A MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

A plan for what? For serving better. And how is that to be defined? By the people of the National Park Service itself, with "a due regard," in Thomas Jefferson's language, "to the opinions" of others, especially to the changing expectations and necessities of the American people. They expect us to protect the cultural and natural treasures entrusted to our care.

For several years now, the people of the National Park Service have been engaged in reexamination of our responsibilities — hundreds of people have worked on scores of task forces for the Vail Agenda, hundreds more have prepared reports to joint commissions such as those on Science in the Parks, Humanities in the Parks, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, Historic Preservation and the Parks. People in and out of the Service have thought long and hard about Ranger Futures, Maintenance Futures, and the beginning of Administrative Futures, as well as natural and cultural resource management needs. A package of legislative changes has required careful reconsideration of how we go about collecting fees, about concessions policy, proper job classifications, proper treatment of seasonals and temporary employees, about benefit and retirement packages.

The recent restructuring process has been aimed at providing better service to our customers and owners — the public — and the places under our stewardship, while meeting certain FTE goals ordained by the nation's determination to reduce its debt through reducing the federal work force. Restructuring has engaged the advice and the thought of several thousand people, considering in detail the ways in which we go about our trusteeship. We seek to protect the resources for which we are trustees by exemplary stewardship and by learning to be better partners with others.

As this Strategic Plan is released, these concurrent processes, from Vail, from commissions and task forces, from restructuring, are coming together. This plan reflects those efforts and is the product of both the leadership and the people throughout the National Park Service. A lot of task-forcing and consulting and memo-writing has gone into those proposals. This plan is, however, more than a synthesis. It is our best effort to consider the traditions and experience of the Service, and to adopt changes in emphasis required by a changing world.

I strongly support this Strategic Plan, and urge all of you to consider it carefully. It is a common effort to build upon a proud tradition. It is also a manifesto to get on with the work our country expects of us. It will not be easy to achieve its objectives, nor will they be brought to fruition overnight. But the Service and our service to our country require that we move ahead across the field, holding our lines steady — perhaps even with an occasional cheer.

Roger G. Kennedy
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As part of its strategic planning effort the National Park Service is developing a network of employees and others to routinely scan what is going on inside the agency and what is happening outside that might affect the agency's mission or operations. This information is being analyzed and communicated to the directorate, helping them keep abreast of current trends requiring management now and alerting them to emerging conditions that might demand a quick, new response in the months or years ahead. National Park Scan is a quarterly publication of selected trends and possible indicators of emerging conditions believed to have the most important implications for the National Park Service.

Strategic planning does not attempt to predict the future. At best the knowledge of trends is an informed awareness of the present and of what the future might be if present patterns hold. With the acceleration of change through the 20th century, patterns have become more tenuous than at any other time in history. New conditions emerge with unprecedented, often shocking speed. Consequently, trends are less predictive than predicative—they affirm what is happening now (nonetheless a highly valuable tool). Through the study of emerging conditions we additionally try to identify those things happening now that might affect the future—change the trends—negate our previous projections. To accomplish this, members of the NPS scanning network are reviewing new information and reporting on change of strategic interest to NPS leaders as they develop policies for the future. Identifying these changes early will give us time to analyze their implications, and if they appear to signal a new direction, to respond quickly and appropriately.

The first section of this and future issues of National Park Scan will track trends in demographics and tourism, land use, the federal budget, and work force issues important to the National Park Service. The trends included in this first issue look at how the National Park Service currently fits into larger national contexts. Subsequent issues will focus on how the Park Service allocates its resources and energy throughout the agency and how the individual parks operate.

The second section of this newsletter introduces some events, occurrences, and conditions identified by the scanning board as possible indicators of emerging change. Ideas surfaced in this section may be new or controversial and do not represent the official position of the National Park Service or a consensus of thinking among employees. Indeed, the purpose of this information is to stimulate a dialogue that may eventually lead to new direction and policies.

You will find information about how to contact the strategic planning office for comments or questions on the last page of this newsletter.
The Nation's Population

Information gained during the 1990 census has caused the U.S. Census Bureau to sharply revise its 1989 projections of the future U.S. population. The census showed higher fertility rates than expected, especially among older women and minorities. Also, 1990 changes in the immigration law could result in 76% more immigrants entering the country in 2050 than previously expected. These changes coupled with revised estimates of average life expectancy (up to 82 years old by 2050) combine to refute previous predictions that the U.S. population might level off after the first quarter of the 21st century. While state-by-state projections have not yet been updated, the greatest population gains will probably continue to be in the southeast and southwest.
The Nation's Heritage and Recreation Estate

Public lands in the United States totaled some 816 million acres in 1990. Of that amount, approximately 708 million acres were in federal ownership and 108, under state and local jurisdictions. The 76 million acres of federal land in the national park system in 1990 comprised about 9 percent of the total national estate and about 11 percent of the federal share. (The national park system comprises about 81 million acres, of which 76 million acres were in federal ownership in 1990.)

It is difficult to accurately compare public use of national parks with use of other public lands, principally because no other agency has developed the consistency and accuracy in counting that the Park Service has. Also, different agencies report using different measurement units. The chart at lower left comparing visitation to federal lands is possible because all federal agencies report visitation in millions of visitor hours as part of the annual fee report to Congress. Because the state agencies do not report this number, no similar comparison of state and federal use is possible. The visit unit reported by the National Park Service is roughly equivalent to the unit of attendance reported by the state parks for day visits (although not for overnight visits). In 1990 the National Park Service reported approximately 260 million visits, compared to 720 million units of attendance reported by the state parks. Visitation to both national parks and state parks has increased by 32-33 percent over the past decade, compared to a population growth during the same period of 10 percent.
The Federal Budget

The National Park Service accounts for about 1.2% of the domestic budget, which in turn accounts for about 8 percent of the total federal budget. In terms of current dollars the NPS budget increased 65% from $603 million in 1980 to $993 million in 1990. However, in terms of constant dollars, adjusted for inflation, the budget was actually smaller in 1990 than it was in 1980. During the same 1980-90 period, the total federal budget increased by only 54% in current dollars. Even though the Park Service has fared better since 1987 than the majority of other federal agencies and programs, it has not fared as well as other agencies in the Department of the Interior, as shown in the chart at the bottom of the page.

How Do We Fare?

Federal and NPS Budget Trends, 1980-93

NPS Budget Share, 1992
Recruiting a Professional Work Force in a Changing Labor Market

Competitiveness in attracting, motivating, and retaining a professional work force depends a great deal on the ability to adjust to major demographic changes in the makeup of the national work force. Earlier predictions that the nation would face a labor shortage by the year 2000 are being revisited; but unquestionably the labor pool is changing in terms of more women, more minorities, and older workers. Remaining an attractive employer to the best of these candidates will require attention to such human resource policies and programs as diversity training, child care, leave sharing, flexible work schedules, and reemployment incentives.

Unlike the private sector, where large businesses are moving aggressively into family-friendly benefits, government personnel management policies and programs seem not to be keeping pace with these new approaches to human resource management. A 1992 GAO report found no governmentwide strategy for dealing with work/family issues. Furthermore, the National Park Service, which has traditionally prided itself on its sense of family, may not be keeping up even with other government agencies.

The following data from the 1992 OPM Survey of Federal Employees compare NPS employees' responses to questions concerning competitiveness factors to the responses of government employees in general. They indicate that the Park Service may not be as competitive as other government agencies in some areas.

From a report by Robert C. Amdor, Superintendent, San Antonio Missions NHP
On detail to the Office of Strategic Planning October-December 1992
Gateway Commercial Interpretation—a New Market Niche Ready to Explode?

In 1984 the developers of a big-screen theater in Tusayan, Arizona, gateway to Grand Canyon, gambled that park visitors were interested in and would pay $7 (the current adult charge) for a commercial interpretive program at the entrance to the national park. Their 34-minute film, *Grand Canyon: The Hidden Secrets*, has proved to be the number one tourist attraction in the area, aside from the canyon itself. It runs hourly, 365 days a year, for 12 hours a day from March to October, and for 8 hours a day the rest of the year. Developers of a similar theater now under construction at Springdale, Utah, gateway to Zion, have contacted the same film maker for a major production about the Zion backcountry.

Other examples of the growing attractiveness of park interpretation and environmental education to out-of-park entrepreneurs are occurring in scattered locations. Near the Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia, an add-on environmental education center and re-created "Blue Ridge town" may be the actual manifestation of what started as a proposal for a theme park about western exploration. *Explore Park*, a joint venture between the Virginia Recreational Facilities Authority and private enterprise, recently got approval for a 2-mile-long access road off the Blue Ridge Parkway. Local support for this consortium of recreational, educational, economic development, and tourism interests had been lagging until the project was reoriented around an educational center focused on the Blue Ridge environment.

At Little Bighorn Battlefield, North Shield Ventures, Inc., a Delaware corporation, has submitted a proposal for review by the Crow Tribe and the National Park Service whereby it would construct and operate a visitor center/museum at or near the national monument. Under the terms of the proposed joint venture, the Crow Tribe would receive a percentage of the receipts, and the National Park Service would receive assurance from the Crow Tribe that tribal lands critical to the viewshed of the battlefield would remain undeveloped. The Park Service has signed a memorandum of understanding to study the feasibility of this or similar cooperative approaches to interpretation and resource management.

Meanwhile, back at Grand Canyon the Canyon Forest Village Corp., an Arizona developer, has proposed a land exchange with the U.S. Forest Service that would position the company to create a new residential community and commercial center 2.5 miles from the south entrance to Grand Canyon National Park. In an interview reported in *High Country News* the developer said his dream (presumably for capitalizing on the heavy tourism in this area) has shifted from plans for a factory-outlet store to a proposed educational center for interpreting the Grand Canyon and its surroundings. Another example of commercial interpretation competing with other tourist attractions (and with NPS interpretation)—and winning?
The entrance of private business into national park interpretation, which in the past has been strictly controlled by the National Park Service, is highly controversial among both NPS insiders and our nonprofit cooperators. Serious concerns are being expressed about the quality of commercial interpretation, the potential for commercial attractions to exacerbate crowding in areas where visitors are already exceeding the capacity of local community and park infrastructures, and the potential for incompatible development adjacent to park boundaries. However, because this phenomenon appears to be driven by visitor demand and market factors, the issue may not be whether the National Park Service likes it, but how we are going to deal with it if it does, indeed, become a trend.

Commercial interpretation can occur with or without NPS participation. So should we participate? What is the motivation behind the market? Do people want to learn more than they can currently learn for free inside the parks? Can we influence the quality of commercial interpretation outside parks? Is there a place for commercial interpretation inside parks?

Faced with near-crisis situations caused by increasing visitor demand and decreasing interpretive budgets some parks, including Yosemite, are considering experimenting with commercial interpretive programs inside the parks. Building on the relatively recent practice of incorporating interpretation into river trips, horseback trips, and other traditional concessioner activities, concessioners may begin offering half-day or day-long walking or hiking tours and charging visitors for the experience. Especially when considered in conjunction with another possible emerging condition—the growing popularity of activity-oriented tours among retirees—this may have major implications for future NPS operations and partnerships with others.

Scan Code: Commercial Interpretation

Gray Visitors—Not Retiring to the Overlooks?

The latest forecasts (see page 2) show the U.S. population is aging. As of 1991 only China and India had larger elderly populations than the United States. Life expectancy at 65 years of age in 1989 was 17.2 more years. (The projected average life span will increase to 82 by 2050.) The elderly population (age 65+) is becoming more educated and more racially and ethnically diverse. Retiring people have better health and more discretionary income. Further discretionary income gains are predicted from the spread of pension plans in recent years combined with better retirement-oriented financial planning, driven in part by the fact that people have been told since the mid-1980s that the Social Security Trust Fund will be depleted in 2036. Consumer expenditure surveys conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicate that spending for travel increases as people age, with the highest average travel expenditures among householders aged 65-74.

The lifestyles of retired people are changing. The idea of spending retirement playing golf and fishing is giving way to alternatives. Some are trying hobbies they never had time for; others are turning hobbies into sources of income. Instead of lying on the beach, retirees are renting "Hobie-cats." A significant number of them are following the example of former President Carter by showing up for volunteer work at hospitals, police departments, and park and forest areas.

As their numbers grow and businesses respond to the market, people in active retirement will face a stimulating array of opportunities. Their travel appetite will be whetted by TV travel channel exposure to places most people have never heard about. Retired people will believe they can do more because Hollywood will depict older heroines and heroes riding, roping, and rescuing their way through the movies. They will have the opportunity to band together with others with their interests, strike out alone, meet with strangers to caravan, bus, bike, or fly on adven-tours, archi-tours, battle-tours, cult-tours, explora-tours, eco-tours, educa-tours, resor-tours, service-tours, spiri-tours, etc.

Scan Code: Gray Visitors

Submitted by Ken Hornback, WASO-TNT

The United States/Mexico Border—A Planning Frontier for the NPS?

NPS administrators, resource managers, and interpreters are beginning to cast more than a casual glance south of the border. Over the past three years NPS managers have found themselves involved in a number of cooperative administrative, resource management, and interpretive outreach programs with their Mexican professional counterparts. These efforts have included cooperative training of biologists and technicians from parks in both countries, cooperative management programs for species whose habitats span the border, and, very importantly, cooperative outreach to local communities and the surrounding rural populations with environmental education and
information about appropriate technologies, sustainability, and the creation of an international, if not global, perspective for resource use along the border.

Several social factors have come together to create a need for a truly international and cross-cultural perspective while planning for border parks. One is the graying of America. Sun Belt population growth has skyrocketed in the last decade, for both residents and retired "snowbirds." As noted above, retired folks in America are younger, healthier, and better educated than ever, and well off financially to enjoy a highly mobile and recreational retirement. During the winter, this segment of our population visits the Sun Belt parks, especially the desert parks near and along the international boundary. The upward swing in visitor numbers to the NPS Sun Belt units reflects this change in our demography. A second factor is the dramatic increase in the population of the northern tier of Mexican states along the international boundary. The population increase is placing heavy demands on scarce desert resources, such as water and firewood, with concomitant impacts to wildlife populations and their habitats. The third factor is the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement between Canada, the United States, and Mexico. This agreement has set in motion a great number of economic schemes all along the border, many of which will affect NPS units. One example is the proposal by a private sector consortium of design and civil engineers for a high-speed, four-lane toll road planned to connect Phoenix, Arizona, with the Mexican port of Puerto Penasco. It would pass through the western half of Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, in an area that is now designated wilderness. This is typical thinking along the border, if the land is open, and supports only cactus, it is fair game for any scheme.

This is an exciting and pivotal time for park planning along the U.S. border. Mexico is in the process of establishing many parks and protected areas in its northern tier of states, some of which will share a common boundary with established NPS units. Cooperative and strategic park and regional planning will be the process by which both countries come to understand their common ground regarding border populations and resource concerns, and their joint need to cooperate in research, resource management, and interpretation of the natural and cultural resources of all protected areas along the international boundary.

Scan Code: Borderlands
Submitted by Larry Norris, DSC-TWE
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The Elements of Foresight

Rapid change has become one of the defining characteristics of our world. Our institutions must adjust repeatedly to new technology and shifts in demographics, values and behavior, politics, and economies. To better deal with this situation many public and private organizations are experimenting with a variety of forecasting techniques and future studies, often called 'foresight' activities, to improve their capabilities for anticipating change. When practiced systematically and integrated into strategic management decisions, foresight activities have proven successful in anticipating change and avoiding crisis management. Two elements of foresight are trend analysis and scanning for emerging conditions.

Trends: Looking for National Patterns

Leadership requires comprehensive information, an ability to see the big picture. Within the National Park Service this often means aggregating data about individual parks and evaluating it to discern national patterns. Each of us in the Park Service observes only a part of the whole in our daily routine—a park, a program, a region. However, that part contributes to larger patterns with important implications for the entire system.

To help discern these patterns, the Strategic Planning Office is beginning to report and analyze data from existing servicewide data bases on such topics as visitation, budget, environmental quality and economic impact (much of which appears in this newsletter). National information about demographics, changing technology, and land use are also being added to the mix. The intent is to identify patterns, to track them through time (establishing a trend), and to discern relationships among various data sets that will enable us to better anticipate changes that might affect a particular type of unit, a region, or the entire agency.

A pattern we have seen repeatedly is illustrated in several articles in this newsletter (see the articles on park visitors and the economics of tourism). It is a bunching pattern where a small handful of units account for a large percentage of the total value. This pattern appears frequently, whether we're looking at park visitation, budgets, acreage, or economic benefits. In fact, 20% of the 367 units in the national park system carry 91% of visitation and 70% of the budget. This pattern seems to hold true whether we look at all the parks together or whether we subdivide them by designation categories. In other words, a small percentage of the national recreation areas carry a large percentage of the total value for that category, and so on.

Our early efforts to explore national patterns are often raising more questions than they answer. As we move further into this field and refine the tools and methods for aggregating and comparing national data bases, we will become much more astute at identifying meaningful trends and understanding their implications for the future of the National Park Service. Do you see patterns within and surrounding the National Park Service? What are they? Where else should we be looking? (Continued on page 11)
Safeguarding Park Values—How Well Are We Doing?

The short answer is, we don’t know. Pressures on park values are increasing faster than our capability to analyze them. We intuitively know that park resources are diminished by toxins contained in agricultural runoff, by fragmentation of native habitat, and by encroachment of development into historic scenes. We also intuitively know that increasing visitor use is degrading some areas of some parks. But little data exist to document what we are losing or how fast we are losing it—and no mechanisms are yet in place to develop a larger picture of national trends and systemwide priorities. Recognizing this deficiency the 75th anniversary steering committee recommended that the National Park Service embark on a systematic, park-by-park, usable inventory of information on park resources and visitor needs.

In offices throughout the National Park Service efforts are underway to generate the kinds of information we need to measure our progress or decline in safeguarding park values. The hope is that our ability to identify and anticipate changes in the health of park ecosystems or the quality of park experiences will lead to better informed, more effective decisions regarding resource management, carrying capacity, and regional land use. The ultimate utility of this knowledge will depend in large part on our ability to consolidate and synthesize information about all aspects of a park’s environment, allowing a more holistic approach to park management, and to distill meaningful national summaries from this data to inform servicewide policy-making and priority-setting.

The promise of national resource data bases, widely discussed since the 1970s, has stalled not only in the National Park Service, but throughout government. The Strategic Planning Office’s search for parameters measuring the nation’s ecological health hit a number of dead ends. Most agencies have huge quantities of data, but their automated data bases are usually organized by program or region and are generally not linked to create national summaries. Major national inventories, like the national wetlands survey, have usually been one-time efforts that are not regularly repeated. Given the general lack of usable nationwide data, a national data base monitoring the state of the national parks would contribute significantly to Americans’ understanding and appreciation of the health of their environment.

Subsequent issues of National Park Scan will seek out and track information aggregated at the national level by the National Park Service and others. Simply measuring how well we are doing will help ensure that the protection of park values receives the highest possible priority.

What gets measured, gets done.
Monitoring Air Quality

Air quality, which became the subject of an intense national debate and protection program in the early 1970s, is the most comprehensively monitored park value to date. Visibility data gathered over the past 20 years show that by the late 1980s unimpaired vistas had all but disappeared from most parks, including those treasured for their scenic grandeur, such as Grand Canyon and Great Smoky Mountains. Although average visibility impairment at Grand Canyon, at 9.6 decibars, is less than at most other parks, some impairment occurs 90 percent of the time. With pristine conditions set at 0 and each decibar measuring a "just noticeable change" in visibility, Grand Canyon's 9.6 is comprised of visibility ranging from 240 miles on the few clear days to only 20 miles when pollution is at its worst. Great Smoky's average of 24.1 represents 20-mile or less visibility most of the time.

NPS visibility data are still too recent to show trends. Total emissions of sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and volatile organic compounds, the three primary precursors to haze-producing particles, are projected to decrease nationally between 1980 and 2010 by 30-40%. However, these reductions are not yet being registered in park data. The acid-rain abatement program authorized by the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 will require electric utilities (who produce almost three-fourths of the nation's sulfur dioxide pollution) to cut their emissions in half by 2000. This is expected to have the largest effect on parks in the East, where sulfates contribute 50-75% of the haze. For the West, the Clean Air Act Amendments created the Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission and charged it with developing a regional plan to combat haze in the Southwest.

Continued monitoring through the 1990s may document successes and failures of these efforts to improve air quality and visibility and will undoubtedly raise and help resolve a number of issues of vital concern to the National Park Service.
Monitoring Cultural Resources

The WASO divisions of Park Historic Architecture and of Engineering and Safety Services are developing a detailed inventory and condition assessment program (ICAP) that will track the condition of historic (and also nonhistoric) structures and identify necessary corrective procedures and costs. The ICAP should accurately record the backlog of unfunded research, emergency stabilization, preservation/maintenance and rehabilitation/restoration projects, which is expected at the outset to be much greater than $100 million. Tracking this backlog will be a way of tracking progress in protecting historic structures. Information about the condition of historic and prehistoric structures is also included on the List of Classified Structures, which is being updated to create a comprehensive, computerized data base. To date only 16,000 of the estimated 20,000-25,000 structures are listed, and much of the current information is inaccurate or incomplete.

At the close of fiscal year 1990, about 53,000 prehistoric and historic archeological sites were known to be present in the national park system. It is estimated that seven times that many sites actually exist. As of FY 90 the regional offices reported that less than 2% of park lands had been systematically surveyed to locate and identify archeological resources and that about 82% of park lands had not received any level of survey at all. (Note that 77% of park lands, and presumably most of the unsurveyed lands, are in parks with more than 1 million acres and vast tracts of wilderness.) A systemwide archeological inventory program, developed in 1992, is projected to take several decades to complete. An automated data base is being developed to archive archeological resource information.

The preservation of entire cultural landscapes is a new idea that will require considerable additional information and research before progress or regression can be monitored. In 1992 a three-year program was initiated to field test an inventory that will provide information about the location, historical development, and current management of cultural landscapes. The CLI will take several decades to complete.

Little is known about park resources important for religious, subsistence, and other traditional uses to contemporary ethnic populations. The NPS will soon begin to document these resources for park planning and management purposes.
Monitoring the Visitor Experience

Basic statistical monitoring of public use of the parks is older than the National Park Service. The first annual report of the superintendent of national parks, published in 1916, counted visitors by entrance, mode of transport (3,600 mounted on horse, 3,500 by automobile), and home of residence. The Socio-Economics Studies Division continues to annually report visitor numbers, and constantly strives to improve the accuracy of the data through rigorous quality control and constant updating of technology for measurement and recording. Excerpts from their 1993 data are included elsewhere in this newsletter.

The assistant to the director for science and technology is developing a standardized visitor survey designed to generate comprehensive baseline data, applicable to the system as a whole, about who comes to the national parks and the factors that influence the quality of their visitor experience. As planned, year-long comprehensive surveys will be conducted at 15 indicator parks each year on a cycle that repeats at each individual park every 5 years. Over time, the surveys will detect changes and identify trends related to visitor expectations and perceptions, their recreational preferences, and their reactions to management actions. The survey was field tested at eight parks in the summer of 1990. Among the information sampled in that survey was visitors' overall satisfaction with their park experience, rated on a scale of 1 to 10, and their perception of crowding. Interestingly, the two parks where visitors perceived the most crowding (Great Smoky Mountains and Grand Tetons) also received the highest ratings for overall park experience. The test survey was limited in size and complexity and cannot be conclusively interpreted; however, it raised some interesting questions that can and should be answered through more rigorous study. The program has not been funded since 1990.

Taking a different approach, the park studies unit at the University of Idaho recently produced a Visitor Services Project pilot data base of information about visitors to 25 parks, gathered during week-long surveys at each park. The immediate goals for the project, which is partially funded by the National Park Foundation, is to create a data base of information from 53 parks where surveys have been conducted to date, and to make the data easily and quickly accessible in a variety of formats to park managers and decision-makers.

Putting It All Together

Planners at the Denver Service Center are developing and testing a process for addressing visitor carrying capacity that can measure a wide variety of park values—natural, cultural, and social—and compare them within the context of each park’s purpose and significance. Known as VERP (for visitor experience / resource protection) the process seeks first to reach a shared understanding of the purpose and significance of a park, then to identify and establish standards for maintaining desired visitor experiences and resource conditions, then to monitor and adjust use to ensure the standards are met. The VERP process introduces a critical first step into the monitoring process: reaching a shared understanding of what to measure and why that condition is important. The process is currently being tested at Arches, and training materials are being developed for use throughout the system.

What gets measured gets done.
Are we measuring the most important things?
The Cost of Knowing

A preliminary estimate of the multiyear servicewide budget required to implement the inventory and monitoring programs described on the preceding pages is an average of $55 million per year for the next 10 years. This would amount to approximately 30% of the $182 million included in the 1993 budget for resource management. Park and region base funding have not been included in these figures. Cultural resource estimates will most likely increase when the regional survey plans are completed in 1994. Although not definitive, the numbers give some idea of the magnitude of increase in the inventory and monitoring program needed to credibly track how well we are meeting our resource management and public enjoyment responsibilities.
The NPS Budget

The 1993 NPS budget totaled $1.4 billion. Between 1990 and 1991 the budget increased by 24%. Since then, however, it has stagnated, growing by less than 1% last year. In 1993 69% of the total NPS budget was earmarked for the operation of the national park system, 16% for construction, 8% for land acquisition, 5% for technical assistance and grant programs, and 1% for the operation of the Kennedy Center.

The ONPS portion of the budget was reorganized in 1993 into five broad activities: maintenance, resource stewardship, visitor services, park support, and administrative costs. The percentages going to each activity are shown in the pie chart on the bottom of page 6. Because of the reorganization, these categories cannot be easily compared to the categories used in previous years' budgets. Thus 1993 represents the first year of a new historic record for documenting changes in the distribution of ONPS funds by activity.

The distribution of the ONPS budget by organizational unit is shown in the chart at right. A comparison of data from 1983 to 1993 indicates that park and regional office operations have remained stable at 62% and 9%, respectfully, while WASO operations has decreased from 6% to 4% of the total budget. Actually, more and more WASO operations are being classified as servicewide programs, which doubled from $69 million and 24 FTEs in 1988 to $140 million and 116 FTEs in 1993. Although regionwide programs appear to have decreased, the 1983 amount was inflated by the height of the park improvement and restoration program (PRIP); actually, regionwide programs have remained relatively stable.

Where Do We Spend Our Money?

[Graph showing distribution of ONPS Funds by Organizational Unit, 1983-1993]

[Graph showing distribution of Total NPS Budget by Region, 1993]

Source: Previous year enacted appropriations from FY 84, 89, and 94 Budget Justifications.
Park Visitors

In 1992 the national park system accommodated 274.7 million recreational visits representing 116.1 million recreation-days of total use. Rather than spreading evenly throughout the system, visitor use concentrated in about 20% of the units, which received a whopping 91% of all the recreation-days of use. In fact, using recreation days as the measure, about 51% of the total park system visitation occurred in only nine parks: Blue Ridge, Golden Gate, Grand Canyon, Great Smoky Mountains, Lake Mead, Glen Canyon, Sequoia/Kings Canyon, Yellowstone, and Yosemite. Each of these parks received use totaling well over 3 million visitor-days. The next highest parks registered fewer than 2 million.

Visitor use appears to be increasing systemwide at an average rate of about 3% per year.

Where Are They?
The Economics of Park Tourism

A money generation model has been developed by the NPS Socio-Economic Studies Division to evaluate the economic impact of a park on its surrounding region. The MGM is a series of formulations that measure benefits from tourism (visitor sales, taxes, job creation), federal expenditures, and other commercial investment. The *visitor sales* segment of the model has been developed most fully and is summarized here. The graphs show that 7% of the parks produce 69% of the visitor sales revenue servicewide. These percentages closely correlate with the figures on park visitation and budget. Since park visitation is a primary component of the tourism section of the MGM, this correlation is to be expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Generating Visitor Sales</th>
<th>Parks Generating Visitor Sales of $10 Million to $99 Million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite $909.8</td>
<td>Acadia $98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone $808.1</td>
<td>Haleakula $76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon $591.3</td>
<td>Everglades $61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Smoky Mtns $490.3</td>
<td>Big Bend $55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia $314.9</td>
<td>Zion $50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Canyon $234.2</td>
<td>Denali $48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii Volcanoes $206.2</td>
<td>Mesa Verde $33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Rainier $153.1</td>
<td>Bryce Canyon $33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenandoah $148.5</td>
<td>Redwood $29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Teton $146.7</td>
<td>Canyonlands $26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands $122.4</td>
<td>Glacier Bay $23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain $121.9</td>
<td>Arches $22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympic $119.5</td>
<td>Crater Lake $22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier $109.6</td>
<td>Mammoth Cave $22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Badlands $20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlsbad Caverns $16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Channel Islands $15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petrified Forest $15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isle Royale $12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biscayne $10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.5% of parks generate more than $100 million each in visitor sales, while 70.4% of the parks generate sales of less than $10 million each.

Money Generation Model CY 1992
National Demographics

The usefulness of U.S. census projections to our efforts to anticipate changing visitor patterns or public expectations will depend on our ability to draw valid, meaningful correlations between national demographics and people's uses of and expectations for parks. Cursory analyses like the one at right indicate a possible correlation between growth or decline in regional populations and increases or decreases in visitation to national parks in those regions. Further studies may suggest more meaningful ways of aggregating and correlating data, using information about visitor origins, age composition and ethnic diversity of visitor populations, and other variables. Such correlations, if they prove valid, may help project changes in visitor use corresponding to national demographic projections. Updated state-by-state demographic projections through the year 2050 will be available this fall and reported in the next issue of National Park Scan.

The state-by-state demographic data for 1990 show a notable difference in ethnic diversity in the 10 NPS regions, as illustrated below. No national data base as yet exists to allow comparisons with park visitor populations.

How Do They Relate to Use of the National Parks?

Gains/Losses in Regional Population and Visitation, 1980-90

Population (million persons)

Visitation (million visits)

*Mid-Atlantic visitation data represent major counting procedure changes in five high-use parks. Remainder of region would show increase of 267,000 visitors.
Emerging Conditions: Scanning for the Unexpected

Scanning is the rapid review of a wide variety of information sources to look for signs of change and to assess their implications for the organization. Proponents liken scanning to "a kind of radar, spotting emerging issues when they are but weak signals of change and tracking them as they evolve and become more clearly defined." Scanning cultivates a broad view of issues and events affecting an organization, improving the whole organization's ability to learn and adapt quickly.

NEEDED: A FEW GOOD SCANNERS

As part of the strategic planning function, we are developing a scanning network for the National Park Service. We need individuals willing to look for signs of emerging change in print, broadcast media, conferences, and daily life and work, and to summarize their observations in brief (one-page) reports to us, preferably via cc:Mail. Experience in other organizations suggests that the average scanner will spend about 8 hours per month in reading and reporting. We will ask for your supervisor's approval, and may ask you to read some particular periodical related to your background or interests. We may also ask you to write or review a short newsletter article on changes you have identified.

If you are interested in being part of the scanning network, please contact us by cc:Mail at WASO Strategic Planning, by phone at (303) 969-7012, or by mail at P.O. Box 25287 WASO-STP, Denver, CO 80225. Please reference "NPS scanning network" in your response. We will send you a training guide and the necessary forms.

The Death of DOS?

Change seldom follows a straight line, but instead makes jumps and leaps. Those unprepared for the next leap must scramble to adapt or be left behind. A leap in computer technology is underway—are we moving fast enough to keep up?

Here in the National Park Service we first saw widespread use of PCs (personal computers) with industry-standard off-the-shelf hardware and software around 1984. While we have made substantial improvements to hardware and software since then, our basic computing environment has remained unchanged—IBM-compatible, DOS-based PCs with limited use of networks and on-line data bases.

Meanwhile, a series of advances in microchip and data storage technology have dramatically increased the speed and capacity of PCs, offering users sophisticated data management and graphics capabilities and easy access to a growing array of on-line databases, CD-ROM libraries, and electronic mail and bulletin board networks. Third-generation fiber optic networks now in use or being developed by MCI, Sprint, and AT&T herald a profound convergence of computing and communications technologies. Systems that once could handle only telephone conversations can now deliver interactive television and an explosion of other computer-generated data. And even the phenomenal capability of fiber optics may soon be surpassed by expanding cellular telephone technology that will tie a phone number to a person rather than a place. Tools such as wireless "personal digital assistants" will soon allow people to send and receive computerized data literally from the field.

Already 7-11s and WalMarts across the country are networked for mail, price updates, supply, and accounting. Assuming that the National Park Service also takes advantage of the opportunity to nationally link its operations, our own "islands of computing" will soon be networked, allowing NPS employees in parks, regional offices, and Washington to share vast sources of information ranging from wildlife counts to budget analysis. As the public becomes accustomed to the new technology, they will demand to talk with us electronically, requesting information about the parks, making reservations, and applying for permits via electronic mail.

The new applications software being developed for this market is highly graphic and interconnecting, including programs like Adobe Acrobat, which is designed to allow the transmission of magazine-quality text and graphics between PCs with different operating systems, applications software, and hardware. Adobe is banking on this capability to compete with the fax and the
$8 billion overnight mail industry.

The best operating platforms for taking advantage of the new technology are also highly graphic and capable of performing multiple tasks simultaneously. DOS is neither. In fact, the new software development methods, which produce closely-related releases for the Windows, Mac, and Unix operating systems, require serious retrofitting to produce versions that can run in DOS. Is it portentous that Adobe Acrobat and other new software are being released first for Windows, Macintosh, and UNIX platforms and are not available for DOS systems until many months later? Such release schedules indicate that Windows has become the platform of choice for IBM-compatible PCs and that the market and support for DOS is fading.

The majority of NPS PCs have neither the speed nor the capacity to run Windows-based software. So if DOS is dying we need to plan for major hardware as well as software upgrading. The minimum configuration for running Windows effectively is a PC with a 386 chip, a speed of 33 mHz, and 8 Mb of RAM. How does your system measure up?

Submitted by Jonathan Lewis, NPS National Mail Coordinator

Working at Home—
Something to Dream about or Virtual Reality?

By the turn of the century that little known entity of the 1970s, the personal computer, is going to have changed not only our jobs but our workplace. For example, some employees at AT&T's Sacramento, California, office have lost their desks and been told to create "virtual offices." The company expects space needs to fall by 15% to 20%. Joining AT&T are such companies as International Business Machines, Dun and Bradstreet, Ernst & Young, and Arthur Andersen & Co., all of whom feel they are getting more value out of rented space and achieving more efficient output. Ernst & Young has targeted one million of its seven million square feet of rented space nationwide for elimination. Michael Bell of Dun and Bradstreet has dubbed this the "un-real estating" of corporate America. Michael Brill, a Buffalo, New York, real estate consultant, estimates that as many as 20% of the nation's nonclerical office workers could find themselves without a permanently assigned desk. And Franklin Becker, director of the International Facility Management Program at Cornell University, claims such "nonterritorial" use of space can reduce a company's real-estate requirements by 25% to 50%. Skeptics, however, argue that midlevel managers will resist supervising subordinates who are seldom in sight and many doubt that the desire for an office can ever be overcome.

Robert Barron, a psychologist who heads the department of management at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in Troy, New York, says workers consistently rank physical office environment as an important component of job satisfaction.

LINK Resources, a research and consulting firm, has been annually surveying home workers for the past eight years. Their data show that daytime "telecommuters" on company payrolls were the fastest growing segment of the home workers market in 1992. The number has more than tripled since 1988. According to Mary Broder, associate project manager for The Roper Organization, "there are a lot of people saying it's a great market; it seems about to take off," but so far most of the change has been attitudinal and rather informal. The average number of hours worked at home per week is 17 according to LINK. A trend study by the Small Business Administration found that people who work at home are no more likely to goof off than people who go to the office every day, and they actually smoke, drink, and take drugs less.

This is all well and good you say, but what about the federal government and the National Park Service? On August 1, 1990, the Department of the Interior began to participate in the flexible workplace pilot project sponsored by the President's Council on Management Improvement and the Office of Personnel Management. OPM encouraged organizations and employees to participate with the anticipation that flexiplace arrangements may become a standard practice in federal agencies.

Using guidelines provided in FPM Letter 368-1, Federal Flexible Workplace (Flexiplace) Project, dated March 26, 1991, regions have been authorized to establish regionwide flexiplace plans. Draft plans are currently being formulated, and at least one region has its out for review. Concerns addressed by regional plans go beyond employees' time and attendance. They are looking at the total work situation. Is the position one that has duties that can be performed at home successfully? Does the home have an environment which is safe and allows for working without distraction? Has the employee demonstrated a personal work history of reliability and independent action? Will additional equipment need to be provided? What about the security of data transferred by modem?

Officially only several positions servicewide are on experimental flexiplace schedules, but many supervisors are opting for a more informal adjustment of schedules to maintain their workforces. For all you dreamers out there—your day may be coming.
New Law Requires Strategic Planning

Last August Congress passed the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. Section 3 of the act requires each agency to submit a "strategic plan for program activities" to the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress by September 30, 1997. Such plans are to cover at least a five-year period and be updated every three years. They will include a mission statement; general and "outcome-related" goals and objectives for the major functions and operations of the agency; and descriptions of how the goals and objectives will be achieved.

Section 4 of the act requires each agency to prepare an annual performance plan "covering each program activity set forth in the budget of such agency." Based on these plans, the head of each agency will prepare an annual "program performance report" for the President and Congress the first report for the previous fiscal year to be submitted by March 31, 2000. These reports will "review the success of achieving the performance goals of the fiscal year;" evaluate the current fiscal year performance plan in light of the previous year's results; and describe why a goal was not met and current efforts to achieve it (or why the goal is now considered infeasible).

Section 5 of the act allows the agencies to request the waiver of selected administrative procedural requirements and controls in return for a commitment to achieve a performance goal. Waivers could cover items such as specification of personnel staffing levels, limitations on compensation or remunerations, and prohibitions or restrictions on funding transfers among certain budget object classifications.

Tracking Results

Meeting the new legislative requirements to establish "outcome-related goals" by 1997 and to measure and report on performance related to those goals by 2000 will require considerable effort by the National Park Service. As we reported in volume 2 of the Scan, work is underway in many offices throughout the Park Service to generate the kinds of information we will need to measure the condition of resources and the quality of service we provide. But the work is barely begun, and we currently have few tools for distilling meaningful national summaries from this data to inform our own national leadership, the Administration, the Congress, and the public we all serve. This volume of the Scan shares information coming from one of the tools we are developing, the resource management plan servicewide data base.

The National Performance Review found that most government agencies measure program activity (how much money they are spending and how many people are assigned) but not program results. The new requirement to develop "outcome-related goals" is an effort to shift emphasis from inputs to outcomes. The importance of pursuing the correct measures cannot be underestimated because attention and effort inevitably focus on those things that are tracked and reported.

Parks are beginning to experiment with a new planning process that helps them get to the correct measures by first reaching a shared understanding of the purpose and significance of the park, then identifying what resource conditions and visitor experiences fulfill that purpose, then establishing measurable standards for the desired conditions and experiences. This is (continued on page 8)
How well are we doing?

**Become a more responsive, efficient, and accountable organization**

**A Little History about the National Performance Review**

The National Performance Review (NPR) began its reform effort from the premise that convoluted systems in government, not individual bureaucrats, were the source of waste and inefficiency. To date, however, talk has centered more around getting rid of 12 percent (252,000) of government employees and less about systems reform. How did the Administration reach a total reduction number of 252,000? They conducted a governmentwide head count of supervisors, budget specialists, financial specialists, procurement specialists, personnel specialists, and people in headquarters and regional offices. The count totaled roughly 690,000. They theoretically cut that group in half (345,000) and then added back in a quarter (86,250)—as substitutes to perform functions such as goal setting and measuring progress—leaving a net reduction of 252,000, more or less. And this is the reduction that the recent buyout legislation has mandated.

The two categories of targeted positions are management and "administrative control structures." Using Office of Personnel Management data, the NPR concluded that executive branch agencies average one manager for every seven employees. The private sector's average is 1:15. To meet the private sector ratio, it will be necessary to cut the federal ratio in half over five years. DOI's "baseline statistics" show NPS with 281 GS-15's and 128 GS-14's, and the department advises a 10 percent reduction (42 positions) by the end of fiscal year 1995. The first administrative series to undergo the streamlining and reinventing process is personnel. DOI's target is a servicing ratio of 1:100. Currently the NPS ratio averages about 1:113, with a range of 1:55 to 1:179 (see the chart on the next page). The trick, say public administration experts, will be to eliminate layers of management and "administrative control structures" along with the targeted grades and series. Failing that, improvement in flexibility, accountability and creativity in government will remain elusive goals.
NPS Ratios of Personnelists:Employees

- Alaska Region: 1:124
- Mid-Atlantic Region: 1:106
- Midwest Region: 1:124
- National Capital Region: 1:107
- North Atlantic Region: 1:118
- Pacific Northwest Region: 1:179
- Rocky Mountain Region / DSC: 1:140
- Southeast Region: 1:154
- Southwest Region: 1:101
- Western Region: 1:111
- Washington Office: 1:94
- Harpers Ferry Center: 1:55
How well are we doing?

Ensure that the national park system reflects our shared national heritage and use the system to help people forge ties with their heritage.

Baseline Data Related to US and Park Visitor Populations

We have little data about the demographics of visitor populations. Limited data were gathered for Mesa Verde and seven other parks in 1991 as part of the General User Survey. That year 45% of Mesa Verde's visitors came from four states: Colorado, California, Texas, and Pennsylvania. Demographic data for those states show that not all groups of citizens visit the park equally. For example, Hispanics make up 12% to 21% of the populations of Colorado, California, and Texas, but only accounted for 3% of the park's visitation.
Inventorying and Monitoring Visitor Experience

A new methodology for inventorying and monitoring visitor experiences is being developed as part of the VERP (visitor experience and resource protection) process. Designed to help establish and maintain appropriate use levels for experiences ranging from solitary hiking to sightseeing at popular attractions, the methodology documents and analyzes people's responses to a series of photographs depicting various numbers of people at one time in a particular park setting. A complex statistical analysis of the data produces summary charts like the one shown at bottom right. In this case, most respondents felt that 16 people at one time was an acceptable level of use but that 24 people was unacceptable; thus the desirable standard appears to be around 20 people at one time. The next step is to define a measurable and manageable indicator of this standard, such as the number of parking spaces available at the site. Establishing such standards and monitoring success in meeting them will help ensure that visitors' experiences are not degraded by overcrowding. The methodology is being tested and refined at Arches National Park, with a second prototype project scheduled for Glacier National Park.

Another process, park experience evaluation, seeks to identify how well various visitor facilities and interpretive media enhance a visitor's experience. The first step of this process is to observe and evaluate people's reactions to the parking lots, pathways, buildings, exhibitry, and other facilities and media provided for their use. The "small lessons" learned from these observations will over time be compared and aggregated into a number of "grand lessons" that can be applied to improve the quality of the visitor experience in parks throughout the system (see examples below).

### Park Experience Evaluation Process

**Small lessons (examples):**
- Live animals are well received by children.
- People looking for a pay telephone can't find one.
- No food or drink is available for growing number of bicyclists.
- Color coordination of exhibitry cases is too subtle to be understood; relationships are not apparent to visitors.

**Grand lessons (examples):**
- Entry/arrival experiences are crucial.
- High-quality design affects visitor behavior; people are uplifted.
How well are we doing?

*Strengthen protection of park resources*

**Resource Management Plan Data Base**

The *resource management plan servicewide data base* is an annual compilation of natural and cultural resource management project requirements for each park. The RMP software is used to track threats to resources, funding requirements, park priorities, and descriptive specifics for each project.

At the park level, the RMP data base can be updated as needed throughout the year, permitting managers to monitor progress and document resource management activities within the parks. The servicewide RMP data base (currently maintained by the WASO Wildlife and Vegetation Division) is updated once annually. Therefore, the servicewide data base represents a "snapshot" in time that is designed primarily to forecast budget activities and needs based upon four-year projections. RMP data are used to complete NPS budget and program planning, answer queries from Congress and other agencies, and provide information to organizations such as the National Parks and Conservation Association and the National Park Foundation. The demand for park project and program information has been increasing.

The information included in this report was extracted from the 1993 servicewide RMP data base. The calculations were made in anticipation that they may serve as benchmarks for future data comparisons and prove helpful in determining servicewide trends in resource management. All figures pertaining to "funded projects" are for projects identified to receive funding in 1993, 1994, 1995, or 1996 (the four-year planning window for the 1993 annual RMP update.) Figures compiled for unfunded projects pertain to those projects that have unfunded needs during the same four years.

Some projects have been assigned several different activity codes; therefore, the total number of RMP projects in the data base (13,353) is less than the sum of the project subtotals for all the activity codes. The same applies to the total number of funded and unfunded projects, since some were counted as both (partially funded).
Threats to Resources
(From the Resource Management Plan Data Base)

The issue codes charted below were selected for this report as basic examples of an assortment of natural resource issues. The chart does not include information regarding cultural resource issues; those data will be analyzed and included in a subsequent volume of the Scan. These "issues" or "threats" are not considered more important than other categories that were not included here but are tracked by the RMP data base (there are currently over twenty natural and nearly thirty cultural codes).

Two fields are used to store the issue code information demonstrated in this table. Parks can identify the two most applicable issue codes for each project. For this reason, the total number of projects identified for each issue code would exceed the total number of projects within the data base.

Questions concerning the servicewide RMP data base may be directed to Tim Goddard, Wildlife and Vegetation Division, at (202) 343-8136.
the VERP (visitor experience/resource protection) process. The NPS directorate is pursuing a similar process for the National Park Service as a whole: reaching a shared understanding of our purpose as an agency and identifying the conditions we hope to achieve servicewide. This is the NPS strategic planning process. Eventually—by 1999—we will need systems that can track our progress in achieving those conditions. Exactly what these systems will track, and how they will interrelate with similar systems at the park and program level is a topic of immediate concern that will require considerable thought by people at all levels of the organization.

To help initiate this dialogue this issue of the scan report is organized around several of the conditions identified in the draft strategic plan as "The Most Important Things We Can Do." The full list is shown in the box at right.

### The Most Important Things We Can Do

- Establish a scientific/scholarly basis for resource management decisions.
- Strengthen protection of park resources.
- Achieve sustainability in all park operations and development.
- Ensure that the national park system reflects our shared national heritage, and use the system to help people forge emotional, intellectual, and recreational ties with that heritage.
- Move toward collaborative management of ecological and cultural systems.
- Lead a cooperative venture to conserve our shared natural and cultural heritage and to provide recreational opportunities for all Americans.
- Become a more responsive, efficient, and accountable organization.
- Pursue maximum public benefit through contracts, cooperative agreements, contributions, and other alternative approaches to support park operations.

---

**Join the Dialogue**

We urge you to consider and discuss what other data and trend analysis might be useful in tracking and reporting how well the National Park Service is carrying out the various aspects of its mission. We will pursue this topic further in future issues of the Scan. You can contact us:

- by phone: (303) 969-7012
- by fax: (303) 969-6913
- by CCMail: WASO-Strategic Planning
- by Internet (after July 1): waso_strategic_planning@nps.gov
- by mail: P.O. Box 25287 WASO-CTP, Denver, CO 80225

Strategic Planning Staff: Heather Huyck (Director), Roger Brown, Gail Slemmer, Lesta Moffett
National Park Service Strategic Plan

Vision
Our Symbiotic Roles

Indisputably, preservation comes first in law. Indisputably, it comes first in logic — without preservation, the rest is utterly pointless.

Robert Utley

Throughout the many pages of law governing the National Park Service, Congress provides one consistent direction: we are charged with preserving those natural, cultural, and recreational places and resources held dear to Americans, places that shape our national identity. These are America's heritage resources — the parks, historic districts, and other special places worthy of preservation for public benefit. They range from the local marsh to the vast expanses of the Greater Yellowstone ecosystem, from the town's pioneer homestead to Independence Hall, and from the neighborhood playground to Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

In carrying out its mission, the National Park Service plays three key and complementary roles: first as a steward responsible for managing America's national parks and their resources; second as a guide and teacher, helping people experience, value, and respect the meaning of our shared national heritage; and third as an advocate for and partner in achieving a quality of life enhanced by natural and cultural resources and recreational open space. These roles are derived from the agency's 1916 organic act and decades of subsequent legislation.

The National Park Service's three roles too often are seen as competing and sometimes conflicting charges. In fact, they are symbiotic. As exemplary stewards we preserve a representative core of the nation's most significant heritage resources. As guide and teacher we foster a national culture protective of heritage values. And as caring advocates and partners we help extend the benefits of a rich natural and cultural heritage more widely throughout society, helping conserve the biological and cultural diversity critical to the maintenance of healthy resource systems. As the parks become increasingly threatened by a steady degradation of the planet, the problems we face today as stewards tell us we must become better educators and advocates. The public must assume greater responsibility for the preservation and management of its heritage.

Asking — and helping — all Americans to assume a greater responsibility for preserving our shared heritage recognizes that no single agency, no level of government, can accomplish this work alone. Preserving our heritage will require the best efforts of the National Park Service, the other federal agencies, state and local governments, our partners in the private sector, and individual citizens throughout the country and the world.
A fourth role of the National Park Service supports the other three. As an organization we provide the leadership, the employees, the relationships with our partners, and the management structure and systems needed to carry out all aspects of our mission. In this role we need to concentrate our organizational resources where they will maximize the public benefit.

There is considerable discussion today about government being more responsive to its customers. This is a valuable concept. However, when we in the National Park Service speak of 'our customers' we include not only park visitors, our partners in preservation and recreation at the national, state, and community levels, and the larger American public, but also future generations and the myriad plants and animals, cultural landscapes, structures, and artifacts, scenic vistas, and even the night skies — all the tangible and intangible manifestations of our heritage that we and our partners seek to preserve.
Our Changing Circumstances

The world has changed and the public expects the National Park Service to change accordingly. Our commitment to preserve heritage resources through stewardship of the national park system and through partnerships and assistance to others remains unwavering. But changing circumstances require new actions and methods. We need to broaden our horizons and to reexamine our various roles in light of our new understanding of environmental and social relationships and new opportunities to work cooperatively with others.

As America's growing population and advancing technology consume more of the nation's resources, many units of the national park system that only a few decades ago were protected by their isolation are now threatened by water and air pollution, fragmentation and loss of wildlife habitat, and the intrusion of buildings and heavily traveled highways. We can no longer protect the national parks* and their resources without becoming deeply involved in regional, national, and even international land use and environmental quality issues.

Growing numbers of visitors with diverse cultural backgrounds and expectations are using parks differently. The effects of use, sometimes subtle, accumulate, requiring more intensive and sophisticated management of visitor use as well as resources.

We face other changes as well. As the American public develops a more inclusive sense of history and a deeper understanding of the connections among all living things, people are redefining what they value about their heritage. They are placing a higher priority on ecological and cultural integrity for geographic regions. The increasing body of legislation on environmental protection, coordinated land use, urban parks, historic preservation, and heritage areas, passed over the last quarter century, reflects a growing awareness of the importance of these values and an expectation that federal agencies like the National Park Service will help advance this broadening environmental ethic. Together these mandates address the very things that support life on earth — breathable air, drinkable water, resilient and sustainable populations of plants and animals — along with those things that reflect and shape human civilization — archeological sites, historic structures and artifacts, cultural landscapes, and the traditions passed through generations.

The American public is also changing its expectations about the roles of government. People are demanding more participation in public decision-making and more responsive service. At the same time they are placing a high national priority on debt reduction. They expect the National Park Service to serve more visitors and to resolve increasingly complex management issues without increasing the cost of government. In a democratic system, these expectations

*The term national parks will be used to refer to all units of the national park system.
force changes in the priorities and methods of the National Park Service. As a consequence, we are and will be carrying out our responsibilities under very restricted budgets and with decreased numbers of employees.

Most people practicing and studying management agree that the best way for governments to accomplish complex missions with limited resources is by "steering" more and "rowing" less. Steering organizations set direction, marshal resources, assign responsibility, facilitate production, and evaluate performance, but they do not try to accomplish all the work themselves. This does not mean that the work itself, the rowing, is not critically important. It is. However, it may be in the public interest to turn some of the rowing over to others or to ask them for help pulling the oars. This management concept is consistent with and reinforces the idea that each of our roles can be strengthened by working cooperatively with others inside and outside the National Park Service.
The Most Important Things We Can Do

- Establish a scientific/scholarly basis for resource management decisions
  - Strengthen protection of park resources
- Achieve sustainability in all park operations and development
- Help people forge emotional, intellectual, and recreational ties with their natural and cultural heritage
- Lead in a national initiative to strengthen the recognition and perpetuation of heritage resources and their public benefits
- Become a more responsive, efficient, and accountable organization
- Pursue maximum public benefit through contracts, cooperative agreements, contributions, and other alternative approaches to support park operations
Establish a scientific/scholarly basis for resource management decisions

The most significant obstacle to operating a proactive program is the void of useable baseline data.

Diane Sontag

Over the past 30 years more than a dozen major reviews by the National Park Service and by independent experts have concluded that park management must be guided by more scientific and scholarly knowledge. The most current and thorough of these reviews, the National Research Council's *Science and the National Parks*, reemphasizes that the problems faced by the parks today (the threats to long-term ecosystem viability caused by the myriad stresses of the 20th century) are too many and too complex to solve without the help of science. A follow-up study conducted by the National Park Service endorses those findings and recognizes the recent establishment of the National Biological Survey.

A parallel study, *Humanities and the National Parks*, also identifies research as a critical part of the National Park Service's mission and calls for greater NPS professionalization in the humanities. Both the *Science and the Parks* and the *Humanities and the Parks* reports emphasize the importance of understanding park resources in their full ecological and cultural contexts and call for extensive coordination and interaction with colleges, universities, professional organizations, and other scientific and scholarly institutions for sharing personnel, resources, and knowledge for mutual benefit.

A scientific and scholarly basis for decision making will require a base inventory of park resources and an understanding of the processes that sustain them and the threats that endanger them. Currently, fewer than 20 percent of the approximately 250 parks containing significant natural resources have complete resource inventories. In 1993 the Park Service published a guideline identifying 12 categories of natural-resource inventory requirements for park management and planning and a park-by-park schedule for meeting them over the next eight years. Prototype long-term ecological monitoring programs were recently established at four parks: Denali, Channel Islands, Shenandoah, and Great Smoky Mountains. The prototype monitoring effort gathers long-term data to evaluate resource conditions over time, allowing managers to deal effectively with a variety of threats, some of which may not appear for many years.

Systems are also being developed to inventory and monitor historic and archeological structures and sites, museum collections, cultural landscapes, and ethnographic resources. To date 16,000 of the estimated 20,000-25,000 historic and archeological structures have been inventoried, and much of the current information is inaccurate or incomplete. At the end of 1990 less than 2% of park lands had been systematically surveyed for archeological resources and about 82% of park lands had not received any level of survey at all. The *Humanities and the Parks* study recommends that comprehensive archeological and historical research, as mandated by section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, be a prerequisite to general park planning. It also cites research as a central responsibility of the National Park Service.
Desired Conditions

Park managers have complete and current resource inventories including information about related resources outside park boundaries. Data available from other agencies and organizations are incorporated into NPS data bases, and NPS data are shared with others. Data bases use spatial coordinates to allow for integration of natural and cultural data for geographic areas. Natural resource data include species distribution, vegetation maps, topographic maps, soils and geology maps, water resource inventories and water chemistry data, air quality analyses, and meteorological data. All museum objects are cataloged. The List of Classified Structures is complete and accurate, and archeological surveys are complete. A cultural landscapes data base provides information about the location, historical development, and current management of cultural landscapes. Resources are monitored for changes in their condition and the factors affecting them.

A current, comprehensive research program conducted to prevailing scientific and scholarly standards provides the National Park Service with the ability to identify and understand park resources and how they are affected by local, regional, and global influences. The NPS staff includes highly professional and nationally recognized scientists and scholars who maintain extensive professional partnerships with their counterparts in other scientific, academic, and cultural institutions. These mutually beneficial relationships ensure that quality research forms the basis for NPS preservation, planning, and educational programs and that this knowledge is broadly shared with the public.

Park managers understand scientific and academic information, use it in local decision making, and bring it to regional and national forums addressing topics that involve park values.
Strengthen protection of park resources

It is only a slight exaggeration that if we do not reverse the degradation of park resources, whether from theft, poaching, overuse, or external threats, the only resource managers the National Park Service is going to need are geologists because the only resources left to manage will be the rocks!

Richard T. Gale

Failure to perpetuate park values unimpaired for the next generation would constitute a fundamental breach of the public trust and undermine the National Park Service's credibility. We know that park resources are being degraded by toxins contained in agricultural runoff, by fragmentation of native habitat, and by encroachment of development into historic scenes. We also know that increasing visitor use is degrading park resources. But little data exist to document what we are losing or how fast we are losing it, and we are often understaffed and inadequately equipped to stop the loss.

Air quality, which became the subject of an intense national debate and protection program in the early 1970s, is the most comprehensively monitored park value to date and can serve as an example of where we are now. Visibility data gathered over the past 20 years show that unimpaired vistas had all but disappeared from most parks. At Grand Canyon, where visibility ranges from 240 miles on the few clear days to 20 miles when pollution is worst, some impairment occurs 90 percent of the time. At Great Smoky Mountains the visibility is now 20 miles or less most of the time.

Illegal uses remain major threats to the parks. At Petrified Forest, for example, an estimated 12 tons of petrified wood is stolen each year, mostly in small, easily carried pieces taken by visitors. Some previously outstanding petrified wood areas have been picked clean. In other examples, invaluable historic artifacts have been stolen from museum cases, and Anasazi pots are routinely stolen from parks and other protected federal lands for the lucrative antiquities trade.
The national parks are managed by highly qualified professionals as integrated systems of natural and cultural resources. Areas that can still reasonably and legitimately be managed as wilderness are protected as increasingly rare and valued repositories of our biological and geological heritage. Areas reflective of past and present civilizations are protected as increasingly rare and valued repositories of our cultural heritage. Parks are managed to sustain biological and cultural diversity. Biological diversity is achieved by protecting natural habitats—not just the spectacular species but also the interdependent, less obvious species and systems. Cultural diversity is achieved by recognizing the contributions of all Americans—not just the unique accomplishments and events, but also the everyday occurrences which altogether comprise our national experience.

Park resources are protected from overuse by visitors and from poaching, trespass grazing, vandalism, theft, and other illegal activities. Consumptive uses authorized in law are managed in accordance with congressionally prescribed standards. Park managers share assistance with other agencies and organizations in protecting park-related resources outside park boundaries.

Regulations and other protective mechanisms such as cooperative agreements are used at the national, regional, and local levels to minimize damage to park resources by air and water pollution, dewatering, habitat fragmentation, urban encroachment, and other intrusions on natural ecosystems and cultural landscapes. Resource-management awareness is part of everyone's job and is communicated to the public both directly, through interpretive programs and chance encounters between park employees and visitors, and indirectly, by demonstrating good stewardship in all aspects of park operations.
Achieve sustainability in all park operations and development

When we use the term 'sustainability', we need to ask ourselves, "what it is we are trying to sustain?" What it comes down to is the need to sustain the ecosystems of which we are a part.

Kathy Jope & Joe Dunstan

Meeting this goal will require a major evolution in the way we analyze and value our actions. It will require a willingness to do our business differently; to learn and to incorporate continuously new knowledge that affects our daily operations; to make the effects on the environment a critical consideration in decisions about everything we do.

John Reynolds

Operating and using the parks while leaving them unimpaired for enjoyment by future generations will require immediate action to establish and meet stringent standards of sustainability in all park practices. The principle of leaving parks unimpaired for future generations (the ethic of the NPS organic act) fits within the fundamental ethic of sustainability, which is to meet the needs of today without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs. Sustainability is a broad ethical construct that should guide not only how we do business within our boundaries but also how we interact with others beyond our boundaries. To ensure that park programs and operations are truly sustainable, we need to analyze the effects of our actions on entire ecosystems, cultural contexts, and the planet as a whole.

The 75th Anniversary Symposium working group on visitor use and enjoyment noted that although we do not have a reliable knowledge base about the extent of impacts caused by park use and development, we know that some areas of some parks are overcrowded and some resources (both natural and cultural) are being harmed by use and overuse. They also noted that education, conservation, public transportation, recycling, and state-of-the-art technologies could provide significant relief to overburdened ecosystems.

The National Park Service subsequently launched a major initiative to improve the sustainability of park operations and development. In 1993 it published the Guiding Principles of Sustainable Design, which will serve as a starting point for analyzing sustainability in all NPS management practices. Taking care of the operational and development needs of the national park system are major programs. They are also opportunities for learning about and applying environmentally sensitive practices and demonstrating this knowledge to the public.
Desired Conditions

Park-related activities and development, whether inside or outside park boundaries, are sustainable parts of the ecosystem and cultural context, working with natural processes and enhancing cultural values.

Park managers understand evolving visitor patterns and how visitor use affects parks and adjacent areas. Credible, timely information and innovative planning methods provide the tools they need to make increasingly difficult decisions about which kinds and levels of use are appropriate and sustainable. Rigorous monitoring evaluates the effectiveness of decisions.

Development alternatives are analyzed to determine need and environmental costs. Adaptive reuse of historic structures often reduces the need for energy- and material-consumptive new construction. Park facilities and infrastructure are energy-efficient and well-maintained. Park development is economically as well as ecologically sustainable. Major investments in construction or rehabilitation are preceded by a determination that long-term maintenance of the facility is a priority use of park funds.

Park support facilities, including visitor lodging, employee housing, and offices, are consolidated and located outside parks where feasible. Park managers actively participate with local and regional planning and development agencies to share responsibility for visitor and tourist needs. Public transportation systems provide energy-efficient, nonpolluting alternatives for visitors traveling to parks.

The parks use management practices (such as integrated pest management) that work with ecosystem processes, conserve water and energy, and avoid pollution. On-site power generation is accomplished with renewable energy, and public vehicles are energy efficient. The parks are demonstration areas and catalysts for reuse and recycling of a variety of materials.
Help people forge emotional, intellectual, and recreational ties with their natural and cultural heritage

Through a combined, coordinated, and integrated approach of public educational outreach and interpretation, we have a far better chance of connecting, projecting, and instilling the values of our shared heritage.

Lincoln Fairchild

If we cannot reach and gain the support of the public, particularly elementary level students, we will have no public support in the future.

Robert Andrew

So long as they reflect our society's enduring values and remain accessible and meaningful to our diverse population, the national parks are excellent settings for experiencing the emotional bonds, intellectual understanding, and recreational renewal that can greatly enrich our quality of life. Such personal experiences in parks can help people gain a sense of place and a stronger sense of history and national identity, and encourage them to take greater responsibility for protecting their heritage and passing it on to future generations. To this end, the National Park Service must continue to provide high quality visitor experiences. The agency that pioneered campfire talks needs to find new ways of reaching more visitors and leaving them with a profound impression of the intrinsic value of parks to their lives. Our ability to provide quality experiences while protecting park resources will depend on knowing more about our visitors and their interaction with parks.

We must also reach beyond park boundaries in helping people connect with the values celebrated in all parks, natural areas, prehistoric and historic sites and districts, and other special places. The stronger our message and the more widely and effectively we can convey it, the broader and deeper will be the support for the conservation of heritage resources, including the national park system.
Desired Conditions

Visitors find ample opportunities to enjoy the national parks in their own diverse ways. All avenues for getting in touch with the natural world and with people's cultural heritage are encouraged so long as they are not illegal, inappropriate, or harmful to resources. The use of park resources for purposes important to people's cultural traditions and for resource-based recreation is accommodated to the greatest extent possible.

A wide cross-section of the U.S. population and many foreign visitors come to the parks. Their visits are supported by improved transportation systems, accessible facilities and programs, and efficient visitor services. People planning to visit parks receive advance information that helps them organize their trips around their desired experiences. NPS professionals systematically analyze public expectations and visitors' satisfaction with their park experiences.

Visitors learn about the significance of each park through high quality interpretive programs. Compelling stories convey the essence and diversity of natural ecosystems and of cultural experiences and achievements, including minority history. These stories help people gain important insights into who they are as members of local, regional, national, and global communities. Parks are places of intellectual growth—where visitors can gain clearer understandings of nature and culture, the ecological and social values of parks, the interrelationships of natural and cultural systems, and resource management strategies. Information used in interpretive and educational programs meets the highest standards of scholarly research.

Citizens can learn about their heritage without a park visit, through school programs, books, films, computer networks, traveling exhibits, television programs, and other media. Special emphasis is placed on serving children, who learn lessons that help them understand their heritage and enhance the quality of their lives, and who hopefully become life-long supporters of heritage resource conservation. NPS employees work with communities and schools to develop goals for teaching about heritage resources, and they assist teachers in using parks and other special places as classrooms.
Lead in a national initiative to strengthen the recognition and perpetuation of heritage resources and their public benefits

NPS can play a leadership role in preserving natural, scenic, recreational, and cultural resources without owning these resources.

Brent Glass

What good would it do society (or all the other plant and animal species in the world) if we were able to protect one or two percent of the nation's natural areas, when the other 98 or 99 percent of the nation's natural values declined?

John Byrne

The Indigenous American sees western science and ideology as having strong capabilities for failure. How else can you explain the disappearance of vast ecosystems from the face of the earth?

Herbert Anungazuk

As the interaction and interdependence among people and resources becomes tighter and tighter, decisions about preserving heritage, resources and providing for their enjoyment will inevitably be folded into larger decisions about whole ecosystems, cultural themes and contexts, geographic landscapes, and socioeconomic regions. In the words of Secretary Babbitt, "The day of meeting our obligations to the land by creating another national park is gone. Ecosystems can't survive behind bars."

Congress has long recognized the value of a broad base of historic, natural, and outdoor recreation resources to society's well being, and the National Park Service has long administered programs for the preservation of significant resources and delivery of services outside as well as inside the national park system. These programs have received varying priority over the years. Now as we face tighter budgets and staffing limitations and reconsider the roles and methods of government, we need to reevaluate the direction of these programs.

In this time of transition, the best approach to the National Park Service's role as advocate and partner is to reorganize our work and thinking around broader systems, emphasizing how various resources are interconnected and how we can work together with those responsible for other resources and values.
Nationally significant sites that represent the nation's diverse natural and cultural heritage and are suitable for the highest level of preservation are managed by the National Park Service as part of the national park system. Nationally significant sites in other ownership are managed as national historic and natural landmarks, national wildlife refuges, national rivers, national recreational trails, or units of the national wilderness preservation system. The national parks are managed as parts of broader ecological and cultural systems. Working cooperatively, park managers and their regional counterparts find ways to preserve ecological and cultural values and to assist people in enjoying the scientific, educational, inspirational, and recreational benefits of protected natural and cultural resources and recreational open space, while meeting human needs for social development and appropriate economic growth. The economic and other impacts of parks, resource conservation, and tourism are considered in management decisions.

Other significant river corridors, trail corridors, landscapes, and properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places are managed by other public agencies and through partnerships to preserve and enhance their ecological, cultural, and recreational values, in many cases while accommodating compatible private residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Sometimes the various units of the national park system form a prominent core from which NPS employees reach out to participate in cooperative regional decision making. In other instances the National Park Service assists in interagency or public/private-sector planning efforts to help define and perpetuate heritage values and sustainable lifestyles across broad geographic regions. The cooperative planning and management of natural resources focuses on ecosystem-based management. Cultural resources are addressed in terms of themes and contexts. Recreational resources are addressed in terms of large landscapes, greenways, and cooperative delivery of recreational opportunities. Some areas or landscapes with multiple resource values are planned and managed cooperatively as heritage partnership areas.

The NPS historic preservation, outdoor recreation, and natural conservation assistance programs advance the preservation and development of resources and geographic areas of high national priority by bringing together the diverse strengths of park management, governmental assistance and authority at the federal, state and local levels, and private-sector contributions. The assistance programs also strengthen cooperative conservation initiatives throughout the nation by supporting public and private agencies that have demonstrated a strong commitment to conserving and preserving significant natural, cultural, and recreational resources and on serving the recreation needs of communities throughout the nation. Such initiatives strengthen the nation's conservation ethic, serve all segments of the population close-to-home, and integrate with other public and private initiatives aimed at improving the quality of life for all Americans.

The National Park Service represents the United States in international forums addressing the preservation of heritage values throughout the world. It participates in cooperative efforts to protect ecosystems that cross its international boundaries, and it brings its considerable resources to joint ventures among the nations of the world to share information, expertise, and technology in the preservation of their shared heritage.
Become a more responsive, efficient, and accountable organization

One of the biggest weaknesses (we have)...is the lack of coherence, clarity, and accountability in the management of the NPS.

Bill Halainen

Each administrative technician in each small field area must know roughly 21 different computer systems. Each of these overlaps others.

George Turnbull

Hierarchical, regulation-shackled, faceless organizations can no longer successfully deal with the rapid changes occurring around them. Authority and accountability must be delegated to the front lines, where decisions are made daily to sustain complex networks of interrelationships among people and resources.

The National Performance Review adopts decentralization of decision-making power as the government's standard operating procedure. It commits all federal agencies to cutting red tape and to streamlining operations through delegation and consolidation wherever possible.

The National Park Service needs to develop leaders adept at implementing the principles of the National Performance Review and other mandates. Their chief tasks will be to provide employees with a strong sense of mission, access to timely, accurate information, and abundant opportunities to work cooperatively with each other and with numerous partners in achieving a set of agreed-upon goals.

Under this system the quality of NPS operations and programs will depend on a highly professional, diverse, and dedicated work force skilled in all aspects of our future roles. Retaining such a work force will require a strong commitment by the National Park Service to provide a quality work environment supportive of all aspects of an employee's life within the particular circumstances NPS employment requires.

The National Park Service needs to periodically assess its organizational structure to ensure it is aligned with changing needs and priorities. During the next several years we expect major changes in the way we do business as the National Park Service streamlines and moves toward more collaborative management. These changes will also entail shifts in the organization's culture, as employees adapt to increasing responsibility, greater cooperation with others, and results-oriented accountability.
Desired Conditions

The National Park Service is guided and bonded by strong national leadership. Each employee understands and supports the agency's mission and organization and his or her role as part of the whole. Leadership decisions are based on how well they serve a shared vision and for their implications for policy, legislation, budget, human resources, and park and program operations. Each unit plans strategically for carrying out its part of the agency mission.

A diverse, professional work force continuously adapts to the agency's changing needs, including current needs for greater scientific and technical expertise, enhanced skills in working with others, and greater facility in communicating with a diverse population. Career-long learning opportunities encourage employees to remain professionally and technically current and to adapt to changing work needs. The work environment supports innovation, experimentation, and calculated risk taking and reinforces teamwork. Employees with leadership potential are actively recruited and trained through planned developmental experiences that prepare them to lead both as managers and as specialists. All employees are treated equitably and appropriately. The work environment is safe and healthy. Managers are supportive of employees' personal and family lives and considerate of many employees' concerns about adequate housing, child and elderly care, isolation, minority issues, and dual career opportunities. Salaries are competitive and include adjustments for high-cost areas.

Wherever appropriate, authority is delegated from Washington to the parks, programs, and partners. Managers place less emphasis on regulation and more on defining and measuring desired results. Administrative systems support field offices and do not burden them with duplicative or cumbersome requirements. In turn, park and program operations are conducted effectively and efficiently with tracking and full accountability by NPS employees and managers that their activities are preserving resources and creating value for the public. The organization rewards employees who demonstrate that they have created value through this system. Expenditures reflect servicewide priorities, and major accomplishments are communicated to Congress and the public.
Pursue maximum public benefit through contracts, cooperative agreements, contributions, and other alternative approaches to support park operations

Partnerships are not necessarily easy: they require thick skins, forgiveness, clear communications, trust, shared visions, and back-up systems in case of failure. From a management point of view, they may seem much messier and difficult than traditional clear-cut, boundary-driven land management. But when they succeed, the sense of public ownership, inclusion, cost-effectiveness, and community empowerment are well worth it.

Steve Elkinton

In today's environment of deficit reduction and flat federal budgets the National Park Service can produce greater public value by leveraging limited federal dollars with contributions from other sectors of society. Partnerships, user fees, concession contracts, matching funds, endowments, and use of volunteers are all examples of how the National Park Service works with others to accomplish more than it could accomplish alone. This is not the only reason the National Park Service seeks to work cooperatively with others. Protection of the national parks often requires consensus-building and coordinated action on a regional scale. The National Park Service also plays a major advocacy and technical assistance role in the protection of heritage resources nationwide. Independent of those considerations, however, the National Park Service can help produce additional benefits for the public by marshalling others' resources to augment its own. This does not mean neglecting the government's responsibilities to protect public resources and provide for their enjoyment; but the Park Service does not necessarily have to do all the work, only see that the work gets done. From this point of view we need to take a more objective look at all our operations, reviewing what only we can do, what others can help us do, and what others can do for us with proper direction and oversight.
**Desired Conditions**

The National Park Service is a good and valuable partner, able and willing to share authority and benefits as well as responsibilities and costs. The agency cooperates with other federal and state land-managing agencies to accomplish work and exchanges professional and technical assistance with professional and scholarly institutions. It cooperates with federal and local jobs programs, including public service and work-release programs, to help accomplish work in parks while meeting needs for job training and public service opportunities. It is attuned to opportunities to acquire surplus or confiscated equipment from other agencies. It contracts with concessioners to provide quality visitor services and a fair return to the government in exchange for an opportunity for reasonable profit to the concessioner. It enters into agreements with cooperating associations to distribute quality educational materials to park visitors for fair market value. It marshals and appropriately recognizes the efforts of volunteers and interns to augment work done by NPS employees.

Every park has active friends groups that understand and support the park’s purpose, goals, and actions. Federal funds are used to leverage other monies through challenge cost-share grants. The National Park Service works with partners to develop packages attractive for donations. It acquires more authority to participate in fund-raising and develops a greater expertise in that area.

Visitors and other park users pay a fair share of the cost of serving them, in line with other costs for travel and recreation and with safeguards to ensure that no one is denied access to a national park because of an inability to pay. Revenues gained from user fees are returned to the parks to help sustain park operations.
As the nation’s principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering sound use of our land and water resources; protecting our fish, wildlife, and biological diversity; preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places; and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to ensure that their development is in the best interests of all our people by encouraging stewardship and citizen participation in their care. The department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island territories under U.S. administration.
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Introduction

A critical part of strategic planning is translating vision into action. The goals and objectives of the vision statement describe where we want to go. The action agenda focuses on what we need to do to get there.

This third part of the strategic plan is intended to assist us in setting priorities for the allocation of money and personnel and in communicating those priorities throughout the organization and to the Congress and our partners.

The actions included in the agenda derive from various sources, including the Vail Agenda, the Science in the National Parks report, the Humanities in the National Parks report, the NPS natural resource program's strategic plan, the NPS streamlining proposal, the National Performance Review, the secretary of the interior's performance agreement with the president, and recommendations by employees and partners. In the process of preparing the strategic plan several hundred action items were proposed, considered, and ranked by the directorate. Those actions determined to be most important have been included in this action agenda.

While the strategic plan's vision statement will guide the National Park Service into the 21st century, the action agenda will be reviewed annually. The action agenda that follows has two sections: the highest priority actions and the other important actions. The highest priority actions are those we believe must receive the greatest resources now. They are where we begin. The other important actions reflect priorities that are already ongoing, are more tactical in nature, or because of inadequate resources must be deferred until the highest priority actions are better addressed. We simply lack the resources to do everything we recognize as important now. In the future, as the highest priority actions are accomplished, their places will be filled by those actions now categorized as other important actions and also by additional actions not yet identified. Such is the dynamic nature of strategic planning.
Focus
FY 1995 Action Agenda

Goal I. Establish a scientific/scholarly basis for resource management decisions

**Objective A.** Park managers have complete and current resource inventories including information about related resources outside park boundaries. Data available from other agencies and organizations are incorporated into NPS data bases, and NPS data are shared with others. Data bases use spatial coordinates to allow for integration of natural and cultural data for geographic areas. Resources are monitored for changes in their condition and the factors affecting them.

**Highest Priority Actions:**
- Meet basic inventory requirements for historic structures, archeological resources, ethnographic resources, cultural landscapes, and museum collections. Capture information that states have been gathering in a contextual format.
- Meet basic inventory requirements for species distribution, vegetative association maps, topographic maps, soils and geology maps, water resource inventories and water chemistry data, and air quality and meteorological data. Cooperate and contract with the U.S. Geological Survey, the Soil Conservation Service, and the National Biological Survey in compiling inventories of resources in and surrounding parks.
- Conduct prototype long-term natural-resource monitoring programs in four parks; extend to additional representative areas with high potential for information transfer throughout the national park system.
- Continue to participate in departmental efforts to use GIS as an integrating tool for all types of resource information in a format usable by park managers, NPS leadership, other land-managing agencies, and academic institutions. Develop field GIS technical support centers.
- Seek a legislated research mandate for the National Park Service and enter into collaborative relationships with academic institutions, professional, scientific, and scholarly organizations, state historic preservation officers, and museums to continuously update the scientific and scholarly knowledge about park resources.
- Coordinate with the National Biological Survey to establish policies and procedures that support NPS goals and priorities for biological research, inventoring, and monitoring.

**Objective B.** A current, comprehensive research program conducted to prevailing scientific and scholarly standards provides the National Park Service with the ability to identify and understand park resources and how they are affected by local, regional, and global influences. The NPS staff includes highly professional and nationally recognized scientists and scholars who maintain extensive professional partnerships with their counterparts in other scientific, academic, and cultural institutions. These mutually beneficial relationships ensure that quality research forms the basis for NPS preservation, planning, and educational programs and that this knowledge is broadly shared with the public. Park managers understand scientific and academic information, use it in local decision making, and bring it to regional and national forums addressing topics that involve park values.
**Other Important Actions for This Goal:**

Implement the inventory condition and assessment program (ICAP) to track condition of historic (and nonhistoric) structures.

Provide resource management training for all superintendents, including training in how to use scientific and scholarly data and technology to forecast events and anticipate effects.
Objective A. The national parks are managed by highly qualified professionals as integrated systems of natural and cultural resources. Areas that can still reasonably and legitimately be managed as wilderness are protected as increasingly rare and valued repositories of our biological and geological heritage. Areas reflective of past and present civilizations are protected as increasingly rare and valued repositories of our cultural heritage. Parks are managed to sustain biological and cultural diversity. Biological diversity is achieved by protecting natural habitats—not just the spectacular species but also the interdependent, less obvious species and systems. Cultural diversity is achieved by recognizing the contributions of all Americans—not just the unique accomplishments and events, but also the everyday occurrences which altogether comprise our national experience.

Objective B. Park resources are protected from overuse by visitors and from pothunting, poaching, trespass grazing, vandalism, theft, and other illegal activities. Consumptive uses authorized in law are managed in accordance with congressionally prescribed standards. Park managers share assistance with other agencies and organizations in protecting park-related resources outside park boundaries.

Highest Priority Actions:

- Continue to develop and maintain the resource management plan data base to track information about resource protection issues and projects and make it accessible to park managers and NPS leadership; integrate with inventory and monitoring data bases.

- Conduct strategic planning for cultural resource management (plan for natural resources is already approved).

- Bring greater professionalism to resource management by hiring resource management professionals and supporting opportunities for continuing education for resource management personnel.

- Review policies and regulations governing visitor use and special uses of the parks to ensure that they adequately protect park values; make necessary revisions and additions to make sure the Park Service is using the full extent of authority granted in law.
Objective C. Regulations and other protective mechanisms such as cooperative agreements are used at the national, regional, and local levels to minimize damage to park resources by air and water pollution, dewatering, habitat fragmentation, urban encroachment, and other intrusions on natural ecosystems and cultural landscapes.

Objective D. Resource management awareness is part of everyone's job and is communicated to the public both directly, through interpretive programs and chance encounters between park employees and visitors, and indirectly, by demonstrating good stewardship in all aspects of park operations.

- Work at the national level with other federal land-managing agencies to protect the quality of public lands relative to grazing, wetlands management, air and water quality, water rights, urban encroachment, endangered species, mining reform, hazardous wastes, and poaching and other illegal activities.

- Provide resource management training for other NPS employees whose jobs may affect the condition of resources.

Other Important Actions for This Goal:

Create a national resource protection operations unit to conduct special investigations.

Implement the case incident reporting system systemwide.

Give higher priority to developing park-level responses to resource protection issues.

Hire additional resource protection criminal investigators. Place resource protection specialists in some parks.

Offer a new resource protection training course and add more resource training to the federal law-enforcement training course.
Goal III. Achieve sustainability in park use and development

Objective A. Park-related activities and development, whether inside or outside park boundaries, are sustainable parts of the ecosystem and cultural context, working with natural processes and enhancing cultural values. They require minimal manipulation of the natural environment, modification of valued cultural elements, or consumption of depletable resources.

Objective B. Park managers understand evolving visitor patterns and how visitor use affects parks and adjacent areas. Credible, timely information and innovative planning methods provide the tools they need to make increasingly difficult decisions about which kinds and levels of use are appropriate and sustainable. Rigorous monitoring evaluates the effectiveness of decisions.

Objective C. Development alternatives are analyzed to determine need and environmental costs. Adaptive reuse of historic structures often reduces the need for energy- and material-consumptive new construction. Park facilities and infrastructure are energy-efficient and well-maintained. Park development is economically as well as ecologically sustainable. Major investments in construction or rehabilitation are preceded by a determination that long-term maintenance of the facility is a priority use of park funds.

Highest Priority Actions:

- Develop policies for energy, water, and materials conservation in all park operations and development.

- Develop the required expertise in social science and in visitor use management techniques, such as the visitor experience/resource protection (VERP) process, and expand implementation of the VERP process through the park planning program, starting in overcrowded parks and including national rivers and trails.

- Develop policies and strategies for making park development and transportation more ecologically and economically sustainable; require consideration of sustainability, value engineering (including environmental costs), and life-cycle costs for all development projects; include strategies for predicting cyclic funding needs and reducing backlogs in cyclic maintenance and repair/rehabilitation.
Objective D. Park support facilities, including visitor lodging, employee housing, and offices, are consolidated and located outside parks where feasible. Park managers actively participate with local and regional planning and development agencies to share responsibility for visitor and tourist needs. Public transportation systems provide energy-efficient, nonpolluting alternatives for visitors traveling to parks.

- Review parks to determine the locations of overbuilt environments; plan demonstration projects for environmental restoration techniques and for low-impact development and use; give priority to projects best demonstrating ecological sustainability.

- Develop park public transportation systems to improve quality of visitor experience and reduce or avoid resource degradation and, where possible and appropriate, link to regional transportation systems.

Objective E. The parks use management practices (such as integrated pest management) that work with ecosystem processes, conserve water and energy, and avoid pollution. On-site power generation is accomplished with renewable energy, and public vehicles are energy efficient. The parks are demonstration areas and catalysts for reuse and recycling of a variety of materials.

- Develop policies and strategies for reducing/reusing/recycling materials used in all park operations.

Other Important Actions for This Goal:

Support parks in achieving sustainability in park operations and development by developing a center of excellence, including development of systems for accessing and delivering information about sustainability.

Cooperate with DOE laboratories to develop and implement a cost-share strategy for developing renewable energy sources in parks (Renew the Parks program).

Convert NPS vehicle fleets to cleaner, more efficient, and where feasible, renewable energy sources.

Cooperate with neighboring agencies and organizations to make local resource recovery centers economically feasible.
Focus
FY 1995 Action Agenda

Goal IV. Help people forge emotional, intellectual, and recreational ties with their natural and cultural heritage

Objective A. Visitors find ample opportunities to enjoy the national parks in their own diverse ways. All avenues for getting in touch with the natural world and with people's cultural heritage are encouraged so long as they are not illegal, inappropriate, or harmful to resources. The use of park resources for purposes important to people's cultural traditions and for resource-based recreation is accommodated to the greatest extent possible.

Objective B. A wide cross-section of the U.S. population and many foreign visitors come to the parks. Their visits are supported by improved transportation systems, accessible facilities and programs, and efficient visitor services. People planning to visit parks receive advance information that helps them organize their trips around their desired experiences. NPS professionals systematically analyze public expectations and visitors' satisfaction with their park experiences.

Highest Priority Actions:

- Review policies governing visitor use, recreation, and special uses of the parks to ensure that park visitor experiences are appropriate, allow for varied skill levels, range from active to passive activities, and reasonably accommodate cultural traditions and the disabled.

- Develop a strategy for improved distribution of NPS information through mass media and through visitor information and reservation systems, coordinating with others who provide travel services and providing information on parks as well as surrounding areas.

- Develop a strategy for expanding the NPS social science program, including the visitor survey program (standardized visitor survey and visitor services project), visitation statistics, visitor satisfaction/program evaluation, customer analysis project, market surveys, and other new research.
**Objective C.** Visitors learn about the significance of each park through high quality interpretive programs. Compelling stories convey the essence and diversity of natural ecosystems and of cultural experiences and achievements, including minority history. These stories help people gain important insights into who they are as members of local, regional, national, and global communities. Parks are places of intellectual growth—where visitors can gain clearer understandings of nature and culture, the ecological and social values of parks, the interrelationships of natural and cultural systems, and resource management strategies. Information used in interpretive and educational programs meets the highest standards of scholarly research.

- Develop a strategy to expand the effectiveness of park interpretation programs, especially for exhibits.

**Objective D.** Citizens can learn about their heritage without a park visit, through school programs, books, films, computer networks, traveling exhibits, television programs, and other media. Special emphasis is placed on serving children, who learn lessons that help them understand their heritage and enhance the quality of their lives, and who hopefully become life-long supporters of heritage resource conservation. NPS employees work with communities and schools to develop goals for teaching about heritage resources, and they assist teachers in using parks and other special places as classrooms.

- Develop a strategy to expand effectiveness of park education programs, especially for the parks as classrooms program and the use of park education specialists.
Other Important Actions for This Goal:

Place a greater emphasis on using volunteers in visitor services, interpretation, and education programs.

Establish stronger ties to academic and agency counterparts to share information and expertise.

Make NPS facilities and programs accessible to other cultures and the disabled.

Implement expanded NPS visitor survey (standardized visitor survey and visitor services project) and visitation statistics programs.

Implement an expanded NPS social science research program including visitor satisfaction/program evaluation, customer analysis project, market surveys, and other new research and use findings to provide better customer service in park programs and services.

Review policies governing interpretation to ensure that park visitor programs and media include all aspects of a park's story and address all cultural traditions appropriately.

Improve interpretive and educational techniques and media, including establishment of a media cyclic maintenance fund.

Create prototype education parks at four resource inventory and monitoring parks to develop methods for integrating research and inventory information into interpretation and education programs.

Revise and expand employee training in interpretation and education to increase foreign language proficiency and cultural diversity awareness, improve the interpretation core curriculum, and better integrate current research into programs.

Establish and maintain cooperative park education units (CPEUs).

Develop CPEU-sponsored training and college credit and degree programs for NPS interpretation and education staffs.

Develop state-of-the-art techniques and media to further interpretation and education programs such as "video camp fire talks" and the parks-as-classrooms media project.

Create park education specialist positions focused on integrating current research and revised thematic framework into NPS interpretation and education programs, assisting teachers, and promoting national, state, and local parks, historic sites, and other special places as learning laboratories.

Increase the parks-as-classrooms grant fund program.
Support the National Park Foundation parks-as-classrooms grant fund.

Work with communities and schools to develop education programs for youths and adults.
Goal V. Lead in a national initiative to strengthen the recognition and perpetuation of heritage resources and their public benefits

**Objective A.** Nationally significant sites that represent the nation’s diverse natural and cultural heritage and are suitable for the highest level of preservation are managed by the National Park Service as part of the national park system. Nationally significant sites in other ownership are managed as national historic and natural landmarks, national wildlife refuges, national rivers, national recreational trails, or units of the national wilderness preservation system. The national parks are managed as parts of broader ecological and cultural systems. Working cooperatively, park managers and their regional counterparts find ways to preserve ecological and cultural values and to assist people in enjoying the scientific, educational, inspirational, and recreational benefits of protected natural and cultural resources and recreational open space, while meeting human needs for social development and appropriate economic growth. The economic and other impacts of parks, resource conservation, and tourism are considered in management decisions.

**Highest Priority Actions:**

- Pursue an energetic program with federal land-management and appropriate regulatory agencies and tribes to coordinate strategic planning and to develop national interagency agreements to support system-based management and other cooperative activities.
Objective B. Other significant river corridors, trail corridors, landscapes, and properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places are managed by other public agencies and through partnerships to preserve and enhance their ecological, cultural, and recreational values, in many cases while accommodating compatible private residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Sometimes the various units of the national park system form a prominent core from which NPS employees reach out to participate in cooperative regional decision making. In other instances the National Park Service assists in interagency or public/private-sector planning efforts to help define and perpetuate heritage values and sustainable lifestyles across broad geographic regions. The cooperative planning and management of natural resources focuses on ecosystem-based management. Cultural resources are addressed in terms of themes and contexts. Recreational resources are addressed in terms of large landscapes, greenways, and cooperative delivery of recreational opportunities. Some areas or landscapes with multiple resource values are planned and managed cooperatively as heritage partnership areas.

- Develop prototype park-based programs that coordinate park planning and management with outreach assistance programs, including heritage partnerships and expanded biosphere reserve concepts.
- Seek legislation to establish a National Heritage Partnership program.
- Develop prototype ecosystem offices for park and regional planning and local conservation assistance, including alternative funding sources and management partnerships.
- Improve training programs to help employees understand ecosystem management and work more effectively outside parks with other entities.
Objective C. The NPS historic preservation, outdoor recreation, and natural conservation assistance programs advance the preservation and development of resources and geographic areas of high national priority by bringing together the diverse strengths of park management, governmental assistance and authority at the federal, state and local levels, and private-sector contributions. The assistance programs also strengthen cooperative conservation initiatives throughout the nation by supporting public and private agencies that have demonstrated a strong commitment to conserving and preserving significant natural, cultural, and recreational resources and to serving the recreation needs of communities throughout the nation. Such initiatives strengthen the nation’s conservation ethic, serve all segments of the population close-to-home, and integrate with other public and private initiatives aimed at improving the quality of life for all Americans.

Objective D. The National Park Service represents the United States in international forums addressing the preservation of heritage values throughout the world. It participates in cooperative efforts to protect ecosystems that cross its international boundaries, and it brings its considerable resources to joint ventures among the nations of the world to share information, expertise, and technology in the preservation of their shared heritage.

- Strengthen the Land and Water Conservation Fund (state and local grants) and the urban parks and recreation recovery programs through administrative and legislative streamlining to enhance the prospect of increased funding.

- Strengthen the Historic Preservation Fund and the National Register of Historic Places programs through administrative streamlining to enhance the prospect of increased funding.
Other Important Actions for This Goal:

Reinvent the park planning process to support system-based management and other cooperative planning and management efforts.

Strengthen the national trails system and provide national leadership to accomplish the goals of “Trails for All Americans.”

Expand the national rivers program.

Expand Volunteers-in-Parks benefits to NPS-affiliated areas.

Implement the strategic plan for the Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA) program, using greenways to encourage large landscape protection and to connect urban areas to nature.

Provide each park and program manager a tool kit on how to implement ecosystem management.

Implement the Metropolitan Conservation Initiative as part of the RTCA program to promote cooperative efforts to conserve natural and recreation resources in urban areas.

Remove duplicative or administratively burdensome aspects of NPS relationships with its partner organizations, relying upon accountability systems and management-by-exception approaches in partnership programs.

Provide energetic leadership for a federal lands-to-parks program to help state and local governments acquire recreation and conservation lands during the military base closure process.

Regularly survey users of services to assess the quality and effectiveness of the programs.

Work with the National Trust for Historic Preservation and others to develop a series of handbooks of existing legal and financial tools to protect and preserve heritage resources.

Clearly define an international program including a legislative mandate.
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Goal VI. Become a more responsive, efficient, and accountable organization

Highest Priority Actions:

Objective A. The National Park Service is guided and bonded by strong national leadership. Each employee understands and supports the agency's mission and organization and his or her role as part of the whole. Leadership decisions are based on how well they serve a shared vision and for their implications for policy, legislation, budget, human resources, and park and program operations. Each unit plans strategically for carrying out its part of the agency mission.

Objective B. A diverse, professional work force continuously adapts to the agency's changing needs, including current needs for greater scientific and technical expertise, enhanced skills in working with others, and greater facility in communicating with a diverse population. Career-long learning opportunities encourage employees to remain professionally and technically current and to adapt to changing work needs. The work environment supports innovation, experimentation, and calculated risk taking and reinforces teamwork. Employees with leadership potential are actively recruited and trained through planned developmental experiences that prepare them to lead both as managers and as specialists. All employees are treated equitably and appropriately. The work environment is safe and healthy. Managers are supportive of employees' personal and family lives and considerate of many employees' concerns about adequate housing, child and elderly care, isolation, minority issues, and dual career opportunities. Salaries are competitive and include adjustments for high-cost areas.

- Implement a process for integrating strategic goals with policy, legislation, and budget decisions and implementation strategies. Focus the quarterly directorate meetings on major policy, legislative, and budget issues and initiatives.

- Update position descriptions, performance standards, and classifications for all job series based upon the skills needed to carry out the mission of the National Park Service. Ensure grades are competitive with other agencies and the private sector.

- Recruit highly qualified candidates and improve opportunities for motivated employees to advance professionally through continuing training and education, including undergraduate and graduate degrees. Focus training programs on the agency's highest priorities, including comprehensive orientation for all new employees, improving skills in developing and using scientific and scholarly information in decision making, and increasing knowledge of authorities and techniques for working cooperatively with others.

- Implement the approved leadership succession concept (determine projected management competencies and develop a methodology for identifying, assessing, training, and developing potential candidates).

- Develop comprehensive human resource policies addressing all aspects of working and living conditions.

- Provide appropriate compensation and benefits to nonpermanent employees. Convert inappropriately classified "nonpermanent" positions to permanent positions. Fairly qualify nonpermanent employees to compete for permanent positions.

- Develop and implement a strategy for ensuring that all employees have access to appropriate, affordable housing, as fully integrated parts of communities outside parks wherever feasible.

- Provide NPS leadership in cultural diversity issues; develop a management policy on cultural diversity, including the need for work force diversity and the inclusion of all groups in park and program operations, research, planning, and management decisions.
Objective C. Wherever appropriate, authority is delegated from Washington to the parks, programs, and partners. Managers place less emphasis on regulation and more on defining and measuring desired results. Administrative systems support field offices and do not burden them with duplicative or cumbersome requirements. In turn, park and program operations are conducted effectively and efficiently with tracking and full accountability by NPS employees and managers that their activities are preserving resources and creating value for the public. The organization rewards employees who demonstrate that they have created value through this system. Expenditures reflect servicewide priorities, and major accomplishments are communicated to Congress and the public.

- Develop a budgeting policy and strategy that gives more authority and flexibility to park and program managers, accurately tracks the expenditure of appropriated funds, and ties accountability to performance goals.

- Develop a strategy for determining and sustaining levels of park staffing and funding adequate for operating parks at appropriate levels to protect resources and provide basic public services (include consideration of contracting, use of VIPs, cooperative activities, etc.).

- Support communications networks needed to operate an efficient, accountable decentralized organization. Provide employees the tools they need to communicate with each other, with management, and with partners outside the agency.

Other Important Actions for This Goal:

Work with Congress and constituents to more clearly define and affirm the mission, core values, and priorities of the National Park Service.

Provide all employees with good orientation to the NPS mission and organization within the first year of their employment.

Conduct park and program strategic planning.

Review all reporting and approval requirements with the intent of either discontinuing them or delegating approval authority to the park manager or employee; cut related management control positions by half.

Document funding needs.

Perform an overall system analysis of NPS administrative systems; review the flow of data through the different systems and build "hooks" between them so that data are entered only once; eliminate all duplicative and burdensome requirements.

Develop park clusters to explore opportunities for enhancing management and operational effectiveness.

Implement self-directed work group models.

Closely examine park uses, services, facilities, permits, etc., in light of the mission and modify or refocus practices as appropriate; eliminate functions that do not directly relate (e.g. drug enforcement).
Goal VII. Pursue maximum public benefit through contracts, cooperative agreements, contributions, other alternative approaches to support park operations

**Objective A.** The National Park Service is a good and valuable partner, able and willing to share authority and benefits as well as responsibilities and costs. The agency cooperates with other federal and state land-managing agencies to accomplish work and exchanges professional and technical assistance with professional and scholarly institutions. It cooperates with federal and local jobs programs, including public service and work-release programs, to help accomplish work in parks while meeting needs for job training and public service opportunities. It is attuned to opportunities to acquire surplus or confiscated equipment from other agencies. It contracts with concessioners to provide quality visitor services and a fair return to the government in exchange for an opportunity for reasonable profit to the concessioner. It enters into agreements with cooperating associations to distribute quality educational materials to park visitors for fair market value. It marshals and appropriately recognizes the efforts of volunteers and interns to augment work done by NPS employees.

**Objective B.** Every park has active friends groups that understand and support the park's purpose, goals, and actions. Federal funds are used to leverage other monies through challenge cost-share grants. The National Park Service works with partners to develop packages attractive for donations. It acquires more authority to participate in fund-raising and develops a greater expertise in that area.

**Highest Priority Actions:**

- Clarify and broaden authorities and policies for entering into and using contracts, cooperative agreements, and special use permits to provide customer services and to meet park management needs.
- Provide additional employee guidance and training regarding the use of partnerships.
- Clarify and broaden authorities and policies for fund-raising; seek direct fund-raising authority for park managers.
Objective C. Visitors and other park users pay a fair share of the cost of serving them, in line with other costs for travel and recreation and with safeguards to ensure that no one is denied access to a national park because of an inability to pay. Revenues gained from user fees are returned to the parks to help sustain park operations.

- Seek and clarify authorities to raise, retain, and use revenues through entrance fees, user fees, concession contracts, and historic leasing and other direct reimbursements.
- Explore ways to link revenues with management needs so that as areas become more heavily visited, revenues from increased visitation can find their way back to resource protection and maintenance.

Other Important Actions for This Goal:

Survey field managers and partners to determine needed changes in policies and guidelines for successful partnership initiatives.

Collect entrance fees.

Establish an information clearinghouse for partnerships.

Establish four partnership laboratory parks.

Demonstrate the effectiveness of internal and external partnerships through information fairs, newsletters, celebrations, donor recognition, awards and other incentives for interdivisional and interagency partnerships.

Investigate the possibility of a partnership career track.

Enhance the National Park Foundation's partnership leadership award.

Explore the possibility of creating a concession operation in conjunction with other nearby federal land-managing agencies.

Accept wide use of volunteers in parks and channel more money to that program; recognize the volunteer work force (80,000) as a work force that requires additional resources and skills to manage.

Seek National Park Foundation sponsorship of local and national programs recognizing the contributions of volunteers.

Revise the criteria and selection process for the challenge-cost-share program so that the most innovative partnerships are selected and to allow any obligated funds to be used to match.

Analyze private-sector involvement in planning, design, construction and maintenance of park facilities and exhibits, and produce guidelines for NPS managers.