



NEWSLETTER

ISSUE NO. 27 MARCH 1982

Two Opinions on "Generalist" Ranger Role

by Fred Soderlund

Jerry Waggoner's article on the "Generalist" role has caused me to dig out Alex's article and reread it. My original thoughts on reading it again are reinforced; the view presented is myopic. The feeling seems to be that if we split off the enforcement aspects (as we now have them) of our role, that we will be returning to the historic duties of the ranger. The basic reasoning given for this is that enforcement takes training and emotional and psychological investment. Also if one is to perform the enforcement duties in a competent and professional manner it is felt that other aspects of our duties will suffer.

I have problems with the reasoning as presented. Why is it that splitting off the enforcement duties will return us to the generalist role? Apparently there is no problem with our being interpreters, re-

continued page 6

by Gary O. Fregien

I was very glad to read the article in the "California Ranger." It not only reaffirmed my belief that many other people are concerned, but also that we still need to find the right answer. I applaud the authors courage in addressing a problem on the minds of most, but rarely publicized.

Though I appreciate their opinion, I would like to offer my own. Mine is the conditioning of departmental experience dating from 1962. I do not intend this to be a "back in the good old days" lecture, but rather a perspective over the years.

I whole heartedly agree that not all rangers are generalists any longer. I have used the qualification "not all rangers" because I firmly believe we still have units where rangers do act as generalists. This is indicative of the complexity of the problems we face in this issue.

continued page 4

CLEAN AIR

by Rick Parmer

An industry-supported bill which would severely weaken protective measures in the Clean Air Act underwent preliminary hearings in the House of Representatives during February. H.R. 5252, if it eventually becomes law, could have serious long-term impacts on air quality standards within the State Park System.

CSPRA members are urged to contact their local Representative by letter, phone, or even in person at public meetings in their district. Tell them you are a constituent and CSPRA member. Let the Board know too so we can determine the effectiveness of these requests. Remember, phone calls and letters both pro and con are recorded by District office staffs. It only takes a few minutes and you can make a difference!

WELCOME NEW MEMBERS

Dorene Clement
Sacramento

Larry Santoyo
Aptos

Edward Bastien
Oceano

Chris Kania
Perris

Mary C. Rohn
Los Gatos

Several "cactophiles" sent in this poignant newspaper clipping to show that Nature can protect herself when assaulted. Thanks to Dana Long and Bill Krumbein for the item.

Heavy Equipment Operator

Must have the ability to read & write; plus 2 years of experience in the operation of heavy equipment, must also be willing to travel to the State Parks in North Central, Northeast & part of Eastern Arkansas & be able to work from equipment based located at Pinnacle Mtn. State Park. Please send application/resume to: Arkansas Dept. of Parks & Tourism, No. 1 Capitol Mall, Little Rock, AR 72201. 371-7742. Annual salary \$8,502. E.O.E./A.A.E.

I thought you might be interested in Arkansas Parks salaries. If the Equipment Operator draws this amount, I'm sure their other classes aren't being overpaid.

John Anderson
Retired in Arkansas

Saguaro's last act avenges its death

PHOENIX (AP) -- A 27-year-old Phoenix man was killed when a saguaro cactus he shot fell on him, authorities said.

Maricopa County sheriff's deputies said David M. Grundman fired a shotgun at least two times at a 27-foot cactus.

The shots caused a 13-foot section of the cactus to fall and crush Grundman, deputies said.

Deputies said Grundman already had felled one saguaro.

Destruction of cacti is a misdemeanor under Arizona law.

Grundman and a friend, Joseph Suchocki, were in a desert area north of here when the incident occurred Thursday afternoon, deputies said.

The Prescribed Burner's Version of "Smokey the Bear"

Verse 1

With a Ranger's hat and shovel, and a pair of dungarees
You will see him in the forest, always pokin' in the trees
You'll never see him sit at home, smokin' on the porch
He's always out there in the woods, playing with his torch.

Refrain

Smokey the Bear, Smokey the Bear
Snappin' and a sniffin' and a scratchin' at the air
You should see his eyes when that fire begins to flame
He knows fire is part of nature; that's how he got his name.

Verse 2

Now old Smokey is no dummy, and he knows about man's sins
He's heard of Dr. Biswell, and knows nature always wins
So when Doc hands you that drip torch and says that it's your turn
Remember to have patience as you watch that sucker burn.

Verse 3

If you've ever seen a forest with a fire running wild
And you love the things within it, like a mother loves her child
When you start to drip that flame, be sure to check your rate of spread
Or you might ignite a condor, and Pete Gaidula will have your head.

Verse 4

You can take a tip from Smokey, that there's nothin' like a fire
Whether it's in the fireplace, in the crown, or just a funeral pyre
So burn it, torch it, fire it up; make sure that it burns well
For you and your friend Smokey will soon both burn in hell.

Written at prescribed burn training
Davis, California
January 25-30
Dave VanCleve
Steve Treanor



Letters → to the Editor

Jeffery Price, Editor,

I would like to have you write a few words for me in the next issue of the Newsletter.

My husband, Caleb B. Smith, retired Ranger from San Luis passed away on January 10, 1982. He was ill for four months from a cancer operation. We went to U.C.L.A. Medical Center in December for treatment and surgery. Before they could operate, we needed at least 50 pints of blood and the donors had to go into the Medical Center as they would not take blood from a blood bank. They gave me one day and half before surgery to find donors.

The response from the Rangers was unbelievable. We received $3\frac{1}{4}$ units of blood and we used $3\frac{1}{4}$ units of blood. U.C.L.A. has never had such a response since they opened their doors. They had to put up special signs directing people to the blood bank as so many were coming in.

The evening before surgery, six Rangers came into my husband's room to visit him. This was the best medicine he could have received. It made him feel proud he was part of such a wonderful organization as he loved the Rangers Association and we both enjoyed attending the G.E.C. convention every year. I just wanted to extend my sincere thanks to the Rangers who gave or tried to give blood and taking time to visit my dear "Smitty".

Again, thank you Jeff for this favor. If my health permits and possible I will try and make a day or two of the convention in Sacramento.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Caleb B. Smith
720 Grace Street
Bakersfield. California 93305

Good News in Torrey Pines' Battle

by Rick Parmer, EIC

At its January meeting, the Coastal Commission issued a much hoped for staff recommendation that would require dedication of an open space buffer and access area to Torrey Pines S. R. This would result in the removal of eight proposed duplex condominiums from the Henegar Homes Inc. residential development project (see Nov. '81 Newsletter article).

The move marked a reversal from previous local government approval action on the project. CSPRA, along with the Torrey Pines Community Planning Group and several protective associations, rallied behind the recommendation in testimony before the Commission.

Thanks to letter writing efforts by CSPRA members in particular the hearing was postponed from the Los Angeles setting to San Diego to allow increased public testimony. The developer wanted a vote taken in L.A. however the point was raised that several letters were on file from elsewhere in the State.

No vote was taken in San Diego either since Henegar Homes Inc. decided to return to the drawing board in an attempt to meet new guidelines within the staff recommendation.

A strongly worded letter from Southern Region Director Herb Heinze expressed serious concern as to the adequacy of mitigation measures from both an environmental and recreational standpoint.

CHANGING
YOUR
ADDRESS?

Please Print

Name

OLD ADDRESS

Street

City

State

Zip

NEW ADDRESS

Street

City

State

Zip

Send to:

Doug Bryce

P.O. Box 28366

Sacramento, CA 95820

Fregien cont.

I think the crux of the problem we now face is a case of "jack of all trades, master of NONE." By attempting to satisfy all of the basic needs of the park operations spectrum with a single class, we have in essence, satisfied none adequately.

My first point of difference with the article is that it fails to recognize that in their larger parks, NPS is also split to separate the resource management function. The reason why is probably central to the viewpoint I wish to express. I believe that separation is a recognition of the importance of the role of resource management, and that it deserves full time attention, unencumbered by any other responsibilities. The proposal of the generalist park ranger does not appear to understand or consider resource management as deserving that stature. In actuality the training, knowledge, skills, etc. to effectuate resource management programs are at least equal to the requirements of law enforcement, interpretation, or other park operations. Resource management is not object management, thereby needing "protection" only, but process oriented needing an understanding of ecosystems.

Secondly, I for one, and I know others in the field, including managers, support the utilization of the "resource technician" class. You may not, but I think we need that class to guarantee sustained accomplishments. In resource management programs continuity is a most important factor. There is just no assurance that will happen when diluted by other programs, as would still be the tendency in many areas if the function were placed only within the generalist park ranger role. To answer a question posed, yes, there is a lack in field resource management functions. A duality of roles (park ranger and peace officer) is not enough to provide adequate resource management or even protection.

I am not saying field personnel do not have the qualifications and expertise necessary to accomplish resource management objectives, but rather, as is correctly identified, other programs are given higher priorities, and resource management needs are not being attended to, and won't be until necessary time (full time) is devoted to them.

For too many years resource management and protection has been a program of patrol, and little else. But patrol alone does not keep resources safe and sound. It cannot be accomplished from the cab of a pickup. The field needs additional support to deal effectively with resource management problems. The place to have that extra help is nearest the resource base, the units. (Obviously, someone will want to make a similar case for interpretation, etc.). It is interesting to note that also during the era before peace officer status, parks were not much better off with respect to accomplishing those necessary resource management objectives.

Thirdly, I disagree with the premise of both the proposals that law enforcement will be improved by adopting either. To turn again to my perspective, during the '60's and '70's park crime was on the rise. It was not only "victimless" crime we were confronted with. It became more and more apparent that the problem would become uncontrollable if direct action was not soon initiated. It was definitely out of our capacity, power or expertise to handle.

Concurrent jurisdictions (local law enforcement agencies) were also hard pressed to stem the rise in criminal activity. Sometimes this was due to the remoteness of some of our units, and sometimes it was due to a similar lack of manpower. Those conditions have not improved appreciably. The crime wave continues to outstrip agencies budgeting ability to effect controls.

Even had a "man of the cloth" been asked to study our crime problem the conclusion would have been the same (though his solution, praying, different), a rising crime trend.

The realization prompted reluctant managers to make tough decisions. To ignore the situation would have been, and still is, a "head in the sand" approach which would have accomplished nothing. To say that crime would, as if by magic, diminish by now stepping back to the previous status is comparable to saying our resource problems will disappear when we have more time to patrol. That is simply not an answer to the problem.

Please don't get the idea that I am pro law enforcement role as such. I consider myself one of the dissenters, though I have been in the role for 9 years, and have observed it for many more. I do agree that too much of our law enforcement activity is unwarranted and should be stifled.

However, our present law enforcement effort, in my opinion, is more efficient than it would be if it were left to other agencies to handle. Again, waiting for their response is part of what brought us head-first into it. Our philosophy during enforcement contacts is another reason management sought a ranger-peace officer class.

I do not dispute the statement that demand of the law enforcement role has shifted our direction and priorities away from other pressing concerns. If one were suggesting a park ranger class with absolutely no enforcement powers or responsibilities, in combination with an enforcement class, the chances of accomplishing some of the other tasks would be increased. But by allocating at least one position in needed areas as a resource "specialist" the chances are much greater that meaningful resource accomplishments will occur. The generalist park ranger would, however, be necessary in implementing projects coordinated by the resource technician. The challenge is to have the courage to give it a try.

I do not accept the status quo. Neither do I accept "turning tail and running" back to the '70's. That, in my opinion, would create a nightmare caused by unimpeded, rampant crime as a result of no deterrent. Nor do I accept continuing to inadequately handle problems of deteriorating resources, which shall continue to happen without a NEW approach and commitment. The new approach should include some specialization in the field.

This proposal may also prove to be unpopular. Likewise, it is inspired out of deeply ingrained concern, not so much that law enforcement has taken over but, that in the process the environment we profess to be concerned about may be succumbing from inattention.

Our failure has not been that we did not make a needed adjustment, but that we adjusted only to one need, sacrificing others. It is time to take resource management seriously, or soon realize our neglect and loss. For me, that is a price too dear to pay.

Gary O. Ferguson

SHIPS FATE DECIDED

What do you do with a crumbling 435 - foot concrete tanker if it's in the middle of your State Beach?

According to Dick Menefee, Pajaro Coast Manager, you close it to the public and let nature take its course.

The concrete tanker, Palo Alto, the only ship of its kind is aground at the end of a 630 - foot pier at Seacliff State Beach. For 50 years it was a popular fishing platform, according to Administrative Supervisor Renee Lewin, until winter storms in 1979 made it unsafe. It was closed permanently in 1980 she says. State Parks had been trying to decide what to do with the Palo Alto: restore it, remove it or let it remain at the mercy of the sea and continue to crumble.

During World War I, the US Government built a shipyard in Oakland to construct concrete ships, due to the shortage of steel. Of the

three ships built, the Palo Alto was the only one never used. She was launched in 1919 after the end of the war and for 10 years was never put to sea.

In 1929, the ship, which originally cost \$1,500,000, was sold to the Cal-Neva Company for \$300,000. It was towed from Oakland to Aptos and run aground where it sits today. The Company spent \$500,000 building the pier leading to the ship and constructing a huge dance floor, swimming pool and restaurant on the upper decks.

Then came the "Great Depression". Cal-Neva went broke within a year. State Parks acquired the ship for \$1 and it became a fishing platform.

Now the ship is structurally unsafe. Unless the Monterey Bay Historical Association can raise money to restore the ship, its shattered hulk will continue to deteriorate.



california state park rangers association

NEWSLETTER

Jeffery B. Price
P. O. Box 1468
200 Palm Canyon Dr.
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

BULK RATE
US POSTAGE PAID
PERMIT NO. 1123
SACRAMENTO CA

AL SALZGREN
9511 CALLE ARENO
CARPENTERIA, CA 92621

◇◇◇◇◇◇◇

6

Soderlund cont.

source managers, park operations managers, or parking lot attendents all at the same time. In taking on more enforcement duties we have become even more of a generalist; our duties covering a wider spectrum. To say that adding enforcement to our duties is to make us a specialist (implied in the desire to "... reestablish the 'Generalist' State Park Ranger.") is a contradiction. It seems to me that to be a truly competent and professional resource manager excludes being a professional and competent interpreter. Both of these areas require a great deal of ongoing training, they also require emotional and psychological involvement in the specialty. At no time can you have two jobs and become truly professional in them both. The adage really goes "Jack of all trades, master of one", not none. While we can all do some aspects of our duties well we need to utilize the talents of those that can perform a specific task professionally.

Why not split off the interpreter role completely? Do we not consider it our most important function? Due to the need to be resource managers, park operations managers or what have you the role suffers. It has historically never gotten the attention it deserves. What about resources? Are they being handled in a professional and competent manner? What do we do in a professional and competent manner? The Director in one of his talks mentioned that we need to attract more people to the parks to increase revenue. What better way than to have a staff of professional interpreters conducting a myriad of high quality, attractive, attendance generating programs.

I also see the "Ostrich Syndrome" exhibiting itself. The statement is made that "Crime... possibly decrease". We are informed that if we give up our enforcement duties or at least return them to the early 70's that crime would decrease. It seems what is being said is that if we do not enforce the laws our statistics would decrease showing we never really had an enforcement problem. Also, conveyed is the idea that if we do nothing about the crimes that are occurring we can consider them to not have happened. The thinking is muddled. Crime will always occur. Yet, to ignore its' existence does not mean that it no longer exists. If a person does not like to perform enforcement duties then they need to change jobs. We have to seek answers for the basic question; How can we better serve the people that use their parks?

Fred Soderlund