



TO: Personnel Board

FROM: Emaan Abdel-Halim, Human Resources

DATE: 25 May 2016

SUBJECT: Park Ranger Program – Parks Division

At the request of Parks Superintendent, Eric Knepp, and Parks Assistant Superintendent, Charlie Romines, a position study was conducted to review and analyze the job classifications (both permanent and hourly) within the Parks Ranger Program. This study included determining the salary placement for a new classification of Park Ranger Leadworker (CG16, Range XX); an evaluation of Recreation Services Assistant (CG16, Range 10, Working Title: Park Ranger) to determine the appropriate classification title and placement in the salary schedule; and creating new hourly classifications of Park Ranger 1 and 2 (Hourly) to replace the Park Ranger Program seasonal positions (#s 1371 & 1361) in the current classifications of Conservation Ranger 1 & 2 (Hourly). Parks has raised concern that the current classifications of Recreation Services Assistant and Conservation Ranger (Hourly) do not appropriately describe the work performed and when the public searches for the Park Rangers, they are unable to find this information on the HR website because of these titles.

This study included review of the respective position descriptions, classification specifications and several discussions including Mr. Knepp; Mr. Romines; Josh Schmitt, Recreation Services Coordinator – Rangers and Aquatics (direct supervisor for the Park Ranger program); as well as the three (3) incumbents of the permanent, part-time Recreation Services Assistant/Park Ranger positions. I also reviewed the comparable classifications of Parking Enforcement Officer (CG16, Range 11), Parking Enforcement Leadworker (CG 16, Range 13) and discussed the distinctions with Ms. Stephanie Neisen, Parking Enforcement Supervisor. Based on the analysis of the position study, I recommend the following actions:

- Create a new classification of Park Ranger Leadworker in CG 16, Range 12.
- Delete the classification of Recreation Services Assistant in CG16, R10, and create a new Park Ranger classification in CG16, Range 10. Reallocate the Recreation Services Assistant incumbents (T. Bierberstien #3823, C. Jauch #4445, & S. Larson #4006) to the new classification of Park Ranger, in the same CG and Range.
- Create new classifications of Park Ranger 1 and 2 (Hourly) to remain in the same pay range of the hourly salary schedule (CG16, Range 00), with the Park Ranger 1 at an hourly rate of \$15.26 and the Park Ranger 2 at an hourly rate of \$16.80. Reallocate incumbents (A. Bowman, V. Fisher, M. Harmatys, W. Jackson, K. Olsen, E. Rivera, K. Rohlfig, A.Thimmig, D. Walker) to the new classifications.

The Park Ranger program is composed of three permanent 0.75 FTE Park Rangers and up to 9 seasonal staff who are charged with providing visitor services and enforcement of parks regulations at over 260 City of Madison parks. These services primarily include cash collection and transactions for various park permits, including dog parks, disc golf (added in 2013), boat launch, etc. With the addition of and increased use of several parks in recent years – 4 new dog parks, a central skate park, and several splash pads - the Park Rangers have more locations to patrol and collect permit fees. Additionally, with the Park Rangers scheduled late on weekday evenings and all weekends, they are a primary point of contact for any Parks emergency or maintenance issues that arise during their shifts. The Park Rangers' enforcement responsibilities range from park regulation education to issuance of violations/citations and up to

bans from City parks. Initially, the Park Rangers' enforcement responsibility focused primarily on educating the public on Park regulations. Over time there has been a shift to issuing more citations related to violations of the Parks regulations. In 2012, several dozen municipal citations were added the enforcement duties within the Park Ranger Program.

Given the enforcement nature of the role of Park Rangers, placement of these positions in the classification of Recreation Services Assistant does not accurately describe the responsibilities of the work. As mentioned earlier, this distinction creates issues for the Parks Division as it appears the City does not have a Park Ranger program. One objective of this study is to create a classification structure that correctly describes the roles in the program as a whole. This applies to the permanent positions as well as the hourly staff in the program. Currently, the seasonal Park Rangers are classified as Conservation Ranger 1 or 2, which is a classification that is also used by the Conservation section of the Parks Division. Both the Recreation Services Assistant and Conservation Ranger classifications are misnomers for the Park Ranger program. Therefore the recommendation is to recreate the permanent classification of Recreation Services Assistant as Park Ranger, and to create a new classification for the hourly positions of Park Ranger 1-2 (Hourly) with no change to the hourly pay rate in the salary schedule.

It is clear that the title for the Recreation Services Assistant should be changed to Park Ranger to better reflect the nature of the work. However, a second question is whether the Park Ranger is appropriately classified in CG16, Range 10. A review of the class specification for the new Park Ranger classification indicates the work:

... is **responsible work** representing the Madison Parks Division and the City of Madison in **direct contact with the community often requiring independent judgment in difficult situations**. Areas of responsibility include **customer service, cash management, parks rules and city ordinance enforcement**, as well as routine custodial and maintenance, and coordination of seasonal staff. Work also includes **providing services to park users**, including first aid as required. Under the supervision of the Recreation Services Coordinator, **work is performed independently** and involves direct citizen contact, at times under stressful circumstances, requiring **the ability to mitigate conflict tactfully while maintaining personal and public safety**. [emphasis added]

For comparison, a review of the class specification for the Parking Enforcement Officer (CG16, Range 11) describes the work as:

... **responsible uniformed work in the enforcement of City parking ordinances** for the Police Department. **Working under the limited supervision** of the Parking Enforcement Supervisor, employees are assigned walking or driving beats to enforce overtime violations, illegal parking, improper use of special permits and related violations. Work involves **considerable judgment and discretion** in taking enforcement actions and/or providing related information/clarifications. Employees also **identify abandoned or stolen vehicles and vehicles with outstanding warrants and initiate appropriate action to include towing/impoundment**. Work involves performing **a variety of standard recordkeeping and reporting activities**. Hours will vary, to include weekend, day, evening, and night shifts, as well as Special Events. [emphasis added]

In evaluating the placement for the Park Rangers, both positions have a direct line of communication with Madison Police Department as needed for call requests and backup. Both positions also include a significant training responsibility and oversight of seasonal, hourly staff. Both positions require similar enforcement duties; however the Parking Enforcement Officers have over 150 various municipal citations that may be issued, which requires a higher degree of knowledge of various City of Madison ordinances that may be violated. Park Rangers have the authority to issue tickets for specific Parks violations; as well as several dozen municipal

citations. Furthermore, the Parking Enforcement Officers have an investigative function related to parking fraud. This requires the officer to identify and investigate possible suspects and suspect vehicles that may fraudulently be using disabled tags to park illegally. Given the comparison of the classifications, I found the Park Ranger salary placement appropriate at CG 16, Range 10; maintaining a one range gap from the Parking Enforcement Officers due to the larger scope of enforcement responsibilities and investigative reporting functions at the higher level.

In addition to looking at the existing classifications, the Parks Division is requesting creation of a Leadworker to assist with the administrative end of the program. The Recreation Services Coordinator – Rangers and Aquatics, Josh Schmitt, works a schedule of Friday-Monday, with 10 hour days each week. However, as noted earlier, the Park Rangers work 7 days a week while the Parks are open to the public. As a result, it is important for the program to have a Leadworker to coordinate the Park Rangers when Mr. Schmitt is not working. I agree that a Leadworker is appropriate and recommend creating the new classification of Park Ranger Leadworker and adding a position of Park Ranger Leadworker to the Parks Division budget.

Next is the evaluation of the proposed new classification of Park Ranger Leadworker to determine the appropriate salary placement. Again, looking to the Parking Enforcement program, there is a Parking Enforcement Leadworker in CG16, R13, which is two ranges higher than the Parking Enforcement Officers discussed above. Noting that the Parking Enforcement Leadworker is responsible to perform all the work of a Parking Enforcement Officer, as well as performing administrative responsibilities for the Parking Enforcement program, the scope of the Parking Enforcement Leadworker is broader than the proposed Park Ranger Leadworker, for the same reasons discussed above. Placement of the Park Ranger Leadworker in CG16, Range 12 would be one range lower than the Parking Enforcement Leadworker, similar to the Park Ranger being one range lower than the Parking Enforcement Officer. In addition, placement in Range 12 would provide comparability with the Public Works Leadworker in Parks, who oversees work of permanent and seasonal staff in the Parks Division. As a result, I recommend placement of the Park Ranger Leadworker classification in CG16, Range 12.

The necessary resolutions to implement these recommendations have been drafted.

Editor's Note:

Compensation Group/Range	2016 Annual Minimum (Step 1)	2016 Annual Maximum (Step 5)	2016 Annual Maximum +12% longevity
16/10	\$45,939	\$51,419	\$57,590
16/12	\$48,753	\$54,085	\$60,575

cc: Eric Knepp – Superintendent, Parks
 Charlie Romines – Assistant Superintendent, Parks
 Kay Rutledge – Assistant Superintendent, Parks
 Josh Schmitt – Recreation Services Coordinator – Rangers and Aquatics
 Greg Leifer – Employee Relations Manager
 Mike Lipski – HR Services Manager