



# REPORTER

VOL. VI  
NO. 27

CSPRA

Wishes You

A Happy  
And Safe  
Holiday  
Season



## IN THIS ISSUE

Prop. 2—Controversy .....	1
State Part Assistants? .....	2
New Weapons Use	
Regulations Recommended ...	3
Promoting Rangers .....	4
Therefore be it resolved.....	5
Park Land Give Away.....	6
God's Pie.....	7
Pines Fellowship Formed .....	8

PROP. 2 — NOW HISTORY — REMAINS A

## SUBJECT OF CONTROVERSY

Proposition 2, the Nejedly-Hart State, Urban, and Coastal Park Bond Act of 1976 has been the subject of controversy within the Association for the past month. As you may know, the Board of Directors voted to oppose the Proposition at the last meeting in September. The vote was very close, in fact the first vote was a tie. The motion was reintroduced and by a slim margin, the Board voted to oppose a Bond that would provide \$280,000,000 for the acquisition and development of state and local park lands? The Board's concern was over the operation of those park lands once we've acquired and developed them.

### New Developments - Old Budget

Over the past few years this Association has vigorously supported Park Bond issues only to see support funds provided at a level that was below the anticipated need. The needs were not pie-in-sky dreams of some incompetent but were arrived at after careful analysis by Operations Division's most experienced people. This year it was decreed that we were to operate any new development coming on line within the established base budget for the Area. In other words, there would be no additional funds for new development. We were to cut back the existing operation to absorb the additional workload. Managers who were already operating at a deficiency were told that instead of receiving

funds to operate those new campgrounds, picnic areas, restrooms and trails, they would have to operate at even a greater deficiency than before. So, when it became time to decide as to whether we should support another Park Bond issue, this bitter disappointment was fresh in the minds of the Board of Directors.

### Concerned Over Vote

As President, I was concerned over the Board's vote. Partly because the vote was somewhat indecisive and partly because of the reaction the Association was getting from a number of sources, some members, the legislature, the Department, etc. I therefore took another poll of the Board to reaffirm the vote. In this vote, the Board voted 7 to 2 to support Proposition 2. They still expressed concern, however, over the need for support funds to operate and maintain the new acquisition and development that Proposition 2 will make possible. I will attempt to express this concern to the people who have reacted to our stand on this matter.

### Work Week Group 1 vs. 4A

The Department's Personnel Section contacted the Association regarding a change in the work week group for Rangers, Trainees, Technicians, Lifeguards and Guides. These classes as you

(Continued on page . . . . . 2)



**PRESIDENT**  
Ron McCall

## california state park rangers association

**PRESIDENT:**

Ron McCall, 1275 Sunnycrest Avenue, Ventura, Ca. 93003

**VICE-PRESIDENT:**

Denzil Verardo, 801 Panoramic Hwy., Mill Valley, Ca. 94941

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:**

Doug Bryce, 8665 Florin Rd., No. 45, Sacto., Ca. 95820

**MEMBERSHIP . . . ACTIVE:** *current or retired, permanent or permanent intermittent employees of Department of Parks & Recreation of State Park Ranger or State Park Maintenance classes.* **ASSOCIATE:** *permanent or retired employees of the Department of Parks & Recreation in classes not eligible for active membership.* **SUPPORTING:** *any interested person not eligible for active or associate membership.* **HONORARY:** *distinguished person nominated by a member and approved by Board.*

## President's Message ..

may know are now in Work Week Group 4A. Personnel's recommendation is to change these classes to Work Week Group I. This change has been proposed in order to allow more equitable compensation for overtime. By changing the above classes to Work Week Group I, it will place virtually all working level classes in the same work week group allowing for compensation for overtime in quarter-hour increments rather than one-hour increments which is what they are in Work Week Group 4A. It will simplify payroll administration and record keeping processes. Because this proposal was sent to the Personnel Board at the same time that Chief Knight issued the order to pay for all overtime rather than allowing compensating time off, many members felt that the two were interrelated. It was merely a coincidence that the two issues arose at the same time. Employees may be paid for overtime under either work week group. Because of the benefits to field employees resulting from the proposed change in work week groups, the Association has en-

dorsed the change to work week group 1. The matter of being paid for all overtime is something else. We will be discussing this matter with Operations Division in the near future.

### ST. PK. ASSISTANT CLASS?

Another issue which is currently being studied by the Department's Personnel Section is the creation of a special class of Permanent-Intermittent employee which would be designated as State Park Peace Officers. The Permanent-Intermittent Rangers may presently be designated as peace officers after the prescribed training. This training is currently achieved in one of two ways. Either the employee attends training at the Mott Training Center or elsewhere at his own expense or the employee's District Superintendent and Area Manager agree that it is worthwhile to expend the needed seasonal funds to send the P.I. Ranger to training in order to gain peace officer status. The original proposal was to create a new class of permanent-intermittent employee which would be trained as peace officers at the Department's expense and then be designated by the Director as State Park Peace Officers. This new class would be titled something other than "Ranger", possibly "State Park Assistant".

The P.I. Ranger class would remain virtually unchanged but would not be designated as peace officers.

What came out the pipe at the other end was two classes of P.I. Rangers, one with peace officers and one without.

### ANOTHER DILUTION

The proposed change has many ramifications. If an enforcement class of Permanent-Intermittent Rangers is established with the existing minimum qualification, i.e. two years of college, we are once again faced with the possible dilution of the Ranger series. The Personnel Board could then ask the question, if a P.I. Ranger with two years of college can do the work of a full time ranger including law enforcement duties, why does a permanent ranger need four years of college?

If the minimum qualifications for P.I. Ranger are increased to four years of college, in many areas we would run into recruitment problems.

The matter has not been resolved at this time. The Association will monitor the progress of the proposal and hopefully have a chance to comment prior to its finalization.

Ron McCall  
President CSPRA

## COMMITTEE REPORT ON THE SUBJECT OF

**LAW ENFORCEMENT****WEAPONS USE  
REGULATIONS**

One of the high priority items the Enforcement Committee wanted to comment on is the Department's Weapons policy. There has been much said concerning the matter and a wide diversity of opinion expressed. The Committee met before a group of Rangers and other concerned members attending classes at the Training Center. After nearly three hours of discussion, the committee was unable to formulate any kind of a recommendation that was agreeable to all of those present. This was anticipated, and understandable due to the controversy on the subject. The greatest difference of opinion centers around the policy concerning the times the Park Peace Officer may or may not wear his enforcement equipment. In addition, there is a large difference of opinion as to whom should determine when the equipment shall be worn. Should the determination be made by the Department, the District Superintendent, the Area Manager or the Peace Officer himself?

After the lengthy discussion, a consensus was reached by the Committee concerning this matter. The feeling was that (1) the Peace Officer should be allowed to wear the Peace Officer Protective Equipment whenever he feels it appropriate to do so, and (2) the Area Manager may designate when the equipment must be worn.

The committee was asked to take this statement home and analyze it and then be ready to comment further on it at our next meeting. Upon reconvening in November, the subject was again discussed and everyone on the committee rejected the

original statement as being ineffectual and unworkable.

It was the committee's opinion that the statement was too bland and so general that anyone can read into it whatever he wishes.

**UPDATE**

The Enforcement Committee, consisting of Roger Werts, John Hart, Don Patton, Bill Walling, Joe Mette, Pat Wiese and myself, met in September to review the Weapons Use Policy Recommendations as submitted by Past-Chairman Ron McCall. We endorsed those recommendations with slight revision, as contained in this Reporter.

President McCall forwarded these recommendations to Chief Knight who has placed them before the District Superintendent for review.

The December Reporter will report on the status of other issues brought before the Committee including, mace legislation, PORT, option of handguns, standards for enforcement vehicles and code 3 equipment, and the Department's position on scanners.

/s/ Lloyd Geissinger  
Enforcement Committee  
Chairman

If the Peace Officer chooses to never wear his equipment he may do so unless his Area Manager says otherwise. We could conceivably end up with a "policy" which allows every Park Peace Officer to go his own way.

This in reality is not a policy but rather a consensus that manages to embrace and underwrite all attitudes on enforcement within the Department. What

we need is a very specific policy statement which offers positive guidance in enforcement. One which allows for very little deviation due to personal choice and which admonishes all Park Peace Officers to meet the statutory requirement to make arrests for general offenses within the State Park System.

Based upon the above statement, the committee would like to make the following recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That Chapter 6, Section 0620 (F) be changed to read as follows:

The law enforcement equipment will be carried and used at all times when the park peace officer is on duty. Exceptions to this may be as follows:

1. When the peace officer is conducting a formal interpretive program.
2. When he is assigned to office duty.
3. When he is participating in formal training.
4. When performing special assignments whereby wearing of equipment could prove hazardous, ie, firefighting, maintenance functions, search and rescue.

**COMMENT:**

The committee feels that the above policy is the only realistic approach to the department's enforcement responsibility. When the peace officer is on duty, one of his primary responsibilities is the protection of the park visitor and the features of the State Park System. While exposure to the perpetrators of those acts which jeopardize visitors and property within the park system: may vary from park to park, the responsibility of the peace officer to enforcement of the law never diminished. It is not the number of incidents or confrontations that a particular park peace officer may be involved in that should determine his capability to protect his life or that of a visitor. As long as the Department has appointed him a peace officer, he carries with him at all times, the responsibility

(continued on page 8)

On The Subject Of:

# Promoting P. I. Rangers

McCALL

Proposes .....

Dear Director Rhodes,

With the inception of the random selection method of establishing interview lists for State Park Ranger Trainee, the Rangers Association has received numerous complaints from members in the Permanent-Intermittent Ranger class. They feel that, after thoroughly preparing themselves for a career as a park ranger, they have no more advantage in the examination process than someone who can barely meet the minimum qualifications. Many of these Permanent-Intermittent Rangers have served the Department for several years continually gaining valuable experience. Some of them have completed P.O.S.T. certified peace officer training at their own expense in the belief that it would give them an edge on other applicants in the interview. Because of the random selection process, very few are even making it to the interview.

After considering this problem, the Board of Directors of this Association would like to recommend that non-probationary permanent-intermittent employees of the Department meeting minimum qualifications be regarded as promotional employees for the State Park Technician and State Park Ranger Trainee classes. By so doing, the employees meeting these qualifications could be placed on a separate promotional list which would take precedence over any open lists established for these classes.

I urge you to consider this recommendation and allow qualified permanent-intermittent the employment opportunity they have worked so hard to achieve.

Sincerely,

Ronald D. McCall  
President, CSPRA

RHODES

Replies .....

Dear President McCall:

This is in response to your letter on behalf of permanent-intermittent ranger members of your association asking that they be given promotional candidate status in the State Park Ranger Trainee and State Park Technician examinations.

We have carefully reviewed the pros and cons of your request and, while we agree with you that our permanent intermittent rangers are a very dedicated, highly motivated group on the whole, I do not feel that the action requested would be in the Department's best interests over a long period for the following reasons:

1. There are presently 191 permanent-intermittent rangers, 138 of whom are off probation. As of March 31, 1976, only 11, or 6 percent, of those 191 persons were minorities; and only 18, or 9 percent, were female. Looking at the number of Ranger Trainee/Park Technician hires we make annually, it is readily apparent that our only source of hires with a promotional feature would be permanent-intermittent rangers, which presently would not help to meet our affirmative action goals.
2. The concept of the permanent-intermittent ranger class is someone who can be available during peak periods and on short notice. While all incumbents do not fit into the "neighbor down the road" category, in many cases persons have been recruited from relatively limited local labor markets, sometimes on the basis of being able to meet a particular schedule or get to a particular location, or because they have had Park Aid experience. These

are not necessarily the criteria that we should be using to select full-time permanent employees who will have to perform in a variety of functions and locations during their careers.

3. One of the real strengths of our ranger group is the diversity of backgrounds and interests that trainees bring to the job. With the quality of our formal one-year training program, it is not necessary that they also have prior experience. While there are permanent-intermittent rangers who did not get called for interview, there are also those who have been called in for interview in the past, and they have not all been clustered right at the top of the resulting eligible list. In short, persons without permanent-intermittent ranger experience have been judged to be as good or better than some of our permanent-intermittent rangers. I feel this flexibility to select the best candidates from a cross-section of all available candidates and, where warranted, based on merit selection principles, to inject some new blood into the organization is very desirable and should be maintained.

I appreciate your concerns in this matter and, while I do not feel it is in the best interest of the Department to make the requested change, I do feel that an active, viable employee group such as the California State Park Rangers Association is in the best interest of the Department, and I or my staff members will be pleased to meet with your group to discuss any matters of interest to you.

Sincerely,  
Herbert Rhodes  
Director

# EDITOR'S NOTE

Much of this organization's sense of direction and expenditure of energy is a direct result of resolutions passed each year at our General Executive Council.

"Therefore be it resolved" provides each of us the opportunity to have our concerns heard and our solutions tested. Yet, each year we march off to GEC with too few well thought out, well written resolutions.

Article IV of the CSPRA Constitution provides that resolutions to be heard at GEC be in writing, signed by any Delegate or by 5 members, and delivered to the Executive Secretary by January 10th. In this way each Active and Active Retired member will receive a copy of each resolution (via the Reporter) at least 30-days prior to GEC.

Denzil Verardo's Vice Presidential comment in the June-July Reporter stated his research "found an amazing success rate on CSPRA resolutions." I encourage you to formulate your resolutions now so that January 10, 1977 will be met with many quality resolutions designed to heighten our "success rate."



## 1977 AUDUBON SCHOLARSHIPS AVAILABLE . .

Two full scholarships for Audubon Camp of the West and one to either the West or the Desert will be awarded by CSPRA early next year. Should you desire one of these scholarships send your name to Executive Secretary Pryce no later than December 1976.

Anyone interested in a partial scholarship to attend Audubon Camp should apply through the normal scholarship process.

# Mailbox

August, 1976

Dear "Mailbox":

The "Mailbox" section of the Reporter may not always be stuffed full of comments by CSPRA members, but letters in the last two issues gave me some thought and, I think, help fulfill one of CSPRA's objectives "to provide a medium of exchange of professional thought."

First, I understood and agreed with the reasoning of the CSPRA Board on the "non-support" of proposition 2, the coastal bond issue. However, after reading Mr. Whitehead's letter and doing a little thinking. I am inclined to agree that perhaps a larger issue is at stake. We all agree that we need more park land or even that over-used and understaffed parks are better than subdivisions, etc. Along this line, perhaps the Boards action was "without imagination". One alternative, I thought practical, would have been early provisional "non-support" of the proposition, to gain recognition of our point, and then support for the larger issue of preserving as much as possible of our coast and park quality lands.

The second item to cause me some thought and action was Jeff Price's letter on outside holders for our mini-folders. With a small amount of effort, I put up a holder at Hatfield, SRA, whose kiosk is often closed. I was just in time, for a few days later I saw Jeff, and it turns out that Hatfield was one of the units he visited which had no folder-holder.

Mike Lynch  
Region 3

*Season's  
Greetings*

Dear Lloyd:

I had a small heart attack the 18th of last month and have received many cards and letters, seems I have made a few friends in the past 26 years with the Dept. So would you please print this little poem?

Thanks for all the cards and letters, that come to me day by day;  
With much good luck and a resume  
of what's what out your way.  
My come back has been slow but sure  
you know how doctors are;  
Don't get too energetic fellow  
until you're up to par.  
As I read your, "I hope your're better,"  
I could see each and every face;  
Hey, you know it's great memories  
as I think of each time and place.  
Thanks again for your thoughtfulness  
and as I return to the daily trends;  
I'll give a prayer also of thanks  
for having such wonderful friends.

Russ McDonnell  
Doheny State Beach



## DID YOU KNOW . . .

that only 1/10 of the total Out-service Training Requests received by the Department's Training Unit come from Operations Division field staff?



## FEATURED OPINION

### "Take Over — Give Away Trend"

BY:  
DENZIL R. VERARDO  
VICE-PRESIDENT, CSPRA

With the Golden Gate National Recreation Area taking over Marin Headlands State Park, Stinson State Beach, Muir State Beach and S.F. Maritime S.H.P. on January 1st it is interesting to speculate on this "take-over", give-away trend.

A recent article in the L.A. Times mentioned the attempt by Alphonso Bell to make Camp Pendleton into a National Recreation Area (with the State Beach included, of course). Another project in the works is Tahoe National Recreation Area which does not, at this time, include the state parks. However, by the time the proposed boundaries are drawn, it will be as easy to include the Tahoe State Parks as they did in Marin Area. The Redwood National Park still includes in its masterplan and literature the supposition that the State Parks in its "boundaries" can be turned over when the Department wishes to do so (and indeed there have been several attempts to do so).

As one can see, with the loss of prime historic, beach, scenic, urban and natural areas, the California State Park System will be relegated to a system of reservoirs. The California tax payer is being asked to expand the State Park System through their tax dollars and once they are developed, turn the land (quote, "the burden of operations") over to the National Park Service. I dare say that it is more expensive to acquire and develop than it is to maintain once development is complete. In the last issue of News and Views Director Rhodes alluded to the fact that we, as park employees, were not adequately serving the public due to their disenchantment with state beaurocracy. No Wonder! Perhaps before another bond act is passed, the NPS and the DPR should look at California from the standpoint of what is National Significance and what is State Significance and lay out the priorities for each system before asking the California tax-

payer to saddle the burden of an acquisition and development program which should be born by the Nation. This would eliminate bond acts which propose more state parks and wind up including give-aways of land with nothing for Californians in return.

Until the above occurs, C.S.P. R.A.'s policy on these matters is to oppose any transfer of DPR lands without adequate studies as to the fate of the employee, the land, and the public's money. At the very least, a trade of lands benefitting both systems should occur.

Perhaps the public contempt of government Director Rhodes talked about in News and Views isn't really because of the field's lack of a work ethic, but because of political mis-management of funds and lands.



**NOTE:**  
Congratulations to Denzil on his new assignment as Manager of Bothe Napa Area.

# THE NOT SO OLD RANGER

## GOD'S PIE

Here is a yarn I've told many times to interpret one of the principles on which the California State Park System was founded. About 1949 I was working at Cuyamaca Rancho State Park. Beaver transplanted from irrigation canals had established a colony along the Sweetwater River above Green Valley Falls.

One winter day on my way home to lunch I noticed a car parked just south of the Sweetwater Bridge. Suspecting out-of-season trout poachers, I stopped to investigate. I found an old time German character actor from Hollywood with a couple of friends watching the beaver in the river. Ernst started asking questions. How many beaver did we have? I told him about 50 and the colony was still growing. What did we feed the beaver? I explained that we let nature take its course. When the colony got too large for the habitat, natural forces balanced the situation. Some of the beaver moved to another location or died or were killed off by predators.

Ernst puzzled over this for awhile and then the light dawned. He told me that years ago in the Fatherland his old grandmother had told him the same thing in different words.

"Human-beings always like to stick their finger in God's Pie but we never know when to quit stirring."

To me that single sentence tells the whole story of our problems in trying to maintain the balance nature.

TINY PHILBROOK

## HONORARY LIFETIME MEMBERSHIP

## Nominations Due

Who? "An Honorary Member may be any person who, for distinguished service devoted to the objectives of the Association, is nominated by a member of any membership class and approved by a two thirds vote of the Board." Section 6, Article 4 of the Constitution of C.S.P.R.A.

How? By placing in nomination a person whose distinguished services meet the following criteria:

I. The individual shall have contributed in an outstanding or extraordinary manner, or to an unusual degree, to the advancement of the State Park concept, the profession of State Park Ranger, public service within the State Parks, or in the field of ecology as it affects the park system or the public use of parks.

II. This service or action is to be beyond that in which the individual would normally have accomplished as part of his job or responsibility.



III. The service may not necessarily be of state or national importance, but is to be judged on its own merit and degree of contribution.

IV. Normally, the recommendation would be made during the person's lifetime.

What? Compose a letter, including the name, address and telephone number of the person, the date and place of his birth, the educational and/or service background and listing the specific accomplishments which you believe qualifies him, or her for the Honorary Lifetime Membership.

When? NOW, complete and sign, along with other participating members, the letter, or letters, of nomination and mail to R. L. Brock at 2270 A Sierra Blvd., Sacto., Ca. 95825.

NOMINATIONS ARE DUE  
DECEMBER 15, 1976

## ALVORD AND FERGUSON

434 West 17th Street  
P.O. Box 677  
Merced, California 95340  
Phone (209) 722-8854

# PARK FAMILIES ESTABLISH "PINES FELLOWSHIP"

Dear Park Friends,

Our Founding Fathers began this Nation in Christian Fellowship. With this in mind, we have begun a Christian "PINES FELLOWSHIP", open to anyone, to serve those in need of assistance in all phases of park life; such as: emergencies, transfers, illness, or support through prayer and sharing in Fellowship together. Anyone interested in joining this Fellowship, please write and give your name, address, telephone number and home church if you wish. (Your telephone number will only be given if you state so, for members only). We will send the names of

fellow members to you. If you have any special talents you would like to share, put them in your note.

Agape Love in His Service,  
(Isaiah 60-13)

Carol Hartwell (Kent) 755-3984

Darline Irwin (Richard)

Doris Avant (Jim)

Duretta Anderson (Paul)

Patricia Macy (Stuart)

Helen Welch (Jack)

Peggy Whitehead (Jim)

Barbara Stewart (Don)

PINES FELLOWSHIP

P.O. BOX F,

Del Mar, California, 92014

715-755-3984

.....



## EVENTS CALENDAR

- DECEMBER 4 - Board of Directors Meeting, Woodlake Inn, Sacramento
- DECEMBER 10 - Return Regional Election Ballot
- DECEMBER 15 - Honorary Membership Nominations Due
- DECEMBER 31 - Audubon Scholarship Requests Due
- JANUARY 10 - Resolution Submission Deadline

## ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Continued . . . . .

and the obligation to take appropriate action should he be confronted with an enforcement situation within the park.

He should therefore be allowed the equipment to carry out that responsibility when the situation arises. It is not sufficient to have the equipment in a brief case or satchel nearby. When that dangerous situation arises, statistics have shown that is most likely to occur when the peace officer is least expecting it. In a routine contact.

We have beaten the dead horse of "our image" long beyond reasonable limits. It is the Committee's conviction that, while always striving to maintain a projected picture of the public service officer, we must now fully accept the total responsibility of our peace officer status.

SUBMITTED BY RONALD D.

MC CALL

CHAIRMAN ENFORCEMENT  
COMMITTEE

12-6-75

ENDORSED AND RESPECT-  
FULLY RESUBMITTED BY  
LLOYD GEISSINGER,  
CHAIRMAN ENFORCEMENT  
COMMITTEE,

9-17-76.

WITH SINGLE ADDITION  
OF RECOMMENDATION,  
ITEM No. 4.



california state park rangers association

First Class

Official publication for the  
CALIFORNIA STATE PARK RANGERS ASSOC.  
The REPORTER, published monthly  
Lloyd Geissinger, Editor  
9605 Linda Rio Drive  
Sacramento, California 95827