CHAPTER 12. 1971–84, The 13-year Struggle: forced transfer attempt, fired, reinstatement, and final settlement

The events involving Superintendent Briggle's devious strategy to transfer me out of the Park, or in the alternative to fire me, and the 13 years of grievance, appeals, negotiations, and court cases, until my reinstatement, are most logically discussed chronologically in their own Chapter. Some personal aspects of the Logan Pass issues covered in the previous chapter were related to my falling into disfavor with Briggle. Material not directly relevant to my firing is presented in other chapters. There are thousands of pages of memoranda, letters, appeals, court filings, records of decision, and various other documents related to these events. I have tried to be selective and include only those records that had significant bearing on my position in the NPS. This narrative is long and is not likely to be interesting reading to most people. However, I believe that it is important to accurately document the manner in which this long-term episode evolved and was concluded. (an abbreviated version is available in the Addendum, p. 403).

As summer 1971 waned, I was continuing to work on the Resources Management Plan and it was nearing completion. A complete draft was done (142 pp.) and I was now working on the final editing and polishing. Ranger Jerry DeSanto and I had worked on a paradigm that described four major Ecosystems in the Park: West Slope Forest, East Slope Forest-Bunchgrass, Alpine, and Aquatic. Jerry prepared accounts of historical human use and its influences within each Ecosystem. I prepared a narrative of management problems as well as diagrams illustrating the energy flows and nutrient cycling within each Ecosystem.

Some problems were identified as having Park-wide influence; they included:

1) Unlimited use:
   "Just as there can be no lasting answer to major problems of the Earth ecosystem without population control, there can be no long range solution to resource management problems in Glacier without limiting types and amount of human use. Overuse in Glacier is inextricably related to the overwhelming problems of world overpopulation. In the long run, the problem of overuse by too many people cannot be solved in National Parks without a global solution. We cannot sit back and wait for the global problem to be resolved, however. If Glacier is to survive in any semblance of unspoiled beauty, the principle of "carrying capacity" in human numbers must be applied quickly. Quantity and quality are not synonymous, Chambers of Commerce not withstanding. Glacier has an unexcelled opportunity to provide quality experience, but not within the context of unlimited use."

Action:
   1. Establish biological and "social" carrying capacities for all facets of Park use (e.g., each campground, campsite, trail, road, etc.) and relate this to a total Park capacity.
   2. Interject discussion of human carrying capacity concept wherever appropriate in interpretive media and in offsite presentations.

Following is a list of the other park-wide management problems in the Plan, with the discussions omitted (anyone interested in the discussions will find the Plan (McClelland 1971) in the GNP Library): 2) Pollution [air, water, soil, noise, and pesticides], 3) Resource Management manpower [field personnel], 4) Trail Maintenance, 5) Protection of the

Ecosystem-specific management problems were then listed and discussed in the Plan. Some parts of the Plan were heavily edited by Superintendent Briggle and in their final descriptions were far from what I had originally drafted. For example, I believed that snowmachines should not be allowed within the Park. Briggle thought otherwise, so the final draft reflected his emphasis on promoting all kinds of recreational winter use. However, I was able to retain the following description of the problem associated with snowmachine use in GNP (Resources Management Plan, p. 31):

“Snowmobiles in their present form disturb the quiet serenity of the park and befoul the air. Inadequate mufflering of existing machines permits the intrusion of excessive noise into the park during a time of year heretofore dominated by nature’s stillness. Without constant surveillance, some snowmobile operators drive across exposed vegetation. Infrequent ranger patrols have been ineffective in preventing violation of closed and posted areas. Snowmobiling is incompatible with use on any park trail. Molesting of wildlife occurs intentionally as when are chased, and even unintentionally simply as a result of noise pollution.”

August was a busy time. I also was writing a report with recommendations for managing backcountry use, based on my previous two summers spent hiking trails and evaluating campsites (my assignment from Chief Ranger Hart). During this period, I attended a staff meeting in which Briggle discussed what he wanted in GNP’s formal Wilderness proposal, being prepared by his staff and the Denver Service Center. I was not assigned any role in that undertaking. Superintendent Briggle stated that he and Director Hartzog had agreed that the Wilderness proposal should include an aerial tram or gondola route from the Many Glacier Hotel to Grinnell Glacier, and new “wilderness” chalets within 100-acre enclaves at Cosley Lake, Debris Creek, Fifty Mountain, and the head of Kintla Lake. Public opposition eventually sunk these inappropriate development schemes. It was clear that neither the Director nor Briggle had any comprehension of, or feeling for, the standards required by the Wilderness Act. The (NPS) did not support the inclusion of national parks in the Wilderness System when the Act was signed in 1964 and the agency never has demonstrated a commitment to the Act. NPS Historian Richard Sellars (1997:193) wrote: “Although many of the National Park Service’s rank and file enthusiastically supported the wilderness bill, the bureau’s leadership seems to have drifted from outright opposition to reluctant neutrality.” The NPS wrote inordinate flexibility into its management standards and it continues to do so.

On the afternoon of 20 August 1971, I was summoned to a meeting in Superintendent Briggle’s office, with Chief Ranger Ruben Hart and Chief Naturalist Edwin Rothfuss present. Such an impromptu meeting was not unusual, so I anticipated only a discussion of some resource issue. However, to open the meeting, Briggle announced that he was abolishing the Resources Management Ranger position—my job! I was in total shock.
Earlier in August, a special management appraisal done by Dr. Richard Bury of Texas A & M had been supportive of my work. There was no recommendation to abolish the position. So, the position for which the NPS had sent me to CSU to earn a Master's Degree, and to fill a long-term position of Resources Management Specialist, was being precipitously eliminated by Briggle. I had not heard so much as a rumor of this action.

Briggle said to me: “If you take the East District Naturalist position here in Glacier, I’ll do everything I can to see that your career goals are realized.” This of course was not his intention at all. He presented me with an option; if I did not want the naturalist position, he would arrange a transfer to some other position in some other park. This naturalist position was in essence the same position I was in when selected to attend CSU in 1967. Briggle was too much of a coward to reveal to me that he already had asked the Regional Office to forcibly transfer me “elsewhere,” as I later learned. Pat and I did not want to leave Glacier, so I verbally accepted the GNP naturalist position rather than opt for a transfer to some unknown place and unknown position. This East District Naturalist position now required the incumbent to reside year-round at St. Mary. This would have been difficult for us, with five children in school. However, the Frauson’s (East District Ranger) were driving their two children to the Canadian border to take a bus to the Cardston school on a daily basis and we could have done the same. The schools at Babb and Browning were very substandard and not an option.

In hindsight, now, nearly 40 years later, I wonder if I should have acted immediately and filed a grievance over the abolishment of the Resources Management position. This seemed like such a bizarre and nonsensical decision. It obviously was a personal vendetta and had nothing to do with the position itself. In spite of the turmoil, I completed the Resources Management Plan and submitted it to Chief Ranger Hart on 13 September.

The Resources Management position was formally abolished, and the Hudson Bay (East) District Naturalist position was created, on 19 September 1971. On that date I was back in the naturalist position I held four years previously. I was not required to move to St. Mary immediately because, as it soon became evident, Briggle had no intention of having me in that position for long. It was a sham assignment while the Regional Office arranged my transfer, requested by Briggle, without my knowledge.

On 6 October 1971, an evaluation of GNP management was issued by Messrs. Harrison and Hassebroek, from the Department of Interior, Bureau of Standards and Evaluations. They had visited the Park during August 9–19 1971. The brief report devoted two sentences to Resource Management in GNP. Research Biologist Martinka was given sole credit for having completed the Park’s first Resources Management Plan. What?? Martinka played NO part in preparation of the Plan. It was my sole responsibility and I had prepared it with the only significant assistance coming from Ranger Jerry DeSanto.

Research Biologist Martinka was instrumental in having Biologist Bob Wasem transferred from GNP in 1970 and it soon became clear to me that Martinka was a force in convincing Briggle to make the same move on me. On 10 October 1971, a headline in the Hungry Horse News read: “Glacier Views Banding Study of Bald Eagles.” The story went on to describe how Research Biologist Cliff Martinka was considering initiating such a study. Martinka had played no part in the annual fall monitoring of bald eagles in the Park that Pat and I instituted in 1965. I recently had apprised Martinka of an expanded study of eagle ecology that Seasonal Biologist Dave Shea and I would be proposing.
It was clear that one of Martinka's goals was to usurp the eagle monitoring and research. Martinka recognized the increasing national interest in bald eagles and saw that he was in a position to usurp GNP's role in eagle research, if he could get rid of any qualified competition within the Park. On 22 October 1971, the Hungry Horse News reported. "Heading the park's eagle study is Cliff Martinka, research biologist."

Briggle was obsessed with having subservient personnel on his staff. He was a micro-manager down to the details of personal grooming. On 27 October he issued Office Order 6, which described and illustrated his required standards for head and facial hair (D-38). At the time, I was the only uniformed employee with a mustache.

On 5 November 1971, I heard that the Park was establishing a Wilderness Ranger position. I immediately wrote Superintendent Briggle asking to be considered for the job. Briggle responded by memo that he would not consider me for the position (D-39):

---

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
National Park Service
Glacier National Park, Montana
October 27, 1971

OFFICE ORDER NO. 6 (ADDENDUM)

Grooming Standards for Uniformed Male Employees

1. Purpose. To implement grooming standards for uniformed male employees of Glacier National Park.

2. Policy. The attached pictures indicate the approved grooming standards for uniformed male employees of Glacier National Park. Note that the length of sideburns offers a good appearance and good grooming, being neat, yet in style.

3. Action. The grooming standards are to be implemented immediately upon receipt of this memorandum.

[Signature]
William J. Briggle

Enclosure

---

GROOMING STANDARDS FOR UNIFORMED MALE EMPLOYEES OF GLACIER NATIONAL PARK

Hair not to cover forehead

Hair not to extend out over ears

No Beards!
If worn, mustaches must be well-trimmed and may neither turn up nor down from the horizontal.

Hair not to come down over collar

Sideburns no lower than bottom of ear lobes

Sideburns may not be flared
That memo made it clear that Briggle was arranging a transfer "for" me. We knew that the guillotine was being prepared and we had to decide what options we might have.

As the conflict with Briggle deepened, it was naively surprising to experience the rapid withdrawal from contact of some people that I always had considered to be my friends. Any employee who reported directly to Briggle treated me as if I had a horrible contagious disease. I was clearly persona non grata to many employees. Most important to them was avoiding the risk of making themselves vulnerable to Briggle’s penchant for transferring anyone he believed was not a team player. Their concerns were understandable. Bob Morey, with whom I had worked as far back as YNP, and with whom I had shared back-country patrols and friendly bike rides, suddenly would not look at me or speak when we passed. "In the end, we will remember not the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends" (Martin Luther King Jr.).

Garry Bunney, who worked with me on several projects in GNP (1966–71), became a back stabber. He transferred to the Departmental Management Training Program in
Washington, D.C. in 1971 and later wrote a letter (included in the Formal Hearing Record of 14 August 1972) supporting Briggle and describing how fair his [Bunney's] transfer had been (he really wanted to go to Washington, D.C.!). Apparently as long as his transfer was fair, everyone else’s must be too. What Bunney chose to ignore was that his career goal was in complete contrast to mine. Bunney desired to advance up the “Ladder of Success” to higher grade levels and increasing administrative “responsibility.” Bunney’s personal goal precisely fit the organization’s paradigm for desirable employees. An employee whose goal was to remain in a field position, working directly with natural resource management, was considered to be unmotivated, a drag on the organization. The creation of long-term Resource Management Specialist (Ecologist) positions for specific parks, as envisioned by Lyle McDowell, did not fit this paradigm and apparently was beyond the comprehension of people like Briggle.

The friendship of others was real and unwavering. East District Ranger Bob Frauson never abandoned me, nor did longtime friend Ranger Jerry DeSanto. There were others who remained stalwart friends: retired Ranger Dan Nelson; Ranger Art Sedlack; Biologist Dave Shea; seasonal rangers Don Lawrence and John Perry; Curator Roberta Seibel; Chief Naturalist’s Secretary Paula Eid Dustin; former Chief Naturalist’s Secretary Lorraine Robertson; Chief Ranger’s Secretary Martha Sloan; former Chief of Administration Ken Beck; Administrative Assistant Rachel Parker, and several trail crewmen including Bill Hutchison (and wife Jan) and Don Burgess. Outside the Park, Rev. Tom Best, Dr. Dave and Janet Downey, Dr. Loren and Mary Kreck, Bob and Laurie Muth, Karen Feather, and Joe Moody provided invaluable moral support.

Director George Hartzog was fond of saying that he wanted every NPS employee to strive to become Director. That always seemed absurd to me. We do not all have the same aspirations or abilities. We each should have the opportunity to strive for our own unique goals, based on what we do best and where we can achieve the most worthwhile work for the organization. Surely this would benefit the organization as well as the individual. Those who yearn to be Director are welcome to it. Lyle McDowell, Chief of Resource Management in the NPS Washington, D.C. Office, sent me the following description of the “Ladder of Success.” I do not know if McDowell actually wrote the description himself. There is no attribution or date on the material (D-40):

THE LADDER OF SUCCESS

“Psychologists tell us most people want to succeed in their chosen professions, craft, or trade. A laborer aspires to be a journeyman in some trade. A machinist wants to be a shop foreman. The company president would like to become chairman of the board. Let us not overlook the U.S. Senator who looks longingly from Capitol Hill toward the White House. This seems to be an inborn trait. There are few people who can honestly say, "I have arrived and I am content to stay." Alexander the Great wept because at the age of 29, or less, there were no more worlds to conquer. He who is honestly content is a person to be envied. This inborn ambition to succeed drives us ever upward and quite often to the psychiatrists couch.

People are attracted to a particular trade or profession for a wide variety of reasons. Quite often this can be described as the "romance of the job." A pre-law student is often attracted by courtroom dramatics he assumes to characterize the law profession. "The life"
of a Park Ranger appeals to many young men who have a genuine fondness for the out-of-doors. Who wouldn’t want to hunt, fish and trap; isn’t that all a ranger does? How long does the romance of the job last? The young attorney may become quickly disillusioned when he learns that courtroom appearances are only a small part of an attorney’s life. The Park Ranger soon learns that he is expected to climb the success ladder by qualifying himself for increasingly more important assignments. To his utter dismay, he learns that he is being promoted away from the romance of the job and the reasons why he became a Park Ranger in the first place. He wanted to be a Park Ranger because he wanted to do the things a Park Ranger is expected to do. With a promotion staring him in the face, what should he do? What will happen to the romance?

A large percentage of Park Rangers at the lower grades have indicated their long range objective to include the superintendency of a large park. How far from the romance of the job is a superintendent of a large park? The following chart will illustrate this point:

If the green portion represents the romance of the job or the PRACTICAL FACTORS and the red portion indicates the MANAGEMENT ASPECTS, it is easy to see that a superintendent at grade GS-15 is pretty far removed from the reasons why he came into the National Park Service in the first place. Of course, it must be remembered that several years of experience and training fill the gap between a GS-5 Park Ranger and a GS-15 Superintendent.

It is not reasonable to ask a GS-5 Park Ranger how far he expects to climb up the ‘Ladder of Success.’ However, after studying the Ladder of Success chart, he should be able to reach some rational conclusions. First, he should realize that it will take several years to reach the top. Second, if he aspires to higher positions and increased pay, he will have to climb the ladder. Third, if he does climb the ladder, he will get progressively farther away from the romance of the job and the reasons why he became a Park Ranger in the first place.
Fourth, the job requirement at each rung in the ladder place different and increasingly heavy demands upon him personally. Generally, as Park Rangers increase their experience, they are more inclined to look forward to more difficult positions and are somewhat anxious to get in the driver's seat; interests change from the "hobby aspects" to the "conceptional aspects." In addition to the foregoing, the chart purports to show that as a Park Ranger climbs the Ladder of Success to a higher grade he receives higher pay. The increased pay may be the reason for seeking the higher grade. There is nothing wrong with this strategy provided the Park Ranger accepts the responsibilities of the higher grade as well as the increased pay. Quite often when the increased pay is the sole incentive for the higher grade, the Park Ranger simply continues to perform at the level of the position from which he was promoted.

It will be noted that as a Park Ranger climbs the ladder, his job requirements change radically. A Park Ranger on the GS-5 rung is in a learning category, long on practical requirements and practically no management requirements. One year after entrance on duty, he is eligible for promotion to the second rung provided he has fulfilled at least minimum requirements. During the second year, he begins to assume certain management functions (entrance station, campgrounds, etc.) although he is now in the journeyman rate (GS-7), he is still learning basic techniques, particularly about supervision and management. After a significant period in grade, the GS-7 Park Ranger should have become qualified for advancement to the GS-9 level. When this time arrives, the man concerned must clearly realize that he is making a break with his "bunkhouse buddies," because he is now definitely in the management field, not wholly so but to a significant degree. In his new capacity as a Subdistrict Ranger, he is a working supervisor. Many jobs he will have to perform himself simply because he is the only one with the know-how, experience or ability. The other part, and perhaps the most difficult, is his supervisory or management responsibility for a geographic section of the Park, one or more permanent rangers, a staff of seasonal employees and relations with concessioners. The manner in which he discharges his management responsibilities will constitute the proof of his worth in his new position.

Advancement to the GS-11 rung brings the most abrupt break with past work experiences. At this level, the District Ranger finds himself two levels above where the work is being done. This is sometimes a bitter pill to swallow. The District Ranger finds that he has two or more Sub-District Rangers working under his direct supervision and in only rare instances is he required to perform the practical aspects of a ranger's job. He now finds that he is responsible for overseeing the entire ranger program going on in widely scattered locations within a half million or more acres. His job is concerned with seeing that the entire job is being accomplished in his district. The chart indicates the larger proportion of his time is concerned with management aspects. The performance of practical factors would be in the area of assisting Subdistrict Rangers as required but allowing them to perform their own duties subject to inspection and approval. Performance of practical factors at this level would most probably be concerned with difficult assignments above the capacity of a Subdistrict Ranger, i.e., fire boss, search or rescue leader, etc. The GS-11 District Ranger is a manager!

As the aspiring ranger progresses up the ladder, he becomes increasingly removed from the practical aspects of rangering and increasingly involved in the conceptual or management aspects of operating the Ranger Division. Budgets, personnel, planning,
operating programs, broad training, correspondence, report writing, etc., take up most of the work time of an Assistant Chief Ranger, GS-12. He is also available as an expert on practical field problems and as an advisor to District Rangers in carrying out responsibilities of the Ranger Division.

The chart plainly indicates the GS-13 level to be heavily oriented toward management. The Chief Ranger at this level is a staff assistant to the Superintendent for those matters having to do with ranger activities. He must also be available and qualified to perform a wide variety of management functions not necessarily related to his experience. The Chief Ranger's job is to assist the Superintendent in the discharge of his overall responsibility for the management of the Park. The Chief Ranger is responsible for providing leadership, guidance, standards, plans, etc., for all functions assigned to the Ranger Division and for being qualified to pass on the acceptability of all work accomplished. Opportunities for performing practical factors are extremely limited.

Superintendents and/or Assistant Superintendents in grades GS-14 and 15, are managers. In order for incumbents of these positions to function at the level of their grades and perform their management duties, all positions subordinate to them must carry out the practical and management aspects at the various levels.

Since our hypothetical young ranger joined our ranks, many years have passed and he has realized his career objective by becoming the Superintendent of a large park. He is pleased with himself and his management ability for it has been acquired over time and was assumed at each level. Although he spends his work day behind a big mahogany desk, this brings satisfaction in spite of the fact that his work for several years has been pretty far removed from the romance he thought he was getting into. His ideas have changed and he found other worlds to conquer.

The problem remains for us to determine where each of us can find contentment on the career ladder. The top is open to him who is willing to give what it takes.”

D-40. The “Ladder of Success,” received from Lyle McDowell.

Michael Frome (pers. comm.) had the following to say about a so-called Ladder of Success:

“...[NPS employees’] opportunities for expression and leadership are circumscribed by institutional ‘team-play,’ premised on a rule that the higher up the ladder a player advances the more political, cautious, and less natural he or she becomes. Preservation of status becomes more important than preservation of resource.”
Although my input on management issues clearly was unwelcome, I continued to comment where I felt it was an essential part of the job (D-41):

Memorandum

To: District Manager, Hudson Bay
From: District Naturalist, Hudson Bay
Subject: Pollution abatement

I have not been asked to comment upon the recent sewage treatment proposals made by contracted firms and have not had official access to their reports. However, a couple of days ago I had an opportunity to read the proposal for St. Mary. My job description requires that I provide you with advice on environmental issues. The following comments are offered because of concern that yet another environmental insult is about to be committed unnecessarily.

In the report some fallacious reasoning is used as a basis for the prediction that the annual addition of 42 to 53 lbs. of phosphorus per acre to the 27-acre spray field will be inconsequential. The statement is made that this amount of phosphorus represents only about one half of what is annually applied to golf courses or similar areas. It is then implied that with such a relatively small application, adverse effects will not result in the meadow at St. Mary. This totally ignores some very important differences in golf course management as compared to natural meadow management. First, nutrients such as phosphorus are annually harvested on a golf course. This is done by mowing and removing the clippings. If clippings were not removed, large annual additions of fertilizer would be unnecessary on golf courses, because the nutrients would be recycled within the system just as are nutrients from the soil in a natural meadow ecosystem. If clippings are not removed from a golf course, but nutrients must still be added, the nutrients are probably being flushed out of the system by water. Assuming that nutrients will not be flushed into St. Mary Lake (a safe assumption?), the park must mow hay or otherwise harvest the annual addition of nutrients in the vegetation of the St. Mary meadow or annual increments will be cumulative and the 27 acres will become excessively enriched. This will obviously lead to significant alteration of the vegetation and other elements of the affected ecosystem. The long-term effects on the nutrient composition of the soil and ground water are unknown.

The point is that the analogy drawn in this proposal, a golf course compared to a natural meadow, is illogical! One might argue that altering 27 acres of bunchgrass meadow is better than producing cultural eutrophication in St. Mary Lake, but one cannot support the argument that these 27 acres will be unchanged. It is incomprehensible that the only way we seem to be able to solve one pollution problem is to create another one. The physical damage bound to result from the installation of sprinkler heads in the meadow is also worth more consideration than is apparent. What consideration has been given to wind-borne bacteria that might travel with the prevailing wind directly toward the public use areas at St. Mary?

These comments do not represent criticism of a project that has no alternatives. Alternatives are presented in the contracted study report. As always, it seems, we have opted...
for the cheapest solution... one that sacrifices long-term stability for a quick, less
expensive solution. The spray field technique is simply not acceptable on meadow lands of
natural areas, even though it may be a useful and practical technique on land areas with
different objectives. Once again we have failed to recognize the unique and careful
management necessary in natural areas. The park needs either systems like the one adopted
at Lake Tahoe, or the effluent must be piped out of the park to be sprinkled or placed in a
lagoon.

The park can expect more adverse comment and public resentment if spray fields
remain a part of Glacier’s sewage treatment plans.

B. Riley McClelland

D-41. Pollution memo from District Naturalist to East District Manager, 6 December 1971.

On 25 February 1972, (I made the following notes immediately after the
conversations described). In the morning, Acting Superintendent Frank Elliot came into my
office and said that he had received a telephone call from the Superintendent of Bighorn
Canyon with a transfer offer for me as Chief Naturalist. I told him that I was not interested
for a multitude of reasons that I would detail if necessary. I immediately wrote a
memorandum to the Superintendent of Bighorn and to the Regional Office declining the
transfer. I also wrote to the Personnel Officer, Division of Employee Evaluation,
Washington, D.C., stating: “I have just received a lateral transfer offer from Bighorn
Canyon. The position offered was Staff Interpretive Specialist. I have no interest in that type
of position, in employment in any recreation area (in contrast to a natural area), or in any
transfer at the present time. I have so indicated on all recent Forms 10-183 that I submitted.
It is a mystery to me why my name was sent to an area and for a position both of which hold
no interest to me and for which I have never requested consideration. May I respectfully
request that you remove my name from any and all transfer registers at the present time.”

In the afternoon I talked with Chief Naturalist Rothfuss. I asked him if the transfer
“offer” was part of a power play by Briggle aimed at getting rid of me. Rothfuss did not
deny it. He said that Briggle has mentioned several times, in meetings, that it was time that I
be moved out. Rothfuss said Briggle had specifically criticized me for my criticism of
environmental management in the Park. He said that Briggle claimed that I never provided
alternatives. This is untrue. Rothfuss also said that Briggle criticized me for not finishing the
Resources Management Plan. This again is untrue. Rothfuss said he (Rothfuss) had no
complaints about my work, but that he knew that Briggle was down on me. I reminded
Rothfuss that when Briggle told me he had abolished my position of Resources Management
Specialist, 5 months ago (at which time Rothfuss was present), I asked Briggle pointedly if
dissatisfaction with my work had anything to do with the abolishment. Briggle said
definitely not. Now Rothfuss says that bothered him at the time because Briggle had
indicated frequent dissatisfaction with my work at other times. Briggle has never criticized
my work in front of me nor have my immediate supervisors.
26 February: I phoned Bighorn Canyon Superintendent Sullivan and said: “Thanks for your offer, but I am not interested in any transfer at the present time, and have so indicated on current forms 10-183.” He said OK, but only the Regional Office could accept a declination and that I should notify them. On 28 February I phoned Regional Personnel Officer Henry Pratt. He informed me that:

1. The Bighorn transfer was an order, not an offer that presented a choice whether to accept.
2. The transfer was part of a four-person “shift.”
3. He invoked again and again “the needs of the Park Service” must come first.
4. Pratt said that Briggle had told the Regional Office that he (Briggle) had conducted a counseling session with me and that I was expecting a transfer (that was of course totally untrue).
5. Pratt said that Briggle had requested the Regional Office to transfer me and that the Region previously had considered sending me to a position in St. Louis, Missouri (Jefferson National Expansion Memorial), or Omaha, Nebraska (Midwest Regional Office).
6. Pratt said that Briggle had implied that my work was not completely satisfactory and that there were certain other “problems” with me.
7. I asked Pratt for specific reasons why I should be transferred 5 months after being assigned to a new job in Glacier. He had no answer, but said that he would ask Briggle to document in writing why I should be transferred (no such documentation was ever provided).

On 3 March 1972, I wrote a memorandum to the Regional Director, through Superintendent Briggle. An employee is required to communicate to a higher echelon such as the Regional Director by “going through” the park superintendent. One has no way of knowing whether such communications are actually forwarded to the intended recipient. The subject of my memorandum was “order to Transfer.” Following is an excerpt:

“The order to transfer that I received from the Regional Office on February 28 comes five months after I was placed in my present position [East Side District Naturalist]. Only five months ago the position of Resources Management Specialist (which I occupied at that time) was abolished. This was done without forewarning and without any kind of discussion as to my views on the job and its role in the park. The National Park Service spent about $15,000 to train me specifically for that job. Then, suddenly, the job was eliminated in the continuous reorganization of the past three years. At that time I was told that there was no complaint about my work. If this indeed is a question, I would invite and welcome an objective evaluation of my work by any outside party at any time. I was told only that the Superintendent would rather have a District Naturalist position than a Resource Management position, and I could either accept it or transfer. It should be noted that the Resources Management position had been established in 1968 at the expense of a naturalist position which was then abolished.”

I went on to provide a detailed account of how Resources Management Specialist positions evolved in 1967–68 and the manner in which I was selected for a year of academic work at CSU to prepare for such a position, and my subsequent selection to fill the position
established in GNP.

I concluded the memorandum in part as follows:

"In good conscience, and in the best interests of the Service, my career, and my family, I cannot accept any transfer to an urban area, recreation area, or to any location in which I cannot function efficiently. Hopefully, the Service will recognize that 'the needs of the Service' would not be met by forcing me from the type of area in which I am interested to an area that is inconsistent with my career goals."

6 March 1972

At 10:00 A.M. Briggle phoned to ask if I wanted to see him today—I asked in return if he wanted to clarify the transfer business. He said come down at 10:30 A.M. The discussion lasted more than an hour. His statements (which I wrote down immediately after leaving the meeting) were as follows:

1) No one, to his knowledge, had ever questioned my professional work and probably no one ever would, but it was up to the Service to decide where it would permit me to work.
2) I'm nonplused about your attitude (attitude of not being willing to go any place to do any job the Service wants done [regardless of professional interests and family situation].
3) The Service will decide whether it can afford to have people like you who are unadaptable and inflexible—this has brought it to a head and you will hear from the Service as to their decision.
4) If I would not resign if I received an ultimatum to move, then I had better prepare myself for an adverse action. I was required to go where the NPS told me to go.
5) He criticized me for having my own secretary type my declination memos; he said that I should have had his secretary type them so that no "outsider" would be involved.
6) The implication throughout the talk was that the Service will decide what is to be "done" with employees. It gave me the feeling I was a draftee in the Army. Career goals seem to play no role in the Service attitude on transfers, nor do personal health problems.
7) Supt. Briggle was evasive and would not answer my specific questions concerning why he wanted me moved and why he had not told me personally about his criticism of my work.

That afternoon, I wrote an evaluation of the NPS Career Development and Placement Plan. Excerpts follow:

"The plan is a deception. It gives the illusion that professional employees are permitted wide latitude in planning and following careers of their choice. The plan appears to be based on the standard that the best qualified and interested candidate is sought to fill a vacant position, but in reality the process frequently has degenerated into finding positions into which to put employees who are branded for transfer. I am proud of the job that I have done for 16 years in the National Park Service. I ask to be judged on the quality of my work and not my willingness to take transfers or to quietly succumb to a 'railroad' job."

After a ranger meeting called by Briggle (obviously I was not invited), Jerry DeSanto told me that Briggle had stated, in relation to the McClelland case: "There is no room in the NPS for preservationists."

Next, I received the following memorandum from the Regional Director (D-42):
Memorandum

To: Mr. B. Riley McClelland
Through: Superintendent, Glacier

From: Director, Midwest Region

Subject: Reassignment - Midwest Regional Office

I have been made aware of your February 25 declination of the opportunity to serve as Staff Interpretive Specialist at Bighorn Canyon. I am disappointed, because it has become vitally essential that Bighorn Canyon's top staff be as strong and well qualified as possible to meet the challenges that confront that area.

I am accepting the declination, but only because a subsequent need for your particular talents and education has arisen. This is as an assistant to Mr. Ed Menning, in this office, who is responsible for the coordination and final preparation of environmental impact statements in this region. At the present time, we have a great many pending or in process. Quite obviously, Mr. Menning is overwhelmed and needs talented assistance without undue delay. The urgency of these services was made quite obvious by the Director before the Senate Sub-Committee on Appropriations last Friday, when he asked for 35 additional positions in the NPS in the 1973 budget hearings. To meet immediate needs, he authorized the position to which I am reassigning you, and we are making internal adjustments within our present resources to accommodate it.

This is a reassignment, on a lateral basis, to meet an immediate and urgent need and in the best interest of the Service. I have reviewed and discussed your qualifications for this reassignment, including the Service's investment in one year of education for you in an applicable field, and find you are especially well qualified to meet the job requirements.

I will be negotiating with Superintendent Briggle on an EOD date but will be insisting it be relatively soon.

I will be looking forward to having you on my staff and I assure you the assignment will be a busy and challenging one.

J. Leonard Volz

Director, Midwest Region

D-42. Memo from Regional Director Volz to McClelland, 7 March 1972.
7 March: On this date I also wrote to *Field and Stream* columnist (and well-known conservationist) Michael Frome. I described the situation in GNP and ended with the following:

“Idealism and dedication are feared by those who cannot comprehend, and today the National Park Service is led by the uncomprehending. The National Park land ethic is dying. We need your help. The National Parks need your help.”

8 March: 9:00 A.M. called Mrs. Meyer, Civil Service Commission (CSC) in Helena. She could not answer my questions so I called Mr. Charles Hoover, Chief, Division of Appeals, Office, CSC, Denver, Colorado. I inquired about grievance proceedings. He said that the CSC has nothing to do with grievances, except for setting standards. He said: “An agency can transfer people whenever they want if they have good reason. The job of an employee is to do what he is told.”

In the evening, I attended a local National Federation of Federal Employees (NFFE) meeting. I requested assistance from someone above the local level who could represent me if I decided to file a grievance. A local NFFE representative telephoned Mr. Glenn Kendall, in Spokane, and made an appointment for me to meet with him in GNP.

13 March: I was informed of meeting scheduled with Supt., at 9:30 A.M. Supt.'s Secretary called at 9:42 A.M. and told Rothfuss and me to come down now. We went down and he said he was busy. His secretary would call again when he was ready to see us. At 10:30 A.M. we were finally "recalled" to Briggle's Office. He handed me a memo from Regional Director Volz reassigning me to the Regional Office (Omaha). He stated that the dialogue would now be between me and the Regional Office and that I was not to disrupt his staff in the Park, I said that I didn't know what he meant by "disrupting" his staff, but that if he meant keeping the transfer order a secret he had no right to require that. He said he was saying not to disrupt his staff, period. He said any written communication with the Regional Office must go through him. The clear implication was that I should not converse with anyone and that advice from the park offices was not available to me. This appeared to be the usual tactic of isolating an individual and providing no avenue for counsel or advice.

I phoned Deputy Regional Director Bob Giles and briefed him on my transfer situation. He said he would have Roger Contor (Acting Regional Director) phone me. He (Giles) said he thought it was a reasonable request when I said I felt the Service should give employees forewarning if they have suddenly decided that employees who don't desire to transfer continuously are no longer welcome in the agency. At 1:00 P.M. Acting Regional Director Roger Contor phoned in regard to my transfer order. I went through my reasons for not believing such a transfer would be in my best interest or the interest of the Service. His reaction was very cold and unreceptive. I said I would write a memo stating my feelings, although I had already pretty thoroughly explained them in a previous memo. He said I would simply have to do what the NPS was ordering me to do or I would be separated from the Service (a euphemism for being fired). I again stated that forewarning should be given if the Service planned to initiate such a callous personnel management program.
14 March: 8:30 A.M. I phoned Roger Contor, in the Regional Office, and said that I felt I should bring to his attention more specific considerations not mentioned to him yesterday in my declination of transfers. I pointed out that certain family health problems (those listed on form 10-143) plus my wife's recent pneumonia made it absolutely essential that we not move in the next six months. I stated I was preparing a written memo detailing these problems. His reply was that it was a waste of time to send in anything like that. They would consider only doctor's statements and only those that stated there were no other doctors capable of handling whatever problems were mentioned. He said everyone lists health problems like allergies, asthma, etc. and that the Service no longer pays any attention to them. He said an employee is better off if he lists none of these, implying that listing a health problem as a reason for not moving, e.g., east of the Mississippi, would be apt to bring about just such a move.

Contor said: "we get pretty snotty, to be blunt, about checking with doctors to make sure employees statements are valid. "We call them up on the phone and check this out." The overall implication was that if you invoke health problems as a reason for not moving, they will assume you are lying until they are shown otherwise. I told him he was welcome to check out any statement I made. I also told him I was well aware of the fact that the whole purpose of any transfer was to move me from GNP, not to fill any particular job. He made no reply. He said that if I planned to refuse to transfer he did not believe I should be retained in GNP through the summer. The Service would desire a "clean" separation at an early date. I told him I had no intention of resigning; and that I didn't believe their reasons for firing me would hold up in a hearing.

15 March: To preclude Briggle from putting the pressure on my supervisor and get him to claim that my work was not satisfactory, I asked my supervisor, Chief Ranger Ruben Hart, for a signed statement. He gave me the following tepid support:

"B. Riley McClelland worked as Resources Management Specialist under my supervision from September 1968 through September 1971. He accomplished in a satisfactory manner all portions of the job which were specified in his position description."

This was hardly a glowing endorsement and I was disappointed that Ruben did not characterize my work as "excellent," as he had in all previous annual evaluations. Ruben probably had to have the wording approved by Briggle and he (Hart) was no doubt afraid to do anything that might upset Briggle. In the afternoon I wrote a memorandum to the Regional Director asking him to reconsider my transfer to the Regional Office.

In the afternoon, Glenn Kendall, NFFE representative, came into my office to discuss my issue concerning coercion by management. We went over to my house and talked for about 1½ hours. I showed him my two memos and the reassignment order from Region. We also discussed the general intimidation going on. He said he knew the situation here was not very good as he had heard this from other sources. After reading the memos and discussing the matter he said he believed I had a good case. He said he would talk with Briggle in the morning. He said I would have to become a member of NFFE if I wanted him to represent me.

That afternoon I filled out an application and gave a check to Union Local Vice President McLarnon (a GNP employee). Kendall said that he would "start the ball rolling"
and get back to me the following day. He also said that if I got a moving date I should immediately file an appeal as this would prevent them from being able to transfer me (I later found out that this is not true).

16 March: Kendall saw Supt. Briggle in the morning and then talked with me after 1:00 P.M. Kendall said “I think you have a good case, but I can't decide it.” You should write it up and send it to the President of NFFE in Washington, D.C. He may look into it himself or he may assign it to a lawyer. Kendall said that I should call him Saturday night if I was going to send it in right away so he could prepare a letter to go in at the same time.

Kendall did not offer any assistance in preparing a grievance, how to write it up, etc. He simply seemed to be washing his hands of the whole affair. He did say he thought Briggle had given some legitimate reasons for my assignment to write impact statements in Omaha and that, besides, they can transfer you anywhere they want to. He also parroted many of the same irrelevancies that I have heard from management in the past several weeks; e.g., he (Briggle) says he is a "hard" manager and must do things like this to get the job done. Kendall said that he could see both sides of the case, but could not decide. He again emphasized that he thought I had a good case, but my writeup would have to be sent to Washington. It upset me that he was removing himself from any further investigation or advice in the matter. It sounded to me as if he, too, had been intimidated by Briggle, because much of what Briggle had told him (and Kendall then repeated to me) was half truth at best, e.g., Briggle claiming that he had to transfer Gil Henry, former GNP Personnel Officer, because he was an alcoholic. The fact was that Gil needed treatment, not a transfer. The truth of that matter was that Briggle broke a promise to Gil Henry and Mrs. Henry not to move Gil before he was released from substance abuse treatment. He was forced to move and died soon thereafter. NFFE has provided no representation for employees at all; it is simply another tool of management.

Later that day I retrieved my check and NFFE application from McLarnon and tore them up. It obviously is a waste of time and money to belong to NFFE, just as I have always heard.

17 March: An employee (some names are withheld to protect them) told me that the employee who contacted Mr. Kendall for me, and other NFFE members, had been "called on the carpet" by Briggle. The employee who had contacted Kendall talked to me about being called before the Supt. this morning. The employee said Briggle was mad about Glenn Kendall (NFFE) being here and wanted to know who contacted him and what channels were followed. The employee said that Briggle, Schwarz, McLarnon, and he were at the meeting. The employee said Briggle and Schwarz described how great it would be for my career to go to Omaha for a year or two and then I could go on to a Regional Environmental program. As if that kind of career appealed to me! The employee also said Briggle pulled out a sheath of papers and implied it was a "file" on me - implying a file of documentation of wrong doings. Briggle also criticized Mr. Kendall for following the wrong channels; this could be why Kendall seemed so intimidated.
18 March: An employee called me on the phone, extremely upset about an inquisition concerning the contact with Kendall. The employee was very emotional about the possibility of being discovered as the one who phoned Kendall and asked me to say that I was the one who had contacted Kendall on the phone. The employee was afraid of losing his job for being involved. The whole thing is another good example of the terrible intimidation going on here.

23 March: This morning an employee asked me what I thought of "the memo." I told her I didn't know what memo she was talking about. It turned out to be a memo (written on 20 March) from NFFE President (Local 456) Dick Reiss to Briggle. Every employee in GNP, except me, received a copy. I had to make a copy from one that a friend had received.

(D-43):

March 20, 1972

Memorandum

To: Superintendent, Glacier National Park

From: President, NFFE Local 456

Subject: Representation of Riley McClelland

The NFFE findings of fact as to the grievance concerning Mr. McClelland is that he is not being transferred because of adverse action, but for the betterment and implementation of management objectives within the Department of the Interior. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 11491, as amended by E.O. 11616, NFFE Local 456 and NFFE National Representatives agree that Mr. McClelland's grievance cannot be supported.

It is unfortunate that these findings were decided in a most unusual manner. However, in the future you will have adequate time to prepare your statements pertaining to various personnel actions. You may be assured that all grievance actions taken by NFFE Local 456 will be presented by the grievance committee and will be in alignment with the Executive Order.

As a coordinator between management and Glacier National Park employees, I once again pledge my support to see that management objectives are implemented in a manner that will project good working conditions and high moral.

In the past there has been no organized spokesman for the employees at Glacier. Hopefully this day is past. I extend my hand in friendship. Let us bury the hatchet and through cooperative efforts span the employee-management gap that exists.

Richard R. Reiss

D-43. Memo from President of the Local NFFE to Superintendent Briggle, 20 March 1972.
Later, Reiss told me the Board of Directors of the Union had approved of his memo. I asked one board member, who had approved of it, and the person replied: "I didn't agree with it, but was afraid for my job" (the employee was extremely upset). The employee said all of the Board Members feared for their jobs as did Dick Reiss, and they were afraid to oppose management. The employee told me that Reiss had been called into Briggle's office and that he (Reiss) came out red-faced and wrote the memo. Reiss told me he had been "pressured" into it, but would do it again if he had to. After reading his memo, I drafted the following memorandum to Reiss (D-44):

Memorandum
To: President, NFFE Local 456
From: B. R. McClelland
Subject: Representation by NFFE

The contents of your memo to the Superintendent and distribution of copies to employees in the Park violate all elements of fairness. The misinformation and lack of factual information upon which your memo was based raise serious questions concerning the ability of the NFFE to serve as an unbiased representative in any cause which challenges a management decision. Since you have involved everyone to whom you sent a copy of your memo, I am obliged to point out a few facts for all to consider.

Your first paragraph states as follows:
"The NFFE findings of facts as to the grievance concerning Mr. McClelland is that he is not being transferred because of adverse action, but for the betterment and implementation of management objectives within the Department of the Interior. Therefore, in accordance with Executive Order 1191, as amended by E.G. 11616, NFFE Local 456 and NFFE National Representatives agree that Mr. McClelland's grievance cannot be supported."

1. I requested advice concerning grievance proceedings from NFFE at an open meeting of NFFE on March 8, 1972.
2. I did not request representation from the NFFE; I requested advice and assistance from someone who was qualified to represent me in a grievance if I decided to file one.
3. I was told by you, first, that I could not be represented by NFFE because a working agreement had not been signed. I was informed, after discussion among the members present, that local representation was not possible but that representation on a grievance could be provided by the National Office of NFFE.
4. Mr. Glenn Kendall, National Representative in Spokane, was contacted by NFFE and an appointment for me was arranged.
5. March 13, I discussed some of the details of my potential grievance with Mr. Kendall. After the discussion he told me that in his opinion I had a good case.
6. March 14, Mr. Kendall, after a discussion with Superintendent Briggle, told me he could not decide on the situation and that if I wanted to file a grievance I should do so directly to the President of NFFE in Washington. He reiterated that he believed I had a good case, but that he was not in a position to decide. He said to telephone him if I decided to file a grievance and he would send a letter to Washington at the same time.
7. You imply that there is a relationship between the fact that my order to transfer is not based on adverse action, and the Union's belief that my grievance cannot be supported. I am at least glad to have the record cleared that the quality of my work or my conduct on the job are not factors. This, however, is irrelevant in a potential grievance. The Union apparently does not understand that Adverse Actions and Grievances are separate and distinct. The fact that no adverse action is involved in my case in no way precludes my filing a grievance.

8. You state that Local 456 and NFFE National Representatives agree that my grievance cannot be supported; to set the record straight:
   a. I have not yet prepared a grievance.
   b. There was one National Representative (Kendall) involved, not representatives.
   c. I have not discussed the facts of my potential grievance with Local 456 or any of its members. How then can you state that Local 456 agrees that my grievance cannot be supported? Based on what facts?
   d. The last word I had from Kendall was that he believed I had a good case. Rationally, he could neither support nor not support a grievance in this case because I had not prepared one when I talked with him. I had only briefly discussed a few of the elements involved in the case.

9. You did not have the courtesy to inform me of the position your Union was taking. Other employees asked me what I thought about the memo before I even knew of its existence. The content of your memo and the fact that general distribution of copies was made expose the coercive, prejudicial, and unethical nature of NFFE's response. Whether action is the result of intimidation by management only you and your Board of Directors can answer. If nothing else, perhaps each employee will do some soul-searching regarding the value of NFFE and the apparent hopelessness of NFFE playing any useful role in the resolution of serious management-employee disputes.

Signed by B. Riley McClelland

D-44. Memo from McClelland to President, Local NFFE, 23 March 1972.
the Regional Office was to go through the GNP Superintendent. The memo read in Part
“...you may remain in residence in Glacier National Park until June. Mr. Ed
Menning of my staff here will be in touch with you to work out a week detail to
this office in the immediate future so that you can become acquainted and
oriented in this important and comparatively new activity, assignments made,
and methods for coordination of work until June. We can later work out a
specific date in June when you can move to Omaha and become fully effective
in this new assignment.”

29 March: AFGE Vice President Mort Davis wrote to Senator Mike Mansfield, asking for
Mansfield’s intervention on my behalf. Davis wrote:
“I respectfully request the intervention of your office in this matter in order to
forestall what may be an arbitrary and capricious action on the part of the
National Park Service, resulting in the loss of a capable, dedicated employee.”

Several other politicians: Montana Senators Metcalf and later Melcher, and
Representative Shoup, later Olsen, and Senator Henry Jackson of Washington, received
numerous letters over the next few years. Nothing substantive came from the Montana
delegation. Senator Jackson’s attempt to correct the situation (through Staff Assistant Jerry
Verkler) will be described at the appropriate time in the chronological sequence.

On 30 March, Olympic National Park District Ranger Jack Hughes established the
“Glacier Defense Fund.” His first message, widely circulated, follows (D-45):
Dear Friend,

This is a request for financial aid in meeting legal expenses to fight the purge of a ranger from Glacier National Park. Earlier this month B. Riley McClelland was ordered, with no choice nor warning, to transfer to Bighorn Canyon National Recreational Area. When he declined for several good reasons, he was next ordered to a desk job in Omaha. Neither of these jobs were in his field of wildlands ecology. At this writing he is under orders to move or leave the Park Service!

The above orders are in direct conflict with stated Park Service personnel policy on several points. Attempts to stop this harassment of a dedicated employee, whose quality of work has never been questioned, have failed to date. Therefore, legal action is the only alternative left. Glacier National Park administration has come under attack nationally for violation of environmental practices in Park management. Rather than counter the charges, the administration has withheld information and dismissed or transferred concerned employees. A case involving 14 trail crewmen is still being fought by friends of National Parks.

As resource management ranger, Riley was in a position to know of this, and other cases of disregard of the Park environment by the Park administration. While he spoke against several items practiced in Glacier in official memos—bear feeding at Granite Park Chalet, use of herbicides in the wilderness, building a boardwalk across alpine tundra, discharge of sewage in alpine streams, to name a few—he always did so through official channels as was his job. This official stand, and "knowing too much," appears to be the reason for the present purge of Glacier's resource management ranger.

If this can happen to a ranger for doing his job in Glacier, it can happen in your Park! Please help us stand up for Park values. All funds collected will be used for legal fees and related expenses to fight this case. Names of donors will be kept confidential, and a statement of accounting with a report of the results, will be sent to you at the conclusion of B. Riley McClelland's case.

Thanks for your support.

Jack Hughes, Chairman Glacier Defense Fund

In addition to the Glacier Defense Fund, our cause was supported by the Montana Wilderness Association, Friends of The Earth, Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs, Northwest Conservation Representative Brock Evans, and the League of Conservation Voters.
Dear Friends,

Thanks to all who have contributed to the cause. We see this type of personnel action as an increasingly common situation in which the agency has branded an employee for transfer rather than following the Servicewide Career Development and Promotion Plan to fill vacancies.

Riley has now filed a formal grievance and some of the funds have been used in telephone contacts with the American Federation of Government Employees in Portland, Oregon. The NFFE in Glacier provided only additional intimidation, but the AFGE has been a valuable source of advice. This legal route is the last level of appeal within the agency. Action beyond this level depends upon the outcome of the hearing.

Our goal is to expose the truth and to bring about transfers based on ethical procedures. The enclosed newspaper article from the Missoulian shows the Truth is beginning to be heard.

To put the case in Glacier in perspective, in less than three years under the present administration, 33 permanent employees out of a total staff of less than 50 have been transferred, retired, or have resigned.

Some facts on the case to answer some of your specific questions:
1. Early last fall Riley’s position as resource management ranger was abolished with no warning or consultation.
2. Riley was given an ultimatum that he could accept the position in Glacier as Hudson Bay Divide District Naturalist, or transfer.
3. February 25, Riley was offered a transfer to a position in Bighorn Canyon, representing a demotion in responsibility. When he declined, he was informed this was an order to move with no choice.
4. The order to Big Horn was rescinded by the regional office, and a lateral reassignment was made to a newly created position in the Omaha office.
5. For the above actions, the original explanation offered by management was only that Superintendent Briggle had requested Riley’s transfer.

B. Riley McClelland
Jack Hughes, Chairman

There were many “ironies” as our situation developed. On 28 April, I received a letter from Bob Taylor (whom I did not know). His letter started as follows: “We don’t know each other, but I believe we have something in common—getting bit by personnel management practices in the Midwest Region. I’m the guy who was Interpretive Specialist at Bighorn. If I’m not too far off you were given a directed transfer to fill my position. If we compare notes I think we have a hell of a case against the system. I was forced out of Bighorn! I did not want to leave under conditions imposed. I had been given the axe out there twice and the directed transfer was enough to make me try to solve it within the system. I initiated what is probably the first grievance, under the EEO laws, against a personnel action, in the Midwest Region. Believe me it doesn’t work. You were smart not to go to Bighorn—it is a real mess there.” He went on to describe some of the issues that led to his characterization. Bob had been forced to move from Bighorn Canyon to Herbert Hoover’s Birthplace National Historic Site, in West Branch, Iowa. What a fate! I continued exchanging correspondence with Taylor as our case escalated. He made every effort to be helpful. I never did meet him.

We were encouraged when we received a letter from John Mauff, a frequent and long-time visitor to GNP (D-47):
On 30 March, I received a letter from Michael Frome Conservation Editor, Field and Stream Magazine, responding to my letter to him (7 March). Mike wrote:

“You and others may count on my confidence, support, and whatever voice I may be able to give to your frustrations and efforts to save the parks. You have some excellent citizen leaders in Montana, who will be heard from, too. Let us stay in touch. Call me collect when you have the urge and need.”

30 March: Bob Nogler (AFGE) wrote to me with suggestions regarding the draft of the “Informal Grievance” that I had sent to him. An Informal Grievance is the first in a lengthy process of grievance filings to be followed by an employee. On 1 April, I wrote to Mort Davis and Bob Nogler (AFGE), in Portland, the following: “I hereby request that the American Federation of Government Employees represent me in a grievance and all related matters with the National Park Service.”

1 April: I filed my Informal Grievance with Superintendent Briggle, as specified by personnel regulations. This was a one page document, with the grievance stated as follows:

“Coercive and unethical personnel management practices including the use of transfer, threat of transfer, and threat of being fired. Disregard for Servicewide Career Development and Placement Plan.”

The grievance went into brief detail concerning the attempts to transfer me to Bighorn Canyon and then to the Omaha Regional Office. The “Remedy” requested was:

“That the order reassigning me be rescinded; that I be allowed to remain in my present or similar position at Glacier National Park, or in a position of Resources Management Specialist (which should be reestablished); and that threats and harassment of me for not accepting transfer cease.”

Briggle forwarded the grievance on to Regional Director Volz, who would make the decision. On 1 April, I personally wrote to Senator Mike Mansfield requesting his assistance in the matter.

2 April: I was formally (on paper) reassigned to the position of Environmental Impact Specialist in the Omaha Regional Office. At this time I also received an order from the Regional Director to fly to Omaha to discuss my grievance with him personally. I spent 5–7 April 1972, in Omaha at the Midwest Regional Office.

5 April, Omaha, Nebraska: 8:30 A.M.

I had a discussion with Regional Director Volz (in his office) with Robert Giles present. The discussion lasted about 1 1/2 hours. Mr. Volz stated that any personal problem could be overcome if an individual set his mind to it. He stated he would delay an appendicitis operation if he were called on by the Service to transfer. It seemed to me at this point that the absurdity of his point was rather apparent. The discussion continued with Volz asking me to accept the Omaha job and me telling Volz and Giles I simply could not. Mr. Volz stated that if a transfer date were set and a person didn't show up he would be placed on A.W.O.L. I stated that the whole situation from the beginning was intimidative and coercive and I had no intention of quietly accepting such unfair and unprecedented treatment. Mr. Giles said very little, but both he and Volz seemed to become more receptive and sympathetic as the conversation drew on. Mr. Volz asked if I could see why he might have
thought problems could have been worked out from what he read, without benefit of personal
discussion with me. I said I did see how he could misinterpret my degree of concern. At this
point he and Giles certainly gave the impression that they were in the process of
reconsidering some of the factors of the case. Their talk changed from hard line to a tone of
reconciliation.

I stated specifically that a transfer to Omaha would not be in my best interests, the
welfare of my family, or in the best interests of the Service. Mr. Giles asked me how I knew I
could not adapt and function efficiently in Omaha, I told him that we each know ourselves
better than others know us.

Mr. Volz ended the discussion by saying “you think it over some more and I’ll think
about what has been said then we’ll get together again tomorrow.”

5 April: Afternoon. I met with Ed Menning, the individual in charge of the EIS program, and
the person for whom I would be working in Omaha. Menning went over the work which
would constitute the job they were attempting to force me to take. He said he had been
working on two things: (1) reviewing EISs from NPS areas and other agencies; (2) writing
statements for wilderness areas (even though he had not even visited them). He said that he
felt a more objective job could be done in writing about an area unfamiliar to the writer. This
is one of the most inane points of view I have ever heard concerning qualifications for
writing EISs.

Menning summarized the status of impact statements from other agencies and
indicated this would be my primary job. He referred to them as "outhouse" statements. They
had quite a backlog of outhouse statements, many of which already were behind schedule. I
was given one to review for “practice.” It concerned a highway project in Waterloo, Iowa. I
was told that 99 out of 100 statements from other agencies would have no direct effect on
NPS lands. The primary job in reviewing the documents was to look at a map and see if the
project affected either an existing NPS area, or a proposed natural history or historic
landmark sites. Since I would likely have no personal knowledge of the landscape being
affected, I would probably not be able to constructively comment on the environmental
impact of such projects. The job, therefore, appears to be one of simply checking a map and a
list of areas - something a high school student could do. It was abundantly obvious that the
job would provide no challenge and no means of contributing anything to the improvement
of environmental sensitivity anywhere. It is a convenient way of putting me on the "shelf" in
a job that can be made to sound good to those who don’t have an opportunity to know what
the facts are. This whole procedure of handling EISs is another bureaucratic jungle which is
defeating the purpose of impact statements.

6 April: Lunch. I received word from Ed Menning that I was to go to lunch with Volz and
him, because Volz didn’t have time to see me otherwise, today. At lunch Volz carried on
small talk for a long while and then said: “Well, I don’t suppose that you feel any differently
than yesterday do you?” I replied that I did not. I couldn’t see that anything had changed. He
said he had made a decision when he reassigned me to Omaha and he intended to stick by it.
His willingness to discuss any issue was gone and he gave every impression of having
decided he would make no compromises on the reassignment. He then pulled out a copy of
the Glacier Defense Fund letter and turned to Menning and read it. Menning obviously had
no background on what had transpired before this discussion and was obviously being put on
the spot by his superior (Volz). Menning reacted as Volz obviously expected him to and
proclaimed his disgust at such disloyalty. He said he had always believed that a person must go along with whatever the organization is doing or he must get out of the organization. I told Menning he didn’t know the details of this case and he was in no position to make any judgement.

I told Volz that I thought that he was being very unfair. He stated that no one had ever accused him of being unfair before. I replied that he must not have ever done anything like this then. I also told him that if he was not considering the circumstances of the case any longer, then it looked as if we had reached an impasse. I reiterated that I could not move to Omaha and that it was certainly not in the best interests of the Service to attempt to force me to do so. He said I would have to make a decision in June, because at that time I would have to move to Omaha. On this unpleasant note, the discussion ended.

When I returned to GNP, Ed Menning phoned and assigned me to prepare the EISs on the proposed sewage treatment plans for Lake McDonald, Many Glacier, and Two Medicine. Although this was exceedingly better than reviewing highway interchange, it turned out to be a difficult task because no one on Briggle’s staff wanted to communicate with me or provide information.

12 April: Regional Director Volz wrote a memorandum to me denying my “Informal Grievance.” He stated:

“I do not propose to rescind my order to you contained in my memorandum, dated March 25, 1972, that you be reassigned in the best interest of the Service to the Midwest Regional Office, effective April 2, 1972. . . . Departmental and U.S. Civil Service regulations provide that formal personnel action proposing the employee’s removal [firing] may be initiated against an employee who fails to accept a directed reassignment such as was ordered in your case.”

Volz went on to state that I had 15 days in which to decide whether to file a “Formal Grievance.”

One evening in mid-April, Missoulian State Editor Dale Burk phoned me at home and asked for an interview. I decided there was not much to lose at this point, so I talked at length with Dale. On 16 April, the Missoulian ran the first of a long series of articles by Dale Burk, concerning our case. These articles appeared in the Missoulian over the next several years. The initial article (on the 16th) was headlined:

“Glacier Park Employee Claims Transfer Used to Stifle Criticism.”

Dale became a wonderful source of moral support and his articles were straightforward and truthful—of course that infuriated Briggle and no doubt the Regional Director and Director. Other newspapers then began to pick up parts of the story; the Billings Gazette, Great Falls Tribune, Kalispell Daily Inter Lake, Hungry Horse News, Port Angeles (Washington) Daily News, Seattle Times, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Omaha World Herald, and the Denver (Colorado) Post.

21 April: My Regional Office supervisor, Ed Menning, wrote the following in a letter to me:

“It would be helpful, Riley, if you could send a weekly progress report to me each Friday. Simply summarize your activities on the Glacier pollution abatement program and any problems encountered. As mentioned in our telecon April 17, we have no other agency statements for you to review at this time. We will send any that have sufficient lead time, especially if they involve Montana.
However, your primary assignment will continue to be the [GNP] pollution abatement program.

23 April: Dale Burk’s Missoulian article headlined:

"Politics Supplants Regulations in NPS."

25 April: I filed a “Formal Grievance,” and requested a hearing at which to present my case. This was the next step in the required administrative process. The written Formal Grievance was only three pages long and for the most part simply elaborated on the points contained in the previous Informal Grievance.

In addition to my own case, I included the following in the Formal Grievance:

“The National Park Service transfer and promotion policy has been bypassed repeatedly by Superintendent Briggle and the National Park Service. Transfers, threats of transfers, or threats of being fired have become management’s tools of coercion. Under Superintendent Briggle, at least 33 employees have been transferred, resigned, or retired. Many of the transfers have been forced under coercive circumstances. This unjust practice has resulted in mental anguish for me and my family and for other employees and their families, disruption of work, lowering of productivity of many employees, low morale, and general distrust of Management motives.”

The two major differences in the Informal and Formal Grievances were: (1) in the Formal Grievance, the employee has the right to request a Formal Hearing, to which a Hearing Officer (an Administrative Law Judge) would be appointed. At the conclusion of the hearing, he would file conclusions and make a recommendation, (2) at the Formal Hearing, the employee can be represented by an attorney (or other person of their choosing). I asked AFGE for representation and Bob Nogler was appointed to do the job.

26 April: Dale Burk’s Missoulian story was headlined:

“Smooth Exterior Conceals Rot.”

His opening paragraph: “Glacier National Park could be likened to a fine-looking tree, with a rotting core. The deeper investigation hacks, the worse the rot seems to be.”

26 April: Jack Hughes (Olympic National Park Ranger and Chairman of the Glacier Defense Fund) circulated an Interim Report which he and I had prepared (D-46):
Dear Riley,

Kindly do not regard this brief letter as requiring an answer. You do not know me, and though having come to Glacier for my summer vacation since 1946, I do not believe I have had occasion to meet you.

However, I do know many of the Glacier permanents and even more of the seasonals. And we share, therefore, many good friends, including some not connected with the NPS, such as Tom Best of Kalispell (who wrote some time ago, as I recall, that he'd been on a ski-touring outing of which you were a part).

My friends in and around Glacier have kept me fully apprised of the situation which bids fair to become a cause celebre in the history of the Park Service. I have received articles from the Missoula and other papers. (I also receive weekly the Hungry Horse News and was appalled, though not entirely surprised, at Kel's editorial playing-down of the basic dilemma that faces the career service in the NPS cadre.)

Having just received a copy of the March 30th memorandum from Jack Hughes, I will do what I can there. This came today. I wrote Mike Mansfield last night urging his support of a thorough inquiry into the administration of the Park Service, most notably and currently that affecting Glacier.

It seems incredible, but we are realists when it comes to government employment, that while my church, Roman Catholic, is becoming at long last flexible in not allowing bishops or other levels of the hierarchy to use priests as pawns and transfer them without any consultation or regard for their personal inclinations or personal dignity, the NPS (in the person of certain "administrators") continues an archaic and thoroughly undemocratic practice. I have too great a stake in Glacier, for all that I'm merely a dude who comes out and hikes the trails and climbs the mountains, to stand by and not want to add my two cents worth if and where it can be at all useful.

For the moment, I can only extend my moral support and stand ready to be counted in opposition to the reprehensible type of personnel management (and I could cite you some other areas I completely take exception to). I am, therefore, one of a legion of well-wishers who are, Riley, 100% back of you.

Sincerely yours,

John Mauff
On 12 May, Glacier Defense Fund Chairman Jack Hughes distributed the following (D-48):

Glacier Defense Fund
2724 S. Oak Port Angeles, Washington

Dear Friends:

This letter is to enlist your support to contact your Congressman via letter, petition, or other means, to ask for an investigation of the Park Service controversy in Glacier National Park.

The enclosed recent newspaper reprints will provide background and information on the forced transfer of an employee who had the courage to speak out on controversial environmental issues. Without an impartial investigation conducted by a Congressionally sanctioned committee, the public will not get the facts and the true story of the employee intimidation and suppression of issues by the agency involved in this dispute.

There is a long list of employees in Glacier National Park who have been harassed and intimidated by the present administration prior to this case. B. Riley McClelland's formal hearing will not provide the means other than to have his individual case heard within the department. He will have no power to subpoena witnesses. A Congressional hearing can do this.

This case is not isolated to Glacier Park. There are other Park Service employees experiencing the same reaction from Park Service management when they honestly express views contrary to what management wants to hear. We are not asking you to decide on the merits of this particular case—only to request further investigation into the controversy.

Please address your request to your own Congressman and include a copy to Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana. Thank you for your interest. As a concerned citizen you will be furthering better Park management and protection of our National Parks.

Sincerely yours,

Jack Hughes Chairman, Glacier Defense Fund

In May 1972, The NPS Director's Office, Washington, D.C., issued a response to Jack Hughes' PRO concern about the de-emphasis and declining role of professional ranger positions in the Parks. The Park Service response of course denied this. It also indirectly addressed Jack's publicized concerns about the transfer process that was forcing me out of GNP. Without mentioning my case, the following absurd statement was included in the NPS "defense:"

"There is considerable mobility and job change in the Park Service, particularly for those who have been identified as having good potential for advancement to more responsible jobs. However, transfers are, almost without exception, voluntary. This policy contributes to individual growth and to the quality of the Park Service programs."

With no concern for the truth, any personnel management program can be justified.
The Regional Office instructed me to fly to Denver, Colorado, to meet with Lon Garrison and Lawrence Zollar on 16 May. I wanted Pat to come so, we purchased her ticket. Lon Garrison was the former YNP Superintendent, for whom I worked. At the time of this meeting, he was Supervisor of the Albright Training Center, Grand Canyon National Park, Arizona, and visiting professor at Texas A & M University. Larry Zollar was Chief of NPS Manpower Development, Washington, D.C. Lon Garrison always seemed to have a special fondness for Pat, with her continuously overflowing pleasantness and happy demeanor. I was glad that she was with me. Following are the notes I made after the discussion:

We considered this to be a very constructive conversation. Mr. Garrison and Mr. Zollar had read my formal grievance and personnel file and were therefore able to communicate with knowledge of both sides of the controversy. They asked me to describe the evolution of this controversy as I saw it, and I did so. They seemed genuinely concerned and receptive to our concern. I tried to emphasize that we were not making a big fuss with the objective of obtaining a more attractive transfer. My motive was to expose and hopefully correct the unethical and deceptive management methods being perpetrated by Superintendent Briggle. I believe that my case is representative of the callous and insensitive way in which the Superintendent has operated for three years in GNP.

I stated that my objective was not to resist all transfers because of personal preference as to location, as has been described as our motive by Superintendent Briggle and others. If the Service intends to embrace the spoils system of personnel management and use it as policy, then it should do so openly rather than pretending that the written policies still apply. Messrs. Garrison and Zollar admitted that the employee evaluation program, upon which the transfer program itself is based, had totally broken down and was inoperative. Mr. Zollar got out my personnel folder and read the statement on my last personnel form stating that my goal for the next 3–5 years was to remain in the Resources Management Ranger position in GNP. He acknowledged that this substantiated my position as far as refusing a transfer was concerned.

There was discussion of my current career goals. I described them as unchanged in the past 5 years. The kind of position for which I am qualified and trained (and they agreed) was either Resources Management Ranger or Biologist, most logically in either YNP or GNP, where previous experience could be most effectively utilized. The subject of leave without pay for a temporary assignment for the purpose of completing PhD studies, which I have understood is now a requirement for a biologist position was discussed. Mr. Garrison said that he felt that it probably would be a good idea to have such a break from duty assignment as well as providing the further education. Mr. Zollar said that he believed that they should confine their recommendations to redress of the formal grievance; their recommendation would be to rescind the reassignment, and reinstate me as District Naturalist, Resources Management Ranger, or an equivalent position in GNP. The choice as to which position it would be would be up to the GNP administration.

Mr. Zollar was firm on the point that their recommendation would be concerned only with settlement of the grievance and that discussion of a transfer elsewhere or consideration of L.W.O.P. be a separate and later matter. He told us: “This will make it a whole new ball game for you.” Mr. Garrison and Mr. Zollar told us in conclusion that they would recommend to the Director (Hartzog) that my reassignment be rescinded and that I be reinstated in GNP. We were to receive consideration for an opportunity to transfer to
natural area, in the best interests of the Service, my family, and myself, after family health problems had been resolved.

There was absolutely no discussion of any agreement to transfer to any particular area as part of the grievance settlement. The agreement was that I would be given an opportunity to transfer at a later time, but that it would not be any part of the grievance resolution. Garrison and Zollar were very cordial and seemed sympathetic and concerned about Briggle’s treatment of personnel. They verbally agreed that my transfer was improper. Lon Garrison stated: “We’ll see how he [the Director] reacts to our recommendation of ‘pulling the rug’ out from under his boy [Briggle].” We left the meeting feeling very upbeat. Lon was an unusual person as a holder of high rank in the NPS. He seemed always concerned about not only natural resources, but the people in the NPS. He was a real role model for the NPS Garrison (1983). He was the exact opposite of Briggle, the self-absorbed power monger, always willing to deceive to get what he wanted. Because of these differences in style and substance, it was not surprising to us that Lon Garrison did not approve of Briggle’s tactics.

23 May: I received a telephone call from Mr. Zollar requesting that I be in Ozark Riverways, Missouri, as soon as possible—no later than the evening of 24 May—to talk with Director Hartzog. Mr. Zollar said that the Director wanted to talk with me about the grievance settlement, and that it looked favorable as to his accepting the recommendations of Mr. Garrison and Zollar. I agreed to meet with the Director and left for Great Falls (where I could book a direct flight to St. Louis) that evening.

24 May: After the night in Great Falls, I was on a 6:00 A.M. flight; I arrived in St. Louis at noon. I rented a car and drove to a picnic area (in Ozark National Scenic Riverways) where I had been instructed to meet Hartzog at 3:30 P.M. As soon as I arrived at the picnic area I was introduced to the Director. He took me over to a picnic table and commenced a 90 minute long discussion. The Director began by stating that he would not move me anyplace until my family health problems were resolved.

He then stated:

“As to your personal problems in Glacier, let me tell you how everyone that I have asked has evaluated you. I hear that you are capable and intelligent, but that you are an opinionated and self-centered individual.”

It seemed to me that this was a poor way to open a “dialogue.” I’m sure that people such as Superintendent Briggle would like everyone to believe that my motives are self-centered. If they were, as I told Hartzog, I could have simply sought a more desirable transfer rather than to try to expose the underlying cause of this problem. I told him that my objective could not be self-serving, otherwise I would not have subjected my family and myself to the emotional strain of continuing harassment and ostracization at the hands of GNP’s current leadership.

He then wanted to discuss the reasons for the transfers of other people from GNP. I said that I did not want to do so because individuals should have a chance to represent themselves concerning such transfers. He said, no, let’s talk about Ken Beck (Ken had been forcibly transferred from GNP to Washington, D.C. previously, and was outspoken in support of our cause). Hartzog stated that Beck was transferred because one of his employees embezzled funds. I asked Hartzog if Ken Beck had been confronted with that accusation and the Director replied that he had been. (I later asked Ken Beck about this and he denied it; he
said that he had been given no reason for his transfer). I finally succeeded in getting the Director off of the subject of “other” people.

He then went into a discussion of how everyone has an obligation to transfer, otherwise all of the parks would be filled with “homesteaders.” We discussed that point for a while after which he stated that a ranger who will sacrifice further promotions and continue to do a good job can remain in his position indefinitely. That, he said, was his policy, but Superintendents and Regional Directors had not implemented his policy as he intended. I asked him again (to make certain of his statement) and he reiterated that his policy was that a ranger could remain in a park in the same position for his career if he did a good job and sacrificed further promotion. I told him that it certainly wasn’t working that way. Again he blamed “others” for failing to implement his plan and for abuse of the new ranger-technician program. He called F.O.S.T. (Field Oriented Study Team) a complete failure.

We then discussed the Resource Management Ranger position, for which I received a year training at CSU, specifically for a position in GNP. I told him that I had accepted the training assignment because it was for a position of long tenure in GNP. I was told explicitly, by the Chief, Branch of Resource Management, in 1967, that the job was designed to be filled by an individual willing to stay in the same position in the same park for a long term, perhaps the rest of his career. The continuity provided by such a position was its real attraction. It provided an opportunity to understand a park and make ecologically sound recommendations.

Director Hartzog then made the following incredible statements:

“A Resource Management Ranger doesn’t need professional training. The position was not intended to be filled by an incumbent for long-term tenure.”

These statements reflect either a total lack of understanding of why his agency established the positions, or an obvious attempt to justify moving someone from the position without regard to the facts of the case. He stated that it would take months or longer to undo the damage done in GNP. I responded that he should place the blame where it belongs, with Superintendent Briggle, not on the victims of his unethical practices. He responded that there was plenty of blame to go around. The Director then stated:

“Every man has his price; it may not always be money, but it is nevertheless his price. Tell me what kind of job you want in the National Park Service.”

This seemed like a simple ploy to mislead me as to his intentions. He surely knew that I wanted only to stay in GNP, but he had no intention of leaving me there. It was an effort to see if there were some other way to “satisfy” me, while getting me out of GNP to satisfy Briggle. We discussed the same career goals that I had discussed with Garrison and Zollar. I explained to the Director that my career goals had been fulfilled in the Resources Management ranger position and that when the position was capriciously abolished the Service’s objectives became very unclear. I repeated that my goal was to work in a natural area where I had knowledge of the resources and could assist in the sound ecological management of that area. Hartzog stated that he believed I should be a research biologist then, because those positions are less subject to transfer. I stated to him that if the Service were to consider me for such a position it should most logically be in GNP or YNP, where I had extensive knowledge of resources. He responded by saying that I should be in contact
with Glen Cole Supervisory Research Biologist for YNP, and Dr. Robert Linn, Chief Scientist. I mentioned to him that the subject of L.W.O.P. had been brought up with Messrs. Garrison and Zollar, because a PhD degree apparently was considered necessary for a research biologist position. He said that I should take that up with Dr. Linn or Cole. He said that others had done it, Miss Meagher, in YNP, e.g., and that I probably could work it out. There was never any comment or discussion about agreeing to a transfer as part of the grievance settlement. In fact, the Director’s concluding remarks were:

“You will hear from me very shortly concerning the grievance settlement. I’ll be in touch with you concerning the biologist matter in a month or so.”

This meeting certainly could not have left the impression that I was agreeing to transfer elsewhere as a necessary stipulation to having the Omaha assignment rescinded. It appears now that the Director may have intended to back me into such a position and in so doing to make it appear that my only objective was to obtain a better “deal,” a more attractive transfer. It was well known that Briggle was Hartzog’s favorite (being groomed to be a future Director). I fully expected Hartzog to back Briggle to the hilt and that the facts of the case would be irrelevant. It seemed apparent that Hartzog was not about to “pull the rug” from under his boy Briggle.

Before my return flight to Great Falls on the 25th, I had time to visit the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Arch and rode the elevator (within the Arch) to the top.

26 May: Upon arriving back in GNP, I received a message that I was to meet with Chief Scientist Robert Linn (Southwest Regional Office) in Santa Fe, New Mexico, on 7 June.

28 May: Local Comment column in the Missoulian, by Dr. James Habeck (UM Plant Ecology Professor): headline National Parks Deteriorating. Jim became a stalwart supporter of our cause and wrote many letters to the Missoulian and to the Montana Senators and Representative.

6 June: In the morning, I phoned Larry Zollar and asked why I had not received written confirmation that my reassignment was rescinded; he said that he didn’t know, but that the reassignment was rescinded and that he and Mr. Garrison had drafted a letter to me for the Director to sign confirming the rescinding. He thought that maybe the Director was waiting until I talked with Dr. Linn. Mr. Zollar read me the text of the letter he had drafted, apparently to go to Congressmen. It stated that my transfer was rescinded and that I could remain in GNP at least until family health problems were resolved, after which I would be given an opportunity to transfer to another natural area acceptable to the Service and to me. I specifically asked Mr. Zollar if he would insert the above underlined at least so that the agreement did not tie an agreement to transfer to the grievance settlement. He agreed to do that. The wording “opportunity to transfer” was the wording he used and it was agreeable to me.

I then agreed that the letter sounded fine, but that to save the Service or anyone involved any possible further embarrassment I should have a confirmation of the grievance settlement in writing and agree to it in writing before any letters were sent out to other parties. Mr. Zollar agreed that this would be wise.

6 June: In the afternoon, I flew to Santa Fe, New Mexico, to meet with NPS Chief Scientist Robert Linn. I met Linn and his associates Drs. Cheek and Sudia, and Regional Scientist Reed, in Linn’s motel room. Dr. Linn said that Director Hartzog had instructed him to
discuss a future assignment for me to any area other than GNP. The Director had made no comment to me concerning such a restriction. On the contrary, he had tacitly agreed that it would be most logical to assign me to either YNP or GNP as a biologist, because of my previous experience in these parks and because biologists can expect to remain in a position for a long term, as has always been my goal. There had been no discussion of any relationship between my grievance settlement and the discussion of a potential future assignment as a biologist.

It was very difficult to carry on a meaningful discussion with three people asking questions and stating opinions. These people had no apparent knowledge of what had previously transpired in my case. Some of them went over the same points I had heard for four months, essentially: “Who do you think you are, to challenge the wisdom of the Service’s motives?” Dr. Linn asked me what type of position and what areas I might be interested in and what my career goal was. I stated that my career goal had been achieved when I reached the Resource Management position in GNP. I had been specifically trained for that position and had been told that the position was designed to be long term (a good chance of being in GNP for the rest of my career). It was designed to provide professional advice on ecological matters. This necessitated an intimate knowledge of the Park. Such in-depth knowledge could be acquired only by long tenure.

I told them that the Resource Management Ranger position was abolished six months ago and that of course has made the Service’s objectives less than clear to me. I asked if this was the policy now—to do away with all Resource Management Ranger positions? They said that they didn’t know. I asked if Research Biologists were going to assume the responsibilities of Resource Management Ranger positions; they said that they did not know. This lack of direction and policy obviously is one of the reasons that superintendents can abolish positions and programs such as Resource Management.

After being bombarded with further questions about my motives in this affair, I accompanied Linn, Sudia, and Reed to a restaurant for dinner that evening. At the restaurant, the disjointed discussion continued. I asked if it would be advisable to make plans to enter a PhD program at UM. I said that it was my understanding that such a degree was necessary to fully qualify for a biologist position. Glenn Cole, Supervisory Biologist for Teton, YNP, and GNP, had told me in writing several years ago that the NPS would hire only PhDs for biologist jobs. Since that time I had looked into the requirements for advanced study at UM.

Dr. Sudia said that he would not consider hiring anyone without a PhD in the future. He stated that it would be a wise and essential undertaking for me. I stated to Dr. Linn that I would be willing to complete such studies on L.W.O.P. if the Service would grant it. Dr. Sudia suggested to Dr. Linn that the Service should try to financially support the PhD study as long as it provided useful information to the Service. I described the study that I had given some thought to, an ecological evaluation of landscape change and human impact in a wilderness area. Advisers at UM had concurred that such a study was feasible in YNP. Both Linn and Sudia said that they believed such a study would be suitable. I said that I did not expect or ask the Service to fund such graduate work, but that L.W.O.P. would make it possible for me to accomplish this study and to qualify for a biologist position.

Dr. Linn said that Director Hartzog had instructed him to discuss future assignment to any area other than GNP. The Director had made no comment to me concerning such a restriction. On the contrary, he had tacitly agreed that it would be most logical to assign me
to either YNP or GNP as a biologist, because of my previous experience in these parks and because biologists can expect to remain in such a position for a long term, as has always been my goal. In conclusion, Dr. Linn told me he would recommend to Director Hartzog the following, in order of preference (Dr. Linn's preferences): (1) That I be assigned to complete the graduate program as outlined, funded by the Service, or, (2) That I be assigned L.W.O.P. to complete a graduate program.

There was no discussion of any relationship between my grievance settlement and the discussion of a potential future assignment as a biologist. The meeting seemed to me to have been rather bizarre. I left confused as to what Dr. Linn would recommend and what his true feelings were.

12 June: Mr. Zollar phoned in response to a telegram I sent to him, asking for written confirmation of the grievance settlement. He said "the reassignment to Omaha is rescinded." I asked why I could not get this in writing. He said he would send me a telegram the same day confirming this and would get Assistant Director Norwood to sign it. He said that he had talked with Dr. Linn, who had said that he could establish a biologist position in Voyageurs National Park and that there was a possibility of one in the North Cascades National Park, but nothing certain at this time. Zollar asked if I would be interested in an area such as Voyageurs. I replied that I would be at a later time, but what about further education necessary for such a position? He said the Director would not consider granting L.W.O.P. for any graduate work.

I told Mr. Zollar there was no way that I would agree to a transfer to a biologist position in any other area at this time. I said that the only reasonable and fair way to proceed was to follow the understanding that had been reached in Denver, i.e., settle the grievance by rescinding my reassignment to Omaha and reinstating me in a position in GNP; any transfer would be handled as a separate and unrelated matter.

I said specifically to Mr. Zollar: "It seems only fair to me, to settle the grievance as previously agreed, and then to talk about a different transfer when these other details are resolved. Do you agree that would be fair and logical?" He replied without further comment or elaboration, Yes, he did. That, was the end of the conversation, which I had every reason to believe ended on a note of agreement.

13 June: As a follow up, I wrote to Zollar, opening as follows:

"A straightforward resolution of my formal grievance seemed to be in the offing after what my wife and I considered a constructive discussion with you and Mr. Garrison, in Denver. Developments since then—including filling the District Naturalist position in Glacier, and then a very high-pressured discussion with Dr. Linn in Santa Fe, where (rather than having a personal dialogue with Dr. Linn) I was bombarded with questions from three people who apparently had no knowledge of what had transpired previously on this case—have intensified the emotional strain that should have ended long ago."

I received no further communication from Zollar. Director Hartzog obviously overruled their recommendation. Robert Linn and his cronies may have influenced Hartzog on the negative side. However, it probably made no difference what anyone said; Hartzog was simply going through the motions of appearing to be objective. He probably was determined to back Briggle regardless of the circumstances.
14 June: Dr. Jim Habeck had another Local Comment in the Missoulian. It was headlined: “Park Officials Ignorant of Law.”

The next communication that I received from the NPS was dated 16 June, a letter from Director Hartzog stating that I had rejected all of their efforts and that a grievance hearing was being called for. This came as a total and unexpected shock. Either the Director had rejected all of the recommendations submitted to him by the parties with whom I had talked, or the parties did not submit the same recommendations that were described to me and to which I agreed.

18 June: I received a letter from Field and Stream columnist Michael Frome, who was a tremendous source of support through the whole affair. Mike’s letter read, in part:

“I know this is not an easy time for you personally, or for your family. But there have been some beautiful letters sent to me from your friends and admirers in Columbia Falls. This fight may be pretty lonely at times, but you are not fighting it alone.” Attached is exchange of correspondence between Big George [NPS Director Hartzog] and the superintendent of Lassen [Dick Boyer], who must be the prize jerk of the whole outfit.”

The letters (D-49 and D-50) illustrate the typical mind set of Park Superintendents and the priority of “loyalty,” loyalty to individuals rather than to ethical and honest behavior. Boyer clearly was not sympathetic to my case, and he knew none of the facts. However, he directed his most hostile comments at Olympic National Park Ranger Jack Hughes, organizer of the PRO and the Glacier Defense Fund.

The recommendation of Garrison and Zollar, that my transfer to Omaha be rescinded, apparently had reached the Regional Office. Regional Director Volz would have assumed that their recommendation would be adopted by Hartzog. On the 19th, Regional Director Volz, then apparently assuming that I would not be transferring to Omaha, issued a memorandum with a Subject heading: “Urgent need for Assistant, Environmental Impact Statements.” This was clearly a solicitation for applicants for the position into which Volz had intended to transfer me (D-52).
Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director  
National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior  
Washington, D.C. 20240  
Dear George:

I have heard of the pending McClelland personnel situation in Glacier, as it now stands, and want to express myself concerning the all-encompassing effects it may have on some pretty dear management and administrative privileges which should not be injured by unconscionable and ill-advised acts, such as the effort by the Park Ranger in Olympic. His intercession is ill-conceived and is being carried out in a hasty and thoughtless manner. I think it is most disheartening to a field manager to see this sort of thing being allowed to occur. There should be no lack of administrative backing at management levels above to counteract the obvious adverse effects.

You are certainly aware, as am I, that there are adequate grievance procedures available to protect both the employee and management in cases such as this. I do not feel that the action to gather funds for "the defense" of the former Glacier ranger smacks of anything other than a misguided attempt of the flamboyant "free Father Berrigan" or "free Angela" or "free anybody else" types. We can do without this sort of action, which is certainly not in the best interest of the fair (although sometimes harsh, when necessary) administrative image which has been developed over the years of the Service.

I do not know what type of action is contemplated, or perhaps already moving along, but I wanted to let you know of my feelings in the matter. It is most difficult to view the situation objectively, I must admit, and especially so when a precedent of this sort, if allowed by inadequate support or lack of action to persist, could very easily pull the walls down upon each and every manager in the Service.

I fully support the personnel actions taken by the Superintendent of Glacier National Park and the Director of the Midwest Region in making every effort to adjust the park staff, as necessary, to carry out the objectives of the Service as directed by personnel policy established firmly many years ago. In addition, if there is any evidence of a violation of constituted authority by the action of the Olympic ranger, I would like to be advised of the appropriate action which could be taken to point out the error of his ways to the instigator, if any.

By copy of this letter to the appropriate Field Directors, I am advising them of my concern for this type of fund-raising "defense" by either the individual ranger or the so-called professional ranger organization he represents. This is not the way to do it!

Sincerely yours,

signed Dick Boyer

---

D-49. Letter from Lassen Superintendent Boyer to Director Hartzog, 11 April 1972.
PERSONAL

Mr. Richard Boyer.
Superintendent,
Lassen Volcanic National Park

Dear Dick:

I have received and read with much appreciation your letter of April 11 expressing strong support of the management decision involving the pending transfer of Mr. Riley McClelland. I am grateful, too, for your loyalty as reflected by your concern over the possible adverse effect on the Service of the actions of "the Park Ranger in Olympic" in connection with this decision. Your letter raises a most serious question, namely: where is the boundary line between legitimate protest, which is a precious right that must be preserved in a free society, and conduct unbecoming an employee of the Federal service, including insubordination? We as managers of the public's business must accept the reality that every one of our decisions is subject to validation by the public. This is a necessary part of the government manager's job if we as an organization are to remain responsive to the needs of people.

The employees of the National Park Service are an extremely important "public." Every Service employee should have the opportunity to be heard. We have tried very hard to create a climate in our management system which is conducive to a free and meaningful exchange of ideas. Thus, we must be prepared for the critical as well as the complimentary dialogue. I suggest that the actions of this employee have demonstrated far more eloquently than anything I could say—and, perhaps, even with more credibility—that we have succeeded in this regard.

I agree with you that it is regrettable that, for the most part, his communications reflect misunderstandings of programs and objectives. It is inevitable, however, that such misunderstandings may occur when the status quo is disturbed. Certainly, we have been in search of new responses to the needs of our changing society. Together, we have wrestled with new challenges imposed, particularly, upon the Service to articulate an environmental ethic to guide our management of the natural and cultural inheritance entrusted to our care. Fundamental changes, such as these, unfortunately, create tensions, frustrations and, indeed, occasionally anger.

Many other large organizations throughout our society face similar situations today. Thus, it is that people holding management positions in any part of the "Establishment," whether it be a church, a university, or a national park, find these are trying times. We must not, however, lessen our resolve to move ahead. While I deplore the fact that "the Park Ranger in Olympic" ignores the normal channels of communication, based on the knowledge I have of his actions, I propose, at this time, to treat them simply as an irregular method of exercising his right to protest. Many thanks for writing.

With warmest personal regards and every good wish, I am Sincerely yours,

_____________________signed George B. Hartzog, JR., Director

Subsequently, Ken Beck, whom Briggle had railroaded from Chief of Administration in GNP to a meaningless position in Washington, D.C., wrote (D-51):

Memorandum

To: Superintendents, Midwest Region

From: Director, Midwest Region

Subject: Urgent need for Assistant, Environmental Impact Statements

This office is in urgent need of the services of a talented and knowledgeable individual to assist Ed Kenning in his overwhelming assignment related to environmental impact statements. The work involves detailed review of statements for adequacy and format, editing, direct assistance to parks in writing statements when the expertise within a park may be lacking, coordination of effort with the Service Center where responsibility is shared, review and comment on other agencies’ statements, etc.

As you well know, a timely and acceptable statement must precede all of your development projects of any significance. So in effect, Ed Kenning and whoever is selected to assist him, are very vital staff members whose input has region wide impact.

Obviously, I am looking for an individual willing to accept an extremely important challenge, cope with frustration at times, respond positively to urgent requests, and willing to accept a big workload that awaits him. It will be an opportunity for someone to make a real contribution region wide.

Please bring this memorandum to the attention of your staff. I am looking for a qualified individual, GS-11/12, wanting to accept a real challenge in a most important and demanding assignment. Let me know by telephone of anyone on your staff interested in being considered for this assignment. We shall then follow up with any necessary paperwork.

J. Leonard Volz

National Parks Centennial 1872-1972

D-52. Memo from Regional Director Volz to Superintendents, 19 June 1972. In contrast to the effort to force me take this position, note the wording “willing” and “wanting.”
Considering the fact that Ed Menning (my supervisor in the Omaha office) had only one assistant—as stated in the above memorandum—there can be no doubt that this memo is talking about the position in which I was involved. During a phone call, Menning told me that he too had heard that my transfer to Omaha was being rescinded. Sometime shortly after this, Hartzog decided not to accept the Garrison/Zollar recommendation. I speculate that Hartzog phoned Briggle to inform him of the decision to rescind my transfer. Briggle probably would have responded that he would resign if that happened. Briggle knew very well that he was Hartzog’s favorite, probably being groomed to become the next director. Hartzog would then have been unwilling to lose Briggle, and would have reinforced my directed reassignment. I then wrote to AFGE Representative Bob Nogler (D-53):

Box 366
West Glacier, Montana, 59936
June 26, 1972

Mr. Bob Nogler
A.F.G.E.
610 SW Broadway
Portland, Oregon 97205

Dear Bob:

The agency, Hartzog in particular, has certainly shown a lack of sincerity and truthfulness in this affair. It is abundantly obvious that they don’t want me around. Actually, I’d rather be fired, than simply accept a transfer without having them answer to the original charge of intimidation. I will never accept any transfer, no matter how attractive it might be, until after they have rescinded the Omaha assignment, and reinstated me in a position in Glacier (even a demotion would be O.K.). This, as I have mentioned, was what Zollar and Garrison told us they were recommending—rescinding transfer and reinstatement. If I were to accept a different transfer without reinstatement in Glacier, at least until health problems are resolved, I would be showing insincerity and would be coping out on the conservation groups who have so strongly supported our stand. I can’t let down the other employees who see this as a representative case either. At least if I lose, as now appears to be the outcome, everyone will know that NPS written personnel policy is meaningless and spoils is the name of the game.

We will have to commit ourselves to a house in Missoula this week so as to have a place to go if everything continues to fall apart.

It seems unfortunately clear that the agency the fact that they are dealing with individuals, people with feelings, and in the NPS especially, idealistic people because The National Park Idea itself is altruistic. As far as we’re concerned, it is a fight worth fighting.

Sincerely,

B. Riley McClelland

D-53. Letter from McClelland to AFGE Representative Nogler, 26 June 1972.
I was always pessimistic and anticipated losing our appeals, so, in summer 1972, I was making tentative plans to begin a PhD program at UM in Fall Quarter 1973. Professor Sid Frissell, in the School of Forestry, was exceptionally helpful in this planning. I am forever indebted to Sid for his encouragement and moral support. He introduced me to Dean Arnold Bolle, who also facilitated my academic plans after I had taken the GRE (Graduate Record Exam). Bolle was soon replaced by Robert Wambach, who remained very supportive and helpful. In mid-July 1972, we finalized purchase of a house in Missoula, at 1612 Bel Aire Place, from Mr. Rogers. A woman renter was staying upstairs at the time and we continued to rent to her until late summer 1973. Dick Rensel stayed in the basement for the second summer session at U of M. We did not charge him rent.

10 July: I heard from AFGE Representative Bob Nogler that the Grievance Hearing would be held in the Park on 14 August 1972.

14 July: Bob Nogler wrote: "... these hearings are not adversary and are supposed to be for the purpose of developing information that can lead to resolution of a problem. Hold tough and I will see you in August!" Bob Nogler’s expectation that the hearing would not be adversary proved to be far from accurate.

3 August: Dale Burk’s Missoulian story was headlined: “Union Throws Support Behind McClelland”

The first paragraph read:

“The American Federation of Government Employees, a national union affiliated with the AFL-CIO, has thrown its ‘unqualified assistance’ behind Glacier National Park employee Riley McClelland in his battle against the Park Service hierarchy.”
Mr. Jack Hughes  
Olympic National Park  
600 East Park Avenue  
Port Angeles, Washington 98362  

Dear Mr. Hughes:  

Enclosed you will find my money order for the Professional Ranger's Association and for whatever assistance it may be to the Riley McClellan fund.  

I'm just another employee in the Centennial Office that has been harassed by the one William J. Briggle and the Centennial Office Administrative Assistant. It so happens that I'm still around waiting to get fired, I suppose. I don't expect anything pleasant to happen to me although most of the Second World Conference people are from a different pattern. A person on the Second World Conference staff did tell me not long ago that if it was comforting to hear—that working conditions at Glacier was as horrendous as working in the Centennial Office.  

I'm sure you'll also enjoy the fact that the week that "Briggle" spends in the Centennial Office the "peon" refer to as "hell week."  

I should have asked for facts to substantiate the slanderous remark by Briggle—however, I just decided that the outfit had it in for "peons." I did report the several incidents to Personnel and they were very sympathetic, however, stated that nothing would be done since the Director had appointed Briggle as the Centennial Director plus the fact that the office was temporary.  

And, so it goes, at times it has been a night-mare—the office has had a tremendously busy workload and could have had a bit of joy coupled with the sweat—most of the people are great—but it is only the few and I mean few that have caused the unhealthy working environment.  

Anyway, good luck to Riley McClelland, some of us have had a little bit of what he's had a whole lot of.  

Sincerely,  

(Mrs.) Rose L. Kreiser  

August 4, 1972  

821 Timber Branch Parkway  
Alexandria, Virginia 22302  

D-54. Letter from Rose Kreiser to Jack Hughes, 4 August 1972.
Dale Burk’s Outdoor Picture column in the Missoulian (6 August 1972) follows (D-55):

Missoulian  6 August 1972

The OUTDOOR PICTURE

—By Dale A. Burk—

Challenging William Briggle

William Briggle, superintendent of Glacier National Park, takes certain liberties with the truth that must be challenged. Specifically, I refer to a letter he recently sent to a weekly Montana newspaper editor in which he made allegations concerning my reporting activities that are untrue.

The letter was mailed to Irvin Hutchison, publisher of the Liberty County Times in Chester, who sent me a copy. Hutchison is an uncle of William Hutchison of Havre, a member of the trail crew that was fired by Briggle last fall for criticizing the construction of a boardwalk at Logan Pass in Glacier Park, but later reinstated. I do not know if Briggle made similar statements falsely representing my coverage of the Glacier Park issue in other letters, but perhaps that is immaterial. At issue is the thrust of what he said, not how many times he may have said it or to whom he might have said it.

Briggle’s Letter

"Dear Mr. Hutchison: Although we have not had an opportunity to meet, I know that your paper has received several state awards in the past. I have just finished reading the May 4 issue of the Liberty County Times and your comments on Glacier National Park have given me an opportunity to correspond with you. The park has been very much in the news of late and all of it has not been on the plus side. Mel Ruder of the Hungry Horse News, the Great Falls Tribune, and local AP and UPI correspondents who have made an effort to become familiar with actual conditions have reported accordingly. Others who have not taken the time to become fully informed have been less than objective in reporting our situation. It might interest you to know that Mr. Dale Burk of the Missoulian has not visited the park or discussed with me any aspects of this current controversy. The purpose of this letter is to invite you to visit us and become familiar with actual conditions in this park. Since you have a nephew working in the park, I would assume that you would have a little closer interest in park activities than the normal visitor so, if you have the time, I think that you will find this to be an enlightening experience. "We took forward to the opportunity to show you around. Sincerely yours, William J. Briggle, Superintendent."

Pinpointing Falsehoods

Briggle’s letter is a curious missive and in at least two instances completely untrue and I invite him to prove otherwise. First, Briggle’s letter is dated May 17, 1972. Prior to that time he and I had a long telephone discussion and on at least a half a dozen occasions I was referred to Briggle’s management assistant and press relations spokesman, Richard Munro, to discuss the controversy. And — on the evening of April 20 in Kalispell — Bill Briggle and Dick Munro sat down with me for more than two hours in a Kalispell supper club to talk over, at Briggle’s request, the stories I was writing about charges that he used intimidation, coercion, and threat of transfer to keep Glacier Park employees under his thumb. "I can provide some two dozen witnesses of that meeting with Briggle and Munro, for to meet with them I had to cancel a previously scheduled dinner engagement with a number of my friends who were in Kalispell that day and evening for the Flathead National Forest’s wilderness candidate study areas hearing. Some of those friends had dinner in the same room where Briggle, Munro and I met — so Briggle’s point that I had not discussed with him any aspects
of this current controversy is simply untrue.

**On Visiting Glacier Park**

His comment to the effect that I had not visited the park also is untrue, but that is of little importance to the issue at hand. Reporting the events surrounding the dispute involving Briggle and employees in the park in no way required that one actually visit the area.

Nonetheless, I was in the park both before and after the stories involving Briggle appeared in the *Missoulian*. In fact, I visited Glacier this past weekend but did not check in with Briggle. There simply was no need to, but again the point is that one can visit Glacier Park without Briggle knowing of it.

**On the Actual Conditions**

Lastly, Briggle must be challenged on his comment about "actual conditions" in the park. The news stories that have carried my by-line have reported what others said about conditions in the park. They shall continue to do that, for to the others involved what they have said is to them the actual conditions. The fact that they and Briggle differ on the subject is what is at issue in Glacier Park, and throughout the National Park Service.

However, The Outdoor Picture is a column of opinion and within it subjective comments on any issue may legitimately be made. My comments today represent the first subjective observations I've made in the *Missoulian* on the situation in Glacier National Park—and I make them to set the record straight.

It is full and open public exposure of the "actual conditions" that must be the goal of all involved, and in the pursuit of that truth I shall maintain an openness of mind to report and comment on the truths and untruths of the situation as they develop. In the process, I also am willing to work with Bill Briggle or anyone else involved to seek that truth so that all of us can get about the job of constructively doing what is right by the public resource involved, Glacier National Park.

Conservation Editor Michael Frome’s column in the August 1972 Field and Stream Magazine follows (D-56):

"CONSERVATION??

...for the good of the Service...

Dear Editor: After months and months of reading Mr. Frome’s articles on conservation I’ve begun wondering: do you think you could loan him to the U.S. Interior Department for a year or so to straighten things out?—Frank Bonomolo, Brooklyn, New York.

Well, Frank, you may have something there, though it probably would require much longer than a year. Assuming, however, that I was invited over tomorrow, one of my first objectives would be to rescue and reclaim the National Park Service, a favorite agency of mine for many years. I lament its degeneration and would pledge to restore its sense of commitment to preservation of our natural treasures.

Since my recent criticisms in this space of Park Service misadventures under its director, George B. Hartzog, Jr., I have been overwhelmed with communications from men in the ranks—rangers, naturalists, and park superintendents—hungry for better ways. In the past few months I have been meeting with many of these men and exchanging correspondence with them. They tell me how life in the parks has changed from a joy to an endless siege of coercion, fear, intimidation, and distrust. These highly motivated public servants deserve to be heard, and following are excerpts from their letters:

"I am not just concerned about myself and my family, or my fellow rangers and naturalists. I am most deeply concerned about the great national parks and the agency that was established to care for them. Many of us who have loved the parks and who believe in the original national park concept see all idealism and meaning being lost. Idealism and dedication are feared by those who cannot comprehend, and today the NPS is led by the uncomprehending. The national park land ethic is dying . . . ."

"The insane overnight relocation of the planning and design offices from Washington, D.C., and San Francisco to Denver represents the culmination of several years of bankrupt policy. The Denver office is temporarily housed above a department store in a typical shopping center. It was hastily furnished with heat, lights, and restrooms. A lease is in effect for approximately 12 to 16 months, after which the government may condemn the place and take it over in order to keep a roof over the heads of its ‘dedicated and faithful.’ Meanwhile, the word is that several million dollars can and will be obtained to construct an appropriate building somewhere in the Denver area . . . ."

"Employee concern for parks has been replaced here at Denver by the concern for family and self-survival. In some instances, previous homes have not been sold. Families are separated. Double mortgages have been acquired. Only the local realtors have something to smile about. Unless the National Park Service and/or congressional leadership quickly face the facts, this Centennial Year will mark a low reached by few, if any, Federal agencies . . . ."

"He is very careful to surround himself with those whose spinal columns are well annealed, making the voice of dissent or a suggestion to alter existing priorities a rare occurrence. This, coupled with an apparent obsession with building an empire through political patronage, has reduced concern for resource conservation and proper maintenance
of facilities to near-extinction. The National Park Service as a conservation organization should be placed at the top of the endangered species list.

"We are busy creating new platitudes and giving lip service to lofty goals, but we are actually being molded into hypocrites. The slightest inclination to voice concern for traditional values brands one as a rigid malcontent, not flexible enough to hold a position in the glorious New Thrust."

"There are a lot of good men in this organization. Unfortunately, none of them seems to be in the hierarchy. It seems you must be an SOB to other people and subvert the policy of the Park Service to get anywhere. We are no longer a conservation organization with sound philosophy—we are ruled by politics, even at the field level."

The men quoted and others in the ranks are ready to come forward and present their testimony. Now, however, is not yet the time, for as one wrote, "If Park Service employees go to their senators or congressmen, the letters usually filter back to their bosses and they are blackballed. The employees are afraid to say anything because they might get transferred or fired."

It is an Orwellian scene. Charges against employees are rarely put in writing. Men are told they must uproot their families and move elsewhere "for the best interest of the Service" at the whim of superiors who bespeak the interest of a bureaucracy that has lost its way and its principles. Transfer is plainly a tool of wholesale intimidation. The unending Hartzog reorganization precludes anybody on top from being blamed, while "those who keep quiet and behave like automatons have the chance to get ahead."

The focal point of dissent thus far has been Glacier National Park, Montana. Under three years of autocratic rule by Superintendent William J. Briggie, the Captain Bligh of the Park System, no less than thirty-two employees have been transferred, or have resigned, or have elected to retire. Finally, Riley McClelland, a conscientious field biologist with an excellent record, chose to stand and fight. He had protested, through channels, against a variety of ecological abuses, for which he should have earned praise and commendation.

"I am a lifelong resident of Columbia Falls and chairman of the Junior High Science Department," Joe T. Moody, a reader of FIELD & STREAM, wrote me recently. "We use Glacier Park frequently for field trips and outdoor classes. Through the years I have worked with Riley McClelland and found him to be extremely concerned, capable, and competent."

"I have never been so discouraged with the administration of Glacier Park. Superintendent Briggie is interested only in himself and his advancement, not in Glacier Park. He has created an unbelievable 1984-type situation in which competent employees are afraid to express the opinions they were trained and hired to offer."

The McClelland appeal apparently is pending, though how Director Hartzog's inner guard can possibly render the promised "fair and impartial review" of its own misdoings is quite beyond me. After all, the evidence shows that Glacier is hardly an isolated case.

Riley McClelland was originally ordered on February 28 to move to Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in southeastern Montana. There he was to succeed one Robert Taylor as interpretive naturalist. The latter, in turn, had received a telephone call from the regional director of the Park Service warning that he must accept a transfer to Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa, or face a charge of insubordination and have his career ruined.

Therefore, let us now inquire into the extent and nature of the upheaval at Bighorn Canyon. I visited this area personally two or three years ago, at which time I met several of the principals involved. Among them were Bruce Shaw, the park superintendent, whom I had known earlier at other stations in the Park System; Don Ripley, heading up a liaison program.
between the Park Service and Indian tribes of the region (a new kind of cooperative effort which seemed to hold great promise); Robert Taylor, the naturalist; and Henry Old Coyote, a cultural leader of the Crow Indians, whose recent employment by the Park Service as a liaison officer had been widely praised as "a stroke of genius."

The national recreation area had come into being following completion in 1966 of the towering concrete Yellowtail Dam and the 71-mile reservoir extending behind it in spectacular Bighorn Canyon. The surroundings are rich in archaeological interest, principally of the Crow Indians, from whom parts of the land for the recreation area and power site had been purchased. The Crows were among the earliest peoples in this region, and called Bighorn the "food valley" because of the numerous buffalo they killed here.

The legislation authorizing establishment of the recreation area provided for the development of access. Presumably it was to be a road, which the chambers of commerce of Lovell, Wyoming, seventeen miles from the southern gateway at Horseshoe Bend) and Hardin and Billings, Montana, were actively promoting, with influential assistance in Washington from Senator Clifford Hansen, of Wyoming. Recently, however, a surge of archaeological interest had developed, led largely by Stuart Conner, a well-known Billings attorney and Indian authority.

During the course of a survey of the Pryor Mountains and the Bighorns, which encompassed lands administered by the Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management, highly significant discoveries were made. Among these were rock shelters engraved with petroglyphs and pictographs; rock breastworks of siege sites; and remnants of religious sanctuaries and burial grounds. As Mr. Conner reported:

"The Pryor-Bighorn Area has the greatest concentration of diverse sites of the Northwest Plains Indians. By reason of geography and ecology there is a greater concentration of sites of much richer quality in the Grapevine-Dryhead Unit (on the line of the projected road). Nowhere in the Northwest Plains is the prehistoric and historic nomadic-militaristic Plains Indian culture so graphically represented as in this unit."

What was the reaction to this of the National Park Service, the protector of our natural and historic shrines? First, Bruce Shaw was transferred to another job at Grand Canyon and a new superintendent, Arthur Sullivan, moved in, obviously with instructions to get the road construction moving.

Appeals from outside and inside the Service to evaluate the archaeological sites and to consider alternate construction routes went for nought. The Montana Wildlife Federation and Montana Wilderness Association filed a joint brief asking for preparation of an EIS, but were denied. As Dr. Eldon Smith, extension biologist at the Montana State University, who drafted the brief, told me, "Construction may have been authorized before passage of the National Environmental Policy Act, but guidelines of the Council on Environmental Quality clearly show this does not excuse submission of an impact statement. Accordingly, a complete archaeological survey and evaluation should have been made."

Henry Old Coyote told me, during the course of a recent personal meeting, part of what transpired on the inside. Five park employees held an open discussion about protecting the Indian sites. They were not against the road; they only wanted to insure that it didn't erase the records of history. Soon thereafter, the five became targets of pressure, harassment, and intimidation.

Terry Rubald, the administrative officer, was the first to be shipped out. Then Robert Taylor followed. His sins included preparation of a plan for a library of Crow culture, with film and records to be available to scholars and Park Service interpretive use. Don Ripley retired in despair and the liaison program collapsed.

"It's like building a road through the graves at Arlington Cemetery," said Mr. Old Coyote. But Superintendent Sullivan retorted, "The Crow tribe can't stand in the way of progress." After many affronts to himself and his people from the park superintendent, Mr.
Old Coyote resigned.

He was not long unemployed. The Billings Gazette, of January 18, 1972, under the heading of "Fortunate Choice," editorialized as follows: "Henry Old Coyote is an inspired choice for the brand-new position of Indian studies coordinator at Hardin High School . . .. Surely the young people will be enriched by the presence of this distinguished teacher." Just the kind of man the National Park Service would want to latch onto, or so you would think. The first 5.6-mile section of the 20-mile road has now been pushed through, from Horseshoe Bend to Devil's Canyon Overlook, obviously in the quickest, cheapest manner. Conservationists are now fighting for application of environmental principles to construction of the remainder.

By now you have the idea. The infrastructure of the National Park Service is a shambles. The fundamental cause is not one of administrative weakness, but rather of policy that has gone hopelessly astray. In the natural areas, the agency policy is to deny fulfillment of the Wilderness Act. As Senator Frank Church of Idaho declared at a Senate hearing in May, the current Park Service wilderness proposals are "undesirable, dangerous, inconsistent with the letter and intent of the Wilderness Act, and altogether unjustified." Here in the metropolitan Washington area, the Service policy is to deliberately promote high rise commercial development and to deny parklands which the people have been seeking and urgently need. So it goes on a wide front.

I propose that the Yellowstone Centennial be celebrated during 1972 by restoring the faith, hope, and confidence of National Park Service employees, and therefore of the public as well. It is, as I wrote here in March, time for a change at the top—time for Mr. Hartzog to go . . .."

D-56. Michael Frome's *Field and Stream* article, August 1972.
10 August: I received a telegram from Jerry Verkler, Staff Director, Senate Interior Committee (Verkler worked directly for Senator Henry Jackson). “Would like opportunity to talk with you Sunday August 13th. I will be staying at 4 Seasons Motel in Kalispell arriving Saturday evening. Please leave message if we can get together.”

13 August: Verkler came to our home in West Glacier. He was very pleasant and seemed genuinely interested in the case. We (Pat was involved in the discussion) were left with the impression that he would try to get Senator Jackson to intervene on our behalf. Nothing ever came of it and eventually we received a phone call from Verkler, apologizing that he had been unsuccessful in his efforts.

14-15 August: The Hearing for the Formal Grievance was held in the Community Building at GNP Headquarters. Robert Snashall, Personnel Appeals Examiner (Administrative Law Judge), Bureau of Indian Affairs, U.S. Department of Interior, had been appointed as hearing Officer. I was represented by Bob Nogler, of the AFGE. The NPS was represented by Richard Robbins, Attorney, Division of Park and Recreation, Office of the Solicitor, Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

Prior to the hearing, Bob Nogler spent several days at West Glacier preparing his case in our behalf. The following individuals met with Nogler and provided information potentially helpful to our case: Retired NPS Ranger Dan Nelson; Biologist Dave Shea; Curator Roberta Seibel; Seasonal Rangers Don Lawrence and John Perry; Seasonal Naturalist Art Sedlack; Chief Naturalist’s Secretary Paula Dustin; Chief Ranger’s Secretary Martha Sloan; Administrative Secretary Rachel Parker; Secretary Lorraine Robertson; Reverend Tom Best; and several GNP trail crewmen, including Bill Hutchison.

Although Bob Nogler assured me, and believed, that the hearing would be non-adversarial (as was emphasized in the preliminary correspondence we received), that was far from the truth and Bob was as upset about it as I was. The government attorney, Robbins, was pompous, sarcastic, accusatory, and exceedingly harsh whenever he mentioned anything about me.

I clearly was on trial and was guilty unless proven innocent to the satisfaction of the government hierarchy. Although I felt that Bob Nogler did a clear and convincing job, with solid evidence, it was an impossible task from the outset. All level of internal “investigation” and evaluation within the NPS and the Department of Interior were inevitably biased towards “defending” the system and the hierarchy.

6 December: pressure from conservation groups finally made NPS Director George Hartzog too much of a political liability for Secretary of Interior Rogers Morton, who announced Hartzog’s resignation.

13 December: Morton announced the appointment of Ronald Walker as the new Director of the NPS. Walker’s prior experience involved organizing and directing all domestic and International travel for President Nixon. Wow—that’s really the experience one needs to direct the management of the national parks.

25 January 1973: We received word of Hearing Officer’s recommendations:

**RECOMMENDATION**

“It is my recommendation that the order of reassignment of the said employee to the Midwest Region, National Park Service, be affirmed; provided, however, that reexamination of his qualifications, training, personal wants and the health of he and his family be made with a view to retransfer in keeping therewith at the earliest possible date consistent with the needs of the National Park Service and good management practices.

Secondly, it is my recommendation that Departmental or Service inquiry be made into management practices and procedures covering the tenure of Superintendent William J. Briggle at Glacier National Park, Montana. To leave
this matter unanswered as a cloud on his administration, particularly in view of
the publicity it has received, is unfair to him, to the personnel of the Park and to
the exceptional reputation of the National Park Service.”

Dated this 22nd day of January, 1973, at Portland, Oregon, ROBERT C. SNASHALL
Administrative Law Judge.

Snashall’s discussion included the following:

“The crux of employee’s contentions in bringing his grievance is that the
Superintendent William J. Briggle used the guise of reorganization as a means of
intimidating employees who disagreed or did not blindly follow his
administrative dictates; that these intimidations were affected through the means
of coercive and unethical personnel practices, including transfer, threat of
transfer and, threat of being fired for refusal to transfer. The record does contain
more than a little evidence tending to substantiate the employee's contentions.
There is direct evidence the Superintendent ran roughshod over his employees
and that during his tenure in excess of thirty employees of a total work force of
approximately fifty were either transferred out or retired. This does appear to be
an inordinate amount of shuffling and transferring of employees from that
facility during the period of his tenure.”

“... the evidence directly bearing upon questions of intimidation and
harassment of employees was meager and not developed. It is impossible to tell
from such evidence presented whether or not Mr. Briggle's actions, or for that
matter the actions of Midwest Region personnel also involved with this problem,
were intended acts of recrimination, intimidation and abuse of managerial
privilege or were merely manifestations of frustration created by the necessity of
a somewhat massive servicewide reorganization.”

“Although Riley McClelland was advised the transfer was for a limited
period only it is unfortunate management did not effectuate this transfer in an
explanatory and forthright manner in such a way as to assuage the employee's
shock. The record of what took place during the informal stage of this grievance
indicates manifest boondoggling and lack of diplomacy. When coupled with
what has been noted above concerning the circumstances surrounding the
purported reorganization at Glacier National Park it is of little wonder Riley
McClelland felt himself put upon. It may well be that this factor plus the manner
in which personnel matters were handled at Glacier Park created the feeling of
intimidation where none actually existed. At any rate, I find no basis for
grievant's second contention that management disregarded the Servicewide
Career Development and Placement Plan.”

“There remain two other considerations which should be commented upon
obiter dictum for purposes of the record of this hearing. The first is as to
technical considerations of ecological and other natural resource matters of
National Park Service policy and individual park management activities in
fulfilling these operational duties. There is much evidence in the record on this
point. I do not and cannot make any findings in connection with these matters
nor is this report in any way to be deemed as indicating any reflection on these
matters since clearly they are without both the jurisdiction and discipline of this
Hearing Officer. Statements, affidavits, letters and testimony of witnesses
appearing in the record bearing upon professional opinions and points of view in
ecological, biological and other natural resource matters must be considered in
another and proper forum.”
“The second is the manner in which this grievance was unfortunately publicized and blown all out of proportion by resort to the media. It is perhaps understandable and therefore excusable that an employee such as Riley McClelland, dedicated to the preservation of our national parks, would seek aid and comfort outside the Service itself when he thought that Service was closed against him; but for a private employee organization [here he is referring to Jack Hughes’ Professional Ranger’s Organization and the Glacier Defense Fund] to pick up his cudgel in a wide use of the media for its own purposes was and is mimical to the interests of both parties to the grievance and is appalling.”

26 January: GNP officials announced the results of the election that would determine which union, AFGE (who was representing me in my case) or NFFE (the union that refused to represent me), or no union, would represent the employees of GNP. AFGE was the winner and of course that pleased us after all of their hard work on our case.

1 February: As a result of the Hearing Officer’s recommendation, the newly appointed Director of the NPS, Ronald Walker, ordered that I be transferred and that an inquiry be made into Briggle’s management practices.

2 February: Regional Director Volz wrote a memorandum to me, stating in part:

“I have been directed to effect your physical transfer to the Midwest Regional Office within 30 days of official notification to you.” ... please provide me with a written statement as to the arrangements you are making to physically transfer here within the 30 days following your receipt of this notice.”

I of course replied that I had no intention of moving to Omaha.

6–9 February: The “inquiry” regarding Briggle’s management practices was conducted in GNP by NPS employees Charles Mangers (Assistant Director) and Joseph Rumberg (Deputy Associate Director). The “investigators” spent their first entire evening socially with Briggle, who supposedly was the one being investigated. The results of the inquiry were classified as confidential and were not made public until seven years later, in 1980. Whenever a government report is classified as confidential (with obviously no relationship to national security) there is reason to believe it contains material unfavorable to the agency involved.

My next course of action was an appeal of Director Walker’s decision, to the Secretary of Interior. At this point I obtained the services of Don Marble, attorney from Chester, Montana. I drafted my idea of what Don Marble’s appeal should contain (D-57). This document is nine pages, but I believe that it is worth including here in its entirety:
Memorandum
To: Director, National Park Service
Through: Director, Midwest Region
From: B. Riley McClelland, Glacier

Subject: Appeal on grievance decision and request for review
Grievance Docket No. PG72-20

In accordance with Departmental Regulation 370 DM 771.1.9, I herewith respectfully appeal your decision to affirm the order transferring me to the Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska, and do request a further review of the case by the Department of Interior. It is possible that some of the comments contained in this statement of appeal would have been included in the grievance file prior to your decision; however I was not accorded the opportunity to review the file, even though Regulation 771.310g makes this mandatory. The aforementioned regulation states:

"On completion of his inquiry, the examiner shall make the grievance file available to the employee and his representative for review and comment. Their comments, if any, should be included in the file."

It is my belief that your decision should be reversed for the following reasons:
(1). The entire history of this grievance and the formal hearing in particular do not represent a full, prompt, and impartial action as required by Departmental regulations.
(2). The Hearing Officer's findings do not support a recommendation to affirm the transfer.
(3). There are numerous discrepancies and inconsistencies in the Hearing Officer's findings and some important issues are not covered at all. The Director's memorandum excludes all of the Hearing Officer's findings that support the case for the aggrieved employee.
(4). Informal attempts to resolve the grievance were conducted in bad faith on the part of the agency.
(5). The affirmation of the transfer order to Omaha, Nebraska, is tantamount to initiation of an adverse action.

DISCUSSION
1. The entire history of this grievance and the formal hearing in particular do not represent a full, prompt, and impartial action, as required by Departmental regulations.

The hearing upon which the Director's comments in his January 30 decision memorandum are based, was not a full and complete procedure. In the oppressive and intimidative atmosphere of fear and reprisal generated by Superintendent Briggle and which existed at the time of the hearing (and still does), it was impossible to have a full hearing within the framework provided. This is clearly indicated, as stated by the employee's representative in the hearing, by the fact that many employees were willing to provide information to the representative, but few were willing to testify for fear of being subjected to the same type of contrived transfer to which the aggrieved employee is subject, or being "reorganized" out of the park. Only a forum wherein employees are endowed with a positive feeling that reprisals generated by Superintendent Briggle will not be permitted, can provide the additional evidence which the Hearing Officer apparently desired.

A blatant continuation of this intimidation took place when Superintendent Briggle and some of his staff, in outright violation of hearing procedures, acquired a copy of the
hearing transcript, giving Superintendent Briggle full knowledge of all testimony by his employees. It is exactly this kind of action which makes employees fearful of a superintendent with a record of vindictiveness and the means of harassing and transferring any who oppose his self-serving policies. If conducted properly by personnel who are truly objective and unbiased, the investigation recommended by the Hearing Officer and ordered by the Director will prove these allegations to be true.

This grievance has not been handled in a prompt manner. It has, in fact, exceeded the time limit by many months and has subjected the family of the aggrieved employee to severe emotional strain and hardship. Sec. 771.304 states that a decision shall be required within 90 days after initiation of the informal procedure. The informal procedure was initiated by the aggrieved on April 1, 1972, thus the 90-day limit expired July 1, 1972. Seven months later the Director's adverse decision was rendered. This delay was in no way caused by the aggrieved.

The formal hearing was not impartial. While purported to be a non-adversary, fact-finding inquiry, it was in fact, a highly legalistic procedure in which a trained government attorney had a distinct advantage over a union representative untrained in and unaccustomed to the legalistic chicanery used by the government attorney. Judge Snashall even states in his findings: "Mr. McClelland was not represented by a trained counselor at law which in fact perhaps accounts for evidence not having been produced with more degree of certainty and productive value." If the essentiality of representation by an attorney had been known to the employee prior to the hearing, in order to assure the adequate development of the case, one would have been sought. The American Federation of Government Employees' representative made a sincere and honest effort to bring out relevant facts, as was believed to be the objective of the hearing. The American Federation of Government Employees represented the aggrieved employee to the best of their ability, while the National Federation of Federal Employees, which at the time had exclusive jurisdiction in Glacier, made overt and unconscionable efforts to undermine the grievance even before it was filed.

The government attorney emphasized character assassination of the aggrieved employee (see management's summary in the transcript) and pompous denigration of those who provided written or verbal testimony on behalf of the aggrieved. No grievance hearing which degenerates into legalistic pedantry as this one did can be termed impartial or fair. It is no wonder few employees take a grievance as far as a formal hearing when it means subjecting oneself to the ridicule and sarcasm of a government attorney whose purpose is to prosecute the aggrieved. Can a hearing in which the government provides a prosecuting attorney for management and lets the employee flounder in a sea of legalistic bombast be considered impartial? How many employees with a serious grievance can afford legal representation apparently essential at such a hearing?

Secretary Morton made the following statement in a letter dated July 27, 1972, and published openly in the NPS Newsletter dated August 7, one week before the grievance hearing: "The Glacier situation has been blown totally out of perspective by highly inaccurate and inflammatory articles. A Superintendent deserves and must count on the support of his fellow Park Service employees. This is the backbone for all effective organizations. Appeals of decisions can be made through legal and well-understood channels. Loyalty to the system does not mean accepting abuses, but there is no excuse for willfully disregarding accepted standards of conduct." This is a highly prejudicial statement, supporting management prior to a scheduled formal hearing. How could the Secretary know whether the situation had been blown out of perspective? He was relying only on management's defense of itself. With such prejudice appearing even before the hearing, it is little wonder the transfer order was affirmed. The channels of appeal which the Secretary considers "well understood" are obscure and cumbersome for most employees. The gross violation of the time limit by the
agency indicates that not even the agency understands the procedure.

2. The Hearing Officer's findings do not support a recommendation to affirm transfer of the aggrieved employee.

The findings substantiate the aggrieved employee's contention that the transfer was originated as a vindictive reprisal by Superintendent Briggle. The Hearing Officer states: "The crux of employee's contentions in bringing his grievance is that the Superintendent used the guise of reorganization as a means of intimidating employees who disagreed or did not blindly follow his administrative dictates; that these intimidations were affected through the means of coercive and unethical personnel practices, including transfer, threat of transfer, and threat of being fired for refusal to transfer. The record does contain more than a little evidence tending to substantiate the employee's contentions. There is direct evidence that the Superintendent ran roughshod over his employees . . ." The Hearing Officer states additionally: "It is impossible to tell from such evidence presented whether or not Mr. Briggle's actions, or for that matter the actions of Midwest Region Personnel also involved with this problem, were intended acts of recrimination, intimidation, and abuse of managerial privilege or were merely manifestations of frustration created by the necessity of a somewhat massive service-wide reorganization." If this question is still unanswered, certainly affirmation of the legitimacy of the reasoning behind the aggrieved employee's order of transfer is premature and no decision on affirmation should occur until answers are obtained in a further intensive inquiry.

3. There are numerous discrepancies and inconsistencies in the Hearing Officer's findings and some important issues are not covered at all in his findings.

The Hearing Officer, in his report, almost totally discounts affidavits and other written testimony and considers them as hearsay. Much of the employee's case was corroborated by these statements. Prior to the hearing, it was understood by the aggrieved employee that notarized statements would be as acceptable as personal appearance by individuals not in the vicinity. If the Hearing Officer had reservations about the veracity or pertinency of these statements, he had the authority to request that these individuals appear in person. They were willing to do so. The Hearing Officer thus failed to assure that a full revelation of facts occurred.

Two written statements submitted by the aggrieved employee, I. Entitled "A Chronological Record of Verbal Communications" and II. An untitled chronology of discussions during the informal stage of the grievance, are basic to the contention that Superintendent Briggle brought about changes in the status of the aggrieved employee in Glacier and eventually a transfer order under the spurious guise of reorganization and finally a clandestined request to the Midwest Regional Office to transfer the aggrieved employees out of Glacier because his "talents were underutilized." Statements made to the aggrieved employed by various individuals, including Superintendent Briggle and Regional Personnel Officer Pratt, and recorded in item 1 of the above-mentioned document, show clearly that the Superintendent was abusing his managerial privilege.

In collusion with Regional Office personnel, reassignments were concocted (first Bighorn Canyon, later to Omaha) as overt acts of intimidation and recrimination, knowing full well that the aggrieved employee would not accept such transfers. Yet the Hearing Officer does not comment upon this evidence in any specific way. Again, if there were any questions concerning the veracity of the statements in those documents, the Hearing Officer should have asked for personal appearances. The Regional Personnel Officer, who was supposed to appear and who figured prominently in the machinations relating to the transfer
orders, failed to appear. His presence should have been required.

The Hearing Officer states that Director Volz ordered the transfer to Omaha because an emergency situation existed. The Hearing Officer records that he accepts the testimony of Director Volz that he was faced with an emergency situation brought about by the Environmental Policy Act of 1969. It appears that Director Volz's connotation in using the term emergency is one of such desperate circumstances that a quasi "draft" situation is justified. Yet no evidence was presented to indicate that the situation was or is in any way that severe. If the aggrieved had gone to Bighorn Canyon, would Director Volz have transferred him again after two weeks? An additional nearly identical Environmental Impact Specialist Position established in the Regional Office in the midst of this controversy was not filled by drafting the best qualified person. It was advertised throughout the Region and announced that the Regional Director was looking for someone willing and wanting to come to Omaha. What is the justification for such discriminatory treatment? Director Volz testified that there are undoubtedly others in the Service who could do the same job. There are even others in Glacier with more experience and expertise in preparing and reviewing EISs than the aggrieved employee. There is no evidence that any particular individual was indispensable in the position to which the aggrieved employee was ordered. During the past year a number of employees in Glacier have rejected transfers. They have not been ordered to transfer. Why was the aggrieved employee subjected to such discriminatory treatment?

The Hearing Officer recommends that review of the qualifications of the aggrieved employee's training, personal wants and health be made with a view to retransfer at the earliest possible date. The Director then states this will be done after two years in Omaha. The aggrieved employee had been in a new assignment as Naturalist for only five months when served with the transfer order to Bighorn Canyon and then Omaha. There are at least two inconsistencies apparent here. Why is it important to make such a reevaluation only after a transfer and only after two years? It would seem that such a reevaluation would be in order now. Such evaluations are supposedly made annually, according to existing written personnel management policy. It is illogical that such considerations are unimportant now, but would suddenly become important after two years in Omaha.

Secondly, the effect of such incessant shuffling upon one's family and upon the efficiency of National Park management is profound. The effect of interminable moving on family life is now well documented in "A Nation of Strangers," by Vance Packard. The effect on park resources is more elusive. A love of the land in a particular place and a feeling for and understanding of unique resources do not develop in a brief year or two. In large national parks, such as Glacier, a minimum of five years or so is necessary before an understanding sufficient for sensitive management recommendations on complex problems can be expected. Every large national park needs at least a few rangers with more than transient experience. It appears from the record that the Hearing Officer was in fact giving the agency the opportunity to reevaluate this transfer now and reconsider the elements listed. The opportunity was apparently neither welcomed nor accepted by the agency. The Hearing Officer states: "The primary function of the Resources Management Ranger in Glacier National Park appears to have been planning and the Superintendent found the management plans of McClelland substantially completed and ready for probable implementation." This is given as the basic justification for abolishment of that position. A careful review of the position description for that job and the testimony in the transcript reveals this justification for abolishing the position is not supported by evidence. It was in fact a sham.

Two pieces of evidence strongly support this contention: a) The job description makes it clear that planning was only one small facet of the position. Of the many plans being prepared, only one, the Resources Management Plan, was substantially complete. b) Identical positions exist in Rocky Mountain, Yellowstone, and Grand Teton National Parks. Resources management plans for these areas were prepared and completed even before the
Glacier's plan. Yet none of these jobs was abolished. The incumbents remain deeply involved in continuing long-term resource management activities in their respective parks. The Glacier position was intended to contribute to the long-term continuity of resource management in the same way.

Reference to the documents relating to the establishment of the position (included in the grievance file with cover memorandum dated August 22, 1972) proves this contention. Abolishment of the Resources Management position was a clear abuse of managerial prerogative, contrary to recommendations by three management appraisals conducted during Superintendent Briggle's tenure, and with the sole intention of eliminating the aggrieved employee from that position and as rapidly as possible from the park. It was an action motivated by the desire to eliminate an outspoken employee whose quality of work was not in question and who could not be "reached" by legitimate means. It was an action clearly not "for the good of the Service." It was, however, not without precedent. Earlier in Superintendent Briggle's tenure an Aquatic Research Biologist position was abolished to remove an individual. Shortly after his transfer, management attempted to reestablish the position. Position "Abolishment" has become a tool to expel employees whose work is of good quality, but who have been branded by management as "political" undesirables.

Indicative of the self-contradictory nature of the Hearing Officer's findings are the incompatible statements: "The record does contain more than a little evidence tending to substantiate the employee's contentions." and "However, the evidence ... was meager and not developed." Regulation 771.310j states: "The decision on the grievance shall be in writing and shall contain findings on all issues covered by the examiner's inquiry. Yet no comment is contained in either the Hearing Officer's findings or the Director's memorandum relating to several key points. The order of reassignment to Bighorn Canyon is not mentioned. Yet this preceded the Omaha order and was rescinded, according to Director Volz, only because he established a new position in the Regional Office into which he could transfer the aggrieved employee. Certainly this point makes it clear that the objective of the scheme was a transfer, the whereabouts was a detail of lesser importance, except that it should apparently be undesirable to the aggrieved employee.

Superintendent Briggle asked the Regional Office to transfer the aggrieved employee, but he did not so inform the employee. Superintendent Briggle then placed comments on the aggrieved employee's personnel form (10-143), recommending transfer of the employee to the Regional Office. This represented an after-the-fact attempt by Superintendent Briggle to "cover" and document his earlier actions. The aggrieved employee had never seen these comments prior to their production at the hearing. If personnel management forms (10-143) asking an employee to state career goals, registers, and positions in which he is interested, family and health considerations, are totally ignored and meaningless, it would seem appropriate to discontinue all such irrelevancies. An honest approach would be to notify all employees that agency supervisors will assign employees as they see fit "for the good of the Service." Current and prospective NFS employees would then be fully informed that agency policy has changed from one ostensibly of sensitivity, fairness, and acknowledgment of individuality, to one of subservience.

Neither the Hearing Officer nor the Director commented upon family health problems which bear directly upon the aggrieved employee's inability to move to Omaha, Nebraska. The agency contends that these considerations are "trumped up" as Attorney Robbins put it. It is sufficiently demeaning to be forced into a situation in which personal health problems must be detailed and then be accused of lying. To be told that such health considerations are of no consequence and have no significant bearing on assignment of any employee is an incredible affront to human dignity. Medical documentation is included in the grievance file. The aggrieved employee has personally never experienced or heard of such callous disregard for family welfare before in this agency.
The Regional Director's use of the exception to the Servicewide Career Development and Placement Plan is invalid. It is convenient to have an escape clause which permits a manager to bypass a plan which otherwise offers built-in equity for employees in matters of transfer and promotion. The Hearing Officer only comments that transfer of the aggrieved employee was ordered under this exception. He makes no comment relating to the contention that this action does not even represent a legitimate use of this exception. The aggrieved employee contends that the Omaha position did clearly have known promotional potential, as shown by the subsequent solicitation by the Regional Director for someone interested in an almost identical position, as GS-11/12, and thus should have fallen under the requirements of the Servicewide Plan. It is also curious that with the aggrieved employee's supposedly "outstanding qualifications and unique talents" and the fact that his talents were "under-utilized" in Glacier, he did not merit consideration for a promotion. But, of course, if considered for promotion, adherence to the Servicewide plan would have been mandatory. The employee has no interest in promotion, only in equity. It is evident that this exception was used arbitrarily and without justification for the purpose of implementing a punitive transfer.

4. Informal attempts to resolve the grievance were conducted in bad faith on the part of the agency.

The aggrieved employee and his wife were asked to meet with two high-ranking NPS officials in Denver, Colorado, in May. They did so, paying for the wife's air fare themselves. The discussion was cordial and both parties (Messrs. Garrison and Zollar) stated that they would recommend to the Director, who had assigned them the task of investigating the grievance, reinstatement of the aggrieved employee in Glacier. The Director did not accept this recommendation, or perhaps they did not make it, but the aggrieved employee and spouse left Denver in good faith with the full belief that a settlement had been reached and that he would be reinstated as requested. Other subsequent, apparently favorable, settlements also deteriorated until finally the Hearing Officer recommended affirmation of the transfer. This was a cruel sequence of events and demonstrated the basic intent of the original action was to either harass the aggrieved employee into submission or bulldoze him out of the National Park Service.

5. The affirmation of the transfer order to Omaha, Nebraska, is tantamount to initiation of an adverse action.

The aggrieved cannot and will not move his family to that location and has made this fact known to the Director, Midwest Region, since the transfer order was served upon the employee nearly one year ago. It appears that the real purpose of this transfer has been from the beginning, a surreptitious plot, initiated by Superintendent William Briggle, and implemented by Regional Director Volz and Regional Personnel Officer Pratt, to force the aggrieved employee either into an undesirable transfer or out of the National Park Service.

The aggrieved employee has made clear his willingness to accept a position of lower grade (even four grades lower) to remain in Glacier National Park. A GS-7 Park Ranger position will become vacant in June, when the incumbent retires. The National Park Service is in this case not determining whether the aggrieved can be more valuable in Omaha than in Glacier, but whether the agency's cherished prerogative to transfer is in this instance so sacred that he must be fired for refusing to accept a transfer that he can not accept in good conscience. Affirmation of the transfer order affirms that it is more logical not to use at all what Regional Director Volz refers to as the aggrieved employee's "outstanding qualifications and unique talents" if they cannot be used in Omaha. The logic of such a
decision is an enigma, particularly in light of the fact that the employee's performance in the position of Naturalist in Glacier National Park was rated excellent just prior to receipt of two separate orders to transfer.

**Conclusion:** If the aggrieved employee is considered by the agency to be guilty of misconduct of some kind, of contumacious behavior, or of failure to perform his assigned duties in a satisfactory manner, he should be so charged and action taken on these counts. The attempt to use transfer or being fired for refusal to transfer is an unjust and unconscionable means of disciplining any employee.

No employee attracted to the National Park Service by the altruistic and idealistic motivation of the National Park "idea" could live at peace within himself by quietly acquiescing to the inhuman and insensitive treatment characterized by the management actions which precipitated and accompanied this grievance. Rescinding this transfer is important not simply as a matter of fairness to the employee, but is in the best interests of the National Parks and National Park Service. The decision represents a clear choice of policy which will affect many NPS employees. Is the managerial privilege of transferring employees sacrosanct and available as a tool of intimidation and coercion? Are employees who experience and oppose irresponsible and illegal practices to be made so fearful of reprisal that they will not oppose such practices even within appropriate agency channels? Are employees to be permitted to retain their individuality? Are career goals, professional interests, employee and family health, and family stability now meaningless?

In this case management has abused the privilege of making transfers and reorganizing a park staff, by doing so in a capricious, discriminatory, and malevolent manner, the intent of which was the elimination of individuals, not the improved management of natural resources. The aggrieved employee respectfully requests that the order reassigning him to the Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska, be rescinded and that he be reinstated in any appropriate position for which he is qualified in Glacier National Park.

signed B. Riley McClelland

---


Don Marble revised and edited my input, added the necessary legalese, and filed a 27-page petition to the Secretary of Interior on 12 March 1973.
My “supervision,” as an employee of the Regional Office, continued to come from Ed Menning (EIS Coordinator in Omaha), who was responsible for assigning projects to me. In March, I was instructed to review the YNP Master Plan draft. I did so, and submitted a report. I received no feedback and this was clearly just an assignment to keep me busy.

13–21 April: I was instructed to make a trip to Rocky Mountain National Park, Colorado, “to make preparation for [an] Environmental Impact Statement.” In Rocky, I was briefed by Superintendent Roger Contor. Contor, formerly Assistant Regional Director in Omaha, had, in that capacity, been the first one to openly threaten me with being fired if I refused the transfer to Omaha. Now, as superintendent of Rocky, he was obviously very suspicious of me and had been alerted to make sure I didn’t — do what? I’m not sure what insidious things they thought that I might do. I was given a vehicle and sent off to “gather data” for the “Eagle Cliff Development Concept Plan” and the “Shadow Mountain Land Acquisition and Master Plan.” No one in the Service Center Office was willing to talk to me, afraid of being tainted, or accused of conspiracy I suppose.

In this regard, it is of public importance to note the way in which Superintendent Briggle made decisions on the preparation of EISs. While my agency and departmental grievance appeals were awaiting decision, I remained in GNP, working on the preparation of some of these statements, under the direct supervision of the Omaha Office. Briggle would, as a standard practice, decide what projects for which he wanted negative declarations prepared and which would have EISs. He would then select an employee to prepare an EA which was supposed to be written to justify his previous decision. Some personnel who were totally unqualified to prepare EAs or EISs were assigned to do so because they could be counted on to prepare justification statements. The Chief Engineer, e.g., prepared a Negative Declaration (a brief opinion statement, without research data, declaring that no significant impacts would be caused by a project) justifying the elimination of nesting cliff swallows from the St. Mary Visitor Center. This was accomplished by a maintenance crew knocking the nests (many with eggs) off of the structure. He also prepared an EIS justifying a major sewage effluent spray field within the riparian zone of Lower McDonald Creek.

Statements which I prepared were heavily edited by Briggle (I was informed by the Regional Office that I was not allowed to speak directly to Briggle or any of his staff). In his editing, Briggle consistently eliminated discussions of adverse impacts which tended to show that alternatives to the proposal might be environmentally more acceptable. Briggle finally became so furious at my failure to produce straightforward statements of justification, rather than objective analysis of environmental impact, that he wrote to the Regional Office stating he would not assign me to any other project.

Briggle’s subversion of the NEPA process was the epitome of environmental irresponsibility. The tragedy was that so many were unwilling to oppose the travesty. The mess resulting from the Logan Pass Spray Field had taught the GNP hierarchy nothing. The big push now was to build spray fields at McDonald Creek and other areas of facility development. My opposition of course just added to Briggle’s malevolence toward me. Plant Ecologist Jim Habeck nicely summed up the spray field issue in the following Missoulian article (D-58):

...
Glacier to Take Sewage Beating

Poor old Glacier Park. It seems like it's going to again have to prepare itself to absorb another physical beating — at the hands of the park's own managers. I really wanted to believe that things in that park were going to get straightened out: Mr. Ron Walker, park service director, had indicated that outside management consulting and management reviews every two months were to be applied to Glacier's present administration.

Drafts of environmental impact statements for the proposed sewage treatment facilities in Glacier Park have recently been made available to the public. An examination of these reveals that the park might be in store for additional mismanagement. The sewage treatment plans are in three parts. My comments here refer to the plan designed for the Lake McDonald area. The plan proposes to collect the sewage from a variety of sites around Lake McDonald, and convey it to a treatment facility to be built near McDonald Creek, in the Apgar-West Glacier portion of the park. The treatment site's specific location is not clearly indicated, but from the general description, I can determine that it will be located in a place where it doesn't belong.

The site is on the McDonald Creek floodplain, in the same, exact area where large numbers of American bald eagles congregate annually in the fall. It is the same area that William Briggles, Glacier's superintendent, had just recently declared as a major visitor viewpoint. The nutrient-rich waste water resulting from the first-stage treatment will be sprayed on the vegetation near McDonald Creek. The current use of the area is as a summer horse pasture. This has been a clearly inappropriate use of national park land in the first place, but to spray sewage waste water over the same area is an added insult.

In theory the nutrients in the waste water are to be taken up by the plants, and perhaps most of the first amounts will be. But with continual spraying of waste water a point will be reached wherein the plants, if not continually harvested, will not take up more nutrients. Success in this method of sewage treatment has been documented on agricultural croplands and on golf courses. The idea of using vegetation as a "living filter" in sewage treatment allows for the possibility of doing this away from waterways that might become polluted. Imagine what your lawn would look like if you applied liquid fertilizer each day of the summer, but never cut the tremendous grass growth. The only stated plan for harvesting the abundant plant growth of the spray field site is to have horses graze on it. It should seem obvious to the park biologists that even the horses will recycle the nutrients. Mr. Briggles and his staff officers keep failing to grasp one of the most fundamental ideas of ecology: In ecosystems, everything goes somewhere.

The solution to sewage treatment in the Glacier Park area is to think in terms of regional treatment. On many sides of the park, the summer visitors swell the population and the sewage levels. The park is responsible for 1.3 million people being in the area. A sewage treatment plant ought to be built outside the park, and designed to handle all of the sewage generated in the region. West Glacier has a golf course that might be benefitted by the nutrient rich waste water. The park service has paid out hundreds of thousands of dollars for an "engineer's" solution to sewage pollution; all that was needed fundamentally was an application of several very simple ecological concepts. It is possible to alter the proposed plans if concerned citizens act now. Voice your complaints to the Glacier Park administration and send copies to your congressmen.

— James R. Habeck, 200 Agnes Ave., Missoula.

In Spring 1973, as we were preparing to be evicted from the Park, we made arrangement with Martha Sloan (Secretary of Chief Ranger Ruben Hart) to rent a small house that she owned. The house was about one mile west of West Glacier and two or three hundred feet from the Middle Fork. It would have been a pleasant place for the family. As we were making preparations for the move, Martha contacted me on the phone; she seemed to be in a frantic state of mind. She said that her boss (Chief Ranger Hart) had just told her that Superintendent Briggle had informed him that if she rented her house to me, thereby facilitating my remaining in the area, she would lose her job. Chief Ranger Hart passed that onto Martha as a simple fact without recourse. Martha told me that she simply could not afford to lose her job and that she would have to back out of our agreement. I didn’t blame Martha. It was and is hard to imagine a park superintendent with such sleazy moral character.

We then developed a plan to build a one-room basement cabin on a 100 feet by 200 feet lot that we purchased from Dick and Sharon Rensel, about 3/4 mile west of West Glacier.

18 May: In the midst of the chaos in GNP, the NPS announced that Superintendent Briggle was presented with a Meritorious Service Citation by Regional Director Volz.

24 May: Regional Director Volz phoned informing me that our appeal to the Secretary of Interior had been denied (denial written on 21 May) in a three-page memorandum. It contained several strange and distressing statements:

"We will not comment separately on each of the points raised in that paper (petition), except to note generally that your statements imputing error and unfairness to the hearing and decision making processes have been found to be without substance."

John McKune, Director, Organization and Personnel Management, signed the appeal denial for the Department of Interior. He further wrote:

"... questions going to the wisdom of the contested reassignment in terms of the Glacier National Park program, and various environmental/ecological matters discussed at the hearing and in the press, are beyond the scope of the grievance procedure and this decision."

No specific comments were made refuting the points we made in the appeal. The fox had simply ruled the fox did not kill the chickens. One can only conclude that there is no system of checks and balances in the environmental management of a national park. Park administrators are authorized to do what they then choose to do and park employees have no effective channels of protest.
United States Department of the Interior
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
MIDWEST REGION
1709 JACKSON STREET
OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68102
MAY 24 1973

Memorandum

To: B. Riley McClelland, Glacier National Park
From: Director, Midwest Region
Subject: Reassignment and Physical Move to Midwest Regional Office

This confirms our telephone conversation on the morning of May 24, 1973, in which I advised you of the Department's decision in the matter of your grievance. On May 21, 1973, Mr. John F. McKune, Director of Organization and Personnel Management, Department of the Interior, wrote your attorney, Mr. Donald R. Marble, relating the detailed decision. Essentially, the decision affirms previous decisions in the National Park Service that the contentions of your grievance are not supported and that your reassignment and directed move to the Midwest Regional Office is proper.

In our May 24 conversation, I advised you to report for duty in the Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska, on Monday, June 11, 1973. Please report at my office at 8:00AM on that day. You will continue in your position of Park Ranger (Environmental Impact Specialist), GS-025-11, in the Office of the Assistant Director for Cooperative Activities.

Please provide me with a written statement concerning the arrangements you are making to physically move here. We welcome you to Omaha and look forward to your continued involvement in the challenges of this important aspect of our work.

Director, Midwest Region

4 June: I received a notice from Briggle, evicting us from park housing within 10 days.
6 June: Received a formal notification of “Change in Duty Station” from the Regional Office, ordering me to physically move to Omaha. I received a telegram from Regional Director stating that if I did not report for duty in Omaha by 12 June, I would be A.W.O.L. and a removal from the NPS would be initiated. The following memo was also received from the Superintendent (D-60):

---

**Memorandum**

**TO**: B. Riley McClelland  
**FROM**: Superintendent, Glacier  
**DATE**: June 6, 1973

**SUBJECT**: Travel Order

The Travel Authority covering your transfer to the Midwest Regional Office is enclosed.

Please check in government-owned equipment or material not later than 5:00 p.m., Friday, June 8.

A copy of the inventory of items for which the Warehouse has you charged is enclosed for your ready reference. A check-out sheet for clearance by other park offices is also enclosed.

---

William J. Briggle

---


I wrote the following response (D-61):
Director, Midwest Region  
Glacier National Park  
West Glacier, Montana 59936

Memorandum  
June 6, 1973

To: Director, Midwest Region  
From: Environmental Specialist, Glacier  
Subject: Order to physically move to Omaha, Nebraska

In your memorandum of May 24, 1973, you instructed, “please provide me with a written statement concerning the arrangements you are making to physically move here.” This is my reply to that instruction. While the Director and more recently the Department have upheld the decision to reassign me to Omaha, it remains my incontrovertible conviction that this transfer is arbitrary, capricious, and illegal. The transfer is not for “the good of the Service.” I refer you to my petition of appeal and supporting brief for more detail.

In addition, I have made it quite clear to you from the onset of this lengthy imbroglio, that I can not and will not move to Omaha, Nebraska, for professional reasons and for reasons of personal and family health. It is of absolutely no consolation to me nor to my family that you, the Hearing Officer, the Director, and the Department believe that those reasons are not sufficient. I intend to immediately prosecute action with the Civil Service Commission, in view of the refusal of the Department to reverse the decision and also in view of the fact that my employment duties have been changed since April 1972.

I have performed, as the record shows, a dedicated and creditable job in the National Park Service for nearly 18 years, which has included many sacrifices “for the good of the Service.” This transfer calls for a sacrifice beyond what I can give. Accordingly, I can not accept reassignment to Omaha, Nebraska and can not report there on June 11, as you have ordered. I am not abandoning my position in any way. This memorandum gives you notice of that point. I am refusing for legitimate reasons to accept a transfer to Omaha, Nebraska.

In lieu thereof, I would be willing to accept any of the following compromise solutions:

a. Demotion to GS-9 Park Ranger position now vacant in Glacier National Park.
b. Demotion to Park Ranger position to be vacated by retirement in mid-June.
c. Continue to function in the capacity of Environmental Specialist working for the Regional Office, but with duty station in Glacier National Park, as I have done for the past 14 months.

If your intent is to separate me from the Service, please forward a notice of adverse action immediately.

cc: signed B. Riley McClelland
Senator Lee Metcalf  
Representative Richard G. Shoup  
Ronald H. Walker, Director, National Park Service  
William J. Briggle, Superintendent, Glacier National Park  
Donald R. Marble, Attorney at Law  


On the 7th, my reporting date to Omaha was shifted one day, from the 11th to the 12th, to give me “ample” time to get there.

Also on the 7th, I received the following letter (D-62):
June 7, 1973

Mr. B. Riley McClelland
P.O. Box 366
West Glacier, Montana 59936

Dear Riley:

The National Park Service has forwarded to me a copy of the letter sent to your lawyer, Donald R. Marble, on the Department's final decision in your case.

It is unfortunate that you were caught in a combination of circumstances in which the present outcome seemed inevitable. The Administrative Law Judge made several observations in his report, regarding not only the management practices at the park but also the roll back of permanent positions being effectuated.

I am sorry things could not have worked out more to your satisfaction. It is my hope, however, that the atmosphere at Glacier Park will improve for the benefit of the workers as well as the visitors. I think your efforts toward this end will be a major contribution.

I wish you every success in your future work.

Sincerely yours,

Jerry T. Verkler

June 7, 1973

Mr. William J. Briggle
Superintendent
Glacier National Park
West Glacier, Montana 59936

Re: 73-156; McClelland v. National Park

Dear Mr. Briggle:

As you know, I represent Riley McClelland in his appeal with the National Park Service. I have received your memorandum of June 4, 1973, to Riley advising that he has to vacate quarters No. 16 within ten days from this date or on June 14, 1973. You have by now received his memorandum of June 6, 1973, which advises that he is not willing to move to Denver and that he desires adverse action proceedings to be started if this is your decision.

Use of these quarters is an integral part of employment at Glacier National Park. Eviction before filing of an adverse action proceeding against my client will subvert the concept of adverse action proceedings which has been passed by Congress protecting individuals such as Riley McClelland. If my client is forced to move from these quarters, his rights of appeal under the Civil Service Laws will be effectively subverted.

I have therefore advised Mr. McClelland not to vacate or clean out his desk as suggested. Any problems or injuries caused by attempts to move him, his wife and five children bodily will be the sole responsibility of the U. S. Government and dealt with accordingly. If you intend to proceed with the eviction, suspension of pay, and removal of office privileges before completion of an adverse action proceeding, please so advise me so we can institute Court proceedings.

Very truly yours,

BUNN & MARBLE

By

Donald R. Marble

cc/ B. Riley McClelland
Ronald H. Walker, Director, N.P.S.
Senator Lee Metcalf
Representative Richard G. Shoup
Robert Nogler, AFGE National Representative
Montana Wilderness Association

On 15 June, Don Marble received the following letter (D-64):

Midwest Region  
1709 Jackson Street  
Omaha, Nebraska 68102  
JUNE 13, 1973

NONSECURITY CONFIDENTIAL  
Mr. Donald R. Marble  
Bunn & Marble  
Westland Building  
Chester, Montana 59522  

Dear Mr. Marble:

This is in response to your letter to Mr. William J. Briggle, Superintendent, Glacier National Park, of June 7, 1973, RE: 73-156; McClelland v. National Park.

The use of National Park Service quarters is not directly or indirectly related to adverse action laws and regulations established for Federal employees. Quarters are assigned to employees based on the needs of the National Park Service. As of June 10, 1973, the official duty station of Mr. B. Riley McClelland was Omaha, Nebraska, and he was to report for work in Omaha on June 12. In view of this circumstance, and Mr. McClelland’s agreement to vacate his quarters upon ten (10) days written notice as evidenced by his signature on Form 10-375, Assignment of Public Quarters, dated 11/26/72, we cannot justify the continuing use of Quarters No. 16 by Mr. McClelland. Therefore, he has been advised to vacate those quarters by June 14, 1973. However, at the present time we have no plans to physically remove Mr. McClelland from the quarters nor to deprive him of the use of office space, although he has no right to remain in the quarters after ten (10) days following the notice to vacate. This notice period expires June 14. His removal from National Park Service quarters would not violate Civil Service law or regulation and his removal from quarters is not an action that can be appealed to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McClelland was advised that his duty station is Omaha, Nebraska, effective June 10. Officially he does not have an office at Glacier National Park and he does not have work to perform at the Park as of that date. He has appealed through the grievance procedure the merits of the case involving his reassignment and change of duty station to Omaha. His directed reassignment was found proper at each level of the grievance consideration. This date we are sending to Mr. McClelland and to you as his representative, a notice of proposed adverse action. We propose to separate Mr. McClelland from employment with the National Park Service because of his failure to accept reassignment and change of duty station to Omaha. Because he has not entered on duty in Omaha as directed, he is being carried on our rolls in a non-pay status (Absent Without Leave), effective June 12, 1973. If he desires to have annual leave for this period he may request such leave from the Director, Midwest Region. Any future correspondence relating to this case should be addressed to the Director, Midwest Region.

Sincerely yours,

signed Merrill D. Beal  
Acting Director, Midwest Region

cc: B. Riley McClelland,  
Ronald H. Walker, Director, National Park Service  
Richard G. Robbins, Office of the Solicitor, Dept. of the Interior

D-64. Letter from Acting Regional Director Beal to Attorney Marble, 13 June 1973.

Dr. Jim Habeck's Opinion Piece in the Missoulian follows (D-65):
He Deserves Support

A recent news report, originating from Denver (June 11) indicated that a top official from the Department of Interior refused to respond to the suggestion that there has been a "cover-up" operation in the Briggle-McClelland case within the National Park Service.

Recent information that has come my way suggests to me that some sort of strange goings on have occurred that may well be an attempt to hide or cloud the true facts in the Glacier Park controversy.

I recently supplied the Park Service with an evaluation of a set of environmental impact statements prepared for the proposed sewage treatment facilities in Glacier Park. In the course of my studies, I discovered that other national parks in the northern Rocky Mountains are also planning sewage treatment facilities, but none of these other parks is developing and submitting impact statements for public review. Only Glacier Park's managers are required to do this.

The regional director of the Park Service informed me that Glacier's projects were judged to have potential controversy surrounding them, and this was one of the main reasons for requiring the extra work and public involvement. Since the other national parks in the Rockies have similar mountainous terrain, construction projects in these parks should also be carefully studied for adverse environmental impact. But only Glacier Park is getting this type of attention. Why?

The "potential controversy" involved in Glacier's projects is really related to the fact that William Briggle, Glacier's superintendent, is in charge of the projects. Thousands of extra dollars have been spent to "safeguard" the management decisions made by Mr. Briggle, and to reduce the possibility of further public outcry of park mismanagement. Other park superintendents have been allowed to proceed without the extra studies being made.

It appears to me that Leonard Volz, regional park director (Omaha), has actually assessed Mr. Briggle's abilities the same way as has Riley McClelland, who is currently being kicked out of the Park Service for voicing his opinions about Mr. Briggle's management abilities. The Park Service obviously does not have the same confidence in Mr. Briggle as it does in its other park superintendents. If this is the case, why is Mr. Briggle allowed to remain in charge of Glacier Park?

The most likely reason is simply to save face. In spite of the fact that Glacier's management is reviewed each 60 days, and other parks only once a year, the effort is being made to protect the "image" of Glacier's administration. The worst part of this protection scheme is the need to get rid of Riley McClelland. The facts in this case, as they gradually emerge to the public, fully support the contentions voiced by Mr. McClelland during the past two years. The Park Service counts on the public not wanting to get itself involved. Western Montanans should, however, realize that Riley McClelland is the best friend that Glacier Park has ever had, and come to his support—James R. Habeck, 200 Agnes Ave., Missoula.


27 July: I was separated (a euphemism for fired) from the NPS for failure to move to Omaha, Nebraska. All of these machinations were the work of Superintendent William J. Briggle. He was the only NPS person I ever encountered that seemed to be absent a conscience (i.e., he was malicious and caused unnecessary pain and harm in the process of enhancing his personal power). He was a successful sycophant, able to cleverly work the system to his own advantage. People that I knew, who had worked with him in YNP, said he was generally inept in the field, but was smooth in concealing his weaknesses and cultivated people with political influence. This often is the type of individual who is rapidly promoted beyond his level of competence (Peter and Hull [1969]; Townsend [1970]).
Then came the coup de grace from Regional Director Volz (D-66):

**United States Department of the Interior**

**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

**MIDWEST REGION**

**1709 JACKSON STREET**

**OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68102**

**JUL 2 0 1973**

**NONSECURITY CONFIDENTIAL**

Memorandum

**To:** Mr. B. Riley McClelland, Park Ranger (Environmental Impact Specialist), Office of the Assistant Director for Cooperative Activities, Division of Federal Assistance and Indian Liaison, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska

**Through:** Superintendent, Glacier National Park

**From:** Regional Director, Midwest Region

**Subject:** Decision to Remove

By memorandum, dated June 13, 1973, I informed you that I proposed to remove you from your position of Park Ranger (Environmental Impact Specialist), GS-025-11, Office of the Assistant Director for Cooperative Activities, Division of Federal Assistance and Indian Liaison, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska, no earlier than 30 calendar days from the date you received the notice. The reason for my proposal was your failure to accept reassignment and change of duty station from your position as Supervisory Park Ranger (Interpretive Specialist Naturalist), Glacier National Park, Division of Interpretation and Visitor Services, West Glacier, Montana, to Park Ranger (Environmental Impact Specialist), Office of the Assistant Director for Cooperative Activities, Division of Federal Assistance and Indian Liaison, Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, Nebraska.

I have given full consideration to the information in your written answer, dated July 6, 1973. I have considered your pleadings in the grievance record, your suggestions for alternate assignments, your various allegations of procedural errors, and the several equitable considerations raised in your written reply.

After having given full consideration to each point in your reply of July 6, 1973, I find that the reason stated in my notice of proposed removal, dated June 13, 1973, is fully supported by your
refusal and failure to accept the reassignment and change of duty station and warrants your removal to promote the efficiency of the service. Therefore, it is my decision that you be removed effective July 27, 1973.

You have a right to appeal this decision to the Director, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 20240, or to the Regional Director, Denver Region, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Building 20, Denver Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225.

If you appeal first to the U.S. Civil Service Commission, you will have no right thereafter to appeal to the Director, National Park Service. In order for your appeal to be considered by the Commission it must (1) be in writing, (2) give your reasons for contesting your removal with such offer of proof and pertinent documents as you are able to submit, and (3) be submitted to the Commission no later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of your removal.

If you appeal first to the Director, National Park Service, you will not be entitled to appeal to the Commission until after a decision on your appeal to the National Park Service is made. If however, no decision on the appeal has been made within 60 days after it was filed, you could elect to terminate your appeal to the National Park Service by appealing to the Commission. An appeal to the Director, National Park Service, must (1) be in writing, (2) give the basis for your appeal, (3) state whether you desire a hearing in connection with the appeal, and (4) be submitted no later than 15 calendar days after the effective date of your removal.

In any appeal, you may represent yourself or you may have the aid of a representative of your choice. You may obtain further information from the Personnel Officer, Glacier National Park, concerning your appeal rights.

Please sign and date in the spaces provided on the copy of this memorandum indicating that you have received it.

[Signature]
Regional Director, Midwest Region

D-66. Concluded.

4 August: We moved from Park House #16 to a one-room basement cabin we had just completed (I-49), on a 100 by 200 feet lot (purchased from the Rensels) one mile west of West Glacier. Our family (seven of us, plus dog Laddie and cat Harmonica) was a tight fit. It would be our summer home for the next 9 years. We accessed the cabin by driving to Rensel’s house, then one-quarter mile north under the power line. Lundgrens, who owned what would have been the logical and much shorter route, would not give us an access easement. For six years (until September 1979) we had no water source at the cabin; in the summer we filled 5-gallon plastic containers at a public drinking fountain in West Glacier. During fall, winter, and spring we brought water from our home in Missoula or the source in Badrock Canyon. In summers, we set up a tent platform about 80 feet from the cabin and put our camping tent on it. That became the bedroom for Mary T. and Jane (I-50).