in the overall scheme and direction of any resultant system(s) coming out of the study.

\* \* \* \* \*

On June 26th, three members of the OPM task force working on the Pay Reform Act project met with staff members from Ranger Activities and Personnel to discuss these issues. Much of the discussion concerned the possibility of crediting rangers involved in emergency services for their work, either through standards or pay. The task force members did not think it likely that a new standard for protective services could be established at this time. The four series presently under consideration for inclusion in a law enforcement and protection system are 081 (firefighter), 083 (police officer), 085 (guard) and 1811 (investigator). The 081 series would have an EMS component. Further discussions will be held on ways to classify and/or credit search and rescue work. OPM will be going to a number of parks Servicewide to look at field operations and see what sorts of classification and pay problems exist among rangers involved in these and other tasks, and will be meeting again with Ranger Activities and Personnel in the future.

Law Enforcement Commission Statistics

Here for your general interest and enlightenment is a listing of the number of permanent and seasonal commissions we've had in the Service each year over the past 13 years. The statistics were prepared by the NPS Law Enforcement Employee Development Center at FLETC:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Permanent</u>	<u>Seasonal</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Permanent</u>	<u>Seasonal</u>
1978	1,341	259	1985	1,410	814
1979	1,973	616	1986	1,472	998
1980	1,965	639	1987	1,501	824
1981	1,216	638	1988	1,563	921
1982	1,304	785	1989	1,471	858
1983	1,697	817	1990	1,523	928
1984	1,416	748			

\* \* \* \* \*

The Ranger Activities Information Exchange is produced by the Washington Division of Ranger Activities. Walt Dabney, Chief Ranger. Address letters, comments and inquiries to: Ranger Activities (650), Stop 3310, National Park Service, Box 37127, Washington, D.C. 20013-7127; FTS 268-4874 or (202) 208-4874. Attn: Bill Halainen, Editor.