AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE NATIONAL PARKS: PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES AND THE NORTHEAST REGION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND HUMAN RESOURCES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

AUGUST 24, 2005

Serial No. 109–109

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Reform

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html
http://www.house.gov/reform

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

25–530 PDF WASHINGTON : 2006

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

TOM DAVIS, Virginia, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Connecticut
DAN BURTON, Indiana
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
CHRIS CANNON, Utah
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
DARRELL E. ISSA, California
GINNY BROWN-WAITE, Florida
JON C. PORTER, Nevada
KENNY MARCHANT, Texas
LYNN A. WESTMORELAND, Georgia
PATRICK T. MCHENRY, North Carolina
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California
TOM LANTOS, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
EDOLPHUS TOWNS, New York
PAUL E. KANJORSKI, Pennsylvania
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
DENNIS J. KUCINICH, Ohio
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
DIANE E. WATSON, California
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Maryland
LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

MELISSA WOJCIAK, *Staff Director*
DAVID MARIN, *Deputy Staff Director/Communications Director*
ROB BORDEN, *Parliamentarian/Senior Counsel*
TERESA AUSTIN, *Chief Clerk*
PHIL BARNETT, *Minority Chief of Staff/Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND HUMAN RESOURCES

MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana, *Chairman*

PATRICK T. MCHENRY, North Carolina
DAN BURTON, Indiana
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
GIL GUTKNECHT, Minnesota
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE, Ohio
CHRIS CANNON, Utah
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
GINNY BROWN-WAITE, Florida
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
DIANE E. WATSON, California
LINDA T. SANCHEZ, California
C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia

EX OFFICIO

TOM DAVIS, Virginia

HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

J. MARC WHEAT, *Staff Director*
BRANDON LERCH, *Professional Staff Member*
MARK PFUNDSTEIN, *Professional Staff Member*
MALIA HOLST, *Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on August 24, 2005	1
Statement of:	
Kennedy, Roger, National Council chairman, National Parks Conservation Association; Marilyn Fenollosa, National Trust for Historic Preservation; Ken Olson, president, Friends of Acadia National Park; and Lt. John McCauley, museum curator, Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts	29
Fenollosa, Marilyn	46
Kennedy, Roger	29
McCauley, Lt. John	57
Olson, Ken	52
McIntosh, Robert W., Associate Regional Director for Planning and Partnerships, Northeast Region, National Park Service	6
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Fenollosa, Marilyn, National Trust for Historic Preservation, prepared statement of	49
Kennedy, Roger, National Council chairman, National Parks Conservation Association, prepared statement of	31
McCauley, Lt. John, museum curator, Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts, prepared statement of	60
McIntosh, Robert W., Associate Regional Director for Planning and Partnerships, Northeast Region, National Park Service, prepared statement of	12
Olson, Ken, president, Friends of Acadia National Park, prepared statement of	55
Souder, Hon. Mark E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of	4

THE NATIONAL PARKS: PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES AND THE NORTHEAST REGION

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2005

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY,
AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Boston, MA.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in Faneuil Hall, Boston, MA, Hon. Mark E. Souder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representative Souder.

Staff present: Brandon Lerch and Mark Pfundstein, professional staff members.

Mr. SOUDER. Good morning and thank you all for joining us. This hearing is the third in a series of hearings about the critical issues facing the National Park Service.

Anyone with even a passing interest in the national parks is aware of the continuing pressures the National Park Service is facing. The National Park Service manages a diverse number of parks, seashores, historic sites, and lake shores. The Northeast region is a perfect example of this diversity. Acadia National Park, Cape Code National Seashore, and Minute Man National Historical Park are just a few of the NPS units in the region.

This hearing will examine northeast regional sites. The natural parks of the region provide recreational opportunities for millions of people. They preserve open spaces, and sustain a variety of wildlife, natural formations, and picturesque landscapes.

The northeast region is also home to a variety of cultural landmarks and historical sites. Just as natural parks provide benefits and inspiration to millions, historical sites offer a window to the past and help us relate to those who have come before us. Given Boston's role in our country's history, it is appropriate that we examine historical preservation in this most historic of cities.

The preservation of our historical and cultural heritage is one of the most important and challenging missions of the National Park Service. These sites represent our history and the story of our Nation. Preserving them is vital if we are going to pass our history to our children, grandchildren, and future generations.

Preservation, restoration, and maintenance of these sites is not cheap. It takes much time and money to keep them in operating

order, to make sure that they are safe, and to ensure that they can adequately convey their story and context in history.

All too often important artifacts are lost through neglect or purposeful destruction. When this occurs there is not much we can do to recover the site. Creating replicas of sites is possible, but they do not convey the same experience. It is imperative that we not let these sites be destroyed.

Acquiring and keeping these sites in good repair is a central mission of the National Park Service. Unfortunately, maintaining historical sites, particularly those acquired in poor condition, is expensive, and the National Park Service budget is tight. This hearing will examine how the National Park Service makes the decisions regarding these treasures.

Furthermore, no assessment of the Park Service can be complete without also speaking to outside groups. The groups represented here today are passionate about the national parks and historical preservation. They have been able to mobilize the public and keep them interested in these issues, sometimes for generations. They have unique perspectives and can inform us how to raise awareness among the public.

Today I am joined on the first panel by Robert W. McIntosh, the Associate Regional Director for Planning and Partnerships for the Northeast Region of the National Park Service and a veteran of these hearings who was at our first one in Gettysburg, and Michael Creasey, the Superintendent of the Lowell National Historical Park and Chair of the Granite Subcluster.

On the second panel I would also like to welcome my friend, Roger Kennedy, the National Council chairman of National Parks Conservation Association, and former director of the National Park Service, and famous author. Also, welcome to Marilyn Fenollosa of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and Ken Olson, the president of Friends of Acadia National Park. Our final witness on the second panel is Lt. John McCauley who is the museum curator for the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts.

Before I proceed with the process of this committee, a lot of times when we are doing field hearings I try to explain what the Government Reform Committee is and what this subcommittee is just briefly so those in attendance kind of understand what our role is.

In Congress we will have an authorizing committee that will do legislation so, for example, Parks legislation comes to the Resources Committee. The Appropriations Committee funds the actual budget. The Government Reform Committee then is to look at whether the funds that are appropriated and authorized are both being spent the way Congress intended them to be spent and whether or not there are things that either need to be changed through regulations, through laws, or through adequate funding questions.

Historically whenever we plunge into an issue, whether it be oversight of problems ranging from in the last administration our committee was most famous from everything from the Travel Office to Whitewater to China investigations. Most recently most people know us as asking Mark McGuire whether he had ever done steroids and him not being able to remember.

Whenever we do these different types of hearings, the authorizing committees somewhat have some concerns. The fact is the oversight committee existed in the early days of Congress before the authorizing committees. What we have been doing here systematically because though my Subcommittee is Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources and we have oversight over Justice Department, HHS, Department of Education, as well as Department of HUD, and any drug policy in any agency, also because of my personal interest in negotiating with other subcommittee chairmen was able to have national parks come under oversight of my subcommittee as well as a number of other issues.

One of the things we are doing is a systematic look at our entire National Park System and looking at it as we move toward our centennial, as we look at the various problems and pressures on the park system. This is the third of what will likely be a minimum of eight hearings around the country moving toward a 2-year report.

We did this a few years ago on Border and that became the fundamental report that we used as we created the Homeland Security Committee and the Border Subcommittee there and we want to do a strong analysis working with all the different groups as well that we can then try to discuss as we try to figure out what in Congress we need to do working with the administration on how best to preserve our national parks.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Mark E. Souder follows:]

Opening Statement
Chairman Mark Souder

"Historical Preservation and the Northeast Region"

Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy,
and Human Resources
Committee on Government Reform

24 August 2005

Good morning, and thank you all for joining us. This hearing is the third in a series of hearings about the critical issues facing the National Park Service.

Anyone with even a passing interest in the National Parks is aware of the continuing pressures the National Park Service is facing. The National Park Service manages a diverse number of parks, seashores, historic sites, and lakeshores. The Northeast region is a perfect example of this diversity. Acadia National Park, Cape Cod National Seashore, and Minute Man National Historical Park are just a few of the NPS units in the region.

This hearing will examine northeast regional sites. The natural parks of the region provide recreational opportunities for millions of people. They preserve open spaces, and sustain a variety of wildlife, natural formations, and picturesque landscapes.

The northeast region is also home to a variety of cultural landmarks and historical sites. Just as natural parks provide benefits and inspiration to millions, historical sites offer a window to the past and help us relate to those who have come before us. Given Boston's role in our country's history, it is appropriate that we examine historical preservation in this most historic of cities.

The preservation of our historical and cultural heritage is one of the most important and challenging missions of the National Park Service. These sites represent our history and the story of our nation. Preserving them is vital if we are going to pass our history to our children, grandchildren, and future generations.

Preservation, restoration, and maintenance of these sites is not cheap. It takes much time and money to keep them in operating order, to make sure that they are safe, and to ensure that they can adequately convey their story and context in history.

All too often important are lost through neglect or purposeful destruction. When this occurs there is not much we can do to recover the site. Creating replicas of sites is possible, but they do not convey the same experience. It is imperative that we not let these sites be destroyed.

Acquiring and keeping these sites in good repair is a central mission of the National Park Service. Unfortunately, maintaining historical sites, particularly those acquired in poor condition, is expensive, and the National Park Service budget is tight. This hearing will examine how the National Park Service makes the decisions regarding these treasures.

Furthermore, no assessment of the Park Service can be complete without also speaking to outside groups. The groups represented here today are passionate about the National Parks and historical preservation. They have been able to mobilize the public and keep them interested in these issues, sometimes for generations. They have unique perspectives and can inform us how to raise awareness among the public.

Today, I am joined on the first panel by Robert W. McIntosh, the Associate Regional Director for Planning and Partnerships for the Northeast Region of the National Park Service and Michael Creasey, the Superintendent of the Lowell National Historical Park and Chair of the Granite Subcluster.

On the second panel, I would also like to welcome Roger Kennedy, the National Council Chairman of National Parks Conservation Association, and former director of the National Park Service. Also, welcome to Marilyn Fenollosa of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and Ken Olson, the President of Friends of Acadia National Park. Our final witness on the second panel is Lt. John McCauley who the Museum Curator for the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts.

Mr. SOUDER. With that background, first let me do two procedural matters. I ask for unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to submit written statements and questions for the hearing record and that any answers to written questions provided by the witnesses also be included in the record. Without objection it is so ordered.

I would also ask unanimous consent that all exhibits, documents, and other materials referred to by Members may be included in the hearing record, that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks. Without objection it is so ordered. Those are procedural things we do with our field hearings.

Let me make one other comment. These hearings are very bipartisan. Mr. Cummings, ranking member and Democrat of this committee, couldn't be here with me today. He was with me yesterday at a field hearing on Meth in the Midwest.

The mere fact that we are holding this hearing without him present indicates this is a bipartisan effort and we are doing this in a pretty much completely unanimous way in our subcommittee and look forward to continuing to involve him and the other members of the subcommittee. That is not typical of the way Congress is working right now. On this subcommittee we have been able to do that both on narcotics and in the parks area.

One of the things we do as an oversight committee is ask all our witnesses to testify under oath. Rafael Palmiero is going through this with his attorneys right now learning why we do this. We don't expect to have that problem today and Mr. McIntosh has already shown that he has made it through the first round fine.

If you could rise and, Mr. Creasey, if you could as well, raise your right hands.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let the record show that both witnesses responded in the affirmative.

Now I would like to yield and we are going to have a—for those of you who don't know me, I am a very conservative Republican so this is hard to say. We are going to have a very liberal clock today. We have a 5-minute rule. We have asked everybody's testimony to be at 5 minutes but if you want to go over, that is fine. We will put the clock on so you know when the yellow comes on with 1 minute to go.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT W. McINTOSH, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING AND PARTNERSHIPS, NORTHEAST REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. MCINTOSH. Thank you, Congressman. As was the case at Gettysburg, I did have a little more extended remarks so the clock expired but if you really want me to stop, just point the finger and I will do that.

Mr. SOUDER. If you see me doze off, that would be an early warning sign.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I am certainly pleased to have the opportunity once again to participate in these hearings and welcome you. Mr. Creasey and I welcome you to Boston and to the Northeast Region of the National Park Service. We hope that our comments today will be helpful in the committee's work and deliberations.

Before I continue, I would like to also, on behalf of the National Park Service, welcome to this session the distinguished former director Roger Kennedy. Roger is a colleague and a friend of, I think, all of the Park Service employees that were in service at the time of his leadership and we deeply and truly appreciate his commitment and dedication to us at that time.

The extent of my testimony will focus primarily on the parks in northern New England. I think we have tried to limit the scope to Maine and Massachusetts and we have one park in Vermont and one park in New Hampshire.

As my testimony indicates, the region itself is 238 square miles with a population of about 68 million people. We are home to about 24 percent of the Nation's population with a population density of 288 people per square mile.

That is against the national average of about 80. We have a lot of folks who are busy in their education and in their work, as well as in their recreational pursuits. We play in the northeast a large role in providing close-to-home recreation as well as destination visits to our great national parks in the northeast.

We service about 51 million people a year. That is about 18 percent of the national total. Region-wide the 13 northeast States contain about 75 congressionally designated units of the National Park System. We have 25 affiliated or related areas including 14 national heritage areas. Within this region in these parks we have about a quarter of the system's museum collections, a quarter of the historic structures, and almost half of the Nation's National Historic Landmarks.

I noted with some pride this morning in the business section of the Boston paper, the Globe, that the owners of Fenway Park are seeking National Historic Landmark status so that they might qualify for the Historic Preservation tax credits which provide developers of commercial development, commercial use business properties up to 20 percent credit for the rehabilitation work that they do. It is aside from the operation of the parks, but it has been a major contribution in this country to historic preservation over the last almost 30 years at this point.

In addition to administering the parks in this region, we provide strong assistance, significant assistance to these heritage areas. We have a very effective Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance program that works with local States and local communities. We administer the Land and Water Conservation Fund which provides money for Federal land acquisition as well as allocations to the State for 50 percent cost sharing for acquisition and development of recreation and open space lands.

Most recently we are active in working with the General Services Administration [GSA] and the Coast Guard in the transfer of historic lighthouse properties. That is done through a Request for Proposals [RFP] process and it makes the property available to nonprofit organizations free of cost as long as they provide for the historic preservation of those properties and for public access.

The region has approximately 4,000 employees that are working across the region in the central offices as well as in the parks. We benefited, at least in 2004, from 825,000 volunteer hours. If you do the math, that is equal to about 496 work-years of effort. In a

sense, our work force has increased by that amount. These people, Volunteers in the Park, have a long tradition and a long list of dedicated individuals who provide assistance to the service across the system.

The region's budget, $261 million in fiscal year 2005, $230 million of those $261 are dedicated in the parks to the operation of the parks. The remainder of that amount is made up of $8.3 million for cyclic maintenance; $10.2 million for repair/rehab; $2.1 million for cultural resource preservation; $1.4 million for natural resources; $1.5 million for collections management; and $7.7 million in other project funds.

These are annual funds that are provided to the service and the projects move from park to park through various priority rating systems as to what parks get what projects in what year. In fiscal year 2006 the appropriations bill will increase the park's financial capabilities in meeting the President's goal to address the maintenance backlog. The amount of $230 million includes the congressionally authorized base increases of 4 percent in 2005.

The 2006 act provides for about a 3.1 percent increase across the board in the Park Service. Those numbers are very telling because while they are increasing it is basically enabling us to stay afloat given the fixed cost of operating the business. Most recently obviously the energy costs that all of us suffer personally and in our businesses and certainly in the Park Service.

One simple factor in that equation is that the benefits of the Federal employees that almost without missing a year we received a pay increase but not every year do we receive the amount of dollars equal to that increase to sustain those costs.

We rely obviously on other funding sources. Namely one of the most important ones is the recreation fee authorization that was reauthorized in 2005 giving the Park Service a 10-year window to use the fee program. At Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, $120,000 went to trails, campsites, and building rehabilitation in the Harbor Islands.

I think it is significant to note in this particular case most of that money went to supplies, materials and supervision of a youth project within the city or from the city that committed the labor for that effort.

At Cape Cod National Seashore $1.7 million went for beach and park improvements and visitor safety. At Lowell National Historic Park, Mr. Creasey's park, almost $419 million for rehabilitating and upgrading the radio system—yes, you keep track of that, don't you? $418,000 for the radio system, visitor and employee safety measures, and conservation of the historic walkways and landscape along the canals and the Merrimack River.

At Acadia National Park the fees since 1997 were $10 million, which have been committed to some very important and very visible projects providing visitor services, resource protection, and maintenance. A notable accomplishment includes the development and operation of the Island Explorer which is a transportation system that responsibilities are shared with the Park Service, the local communities, and the State of Maine as well as Friends of Acadia, the nonprofit Friends group that ably supports us.

Historic preservation, obviously given the statistics of this region and given the history of this region, is a core mission for us. Obviously within this region, in Boston and Philadelphia and New York various activities that constituted the debate that this room itself is significant in American history for the striving for independence from colonial powers and so on.

Boston National Historical Park is made up of a series of historic sites that were significant at that time. Paul Revere's home, the Old North Church. Just south of town in Quincy the Adams Homestead. That along with the John F. Kennedy Birthplace are the two Presidential sites within the National Park System in New England.

Then a little further to the west and certainly significant in the strive for independence was Minute Man National Historical Park in Concord. Minute Man just completed, or is completing a major project, the rehabilitation of the Old North Bridge and the landscape surrounding that and the two monuments that are at that location. That is a park which is significant in visitation and the tourism industry in Massachusetts and receives about 1.2 million visitors a year.

Most recently as well at Minute Man a significant effort was undertaken to bring the battle road unit to life. That is the largest unit in the park and its significance is the route of Paul Revere's ride as well as the line of retreat for the British after the battle at the bridge. In addition to that, the landscapes along that route as well as several historic properties that were extant at the time of Paul Revere's ride and the battle have been restored.

At Lowell most recently the park has joined forces with the Friends of Longfellow to recover the rich and historic landscape of the formal garden properties to its former glory. A capital campaign completed by the Friends in 2005 raised $800,000 in public and private donations for that effort.

Longfellow as well was one of the first projects of Save America's Treasures and in the late 1990's received a combination of funding sources but received about $2 million to rehabilitate the historic structure and provide for fire suppression and air conditioning and other necessary things for a historic structure like that. In this building, and just down the street at the old State House, in 2004 they received significant meticulous renovations that took care of the many aspects of deterioration and maintenance needs of these two buildings.

I think one story that is important to tell here is that it is only 15 years ago that we spent a significant amount of money in these two buildings as well but not because of overuse and not because of anything but historic structures or any structure that requires ongoing maintenance so 15 years later we are touching up and fixing many of the things that were fixed 15 years ago.

Once we provide funds for a project, it is not that we need to be thinking in that time line and that is the importance of those cyclic programs and the repair rehab programs to provide that type of funding.

At the Boston Navy Yard, funds are provided for the Historic Paint House and the Commandante's House. This year just re-

cently the Boston Historical Park broke ground for the restoration of the Bunker Hill monument and the parkland surrounding it.

In Acadia, again, Federal funding and partner funding for the rehabilitation of the historic campgrounds built in the 1930's by the Civilian Conservation Corps and rehabilitation of the trails which were laid out originally prior to the establishment of the National Park System and prior to the establishment of Acadia National Park. The Friends of Acadia once again provided significant help and leadership in making those projects real.

In the maintenance backlog realm the region in the new system of quantifying our resources, we have 6,814 assets which are made up of structures, roads, water, waste water systems, and the like. That is about 10 percent of the total assets of the National Park System. Interestingly enough the actual square footage of our buildings is about a third, or 33 percent, of the total in the system. While the west can brag about its acres, we can brag about our structures.

The region has completed a comprehensive condition assessment of 64 of those 75 parts. We can't go on without noting that many of these resources like this building, like buildings at all of our historic parks, as well as the natural resource parks, are priceless and irreplaceable. Ongoing maintenance is critical to their preservation.

Between 2002 and 2005 in the various fund sources we dedicated about $120 million toward the backlog maintenance in this region. I would just add parenthetically that the system that we were working with adds up about $756 million backlog or ongoing maintenance projects in this region. It is a very fluid system with numbers being added and adjusted on a daily basis. In a snapshot taken a couple of weeks ago, it looked like about $756 million and that looked like about 13 percent of the services total.

Maintenance projects are also preservation projects and the testimony lists various projects, at Marsh-Billings, at New Bedford Whaling National Historic Park, at Frederick Law Olmsted, a new project just underway and the park is closed for this purpose, to rehabilitate the building and provide necessary HVAC and other critical needs in that park. Again, back to Acadia more than $22 million have been dedicated to park maintenance projects over the last 5 years.

In your instructions on this hearing you mentioned Homeland Security. I would point out that since 2001 the service has been provided $11 million in operating base and line item construction projects directed toward enhancing the security and the protection of the resources of the icon parks as well as the visitors. In 2003 Boston Historical Park received a permanent base operating price of $1.2 million for enhanced security and $3.7 million for emergency preparedness as well.

I would note also that Federal Hall in New York received $16 million in the aftermath of September 11th itself. Federal Hall on Wall Street is just a few short blocks away from the World Trade Center site and it received extensive damage at that time.

The region is also a very successful participant in the Federal Lands Highway Program and the Alternate Transportation Program. We received approximately $10 million annually. Again, our

premiere example of that is the Island Explorer at Acadia but other parks are benefiting from that program as well.

In the sense of our initiatives and management and just general park management we have been developing over the years various tools to try to get us more informed and increase our ability to make better decisions. One is the budget cost project tool. Actually, that is a projection tool. It is a system that is based on past averages and trends, and the current situation in terms of appropriations, so we can model various scenarios into the future.

What is critical here obviously is the percent of our park base that is dedicated to payroll versus other costs. When you have a park that has a high percentage of payroll, which many, if not all, of our parks do, and you increase the payroll cost against a more-or-less fixed budget bottom line, you quickly put the park in peril and you quickly provide money for salaries but you have a few dollars left to maintain the bathrooms, let alone buy the paper towels.

This new facility management software system is the system that is allowing us to collect information about all our assets. We rank those assets in terms of priority, in terms of park mission, and we rank those assets in terms of their condition so that allows us in a very park-wide, region-wide, and service-wide way to get a picture of what the condition of our parks are across the board on a relatively even playing field, which has been very important.

In the past it has been the art of the author in terms of the funding proposals that has dictated some decisions. This still has not opportunity but it does allow us to level the playing field quite a bit.

And this CORE Operations Analysis which is just getting underway in the Service is parallel to the Facility Management System, an attempt to try to get on an even playing field with what the operational requirements of each of the individual parks are.

In line with OMB Circular A–76 we are also working toward the Preliminary Planning Efforts at the national parks of New York Harbor which is Gateway National Recreation Area, Statue of Liberty, and Ellis Island, Manhattan Sites, and Governor's Island National Monument. These parks have completed the work performance statement for facility and maintenance functions and are currently developing their most efficient organization. As you know, under that direction we then look at comparables in the private sector as to what the most efficient way to do our business is. Just now beginning in Boston National Historical Park is the Preliminary Planning Effort as well.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my formal comments. Again, I want to express our appreciation for your leadership in undertaking this effort and having these hearings across the country. We look forward to answering your questions and we look forward to your deliberations as they go forward through the summer and fall. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McIntosh follows:]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT W. MCINTOSH, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING AND PARTNERSHIPS, NORTHEAST REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE, AT AN OVERSIGHT HEARING CONCERNING THE NATIONAL PARKS: PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES AND THE NORTHEAST REGION.

August 24, 2005

Mr. Chairman, permit me to welcome you back to the Northeast and thank the committee for the opportunity to appear today to discuss the many facets and initiatives of the Northeast Region of the National Park Service. I am here with Michael Creasey, Superintendent of the Lowell National Historical Park and Chair of the Granite Subcluster that includes all of the parks in Massachusetts, who will be available to help answer specific questions about local parks. First, on behalf of the National Park Service, I would like to acknowledge and thank Congress for its continuing support of our parks and programs here in the Northeast, as well as the entire National Park System.

This is indeed the region "Where a Country was Born and a Nation Came of Age." It is a challenging place because of its complexity, but the National Park Service has been a leader in natural and cultural resource preservation and providing myriad opportunities for public enjoyment. We are very proud of the work we do in carrying out the mission of the National Park Service and the work of our many partners who contribute so much to resource protection, heritage development, and education. My testimony today will provide you with an overview of the region and also focus on the work of parks here in New England.

The Northeast Region comprises a land area of 238,000 square miles over 13 states from Maine to Virginia with a diverse population of 68,600,000 persons - 24% of the nation's population. It is characterized by an urban/suburban and rural mix of landscapes with an overall population density of 288 persons per square mile contrasted to the national density of 80 persons per square mile. The National Park System here in the Northeast serves close to 51.25 million annual visitors (18% of the total national visitation of 276.9 million in 2004), and provides assistance to our many partners who manage significant sites and programs that preserve and interpret the natural and cultural resources in the region.

The Region contains 75 park units, over 25 affiliated or related areas including 14 National Heritage Areas, ¼ of all National Park System museum collections, ¼ of all the historic structures, and almost ½ (1,086 of 2,500) of the nation's National Historic Landmarks (NHL). We are known for developing effective park partnerships, managing cultural resources, supporting strong partnerships with NHLs, providing assistance to 14 National Heritage Areas, implementing effective Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance projects with community partners, and providing leadership in education and civic engagement. We have made major strides in management accountability, security for our icon parks, effective budgeting tools, and other initiatives that I will discuss.

In the Northeast Region of the National Park Service our management priorities are clear and unambiguous: Efficient and effective operations; effective customer service; open and clear internal and external communications; employee involvement and buy-in as we pursue our goals; partnering with public, private and nonprofit entities; and cooperation both internally and externally.

We are also at the forefront in responding to National Park Service Legacy Goals, which call for management excellence, outdoor recreation, conservation, sustainability, and 21st Century relevance. Our 4,000 employees are committed to management effectiveness and efficiency, providing the highest quality visitor services, and protection of the resources under our stewardship. We share these commitments with our many valuable volunteers who provided over 825,000 volunteer hours in 2004.

Funding

I would like to thank Congress for providing steady increases in park operating funds for our national parks. For FY 2005, the Northeast Region's budget is $261.20 million of which $230 million is Operation of the National Park System (ONPS) and project funds as follows: $8.3 million for cyclic maintenance; $10.2 million for repair/rehab; $2.1 million for cultural resources; $1.4 million for natural resources; $1.5 million for collections management; and $7.7 million in other project funds. The recently signed FY 2006 appropriation bill will increase our parks' financial capabilities and assist in meeting the President's goals to address the deferred maintenance backlog. The ONPS amount of $230 million includes the congressionally authorized base increase for parks of 4% in FY 2005. The FY 2006 act provides a net increase of 3.1% for ONPS after the across-the-board reduction, including a 2.4% increase for fixed costs, a 1.5% across-the-board increase for parks, and $5 million in park base programmatic increases.

We also rely on other funding sources, such as recreation fees, to carry out our mission. Here in New England, our parks have particularly benefited from the use of recreation fees in FY 2004 and 2005. At Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, portions from the $120,000 total in recreation fees were used to rehabilitate trails, campsites, and buildings on harbor islands. The work was done by youths in the Boston area. At Cape Cod National Seashore, the $1,723,000 in total recreation fees enabled the park to make beach and park improvements and provide for visitor safety. At Lowell National Historical Park, $417,950 in recreation fees contributed to rehabilitating and upgrading the park's radio system, visitor and employee safety measures, and conservation of visitor walkways and landscape along historic canals and the Merrimack River. At Acadia National Park, the recreation fees have funded over $10 million dollars of critical projects related to visitor services, resource protection and maintenance since its establishment in 1997. Notable accomplishments include development and operation of the Island Explorer transit system; rehabilitation of trails, roads, restrooms, ranger stations, visitor center and wayside exhibits, and numerous other visitor facilities; conservation of museum objects; and restoration of disturbed sites. The partnership between the Friends of Acadia and Acadia National Park is central to the success of the transit system, carriage road, and trail system projects.

Historic Preservation

This region has one of the nation's most important collections of historical parks and cultural resources. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were forged in Philadelphia. The first shots of the Revolutionary War were heard a short distance from here and we protect and celebrate the resources and stories of that era in this great hall, at Paul Revere's home, at the Old North Church, at the Adams Homestead in Quincy (along with John F. Kennedy Birthplace, our two presidential sites in New England) and at Minute Man National Historical Park in Concord. All of these sites are reachable by mass transit from downtown Boston. Historic preservation is a core of this region's mission and we have many successes to build upon into the future.

Minute Man is completing a major historic preservation and backlog maintenance project in the park's North Bridge Unit including restoration of the North Bridge, rehabilitation of the historic landscape, resurfacing of historic pathways, restoration of the base and steps of Daniel Chester French's "Minute Man Statue" and for the restoration of the 1836 obelisk commemorating the opening battle of the American Revolution. This project has protected resources and greatly improved visitor experience and enjoyment for the park's 1.2 million annual visitors.

Recently, a major multi-million dollar effort was undertaken to "create" the park in the Battle Road Unit - the park's largest. Until this project was completed, the Battle Road Unit, the route of Paul Revere's ride and the line of retreat for the British, was essentially inaccessible, unutilized and unrecognized as a national historical park. Today, it is well-used by visitors with interpretive waysides. Additionally, the park has successfully rehabilitated seven historic structures that witnessed the events of 1776 and rehabilitated acres of historic farmland and associated stone walls.

Longfellow National Historic Site has joined forces with the Friends of Longfellow House and the community to recover its rich and diverse historic landscape and return it to its former glory. A capital campaign completed by the Friends in 2005 raised $800,000 in public and private donations for the landscape. Rehabilitation of the formal garden and house forecourt is under way including replacement of hundreds of trees, shrubs, and flowering plants. Historic features such as a dramatic garden pergola missing since the 1930s and fences, paths, and a driveway have been reconfigured or replaced. Visitors will also benefit from new directional signs and lighting in the landscape. Longfellow National Historic Site was one of the first official projects of the Save America's Treasures initiative. Many invaluable objects and furnishings dating from the late 18th-early 20th centuries have been conserved.

In the spring of 2004, Faneuil Hall, Boston's "Cradle of Liberty," and the nearby Old State House, according to Harrison Gray Otis, the "Temple of Liberty," underwent a meticulous renovation that included painting of all exterior architectural wood and stone, metal railings, fencing and hardware; and stripping and re-gold-leafing of the domes of the roof cupolas. At the Navy Yard, contracts will shortly be let for the rehabilitation of Building 125, the Historic Paint Shop, and the Commandant's House. In 2005, Boston broke ground on restoring the 221-foot tall Bunker Hill Monument to its position as one of the city's most recognized historic landmarks on Boston's Freedom Trail.

Acadia National Park has completed or is in the process of completing several major projects involving properties listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. These include complete rehabilitation of the two park campgrounds originally constructed by the

Civilian Conservation Corps; rehabilitation of the highly crafted trail system, most of which predates the 1916 park establishment; and rehabilitation of all the John D. Rockefeller Jr. constructed carriage road bridges. Once again, the Friends of Acadia continue to play an invaluable role.

Maintenance Backlog

The Northeast Region is making steady progress on the President's priority of addressing the maintenance backlog, both in terms of devoting more funding to maintenance and in better managing our assets. Under NPS's systemwide comprehensive asset management strategy, the region has been able, for the first time ever, to inventory our assets and measure the condition of our facilities. The region contains 6,814 standard assets (buildings, housing, campgrounds, trails, paved and unpaved roads, and water and wastewater systems) - 16% of the total assets of the National Park System. The actual square footage of our buildings is over 1/3 of the system's total. The region has completed comprehensive condition assessments at 64 of our 75 parks. Given what they are, many assets managed by this region are priceless and irreplaceable – and on-going maintenance is critical for their preservation. We have been targeting our cyclic maintenance, repair/rehabilitation, about 2/3 of line item construction appropriations, and recreation fees to address this issue. Between 2002 and 2005, available appropriated funds to address the maintenance backlog in the Northeast amounted to close to $119 million. Planned preventive maintenance for our assets is a regional priority.

Many of the maintenance projects serve also to preserve historic resources at our parks. At Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park in Vermont, funding from the repair/rehabilitation program has enabled the park to undertake a $1.085 million multi-year initiative to install fire suppression systems in five park structures, protecting both the historic buildings and their extensive museum collections from catastrophic loss due to fire. This is a major preservation undertaking, which began in FY 2001 and included fire protection for the 1805 Mansion, a National Historic Landmark. The building contains more than 14,000 original museum objects, furnishings and books collected by three prominent American families, including paintings of many of America's greatest 19th century landscape artists.

The region is investing almost $5.5 million in a major rehabilitation of the Corson Building at New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park. At Frederick Law Olmsted National Historic Site, life and safety systems are being upgraded and the home and studio are being rehabilitated with close to $2 million in line item construction funds. Funding of $660,000 is resulting in the stabilization and rehabilitation of the interior of the historic railroad terminal at Lowell National Historical Park.

At Acadia National Park, more than $22 million dollars have been dedicated to the park's maintenance projects over the past five years.

Homeland Security

Since September 11, 2001, the Northeast Region has received over $11 million from ONPS and line item construction accounts directed towards enhanced security and protection of our visitors, primarily at our icon parks. In 2003, Boston National Historical Park received a permanent base operating increase of $1.2 million for enhanced security. Line item construction funds for

emergency preparedness have also been approved at a cost of almost $3.7 million. Of this amount, Boston received $670,000. Federal Hall received an additional $16.82 million for emergency recovery and major rehabilitation after September 11, 2001. We will continue to direct funds to protect our icon parks and visitors here in the Northeast.

Transportation

The Northeast Region has been very successful in attracting Federal Lands Highway Program and Alternative Transportation Program funding for our parks, approximately $10 million annually. Our premier transportation attraction is the highly successful Island Explorer at Acadia. While we have not yet determined the full impact of the recently enacted transportation bill, we believe that projects contained in the legislation will assist our parks, our partners, and most importantly, provide additional enjoyment for our visitors in the coming years.

Management Initiatives

Our achievements in the Northeast are largely due to our application of advanced management strategies in our parks and the regional office. We developed, initiated, and are continually refining the Budget Cost Project Tool (BCP), which attempts to provide future financial information to park management, the region, and our Washington office. The BCP has been adopted for use by the National Park Service in its nationwide program of core operating analysis. This process ensures that funds are spent wisely on the most important park priorities. Guiding our investment decisions are asset management tools including the Facilities Management Software System, Asset Priority Index, the Facilities Condition Index, and the Choosing By Advantages process in setting regional and national priorities. We are implementing CORE Operations Analysis at the regional office and at two pilot parks – Shenandoah National Park and Valley Forge National Historical Park.

The region is also pursuing Preliminary Planning Efforts, in accordance with OMB Circular A-76, Attachment B, at The National Parks of New York Harbor, which consists of Gateway National Recreation Area, Statue of Liberty National Monument, Ellis Island Immigration Museum, Manhattan Sites, and Governor's Island National Monument. These parks have completed Performance Work Statements for all facility and maintenance functions, and are currently in the Most Efficient Organization (MEO) phase of the Preliminary Planning Effort. The results of this process will be provided to the Director of the National Park Service this fall. A decision will then be made to implement the Most Efficient Organization or proceed with the formal competitive process. Boston National Historical Park is scheduled to begin the Preliminary Planning Effort this month.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, we have attempted to give you a flavor of our work and its results, as well as examples of the progress we have made in some of our New England parks. We appreciate your continued interest in the National Park Service. We hope you will have many opportunities to enjoy the parks of the Northeast Region. That concludes my testimony. Mr. Creasey and I will be happy to answer any questions you may have today.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your comprehensive testimony. Let me start with a couple of medium broad budget questions. So Boston Harbor Island is now a national recreation area? I think when I was here it was a national park area.

Mr. MCINTOSH. The legislative title is national recreation area. We have locally adopted the formal but unofficial legislative title as a national park area.

Mr. SOUDER. When that was added to this system, did you get an increase in regional funds?

Mr. MCINTOSH. The park got a modest increase in their establishment funds for the park base operations. The region itself did not get an increase because this park or any other park is added to the system.

Mr. SOUDER. So, for example, when the Charleston Harbor gets added—what I am trying to figure out is because we certainly having spent a number of years on the Park Subcommittee and on the Resources Committee watching the budget process, when the bills go through usually by the time they get there under suspension with minimal amendments we never have a discussion of is this going to add to the 3 percent increase that the national parks are getting. But I am wondering internally how you handle that then. Do you get a regional budget with occasional earmarks coming out of Congress and do funds get shifted between regions or do you have to manage this within your region?

Mr. MCINTOSH. There is no one answer for all situations but generally speaking we manage within the region. There is no contract between the Authorizing Committee and the Appropriations Committee with respect to a new park and the guaranteed allocation of funds, line item of funds for that particular park.

Sometimes it comes simultaneously. Sometimes it comes a year or 2 years later. In the meantime the mobilization, the implementation of that park, the activation of that park, is begged, borrowed, and stolen from either the regional office or neighboring parks that might support with staff.

Governor's Island in New York is a good example. That monument was declared. No funds were provided. It was declared by Presidential proclamation and no funds were provided. For the first couple of years within the New York area the regional office provided staff as well as the parks loaned staff to get that park mobilized.

Mr. SOUDER. Having been around this for some time, and possibly answering this question somewhat at your own peril, this is not a new debate but sitting on my side and being very interested, I don't even know how you get information to make an intelligent decision because under the current administration every time there is a new park they oppose it.

Under the previous administration I don't think they ever opposed one. We never get told when the park is coming up. It usually divides on whether you favor spending more money or less money. There is no kind of nuance answer. Boston Harbor Park area is beautiful. We don't own land there at the Federal Government but it has several different State parks and local things in it, the first lighthouse and all sorts of great sites.

But there is no question there was a political motivation in developing that would be the classic of Mr. Ridenour's park barreling to some degree. And Charleston Naval Harbor openly says it. While we were worried the Naval Yard was going to be closed, it doesn't mean it is not an important part of history but I am trying to figure out the value process.

Now, what we are not doing in the tradeoff process here because I basically believe that if a historic site falls down, you will never get it back. Therefore, I am not against new additions but we are not knowing what tradeoffs we are making when we do new additions.

Do they ask you as regional director and say, because, one thing, if a Congressman was told in that area or in a region, "If we are going to get a new park in our area, here is what we have been looking at," do you do any forward thinking in the sense of here are sites that would be nice to have in the system?

We do analysis and, finally, we are doing much better analysis of here are the sites that are most critical to keep from falling down. Here is where we need to do the investment. We are doing analysis internally. I know there are risks of doing external analysis because then you could get speculation on the property, other groups thinking, "The Federal Government is going to take it over. I don't have to take care of it anymore." That type of risk, but do you do that kind of analysis that would ever come up and say, "Well, look, if you are going to do this, here is what we really need here."

Mr. MCINTOSH. We do part of what you are suggesting. There is no analysis currently where the Park Service looks at the landscape and for whatever the values and for whatever the reason says we should be considering this area or that area for potential inclusion.

As you know, the Thomas Bill of the mid 1990's, the Omnibus Parks Management Act provided that all studies or all inclusions in the National Park System are subject to what is called a special resource study and that study is aimed to do several things. One is to determine the national significance of the area. Second, determine the feasibility of that.

Basically that is an examination of the potential of that site in terms of the resource. Is there integrity there? Is there the capability to provide public programs. And the suitability in the sense of is it necessary or appropriate for the National Park Service to take over the administration of this site.

Many sites that we are asked to consider are already State properties or owned by nonprofits and some obviously are private properties. In doing that we are also required to provide budget information as to what the land acquisition, if necessary, would cost, and also what the operating cost over the first 5 years, let us say, what impact that would have in terms of the Park Service budget.

That information is done with NEPA compliance. Therefore, those reports are provided to the public for public comment prior to the finalization. The Thomas Bill provides that the director must make a professional finding of the service's professional determination of the significance suitability, and feasibility of that site and

the Secretary would make a recommendation when she transmits that report to the Congress.

Mr. SOUDER. So what you are basically saying is that it is a reactive process primarily to some degree designed——

Mr. MCINTOSH. To provide a very general summary, yes. I would say it is a reactive process.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Designed pretty much by my party to say, "Look, we have concerns about whether there has been a systematic review of the process." It was an attempt to get at what I was saying but it is still a reactive process. In other words, a Member of Congress thinks of something he wants in his district which may be motivated by everything from environmental to economic shutdown to a variety of different questions which may not be related to its historic significance, national significance, risk of being lost.

Presumably a good politician is going to listen to some of those interests in his area, too, but often the kind of national and systematic interest aren't the same as local driving issues such as this is good for business, for jobs, or other types of things which means it would be pretty cheap to criticize pork barreling if there is no other alternative to pork barreling.

In other words, its the only way to add things to the system. Furthermore, we have spent at least a year trying to get from the National Park Service the list of how many of these studies for national heritage areas that were actually out there. We were passing heritage areas through the Resources Committee like crazy.

Finally, when we got the data, it was, I believe, 32. This is a couple of years old. Something like 30 or 32 studies of which they could do eight a year with the complicated process you were doing, particularly under the budget crunch which means we are already backlogged 4 to 5 years.

Well, since congressional terms are 2 years, the whole process you just said is, of course, subject to you pass it. If you want to pass a heritage area on the floor and fund it, basically you waive the rule and you don't require the study. If you waive the rule, then the law doesn't apply.

Furthermore, the appropriators on the Appropriations Committee often will fund their heritage area whether or not it has been waived on the authorizing side or in the Park Service. I can assure you because I thought I was going to get my head chopped off because it was one I was questioning in Atlanta that had a series of things that were of local and State significance but I didn't see a national significance but I got caught up in, well, we did a trade.

To get this one we did this one and this is supposed to move. It moved through and then the funding moved through. What I am trying to figure out is how do we get control or, at least, some kind of a substantive input into saying, if we say, "We are short of sites that relate to Africa American heritage. We are short of sites that relate to Asian heritage, Hispanic heritage, religious heritage. Oh, here are five sites in the United States that are coming up that are critical to our understanding of this period of American Revolution that may be lost forever."

Is there any kind of that discussion in the National Park Service here? You are at the cradle of the American revolution in discuss-

ing what sites may be—these groups are floundering economically and they wind up saying that the national system may be lost. I am just wondering whether at least there is—I am sure Friends groups are doing that to some degree. For example, in Civil War battlefields there are really strong lobby groups.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I would in summary answer that right now there is not that type of discussion. The focus and priority is to take care of what we have and there are certainly significant needs there. There have been in the past attempts to try to undertake a comprehensive review and make a statement as to what it would take to complete the National Park System.

I think that, too, is challenged in the sense that if we did that study in the 1970's things that we were thinking of then have elapsed and other equally important but overlooked sites, particularly in the Historic Preservation and culture resource side of the shop.

Mr. SOUDER. Especially since we all know history stopped in, what, 1958? Now, let us move more specifically into how the budget is impacting your region. You said you had an increase in Homeland Security funds. Did that cover all the additional cost on Homeland Security?

Mr. MCINTOSH. If I understand the question, that money was dedicated to the "icon parks" which in this region is Independence Hall, the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia, the Statue of Liberty in New York, and the Charleston Navy Yard which is the host port for the U.S.S. Constitution which is actually an active ship in the Navy.

Mr. SOUDER. And did the money that came in, did you have to move rangers that were doing other things into Homeland Security protection, bring people from other parks, certain icon parks in your region, or did the additional funding increase cover those costs of Homeland Security?

Mr. MCINTOSH. The initial response was we begged, borrowed, and stole rangers from all over the service to go to the icon parks. Since then with this amount of funding we have been basically able to level the playing field and provide through the three parks the operational needs.

Mr. SOUDER. So the rangers providing other protection have not been dramatically impacted?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Certainly less. Now if you go to Independence you will see that the law enforcement rangers are at the minimum and security guards, contract guards, are providing the lion's share of the surveillance of people processing through to see the Liberty Bell and Constitution Hall.

Mr. SOUDER. You said contract people are providing it?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct.

Mr. SOUDER. And where did that money come from?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That came out of this fund source.

Mr. SOUDER. I think you said you were getting—it can be New England specific but if it is easier to do it by region. If you get, let us say, a 3 percent increase, as a practical matter roughly on an annual basis what is your fundamental payroll pressure increase?

In other words, payroll pressure isn't just salary. Payroll pressure would be pension obligations, healthcare, when you have a given employee. My presumption is if you are getting a 3 percent

increase, you are having a declining payroll, absolute number of people because the fundamental costs are increasing faster than 3 percent.

Mr. MCINTOSH. It all depends on what the legislative pay raise is and what the appropriated amounts for the park are. But if those two aren't equal, then you are looking at an immediate decline. As I said, also there are other fixed cost impacts in the budget that don't decline, or can't decline and, therefore, if the increase only takes care of the payroll, then your other fixed-cost increases are impinging on the park operating budget as well.

Mr. SOUDER. Because we are trying to sort through, to the degree we can do the regional hearings, and kind of get some of the basic information at some point, we will be asking for systematic information out of the National Park Service headquarters. But if you are devoting funds to reducing the backlog and you have 3 percent increase, which just assuming you didn't get any new parks or any new facilities, but if you get a 3 percent increase and you are trying to increase your backlog reduction, 3 percent increase almost covers inflation.

Some years it would and some years it wouldn't. Nobody's healthcare cost are going up at 3 percent and part of the solution has been contracting out or using part-time people. Would you agree you are less likely to add full-time employees right now?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, yes. I mean, our ability to hire new staff is certainly curtailed—permanent staff. Our ability to hire seasonal staff is curtailed. I think as you look at the budget framework as the administration presents it, you can see that the emphasis is on this backlog issue, the ongoing maintenance at the expense of parks having the benefit of the capacity of their budgets in the decades past.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you see in these budget operations as you look at the Government pension obligations, the healthcare cost? Let me ask this question. When somebody retires in your region, do you have the ability to replace them if they are a full-time employee?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Not one for one, no.

Mr. SOUDER. Would you say you are doing two-thirds to one? I am asking a really broad question.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I don't have a real good framework to answer that with so I can't.

Mr. SOUDER. When we get the individual data that is exactly what we will be looking at to see is how much, in fact, we are reducing. The Park Service is probably the most contracted out agency already in the United States. We can probably contract out a little bit more but pretty soon you lose your ability to have a system-wide control or system-wide definition if everything is contracted out. Going to part-time has pros and cons, particularly when you are in a place where it hasn't snowed in 6 months. That may make more sense but I doubt if—while your visitation, I am sure, in this region is higher in the summer, it isn't the dramatic changes you see out west. How much would you say is seasonable in the Boston region?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Can you answer that for Lowell?

Mr. CREASEY. Well, it is very seasonable for most of us, I would suggest, but it levels out if you include the educational institutions

coming to the national parks throughout New England. I think many of us are very aggressive in working with the local school systems to make sure that we service that population as well. It is seasonable, yes.

Mr. SOUDER. So sites like here in the Boston area, Man of Defiance. Clearly Katie would be more seasonable but in the immediate area here you would have a summer-driven tourist traffic but then education groups would pick up the difference. What about conventions? Is there much of a spin-off from that?

Mr. CREASEY. I think many of the parks work very closely with the tourism industry and the conventioneers, I think, contribute throughout the season. I am not sure it is limited to just one particular season but my sense is that we work closely with the Massachusetts Office of Travel and Tourism as well as the Boston Area for tourism development. Obviously the national parks are a major thrust in terms of their marketing campaign so I would say we get quite a bit of tourists.

Mr. SOUDER. Some of these type of things will be dealt with by using seasonable as well as contracted out. But in one area if you are dealing with backlog and you are dealing with potentially replacing retired full-time employees with seasonals or contracted out people, would you say interpretation was hardest hit?

Mr. MCINTOSH. The traditional seasonality of that effort tends to be limited in terms of the permanent staff and expanded in the high seasons. Therefore, that is where the flexibility is in your budget. Therefore, seasonable maintenance, seasonable interpretation are the areas where you would have the opportunity to make your adjustment.

Mr. SOUDER. What would the other hardest hit areas be? Would it be historic and archeological research, biological research other than interpretation?

Mr. MCINTOSH. We have benefited significantly almost in the order of $100 million over the last several years with the Natural Resource Challenge Program. That is put in place a system-wide effort with inventory and monitoring of the resources in the park. There is a good head of steam in that area.

I think in this region we have with the amount of historic resources that we have, the structures, the collections, and archeological sites and so on, that we are challenged to keep abreast in terms of the research mode in terms of understanding the resources in the park, even though they have been in the system considerable periods of time.

Mr. SOUDER. When you get funds from this Resources Challenge Program and from Saving America's Treasures, I should know the answer to this question but I don't off the top of my head but I believe on some of these they are still within the Park Service's regular budget. Isn't that correct? They are just reshuffled?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Both of them. That is correct, yes.

Mr. SOUDER. Then what I am trying to sort through because when we lay this over the top of each other, if you are getting $100 million in the resources challenge program and the Save America's Treasures Program, where did that money come from because the total net to the Park Service is only up 3 percent and the payroll pressures are far—I have seen some tentative collapsed numbers

that suggest if you go out 10 years just the payroll drowns the system given the current budget.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Given past trends and current projections, the out years are very, very challenging. If I may just circle back a bit on the seasonability question. I think what is important to understand also, and we have observed this, and probably caused by many different sectors but what sort of traditionally was the season, Memorial Day to Labor Day, is nowhere close to what the season is now. With the mobility and the retirement population being so active enjoying our national parks from the break of ice in the north until after Columbus Day in the fall the pressure is on the parks. In a sense what used to be that 3-month window of pressure is now expanded maybe to 6 or more months depending on where the park is in the region. Certainly in the south in the Civil War parks in Virginia, parks in West Virginia and so on, the pressure is largely year round.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me pursue a slightly different angle. Let me ask you do you believe that reducing—you referred in the backlog to also cyclical maintenance. Do you believe that in concentrating on the backlog other things aren't being done? I mean, when you look at this money, if you see this pressure on payroll and you see this attempt, which I believe support trying to address a backlog, what I believe is nobody has tried to reconcile these different pressures.

We are trying to put in some of these special funds. We are trying to address the backlog and we have this pressure on payroll. Where did the funds come from especially if we have added, like in this area, two major additions to the system, where did the money come out of and is that leaving, for lack of a better word, a new frontlong or something of things that are developing underneath that haven't been taken care of.

Then are we really reducing the backlog or reducing a static backlog which is not getting the normal cyclical maintenance things and other things have been added to the park are they then being added—maybe one of the questions is what defines backlog? Is it a static list that we picked a year or whenever you get behind add it to the backlog and do we, in effect, ever get that addressed?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I would hate to count the hours that people have talked about that. Not even debated it, just talked about how to define the backlog. Obviously a backlog project today that gets funding tomorrow and that work is completed, then that comes off the backlog list so you are going to see this cycle of projects in any given park go on and off for the same thing such as the example I gave earlier of the work here at Faneuil Hall.

The day after that project was completed in the early 1990's it wasn't on the backlog list. Now 15 years later, or however long it was on there before that, I am not sure but it comes back on as the needs become apparent. The new facility management system will better enable us to be able to track exactly what is in the system and what the needs are.

What we have never really had before in that system that this system will provide is a way to evaluate the project against the importance of the structure if it is a historic structure. Some historic structures in the mission of that particular park are more impor-

tant than others and having to make those tradeoffs is an important—this will give us the important tools to do that.

Mr. SOUDER. But you don't have that yet where you could tell me where we reduced our A backlog by 30 percent or our B backlog by 20 percent and our C backlog by 10?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, I think you could do it on an individual park on an individual moment in time but the numbers continuously roll. The only way to work that system in terms of making statements of what the condition is, the conditions change constantly. It has to be a snapshot as of that day.

Mr. SOUDER. Not that the Department of Interior is known for wonderful computers but in this day and age if it is available by individual park, it seems like a very short software program to be able to——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Roll it up. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me move to a slightly—I was interested a number of years ago, I believe it was the National Trust, talk about a problem at the Adams site. I believe it was there. It has been a while since I have dealt with this.

I believe their china collection or silver service was going to be split off or auctioned off by the private group that was managing the site because that led to a discussion after whether we should have some sort of seed fund like we have for properties for collection items like that could be leveraged with the private sector to try to purchase things before they get up in market and then we would spend the next 30 years trying to put the collection back together. What has happened with the Adams site and how do you look at critical collections that are often in private foundation hands that could all of a sudden have financial pressures or whatever?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, again, there is no one answer. Individual parks have authority to purchase collections or not. In the Adams situation, and my memory doesn't recall what the final resolution was but in the Adams situation the silver collection I think you are referring to belonged to the Adams' Church, the Parish Church.

Mr. SOUDER. They donated it to them. The Adams family, I think, had donated it to the church.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right. And the question at the time was the church was in serious financial straights and was trying to figure out a way to raise money. There was an effort made to purchase that collection from the church but I cannot answer. We can provide you the answer but I don't have off the top of my head the ultimate resolution.

Mr. SOUDER. How much of your collections are in storage, do you know, of historic collections in this region?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I don't know that answer specifically but I think it is a general standard in the museum industry that maybe 3 to 5 percent of your collections are an exhibit and the rest are in curation or in storage. I think that generally is true of any of our parks.

Mr. SOUDER. From what I have seen I have not looked at this issue in northeast. I know a number of years ago we dealt with it in Gettysburg because clearly we had inadequate and safe storage of the old muskets. Then we paid $1 million to rehab and then they

go back down in a musky cellar and then we paid to rehab them again. Just a rather short-term budget strategy.

How is it here in the New England area as far as storage capability of only 3 to 5 percent is available for public display? Are these things safe? At Valley Forge I know the Benninghoff collection had all this—I mean, one time they showed me original journals that had never been preserved or copied that were down in this basement. How are you going to get a Valley Forge journal back? What is the status of the collection preservation?

Mr. MCINTOSH. The service started in either the late 1980's or early 1990's, the museum collection program, which provided a significant chunk of money across the country to do the cataloging. And parallel to that as we grew to understand what was in our collections, unfortunately because they were in many cases heirlooms of the family that donated the home or sold the home to the National Park Service, they weren't kept then under professional standards and we didn't immediately have the resources or the wherewithal to provide that.

Many of these collections stayed in the Park Service's facilities, historic homes or otherwise, for many years before we got around to collecting or curating them. Since then we have made significant strides, but to say that the issues are all resolved and we don't have significant issues in front of us would not be true.

At Longfellow we made a significant investment there. We provided over the last 4 or 5 years better temperature and humidity controls within the building. That takes care of the collection pieces that are on exhibit in the house itself as well as those that are in the storage. Again, we are limited by the capabilities of the site as well.

I mean, there is the Longfellow House and carriage house. No other significant built structures are on that site and no wherewithal to go elsewhere. We now have in the basement provided professional quality storage facilities, albeit still in the basement. Several of the sites now are starting to use offsite storage in professional storage facilities in pay the fee, the rent, so to speak, to do that.

Mr. SOUDER. Is there any program inside the National Park Service that looks at historical documents and museum collections like you are doing on buildings where you are going to be able to—or on backlog where you say, "Here is an A, B, C, D priority," or is it almost purely random at this point?

Mr. MCINTOSH. No. I think when the park has the good fortune to benefit from the collections management program, objects and archival material are treated equally and there is an assessment made. We develop what is called a statement of collection which defines what should be in the park's collection or what should not deaccession many of those things that should be not so that we don't have to have the responsibility for that.

At Olmsted over the last—it has just been completed over the last 15 years all the original drawings and archival material from the Olmsted site which were in deplorable conditions in the storage vaults that the family and the business had for that purpose we were able to set up a paper conservation lab in some space in

Springfield 90 miles away. We transported all of that collection, various pieces at various times, to Springfield.

We had a staff of two or three people, professional curators, archival curators, conservationist working on that collection who have now fully conserved that collection and brought it back to the site. Given the fact that the site is closed and under major renovation, those are now being stored offsite.

Mr. SOUDER. In something like the Olmsted collection is the information accessible or shared such that if you make a decision, if these things are relevant to teaching this site, that you have these materials which may be priority D but may actually be the biggest single original document on a park you designed in some other city who may have an interest in not having it be buried in a museum somewhere where it may or may not be protected or may or may not be seen as critical to that site that it could be transferred?

I remember just working on the Northwest Territory stuff and I was trying to get the Library of Congress to do a thing on the Northwest Territory and I said I thought because I had been to a number of sites, Ft. Megs and others, and I had seen things like property of the U.S. Congress on a copy of a map that you must have a fair amount of documents. They said, "We have never analyzed anything that we have had on the Northwest Territory."

One guy piped up and said, "We have William Henry Harrison papers. Would that be a help?" "Yeah, that would be a good start." "We have Anthony Wayne's papers. Would that be a help?" "Yeah, that would be a start." If they had a couple of those papers in the critical areas of the midwest, it would be a huge thing and it would be a major preservation project but it would be low tier.

The Library of Congress, of course, has the world's biggest attic along with the Smithsonian. The National Park Service has these incredible collections of art, of original documents. Often you interpret a site at a given year or era as it should be. I am wondering do we have any way of systematically looking at this and sharing because if you catalog and it is on a computer, then people can access and say, "Hey, what about that piece?"

If we don't have any dollars for cataloging or doing the research or identifying and getting the stuff more than in a person who may be retiring as head, but into a systematic analysis we can't cross fertilize.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, the museum collection program addresses that need. We are far from complete in the service-wide efforts there. In places like Longfellow and places like Olmsted where that project, as I said, in terms of the cataloging as well as the conservation of the documents took maybe 15 years, that information is available now and is used extensively by professional as well as academic researchers who are studying Olmsted or, in many cases, a private firm so we have been commissioned to rehabilitate an Olmsted landscape at some private facility that the firm designed to come and use that resource.

Mr. SOUDER. I need to go to the second panel but let me followup a little bit on that with Lowell specifically, the superintendent. I am looking forward to going there tomorrow because I have not been there before. It is unusual in the sense that it is an old industrial community and in trying to interpret some of our economic

history, how do you define what you have there? Do you also look at what you don't have that you might need to add? This is a whole other—it is kind of interesting because we don't do a lot of interpretation of our economic history in the United States.

Mr. CREASEY. That is a good question. We have about 700,000 objects of which we have cataloged about 95 percent of our collection of which it is all online, as Mac said. I think the cataloging system and what we have got with the museum services when fully loaded will be a tremendous asset for the American people and for researchers and scholars. I feel we are in pretty good shape at Lowell in terms of our collections and our cataloging.

Five percent, to be quite honest, are materials that are not of higher value than things like the locks and canal papers, engineer drawings, architectural drawings, which are quite wonderful of how Lowell came about in terms of this economic engine for New England and the country.

I have been at Lowell for 6 months so I am still a study on this but my sense was that when Lowell was established in the 1970's we did have a collections strategy of which we went and collected items such as the 100 some looms that came from the Draper Corp. in Hopedale, MA that powered the mills. We now have them currently in our working collection you will see tomorrow if you come visit 80 some working looms in the mill itself.

Those kinds of items were collected. We are also fortunate to have a strong partner in the American textile museum which has a much larger collection, something like five stories of industrial artifacts that range from preindustrial all the way through modern day technology.

Mr. SOUDER. If I can ask, Mr. McIntosh, just because you have been involved in the Park Service for some time your reaction to this. The temporary fee charges are the longest temporary fees of probably about anything we have had in the system and it is one of the interesting things because we are trying to make them permanent.

It is amazing. It shows the support of the National Park System. It shows why people would probably support some form of a check off where they can give donations and that sort of thing because we have had almost no resistance in spite of all the people who said we were going to have resistance to these different fees because, as you know, they are going to the park and they see how they are being used.

People generally speaking support the fees. One of the challenges as these fees go up is how to deal and a concern about how it is going to impact access to the parks by lower-income groups. I have had sign-off support from the appropriations and the authorizers if we could figure out how to do it.

In an earlier parks trip this summer a gentleman who had worked as a concessionaire in the Park Service suggested to me that one possibility would be to have it be on the IRS form that, "If your income falls under a fixed amount, whether it is $30,000 or $35,000, and you want a national parks' pass, check the box and we will send it to you." The question is how do we identify? You can't check and you can't ask them to show their IRS return at the gate or the building.

You don't want to say, "Are you kids on reduced lunch?" It would be pretty tough to commit fraud with the IRS because they have your income there. The question is how many people would actually request that pass or may never use it. In Government terms it is a cipher in the budget to print the cards. Mailing costs are a little bit higher.

We could say there may be a way to send a sheet of paper as opposed to the pass. I wonder what your reaction is because we have been trying to figure this out. I have the support to do that. It is a clear challenge as we tackle this issue. Now with a constructive suggestion, then I am trying to figure out what does that do to your substructure if a whole bunch of people are showing up with passes. On the other hand, they may be people that wouldn't have visited the park otherwise.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is a very important and complex issue. My personal belief is that the IRS and the tax form is for that purpose and to complicate it with a lot of things is probably not in the best interest of anybody. If that happens, I am sure it can be accommodated.

The ability to provide access to various aspects of the population are permissible within our system. There is flexibility. The superintendent can have, as museums do, a free day or the mornings or various things like that. I think there is flexibility on the part of the superintendents that may not be always exercised.

Then there is the question of not just access to the gate, it is access to the park, to get to the park, which is also, I think, an important and complicated issue. Generally one of the reasons—I mean, how to collect fees at places like Gateway where you can come in off city streets and so on. I think it is one of the reasons why the superintendents in those situations don't even think about it because it is so—the park itself is so accessible to such a diverse community that those populations and other populations are accommodated that way as well.

Mr. SOUDER. They are doing building fees.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Say again?

Mr. SOUDER. Often there is a fee then to get in the different homes. At Independence Park, for example, you have a $2 fee for this house. Even though you can get a Parks pass to get in, you do it by building.

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is true. That is a double-edged sword for us because we want to make it as successful as we can to everybody. On the other hand, as the numbers show, the contributions to the fee program are significant in terms of our ability to maintain our resources to operate the parks.

Mr. SOUDER. I have a consistent position and that is I believe in simplifying the tax form except when I want to complicate it. Thank you for your testimony.

If the second panel could come forth. If you want to submit anything else for the record, please do so.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let the record show that each of the witnesses responded in the affirmative.

I thank you each for coming and we will start with Mr. Roger Kennedy, former head of the National Park Service, National

Council chairman for the National Parks Conservation Association. You have been tremendous in helping coordinate all these hearings. We thank you for your years of leadership and authorship and stewardship.

STATEMENTS OF ROGER KENNEDY, NATIONAL COUNCIL CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION; MARILYN FENOLLOSA, NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION; KEN OLSON, PRESIDENT, FRIENDS OF ACADIA NATIONAL PARK; AND LT. JOHN McCAULEY, MUSEUM CURATOR, ANCIENT AND HONORABLE ARTILLERY COMPANY OF MASSACHUSETTS

STATEMENT OF ROGER KENNEDY

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you, sir. I am Roger Kennedy. I have been around the parks for nearly 80 years. I have watched the Congress work with the parks for more than 60. Mr. Souder, I want to say for the record that no one since the immortal Chairman Sidney R. Yeats has given the national parks your kind of sustained, intelligent, and informed attention grounded in a moral fervor for the national patrimony and for our common obligations to our decedents.

We have to reach back to the progressive era to the founding generation nearly a century ago to observe such a fortuitous confluence of a national conservation necessity and your kind of straightforward, candid, and honest stewardship. I want to begin by saying thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would like to file my formal testimony for the record and proceed on my own if I may.

As these hearings have already shown across the Nation the accumulated rot in the National Park System, more politely known as the maintenance backlog, would by now cost at least $4½ billion to make right. Two-thirds of park roads are listed as either poor or fair condition. More than half of the bridges on those roads in the parks are classified intelligently as deficient.

The capacity of superintendents to do the job that the Congress and the people expect is steadily eroded in the face of unfunded mandates and service cost inflation as you have already reviewed this morning. Here is how the New England parks in particular manifest an unfulfilled need for stewardship. This is accumulated over the years. This is nothing new but its flagrancy grows. When you deduct, as you have noted already this morning, the loss of purchasing power for the last 3 years alone in the Acadia's superintendent's budget it is down about 10 percent.

For last year alone unfunded mandates required by Congress or pay increases alone were twice as big as the increase in the nominal Park budget. I can give you the numbers but that is what it amounts to. If you add the general inflation rate to the parks' other cost, not just those salary cost and return cost, you would add another couple of hundred thousand dollars in lost purchasing power to provide service to the public.

Since the superintendent doesn't have the money to do his job, he has to leave important jobs undone, as you have already indi-

cated. I want to congratulate my Park Service colleagues for reading their scripts with enormous skill. I have had to read scripts myself. The glory of being retired is you don't have to read anybody's script.

That superintendent can't fill nine traditionally permanent jobs because he can't pay for them. The requirement that law enforcement trumps everything else means that everything else suffers even more, the education function, conservation. You call attention to these functions and you are absolutely right in doing so because even they and waste disposals suffer.

Let me point out that in Acadia last winter the park had to close all but 3 of its 12 restrooms during the cross-country skiing season. The cross-country skiers were there and the restrooms weren't open. Springtime in Acadia. The park has staff to cut the grass along its famous hiking and biking road only once a year. The grass grows very fast in Acadia. It is desperate to grow up there where it is cold and it covers a lot of sharp rocks. If you can't cut it more than once a year, people are going to suffer.

At Cape Cod most of the park goes unpatrolled for lack of rangers. The park needs at least 10 more seasonal law enforcement personnel to do its job which it used to have but it needs that to do its job.

At the Longfellow House in Cambridge a $400,000 annual funding shortfall prevents the park from filling the key maintenance and curatorial position. We could talk for a long time. I was a museum director for nearly 15 years at the Smithsonian. The problems that you have pointed out this morning, my colleagues in the Park Service have done their very best not to complain too loudly about are real. You are right and so is the problem of congressional enthusiasm for nifty new parks and new ribbon cuttings not coupled to the sustaining of the budgets required to do the job. You are absolutely right on the money on that.

Longfellow like Cape Cod has a Friends group but even Friends get tired of bailing out the Congress. Friends groups are partners. They are not receivers in bankruptcy. The truth is that parks are in trouble. The Park Service is in trouble and the Congress has for years failed in its trusteeship to the American people to take care of our national treasures.

This is not this administration's and this Congress' only problem. They have lots of other problems and they are not responsible for the long accumulation. That long accumulation is papered over by the kinds of reports you get from the system as it is currently operating. You are right in pushing hard. Thank you for doing that.

These kinds of problems that have accumulated over time are going to have to be dealt with in this generation or they will be impossible for the next generations to deal with. Rot is rot. It doesn't go away. You can fuzz the figures but you can't pretend that the rot doesn't get worse. That is something that directors can't say when they are in office or if they hope for further office, but it is true. The problems you are going after are there.

God bless you, Mr. Souder, for trying to be a good trustee. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kennedy follows:]

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Protecting Parks for Future Generations

Testimony of
Roger Kennedy
Chairman, National Council
National Parks Conservation Association

Re: "The National Parks: Will they survive for future generations?"

before the
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources
of the House Government Reform Committee
U.S. House of Representatives

Boston, Massachusetts
August 24, 2005

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is my great honor and pleasure to appear before you today. My name is Roger Kennedy, Director Emeritus of the National Museum of American History and former Director of the National Park Service. I am here in my capacity as chairman of the National Council for the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA), and as a member of the NPCA Board of Trustees. Since 1919, the NPCA has been the leading voice of the American people in protecting and enhancing our National Park System. NPCA and its 300,000 members and hundreds of partners work together to protect the park system and preserve our nation's natural, historic, and cultural heritage for generations to come.

We are gathered here today to discuss the future of our national parks, in particular, those in the northeastern United States. As we rapidly approach the centennial of the National Park Service in 2016 we can proudly boast of a 388 unit strong system that celebrates the natural wonders and cultural heritage that make this nation unique. Still, we must be mindful that our national parks, loved and admired equally in blue states as well as red, face tremendous challenges; especially when it comes to funding.

An analysis of business plans developed by more than 80 national park units reveals the parks suffer from an annual shortfall in operations funding that exceeds $600 million. Additional investigation reveals the following details about the dire state of park funding:

- A maintenance backlog estimated at between $4.5 to $9.7 billion burdens the entire park system, draining critically needed funds from day-to-day core operations.
- Unfunded mandates cost the Park Service approximately $170 million between FY 02 and FY 04.
- Homeland security demands now cost the parks $50 million annually in recurring expenses they did not have prior to September 11, 2001.

1300 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone (202) 223-NPCA (6722) • Fax (202) 659-0650

- Nearly half the maintenance backlog consists of park road and bridge improvement or repair projects (two-thirds of park roads are listed as in either poor or fair condition, while 56% of bridges are classified as "deficient").
- Countless historic treasures held in Park Service collections have not been catalogued and are at risk of deterioration.

Our national parks are suffering from decades of inadequate investment by successive congresses and presidential administrations. The repeated failure to fund new fiscal demands placed on national parks has meant a steady decline in the purchasing power of park managers, and in many cases has forced the Park Service to compromise the services it can afford to provide to the American people and to forego critical resource protection projects. Fulfilling day-to-day core functions, such as ensuring visitor safety and the preservation of natural and cultural resources, becomes a luxury to be deferred until some crisis forces attention those needs. Meanwhile, the ability of the National Park Service to serve as guardian of the nation's heritage hangs precariously in the balance.

Goodwill alone cannot resolve this problem. True, the Park Service must continue its efforts to enhance fiscal responsibility, reduce superfluous spending, and improve management practices. But Congress and the American people must play their parts as well. We have a prime opportunity to renew our commitment to these national treasures and invest in their protection to ensure a healthy, happy birthday for the park system and the dedicated staff that continue to inspire the world. And we must, as a nation, rise to the challenge of helping our national parks not merely to survive, but to thrive.

The financial challenges crippling our national parks did not develop overnight, nor can they be solved quickly. In the 11 years that remain before the 100th birthday of the National Park Service, we have the opportunity and the moral obligation to improve the situation of our parks so they shine in 2016. This will be a challenge, particularly in the difficult fiscal environment that exists today, but it is the kind of challenge to which the American people and the Congress have shown the ability to rise over the course of history. NPCA has identified four key areas that should be addressed through innovative, broad and sustained effort:

- Enhanced annual commitment by Congress to Park Service operational funding;
- Enactment of the National Park Centennial Act;
- Continued and increasing vigor in Park Service management and budgetary practices through the development of business plans by every unit in the system; and
- Enactment of a robust Federal Highway Bill.

Highway Bill: An opportunity missed

Congress failed the parks in passing the Highway Bill at the end of July. Pork won and the American people lost. Roughly half of the National Park Service's multi-billion dollar maintenance backlog is accounted for in road repair needs in the national parks. Passage of the Highway Bill at the robust level for national parks promoted by the administration and included in the Senate version would have helped to significantly reduce the maintenance backlog. Unfortunately, the bill recently passed by Congress provides the National Park Service with only $1.05 billion to address park roads—nearly 75% ($600 million) below the amount the U.S. Senate and the administration said was needed in May of 2005.

The enormity of the backlog means that even the funding for park roads recommended by the administration and the Senate would have fallen far short of meeting the entire need. But those proposals would have had a genuine impact in reducing the backlog. The paltry funding level in this bill virtually guarantees minimal progress in reducing the road maintenance backlog for years to come, and sadly must be regarded as a missed opportunity for Congress to support fundamental park needs.

Now that Congress has failed its first test in aiding the parks through the Highway Bill, the only opportunities remaining during the next five years are the annual appropriations process and enactment, Mr. Chairman, of your National Park Centennial Act (H.R. 1124 and S. 886). As you know, the bill would establish a National Park Centennial Fund within the U.S. Treasury, in order to eliminate the backlog and meet critical natural and cultural resource preservation needs. The fund would be financed in part using proceeds from a voluntary check-off box on federal tax returns. The bill creates a grand bargain, because it also guarantees that if taxpayers make contributions to restore and renew our national parks during the next decade, the federal government will provide the difference necessary to get the job done from the general treasury. Thus individual Americans would be given an opportunity to leave a legacy for their children by contributing to the preservation of the most significant natural, cultural, and historic places on the American landscape, and Uncle Sam would promise to get the job done.

Mr. Chairman, the failure of Congress to follow through in addressing park needs in the Highway bill makes your exercise in holding these hearings increasingly important in educating your colleagues and the American people about the genuine risk continued neglect holds for our beloved national treasures, and about the necessity for taking bold steps to preserve and protect our national legacy.

Introduction: The Notable Northeast

After viewing an 1877 exhibition of French Impressionists, J. Alden Weir remarked that he thought the paintings "worse than a Chamber of Horrors." Weir eventually warmed to the style and helped to establish the American Impressionist movement. The bucolic setting of his Branchville, Connecticut farm featured prominently in many of Weir's paintings. Weir's slow conversion to impressionism and his influence over other American artists helped to invigorate and redefine artistic expression in the United States during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Weir Farm is currently one of 45 NPS sites in the northeast that help to tell the complex and fascinating story of how America forged its unique place in the world. And as the New England landscape inspired the art of J. Alden Weir so too has the land made a lasting impression on the natural and cultural legacy of the United States. According to the Park Service, the Northeast Region of the United States contains "one third of all NPS museum collections, a quarter of all historic structures, almost half of the country's National Historic Landmarks, and more than half of the National Heritage Areas." From Minuteman NHP where Patriots fired the first shots of the American Revolution to Lowell NHP where the power of New England rivers and the sweat of 19th Century "mill girls" launched our industrial revolution; from the rocky coastline of Acadia National Park to the beaches and ball fields of Gateway National Recreation Area, and from the homes of presidents to the nesting places of piping plovers, the national parks of the northeast educate and inspire.

Darkening that landscape, however, is the long shadow of an acute funding crisis. One that has plagued our national parks for decades, and one which, on a daily basis, impedes the ability of the Park Service to effectively manage the sites that commemorate our heritage. Under current conditions, the future for our northeastern parks is not an entirely bright one.

Northeastern Parks: Funding at a Glance

While the national parks of the northeast region remain premier destinations for American families a description of current conditions in these units reveals a troubling situation. At the exact moment when the public is rightfully demanding increased access, the national parks of the northeast must meet that need with diminished capacity. Of the 45 national park units in the northeast, 39 received a base operating budget increase of 3% or less between FY 05 and FY 06. 12 units received no increase to their base operating budgets at all. During this same period, the rate of inflation equaled 3.11%, with an equivalent amount required to pay cost of living adjustments for Park Service staff. The budget request for FY 06 continued this differential, providing for a 2.3% COLA while Congress is likely to mandate one closer to 3% before the year is out.

While last year's appropriations bill for fiscal year 2005 provided more money for many parks, the vast majority of this increase went to pay for jumps in costs and unfunded obligations, meaning it did little to chip away at the $600 million annual shortfall the parks face. Instead our parks remain subject to what historian Bernard De Voto called the "progressive impairment of the parks by budgetary bloodletting."

Base Operating Budget of Select National Park Units of the Northeast
NPS FY 2005 – FY 2006 (all dollar amounts in thousands)

Unit	FY05 Estimate	FY 06 Request	Increase FY05-FY06*	% Increase	% gap between inflation** and funding request for FY 06	Decrease in real dollars from FY 05 to FY 06 request
Acadia NP (ME)	6,424	6,505	81	1.2	-1.91%	-121
Adams NHP (MA)	2,764	2,818	54	1.9	-1.21%	-34
Boston Harbor Islands NRA (MA)	909	937	28	3.0	-.11%	-1
Boston NHP (MA)	8,527	8,699	172	2.0	-1.11%	-99
Cape Cod (MA)	6,361	6,379	118	1.8	-1.31%	-80
Edison NHS (NJ)	2,007	2,058	51	2.5	-.61%	-13
Fire Island NS (NY)	3,890	3,963	73	1.8	-1.31%	-50
Gateway NRA (NY)	21,573	21,988	415	1.9	-1.21%	-269
Hamilton Grange (NY)	159	159	0	0.0	-3.11%	-5
John F. Kennedy NHS (MA)	310	310	0	0.0	-3.11%	-10
Longfellow NHS (MA)	871	871	0	0.0	-3.11%	-27
Lowell NHP (MA)	9,270	9,397	127	1.4	-1.71%	-165

Saint-Gaudens NHS (NH)	988	1,006	18	1.8	-1.31%	-13
Weir Farm NHS	814	823	9	1.1	-2.01%	-17

*Based on administration request of $50.5 million increase. The fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill provided an additional $10 million.
**Based on an inflation rate of 3.11%.

Acadia National Park (ME)

Established by Presidential Proclamation in 1916 as Sieur de Monts National Monument, Acadia National Park (renamed and re-designated by Congress in 1929) preserves and protects 46,000 acres of the Acadian archipelago. Acadia National Park contains a wide variety of unique natural and cultural resources from glaciated coastal and island landscapes to the famous carriage roads. The mission of the National Park Service at Acadia National Park is to protect and conserve the "outstanding scenic, natural, and cultural resources for present and future generations."

In 2001, Acadia National Park released its business plan analysis based on Acadia's fiscal year 2000 budget and staffing levels, which provides an excellent base from which to explore current funding trends and needs. The 2001 assessment identified a number of concerns regarding funding levels at Acadia including a $7.3 million budget deficit, an over dependence on "soft money" (including fee demo dollars) to finance park operations, and a pronounced staffing shortfall of 109 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) employees.[1]

Since that time, Acadia's annual operating budget has not come close to keeping pace with the rising cost of operating the park. System-wide, mandated cost-of-living adjustments have averaged 3.0% per year between 1996 and 2005. During that same period, system-wide, funded cost-of-living adjustments averaged only 1.3%. The $127,000 budget increase Acadia received as a result of the fiscal year 2005 appropriations bill was offset by a projected labor cost increase of $243,000, putting the park further behind despite a highly successful year for the park system in obtaining operations funding.

External factors also contribute to Acadia's budgetary woes. As homeland security concerns have increased, rangers stationed at Acadia have been temporarily reassigned to assist personnel needs at high-priority Park Service sites around the country. These rangers continue to draw on Acadia's payroll despite their absence from the park.

Recent Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Office of Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) assessments have required park staff to increase their commitment of time and resources towards safety and environmental management. Spot checks, safety training, safety meetings, and stricter adherence to compliance standards, are necessary to avoid penalties and injuries that could amount to several hundred thousands of dollars. Nonetheless, the estimated annual cost to Acadia exceeds $30,000 per year.

Double digit population growth in Hancock County, Maine, as well as increased construction around Mount Desert Island have forced park staff to invest more funds in enforcing boundary issues, managing conservation easements, and preventing harmful or illegal activities within park boundaries. The fact that parklands are scattered across the island contributes to confusion about the

[1] Acadia's Business Plan: An Assessment of the Park's Operational Needs. 2001, p.2

location of Acadia's boundaries. This uncertainty has led to an increase in unauthorized trail building and illegal snowmobile and ATV use. Staffing shortfalls impede the ability of the Park Service to adequately monitor and enforce regulations meant to protect and preserve Acadia's vast natural and cultural resources.

Staffing shortfalls have also led to a restructuring of interpretive programs. Ranger-led hikes have been reduced in favor of family oriented activities that connect park rangers to a maximum number of park visitors. Interaction with park staff remains of remarkably high caliber, but this new approach to outreach is a clear result of a park unit struggling to cope with too few staff and increased visitation.

The maintenance division at Acadia has suffered from the overall reduction in FTEs. After rehabilitating the Blackwoods camp ground with new restrooms, the park then determined it did not have adequate maintenance staff on hand to monitor and clean the facilities. Over the winter of 2004/2005, Acadia closed all but 3 of 12 restrooms in the park much to the discomfort of many visitors.

NPS staff at Acadia must protect, preserve, or control 22 threatened and endangered plant species, 4 threatened and endangered animal species, 206 invasive non-native plants species, 147 miles of hiking trails, 44 miles of carriage roads, 27 miles of shoreline scenic drives, 2 beaches, 5 picnic areas, 3 campgrounds, 111 archaeological sites, and 1.3 million objects in the park museum collection. And do so while balancing the need to preserve with the publics right to access and appropriate enjoyment of these resources. Managing such a workload would be difficult enough in the best of times, but the Park Service must meet these challenges in a time of shrinking budgets and overstretched staff.

What will Acadia be forced to sacrifice? As the park's Annual Performance Plan for FY04 states, "Hard choices must be made."

Gateway National Recreation Area (NY)

When Congress authorized the creation of Gateway National Recreation Area in 1972, their intention was to create a federal recreation area "in the heart of an urban complex." Gateway was to serve as a refuge for east coast residents, especially New Yorkers, and fundamentally improve their quality of life by providing access for millions of Americans to rolling green spaces, well-manicured ball fields, and sandy beaches. Gateway would be a potent antidote for humans to the stress and strain of big city life, and function as a habitat for a variety of plants and animals, including migratory birds for which the park has served as a traditional stop over point.

Unfortunately, for over 30 years a persistent lack of attention and funding has halted any progress towards the development of Gateway. Sandy Hook, Floyd Bennett Field, and Fort Tilden are home to dilapidated structures and overgrown fields. The salt marshes and shoreline of Jamaica Bay remain in dire need of restoration. And worst of all, there is no coherent, creative vision in place to help the Park Service effectively and creatively manage this woefully underutilized resource.

According to Park Service staff, Gateway has in excess of $98 million in unfunded construction, refurbishment, and rehabilitation needs. Far from being a wish-list of far-future desires, Gateway's exhaustive menu of stabilization and improvement projects focuses on basic upkeep

meant to prevent historic structures from collapsing to the ground, shorelines from eroding needlessly into the sea, and ball fields from being consumed by weeds.

Gateway staff have requested $579,000 to replace the roof, windows, and doors of the historic Torpedo magazine, $10 million to rehabilitate athletic fields at Miller Field and Great Kills Park, and $72,000 to remove asbestos tiles discovered in the basement of building 210 in Fort Wadsworth.[2] Additional requests include $88,000 to correct code violations in the maintenance and office shops, $143,608 to replace the law enforcement patrol boat at Sandy Hook, and $1.3 million to pay for a general management plan. As of August 2005, Gateway had not identified any sources to provide the money required for the completion of these projects. The gaps created by insufficient funding not only impede the ability of the Park Service to manage Gateway effectively, they also present safety hazards to NPS employees and park visitors, and contribute to the slow but steady demise of the health of the park's natural and cultural resources.

Between FY 04 and FY 05 Gateway received a 3.0% increase to its base operations budget. An anemic 1.9% increase between FY 05 and FY 06 failed to keep pace with the rising price of fixed costs and places Gateway staff even further behind in their efforts to protect and enhance the park.

NPCA's New York Regional Office is committed to helping the Park Service and partners throughout the region and across the country craft a positive vision for Gateway. One that would elevate public awareness of the park's needs and potential, and galvanize federal and state support for a bold plan of action that would reverse decades of neglect that have stymied any meaningful progress from taking place. NPCA's vision for Gateway matches the plan originally put forth by Congress a little more than three decades ago, in that we see possibility of a well-funded, well-managed national park that provides an unparalleled visitor experience for millions of people each year. But until Congress and the American people muster the commitment to act on behalf of Gateway, the park's potential will remain a dream deferred.

Cape Cod National Seashore (MA)

The mission of the National Park Service at Cape Cod National Seashore is to protect the natural and cultural resources along the 40 miles of beach and over the 44,000 acres that serve as one the northeastern United States' most premier recreation and vacation destinations. On the surface, NPS staff at Cape Cod appear well on their way to fulfilling that mission.

For example, the Park Service has almost completed a major renovation project at the Salt Pond visitor center. Beginning in April of 2003, major renovation of the salt Pond facility began. $3 million was devoted to completion of the project, which included upgrading the utility systems, removing lead paint and asbestos, and installing fire suppression systems to bring the building up to code. The enhancements also included improved handicapped access within the facility and around the grounds, reduction of pollutants entering Salt Pond from park's septic system, and the addition of a new comfort station next door to the visitor center.

On schedule for completion this fall is the reopening of the Salt Pond museum and the installation of a modern audio-visual and public address system. The park's museum collection will

[2] Amounts taken from a park spreadsheet listed "unfunded funding components" projects for Gateway National Recreation Area, August 10, 2005.

be reinstalled after the repairs are finished. Additional landscape and trail maintenance work will complete the project.

But although there is good news to celebrate at Cape Cod, funding shortfalls contribute to management woes at this park as significantly as they do elsewhere in the northeast. NPS staff at Cape Cod have referred to the challenges created by successive tight budgets as "death by 1,000 cuts." For example, inadequate funding has led to a drastic reduction in the number of law enforcement rangers at Cape Cod. The park's current protection force is deployed primarily near the visitor centers, parking lots, and beaches, leaving vast portions of the park without an NPS law enforcement presence. As a result cape Cod staff have witnessed a rise in the looting of artifacts and encroachments upon park boundaries by in-holders. Park Staff estimate that the addition of ten more seasonal law enforcement personnel would restore their ability to adequately monitor and protect the park.

Similarly affected by funding shortfalls is the park's lifeguard program. Cape Cod receives over 4 million visitors each year, 70% of who visit the park for the express purpose of going to the beach. From mid-June to Labor Day visitors are charged a $15 beach fee, from which $10 is set aside to tackle backlog maintenance projects and $5 goes to fund the lifeguard program. The beach fee usually raises about $350,000 to support the 48 seasonal lifeguards posted at Cape Cod's 6 designated swim beaches.

Normally, recreation fee money of the type generated by the beach fees could not be used to pay for a lifeguard program. Cape Cod was able to obtain a waiver, but the deferral must be applied for on an annual basis. Failure to secure the waiver would necessitate termination of the lifeguard program altogether as there are no other funds available with which to pay for the service.

The renewal of the Cape Cod lifeguard program should not be an annual waiting game. Nor should the staffing levels at premier destinations such as Cape Cod be reduced to a point where law enforcement rangers are able to protect the parking lots but not the park. In the strategic plan for Cape Cod covering FY 00 to FY 05, park staff warned:

> "We would, however, be remiss in our duties as stewards of the priceless natural and cultural resources that are in our care if we did not note that we sincerely believe we are under-funded and under-staffed to fully achieve our important mission and goals."[3]

A sign in the salt Pond visitor center describing the rehabilitation work that had taken place there states that the projects completed were "not visibly apparent but… vitally important" to protection of park resources and visitor safety. At Cape Cod, one might say the same of the park's funding needs

Hamilton Grange National Memorial (NY)

Upon completion of his term as the first Secretary of the U.S. Treasury (1789-1795), Alexander Hamilton commissioned architect John McComb Jr. to build a home on a 32-acre estate in upper Manhattan. Hamilton's Grange was completed in 1802. The acquisition of the property and construction of the "Grange" cost Hamilton $30,000. Hamilton had hoped that

[3] Cape Cod National Seashore Strategic Plan FY 00 to FY 05, p. 4

proceeds from the sale of vegetables grown on his farmland would offset the exorbitant cost of his estate but quickly reconciled himself to the fact that "The greatest part of my little farm will be dedicated to grass."

He lived there for only two years before being killed in a duel on July 11, 1804, by his political rival Aaron Burr. In 1889, the Grange was moved approximately 400 feet to its present location to accommodate the expansion of the New York City street grid. The property was slated for demolition but then purchased by a local church for use as a parish house. Finally, in 1962, an Act of Congress established the Hamilton Grange National Memorial, and directed that the house eventually be relocated and "preserved in a fitting setting" for proper administration and interpretation as a national memorial.

At the present moment almost all the pieces are in place to accomplish the goals of the 1962 restoration plan for Hamilton Grange. An easement from New York City Parks & Recreation for the use of one acre in St. Nicolas Park (approximately 400 feet from the present location) was approved several years ago. The New York State Assembly, the State Historic Preservation Office, all relevant agencies, various community groups, and numerous elected officials including Representative Charles Rangel, have reviewed and approved the restoration initiative.

Conspicuously absent from the process, however, is the $10,465,105 needed by the Park Service to complete the move. Initially placed in the FY 06 construction budget, the money was subsequently removed from the Executive Budget. Park Service officials have pledged that full funding for this important project will be included in the FY 07 budget. In the meantime, the only home founding father Alexander Hamilton ever owned languishes in neglect.

Hamilton Grange is in poor condition with very limited public access. The Alexander Hamilton Historical Society has referred to the present site on 141st Street and Convent Avenue as "a third-rate national memorial with few furnishings and bare interpretive material." A base operations budget increase of 0.0% between FY 05 and FY 06 will further impede the ability of Park Service staff to protect and enhance the Grange and educate the public about the legacy of a man much too significant to be confined to the dust bin of history.

Alexander Hamilton was one of General George Washington's closest aides de camp during the American Revolution, and led the American assault on Redoubt Number 10 during the Siege of Yorktown. He later co-authored the Federalist Papers, was a signer of the Constitution, and was an early proponent of Abolition. He was a man of humble origin who became, as Theodore Roosevelt observed, one of the keenest minds of his generation. Delivering Hamilton's eulogy in 1804, Governor Morris exhorted the gathering to protect Hamilton's fame. "Let it be the test," he said, " by which to examine those who solicit your favor." It is a test that we, some 201 years later, have largely failed.

Longfellow National Historic Site (MA)

The current condition of Longfellow National Historic Site provides a stark contrast to the state of affairs at Hamilton Grange. A recently released NPCA State of the Parks report finds that public and private partnerships have greatly contributed to preserving and enhancing the well being of the natural and cultural resources at Longfellow. Still, the consequences of inadequate funding have managed to adversely impact this park in a variety of ways.

The Longfellow House was built in 1759 for John Vassall, a wealthy loyalist. Vassall abandoned the house on the eve of the American Revolution and General George Washington used the Georgian style home as a headquarters during the 9-month siege of Boston. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow first came to the house as a boarder in 1837. He received ownership of the house in 1843 from his father in law as a wedding gift and would write some of his most enduring poems and translations while living there.

The Longfellow National Historic Site remains home to vast archival and museum collections dating from the late 17th to the mid-20th centuries. The Longfellow family library alone contains 14,000 volumes. On exhibit or in storage are 35,000 items of historic furnishings and decorative arts, rare documents, letters, and family journals, as well as 12,000 photographs. These heirlooms connect visitors to the daily lives of the Longfellow family and trace generational interests and participation in the most significant events in American History including the Revolutionary War, the Abolitionist movement, the Civil War, women's education and equality, and emerging trends in American art and literature.

NPCA's 2005 State of the Parks report concluded that Longfellow benefits from the active presence of a strong friends group and a broad network of supporters that help fill critical service gaps and "complete projects that would not otherwise be possible."[4] For example, NPS staff and their colleagues have made considerable progress in cataloging the Longfellow collection and protecting and preserving the cultural resources in their charge. The park has also maintained a high degree of public access to archival materials and works with 450 researchers on an annual basis. Restoration of the formal garden and house forecourt is underway, and an on-line tour provides visitors with an introduction to the museum collection as well as background on the 250-year history of the house and all its various occupants.

Much of this success is due to the fact that Longfellow has not had to rely solely upon annual appropriations to support core needs. Since 1998, the park has received just under $5 million in grants or special projects funding from a variety of sources both private and federal. The Friends of the Longfellow House completed a capital campaign in 2005 that raised $800,000 to support landscape enhancement projects. The Save America's Treasures program has contributed $1 million to conserve "at risk" portions of the museum and archives collection and $90,000 for archaeological work. These contributions have given Longfellow a boost not readily available to other NPS units in the northeast. And still challenges linked to inadequate funding remain.

The $400,000 annual funding shortfall prevents Longfellow from filling key maintenance and curatorial positions. A large number of the park's cultural resources are stored in attics without proper security or environmental controls, thus making them susceptible to damage and loss. And public access to Longfellow has suffered the most from inadequate funding; the park remains closed eight months of the year and open only five days per week during the summer months, restricting access for school groups and other visitors.

Simply put, the park's operating budget has not kept pace with rising costs. A 0.0% increase to Longfellow's base operations budget between FY 05 and FY 06 will exacerbate the short-term

---

[4] *State of the Parks, A Resource Assessment: Longfellow National Historic Site.* The National Parks Conservation Association, August 2005.

challenges for resource preservation and visitor access, and create a host of long-term challenges to the health and well being of the park. Despite the best efforts of enthusiastic volunteers and philanthropists, circumstances at Longfellow prove that there are still some critical park needs that must be more fully addressed by Congress. Friends groups should provide a margin of excellence for our national parks, but never a margin of survival.

Weir Farm National Historic Site (CT)

In the 1980s, artists in residence Sperry and Doris Andrews became concerned about the impact of nearby development on the future of Weir Farm. A coalition of supporters formed the private non-profit Weir Farm Heritage Trust and, with backing from larger conservation organizations, purchased as much of the original Weir Farm property as they could, managing it until a suitable owner could be identified. The farm was listed on the register of historic places in 1984, and soon thereafter the Park Service began a study to determine the feasibility of adding Weir Farm to the National Park System.

Weir Farm National Historic Site was established on October 31, 1990. The mission of the site is to preserve and interpret the "historically significant properties and landscapes" associated with the life of painter J. Alden Weir. Weir Farm is currently one of only two national park units that focus primarily on fine art.

When it comes to funding Weir Farm has two stories to tell. The Weir Farm Heritage Trust has done an exemplary job of supporting park improvements and engaging the public, especially artists and art students, with education, outreach, and visiting artists programs. Park Service and Heritage Trust partnerships with Western Connecticut State University, the University of Connecticut, and local communities have helped to establish Weir Farm as the beau ideal of the appropriate mix of preservation, enhancement, and public access.

Nonetheless, funding needs continue to hamper the ability of Weir Farm staff to effectively manage the park in a way that ensures the brightest possible future. For example, unlike Longfellow National Historic Site in Massachusetts, Weir Farm does not have ample collections of work produced on site by the owner, family members, or guest artists in residence at the farm in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In fact, paintings by contemporary artists in residence are displayed in greater numbers at the park than Weir's own work. Possession, preservation, and interpretation of Weir's artwork is a vital component of the Park Service mission at Weir Farm. But even as Weir's paintings are donated or acquired with private funds there exists no gallery or "museum-quality exhibition and storage space" on site in which to display or warehouse precious works of art.

The situation at Weir Farm is a perfect catch-22. As the park's general management plan states, Weir Farm's "modest collection of art and its minimal facilities must be enhanced to support" interpretive programming. Yet, without the financial wherewithal to provide for proper storage and display bringing irreplaceable cultural resources to Weir Farm would be a potentially disastrous mistake. Without the ability to safely exhibit and store valuable works of art, Weir Farm remains a place of inspirational beauty with all the untapped potential of a blank canvas.

Adams National Historical Park (MA)

Adams National Historical Park commemorates the prominent place in American History of a unique and distinguished family that helped to found the United States and shape the principles that

guided the nation's early development. The 14-acre park includes the birth homes of Presidents John Adams and John Quincy Adams, the Old House (home to four generations of the Adams family), the United First Parish Church, historic gardens and landscapes, and an estimated 87,300-item collection of artifacts. Adams National Historical Park has the distinction of being the only historic site in the country "where the stories of two presidents can be told from birth to death." Adams National Historical Park was designated part of the National Park System in 1946.

In 2001, NPCA issued its inaugural State of the Parks Report on Adams National Historical Park. From a possible score of 100 the report rated the condition of the park's cultural resources at 72, and the condition of its natural resources at 64. The assessment regarded these scores as "fairly high," but concluded that should the "current administrative policies and management practices prevail…" the condition of the natural and cultural resources at Adams would "likely deteriorate" over the next ten years. Funding will play a key element in determining the future condition of Adams National Historical Park.

The operational deficit faced by the park adversely impacts the ability of the Park Service to care for and provide public access to a remarkable trove of historic artifacts that include a wet pressed copy of the Declaration of Independence presented to John Adams in the 1820s. Public access is limited because the park is closed from November to March. And during the months the park is open, the current visitor center does not adequately prepare visitors for their park experience.

235,000 people visited Adams in FY 04. That number is expected to increase exponentially in the coming years due in part to the success of David McCullough's recent biography of John Adams, and an upcoming HBO biographical mini-series on the Adams Family produced by Tom Hanks. John Adams and his family are undergoing a renaissance in popularity at the very moment when the country has failed to fully support those tasked with commemorating their great legacy.

Guided tours are the only way for the public to gain access to the birth homes, Old House, and Stone Library, the structures that contain the artifacts and objects that help give life to the story of four generations of Adamses. Highly qualified interpretive rangers lead the tours and provide expert commentary on the homes and the people who lived in them. But to accommodate a maximum number of people, the visits are brief and frequently crowd visitors into cramped viewing spaces. In such close quarters and under such conditions, irreplaceable heirlooms sit or stand one errant turn away from being damaged or destroyed.

Increasing the amount of storage and exhibition space at Adams would alleviate much of the problem. In 2001, nearly half of Adams National Historical Park's collection storage facilities did not meet professional museum standards for preservation. A secure, well-designed visitor center could also play an important role in enhancing interpretation and improving the visitor experience. The display of key artifacts (such as the John Adams' copy of the Declaration of Independence) in a proper exhibition space would provide visitors with the opportunity to consider such items under less rushed and cramped circumstances. The current visitor center cannot house such important documents because non-Park Service maintenance personnel have independent access to the building.

The staff at Adams have taken measures to address some of these concerns. The park recently completed the rehabilitation of the Carriage House, adding a climate control system to ensure the

protection of the artifacts stored in that building. Grant money has been awarded to upgrade the park's security system, and, in direct response to the needs identified in the 2001 State of the Parks report for Adams, $86,000 has been donated to assist with the conservation of the archival and artifacts collection.[5] Still, no money has been set aside to support a new visitor center.

While the park waits to receive the money from Congress to buy or build a new visitors center, many precious and irreplaceable artifacts remain on view with only the diligence of Park Service staff and a velvet rope to protect them from accidental or intentional harm.

Boston National Historical Park (MA)

The mission of the National Park Service at Boston National Historical Park is to provide visitors with a coherent view of the history of Boston's revolutionary era generation. The park's 2.5-mile Freedom Trail guides visitors past 16 sites and structures that explain the prominent role the City of Boston played in the transition of America from colony to independent nation. From Dorchester Heights, where General Washington maneuvered the British out of Boston, to the deck of the USS Constitution, the oldest commissioned warship still afloat, Boston National is chock-a-block with some of the most well know icons of the American Revolution.

In FY 04 just under 2 million people visited Boston National. Such numbers are a strong public endorsement of the significance of the stories preserved and shared at Boston National and confirmation of the pivotal role NPS plays in enhancing public knowledge and understanding of our history and culture. Yet, between 1990 and 2003, Boston National had the lowest rate of growth of all park units in the New England Cluster.[6] Consistently flat budgets forced park managers to make "service level adjustments and eliminate positions and curtail services." How odd and troubling it is to note that this premier classroom on the American Revolution is also one of the least adequately funded National park units in the northeast region.

During the 13-year period from 1990 to 2003, a pronounced lack of funding forced the park to drop 16 FTEs (from 118 to 102). Only one other unit in the 17-park "Granite Cluster," Saugus Iron Works, reported a loss in FTEs for those same years. By comparison Boston African American, Saint Gaudens, and Salem Maritime managed to increase their number of FTEs by 5, 5, and 12 respectively over the same period of time.

As a result of the dire financial conditions, core programs and services at Boston National have been reduced or phased out. As of FY 03 the School Outreach Program had been reduced by 80%, guided Freedom Trail tours had decreased by 70%, and staffing at Dorchester Heights had been cut back from full time to 3 days a week.[7] Insufficient staffing levels still hinder Park Service efforts to conduct "cyclic and preventive maintenance" on buildings, and exhibit and monument maintenance has been eliminated altogether.

Unfunded mandates and unplanned expenses have taken their tolls on Boston National's spending power as well. In FY 03 the park was required to pay for a government sponsored employee transportation subsidy program that drained $26,147 from the operations budget. A lead

---

[5] E-mail communication between Adams Superintendent Caroline Keineth and NPCA intern Bryan Feahner, August 15, 2005.
[6] Taken from unpublished fact sheet received from park staff in August 2005.
[7] ibid

paint abatement project in one of the park's housing units cost $100,000. Repair of the air conditioning compressor in the visitor center totaled $5,000. Regional or national support for these expenses is sometimes forthcoming. But more often than not Boston National must absorb the cost of unplanned expenses on its own.

Even projected expenses are taking a bigger bite out of Boston National's budget. As the price of line item expenses such as fuel, vehicle leases, snow removal, utilities, mandatory training, and other "essential services," increases at a faster pace than the park's budget, an ever-increasing percentage of operations dollars must be devoted to simply keeping the lights on. As any budget officer in the Park Service will tell you, fixed costs are "fixed" in name only.

Boston National did receive $1.2 million in FY 03 for homeland security enhancements. That funding, however, was exclusively directed to support law enforcement and ranger functions tied to homeland security. A more robust 8.0% increase to the base-operating budget was enacted between FY 04 and FY 05, and the number of FTE positions at Boston National rose in FY 04 to 112. But the park remains a long way from making a complete recovery from decades of financial neglect. A subsequent 2.0% increase for FY 06 signaled an abrupt halt to any plans to provide Boston National with the kind of significant, long-term investment the park deserves.

In the meantime, visitors continue to stream into Boston National to see the places and learn about the people who helped conceive our nation. At Charlestown Navy Yard the public will enter the visitor center through the one working door, its cracked glass held in place by tape, after passing a brick wall from which the NPS logo has either fallen or been torn from its place. The remaining bare screws and outline of an arrowhead are silent but powerful symbols of our neglect and the park's distress.

Minute Man National Historical Park (MA)

The British foray to Lexington and Concord on April 19, 1775, was meant to prevent a war, not start a revolution. But by the end of the day 73 British soldiers and 49 colonial militia – minute men – lay dead, and the opportunity for a peaceful resolution of the crisis between England and America had vanished into thin air. Minute Man National Historical Park was established in 1959 to preserve "the sites, structures, monuments, and landscapes associated with the beginning of the American Revolution." In FY 04 more than 1 million people visited Minute Man and learned about the series of unplanned actions and events that helped move the country several steps closer to independence.

The funding story at Minute Man is equally as complex as the history the park interprets. Between FY 04 and FY 05 the park received a healthy 8.4% increase in base operations funding. In FY 05 park managers reallocated $30,000 from travel funds to support operations, and received $138,000 to "restore visitor services." According to park staff, these increases allowed "closed facilities to be reopened & primary resources to be adequately maintained."

There is, however, a sense that this success may be ephemeral at best. Funding shortfalls forced Minute Man to reduce its number of FTEs from 39 in 2000 to 26 in 2005. The result is that even recently reopened facilities and structures suffer because the park does not have enough staff to

perform routine care and maintenance. The park has been able to keep both its visitor centers (Minute Man and North Bridge) open, but Minute Man facility is only open from April to October.

Heading into the FY 06 budget process, park staff at Minute Man submitted a request for an increase of $442,000 to their operating budget. The funding, if received, was to cover routine maintenance of new and rehabilitated facilities in the Battle Road Unit, the development and implementation of educational programs and interpretive services at FY 04 levels, and the establishment of an "alternative funding/leasing program designed to increase income by renting appropriate park-owned facilities to non-profits and local business people.

Unfortunately, the life-support provided by the increase in base operations funding between FY 04 and 05 was followed by a weaker appropriation in FY 06. With the rate of inflation hovering at 3.11%, the 2.2% increase in base operations funding—nearly one percent below the cost of inflation--stalls progress towards addressing the enhancement, programmatic, and staffing needs at Minute Man.

Conclusion

The national parks of the northeastern United States protect, preserve, and interpret some of our nation's most prized natural and cultural resources. But significant funding shortfalls make it increasingly difficult for the men and women of the Park Service to serve as guardians of the nation's heritage. Successive years of insufficient budgets have eroded the actual spending power of parks in the northeast, and contributed to the slow but steady decline in the ability to manage the day-to-day core functions of parks in an effective manner.

In the northeast, this remains, for the most part, a quiet crisis. The professionalism and "can do" attitude of Park Service employees has created an organization adept at overcoming obstacles and delivering a high level of service to the public. Still, the stresses of coping with inadequate funding are beginning to manifest themselves in many parks in increasingly visible ways; closed facilities, reduced public access, less interpretive and educational programming, management by crisis, diminished law enforcement capabilities, and compromises to visitor safety and enjoyment, are all symptoms of a larger disease. We can and must do better for our national parks.

The 388 units of the National Park System are special places that inspire--that teach our children about the history of the United States and the wonders of the natural world. They are truly the most significant natural, cultural and historic places on the American landscape. Our parks need a national vision that matches their greatness, and ensures that the legacy of our National Park System will long endure, benefiting generations of Americans yet unborn.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Next is Marilyn Fenollosa, National Trust for Historic Preservation. Thank you for coming today.

STATEMENT OF MARILYN FENOLLOSA

Ms. FENOLLOSA. Good morning. My name is Marilyn Fenollosa and I am senior program officer and regional attorney for the Northeast Office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private nonprofit membership organization dedicated to saving historic places and revitalizing America's communities.

Recipient of the National Humanities Medal, the National Trust was founded in 1949 and provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to protect the irreplaceable places that tell America's stories. Staff at our Washington, DC, headquarters, six regional offices, and 26 historic sites work with 270,000 members and thousands of preservation groups in all 50 States.

The act of Congress that created the national trust had as its purpose to facilitate public participation in the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest and it is with that purpose that I come before you today.

The National Park Service has its roots in New England. Writing from his home in Brookline, MA, now the Olmsted National Historic Site, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., crafted the words that served as the foundation for legislation establishing the Park Service in 1916. That is, "To conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Our two organizations have worked hand in hand as a public-private partnership to preserve the cultural and natural resources that are the heritage of our country. Yet, we have become increasingly alarmed at the declining capacity of the National Park Service to care for the parks in its stewardship in New England and, indeed, across the Nation.

Even as the administrative burdens have increased, Park Service staff has decreased due to the erosion of base funding. The National Park Service has not had the resources it needs to maintain its side of the partnership.

The fiscal year 2006 budget justifications for the Park Service, available on the Service's Web site, notes that the cultural resources within its stewardship are threatened by inadequate attention to stabilization, maintenance, and repair of structures, landscapes, and museum collections; by the failure to monitor changes in the resources; by the failure to correct improper uses; and by the lack of documentation and determination of appropriate treatment strategies.

Indeed, that report notes that in 2004, and again likely in this year, only 45½ percent of the Park Service's historic structures are in good condition. That is less than half. The National Trust has assumed a watchdog role in recent years, by naming the most compromised national parks to our annual list of America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places.

This list is intended to bring public attention to significant buildings, sites and landscapes that are threatened with demolition, deferred maintenance, lack of funding or the will to preserve them. In recent years we have listed the following sites in the Northeast alone: Independence National Park—due to years of inadequate funding and deferred maintenance; Ellis Island—due to proposed inappropriate development and structural deterioration that threatened dozens of the island's historic buildings; Gettysburg National Military Park—due to encroaching development on privately held acres surrounding the park that threatened to destroy its historic character; Governor's Island—due to the uncertainty facing this Coast Guard facility, America's oldest continuously occupied military post that is now a national park; Valley Forge National Historical Park—due to untreated water damage, mold and failing roofs at the officers' quarters for Washington's army; and, most recently, Minuteman National Historical Park—due to lack of planning to alleviate the noise, visual intrusions, and vehicular traffic generated by commuters flying out of the civilian airport at next-door Hanscom field.

Minuteman is a case in point: this park, the site of the first battle of the Revolutionary War and the march and retreat of the British soldiers, is arguably one of the most important sites of our history and one of the most heavily visited in the Northeast. The park serves over 1.2 million visitors every year from all parts of the country and indeed the world. Visitors come to understand what ordinary citizens did so long ago to secure their liberty. Yet, the park has lacked the funding to maintain itself as a premier park.

The park was faced with canceling its seasonal program in fiscal year 2005 due to lack of funds but was able to open, at a reduced level, due to a last minute congressional appropriation. The park's principal visitor center is now closed during most of the winter. The hours and programs at the Wayside, Nathaniel Hawthorne's house that is within the park limits, have been severely reduced. The park's budget only permits three full-time interpretive rangers for those 1.3 million visitors and this will be reduced to two in fiscal year 2006.

Park management has rehabilitated many of its historic structures for lease to raise operating funds, but lacks the funding to run a leasing program. Over the past several years there has been a multi-million dollar public investment to restore the historic structures and landscapes within the park and provide facilities for its visitors, but it has no resources to maintain them.

It is unconscionable that these properties, under the stewardship of the U.S. Government, should have to operate under these challenges. New England abounds with historic parks and sites, and the tourists that come to see them are a critical component of our economy. But more important than the dollars they leave are the experiences that these visitors take back home.

They learn about the events of our shared history, especially the Revolutionary War. They learn of the values that were shaped by those events, and they are enriched by their memories of what they have seen and heard.

It is our, and your, responsibility to ensure that our national parks continue to exceed their expectations. We cannot let our

parks fail for lack of adequate funding. As Olmsted wrote in 1916, "We must keep the national parks unimpaired for the enjoyment of all future generations." It is our moral obligation to do so. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Fenollosa:]

NORTHEAST
OFFICE

NATIONAL TRUST
for HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Testimony of
Marilyn M. Fenollosa
Senior Program Officer and Regional Attorney

Before

The Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources

"The National Parks: Preservation of Historic Sites and the Northeast Region"

August 24, 2005

Good Morning. My name is Marilyn Fenollosa and I am the Senior Program Officer and Regional Attorney for the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Northeast Office.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a private, nonprofit membership organization dedicated to saving historic places and revitalizing America's communities. Recipient of the National Humanities Medal, the Trust was founded in 1949 and provides leadership, education, advocacy, and resources to protect the irreplaceable places that tell America's story. Staff at the Washington, D.C., headquarters, six regional offices and 26 historic sites work with the Trust's 270,000 members and thousands of preservation groups in all 50 states.

The Act of Congress creating the National Trust had as its purpose "to facilitate public participation in the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest", and it is with that purpose that I come before you today.

The National Park Service has its roots in New England. Writing from his home in Brookline, Massachusetts, now the Olmsted National Historic Site, Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. crafted the words that served as the foundation for legislation establishing the Park Service in 1916: "To conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Our two organizations have worked hand in hand as a public-private partnership to preserve the cultural and natural resources that are the heritage of our country. Yet we

NORTHEAST OFFICE
SEVEN FANEUIL HALL MARKETPLACE
BOSTON, MA 02109
617.523.0885 · FAX: 617.523.1199
NERO@NTHP.ORG
Serving: CT, ME, MA, NH, NY, RI & VT

NORTHEAST FIELD OFFICE
6401 GERMANTOWN AVENUE
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19144
215.848.8033 · FAX: 215.848.5997
E-MAIL: ADRIAN_FINE@NTHP.ORG
Serving: DE, NJ & PA

NATIONAL OFFICE
1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036
WWW.NATIONALTRUST.ORG

have become increasingly alarmed at the declining capacity of the National Park Service to care for the parks in its stewardship in New England and across the nation. Even as the administrative burdens have increased, Park Service staff has decreased due to the erosion of base funding. The National Park Service has not had the resources it needs to maintain its side of the partnership.

The fiscal year 2006 Budget Justifications for the Park Service, available on the Service's website, notes that the cultural resources within its stewardship are threatened

- By inadequate attention to stabilization, maintenance and repair of structures, landscapes, and museum collections;
- by the failure to monitor changes in the resources;
- by the failure to correct improper uses; and
- by the lack of documentation and determination of appropriate treatment strategies.

(the "Greenbook", National Park Service FY 2006 Budget Justifications, p. ONPS –36; see http://data2.itc.nps.gov/budgetweb/fy2006/ONPS_RS.pdf

Indeed, that report notes that in 2004 and likely again in 2005, only 45.5% of the Park Services' historic structures are in good condition. That's less than half!

The National Trust has assumed a watchdog role in recent years, by naming the most compromised national parks to our annual list of America's 11 Most Endangered Places. This list is intended to bring public attention to significant buildings, sites and landscapes that are threatened with demolition, deferred maintenance, lack of funding or the will to preserve them. In recent years we have listed the following sites in the Northeast alone:

- Independence National Historical Park (1991) – due to years of inadequate funding and deferred maintenance;

- Ellis Island (1992, 1997) – due to proposed inappropriate development and structural deterioration that threatened dozens of the island's historic buildings;

- Gettysburg National Military Park (1992) – due to encroaching development on privately held acres surrounding the park that threatened to destroy its historic character;

- Governor's Island (1998) – due to the uncertainty facing this Coast Guard facility, America's oldest continuously occupied military post that is now a National Park;

- Valley Forge National Historical Park (2000) – due to untreated water damage, mold and failing roofs at the officers' quarters for Washington's army; and

- Minuteman National Historical Park (2003) – due to lack of planning to alleviate the noise, visual intrusions, and vehicular traffic generated by commuters flying out of the civilian airport at next door Hanscom Field.

Minuteman is a case in point: this park, the site of the first battle of the Revolutionary War and the march and retreat of the British soldiers, is arguably one of the most important sites of our history and one of the most heavily visited in the Northeast. The Park serves over 1.2 million visitors every year from all parts of the country and indeed the world, visitors who come to understand what ordinary citizens did so long ago to secure their liberty. Yet the Park has lacked the funding to maintain itself as a premier park:

- the Park was faced with canceling its seasonal program in FY '05 due to lack of funds but was able to open, at a reduced level, due to a last minute Congressional appropriation;
- the Park's principal visitor center is now closed during most of the winter;
- the hours and programs at the Wayside, Nathaniel Hawthorne's house that is within the Park limits, have been severely reduced;
- the Park's budget only permits three full time interpretive rangers for those 1.3 million visitors, and this will be reduced to two in fiscal '06;
- Park management has rehabilitated many of its historic structures for lease to raise operating funds, but lacks the funding to run a leasing program;
- over the past several years there has been a multi-million dollar public investment to restore the historic structures and landscapes within the Park and provide facilities for its visitors, but it has no resources to maintain them.

It is unconscionable that these properties, under the stewardship of the U.S. Government, should have to operate under these challenges.

New England abounds with historic parks and sites, and the tourists that come to see them are a critical component of our economy. But more important than the dollars they leave are the experiences that these visitors take back home: they learn about the events of our shared history, especially the Revolutionary War; they learn of the values that were shaped by those events; and they are enriched by their memories of what they have seen and heard. It is our, and your, responsibility to ensure that our National Parks continue to exceed their expectations. We cannot let our parks fail for lack of adequate funding. As Olmsted wrote in 1916, we must keep the National Parks unimpaired for the enjoyment of all future generations – it is our moral obligation to do so.

Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Our next witness is Ken Olson, president of the Friends of Acadia National Park in Maine.

STATEMENT OF KEN OLSON

Mr. OLSON. Thank you, Congressman Souder, for both holding these hearings and for inviting me to speak. I am, as you said, Ken Olson and I am president of Friends of Acadia which is a 3,000 member nonprofit philanthropy that was founded in 1986. We raise private funds for Acadia National Park. I also serve on the Executive Committee of the National Park Friends Alliance which consist of chief executives of about 40 leading park philanthropies.

You have asked me to comment specifically on Park budget issues and citizen philanthropy. Friends of Acadia is completely independent from Acadia National Park and the National Park Service. From 1995 alone we have donated $5.1 million to the park or to community entities for projects that complement Park values.

Our charitable funding makes possible the employment of about 115 seasonable workers, that is about 50 MTEs, in Acadia National Park or in the towns. For example, Explorer Bus System is a community and Park project and our funding, thanks to L.L. Bean, helps run that very successful system.

Friends of Acadia has also raised $16 million in endowments and other invested funds. Each year we grant the interest, about 4 percent, to the park. For example, Friends created the only endowed trail system in national park history. Same for our carriage road endowment and the endowment for the park's wheelchair-accessible horse carriages. In all cases the funds flow to maintenance forever.

Without our private dollars these projects could not have been initiated. If Friends should for some reason go out of business, our remaining assets must be transferred to another entity and used for the original purposes.

Several Acadia summer positions were cut for budget reasons in 2004. As Roger Kennedy noted, many restrooms, and most of them built quite recently, were closed in winter which is a real inconvenience, of course, and does cause sanitation problems as well.

Eleven permanent jobs are vacant now. That number is rising from last year. It was about eight and they won't be filled. The reason is that the funds that would support those jobs have to go to seasonable positions that would otherwise disappear. In other words, there is a long-term tradeoff for a very profound short-term need.

Also, about the interpreter programs, within Acadia National Park approximately 30 percent of the interpreter programs have been cut in recent years and that means that about 65,000 people are not getting educational offerings at Acadia National Park.

The President's 2006 budget contains an increase for Park Service operations nationwide and we thank him. However, in many cases the money won't reach the parks themselves. The President and Congress may be unaware of this business snag. I would like to say this is not a problem of too much overhead in the regional offices. It is not a problem with that.

Take the 2005 park budget increase for which Congress deserves considerable credit. Mandated employee raises, agency internal assessments, retirement system changes, terrorism alerts and emergency expenditures are consuming the new money and that is what is producing the shortfalls.

It is not clear whether the full Congress understands the paradox which is this: it is well intentioned and welcome funding increases are nonetheless resulting in service reductions at the park level. Pressure is mounting on philanthropies to fund operating shortfalls.

A recent Park Service review in a western national park stated that its supporting nonprofit, a group like ours "should first and foremost raise funds for the [park] superintendent's priorities (which we agree with 100 percent) be they a capital improvement project or for operations."

It is the operations part that is quite concerning. That is because the role of philanthropy is to supplement and not replace Federal funds. Our purpose is to add value to national parks including for select improvements and programs to bring a margin of excellence beyond what Park Service budgets can accomplish by themselves. Donors have to be recognized as volunteers of money.

Charities must never subsidize government operating losses. Doing so would undermine donor motivation. In other words, there would be nonprofit investment going on. At the same time there is actual government disinvestment going on. That is a real motive killer for people who like to support the national parks. It would be like taxing people twice for national parks, once on April 15th when we all pay, and then once by the charity to offset the lost appropriations.

Federal operations are a government duty, period. Fortunately, Park Service Director Mainella, whose tenure has emphasized nonprofit partnerships, vigorously supports that philosophy. I have spoken with her at great length about it and I know that is how she feels and she has written about it as well.

All agency employees need to understand it. I am happy to tell you that our superintendent of Acadia National Park, Sheridan Steele, his staff and the Northeast Regional Office do understand it and partnering with them is a great professional experience.

David Rockefeller, Jr., whose family's gifts helped establish Acadia, and you may recall that this is the first national park created east of the Mississippi and is the first to have grown full blown from private philanthropy. That family is responsible not just for places like Acadia but Grand Teton, Virgin Islands. They have a tremendous record of generosity.

David Rockefeller, Jr., said this when he was chairman of the National Park Foundation which you can think of as the granddaddy of the Friends organizations and is responsible, in a sense, for the whole Park System. He said that Americans "need to have assurances that their private dollars will not be used to offset public responsibilities . . . I refer to this distinction as the 'bright line.'"

Friends of Acadia urges Congress to apply the proper management fix to the cash delivery malfunction. I want to emphasize again that this is not a problem of too much overhead sitting in the

Park System somewhere. To do so, to fix this malfunction, would honor the bright line that David Rockefeller, Jr., talks about. It would expand charitable giving, we believe, and ultimately would reverse park-level deficits. Congress can accomplish this by appropriating an annual funding margin that exceeds the exactions that will otherwise eliminate it.

Thanks very much and I would be happy to answer questions later.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Olson follows:]

Testimony of Ken Olson
President, Friends of Acadia
Bar Harbor, Maine
At the Oversight Field Hearing of the Government Reform Committee
On Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources
Fanueil Hall, Boston, Massachusetts
August 24, 2005

Thank you, Congressman Souder, for inviting me to testify. My name is Ken Olson. I am president of Friends of Acadia, a 3,000-member nonprofit philanthropy founded in 1986. We raise private funds for Acadia National Park.

I also serve on the executive committee of the National Park Friends Alliance, which consists of chief executives of forty leading park charities.

You have asked me to comment specifically on park budget issues and citizen philanthropy.

Friends of Acadia is completely independent from Acadia National Park and the National Park Service. Since 1995 alone, we have donated $5.1 million to the park or to community entities for projects that complement park values. Our charitable funding makes possible the employment of about 115 seasonal workers (approx. 50 FTEs) in Acadia or directly serving it from the outside, such as the fifty to sixty drivers of the Island Explorer propane bus system, thanks to L.L. Bean's generosity.

Friends of Acadia has raised $16 million in endowments and other invested funds. Each year, we grant the interest--about 4%--to the park.

For example, Friends created the only endowed trails system in national park history. Same for our carriage road endowment and the endowment for the park's wheelchair-accessible horse carriages. In all cases, the funds will flow to maintenance forever.

Without our private dollars, these projects could not have been initiated. If Friends should for some reason go out of business, our remaining assets must be transferred to another entity and used for the original purposes.

Several Acadia summer positions were cut for budget reasons in 2004. Many restrooms were closed in winter, inconveniencing cold-weather recreationists and creating sanitation problems. Eleven permanent jobs are vacant and won't be filled, in order to fund seasonal positions that would otherwise disappear.

The president's 2006 budget contains an increase for Park Service operations nationwide, and we thank him. However, in many cases the money won't reach the parks themselves. The president and Congress may be unaware of this business snag.

Take the 2005 park budget increase, for which Congress deserves considerable credit. Mandated employee raises, agency internal assessments, retirement system changes, terrorism alerts and emergency expenditures are consuming the new money, producing shortfalls.

It's not clear whether the full Congress understands the paradox, which is this: its well intentioned and welcome funding increases are nonetheless resulting in service reductions at the park level.

Pressure is mounting on philanthropies to fund operating shortfalls. A recent Park Service review in a western national park stated that its supporting nonprofit "should first and foremost raise funds for the [park] superintendent's priorities be they a capital improvement project or for operations."

Let's be clear: philanthropy's role is to supplement, not replace, federal funds. Our purpose is to add value, including for select improvements and programs, to bring a margin of excellence beyond what Park Service budgets can accomplish.

Charities must never subsidize government operating losses. Doing so would undermine donor motivation. It would be like taxing people twice for national parks: once on April 15 and once via the charity to offset the lost appropriations.

Federal operations are a government duty, period. Fortunately, Park Service Director Fran Mainella, whose tenure has emphasized nonprofit partnerships, vigorously supports that philosophy. All agency employees need to understand it. I'm happy to tell you that Acadia Superintendent Sheridan Steele, his staff, and the Northeast Regional Office understand it. Partnering with them is a great professional experience.

David Rockefeller, Jr., whose family's gifts helped establish Acadia, Grand Teton and other national parks, said that Americans "need to have assurances that their private dollars will not be used to offset public responsibilities…I refer to this distinction as the 'bright line.'"

Friends of Acadia urges Congress to apply the proper management fix to the cash delivery malfunction. This would honor the bright line, expand charitable giving, and ultimately reverse park-level deficits. Congress can accomplish this by appropriating an annual funding margin that exceeds the exactions that will otherwise eliminate it.

Thank you. I'll be pleased to answer questions.

* * *

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Our final witness in this panel is Lt. John McCauley, museum curator of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts. Thank you for coming today.

STATEMENT OF LT. JOHN F. McCAULEY

Lt. MCCAULEY. Good morning, Congressman. My name is John McCauley. May I introduce you to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts. It is the oldest chartered military organization in the western hemisphere.

Founded in 1637, its mission was to train officers for the existing militia. We no longer train officers, and our mission today is to preserve the patriotic traditions of America. We read the Declaration of Independence from the balcony of the Old State House every 4th of July, as it was read by an Ancient in 1776.

On April 19th we march to celebrate the beginning of the American Revolution in Lexington. Before we march in Lexington, we take time to decorate the graves of those signers of the Declaration, buried in the old Granary Burial ground. Every year we travel to some country of the world to show the American flag and take part in ceremonies with military units of other nations. We feel that these programs help to preserve the historical culture of this area.

Our relationship with Faneuil Hall began in 1746, 4 years after the opening of the building when we were transferred from the Old State House. The Company was allotted space in the building, actually it was in the attic, to hold its meetings. They did their training on the Boston Common.

Faneuil Hall has changed many times in its 263 years. It went from a small two-story structure with a ground floor market place to a building four times its original size. In 1805 when the building was enlarged, a fourth floor was added to accommodate the militia units of Boston. It is on this floor that the Company maintains its armory, museum, and headquarters.

In the old building the Company contributed to the preservation of it by improving their headquarters, the attic, at their own expense. In the new building the Company contributed their share of improvements with other militia units to improve the fourth floor. By 1880 the Company was the sole tenant of the fourth floor and has maintained it ever since.

All funding for the activities, maintenance and improvements for the company is derived from the members. An annual assessment creates the budgetary needs. No moneys from the city of Boston, Commonwealth of Massachusetts or the National Park System are given for the support of the Company. Monies for demonstration fees, in this case the maintenance of the museum and library, come from the Company's budget.

The only time I can remember when funding from the outside came from the national park reimbursement program, it came for the expenses incurred when the Company moved from the fourth floor to the Coast Guard Base from 1990 to 1992. Total moving expenses were $140,000. We were reimbursed $129,000.

Internal security for the fourth floor was installed in 1991 during the restoration of the building. It consists of four non-recording cameras, three were installed then, the Company added a fourth.

Two monitors installed, the Company added a third. Motion and fire/smoke detectors were put in at that time.

Two employees, the curator and secretary, are there during operating hours and no police patrol the fourth floor. Other testimony may speak of the rest of the building. We feel that the present system is basic and does not fill the needs of securing the floor and its contents. At the present time we have engaged security analysts to create a better system. The present system operates independent of the rest of the building. To my knowledge at no time have we been approached by the Homeland Security Agency nor any exercises up there at all on security.

The fourth floor, although occupied by the Company, is used for many other functions during the year. The city of Boston uses it for some of their functions, while other military units use it for ceremonies. This multi use creates a need of constant upkeep. While employees take care of everyday cleanup, the Company hires outside cleaners after many functions. Last week we closed for a week to have the floors refurbished. You can probably still smell it. All was paid for by the Company.

The ceiling of the Armory has been a problem since the restoration of 1991. The paint peels off. As the present time it is under study by the Boston National Park System. With the exception of the ceiling all costs for maintenance are absorbed by the Company. While this report so far seems to assume we operate on an independent basis, our interaction with others makes us take an interest in the well being and preservation of several sites in the Boston and New england area.

During the years we have used the streets of Boston, the Old State House, the cemeteries in Boston and the churches. President John F. Kennedy was a member of our organization, therefore, the site of his birth in Brookline holds an interest to the Company.

Every day I meet people from many countries. They marvel at the historic sites in Boston and are excited with the idea that this area is the place where the American Revolution began. Not many places in the world can show the birthplace of liberty. Sites such as Bunker Hill, U.S.S. Constitution, Paul Revere are a continued source of conversation with the visitors.

The interest is there. We need both private organizations, private citizens and government agencies to pay attention to these historical sites and encourage their preservation.

May I digress for a moment, please, to tell you I have served 33 years as a volunteer in the National Park System, primarily at Minute Man National Historical Park in Concord, and also at Saratoga, Morristown, Moore's Creek and Harper's Ferry. Every time I visit a park I learn something. I have also noticed the intensity and the dedication of the park employees. They take pride in their work but they need the necessary tools.

I have a daughter who is a curator at a historic house and a son-in-law who is a preservation specialist within the national parks. My whole family was involved. A new danger seems to have appeared recently with the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court that allows property to be taken for commercial purposes. What happens when a historic site is in the way?

I thank you for the opportunity to speak before this panel on behalf of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company for the preservation of historic sites, not only here in New England but all over this great land of ours. Thank you very much, sir.

[The prepared statement of Lt. McCauley follows:]

TESTIMONY GIVEN AT

OVERSITE HEARING ENTITLED

"THE NATIONAL PARKS: PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC SITES

AND THE NORTHEAST REGION"

AUGUST 24, 2005

FANEUIL HALL, BOSTON

CONGRESSMAN MARK E. SOUDER, CHAIRMAN

Testimony given by:

LT John F. McCauley
Curator of the Museum
Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company

Mr. Chairman:

May I introduce you to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts. It is the oldest Chartered military Organization in the western hemisphere. Founded in 1637, its mission was to train Officers for the existing militia. Although we no longer train Officers, our mission today is to preserve the patriotic traditions of America. We read the Declaration of Independence from the balcony of the Old State House every fourth of July, as it was read by an Ancient in 1776. On the 19th of April we march to celebrate the beginning of the American Revolution in Lexington. Before we march in Lexington we take time to decorate the graves of those signers of the Declaration, buried in the Old Granary Burial ground. Every year we travel to some country of the world to show the American flag and take part in ceremonies with military units of other nations. We feel that these programs help to preserve the historical culture of this area.

Our relationship with Faneuil Hall began in 1746 four years after the opening of the building, when we were transferred from the Old State House. The Company was allotted space, actually the attic, to hold its meetings. They did their training on the Boston Common. Faneuil Hall has been changed many times in its 263 years. It went from a small two storied structure, with a ground floor market place to a building four times its original size. In 1805 when the building was enlarged, a fourth floor was added to accommodate the militia units of Boston. It is on this floor, that the Company maintains its armory, museum and headquarters.

In the old building the Company contributed to the preservation of it by improving their headquarters, the attic, at their own expense. In the new building the Company contributed their

share of improvements with other militia units to improve the fourth floor. By 1880 the Company was the sole tenant of the fourth floor and has maintained it since that time.

Funding

All funding for the activities, maintenance and improvements for the company is derived from the members. An annual assessment creates the budgetary needs. No monies from the City of Boston, Commonwealth of Massachusetts or the National Park System are given for the support of the Company. Monies for demonstration fees, in this case for the maintenance of the museum and library, come from the Company's budget. The only time I can remember when funding from the outside came from the National Park reimbursement program, it came for the expenses incurred when the Company moved from the fourth floor to the Coast Guard Base from 1990 to 1992. Total moving expenses were $140,000. We were reimbursed $129,000.

Security

Internal security for the fourth floor was installed in 1991 during the restoration of the building. It consists of four non-recording cameras, three were installed then, the Company added a fourth. Two monitors installed, the Company added a third. Motion and fire/smoke detectors were put in at that time. Two employees, the curator and secretary, are there during operating hours, No police patrol the fourth floor. Other testimony will speak of the rest of the building. We feel that the present system is basic and does not fill the needs of securing the floor and its contents. At the present time we have engaged security analysts to create a better system. The present system operates independent of the rest of the building.

Maintenance

The fourth floor, although occupied by the Company, is used for many other functions during the year. The City of Boston uses it for some of their functions, while other military units use it for ceremonies. This multi use creates a need of constant upkeep. While employees take care of everyday cleanup, the Company hires outside cleaners after many function. Last week we closed for a week to have the floors refurbished. All paid by the Company.

The ceiling of the Armory has been a problem since the restoration of 1991. The paint peels off. At the present time it is under study by the Boston National Park System With the exception of the ceiling all costs for maintenance is absorbed by the Company. While this report so far seems to assume we operate on an independent basis, our interaction with others make us take an interest in the well being and preservation of several sites in the Boston and New England area.

During the years we have used the streets of Boston, the Old State House, the cemeteries in Boston and the churches. President John F. Kennedy was a member of our Organization, therefore the site of his birth in Brookline hold an interest to the Company. Every day I meet people from many countries. They marvel at the historic sites in Boston and are excited with the idea that this area is the place where the American Revolution began. Not many places in the world can show the birthplace of liberty. Sites such as Bunker Hill, USS Constitution, Paul Revere are a continued source of conversation with the visitors.

The interest is there. We need both as private organizations, private citizens and government agencies to pay attention to these historical sites and encourage their preservation.

May I digress for a moment to tell you I have served thirty three years as a volunteer in the National Park System, primarily at Minute Man National Historical Park in Concord, also at Saratoga, Morristown, Moore's Creek and Harper's Ferry. Every time I visit a Park, I learn something. I also noticed the dedication of the Park Employees. They take pride in their work.

I also have a daughter who is a curator at an historic house and a son-in-law who is a preservation specialist in the Parks. May whole family was involved at one time. A new danger seems to have appeared recently with the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court that allows property to be taken for commercial purposes. What happens when an historic site is in the way?

I thank you for the opportunity to speak before this panel on behalf of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company for the preservation of historic sites not only here in New England but all over this great land of ours.

LT John F. McCauley
Curator
Ancient & Honorable Artillery

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you all for your testimony. I would like to start with Mr. Kennedy on some broader questions because this is starting broad and then we will get narrower as we are launching into this kind of parks oversight and behind it highlighting the general needs of the Park Service and the shortfall of the budget.

I will ask a couple of technical bureaucratic questions first. Do you believe inside the Department of Interior—in my experience, formerly as a staffer and now as a Member, that OMB tends to drive statements of almost every administration. Do you sense that there has been without commenting on individuals, it is more systemic? How much is this happening everywhere? Is the Park Service less independent inside the Department of Interior and Interior more or less independent? I don't have a strong sense of how this is working right now.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Park Service as it is currently being managed is exceedingly dependent upon the management and the objectives of the Department of the Interior. It is not functioning as an independent agency that ebbs and flows with the degree to which the relationship between the Secretary and the Director functions. But at the moment there is a very intense interaction downward from the Secretary toward the Director.

That changes over time. There is no question in my view that the Congress historically has lacked the kind of precise understanding of the Park Service's budgetary functions that you are seeking. It needs to re-register the inadequacy of its understanding of what the actual consequences on the ground are of the money it thinks it is appropriating.

Mr. SOUDER. In a broad question again because my experience started more from Parks up and now I am trying to figure out how the system works. How do you see how the regional directors and their flexibility are fitting in the system?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. McIntosh's testimony this morning tells you quite a lot about that. Here is somebody who really knows the system. He has been in the system a long time and the missing element in our discussion so far this morning has been the importance of the service as well as the system. You have to have people who know what they are doing, have accumulated that understanding over time, and have a professional skill adequate to respond to you.

The problem, the primary problem of the moment is not, in my view, the physical condition of the park. It is the actual morale condition and the competency condition of the Service. What rewards are there for people to do good, candid work? What really is happening to archeology, to history, to natural resource protection? How good are the people and how long are they staying? What are the incentives to them to stay to learn to do their work properly?

Now, some of those people are necessarily situated in regional offices. Some of them, for example, can be deployed from time to time to do intensive visitations in parks. But many parks, I think particularly of Bandolier, for example, their conditions are so—Acadia is another. Their conditions are so specific to them, to their ecosystems and to their particular kind of archeology and history that they need some continuity in those parks of people with those competencies. Can't all be done at the regional office however good the regional offices may be.

So there is a combination here of a deplorable task force of competent people working in regional offices and, to some extent, in the national offices. There needs to be a park historian. There needs to be a national park archeologist. But there has to be continuity of service in the parks themselves because they all are complicated systems naturally, and historic. That is what managers are for. Congress is to write the checks and to understand what the checks go for. Competent managers are what you grow in a system like the Park Service or the Marine Corps.

Mr. SOUDER. I know this is more system-wide than specific here but having a former director who has worked with us for so many years gives me a chance to probe some other types of questions here. They have a number of training systems to train in advance superintendents.

Clearly, at least historically, there has been both movement between parks so that people learn parks sometimes within. There has been almost stovepiping between historical and natural but anymore there are so many natural features and historical parks and many of them with natural features and vice versa.

That has been a little less true and a little less kind of looking down the nose at the historical people by the natural people. I have seen some parks where superintendents have stayed a decade or more. More likely it is somebody who goes up and kind of, "I am a cultural resource person and I am going to stay 15 years because I want to be here at this park." There is some of that.

One of the dilemmas we have in government, and I am going to lay a premise and I want to hear you react to this, that no matter how successful we are in pulling out the shortfalls in the Park Service, the fact is what I see as a Congressman is this isn't just in the Park Service. We have this problem everywhere. We have taxpayers who don't even want to have their local township tax increased or their library tax increased. They don't want to have the State. They don't want to have the Federal.

The bulk of the budget is now under entitlement programs that have exceeded 60 percent, the military for all the discussion about it, and the supplemental has dropped from what used to be in the Kennedy days more like 30 percent down to about 8 percent of our budget.

I met with mental health people earlier this week in my home district and they are dying. The juvenile justice people are dying. How we deal with Medicaid, with the health cost pressures. We can't even begin to meet the—take what is happening in Northwest Airlines and Delta and everything in the airlines right now trying to do field cost and healthcare cost in the private sector and the government has promised more to the citizens than the private sector has and we don't have any money to do that.

Clearly we are going to have cost pressures. Every year we start out arguing the Parks budget ought to be increased by $100 million and we have been able to increase it. In fact, there is a lot of jealousy in the system and for all our struggles it shows how strongly—I mean, our leadership pleads with me not to offer floor amendments on the Park Service because everybody will do more.

Fish and Wildlife is absolutely panicked that in Interior there is no top to the Park Service as long as I keep inside Interior. They

pretty well wipe out the Fish and Wildlife Service inside moving over the Park Service. Yet, you have to say it has a function, too. We are going to have to do some things differently and try to get more money.

The best way to get more money is to focus like we are doing on the centennial, to have a vision that grabs people and have people talking about it, to make people aware of the shortfalls. Even that said, I see some fundamental things that are there. Mr. Olson has raised one on what is going to be the role of Friends groups and support groups. Can they do the traditional or are they going to have to step in and fill in on operational?

As we contract out and move more toward seasonal and follow what the private sector is doing which is a fear of having full-time employees because it doesn't give you the flexibility and the healthcare and the pension cost. What is the career track? Maybe we can have a senior corps but where does the junior corps start to get to the senior corps?

Clearly we are going to have to figure out creative ways for interpretation that other museums are adjusting to and how in the Park Service—I mean, do you start to convert an agent system dependent on mostly human interaction to better computer utilization. My lands, we heard about Lowell a minute ago and finally getting some things online.

My daughter was doing in third grade a bat project for third graders in Indiana. Carlsbad Caverns has the most bats. Got her in touch with the superintendent there to get her some bat materials. Now, if you are in New Mexico you might know about Carlsbad Caverns and get hooked in. But this is a different era here.

It isn't just trying to have the local school kids walk through. We have the most science, the most history. All these things are in the Park Service if we can figure out how to get it out. How do we do a transition here and should that be part of our vision, too? I threw out a bunch of concepts there. We need more money but it is not going to be like the old days and how do we best get hold of this?

Mr. KENNEDY. To the extent that I can remember, let me see if I can run through them in sequence. First of all, with respect to the budgetary pressures, what we are doing today is to register the importance of the National Park System to you and to this audience and to everybody else because the National Park System does not have a well-paid body of profiteers working in Congress in the corridors because they are making money on it.

This is very different from the defense establishment. It is different from the agriculture subsidies. It is different from the steel subsidies. It is different from almost every other major domestic pressure on the Congress. What we are doing is to compensate through citizen involvement for the absence of very well-paid lobbying that go after you guys every day of the week. That is what we are doing here.

This is Kenneth Galbraith compensating factors. We are providing in a democracy citizen participation. We are trying to register with the Congress that there are a lot of people who care a lot about this and they will vote. Do they write big checks at campaign time? No, they don't. Not in competition with the other special interest that are going after you guys. That is the first point. This

is important what we are doing here. This is the life of democracy in a real system where money counts.

Second, with respect to a senior corps we have a—we got terribly enthusiastic about the importance of redeployable senior citizens—not senior citizens but senior staffers. It wouldn't be terrible if some of them were a little older but, in any case, senior staffers that you could redeploy as needs occurred.

The problem with that is that they are politically vulnerable and they get redeployed to serve the partisan or specific purposes of an administration whether it is Republican or Democrat. Those people are more vulnerable to redeployment for political purposes or exile. If they are a little bit too candid those folks can get exiled by an administration as they currently are and have been before. That is the problem with the redeployable corps that doesn't have a grounding in a system that is strong enough to support them.

Now, the beauty of the National Park System is that it is place specific. You can't computerize Independence Hall. You can computerize Yellow Stone. It isn't just mountains and water falls. It is the specific gritty under-your-feet experience that our kids have had and we have with having been at the bridge in Concord, having actually been in Yosemite when the sun comes up and it plays upon that water fall. That immediacy. And the Boston Harbor islands, no, they are not glamorous but, by golly, the experience of being there is a powerful experience.

If you have any sense of the history of the evolution of the American city, being at the Olmsted site helps you understand why the cities that we live in are struggling to be better places for people to live in because that is where he put his work. Sure, he helped found the National Park System but at the end of the day he is about a city that is livable. That is what you get at the Olmsted site.

If you go to Lowell, it is a place in which the evolution of the American system in all its grit, in all its tension, in all of its antiphonies that are there. It is real. This is a slave traders' hall. Faneuil was a slave trader. Is that important? You bet it is important. These are places where we learn real truths. They are specific places. We can't just do that on the Web. They have to be served to provide that tactile, that under-the-feet, that immediate sense.

A lot of Maine has been, and will be, trashed but Acadia is magic because it won't be trashed. My argument is there is no replacement for a National Park System. If it is not the best idea America ever had, it is a real good idea and we are the trustees so we have to struggle for it. Every day that you hold a hearing 10,000 lobbyists, well paid in a $3,000 suit, are working on some other Congressman for something else so thank you again.

Mr. SOUDER. One of the things it does, too, this hearing, basically this date was relatively fixed because of my schedule but also I know I talked to Congressman Capuano who wanted to be here but he couldn't be here this particular day and Congressman Lynch who we have worked with on the steroids as well as well as oxycontin and other issues became more aware of what we are doing here. He is on the actual full committee that this subcommittee is part of.

And my friend Bill Delahunt, who I have worked with on the Adams site, was trying to get me to do this over in Cape Cod. You have a process even in the course of doing a hearing to talk to the other members in the region and get them aware of the things even if they are not here.

Ms. Fenollosa, you talked about in the national trust a very effective program of identifying at-risk sites which is emulated. I know Indiana's landworks board, of which I am a part, although I haven't been as active as I would like to be, I have certainly been supportive and on their board, does a similar thing in Indiana.

My hometown of Fort Wayne does a similar thing. In Fort Wayne it is a much emulated approach. One thing your organization could do is even expand this more intensely inside the Park Service as opposed to just necessarily identifying the different parks. Then identify, as you did in your testimony, certain specific sites or types of things.

Do you see any expansion of this because it is a great way to capture people's attention. Congressmen like short lists. The media likes short lists. I think that program that you started has just proliferated and is one of the most effective things. I picked up a "National Geographic Traveller" magazine yesterday at the airport. They did the 55 parks and analysis of the deterioration. That is one way to get people's attention and rate as well.

Ms. FENOLLOSA. In response I would say that the problem is one of space and size. As you said, Congressmen like short lists. We have decided that we are only going to pick 11 sites every year from 50 competing States, all of whom rightly believe that their places are the most important ones so we have to make choices. I suppose we could list the National Park Service as an endangered site which might focus attention.

Mr. SOUDER. I was thinking more on the lines of not putting it on the national list, but as you work through the regional, I don't think national parks because they are national are usually thought of in the State and local list.

If there was an interaction, for example, as a sublist of, OK, let us say you have these bigger parks that you have mentioned and you had some sub things inside of them, but as you look at the top 10 endangered sites in the midwest region, then in the national parks in the State of Indiana what are the three most endangered historic preservationsites in those parks so for Indiana Dunes boyhood site if there are any original sites there, and the Vincent site in Indiana, are there a couple things in there that your organization would highlight. Not that you would expand your national list but that there would be sublists that, in effect, could supplement because often those things are viewed as, "Oh, that is national. We are focused on our State and local." It is an interesting way to kind of highlight and supplement what we are trying to do in highlighting the problems of the National Park Service.

Then the other thing is not just the buildings but some of these collections inside. In historic preservation do you view your organization, primarily it is buildings, but do you focus on collections as well?

Ms. FENOLLOSA. Yes, I would say that we do and we have in the past. In terms of your earlier question, as a national organization

we try very hard to work very closely with our statewide and local partners. No one at the State or local level wants to be told by an organization in Washington, DC, what should be important to them.

Your former colleague and our great representative Tip O'Neill used to say that, "All politics is local but all preservation is local." Therefore, for the National Trust to do this might imply a right to those places that we don't have, a right to the prioritization of those places that we don't have.

What we do is we work with the organization such as the Indiana Landmark Preservation group to ensure that we support them in what they do so that if they identified the Indiana Dunes as being a significant place, we will work with them to our regional office to focus whatever attention we can as a national organization on that place.

We have identified places like prairie churches throughout the midwest where there is a unified theme, where there is some sort of resource that has impacted a great number of people that is suffering the same kinds of problems such as deferred maintenance or lack of funding to focus on these things as a unified whole, as a systemic problem that perhaps is transferrable to other parts of the country.

Could we do something such as you suggest? Absolutely. To focus on a subset of national parks or a subset of issues of national parks, yes, I believe we could. In fact we have tried to expand the partnership with the National Park Service through our regional offices and through our headquarters, the Park Service headquarters in Washington and our headquarters in Washington to try to find places where we can work together to try to save these places, to use the various assets that each group has, the avenues that we have and the politics that we have or don't have.

Mr. SOUDER. For example, it wouldn't even have to be done nationally but as national organizer you could have Indiana suggest which things in the national park sites or government sites in the State should be included in that list. Another model of this is the "U.S. News and World Report" has done such a great job by however they arbitrarily rate the best colleges and universities in the country but everybody has gotten used to that and your endangered list is very similar to that but they break it down.

The front page of the Fort Wayne newspaper the other day had three local colleges ranked in the top 25 of the private universities under 1,000 in this three-State area. It still helps you focus, particularly those of us in public policy who are looking to say which is the panic thing because planning ahead is like this far. It helps us identify priorities. I am not meaning to be critical. I am just looking for innovative ways that this might help.

I am also very interested because I believe it was in your magazine that I saw this about the Adams collection and how we don't lose these pieces. The land trust organizations have done a better job, I think, with land. It is like we are anymore getting multiple tiers of how adjacent lands are held together but we haven't really figured out how to do it with objects as much.

Ms. FENOLLOSA. We haven't. That is absolutely true. I would say that the consciousness of the American people isn't as raised for

matters of historic preservation, the preservation of objects and sites, as it is for landscapes. I think the environmental community sets the standard of how we should all organize ourselves to promote an agenda.

As to where the appropriate place for that kind of organizing is I would hope the National Trust would take the lead. But I also believe that Mr. Kennedy's organization does precisely that.

Mr. SOUDER. The NPCA does a great job.

Ms. FENOLLOSA. They have that broad perspective.

Mr. KENNEDY. The American Museum Association—the next time you have the Smithsonian before you inquire as to its national role under its original endowment as acting as a national clearinghouse, not just the proprietor of its own property. You might want to ask them to look again at James Smithson's gift and the initial hearings, John Quincy Adams and Jefferson Davis among those present, as to what its job is to help precisely with the curatorial function which is different from the land conservation function. The Park Service has both and the NPCA does what it can. Essentially this is a curatorial function you are talking about and there are people who do that for a living.

Mr. SOUDER. It is not a very active caucus. It is a small caucus and ironically yesterday we were trying to get the national parks caucus going but Congressman Turner, who was in yesterday, is a co-chair of the preservation caucus to try to protect the trust. As former mayor of Dayton he was interested in how to preserve older buildings. Which, by the way, also illustrates one of the other things that we need to figure out how to capitalize on.

It has been very interesting as I have worked through this hearing process. Individual Members will get on the bill or come up and talk to me but Congressman Turner just completed 2½ weeks where he flew back to his district three times abandoning his wife and kids a couple times on this tour as we politicians sometimes do.

But they did like 10 different parks and he was recreating something that his dad had done with him when he was 12 and his children are 11 and 13 and he is all fired up to help with the Parks things. Congressman Platts, who has had our Gettysburg hearing, has been the last, I think, 3 years taking his kids on a parks tour. When I was out west Heather Wilson has now done it the second summer with her family on a parks tour.

Well, when they start to get out there if we can have them meet the different people and see that, it is a great way to communicate values. As we get people interested, they want to know, "What can we do specifically?" Sometimes if I have a criticism of landmarks and the trust is when we hear preserve all prairie schools, preserve all bridges, preserve all churches.

In political terms you look at that and say can't do it. Where is the priority in my given area? How do I deal with this in this town and this county. I am not an expert and I'll never be an expert. My staff will never be experts in it. The people who are in this need to give us some prioritization so we know how to focus and work.

Ms. FENOLLOSA. Unfortunately most preservation organizations, most grassroots efforts get their impetus, get their energy from the potential loss or the actual loss of a beloved place and that is what

prompts the process. Suddenly it is too late because the property they love, the property that they always expected would be there, their local landmarks are gone.

It is then when they turn around and say, "Oh, my goodness. What could we have done about this?" We tend to expect that our important buildings will always be here. We just expect it so that when a building, a place, a historic landscape is compromised, is endangered, we haven't been good at figuring out how to save it because we just expect that it would always be there.

I think the opportunities working through the National Trust, through the National Park Service, through the National Park Conservation Association, these groups have an obligation to educate people that these places are not always going to be there. You are right, the list is a good way of doing that but the list has to start locally and build. It has to build State-wide but it has to go national-wide and then it has to build interagency-wide because these places are just too precious and we can't afford to lose them.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Olson, did I understand in your testimony you stated that you were funding seasonal rangers through your organization? Is that what you said?

Mr. OLSON. We are not funding seasonal rangers.

Mr. SOUDER. It makes possible the employment of about 115 seasonal workers.

Mr. OLSON. 115 seasonal workers inside the park and outside the park who are directly serving it. For example, bus drivers who are not on a national park payroll. A good amount of our money is funding people who work for Acadia National Park or people that we detail to work for Acadia National Park.

We try to do it in a way that is add on. As I said before, it is ad valorem philanthropy in the sense that the Park Service capacity to do a project doesn't exist unless we step in. An example being our trails endowment. The trails of Acadia National Park of which there are 130 miles would never have received any kind of priority or private funding not interjected into the picture. We did that and, as a consequence, the park's trail crew for doing that work has grown and so we make possible things that couldn't have happened without private money.

Mr. SOUDER. In looking at the role of private money in developing things like that, do you believe if the private money developed something inside of a park they should also have a sustainability for what they developed as opposed to—in other words, this is a philosophical question partly.

If the representatives of the taxpayers have said this is a prioritization of funding and a Friends group set something up that then needs to be maintained and wasn't part of the elected group. I am not saying it is a very pure election because we are talking about a tier, a tier, a tier, a tier but, nevertheless, are still responsible inside an elective system.

I am very supportive of Friends. I am just trying to work through mentally how this works should a gift come with a support endowment with it or a way to maintain that because a second unstated part of this is a zero sum game like the Park Administration is more or less in. Whenever there is an addition, there is a subtraction. In effect, strong Friends groups and groups like Grand Can-

yon, Yosemite, and so on that just do additive things that then have to be maintained by the park budget in effect take it from poorer parks without Friends groups.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, I understand that problem. I can tell you how Friends of Acadia does it. We have helped rehabilitate the 44-mile carriage road system which was gifted to the American public through John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s will and those roads had fallen into disrepair. We had a meeting with our then representatives who included Senior Mitchell and then Congresswoman Olympia Snow, the superintendent of Acadia National Park, a representative of the Friends of Acadia, and some others.

The agreement that we came to was that the responsibility would be divvied up in a public/private effort where the public sector through Senator Mitchell and others would seek a $4 million appropriation to reconstruct the carriage roads. In other words, to do the capital work. Friends of Acadia was asked to raise $4 million to endow the roads and perpetuities.

That became a good model. That generates now about $260,000 a year for the Park Service to actually have seven people on those roads who weren't able to work on those roads before. We intend it to be forever. We are subject to market influences.

The 3-year down market didn't help us very much in our grantmaking ability but we still managed to find the funds to do this so what we are trying to promise as a model is elimination of some of the vicissitudes of congressional funding but not all of it. We are looking at the maintenance question and that is just one of several endowments that we have.

Why this is not used in other national parks among their Friends groups I don't know. They have chosen to emphasize capital projects and then to, I think, convince the policymakers that the private sector has now done its share and it is now a legitimate responsibility of the National Park Service to maintain them and please have the funds available.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Kennedy, do you have any comment on that? Have you seen it Park System wide?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yeah. That was such a polite exchange that the implications, I guess, we could leave in the polite stage but there is no question that the Friends of Acadia understand what endowing means. You do something and then you pay to keep it going.

This reinforces an earlier point which we were very polite about also but needs maybe to be emphasized. Private giving is private giving. Each of us make a choice whether we are going to give or not. We don't want to be bludgeoned into giving because the Congress didn't do its job. It isn't true that if you say, "Well, too bad. We, the Congress, aren't going to do our job. It is up to you."

That doesn't produce in a lot of us a deep sense that it is up to us to come forward to make up for it. It is a big mistake for the Congress to think that it just ought to throw the responsibility over to the private sector because the private sector being private may decide it wants to give its money to something else. Congress has to do its job. Almost every 10 years somebody has the bright idea, "Oh, well. The people who use it ought to pay for it," which ignores the notion that may be unborn so far, posterity isn't there to represent itself.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me throw out a variation. I would be interested in your response and Mr. Olson's in particular, and that is part of what happens is that different things are added to our Park System whether you want to call it park barreling or temporary phenomena that we say it is a personal interest to somebody if we add this. It may or may not have public support. That is one class.

A second may have public support because it seemed like a bright idea at the time. It often is a function of how much a particular Congressman will trade or end his career or whether he thinks something is going to be named after him or it defines him and helps cover another type of a problem.

All those kinds of things are in the Park Service basically in the first four parks so it is not like a new phenomena. The one in Oklahoma and Mackinaw Island was in and out and Hot Springs were all there very early so it is not something new. But to some degree by having individuals pay, by seeing how strong your Friends group is, is that not somewhat of a winnowing process that the people are, in effect, determining which ones had longevity and where the support was as opposed to being a short-term?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yeah. As you point out, though, it could be just a rich person's personal pressure on the particular Congressman at the particular time. I think your earlier discourse leads us back to the phenomenon of the early 1990's in which there was a real effort on the part of Congressmen on both sides of the isle to find some way to make it harder for there to be a whimsical entry into the National Park System.

The flaw in that process was that it got loaded up with the notion that we should spend a lot of time and money unloading parks. You spend vastly more time studying what you are going to unload than you would save having unloaded. That is the simple truth of the matter. It cost a lot more to the taxpayers to figure out what you can get rid of. It could take you 10 years and you fiddle with it.

That is a dumb idea. The not dumb idea is for the Congress to establish very, very high hurdles for new entries and really require the Park Service to commit itself with a view on any new entries before they can make it. If it were me playing the archangel, I would say two-thirds majority for any new park. Just make it tough.

Mr. SOUDER. One of the wrinkles with that is and what I was kind of suggesting is one of the ways we actually deal with this is that—because I don't know that we will ever change a political—we can make it tougher but we will never make it so tough that it can't be varied with a waive of the rules. To some degree we determine whether it was a whimsical addition by the fact does it have broad popular support to subsidize the funding.

Mr. KENNEDY. On the other hand, sometimes the Nation isn't quite ready for Manzanar. The Nation may be ready for the Arizona but it may take some people with real courage to know that we had better remember what we did to our fellow citizens from time to time. After all, Manzanar is like Gettysburg. It is not a happy story but it is part of our story. You need to have some room for this. We have to make it tough to get in but you shouldn't have

to have the built in constituency. There may just be a wise persuasive person who says——

Mr. SOUDER. We waited almost too long on Angel Island as an example.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yeah.

Mr. SOUDER. Another variation that is interesting—this is my first time this summer to Lassen Volcanic National Park which was interesting because right around the time the Park Service was being created, they have this volcano and so it gets added to the system. It might not have been added had that not been the case.

On the other hand, now that it is in there, what it gives us the ability to see is what Mount St. Helens is likely to look like in 70 years so it might have been a somewhat historical fluke that it was there but now it is interesting to compare it to the other systems. It is a hard thing to predict but I was wanting to create a proxy.

I would ask if you would elaborate a little bit more on Acadia, too, as far as how you see some of that relationship of people are, in effect, and I believe Acadia will always probably be pretty broadly supported. I have three questions for you. That is one.

Second, Acadia scored really low in this rating of parks in qualitative area rounded and the pressure is on the Park System. Have you seen the "National Geographic Traveller?"

Mr. OLSON. I am sorry. I couldn't hear you.

Mr. SOUDER. There was like a group of experts that went in and evaluated based on the community pressures around it how the park was sustained and Acadia was one of the lowest of the major parts.

Mr. OLSON. Yes, I did see that.

Mr. SOUDER. Then the third question is part of the thing there was that it said the neighboring community is feeling the kind of social—Bar Harbor has always been a wealthy retreat but whether it was going to change the community around it. That also leads into this question on the fees and how to make sure people can have access to the park as we get more charges.

Mr. OLSON. Yes. Let me take the last one first about the fees. At Acadia National Park the fee is now $20. It recently went up from $10 and it includes a transit fee. If you are a family of four, for example, you pay that fee or if you have six in the car or one person you pay that number. For a family of four to attend a movie in Ellsworth, the nearby community that has a year-round movie operation, I am guessing it is $28 for four people for 2 years. It may be more than that now.

As a market matter, the fees are very low. As an equity issue I think you raise a very good one when you talk about people who don't go to national parks. I think Bob McIntosh made a good point that it is probably less the fee at the park than it is the access, the habits of travel, the ability to take time, cohesive family, whatever it may be.

But that doesn't, I think, negate the need for something like a people's pass, for lack of a better term, at this point in which, as you point out, there is a confidential exchange of financial information that is automatic through the IRS form and the choice of the

person to receive a national park pass is done very quietly. It sounds like a great thing to do.

Otherwise, the fees are held hostage to this question of equity over time and I don't think there is a real disequity in those fees and they should be allowed to float in a reasonable way because they do empower the park to do an incredible amount of work which is very visible to people. It is a popular program, as was stated earlier, because people can see the money going back into the ground. The Park Service does a really good job of explaining what it is doing with the money.

On the question of the elite nature of the community, there is no question that the history of Acadia National Park is one of the first founded from private property and founded in a resort community which rivaled Newport, RI at the time. Sort of a Gatsby kind of community. There is that element of Mt. Desert Island that is always going to be there but there is also a Yankee tradition in Maine.

There have been surveys done by the Park Service by visiting the local dump, the local post office, and places that are not frequented by visitors to find out how much use of the park is by local people. It turns out the carriage road system alone at Acadia National Park services 75 percent of the public who live on the island year round. I was so surprised at that number.

There is still some residual resentment about the establishment of the park. We see it but it is not very much and it is usually a cranky individual or so. I think also any kind of conservation activity today, the white noise is that it is an elitist kind of activity when it is really an opening kind of activity. If you really believe in national parks you believe in the second part of the mission as much as you do the first part.

The first part being conservation of resources and wildlife therein, and the second part being for the enjoyment of generations unimpaired. The generations part is a real thing and we want people to be able to use Acadia National Park whatever the social strata, economic strata may be. I think the elite question will always be there but it is insignificant really in the long run.

As to community pressures, Acadia National Park is used by about 2½ million visitors in a year. A visit is one person going to the park for 1 day and coming back the next day would be a second visit so it is not unique individuals. Maybe there are 700,000 or 800,000 people that descend upon that island.

There are definitely pressures, especially in the form of transportation on this granite pluton that is Acadia National Park and Mt. Desert Island. The physical limits are basically there as far as transportation goes. The community has mixed reactions about it because some merchants believe that people shop from automobiles and the more people in cars on the island, the happier they are.

Whereas other people feel that the kind of irreversible thing that is happening socially about the living and visiting experience at Acadia National Park is a form of endangerment for what we all treasure. I would say if you consider the Census Bureau's moderate figures projecting to the year 2050, it expects that there will be 400 million Americans. We are about 300 million right now so 100 million Americans are going to be seeking rarities like Acadia Na-

tional Park in numbers that we really don't appreciate yet and that will be tremendous pressure beyond what we have now on our national park and on our communities.

Unlike in the American west where a rectangle of land is superimposed upon a piece of public domain, this national park is mixed private and public property so the National Park Service has a tremendous negotiating job every step of the way about community life and park life.

And, finally, on broad support it is very frustrating, I think, for a Friends organization like us, or probably any Friends organization, to have to report that we have only 3,000 members when maybe 700,000, 800,000 unique individuals use Acadia National Park in the course of a year. Or that our community has 5,000 year-round residents, 15,000 when you add the summer residents, and we still have only 3,000 people supporting national parks.

We don't have the broad support that I believe is there and this is a conundrum for anybody who is in the nonprofit world because these parks are so available to so many kinds of people. Creating the alliances and the allegiances is a long-term effort.

When we talk about the problems that Roger raised about lobbying and where the constituencies are, I don't believe we have helped you very much. Although some excellent work is being done nationally by the National Parks Conservation Association, the Trust, and others, we still haven't been able to help you the way that you are asking us to do so. I think you should continue to ask us how to do this.

I just want to make a comment, if I might about the—you mentioned the outsourcing question. This is an interesting one because Acadia National Park about 38 percent of the jobs that are in the park are held by people wearing the gray uniform and the flat hat. And 62 percent of the functions in Acadia National Park belong to nonprofits, for profit concessioners, motor tour buses, volunteers, etc.

The question, I think, is to what extent do we consider the park already privatized or amply privatized? Have we perhaps exceeded something at Acadia National Park. Will people who volunteer or give money through private means wish to volunteer to work for a contractor? I don't know. Would they give to us if we are paying contractors? I don't know. There is something magic about the Park Service uniform and the dedication of employees that means a lot to how we try to sell, if you will, giving money to government.

Mr. SOUDER. Lt. McCauley, in your organization you have worked with volunteers for years. You yourself have been a volunteer. Could you pick up on the last point a little bit? What motivated you to get involved? What motivates other people to get involved. Do you see younger people coming in as well with a passion and what do you think we might be able to do to get people like yourself to continue to do this?

Lt. MCCAULEY. In 1966 when I started to volunteer at the national park we were involved at that particular time with the Minute Man organizations locally here. I happened to have been the head of them. We volunteered our services to do demonstrations at Minute Man and became more involved in the Living History Program on our own.

My wife became involved and started making clothing. We became so involved we went to Williamsburg to learn how to make it. We went to England to learn how to make clothes and involved our whole family and it became a tradition that we would attend the National Park System.

In return the national park offered me their services of doing some training at other national parks. This I accepted but I must say that my profession at that time allowed me the time to do it. I am not sure that somebody in a paid regular day-by-day job would be able to take the time to do these things but it was a unique experience.

I enjoyed it. I learned and I still pass it on to the point where I retired as an optometrist and went back to school and got my BA and MA in history with a certificate in Museum Studies and I continue this same idea of living history or using history right above us upstairs here.

One of the most oppressing things I find on an everyday basis is the lack of knowledge of history. I am talking basic history. What does the 4th of July mean or things like that. People do not know. If you don't know, you won't take part. Somewhere along the line not necessarily the national park, in a school, or somehow we have to reeducate the people that we have a past and without that past being known to everybody our future isn't going to go any place.

Mr. SOUDER. It is fascinating. We have legislation where we are trying to even just make sure history is covered in our schools anymore. In the same time as when you see young kids at the different places there is this fascination, even in the Civil War reinactments. On one hand, it is harder to get young people involved in the organization. On the other hand we have this proliferating use of the national battle fields in a way that none of us ever foresaw but it is a huge challenge.

If, in fact, funds get tighter and we need volunteers, where are the volunteers going to come from and how do we get people? Particularly in historic preservationsites, you know, McCullogh and the late Stephen Ambrose could sell lots of books. We need more people like that who can keep the books up at the front.

Let me mention one other thing that Mr. Olson kind of alluded to which I believe is one of the most amazing transformations in the National Park Service, and that is partly our big parks anymore aren't the traditional what people think of the big parks. It is Gateway, Golden Gate, Santa Monica, the ones by the big cities. It is a whole different challenge because we are talking 12 million, not 3 million at those parks.

Brian O'Neil, who is kind of the apostle of this movement, has hit me with a statistic that just turned my head around and it related to what you said about Acadia and that is I think 150 mile radius of the Yosemite National Park. A higher percentage of the people who visit Yosemite are from within 150 miles and visit Golden Gate. That is counterintuitive because the whole thought of the national recreation areas where these are in the big cities they will function like city parks. Why aren't the cities doing these things?

In the old days Olmsted would have done this as a city park. How come this is a national park? Why did that get into our system? But when you think about it, it is the conventions that people go to San Francisco and in their studies.

The Japanese groups that come through, the people from the midwest who go to San Francisco convention, they don't have time to get in the car and go out to Yosemite. They go to the local Golden Gate Park so he is running like 20 percent higher than Yosemite beyond 150 miles which is totally counterintuitive, particularly given the numbers at that.

I don't think Santa Monica is quite that way but Los Angeles had similar things. New York has certainly got a lot of that. Jones Beach stoics the whole thing but outside that you are approximate to a big city with lots of conventions, lots of tourism coming in and they can hit something in a couple of hours. I would assume Boston benefits from this to a degree, too, in the historic sites because every time there is a convention here, every time schools come into the city it is a different concept.

In the Park Service it is a different challenge because historically we have been defined by big natural parks, the crown jewels and a few of the major historic parks. In reality this whole system has changed. Then in trying to look at funding and the conflicting things that we are doing here. To name one of my favorites is San Antonio Mission Park. How do you count attendance there?

When I went there, there were, I think, maybe you might have seen as many as 30 people at the Mission and you might have seen as many as 2,000 people picnicking on the grounds from the Hispanic community in San Antonio. Great Falls is a similar thing. This wasn't meant as a picnic park but with so little green space and we say, well, the Hispanics aren't coming to our national parks.

Well, they are going to that one or they are going to others but they are using them more like recreation areas. Then maybe they will wander over and see the Mission and be exposed to it. We have to think there are parking challenges. There are different use challenges. At Sequoia you see these people going down where they are not supposed to be going down in plastic bags sliding like it is for sledding but it is not the designated sledding area but we wanted to get them into the park.

How are we going to accommodate kind of the different usages? The fundamental question by just focusing on backlog which we tried to work through. We want to get the backlog. We want to get the overhead but the truth is if we are going to go from 300 million to 400 million, you are right.

The pressure on the existing space and the existing green spaces is people want to see those. They want to share it with their family. They want to get out. This is not just a Federal problem, although I am a Congressman and we are doing it. Where in the world are our State parks and our city and county parks because it is putting extra pressure on the Federal system because many of the States haven't updated their State park system for so long.

Mr. OLSON. I just wanted to respond to that. I really appreciate what you're saying. I think one of the things that is going on is that as different user groups historically have used parks, they

weren't really sure they were in a national park or a national forest back when those were just relatively natural areas.

Mr. SOUDER. Now they know it because they have a fee at each one as they go through like BLM. That is a joke.

Mr. OLSON. I thought we could do a survey, even at Acadia National Park, of our fairly homogeneous users, although there is a lot of increasing international use. Many of them would answer to a question of who runs this facility, "Whose land are you on?"

I really wonder whether we get a national park as an answer on its own by them or in trust by the government, or whether they think it is a State operation, or they think it is a private operation and if you look at that from the standpoint that it has probably always been that case, the Department of Interior, people don't know the difference between that and the Department of Agriculture. If you add in a lot of new users who are putting the pressures on the place, they don't understand that maybe there is a single really estimable agency out there that is doing this and there is a lot of private that is doing it.

You can be part of it now that you know about it. That is the education job that has to occur in national parks. I bet we could do that survey and prove that hypothesis that a lot of people don't know they are in a national park, especially in an urban setting.

Mr. SOUDER. At Redwood when you get in the national park there is no such thing like a system. Everything is kind of a variation. At Redwood it is the Redwood National and State Parks because the State parks preserve the land. The Federal was slow. Now the Federal has kind of this connective between the State parks.

What is interesting to watch some of the chaos that occurs from this and we are going to have to figure out how to deal with. The State now with, I think, 120 Federal employees in 40 States but the State has been declining and the Federal has been increasing even though almost all the land is State which then raises questions like the national park boundary that goes around the State parks. It isn't national park land anyway.

There is an area that the State has added that is critical water shed that the State hasn't added employees to cover that water shed and the Federal employees aren't allowed to go into that watershed because it is not part of the boundary. It is just this fascinating mosaic of individual cases brought under a system. I know you, having presided over that share, that this is some of what becomes big challenges because the State and local have to be partners in this as well if we are going to be partnered in the parks.

Mr. KENNEDY. One of the things that is striking to me is that your attention to this subject is remarkable. I said earlier that it was remarkable. It also represents a further argument for the importance of the National Park Service as a group of professionals who are around all the time competent and growing in competency in balancing precisely these complex questions because that is what they get paid to do every day. That is their job.

Now, you are wonderful and extraordinary. No irony, but you are also exceptional. The Congress doesn't give this kind of oversight, doesn't pay this kind of attention, doesn't bore in very often. While

we are grateful for that, that really means that most Congressmen attend to it very, very occasionally.

You have to have a professional service that does its job, that understands the evolutions and complexities and cares a whole lot about resolving precisely these kinds of ambiguities because you can't do that full-time. You have a few other things to do with your life. The necessity for a qualified compensated honestly advanced high morale public service professional group, that is the core of the ambiguities that you have been addressing simply because it is so extraordinary that you are paying attention.

Let us hear it for the State Park System's evoling professional skills. Let us hear it for the National Park Service and let us be real careful in the Congress that we make it as easy as possible for people to make good careers in that service and be thanked for it so we don't outsource the system and lose those continuities.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank you for your passion and everybody's passion with this. Would anybody like to add anything before we conclude? Any additional comments? If you want to add anything after we adjourn in the record, we will be doing, in addition, each hearing comes out as a published book after a number of months. We are going to be putting this together as a national report which hopefully will supplement what NPCA has been doing but inside Congress and that is where we are headed.

In the first hearing it was kind of defining and taking subgroups. Today was a little more focus on the history angle. Our next one in Seattle will be more natural parks with a couple variations there of some of the State and local cooperations, Lewis and Clark being a new park and a classic example of State and local. Grand Canyon and the Arizona parks in that area will be a whole other type of thing.

We know what our constant is, there isn't enough money if we are going to maintain this system. We need to have a frank analysis inside Congress that there isn't enough money. But underneath that what does that mean? What does it mean for local parks? What does it mean for the quality of the personnel?

What does it mean for historic preservation? What tradeoffs are we making because every day we are making tradeoffs but we don't know we are making them, and to try to articulate the tradeoffs inside to the degree we can simplify this incredibly complex thing.

I will finish with this. My dad thought this was just hilarious and I thought it was the stupidest thing when I was in high school. I was in band and he got this plaque when we were on vacation and he gave it to the band director. The band director put it up and we had to watch every day in band. It said, "Why can't all of life's problems come when I am young and know all the answers?"

It is kind of like when you get into the Park Service you come in with a couple of "Why don't we do this and this and this?" Then you realize this is exceptional. They have snowmobiles here for 3 months of the year and it was grandfathered in and every park has these unique things. We are trying to figure out what commonalities are there.

How can we simplify this enough and yet show the incredible complexity of this system which most Americans don't even understand the complexity? They see a brown sign and assume that the

same rules apply everywhere and they don't. Now national monuments are in BLM and Forest Service, too, which further confused matters. We are trying to work this through.

I believe we are getting a group of members who are paying attention and I thank all of you for your passion because that is what is going to make the difference because the National Park System is our contribution to the world and we are going to do our best that, at least, while we can make noise we will continue to make noise. I hope I continue to do it at age 80 like Mr. Kennedy.

Thank you very much. Thank you all those who attended. The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:02 p.m. the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional information submitted for the hearing record follows:]

Brenda J. Boleyn
P.O. Box 1208
Truro, MA 02666-1208
trurodune@c4.net

ph: 508-349-2903
fax: 508-349-3273

August 30, 2005

Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources
Congressman Mark E. Souder, Chairman
2231 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Subject: public hearing, Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., August 24, 2005
"The National Parks: Preservation of Historic Sites and the Northeast Region"

Dear Chairman Souder and Subcommittee:

Thank you for taking up the matter of NPS funding and for inviting public testimony. Unable to attend the hearing last week, I submit the following comments:

A 35-year resident of Truro [one of the six towns within Cape Cod National Seashore (CCNS) boundaries] and long-term member of the Advisory Commission to the CCNS (during terms of three Superintendents), it is my observation that this national seashore carries out its mission very well, owing to skilled and prudent management by its leadership and the support of a highly professional staff.

However, with essentially flat budgets and rising costs, the erosion of some services has been inevitable. Additionally, beginning last year, the park has had to absorb the cost of a pay adjustment for staff (included in "Boston locality pay area") in the amount of approximately $265,000 per year.

To their credit, the Superintendent(s) and staff have tried to minimize visitor impacts, making cuts in programs and services as gradually and inconspicuously as possible. But some service adjustments can no longer remain hidden:
Reduced trail management (volunteer organization, Friends of the CCNS, doing some of the work).
Delayed start in spring and early close in fall for some programs and facilities, thus saving resources for the busy summer months.
Headquarters building in Wellfleet no longer offering visitor services.

Reductions in staff, both seasonal and full-time.
Raising of some fees.

As in most national parks, deferred maintenance is an ongoing challenge. Luckily, the Penniman House in Eastham, arguably our most illustrious historic building, received "nick-of-time" repairs a couple of years ago.

On the plus side, the CCNS natural resources/science program has been well supported, enabling the Seashore science team to work cooperatively with its six towns on such projects of major importance as groundwater (drinking water) supply and salt marsh/estuary restoration, a flagship effort attracting national attention.

I believe that most citizens would agree that the value of the Cape Cod National Seashore to the quality of life and the economy here is inestimable.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments. I hope that they are helpful and that the base funding for CCNS can be increased to help meet growing operating costs.
I also hope that you will come for a visit sometime.

Sincerely,

cc: George Price, Superintendent CCNS
CCNS Advisory Commission, Ron Kaufman, Chairman