AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

NATIONAL PARKS OF HAWAII

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

DECEMBER 1, 2005

Serial No. 109–147

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

27–922 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
JEAN SCHMIDT, Ohio

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

MARC WHEAT, *Staff Director*
JIM KAISER, *Professional Staff Member*
MALIA HOLST, *Clerk*
TONY HAYWOOD, *Minority Professional Staff Member*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on December 1, 2005	1
Statement of:	
Hays, Frank, Pacific Area Director, National Park Service, accompanied by Geri Bell, Superintendent of the Kaloko-Honokohau, Marilyn Parris, Superintendent of Haleakala National Park, and Cindy Orlando, Superintendent, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park	10
Obey, Craig, vice president, government affairs of the National Parks Conservation Association; Suzanne Case, executive director of the Nature Conservancy in Hawaii; George Sullivan, chairman of the Arizona Memorial Association; and Casey Jarman, board member of the Friends of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park	40
Case, Suzanne	56
Jarman, Casey	64
Obey, Craig	40
Sullivan, George	63
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Case, Hon. Ed, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii, prepared statement of	8
Case, Suzanne, executive director of the Nature Conservancy in Hawaii, prepared statement of	58
Hays, Frank, Pacific Area Director, National Park Service, prepared statement of	14
Jarman, Casey, board member of the Friends of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, prepared statement of	66
Obey, Craig, vice president, government affairs of the National Parks Conservation Association, prepared statement of	43
Souder, Hon. Mark E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of	3

NATIONAL PARKS OF HAWAII

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2005

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:11 a.m., at the Hawaii State Capitol, room 329, 415 South Beretania Street, Honolulu, HI, Hon. Mark E. Souder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representative Souder.

Also present: Representatives Abercrombie and Case.

Staff present: Marc Wheat, staff director and chief counsel; Jim Kaiser, counsel; Mark Pfundstein, professional staff member; and Tony Haywood, minority counsel.

Mr. SOUDER. The subcommittee will come to order. Good morning, and thank you for joining us today. This is the seventh in a series of hearings focusing on the critical issues facing the National Park Service. I would like to welcome Members of Congress who joined us today who deeply care about the National Parks, like Congressman Abercrombie and Congressman Case. I have worked together with them on numerous issues, and it's good to be here with them here in Hawaii.

This hearing will focus on parks in Hawaii. Millions of Americans have been captivated, either in person or on television, by the nearly continuous eruptions of Hawaii's volcanoes. The unparalleled sight active volcanoes are a unique part of the National Park Service.

Also unique among the National Park Service units is that of the USS Arizona Memorial. This site, a memorial to those who lost their lives on a quiet Sunday morning nearly 64 years ago, holds a special place in the hearts and minds of Americans.

The National Park Service is facing many challenges and problems. Management and funding are of constant concern to all park units. Underneath these issues are problems special to each park unit. In Hawaii, visitor services are of a particular concern. The popularity of Hawaii's parks and the number of people wishing to visit them pose many difficulties. The USS Arizona Memorial's location, in the middle of Pearl Harbor, places special demands on the National Park Service—how does the Park Service transport so many people out to the Memorial, and how can this be improved?

Moreover, the tendency of lava to move and flow where it wants creates a problem because people want to visit the lava. Moving

visitor's centers closer to lava or losing centers to lava flows is certainly costly and hard to manage.

Also of concern to the National Park Service is the cost involved with invasive species. A problem throughout the United States and throughout Park Service units in every region of the country, Hawaii may be one of the best examples of this problem. The enormous task of combating this problem undoubtedly impacts management and funding considerations on many levels.

I would like to welcome Congressmen Neil Abercrombie and Ed Case to this hearing. Although not Members of this committee, I welcome them to join the panel for this hearing. Both gentlemen are strong advocates for Hawaii and for the National Parks.

Our first panel I would like to welcome Frank Hays, the Pacific Area Director of the National Park Service. He will be joined during the questioning time by Geri Bell, Superintendent of the Kaloko-Honokohau—close?

Ms. BELL. [Shakes head].

Mr. SOUDER. No. Marilyn Parris, the Superintendent of Haleakala National Park, and Cindy Orlando, the Superintendent of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

Mr. SOUDER. Our second panel will be Craig Obey, vice president for government affairs of the National Parks Conservation Association; Suzanne Case, executive director of the Nature Conservancy in Hawaii; George Sullivan, chairman of the Arizona Memorial Association; and Casey Jarman, board member of the Friends of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

Last summer I spent 3 weeks here doing narcotics-related things in the parks and was able to visit with many of you at the different parks and see firsthand the variety of challenges. One of the most troubling—and I hope we can get into it a little bit, too. We were just talking about the lawsuit at Hawaii Volcanoes and the one over at Haleakala where the person fell into the water and drowned. It is a huge challenge how to figure it out, with so many tourists that do not follow the signs. And unless you're going to put a ball and chain around them, how you can enjoy the visitor experience?

I also saw firsthand—fortunately the Navy took me out to the Pearl Harbor site, but I saw that in the summer and earlier in January, the long lines. And it isn't just a small visitor center. I think in the summer it's a 6-hour wait to get tickets to the USS Arizona. There's only so many the actual site can hold, in addition to the visitor's center challenge. So we have some huge challenges with that Memorial.

I thank you all again for coming and yield to Congressman Abercrombie.

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

Opening Statement
Chairman Mark Souder

"National Parks of Hawaii"

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

December 1, 2005

Good morning and thank you for joining us today. This is the sixth in a series of hearings focusing on the critical issues facing the National Park Service. I would like to welcome the Members of Congress who have joined us today, and who care deeply about the National Parks.

This hearing will focus on the Parks of Hawaii. Millions of Americans have been captivated, either in person or on television, by the nearly continuous eruptions of Hawaii's volcanoes. The unparalleled sight active volcanoes are a unique part of the National Park Service.

Also unique among National Park Service units is that of the USS Arizona Memorial. This site, a memorial to those who lost their lives on a quiet Sunday morning nearly 64 years ago, holds a special place in the hearts and minds of Americans.

The National Park Service is facing many challenges and problems. Management and funding are of constant concern to all park units. Underneath these issues are problems special to each park unit. In Hawaii, visitor services are of particular concern. The popularity of Hawaii's parks and the number of people wishing to visit them, pose many difficulties. The USS Arizona Memorial's location, in the middle of Pearl Harbor, places special demands on the NPS – how does the Park Service transport so many people out to the Memorial, and how can this be improved.

Moreover, the tendency of lava to move and flow where it wants creates a problem because people want to visit the lava. Moving visitor's centers closer to lava or losing centers to lava flows is certainly costly and hard to manage.

Also of concern to the National Park Service is the cost involved with invasive species. A problem throughout the United States and throughout park service units in every region of the country, Hawaii may be one of the best examples of this problem. The enormous task of combating this problem undoubtedly impacts management and funding considerations on many levels.

I would like to welcome Congressman Neil Abercrombie and Ed Case to this hearing. Although not a Members of the Committee, I welcome them to join the panel for this hearing. Both gentlemen are strong advocates for Hawaii and for the National Parks.

On our first panel I would like to welcome Frank Hays the Pacific Area Director of the National Park Service. He will be joined during the question time by Geri Bell the Superintendent of Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park, Marilyn Parris the Superintendent of Haleakala National Park, and Cindy Orlando the Superintendent of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

Our second panel will be Theodore Jackson the Deputy Director for Park Operations of the California State Parks, Gene Sykes representing the National Parks Conservation Association, Greg Moore of the Golden Gate Conservancy, and Daphne Kwok of the Angel Island Immigration Station Foundation. Welcome to all of you.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know you're anxious to get to the panel. I just want to say welcome to you. We're delighted that you're here, and I want to indicate to all the folks here you may find it unusual that the Committee on Government Reform is hearing something having to do with parks or the other subjects that are before us, and it has to do with a philosophy. For one thing, we're fortunate that Mark is an alumnus of the Resources Committee, so you already have someone with familiarity with what we're trying to do. And he's trying to promote at the present time a way to deal with the National Parks through his National Park Centennial Act dealing with the maintenance backlog, and hopefully that we can deal with this in a volunteer way, in certain respects. Across the country, there are people who love the parks and want to see them succeed.

So what's happening here today? I'm a great believer that politics is addition; the more people you can get for you and where you want to go, the better off it is for whatever reasons they have. And the reasons, the rationale of the Committee on Government Reform has a different mission than the Resources Committee, but the result is the same, if we're able to get exposure for the meritorious activity we're trying to promote regarding parks, particularly here in Hawaii today.

So we're delighted that he's here and we're delighted to participate in this hearing. I'm delighted that yet another Member, particularly a Member with the influential position that he occupies as chairman here of the subcommittee, I'm sure we're—I'm confident at the end of the day we're coming out of here with another ally in our quest to get full funding for the activities that are associated with the Memorial and with the National Parks in Hawaii.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. Congressman Case.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Thank you very much, Congressman. I want to join Representative Abercrombie in thanking you for doing this. I think Mark alluded to it in his opening remarks, but I wanted to let everyone know that he's been a strong supporter of Hawaii, both in this area as well as in the area of crystal methamphetamine, where he is rightly regarded as a leader in our county's effort in that way. He was at a hearing with me in Kailua-Kona, a field hearing, I guess you would call it, not an official hearing, but certainly a full-scale meeting on Maui on that, spoke yesterday at a national conference that's taking place right here in Hawaii right now, as he noted, has visited our parks, is interested in our parks, and is regarded as a national leader in terms of protecting and saving our National Parks.

Let me make a couple of introductory remarks. I hope the people that are going to testify get to some of these points, but I think the first thing I want to say on behalf of all of us Congressmen is that here in Hawaii we love our National Park system. We have a very, very long history with our National Park system, going back almost a century. We have great National Parks and units within the National Park system, eight in all. They have some common similarities, but they're quite different also. If you go to each one of them, you will see the uniqueness of them. Some focus on geological and cultural and scenic issues, some on history, some on recreation.

We have a very obviously unique one at Kalaupapa, the National Historic site on Molokai, which you're still waiting to get to and we're going to try to get you to that. That park is actually celebrating its 25th year this year. Of course we have the USS Arizona, in dire and pressing need of some rehabilitation and kind of an upgrading to handle crowds and interest that is way beyond anything that anybody could have reasonably projected when that was going.

I think the second thing I want to do is just commend the employees of the National Park Service. I think we would all say that in all of our experiences we have great employees here. We have the best professional staff throughout the Federal Government, and it's been a real pleasure for me personally—and I'm sure Neil will echo this as well as everybody else—to work with each and all of you. You're fantastic, easy to work with from a congressional perspective. We're all on the same page. When we have issues, we work them out together. So I really thank you for that.

A couple of kind of specific points. Clearly, as you look at the challenges facing our National Parks, I think the first one, of course, is perhaps unlike some of the units in the states on the mainland. I think it would be fair to say that most of us want to expand the National Park system in Hawaii, and I certainly am among them. I believe that Hawaii's natural, historic, cultural, scenic, recreational, open spaces are under attack, under threat, and are not going to survive unless we protect them. The National Park systems offers a perfect opportunity to protect them. The question is one of priorities. The question is priority of what we bring in, what is consistent with the mission of the National Park system, and how we bring them in, just as a raw level of funding.

At the National level, and I may disagree with the National Park system a little bit on this, at the National level the focus from the top policy perspective at this point has been not on acquisition but on repair and maintenance. And I have made the statement in the past, and I believe it, that you can repair and maintain any time you want, but when you miss the opportunity to acquire, it's missed forever. And we have those situations throughout Hawaii. I have introduced into Congress various proposals to in fact expand the National Parks area right here in Hawaii, and in particular, areas that are especially threatened.

I would probably say the top one would be the Ka'u coast on the island of Hawaii, which I hope and believe should be an extension of the National Park system coming down the southeast coast of Hawaii along the incredible coastline. Mr. Hays has kindly undertaken a reconnaissance study of adding that. We have the so-called Kahuku Makai parcel. We just had a major acquisition for a National Park on Hawaii, on the mauka side, tremendous expansion of the park, now if we can finish that job. Over on Maui, the north coast of Maui between Paia and Spreckelsville, an incredible resource that will be lost pretty soon to development if not protected, and then the south coast also around what is referred to as Pi'ikinau, a unique area of cultural significance which has its own challenges. Right here on Oahu, we have some possible sites for the National Park system. Over on Kauai, we have the Mahalapu, which is an incredible coastline resource. We have many, many

areas that frankly I'd like to expand and potentially bring into the National Park. Clearly that's an issue of funding.

I am proudly a co-sponsor of your bill, Congressman Souder. I want to make sure everybody knows about the National Park Centennial Act, which was introduced by Chairman Souder here, which tries to provide a couple of things. First of all, just a recognition of where we are with the National Park system, but, second, a realistic way to fund both the acquisition and the repair and maintenance. It is going to be increasingly harder for us to do this out of the general fund of the U.S. Treasury as we go through the next 10 to 20 years.

So we can either fight that battle all we want or try to develop alternatives by which we can provide for a realistic way of funding on a directed basis and satisfying the desire of many, many millions of citizens of our country to bring these into the National Park system and to take care of them. So I would cite that specifically as an issue we have to walk through, whether it be dedicated Federal funding or enhanced means for private-public partnering, which have been a real key to success right here in Hawaii, through some of the testimony you'll hear right here in the second panel, and perhaps in the first panel as well.

The second area I want to just highlight briefly are invasive species. Our environment here in Hawaii is unique and one of the most endangered in the world, the invasive species capital of the world. And that is true whether you're in a National Park or not in a National Park. It's our National Parks that we're trying to protect, our natural environment, and one of the mistakes that we sometimes make is to distinguish between National Park and everybody else. In reality, the invasive challenges are everybody's problem. I personally have come to the conclusion that the only way for us to really prevent invasives is to have the equivalent of the New Zealand incoming inspection system. It's very successful there, and which we use here in Hawaii on an outgoing basis to protect California. We're not busy protecting ourselves. We're busy protecting the U.S. Mainland from invasives from Hawaii, which ironically came from the mainland for the most part.

Nonetheless, we have had—I hope the first panel highlights some of the examples where we have had invasives destroy natural wildlife. So we have to work on joint efforts which are not just efforts on behalf of the National Park, but everybody to provide a greater level of protection.

Finally, just two quick points and then I'll turn it over. We clearly have stress on many of our visitor facilities here. Haleakala, I think, is probably the one that has the highest intensity of focused visitor ship on any single day. Hawaii Volcano National Park is real spread out and accommodates it better, but Haleakala is one road to the top and one road back down and it's pretty stressed out. Our National Park there needs to develop some pretty innovative visitor management kinds of issues that may be along the lines of Yosemite that just became necessary as a result of the popularity of that park, and, of course, the old adage that we're going to love some of our National Parks to death if we don't watch it.

And then finally, I think everybody will attest to this, whether they say it or not. I have freedom of saying whatever I want. No-

body's censoring me. But certainly I've been listening, and I think that clearly many of our parks are functioning under management plans, management regimes which are a quarter century old. Hawaii's changed in a quarter century. The parks have changed in a quarter century. The focus has changed. The usage has changed. The entire scheme under which they're operating has changed. They are short of the fiscal and management abilities to develop updated management plans. I think that's a penny rich and a pound foolish. So I would hope—and I hope this is coming out of the hearings throughout the rest of the country, but I would hope that one of the things we commit ourselves to as we move forward is simply updating some basic long-range management plans for our parks. Hawaii Volcanoes needs it, Haleakala needs it, Kaloko-Honokohau needs it, and many others.

So those are the areas that I think are at issue here. Some of them are similar to the rest of the country, some of them are a little more unique to Hawaii. For example, the invasives, I think, is much more acute here than the rest of the country. The solutions are much more manageable than the rest of the country in that area, but we're going to take care of our National Parks. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Ed Case follows:]

Supplemental Comments by Congressman Ed Case

Field Hearing on National Parks in Hawaii
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources
Committee on Government Reform

December 1, 2005
Honolulu, Hawaii

It is my understanding that the Federal Aviation Administration and the National Park Service have not yet produced an air tour management plan for a National Park in Hawaii. I am concerned that air tour management plans for our parks in Hawaii are potentially very controversial and believe we should provide the fullest possible opportunity for public input. Therefore, I think it is appropriate that the FAA and NPS replace the current environmental assessment process with a full environmental impact statement. I would like to receive a quarterly update on the progress on the air tour management plans and suggest that Subcommittee Chairman Souder also receive a quarterly update.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. Next, we have some procedural matters, before we hear the testimony. First, I ask 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.

Second, I ask unanimous consent that all exhibits, documents, and other materials referred to by Members and witnesses may be included in the hearing record, and that all Members be permitted to revise and extend their remarks. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that all Members present be permitted to participate in the hearing. Without objection, it is so ordered.

That gives me the opportunity to make one other point, and that is that in the sometimes difficult environment of Washington we've had incredible bipartisan flexibility in our subcommittee. We were hoping that Congressman Cummings was going to be able to join us. He originally was planning to and at the last minute could not. Our Democratic Minority Staff Director is here as well, Tony Haywood, but we've been able to have a lot of flexibility in how we conduct hearings because of the bipartisan nature of how we try to work through our subcommittee, both on this and other issues, and I appreciate that as well on the full committee level with Chairman Davis and ranking Member Waxman. And it's enabled us to do these with flexibility, have other Members joining our hearings, which is a waiver of normal House rules. This and meth are the only two things right now that we've been able to get some bipartisan cooperation on and it's exciting to try to pull this through with the National Park Service, because historically it's been a tremendous opportunity. And we have had at our different hearings—when Jim Ridenour, however, when he testifies in January at a hearing in the Chicago region, I think he will be our fourth former Park Service Director participating at these hearings, so we appreciate them and the entire executive core for speaking out as well.

With that, would our first panel like to begin with the opening statement of Frank Hays, Pacific Area Director of the National Park Service. We have a clock here that gives a rough—the red means stop, which is 5 minutes. It starts at green, turns yellow at 4. We're going to work this on Hawaii time, which means up to 20 minutes. We'll be flexible. We know we want to get through the two panels. And I forgot to swear everybody in. Because it's Government Reform, we need to do that. So could each of you raise your right hands?

[Witnesses sworn.]

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

Mr. Hays.

STATEMENT OF FRANK HAYS, PACIFIC AREA DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ACCOMPANIED BY GERI BELL, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE KALOKO-HONOKOHAU, MARILYN PARRIS, SUPERINTENDENT OF HALEAKALA NATIONAL PARK, AND CINDY ORLANDO, SUPERINTENDENT, HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK

Mr. HAYS. Thanks.

Mr. SOUDER. Now you really do have to change your statement, maybe.

Mr. HAYS. I'll cross out things and stuff. I can start out by saying I've never used steroids, so I can attest to that.

Mr. SOUDER. Or masking agents.

Mr. HAYS. That's right, or masking agents.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you, Representative Abercrombie, and Representative Case today on this hearing on National Parks in Hawaii. We are pleased to welcome you to Hawaii and appreciate your interest in our work here.

As the Pacific Area Director, I oversee the seven National Park units and the Alaka'ahai National Historic Trail in Hawaii, and units in Guam, American Samoa, and Saipan. I'd like to summarize my testimony and submit my entire statement for the record, if that's OK.

We have seven parks in Hawaii. On Oahu, the USS Arizona Memorial commemorates the attack on Pearl Harbor. The other six units on the other Hawaiian islands protect and interpret the range of natural and cultural resources, including many associated with native Hawaiians. Three units built around archeological sites on the island of Hawaii are specifically devoted to native Hawaiian culture.

In addition to preserving and interpretation sites that draw visitors to Hawaii, the NPS also works with Hawaiian residents in building partnerships to enhance resource protection. The National Park Service's Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program has been assisting local recreation groups on Maui, specifically, outside of areas of the National Parks to develop well-managed off-road vehicle areas, enabling ATV enthusiasts to enjoy that activity while helping to protect Hawaii's resources.

We wanted to give you kind of a brief summary of the visitor service issues that are going on in Hawaii, and we tried to take a strategic look at visitor services. About 1.5 million visitors come yearly to the USS Arizona Memorial to pay their respects to the 2,300 members of the armed services who made the ultimate sacrifice for the Nation. In the attack on Pearl Harbor, about half of them died on the USS Arizona. The current visitor's facility, which was mentioned a while ago, is deteriorating and is often overcrowded, since it was designed to accommodate only half of the number of visitors it currently receives.

Right now the Arizona Memorial Museum Association is heading up a $34 million fundraising effort for a new visitor center that will offer more exhibits and amenities. And we're also moving toward coordinating ticketing, parking, security, and concessions with the non-profit operated USS Bowfin Submarine Museum and the USS Missouri, and as well as an air museum that's being proposed for

Ford Island. All of these efforts will greatly improve the visitor experience at the USS Arizona.

Haleakala National Park also attracts about 1.5 million visitors annually, and an increasingly large number of those folks want to experience sunrise right at the Haleakala summit, so we are now developing a Commercial Services Plan that will help us better manage visitor use. We want to enable visitors to enjoy the sunrise more and to help them better understand why the site has so much spiritual significance for the native Hawaiians, and also to encourage folks to visit Haleakala at all times of the day. Sunsets are spectacular from the summit as well.

Kaloko-Honokohau National Historic Park has recently been made more accessible by the opening of a visitor contact station and parking lot adjacent to park trails, and we anticipate opening a similar facility within the next year at the Pu'ukohola Heiau National Historic Site, and those are fairly self-service visitor contact stations.

Hawaii Volcanoes National Park has the newly renovated visitor center as well, and that offers very nice, state-of-the-art maps and it also has the Jagger Museum, which is operated by the U.S. Geological Survey, where visitors can learn more about volcanoes. Of course we have Cindy here today. I'm going to have to talk to her afterwards because she lost 34 acres of her park yesterday when a large lava bench fell into the ocean. So I don't know what we're going to do about that. No, actually, it's quite an amazing park to be able to see those active landscape scale activities going on. And we also offer an intensive interpretation program at the lava's end by the ocean.

Of course Congressman Case talked about the seriousness of invasive species, and that is a serious problem. Battling invasive species proliferation is the most serious resource protection problem our parks face. Because invasive species cross geographic and jurisdictional boundaries, we need collaborative efforts among Federal, State, and local entities and others to manage the problem. A critical area barrier that faces—NPS faces with these efforts is the lack of authority to expand Federal dollars for work outside the land it manages. And we're—NPS and the Department of Interior are trying to address that problem with the legislative proposal that the administration has submitted to Congress to give the National Park Service authority where there's clear and direct benefit to park natural resources. Passage of this legislation would give the NPS the same authority that the other three major Federal land management agencies already have.

And with the continual arrival of new invaders to Hawaii, the problem of non-native species occupying park areas only increased. The Coqui frogs are beginning to appear in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. These frogs will consume the insects that native birds depend on and that pollinate the Hawaiian forest, and will interfere with the natural quiet. If you've ever been around a bunch of Coqui frogs, you know it interferes with the natural quiet.

On Oahu and Maui, the recently arrived rust, and I'm not talking about stuff on your car, initially found on ohia trees in plant nurseries, has now been observed in wildland ohia forests and is potentially a very serious problem.

The veiled chameleon, which is considered by island biologists to have the potential to decimate native bird populations, is similar to what the brown tree snake has done on Guam. In addition, invasive marine algae can kill corals and significantly impact the health and biodiversity of coral reef communities and could result in major financial losses to the tourism industry as well. One area that has been recently invaded is Kaloko fishpond in Kaloko-Honokohau National Historic Park. Red algae currently covers about a third of the bottom. In addition to restoring this important native historic resource, we want to prevent the algae from spreading to the reef adjacent to the fishpond and throughout the Kona coastline. And the University of Hawaii is joining us in dealing with that issue.

At Haleakala National Park, over 20 years of fencing and feral animal control, followed by invasive plant control and rare plant stabilization, has resulted in spectacular recovery of native species. If you go up there, you can see silver sword coming back in large numbers and other species. However, non-native species, such as Miconia, which is called the green cancer, threatens to reverse this recovery. Pampas grass and silk oak also threaten to convert native grasslands and forests into single invasive species stands. So far these three species have been eradicated from parklands through joint partnership efforts, but reinvasion is a constant threat.

One way we do address invasive species is through our Exotic Plant Management Teams, which provide highly trained, very mobile strike forces of plant management specialists who assist parks in the identification, treatment, control, restoration, and monitoring of areas infested with invasive plants. Another way is through the Department of Interior's Cooperative Conservation Initiative, through which land management agencies partner with landowners and communities to battle invasive species and restore natural areas. And yet another partnership is with the Student Conservation Association, where student teams are building our capacity to address the problem. We anticipate that the Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act, passed by Congress last year, will help provide financial and technical support to our State partners in controlling weeds.

We work with all partners at all levels of government as well as in the private sector in addressing the invasive species problem. One example of a successful public-private partnership that's occurring at Hawaii Volcanoes is with the 'Ola'a Kilauea Partnership. The partnership's goal is to enhance the long-term survival of native ecosystems and manage 420,000 acres across multiple ownership boundaries. The partnership also offers valuable educational and cultural benefits by providing staff and field sites for hands-on environmental education activities for teacher workshops and student programs. The private landowner in the area plans to restore the ranch adjacent to the park and use the entire area for conservation, cultural enrichment, and education.

The most cost effective and successful strategy for battling invasive species—I think Congressman Case mentioned this—is preventing them from entering Hawaii or our National Parks. New and innovative programs are being established to institutionalize prevention programs and the National Parks Service's Inventory

and Monitoring Program networks are helping parks develop monitoring programs for the detection of new invasions, so a quick response can ultimately remove the threat before it becomes unmanageable.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hays follows:]

STATEMENT OF FRANK HAYS, PACIFIC AREA DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE, AT AN OVERSIGHT HEARING ON NATIONAL PARKS OF HAWAI'I

December 1, 2005

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today at this oversight hearing on key issues facing the National Park Service in Hawai'i, with particular focus on visitor services and invasive species. We are pleased to welcome you to Hawai'i.

The National Park Service (NPS) administers seven park units, and a National Historic Trail, in Hawai'i. Along with units in Guam, Samoa, and Saipan, the units in Hawai'i are organized as the Pacific West Region's Pacific Islands Network. Here on Oahu, we have one unit, the USS Arizona Memorial, dedicated to those who lost their lives in the attack on Pearl Harbor. The other units, on other Hawaiian islands, protect and interpret a range of natural and cultural resources—volcanoes, fragile ecosystems, rare and endangered species, and archeological remnants from native Hawaiian settlements and sacred sites. One unit, Kalaupapa National Historical Park, tells the story of the establishment of a colony for patients of Hansen's disease, or leprosy. Although open to visitors on a limited basis, Kalaupapa still serves foremost as a patient community.

The preservation and interpretation of cultural resources associated with native Hawaiians is a central focus of the NPS in Hawai'i. Three park units built around archeological sites on the island of Hawai'i are specifically devoted to native Hawaiian culture. Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park was the site of important Hawaiian settlements before the arrival of European explorers. Pu'ukoholā Heiau National Historic Site contains the ruins of the "Temple on the Hill of the Whale" built by King Kamehameha the Great during his rise to power. Pu'uhonua o Hōnaunau National Historical Park was the site of a sacred place where vanquished Hawaiian warriors and others could live in safety. The other park units emphasize native Hawaiian culture in their interpretive programs.

In addition to preserving and interpreting sites that mainly draw visitors to Hawai'i, the NPS also works with Hawaiian residents in diverse ways, including building partnerships to enhance resource protection. The NPS Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program, for example, has been assisting local recreation groups in areas outside of the national parks to develop well-managed off-road vehicle areas, enabling all-terrain vehicle enthusiasts to enjoy that activity while helping to protect Hawai'i's amazing array of resources.

National park units in Hawai'i received about $19 million in operations and maintenance funding in FY 2005, an increase of about 6 percent from FY 2004. As is the case throughout the National Park System, parks in Hawai'i are funded from several different sources in addition to their operating budgets to help carry out their mission. Many receive cyclic maintenance funds, which are distributed by the regional office, and some have construction and land acquisition funds, which are designated for individual parks in appropriations. Parks also collect concessions fees, transportation fees, and recreation fees. For FY 2005, Hawai'i parks received

about $5.5 million from the 80 percent portion of recreation fees that individual parks retain, which will be used mostly for structural projects that benefit visitors. In addition, Hawai'i parks have been given a great deal of financial and in-kind support from cooperating associations, friends' groups, and other partnership entities. Many Hawai'i parks benefit tremendously from the work done by volunteers, which increased nationwide by 14 percent in 2004.

Visitor Services

The NPS continually strives to provide the public with very positive experiences at national park units. In Hawai'i, the NPS is engaged in a strategic effort to improve visitor services. We have opened some new facilities recently and anticipate the opening of several new facilities over the next few years.

The USS Arizona Memorial is a U.S. Navy memorial and visitor facility that is managed by the National Park Service under a use agreement. It attracts about 1.5 million visitors annually who come to pay their respects to the more than 2,300 members of the Armed Services who made the ultimate sacrifice to the Nation, about half of whom died on the USS Arizona. Visitors may view a film about the December 7, 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor at the center before taking a short boat ride to the memorial.

Replacing the visitor center is a high priority. The current facility is deteriorating, and furthermore, it was designed to accommodate only about half the number of visitors it receives. With the help of the Arizona Memorial Museum Association, which is heading up a $34 million fundraising effort, we are planning the construction of a larger visitor center that will offer more exhibits and amenities. We are also working toward improving the visitor experience at this site by coordinating ticketing, parking, security, and concessions with two historic naval attractions in the vicinity that are operated by non-profit associations--the USS Bowfin, a submarine museum, and the USS Missouri, where the World War II surrender papers were signed.

Haleakalā National Park, on Maui, which protects the fragile Hawaiian native ecosystems from the summit of the volcano to the ocean, also attracts about 1.5 million visitors annually. We are faced with increasingly large number of visitors arriving by tour buses, vans supporting bicycle tours, and private vehicles to experience the sunrise at the Haleakalā summit. Within the last month, the NPS has initiated development of a Commercial Services Plan for the park that will evaluate how the NPS can better accommodate the increased use, while providing for visitor safety and enjoyment and protection of the valuable resources at the summit. Better management of the traffic will promote not only more enjoyment of the beauty of the sunrise but also better understanding of why the site is imbued with so much spiritual significance for native Hawaiians.

Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park, which was authorized in 1978 and is being developed gradually, draws about 90,000 visitors annually. We anticipate that visitation will grow now that we have opened a visitor-contact station and parking lot adjacent to park trails, which has made this gem of a park more accessible. The visitor-contact station, which is smaller than a standard visitor center, has educational exhibits, restrooms, and a small sales outlet, and is much less expensive to operate than a full-scale visitor center. We anticipate opening a similar facility within the next year at Pu'ukoholā Heiau National Historic Site. Currently, visitors may

learn about this historic site, even when it is closed, by reading the interpretive exhibits around the site's outer walls. A visitor-contact station, however, will make the site more welcoming.

Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park, on the island of Hawai'i, has improved the visitor experience in several ways recently. The visitor center has been renovated in the last year and now offers very appealing exhibits, including original artwork and state-of-the-art maps that are useful for trip planning. The U.S. Geological Survey is a partner in providing interpretation with its Jagger Museum, located in the park, where visitors learn about the science of volcanoes. In the last ten years, the park has provided an intensive interpretation program at the lava's end by the ocean, which is a real highlight for visitors.

Invasive Species

In Hawai'i, battling invasive species proliferation is the most serious resource protection problem the parks face. Recognizing that invasive species cross geographic and jurisdictional boundaries, collaborative efforts among Federal, State, and local entities and willing private landowners can be highly effective in managing a shared problem. A critical barrier the NPS faces with such efforts is the lack of authority to expend Federal funds for work outside the lands it manages. The Department believes that the NPS should have that authority where there is a clear and direct benefit to park natural resources and has submitted an Administration legislative proposal, "the Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act," to Congress for that purpose. Passage of this legislation would give the NPS the same authority that the three other major Federal land management agencies already have to use its funds to fight invasives outside their boundaries.

With the continual arrival of new invaders to Hawai'i, the problem of non-native species occupying park areas only increases. For example, the Coqui frogs (Eleutherodactylus coqui) are beginning to appear in Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park. With densities of 10,000 to 40,000 per acre, the Coqui will consume native forest arthropod fauna resulting in significant alterations of food source for native birds and loss of pollinator species critical to maintaining Hawaiian forests, while also degrading the natural quiet of the park and impacting the tourist industry. On Oahu and Maui, a recently arrived rust (tentatively identified as Puccinia psiddii), initially found on ohia trees (Metrosideros polymorpha) in plant nurseries, has now been observed in wildland ohia forests. Its potential to seriously harm this most abundant native tree species and other key species in the native ecosystems is not yet known. The veiled chameleon, which is part of the illegal pet trade, has escaped and is considered by island biologists to have the potential to decimate native bird populations similar to what the brown tree snake has done in Guam. The veiled chameleon feeds on birds and can capture them in mid-flight.

Invasive marine algae are rapidly invading the Hawaiian Islands. These invaders can overgrow and kill corals, devastate coral habitat, alter ecosystem processes, and significantly impact the health and biodiversity of coral reef communities. With Hawai'i's tourism industry so dependent on marine resources, these impacts can result in major financial losses. The NPS is embarking on a two-year project to rapidly assess the threat from invasive marine plants within and adjacent to national parks in Hawai'i, as well as Guam, Saipan, and American Samoa. One area that has been invaded is the Kaloko fishpond, in Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park. Red algae has entered this spring-fed embayment and currently covers about a third of the bottom. In addition to restoring this important native historic resource, our concern is that the invasive algae

will spread to the reef adjacent to the fishpond and throughout the Kona coastline. In cooperation with the University of Hawai'i, the NPS is conducting a removal project to evaluate methods to diminish and control this invasion and prevent its spread. These methods include biological control using herbivorous fish, manual removal, shading, and re-cropping.

At Haleakalā National Park, over 20 years of active ecosystem management, which includes fencing and feral animal control followed by invasive plant control and rare plant stabilization, has resulted in a spectacular recovery of native vegetation and associated fauna. Thirteen endangered plants and five endangered birds are harbored on parklands along with dozens of rare plants and a diverse array of native arthropods. However, many non-native species threaten to invade native habitats at the park, potentially reversing this recovery. For example, miconia, an invasive tree, feared as the "green cancer", would transform arguably the best remaining Hawaiian rainforest, and the only remaining home of two critically endangered forest birds, the Maui Parrotbill and Akohekohe, into the green and purple monoculture that has become the fate of the forests in Tahiti. Its prolific growth pattern and large leaves shade out native species; its shallow roots do not hold soil and can result in increased erosion or land slides. Pampas grass and silk oak also threaten to convert native grasslands and forests into single invasive species stands. So far these three species have been eradicated from parklands through a joint partnership effort, but reinvasion from adjacent lands remains a threat.

As part of the NPS's Natural Resource Challenge, a new management strategy was created for addressing invasive species in parks. Modeled after the approach used in wildland fire fighting, field-based Exotic Plant Management Teams (EPMTs) provide highly trained, mobile strike forces of plant management specialists who assist parks in the identification, treatment, control, restoration, and monitoring of areas infested with invasive plants. The NPS has 16 teams covering 209 parks nationwide, including one that is dedicated to the Pacific Islands Network. This successful model has now been adopted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Student Conservation Association as well. The success of the EPMTs derives from its ability to adapt to local conditions and needs while still serving multiple parks within a broad geographic area.

The Department's Cooperative Conservation Initiative (CCI) is an innovative and collaborative program through which land management agencies partner with landowners and communities to battle invasive species and restore natural areas. During 2003 – 2004, the NPS received about $6 million for invasive species work. Since 2000, the EPMTs have entered into over 40 different cooperative efforts throughout the United States with more than $4 million dollars in matching support from public and private sources. In 2004 alone, volunteers contributed over 4,000 hours to our weed management efforts. In addition, we anticipate that the Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act passed by Congress last year will help provide financial and technical support to our State partners in controlling weeds. Finally, through a new Student Conservation Association partnership, student teams are being fielded to build our capacity and to train new invasive species management professionals to work beyond our boundaries.

Because collaborative efforts are so critical in managing the problem of invasive species, the NPS has been an active member on many partnership committees. At the national level, the NPS participates in a number of interagency partnerships and cooperative efforts of the National

Invasive Species Council, an inter-agency council charged with coordinating Federal invasive species programs that is co-chaired by Secretary Norton. The NPS also participates in three Federal coordinating organizations for specific types of invasive species, which enables the NPS to draw on broad expertise, identify shared priorities, pool resources, and work collaboratively on invasive species issues of national significance.

The NPS also works with partners at the regional and local levels. We are a member of the Maui Invasive Species Committee, an informal partnership of private, county, State and Federal entities that has for the last three years worked to control invasive species through $1.6 million dollars in county and State grants. A similar effort led by the Big Island Invasive Species Committee is working to coordinate invasive management actions on that island.

One example of a successful public-private partnership is occurring at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. The ʻŌlaʻa Kilauea Partnership is a cooperative land management effort involving State and Federal entities and willing private landowners. The partners include the Puʻu Makaʻala Natural Area Reserve, the Kamehameha Schools, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey Biological Resources Division, the USDA Forest Service, and the Nature Conservancy. Through the partnership, Kulani Correctional Facility inmates are provided with education and work training in fencing, native plant horticulture, and other conservation projects.

The goals of the partnership are to enhance the long-term survival of native ecosystems and manage 420,000 acres across multiple ownership boundaries. The partnership is focused on management and research to remove or reduce impacts from feral animals such as pigs, invasive plants, and non-native predators and restoring native habitat and endangered species. The impacts from feral pigs include spreading the seeds of exotic plants, feeding on rare native plants such as orchids and lilies, and by their rooting behavior creating habitat for exotic plants.

The partnership has jointly fenced 14,100 acres on State and private lands and eliminated the feral pig population from 9,800 acres, while controlling feral pigs in an additional 4,300 acres. The partnership also offers valuable educational and cultural benefits by providing staff and field sites for hands-on environmental educational activities for teacher workshops and student programs. The private landowner involved in the partnership plans to restore the ranch adjacent to the park and use the entire area for conservation, cultural enrichment and education.

The most cost-effective and successful strategy for battling invasive species is preventing them from ever entering our national parks. New and innovative programs are being established in a handful of parks to institutionalize prevention programs. In cases where this is not possible, the sooner new introductions are detected and addressed the greater the likelihood of eradication. The NPS' Inventory and Monitoring Program networks are helping parks develop monitoring programs for the detection of new invasions so a quick response can ultimately remove the threat *before* it becomes unmanageable. The information is also used by EPMTs for identifying treatment areas and coordinating control projects with parks.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the interest and support of this subcommittee in our endeavors here in Hawaii. That concludes my statement, and I will be happy to answer any questions you or other members of the subcommittee may have.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me start with a kind of off—because I think it's safe to say, given the number of regions that we're hoping to cover, and in fact we're headed into an election year, that we're not going to get to Guam, Samoa, Saipan, or other territories. Can you submit for the record, if you have—we'll work with some questions of how to do this, but some one-page summaries on what—two pages so we can put them in our hearing book report, and then maybe we can work into this hearing Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and have a subsection on these territories.

Up until I went on the Resources Committee, quite frankly, when I first got on the committee and saw all the delegates, I wondered, why are you on this committee? Most of the constituents I represent or Americans don't know what percentage of these islands we actually own, how much land space has been turned over to the Park Service. So if in each one of these you could give a couple of the challenges that you're dealing with there, an idea of visitation, idea of budget, and whether it's flat, going up or down, and what you have there. What we're going to do systematically is match up our hearings and give 3 years of—here's 1 year, here's 1 year, and here's the last year, to see where the FTDs are and the budgets are. We may get that out of our headquarters. I'm not sure yet which way we're going to do that. That's when we get toward the end.

We're going to sit down with them, figure out what is the most simple way to do this, but also not only the acreage but the percentage of the land there that is the Park Service. Because it's interesting, for the record, also Fish and Wildlife, I don't know that there are Forest Service, and then also try to get the military an idea of what percentage of Guam, what percentage of American Samoa, what percentage of these places are actually under the U.S. Government and how do we interrelate things like invasive species, visitor services, land utilization, because we dominate many of those islands.

Mr. HAYS. That's correct, even the—this is off the top of my head, but I believe the National Park Service controls 20—well, we lease from the American Samoa government 20 percent of American Samoa, which is pretty substantial amount of their land base.

Mr. SOUDER. Then first kind of, we'll probably deal with this more on the second panel, but on the USS Arizona challenge, it's very confusing for me that the—what's military, what's what branch of the military, the Missouri isn't part of the Park Service. You've made a statement here that you're going to try to coordinate those together, and Ford Island Air, would that be Federal or would that be private?

Mr. HAYS. Those are the three non-profit organization attractions, but to provide a very kind of seamless visitor experience.

Mr. SOUDER. Like in Oregon they have a pass for whether you're—first off, just getting the Bureau of Land Management and Fish and Wildlife to partner, and then they have the State Parks where you get a pass that's good for everything.

Mr. HAYS. I think they're looking closer at kind of a ticketing facility where you can package tickets to all four attractions together and individually, and of course the three non-profits may evaluate it sometime, too, to do a package deal for their sites. But the Ari-

zona, because the ticket is kind of the access onto the tour and it's a no-cost ticket, I think that would remain separate.

Mr. SOUDER. This is a side point, but I have the Lighthouse Transfer Bill, and some of the non-profit groups should learn from that, make sure that if there are—sounds like you're not going to do this, but if you do, we have an incredible problem with disentangling the dollars. Because when you have any agency transfer—DHS is now trying to claim this private group's money.

Mr. HAYS. Yeah, the effort has been going on for several months now, but it's still in the preliminary stages. I think the direction that they're leaning is kind of a joint ticketing facility.

Mr. SOUDER. And in this, is the $34 million for the museum and new visitor center, is that viewed as mostly private, public-private, how do you see that?

Mr. HAYS. That's the fundraising portion from the Arizona Memorial Association and the National Park Service through the line item construction program that's funding approximately $7 million.

Mr. SOUDER. You said it's projected in the budget? What year do you plan——

Mr. HAYS. In 2006, fiscal year 2006 it's in the line item.

Mr. SOUDER. And we'll talk more on the Association. Are they coming along in the case of fundraising?

Mr. HAYS. They are. I think what I saw was about 12 million, and they feel, you know, pretty solid about their fundraising.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. May I interject?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Part of this has to do with us getting the agreement.

Mr. HAYS. That's correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. And I'm confident, Mr. Chairman, that the private fundraising will roll once everybody knows that the deal's been set.

Mr. SOUDER. You have space for it?

Mr. HAYS. Yeah, there's actually a concept plan that's been—we've actually, through luck and some happenstance and through a great cooperation with the Navy, current Admiral out there, looks like we're going to be able to transfer 6.6 acres that's between the Memorial—the Arizona Memorial and the Bowfin to the National Park Service for management. And that just facilitates the overall site plan and traffic flow plans to get people around to the various attractions up there.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, between Senator Inouye and myself, the cooperation with the military will be ensured.

Mr. HAYS. They have been very cooperative. Admiral Vitale should be commended for his efforts.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Excellent job. If he wanted to—don't get me wrong. I'm saying it with a smile on my face because they are—everybody is very anxious to participate in this. Believe me, it's not a question of competition or confrontation or anything. Quite the opposite, it's everybody making sure that from their own institutional base that they do the right thing in order to make sure there's a smooth conclusion to all of this, including whatever land transfers have to be done, whatever—you're quite right about ticket

differentiation, different packages. That all has to be worked out, but they know they have to do it and it's well under way. The Park Service is kind of a focal of all of this.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you——

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. The good part here, honestly, I think Mr. Hays will agree, is that the Park Service, having been a little bit of an orphan in this whole process in the past, now has the problem of so many foster parents——

Mr. HAYS. That's right.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE [continuing]. In the waiting room out there that it's a matter of coordinating all the positive—you've got so much help, you're not quite sure how to put it all together, right?

Mr. HAYS. They actually have formed what's called the Pearl Harbor Historic Partners, which includes the non-profits and the National Park Service working together to come up with business plans, kind of a—ticketing plans and so forth, traffic flow plans, and, you know, there are issues of trying to then coordinate with what's going on with the National Park Service plans. And since this 6.6 acres just recently came to us, or is going to come to us, that has set us back a little bit, but we're ready to move forward again.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. It's a good problem to have.

Mr. HAYS. A great problem to have, and I think visitors, when they arrive there in a few years, will have—it's an overused term, but a world class experience to learn about World War II and the Pacific——

Mr. SOUDER. Will the visitor center be large enough to accommodate what's been the outside waiting lines?

Mr. HAYS. Yeah, there's going to be a—there's 20—proposed for about 23,000 square foot interpretive center with exhibits. And, you know, people will be able to get their tickets and then have their choice of spending time up in the 23,000 square feet of exhibits, going to the Bowfin, maybe catching the bus over to the USS Missouri.

Mr. SOUDER. And do you think that will alleviate some of the pressure?

Mr. HAYS. That should help quite a bit.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, again, if I might. This has been complicated a little bit by the fact that the city and county of Honolulu is now in the process of determining whether it's to have a rail transit line, and one of the stops on the rail transit line inevitably would be in the area of the Arizona Memorial and the stadium, which is called the Salt Lake area, and that has to be figured out. But if that comes to fruition, it will add to the logistical problems that we're speaking of right here because it will make it even more convenient for people to be able to come, say, from Waikiki to Pearl Harbor as part of their visitor experience, not that they have any problem attracting people now, but it will be even more convenient in that sense. Therefore, the kind of planning that's being undertaken right now has added pressure because the numbers may actually increase even over what was anticipated now.

Mr. HAYS. They're actually pretty limited at this point with operating dollars and so forth.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. So would you agree that part of what has to be planned for here is the actual visit to the Memorial? And this, I think, is part of the confusion that you mentioned that takes place. That's one thing, and that's highly limited.

Mr. HAYS. Exactly.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. A visit to the site, to the visitor center, or the various designations or various other non-profits, that's another question entirely. Some people may be able to integrate all of those activities, but the likelihood of only a small percentage ever actually being able to visit the Memorial will remain a constant; isn't that the case?

Mr. HAYS. Unless they're able to increase the number of barges or the operating hours, but——

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Even then——

Mr. HAYS [continuing]. The current status, yeah.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Even there you're still talking of an extraordinarily small number?

Mr. HAYS. That's correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. And rightly so. I mean, the Memorial itself is not—you know yourself when we go to—at the Capitol the stairs become a question because so many millions of people walk on the stairs they actually get worn away. We can't have that happen to the Memorial, after all. And, logistically, only so many people can arrive there, so many hours in a day, and have it in the context of respect. This is not something where you troop up to the Venus de Milo with your camera and people have this—having done this just recently, watching people not actually viewing or experiencing the attraction, if you can call it that, itself, saying in this instance the statue, but they're taking pictures of it in a crowd sticking their cell phones in the air or something. They're not really doing it. We can't have this with the Memorial. This is not some kind of a free-for-all that takes place.

Therefore, one of the difficulties—or one of the challenges—it's not a difficulty. It's a challenge. One of the challenges to be met is that the—and Mr. Sullivan I'm sure will speak to this when his turn comes, is that you have to provide an experience for the visitor who isn't actually going to go to the Memorial itself. The visitor has to be able to observe the Memorial is there and have some opportunity to experience that in a respectful way, but at a distance. And so there are various ways in which that can be accomplished. But we have to understand that the average visitor coming to the Arizona Memorial site is not going to go to the Arizona Memorial.

So we have to have the observation venue, we have to have an experience which incorporates that visit in a respectful way, but takes into account that literally tens of thousands, in fact hundreds of thousands of people will be there without ever actually going to the Memorial itself. Is that a fair——

Mr. SOUDER. Let me clarify that. If you don't have this, I do. How many people come to the Pearl Harbor site, park visitor site?

Mr. HAYS. It's 1.5 million visitors a year.

Mr. SOUDER. And how many actually go out to the site?

Mr. HAYS. The majority are actually going out to the Memorial right now. They're getting tickets and going out there. I don't know the—I can get you the——

Mr. SOUDER. Not the exact figure, but you think it's over 50 percent.

Mr. HAYS. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. And if you can give us what the peak seasons are where the percentage drops the lowest.

Mr. HAYS. I do know that there's really not a peak season. It's busy all the time. There's a little bit of a drop, I think, in the fall and the spring, but it's pretty busy.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you do on-line advance reservations?

Mr. HAYS. They do not yet.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you see that coming?

Mr. HAYS. There is talk for on-line reservations.

Mr. SOUDER. At any kind of preference?

Mr. HAYS. That I don't know.

Mr. SOUDER. One of the concerns, if you look at this as we go to the 100-year Anniversary of the Park Service, how are we going to handle the most intense visitation points in the Park Service? And should there even be kind of a record where we say we have one shot at this? Yosemite Valley, right down to the Grand Canyon, how much of this should be advance plans, how much of it should be flexible, and how will we manage this? Because in effect you've got the equivalent of, or certainly, probably more so than most, this intense usage. But we dealt with this with the Grand Canyon for a long time. Unfortunately, that means anybody that plans a last-minute trip can't get there, and so how to balance those kind of things is a huge challenge. Getting to Old Faithful is getting to be an adventure. How do we do this?

In my second round I'm going to do the other parts. This is where going out and seeing the Hawaii Volcanoes and seeing the lava at night last summer, it—I saw one of the advantages, which I don't exercise that often of being a Member of Congress, because you drove me up——

Ms. ORLANDO. Shhh.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. And saw what was there. And clearly warned, beyond the signs, that I was supposed to wear long pants, no flip-flops, and flashlights, otherwise I might not be walking as well today. But those type of experiences become very intensely used. How are we going to manage this in a fair and equitable way that—by the way, a huge advantage—this is an even more explosive question, the huge advantage to more highly educated, upper middle class people who plan ahead and have the resources in which to plan ahead and to get to these sites. It's a tough, tough dilemma.

And then the whole net thing becomes even more explosive when you have certain really important memorials like this that are so intensely meaningful. We haven't even talked yet today about what about kids and grandkids of people who were at Pearl Harbor, when grandkids come out to Hawaii and can't get to the Memorial site. Should there be some kind of consideration that we have to that family heritage? Because I know the 1-day we were there the tickets—you sell out the tickets early in the morning?

Mr. HAYS. They are distributed early in the morning, generally.

Mr. SOUDER. I think by 9 a.m. they were gone.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. We'll try to——

Mr. SOUDER. Is it OK if I yield to Mr. Case?

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Let me just first, for the record, endorse and indicate my support as well for everything Neil has said about the Arizona. I mean, although it's technically in the First Congressional, none of us stand on ceremony on that. And I agree that this is of the most immediate priority for the National Park system in terms of getting this right. We've got the critical mass. We've got the opportunity. We have the need.

Mr. Hays, just a couple of quick questions. I spoke in my introductory remarks about acquisition versus repair and maintenance. And assume that you were acquiring for Hawaii, assume that we were considering additions to the National Park system. Do you have any sense of what would be the most acute, what would be most needed or consistent, whatever criteria you might use? I mean, where would we need to go in Hawaii to assure that natural resources appropriate for protection of the National Park system were in fact brought into the National Park system that are not now? Do you have a list that you're following?

Mr. HAYS. You're talking about specific geographical areas.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. I would have to provide that for the record, because I don't know that.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Can I request that, Chair, a response to that.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes. And if I could interject that it may be tough to get clearances to rank, but if you could provide things that the Park Service has considered and have been opposed to the Park Service. If you agree that you would have more reservations about some than others, then we can put our opinions in and sort that through, then that's more likely to get it through the process.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. That's fair. I think it is a matter of priority. It is a matter of what we can do. It is a matter of what we want to do. It's a matter of kind of turning to the list of what is practically achievable under whatever climate we're dealing with over the next 5 years. I think it does have something to do clearly, I will state, with pressures for alternative use, where you have untouched—relatively untouched resources that otherwise would be lost forever.

Mr. SOUDER. And let me put one other caveat, so we don't get back what we normally get back at this portion of the hearing, which is we believe we have to take care of backlog maintenance before we purchase additional lands, which is a clear statement that will come through. But if the Park Service got additional money and we said we were giving additional money to the State of Hawaii specifically for land purchase, then how would you consider these based on the recommendations of other types of things? And if they want you to put the boilerplate in front of it, that's fine.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. We'll just put it in front. Boilerplate, it's done with, gone. We acknowledge the repair and maintenance side of things. Now let's get to the second part.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. This is beyond repair and maintenance, way, way, way beyond that. So that's not an issue.

Mr. SOUDER. But as you know, they always send out——

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I know, but that's one reason we're happy you're here, Mr. Chairman, because we're talking about the actual facts on the ground and not a theoretical construct, or even a practical construct, but here that question is essentially secondary because we have to literally change—not literally change, but we'll worry about maintenance and the rest of it when we get the new facility. That's not what we're talking about. And I just want to make sure on the other part that I have it clear. We're talking about land here, primarily. Purchase is not necessarily a problem here. A lot of this has to do with transfer, right? The majority of what we're talking about, if we're talking about land, is less an acquisition question. I'm talking about Arizona and Pearl Harbor, talking less about acquisition——

Mr. HAYS. That would be a transfer.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Pardon?

Mr. HAYS. That would be a transfer from the Department of Navy.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. And there may be—you've got the city, you've got—there's all kinds of things that might or might not take place, like as I said, with the transit circumstance, but principally we're probably dealing with an overwhelming majority, if not in its entirety, land questions involving transfer and responsibility rather than purchase problems that would require appropriations for that purpose.

Mr. SOUDER. But in Mr. Case's question, as it relates to outside of the USS Arizona, to look at this—one of the supplemental types, if I may interject here, is that unlike many other areas in the country, the Park Service is mostly looking at reclaiming land, land that's been forested over, land that has—you know, a lot of the kind of crown jewel parks are overrun. In Hawaii, they're still crown jewel space, and it's either that or development. So some kind of combination also of what is the opinion of the Park Service, if Congress were going to allocate. Because we'll do what we want anyway, regardless of what the Park Service recommends. So it would be nice to have the Park Service proposals as to how you do the tradeoff of development threats, land that would be helpful to keep, and maybe you can make comments on this subject regarding some of the different proposals that are out there. Which ones would help invasive species control? Which ones are naturally more important for wilderness? Which ones would have the advantages for visitor usage that we keep open area? Which ones have developmental threat? Where are the State parks strong and where there might be a State park or private supplemental? If the Federal Government took some of the land, would Nature Conservancy or other groups be able to get other lands to hold so we pick up some of that?

Give us some of the depth of the variation of the challenge in the islands of Hawaii, which are different than what we're hearing in other hearings. It's different because there is still undeveloped land that's under tremendous developmental pressure in Hawaii.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. And then I think, following up, really, on both of those observations, you've worked throughout the system. Is there another way that we on the national level can look at the challenge of funding the National Park system, specifically acquisi-

tion? Not to take away from the repair and maintenance perspective, but I'm talking about acquisition. Because sometimes I feel we get stuck in the rut of, OK, we don't have enough earmarked in the park budget this year, so therefore we can't acquire. Whereas my impression of here in Hawaii is we've prevented—we haven't prevented, but we certainly have been utilizing some means of acquisition that works pretty well, private-public partnerships, acquisition by a private entity holding.

I think we have to note that there are many people out there that are willing and able to donate their land to the National Park system. They're willing to let it come on in, and that's not just private entities. That's the State and county governments. We have several situations in Hawaii where the State government would transfer to the National Park system, you know, and we're not talking about monetary consideration. We're talking about protection.

So the direct question is is there—given your experience in the system, are there unique means of funding or facilitating acquisition in Hawaii where there can be a lesson learned on the national level that we could somehow implement or change or fix or include in the Federal law? Or are we just like everybody else, we just kind of do it?

Mr. HAYS. I think—well, there are some unique examples in the Pacific island network with the number of leases that the Park Service does, you know, like with American Samoa where we're leasing from American Samoa. Now, those aren't no cost, but there could be no cost ways to do that. I can't think of other kind of innovative approaches that have been used. I don't know if my colleagues have any examples.

Ms. ORLANDO. Public-private partnerships are pretty much it. You could also flip it to the other side, and I think—and I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your bringing up the Oregon Coast pass, because that was something that I worked on. I think on the flip side, if we look at the National Park Service doesn't necessarily have to manage everything and we work with local communities. Mr. Hays alluded to the partnership that we have with Kamehameha Schools and their vision for really their own park. They shifted from back in the 1930's and 1940's, we don't want to be like the National Parks, to today asking themselves why don't we want to be like the National Park? So even co-management might be another way to look at it, and I think Redwood National Park, certainly, up in the northwest, northern California is a good example of that.

So co-management, seamless passes. Public doesn't know whose land they're on, and sometimes maybe they don't really care. They just know that every time they walk in the gate, they're getting dinged another $10 or $5. I think those might be some ways.

Mr. HAYS. The Kona Coast Task Force that the State legislature just recently chartered I think in a couple years will tell whether that's an effective approach to managing some of the lands in the Kona Coast. There's a community-driven kind of approach to preservation.

Mr. SOUDER. Following up before I yield to Mr. Abercrombie, do you have in Hawaii any kind of variations of like conservation easements that Teddy Roosevelt—to try to keep some of the his-

toric ranchers there when they weren't doing ranching anymore? You do some of the ranching, I believe, at Haleakala. You've got an experimental—you've kept one of the farming areas where you have poi in there.

Ms. PARRIS. Yes, raising of the taro for the poi.

Mr. SOUDER. Yeah, taro, but that's a small kind of demonstration type area. Do you see potential that with the development pressure, some of these open areas you would get easement type things to try to work through and do you have anything like that?

Ms. ORLANDO. We don't have any easements I'm aware of. We certainly do in the system. National Historical Reserve is a perfect example of that.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. We're going to hear testimony regarding conservation easements from the private perspective.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Abercrombie.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. No.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me cover—I want to make sure we—and we'll do additional involvement, but, Ms. Bell, could you describe a little bit the historic parks you have, the unusual relationships you have with native Hawaiians, and the nature of the parks you're managing?

Ms. BELL. I sure can, Chairman Souder. I'm the superintendent at Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park and also Pu'uhonua O Honaunau National Historic Park. And Pu'uhonua O Honaunau, Pu'uhonua means place of refuge. That was one of the largest places of refuge on the island of Hawaii. And we do have at both parks extensive use by the native Hawaiians, because those places are still special and sacred. So we work very closely with our—the descendents, particularly, of the areas, the cultural and—the cultural descendents in the area, and, as we do with all of the parks, we allow them access to those cultural sites and try to balance management of the parks and visitor use with their uses of the park.

At Pu'uhonua we have begun a resource stewardship program with the descendents of the park to make them more responsible for those sites that have been part of their families for generations. At Kaloko-Honokohau we have an advisory commission that we work with made—composed of native Hawaiians, and it's congressionally mandated, that support us, particularly with the interpretive programs of the park. And at Hawaii Volcanoes and Haleakala they have kupuna, or the elders, that provide advice on cultural issues occurring in the park. So we do enjoy a good relationship with the native Hawaiian communities.

Mr. SOUDER. What's the third park?

Ms. BELL. Pu'ukohola Heiau, which we refer to as the independence hall of Hawaii, and very, very important site for native Hawaiians. Each year they have a festival there where hundreds of Hawaiians throughout Hawaii and even from the mainland convene to celebrate Kamehameha the Great.

Mr. SOUDER. And do you have it written into the park agreements, the native Hawaiian usage? How does that work?

Ms. BELL. Yes, we do. Some of the—some of us do and there are some uses that we're still looking into.

Mr. SOUDER. Is it the—I believe it's the refuge park. I thought I had it phonetically here.

Ms. BELL. Pu'uhonua O Honaunau.

Mr. SOUDER. My sons went last—is that where the snorkeling is, over near that park?

Mr. HAYS. Yes, it is.

Mr. SOUDER. Now, of all the places they had tried, they said that was the best snorkeling. You said this is one of the intentions you have. Is there a concern about the heavy usage you have? And that's not actually in the park.

Ms. BELL. It's not in the park. It's right next door. It's State property and managed by the county of Hawaii. It is one of the best of two on the west side of the island, and we do have a lot of folks come to the park looking for the snorkeling, which is next door, but we do—there is a lot of visitation to South Kona, to that area, and then of course to the park.

Mr. SOUDER. How does that affect your parking?

Ms. BELL. Actually, it—we allow folks to park in the park. They pay a park fee. And the county and State have done some things with the area to make parking more manageable, but it is still a contentious issue with the residents over there.

Mr. SOUDER. In what way?

Ms. BELL. When there is no parking, they will be parking in people's driveways or yards or blocking parking, because the area—there's a one-lane road into that area and the area is just too small, space is just too small.

Mr. SOUDER. Have you had——

Ms. BELL. I'm sorry.

Mr. SOUDER. Go ahead.

Ms. BELL. We have been working with the community, Kamehameha Schools, because they own the bulk of the land there, to try to alleviate some of it, you know, to have folks park further up on the highway or just say, sorry, no parking.

Mr. SOUDER. Have you had a flat freeze in your budget, a slight increase, or have you reduced the number of employees over the last few years?

Ms. BELL. At Kaloko-Honokohau we have had an increase in our budget, particularly to manage the visitor services because we built a—two years ago built a visitor contact station there. So we did enjoy the increase, at Pu'uhonua, a slight increase in our budget to manage personal services, etc. So we've been holding our own. One of the wonderful things about managing both parks is that I get the flexibility, you know, to use employees where I need them.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. My wife had the pleasure of going to Pu'uhonua Sunday, and I just wanted to emphasize the importance, critical importance of personnel at places like Pu'uhonua. Some of the other places you can have signs and it's a little bit more of the visitor being able to handle himself or herself or even their group in a way that's manageable without necessarily a lot of contact with individuals. But would you agree that Pu'uhonua is unique in the sense that the participation of the people who come to visit there with the personnel that are there can explain what they're doing, why they're doing it, how they're doing it, and who they are is a critical element in the visitor experience? And by defi-

nition it kind of has to stay small. I understand about parking, but you cannot handle at Pu'uhonua thousands and thousands of people coming through because it would destroy what Pu'uhonua is all about. Is that a fair assessment?

Ms. BELL. That's a fair assessment, and we are—you know, we are experiencing marked increase in visitation from the ships that are coming into Kailua-Kona, and, you know, the ships are in now maybe three times a week and we have busloads of visitors to our park. And you're right, it is a unique and special place, and we can accommodate so many of our—just so much visitors to the park, but the interaction with the employees there is so important. And about 60 percent of my staff is from the community. They are lineal and cultural descendents of that park. So they have a stake in how——

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Right. I remember when I first went—when it was first open, you could go and have a conversation not much different than what we're having right now, but the employees now have to have microphones and, you know, amplification because they have to deal with 50 people at a time or something like that or——

Ms. BELL. We do have the amphitheater, if you remember, so we do schedule talks in the amphitheater. I also impress on my employees to do roving interpretations. So we have uniforms out in the area. We will not use the amplification, etc., but it is getting more and more difficult to make contact with our visitors. We call the visitors off of the ships our 20-minute visitors. They get off the buses. They have to use the restroom because they've come all the way from Kailua-Kona. They need to buy a book or postcard to take back, and then they need to see the park, and all of that in 20 minutes.

So that's where we're trying, you know, to get the pre-education, but most of them have already done their homework. We have very educated visitors to our parks. They've done their homework. They know about the park, but they want to be there because of the specialness of that area. It attracts people from around the world.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. So are you able to work with the cruise ship people to kind of alert them ahead of time, here's what you're heading for?

Mr. SOUDER. Let me ask a specific question on that, and let me ask all three of you if you've done any of this, and that is in Alaska you see more rangers on the boats or going into Skagway so they can use some of that time in advance?

Ms. BELL. That's one of the things that—we haven't done it, but we're looking into it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Pardon me. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, because the cruise ship thing is just getting to settle into Hawaii in a significant way, because we instituted now inter-island travel that didn't exist before. And now that this is institutionalizing itself, we're going to be dealing with thousands of people in the parks. This is a new phenomenon.

Ms. BELL. Very new. What we have done, we are looking at approaching the cruise ship operators to get our rangers on the ship. We have—and this is a couple of years ago when they first started was actually put a ranger on a ship from Hilo to Kona, which

worked out really well, but where we're trying to focus is tour drivers, the drivers that are on the buses and to try to get them to do the orientation before they get to the park. And that's working.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you give a certificate of training course where you conduct the training?

Ms. BELL. It's been done, yes.

Ms. ORLANDO. Likewise, the same. We're looking at about 7,000 visitors a week now from the cruise ships. It's a huge impact, huge impact. And I would say none of us have the infrastructure to support that kind of activity. Now, as Geri mentioned, the buses—the cruise ships are on a schedule. So unfortunately the visitors are not getting the quality experience that we would like to offer. And in fact, at Hawaii Volcanoes it's even lesser so because the buses cannot go down to the eruptionsite. So they can't even see the primary resource that they've come to see.

Mr. SOUDER. What about at Haleakala?

Ms. PARRIS. Unfortunately, we're not getting the educated visitors that apparently are going to Geri's park, and that does concern me. I've just arrived at Haleakala. One of the things I've already been talking about with my staff is that we need to make better contact with the cruise ships and educate the visitors better about the park. And what makes Haleakala so special, and especially the sunrise, is that sacred, that spiritual place that it is at that time of day. That sun could be rising anywhere right now. They come off the cruise ships from the hotels with the bike companies, boom, the sun comes up, and they're gone. And we need to find a way to better educate by working with the hotels and the cruise ships, and that's something that we're going to look into.

It's going to be difficult to go get with those people the night before but yet still have the staff there that morning to talk to them when they arrive, but I'd say our visitors aren't that educated about the special place that they're visiting, or that's not been my experience or that of my staff.

Mr. SOUDER. If I could move to my impression of Haleakala for a minute. My impression of the bike riders is almost like bats coming out of a cave. Are there times when you're at peak load as to how many bikes can actually come down that mountain? How close are you to that at sunrise?

Ms. PARRIS. We don't know what that would be right now. Pretty much all day starting before sunrise still the end—till the afternoon there are bikes coming down the mountain, and right now the park—I wouldn't say we would know what our capacity is there, but this commercial use study, commercial services plan will take us there.

Mr. SOUDER. That's a study that you started.

Ms. PARRIS. We're—we've got to get the package approved, but we've already written up the package. We'll be doing it with some of our fee demo money. And there really are two planning processes that run parallel. One will look at commercial services, how do we best manage that. And it's not just the bikes. It's horses as well. We've got four-foot troughs in the trails down in the crater from too much horse traffic on those very fragile cinder trails.

But, OK, so we're doing that. How do we best manage the commercial services? We also need to know what is our capacity, and

we'll do what's called a visitor education resource protection study that will say this is how many people this small area—this is how many people that this small area can maintain without—while maintaining a good visitor experience, but also without damaging the resources, which we're seeing both cultural and natural. There's over 1,000 people a morning at the top of the summit.

Mr. SOUDER. Each bicycle company pays you a fee per person, is that how it's working now?

Ms. PARRIS. They pay an entrance fee. They also—right now they are paying $50 a year to get the permit and then are paying $200, which is supposed to be going—which comes to the park supposedly for us to manage it.

Mr. SOUDER. And then are they capped as to how many they can bring in a morning?

Ms. PARRIS. They can only have 14 riders on one tour, one group, but some of them are bringing four or five different groups a day.

Mr. SOUDER. So they're not restricted under their permit how many they can bring? They just have to have certain level of management?

Ms. PARRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOUDER. That's what your study is going to look at.

Ms. PARRIS. Effective November 1st we needed to—again, I just arrived a couple of months ago, and we needed to somehow get a way of handling this. We were in gridlock, which causes a problem because we couldn't get emergency vehicles in or out. The cruise ships started bringing huge buses. The bike companies—I mean, it's just a madhouse up there. And so effective November 1st.

Mr. SOUDER. Unless a visitor actually sees it, it's hard to visualize how much of a madhouse it is.

Ms. PARRIS. My second day there, Frank joined me. We kind of went up incognito, and I was stunned. I was like, oh, my. But we kind of went up incognito to experience it, and it happened to be a very busy day.

Mr. HAYS. It was a busy day.

Ms. PARRIS. And I didn't even get to see the sunrise because just as the sun started coming up two bike companies figured out who I was—who we were and came up and started asking me questions. But what we implemented is what we call an interim operations plan that cut—that limited how many bike tours could be up there at sunrise, the size of buses until 2 hours after sunrise for the cruise ships. You know, like one bike company had cut what they were doing by half, and it's a way of us to kind of manage it now while we find a more final solution. And it's—but we're still turning people back every morning that come up in private vehicles. We're—just about every morning we're having to say, no, we've reached capacity and turning them away.

Mr. SOUDER. I want to plunge into something where your collection of parks here is at a potential threshold of huge problems for the National Park Service. Let me start with the bikes. If somebody gets hurt, do they sue you?

Ms. PARRIS. We have been sued a lot at Haleakala.

Mr. SOUDER. And I'm going to talk about the ponds at Hana in a minute, but let's take the bike riders. Clearly some people didn't—I mean, it's in some of the materials that this is going to

be a fast bike ride and good luck. If somebody happens to have a heart condition or they're moving at too fast a rate or they go off a curb, have you been sued from the bike riders at this point?

Ms. PARRIS. Not to my knowledge. I'll have to get back with you over the last few years.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you have a release form they have to sign?

Ms. PARRIS. The Park Service does not. That would be with the bike company. And there are bike accidents every day. We had two broken legs last week, a smashed nose. I mean, my rangers every day deal with bike accidents.

Mr. SOUDER. I'm going to go off on a tangent, and I apologize. Are the fees from the bike companies enough to cover your cost to just handle the accidents?

Ms. PARRIS. No, sir, they're not. And in fact I've asked our regional office to look at what we're charging the bike companies and give me a better assessment of what would be a fair—what would be a more fair sum. The costs we're getting now, both through the horse use and the bikes, aren't allowing us to properly manage.

Mr. SOUDER. Let's talk about the person who drowned in the pools. Almost every guide that I picked up—and I'm a person who picks up everything they can get. One of the things they say is everybody's encouraged to go to Hana and then go swimming in the pools. And it's clearly—there are signs posted about the dangers. Part of the problem is you can't see a flash food coming because it may be raining up higher and it isn't raining down where you are. But clearly this person, in my opinion, with a standard warning, should have realized that where they were was risky. And there were plenty of signs. You just have to be sued in one.

This is one of the only cases where there's been a lawsuit that's been won against the Park Service, and that impact, if we can't figure out how to deal with this, is—I don't know how anybody is going to be able to go down to Crater Lake. I don't know how they're going to be able to go in the Grand Canyon on a mule.

Could you put a little bit of what happened with that particular case and maybe just a brief synopsis here and give us some history on that case. Because then I want to move into the Hawaii Volcanoes case, because this could incredibly cripple visitor services in the United States, unless we can figure out how to handle the liability.

Ms. PARRIS. Again, I'm fairly new there. I don't know how they won that case. We are now being sued by another family, a husband—or a father and a daughter that were killed as well for $35 million, and that suit is going on now. Same thing, in a matter of seconds, a 5-foot wall of water took them over 180-foot falls down some other falls. You know, I was at the top of that falls recently. If there had been this much water in there, I wouldn't have gone in that pool, much less the average water. I just value my life too much to be on slippery rocks near a 180-foot drop, but we do have numerous signs. The brochures that you're reading are outside—are not Park Service brochures.

Mr. SOUDER. Right, I understand. The question——

Ms. PARRIS. And I think we're going to have to do a better job of educating.

Mr. SOUDER. And should they be held liable if in fact the Park Service has warnings but the brochures and guides don't have warnings? This is interesting legal challenge here, because if the Park Service puts out the warnings—Ms. Orlando, could you talk a little bit about that? You said you have some case?

Ms. ORLANDO. Well, we had—the one that you and I discussed previously, and I think everybody in the room knows it, it actually is currently in litigation, so I'm probably not privy to talk too much about it, but a similar situation where we have a lot of visitors coming in with commercial operators, some are signing, you know, liability waivers and others are not. In this particular case the woman was left behind, so there's multiple suits against both the Park Service, the operator, as well as even the cruise ship.

Mr. SOUDER. Isn't it, to some degree, just like the bike riders on Haleakala, the nature of getting on that bike without having done a pretest of how fast you can ride and your ability, you are taking some risk. When you walk out on hard lava, how many visitors would you say you have on a regular basis, not necessarily——

Ms. ORLANDO. Oh, every day, every day probably at least a half dozen, maybe more. And it can be basic didn't bring the water that we told you to bring. Every time I go out there I have a backpack full of water because I know I'm going to encounter somebody who doesn't have any water and can't make it back. I might add, too, in the case of Hawaii Volcanoes, we don't allow the bikes either to drive—to go down on their bicycle down to the eruptionsite. They have to go in their van with their tour group and drive down, but we don't allow bicycles to go down that road, also.

Mr. SOUDER. Would you describe at Hawaii Volcanoes the—I believe certainly in recent times you were the only park to lose a visitor center to a volcano. Can you describe some of the challenges of trying to work with a site that gives way every so often, or the road goes over?

Ms. ORLANDO. We lose 30 here, we gain 5 here, it's just, you know, we're a park on the move. I guess, you know, we made the conscious decision that we would not rebuild the visitor center. That was an incredibly significant visitor center. Superintendent Bell would attest to that. It was our cultural center, largely supported by the Kalapana community, native Hawaiian community. So the decision not to rebuild—obviously not to rebuild the road. Now we've got buildings down there on wheels and that works for us. We use our user fees to staff an eruption crew, unlike any other crew that I'm aware of in the Park Service. So we've tried to be creative.

I think that's one of our success stories, is the ability to provide safe access to lava flow. We want to be able to do that. We made a couple of decisions in the last year that we wondered what the backlash would be in terms of closures. The bench collapse is a perfect case where 6 months ago my partners at USGS advised me that we were in imminent danger out there, and I made the decision to close the site. In 6 months I received one written complaint about closing the site to ocean entry viewing.

So we've all mentioned that it's education, it's valuing your own life, and yes, you are going to get the rogue visitors who will do what they want to do. You've probably also heard about a couple

of folks who have been lost out on lava, but actually outside of the park boundary. They were on county property on the other side of the park, but people do strange things.

Mr. SOUDER. What you need is a video-enhanced image of that as if there had been tourists there and showing all the people falling in. That would be a great visitor education to see at the beginning of the film.

Ms. ORLANDO. You've seen the film down there. We have the film and we've got rangers and we try to approach as many people as we can, and frankly, because we have closed off this dangerous site, we are able to encounter that many more visitors. It's made life so much easier for the rangers down there. We can have more one on one. So we do the best we can.

Ms. PARRIS. Could I add? It kind of goes back to what you were asking about the Hawaiian culture and how we work with them. The situation is getting to such at Haleakala that the native Hawaiians, pretty blunt with me, saying they don't come to the park anymore. There's too many visitors trampling their sacred sites. In fact, I was telling—sharing with my colleagues here, I met with one of the kupuna groups on Tuesday and, boy, they beat me up pretty bad about how they just refuse to come up there anymore. And so we've got to find that balance between visitors—visitor experience and protecting the site, but also allowing that traditional use.

Mr. SOUDER. We need to get to the second panel, so if you could comment on one other thing that seems unusual. I know at Haleakala and with Geological Service at Hawaii Volcanoes and maybe you could give us kind of an overview of your other parks, you have a lot more scientific land usage inside your park. It's kind of like a different type of in-holding. I also wanted to ask you that question. Do you have much in-holding in the Hawaii park system? Are there landowners inside of the Federal Government land holdings?

Ms. PARRIS. Not at all.

Mr. HAYS. No.

Mr. SOUDER. So it's mostly the Federal Government observation towers up at the top, the Geological Service? If you could give us some idea, do you have a chart there.

Ms. ORLANDO. You just happened to see me pull that out. Just specific to Hawaii Volcanoes, and I'm not sure if I provided this to you before, but we're only—the National Park Service and Hawaii Volcanoes is only 90 percent of the total work force in the park. So we've broken that out. In terms of our cooperators, our public-private concessionaires, SCA, other partners, volunteers. We had 42,000 volunteer hours last year. That's the equivalent of 26 people. We could not open the doors without those volunteers.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me do one other thing here, and we'll ask more specific data. Like I said, this will give us in effect—when we print the hearing book, we try to figure out how to get those in the key hands, but also up on our Web site where individuals can download, and we'll want to fill out printed materials, much more specific data, what percentage you get from fees and this type of stuff. So in effect we'll have a Hawaii book when we're done.

But as we look to the 100-year birthday of the park, what kind of vision are we going to have for the Park Service? Part of it is we clearly have backlog. Part of focusing on the backlog means we haven't kept up with, for lack of a better term, the front log. In other words, we're seeing a decline of visibility of actual rangers, how we deal with pension, Homeland Security, other types of questions like that. And then this huge question, we're dealing with the backlog, keeping personnel funding. What about opportunities and holes in the Park Service that we need to fill in?

I was at Angel Island earlier this week. As we look at Native American sites, what do we have there? Land type opportunities to purchase. Once they're gone, they're gone. And then you can't worry about what kind of rangers you're going to have at the visitor center, because you don't have the land. It's already built over.

As you see us trying to capture the public imagination—and all of you have probably served at multiple parks in Hawaii. Why don't we start with Mr. Hays and go to Ms. Bell, Ms. Orlando, and Ms. Parris. This is your chance to say, here are some ideas on how we can capture the public imagination, what should we be looking at both executive-wise, congressional-wise as we move toward the 90th next year, 100th. Mission 66 didn't start in the anniversary year. It started way ahead.

Mr. HAYS. Well, you know, parks are associated with superlatives. I mean, we talked about crown jewels already today. They've been called America's best idea. I've read that they've been called the sincerest expression of democracy. They create history for Americans. They create knowledge about natural ecosystems and so forth for Americans, and I would hope that anything we do will ensure that for the next 100 years or 200 years that those kind of adjectives are used about the National Park system.

And some of the approaches and considerations and issues to think about as we move into 2016, our anniversary coming up, I think maintaining relevancy with our changing demographics in the country is particularly crucial. You know, we need to make sure that we're reaching out to the amazingly diverse America that we're becoming. I had the opportunity to be superintendent at Manzanar before my current position, which was a Japanese-American internment camp, and I never thought before I got to Manzanar that I would have the opportunity to hear a Buddhist priest thanking the National Park Service for taking care of a significant site like Manama.

So I think you look at the sites that are saved that may be relevant to other cultures, but also the Park Service's efforts to reach out and talk to and encourage other ethnicities, other than the typical visitor to National Parks, is a critical thing to do. And I think our work force ought to reflect that diversity in America, and the Park Service has been working hard over the last several years to increase diversity. Because a lot of folks, frankly, before this effort looked a lot like me, balding white guy with a beard. So I think it's a nice, appropriate thing to make sure that our work force reflects the diversity—the great diversity of America.

You know, I think engaging the public, and that kind of ties into the topography issue. I think most parks already have been doing it, but this is a little more formal process to really get out there

and do ground-up public engagements about how parks are managed, and the more we can do to get parks involved—or people involved in the management of parks, I think that's crucial. And, you know, it would be great to see the National Park Service as seen as the best in doing sustainable design, the best in resource management programs, and invasive species programs.

I was out at Hanauma Bay, which is just Diamond Head—or east of Honolulu here and the community visitor center out there—it's the city and county of Honolulu that runs the visitor center, and I was impressed with the design. It's very sustainable yield. It blended into the landscape. They have wind generating and solar-powered lights in the entire parking lot, and it's just great to see the park system is really actively pursuing sustainable design. It's a great idea for the Park Service to make sure they're a leader in sustainable design.

Mr. SOUDER. Our other goal on Mission 66 was to maximize as much usage of as much energy as possible by creating big, high ceilings.

Mr. HAYS. Exactly. So maybe now those are cultural features that we need to preserve in many cases, so, yeah, I think being a leader in sustainable design would be great. And I think those are key things, from my perspective, that should be considered.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. Ms. Bell.

Ms. BELL. I'm going to ditto Mr. Hays' comments. He used the word relevant several times, and what I'd like to see is that the parks that I manage in the National Park Service still are relevant as special places to the American people, and particularly for me as a native Hawaiian and a manager of two cultural parks, that it remain relevant to the native Hawaiian community.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Orlando.

Ms. ORLANDO. We really didn't discuss this beforehand, but my big word was the R word. You know, on a personal level, I worked—this is my 36th—I'm going into year 36. Unlike most of my children who will probably have multiple careers in their lifetime, probably yours as well, it's been my only career, with the Park Service. I've worked at four parks, two regional offices, and the National office. And I do have to say, as Mr. Hays alluded to, that growing up in the Park Service, 20 years ago you wouldn't have seen three females sitting up here in a senior management position.

So relevancy is incredibly important, I think, to a generation in the next century that did not grow up with the National Park ideal. So we are challenged, and in Hawaii even more so because we want to remain relevant and important to the native Hawaiian culture, but broadly—more broadly is how do we connect our places to the public in a way that they understand that we are managing for their benefit, and I think that's really critical in getting that story out there.

I think we need to manage smarter. I think we need to look at leveraging resources. And I think also, as Frank alluded to, sustainability, leading by example, and it's difficult to lead by example sometimes when your resources are a little thin.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Parris.

Ms. PARRIS. Well, ditto the relevancy. Anyway, you know, I've been doing this for 30 years, and like Ms. Orlando, this is the only job I've ever known. Haleakala is my 17th park that I've worked in and seventh one I've been superintendent of. And visiting National Parks is what I do on my own time as well. And I think over the years our—my hope for our 100th anniversary is that we've gone back to what was the primary goal when I started with the National Park Service, and that was the visitor experience, uniforms on the ground talking to people. And as I've traveled around other National Parks over the years, every time I go you see less and less of Park Service employees. And I think that does diminish the visitor experience less and less. And it's not all about money. It's just as we—there's just a lot of things we're having to deal with as managers and employees now that takes us away from that front desk, that front line, that roving out on the trail.

You know, the general public, everybody loves the National Park Service, but they really don't understand what we are and what our mission is. And that's always puzzled me in my career. I remember back when we had the closures a couple of years ago, and I'm standing out there with a news reporter at one of the parks I was superintendent of in western Pennsylvania. They pulled up and they were like, well, darn, why can't we go in? I was like, well, you're aware of the Federal closures? Yeah, but what's that got to do with you? You know, what does the term national mean to you?

So I don't know how we attack that, but I think we need to focus and get back to visitor experience, because in preserving and protecting our resources, knowledgeable visitors helps make our job easier. And I've always taken a great amount of pride in that my job has been to preserve and protect our Nation's heritage, and that's what I take seriously, as I know my colleagues do.

So that's my hope for 2016, is that we stop and look, and a lot of the things we do are important, but it's all about preserving and protecting resource and educating visitors on what we do and why there's a need.

Ms. ORLANDO. I just wanted to add one other thing, that I think we have an opportunity in Hawaii—we were the 12th National Park established, and I say we collectively because Hawaii Volcanoes and Haleakala were established as one park before the National Park system existed. So we have an opportunity at the local level to walk our talk and to prepare our parks for that event as well. So I would just remind everyone that there were 12 National Parks established before the Park Service, and not to forget them in 2016 either.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Case, any final comments?

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. I guess, first of all, on that question, I agree with what you just said. I guess that is your mission, to preserve the heritage of our country. And I think looking at what—chairman, I think one of the things that I think we're all focused on is Hawaii is unique in so many ways, as are many parts of our country, but here in Hawaii we have certainly a unique ecology, geology, unique scenery, unique history, unique culture. And I think the National Park system is absolutely integral to preserving that uniqueness about Hawaii. As one of the major components of that native Hawaiian culture, it's under threat. Hawaii, in general, is

under threat, and I think the National Parks system is just an absolutely indispensable part of our own effort to preserve our unique qualities.

If I could just—for the record, this would just be—I want to make sure I ask the right question. I made opening remarks to outdated management plans. Is there some way of asking so that the record is clear on how old the management plans are here?

Mr. HAYS. Sure. We can provide that.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you know off the top of your head when your last management plan was?

Ms. BELL. My management plan was written for Kaloko-Honokohau in 1996.

Ms. ORLANDO. 1970's, one of the older ones.

Ms. PARRIS. Ten years old, very outdated. Doesn't——

Ms. ORLANDO. Lucky you.

Ms. PARRIS. There's been a lot of land added.

Mr. HAYS. We'll get that.

Mr. SOUDER. And whether you're doing current analysis.

Mr. HAYS. I'll get you the status, because there's one for Hawaii Volcanoes is online.

Ms. PARRIS. I hope to get one online, too.

Mr. SOUDER. Are you done?

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. One challenge that I want to get out that I've been kind of ramping up as I go here is that very seldom do I ever at these hearings get out of the Park Service the biggest single change that's happened in the United States, and it's partly the nature of your business that you're outdoors people and you're there, and that is the explosion of the Internet in the education system and how people are experiencing things.

Park Services Internet has improved. I know Dick Ramey had worked for a period of years and many others on how to do education stuff, but the truth is that you're the biggest repository of science, you probably have more art than the National art museums combined inside the Park Service, and most people aren't going to see it. They may get to their regional park at one time or another. The question is as we move—we're looking at 2016 and the next 100 years after that. Much of the experience is going to be you're going to be able to get 3-D multi-sensory experiences in your head or around you through your television and other types of things, how can we interconnect this with the tremendous resources we have in the Park Service?

Everybody's having to adjust to it. People on the ground have to decide whether they're going to go to tapes or rangers and how you handle even the quantity on the ground. People are looking at local and regional parks as the next generation needs hiking and walking places near them. My experience with the Park Service is that you're very good, because each superintendent is told they have to make peace with the people around it that have somewhat different vision than the majority of the taxpayers who are paying for the park, such as you're used to accommodating them so local schools get in.

But, for example, through a fluke, both a personal contact and my son's contact, my daughter in third grade in Indiana was teach-

ing bass as part of a science course. So she hooked with Carlsbad on bass and was able to do a conference call of materials that made that experience so much richer. It shouldn't just be that the people who are in the immediate area that happen to have a visit from a local ranger can tap into the natural resources.

We've got to think big here. How do we take and build the support and extend the support? And that's one way we're going to reach lower income, diverse members of the population to get them exposed to it in their classrooms, then whatever their local urban park is, and then a regional park. And then to visit the great natural sites will always be more inclined toward middle class and older people, as they get more income and more ability to travel, unless you're geographical. And I want you all to think about and if you want to add anything to that of what you've done in those areas.

Ms. ORLANDO. I would just say we're just embarking on it. The National Park Foundation has a partnership with Ball State University and Best Buy, I think, is the corporate sponsor of an electronic classroom. Grand Canyon I think completed it a couple years ago, and they are receiving 25 million kids on that electronic classroom. We're working on, I think, Carlsbad this year. They do one National Park a year, and Hawaii Volcanoes is scheduled for 2007. So we can expect, as you say, to see more of that kind of a contact made.

Mr. SOUDER. It's a transformation, even in our offices. We get 300, 400 letters, calls, and direct emails a week, and that's held pretty steady in my 10 years in the House and the history of our congressional district. We did a check, as we've upgraded our home page, I think we had 2 million hits in June. We had 120,000 being there for 2½ minutes or more. And when you look at those numbers, it just staggers the traditional contacts you have. And the world is changing underneath us and we've got to figure out how to do that too.

I also want to make one more comment. When we were at Lassen last summer and this summer, that it shows you what you can see in our National Park Service. Because Lassen came into the Park Service when it had been like Mount St. Helens, Hawaii Volcanoes. Now you see an old park that in effect we're seeing how it's rehabilitating itself in volcanoes. You can go to Crater Lake, where I was this summer in my northwest tour of the parks, Crater Lake is a sunken volcano. Mount St. Helens is still smoking. You've got lava. And in fact you can do—but it is—the question is when can you go to your site and say I'm going to research volcanoes. I can see this whole thing. I can watch a site that's erupted, that's rebuilding itself. I can go a little bit to the north and see a sunken lake, see one smoking, see one with lava inside the same Park Service. We're thinking in terms of Hispanic tours, if we could get the Asian culture subgroup. How could we do this in other types of——

Ms. PARRIS. There was actually an all American highway, I don't know if you saw the signs when you were in the park, but there's a scenic byway, Federal scenic byway that takes you from Lassen Volcano all the way up to Crater Lake, and it was being extended to Mount St. Helens. It includes private organizations, the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, local communities work-

ing together to tell that story kind of—it's along a highway, because they connect, but it's——

Mr. SOUDER. And like what finally Lewis and Clark, after——

Ms. PARRIS. Exactly.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Ten years of hounding on them, as we headed up, the last 2 years they finally started organizing Lewis and Clark. But often these things are inside a region, when in fact it's a stove pipe, much like we have to do in the Department of Homeland Security, about across the region. It's a start to get it in the regions. It's a start on the home pages. We're getting much more live cam type things, and there's definitely been improvement, but it's kind of like how can we big picture this.

Ms. ORLANDO. One other thing on that, we can also do it among—between agencies, and we have an exchange with the Forest Service at Mount St. Helens. We bring an interpreter over every summer and we send one of ours there, and what a wealth of experience and knowledge they bring back to their job and their agency. So we are trying to make that leap across agency boundaries.

Mr. HAYS. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your testimony. Appreciate the patience. Second panel, if you could come forward.

[Recess.]

Mr. SOUDER. If you could just give us your name, please.

Mr. SAUNDERS. It's Saunders, S-A-U-N-D-E-R-S. First name is Ansil, better known as Sandy.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you want to spell your first name so she has it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Ansil, A-N-S-I-L, Saunders, S-A-U-N-D-E-R-S.

Mr. SOUDER. OK, I know each of you were here at the beginning, so let me go ahead and swear all witnesses. Please raise your right hand.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let the record show that each of the witnesses responded in the affirmative. We'll start with Craig Obey. We appreciate your leadership in the NPCA and working with us in the whole hearing process and giving us an overview as we go into each of these hearings, and just so we have—in the interest of full disclosure, we all know your dad. And he's a great leader in Congress, and appreciate your being here.

STATEMENTS OF CRAIG OBEY, VICE PRESIDENT, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS OF THE NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION; SUZANNE CASE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATURE CONSERVANCY IN HAWAII; GEORGE SULLIVAN, CHAIRMAN OF THE ARIZONA MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION; AND CASEY JARMAN, BOARD MEMBER OF THE FRIENDS OF HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK

STATEMENT OF CRAIG OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity. As you know, I'm vice president of government affairs for the National Parks Conservation Association. Since 1919, NPCA has been the nonpartisan voice for the National Parks throughout the country to protect parks for present and future generations. On behalf

of our 300,000 members, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this, which is actually the seventh of your hearings, including the one held in D.C., and those hearings are really unprecedented as far as we can tell in the history of the park system, very important.

Despite their place in society as the birthright of every American, our National Parks have been neglected by too many successive Congresses and administrations. We merely pay lip service to their trust and responsibility for this remarkable gift. This malignant neglect places at risk much of America's birthright and makes me question whether my son and daughter will have potential for the kind of experience of the National Parks that I took for granted when I was growing up.

Hawaii is a spectacular place, with some of our Nation's most compelling national treasures. Hawaii's seven National Parks include national wonders like Haleakala and Hawaii Volcanoes that inspire and lift the soul and the spirit. They preserve examples of our culture, places like Kaloko-Honokohau and Pu'uhonua O Honaunau historic sites. And they commemorate the legacy of those who gave their lives for our country at the USS Memorial—Arizona Memorial, Pearl Harbor.

Despite their distance from the mainland, Hawaii's National Parks face some of the same challenges as their mainland counterparts. Parks have faced many years of budgetary bloodletting that led to a system-wide operating shortfall of $600 million and a maintenance backlog estimated at $4.5 to $9.7 billion. Imagine running a business on two-thirds of what you need every year to operate with your physical plant in dire need of repair. You wouldn't be around very long.

Far off events are also affecting Hawaii National Parks. For example, a long overdue joint curatorial facility for the three National Parks on the west side of the Big Island is being delayed from 2008 to 2010 because of Hurricane Katrina. In light of the many challenges that they face, people in the Park Service deserve enormous credit for holding our National legacy together, given the difficult challenges they have.

Hawaii's first addition into the National Park system was Hawaii Volcanoes, including Haleakala. It's a constantly changing place, which was demonstrated by the bench collapse yesterday, presenting unique challenges to the park. This incredible place has become the poster child for one of the increasingly widespread challenges for many of our National Parks, invasive species, and has suffered from years of neglect. The park has produced important results in removing some exotics, goats, and feral pigs. However, fences used to keep those animals out are expensive. They cost $30,000 a mile, and that's money very difficult to come by in the operation budgets for the parks.

They also face significant challenges with a variety of other animals and plants. For one example, fountain grass, which they've done a pretty good job of going after over the last 15 years in the park. But now with the Kahuku Ranchland that was just added, which is an exciting addition to the park, which really has opened up places that have been closed to the public for 100 years. The park has a challenge of now eradicating fountain grass in that

area, as well as other exotics. And they've done a very good job creating partnerships to help accomplish some of these things, but in a park that has a $5 million operation shortfall, 37 percent of the park's actual budgetary needs, it's a challenge.

It's also why aggressive funding of the National Resource Challenge both through appropriations and through your National Parks Centennial Act is so important, as well as initiatives like Mr. Case's and Senator Akaka's bill.

Another manifestation of the funding strain at Hawaii Volcanoes is interpretation. The park recently opened a terrific new visitor center with interpretive exhibits. You venture beyond the visitor and you see interpretive signs that appear to be 25 or 30 years old. Many of them are difficult to read because they're so weather-beaten. The park is doing its best with its resources. With the resources as they stand now, it's likely to take years before the park can even replace the signs.

Hawaii's National Parks face many additional challenges. Overcrowding at Haleakala, the bike situation, as you already discussed this morning, and the challenges facing the Arizona, which are well documented and I won't belabor you with. If you visit Kaloko-Honokohau, you'll see what's essentially an urban park, surrounded by development, that really appears to just be getting off the ground, despite having been created in 1978. And invasive plants in the park there challenge not only the natural environment, but are wreaking havoc on many archeological sites, and they make interpretation extremely difficult and non-existent. The past couple fiscal years the park has received funds to combat some of these problems and has made some strides forward, but those funds are really a drop in the bucket compared to what we need.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, the National Parks throughout the Nation, Hawaii's National Parks, like them, are feeling the strain of multiple responsibilities, unfunded mandates, and insufficient budgets. This places the long-term health of our parks and the experience of visitors to them at risk. Now is the time to seize the opportunity presented by the centennial, as you've discussed, to really renew our commitment to these treasures. We don't have this kind of opportunity every day. NPCA recently released a report describing the 10 reasons to reinvest in America's park heritage, but really we need only one, and that's so we can protect this legacy for future generations so our kids and their kids can see them and experience them. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Obey follows:]

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Protecting Parks for Future Generations

Testimony of
Craig D. Obey, Vice President
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

December 1, 2005

Congressman Souder, it is a privilege to be here today as we once again examine some of the significant challenges that impact the ability of the National Park Service to protect the parks and serve park visitors. My name is Craig Obey and I serve as Vice President for Government Affairs for the National Parks Conservation Association. Since 1919, the nonpartisan National Parks Conservation Association has been the leading voice of the American people in protecting and enhancing our National Park System for present and future generations. Today we have 300,000 members nationwide who visit and care deeply about our national parks.

The national parks preserve the most superlative examples of America's natural, cultural and historic resources. Each unit of the National Park System is designated for the common benefit of all the people of the United States—those of us here today and those who will come after us. This gives the National Park Service not only a stake, but also an affirmative obligation to protect the national parks in carrying out the mission entrusted to it by the American people.

Fifty-one years ago, historian Bernard De Voto said, "The progressive impairment of the parks by budgetary bloodletting is a national disgrace." Sadly, that statement remains as true today as it was in 1954. While national parks remain premier destinations for American families, all is not well for the units of the National Park System. According to the 2005 report *Faded Glory: Top 10 Reasons to Reinvest in America's National Park Heritage* released by the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) a description of conditions in our parks would include dilapidated historic buildings, education cutbacks, traffic jams, marijuana farms operated by drug cartels, forest besieged by foreign insects, dirty restrooms, and crumbling artifacts. To be sure, the National Park Service often works marvels despite limited funding. But behind the scenes – and sometimes peeking through the curtain – is a growing litany of problems caused by chronic underfunding.

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

This crisis is an unfortunate reality rooted in decades of inadequate investment by successive Congresses and administrations. But we can no longer neglect our responsibility to act. The national parks represent America's heritage-our legacy to the future. Under current conditions, the future for the parks is not a bright one.

Our national parks include icons of democracy such as the Statue of Liberty, the home of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the *U.S.S. Arizona Memorial*, Fort Necessity, Little Bighorn, and Gettysburg. We are inspired by Thomas Edison's laboratory, the cliff houses at Mesa Verde, and the Seneca Falls, New York home of suffragist Elizabeth Cady Stanton. We bring our families to enjoy campfire stories at Toulomne Meadows in Yosemite, marvel at the temple built by King Kamehameha at Puukohola Heiau National Historic Site, and bask in the glory of a sunrise at Haleakala. Simply put, our national parks constitute the most significant natural, cultural, and historic places on the American landscape. And they remain in dire need of greater financial assistance.

Hawaii Park Funding at a Glance

The funding status of Hawaii's seven national park units is somewhat comparable to that of sites in the 48 contiguous states, Alaska, and the U.S. territories. Hawaii's national parks budgets today (FY 2006) are less than eight percent higher than they were three years ago (FY 2003), not keeping pace with inflation and other increased demands placed on the parks. While Hawaii's national parks did receive an average increase of 6.3 percent between FY 2005 and FY 2004, this increase was undermined the following year by base operating budget increases that averaged only 2.2 percent, well below the 3.1 percent rate of inflation. Individual park units, such as Hawaii Volcanoes, face a budget that is only 3.6 percent higher than it was three years ago.

The subsequent budget for FY 06 recognized the importance of maintaining a higher level of support for national park budgets to cover fixed costs. Unfortunately, that budget made no additional headway in addressing the problems plaguing our parks. 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. 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. And despite $50 million in recurring homeland security expenses incurred by the Park Service since September 11, 2001, the agency has not received one penny in reimbursement from the Department of Homeland Security budget.

With the current budget national parks will barely manage to tread water for another year, and this is without accounting for likely across the board cuts that may further weaken the budget. Without greater progress on funding, the crippling annual operating shortfall threatens the long-term well being of the natural and cultural heritage protected and preserved in our national parks.

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

The impact of chronic underfunding on Hawaii's national parks ranges from subtle to tragic. The Park Service does not have enough money to fully archive and interpret many of the extant documents that tell the stories of the men and women who were present at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Invasive species (plants and animals) are destroying the natural resources that make the islands unique. Both of these developments impact the ability of the Park Service to effectively serve as the steward and guardian of Hawaii's natural and cultural resources.

Malama ka `Aina – Caring for Hawaii's Natural and Cultural Resources "in a good way."

Native Hawaiians have a special relationship to the water, land, and sky, and to the history that ties them through generations to a specific place. To be the son or daughter of someone, to have been born and raised in a particular area, and to honor one's ancestors and colleagues through the sharing of such personal information, is equally as important (if not more crucial) to many Hawaiians than one's job title and affiliation. The spirit of malama ka `aina (care/love of the land) and the deep respect the culture bears for ancestral traditions and history make Native Hawaiians the perfect partners to help guide Park Service efforts to protect and enhance Hawaii's natural and cultural resources "in a good way."

The incredible beauty of Hawaii's natural resources, the landscapes, plants, and animals found on the islands, is relatively well known. Less well know, however, is the rich history of the native peoples thought to have reached the Hawaiian Islands around 1,000 B.C. from western Melanesia and southeastern Asia. These Polynesian explorers brought with them minimal tools and supplies. Successful settlement of the area depended jointly upon their ability to adapt to new surroundings and manipulate the new environment to better provide for the needs of the people.

Native Hawaiians developed and evolved fishing and agricultural activities as well as unique social, political, economic, and land use patterns. And from 1400 A.D. "Hawaiian society underwent a systematic transformation from its ancestral Polynesian descent-group system to a state-like society" with varying degrees of somewhat rigid stratification by class, power, and privilege. High chiefs, such as Kamehamea, reigned over a feudal system that grew increasingly complex in nature.

Accurate interpretation of Native Hawaiian culture and history is no easy task. For instance, Native Hawaiians recognized at least five different types of fishponds and fish traps. These were the structures and devices that allowed islanders to catch, hold, and harvest fish throughout the year. The ponds were constructed with regard to certain guidelines and used in very specific ways, and capturing that kind of detail ensures that native culture will be represented in a truly respectful fashion. Involving Native Hawaiians in shaping the public face of their history is the best way to make sure that the Park Service gets it right.

Fortunately, in Hawaii, the development of partnerships between Park Service staff and Native Hawaiians is a well-established way of conducting business. For example, at Haleakala

National Park, the Kipahulu `Ohana (a non-profit cultural organization) have a formal cooperative agreement with the Park Service (signed in 1995 and recently extended to 2008) to provide assistance with interpretive displays, outreach, and programs, that celebrate traditional Hawaiian culture. Kipahulu `Ohana were awarded a $45,000 grant from the Office of Hawaii Affairs in 2004, to support the organization's Kapahu Living Farm project, where over an acre of ancient taro patches (within park boundaries) have been cleared, restored and returned to traditional organic production use and a traditional hale serves as a space for educational activities. And at Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park (Kailua Kona, HI) the Park Service and leaders from the Hawaiian community formed an advisory council, which has assisted in the redesign of the park's brochure and the development of a live-in culture/education center.

Insufficient funding does, however, have adverse impacts on the ability of these partnerships to effectively serve as stewards of Hawaii's cultural resources. For instance, the $3.6 million required to construct a new curatorial facility for the Park Service at Kaloko-Hanokohau remains an unfunded line item on a PMIS list. This facility would house both artifacts and natural resources and would act as the key curatorial facility for all Hawaii national parks. Existing facilities do not provide state of the art protection for the valuable resources they house.

Support and leadership from community members is a vital component of the Park Service's ability to adequately and accurately preserve and interpret the native culture of Hawaii. These are valuable relationships based upon trust and a belief on the part of many in the community that their cultural resources and ancestral heritage will be preserved and protected in a respectful and honorable way. Hawaii's national parks must have sufficient staff and resources to conduct community outreach and form effective partnerships, or risk losing some of that hard-earned trust.

The Sinking Memorial

The troubles facing the *U.S.S. Arizona Memorial* have been relatively well documented. When the memorial first opened in 1980, the state of the art complex was designed to accommodate 750,000 visitors annually. The site currently draws double that number and is the most visited Park Service site in the Pacific. Visitors must often contend with long lines and crowded conditions at the memorial.

In addition, the *U.S.S. Arizona* Memorial has been sinking for several years. Some parts of the memorial's structure have settled as much as 30 inches producing numerous cracks in the foundation. Water pools several inches deep collect in the basement after some rainstorms, and the pilings used to elevate and shore up the structure have been raised as far as possible.

Plans are in place to construct a replacement visitor center. The new structure will cost $34 million. The U.S. Navy, which jointly manages the current memorial with the Park Service, expects to award a design and engineering contract soon, with ground breaking for the project set

to begin in March of 2007. Private philanthropy has already raised $11 million and planners are hopeful that additional fund raising campaigns (the state of Arizona will raise funds to support construction costs throughout 2006) and congressional appropriations will account for the outstanding balance.

While federal, state, and private interests pursue the larger funding goals related to the construction a new *U.S.S. Arizona* Memorial visitor center, it is worth noting that a significant number of smaller investments from the park's Project Management Inventory System (PMIS) remain unfunded. The list includes a cultural landscapes inventory, research on U.S.S. Arizona casualties, U.S.S. Arizona GIS database development, and the cataloging of the Pearl Harbor Survivor's Collection.

We expect the Navy and the Park Service will build and manage a world-class memorial befitting the service members who lost their lives on December 7, 1941. Our concern is that the less prestigious but vitally important support projects that will imbue the memorial with a profound sense of spirit and relevance will be sacrificed to accommodate a restrictive bottom line. Any consideration of funding for the *U.S.S. Arizona* Memorial must ensure that the Park Service receives enough money to commemorate the legacy of the 1,177 service members who gave the this country their last full measure of devotion. Anything less should be regarded as a half step.

Inherit the Weeds: Invasive Species Cause Trouble in Paradise

According to Park Service documents, Hawaii is the "leading state for both extinctions and federally listed endangered species." Invasive plants and animals such as coqui frogs, faya tree, miconia, feral pigs, fire tree, and nettle catepillars (newcomers like red fire ants and brown tree snakes could be on the way), are having a devastating impact upon their native counterparts. More than just nuisances, these invasive species are destroying vital plants, animals, and other organisms that make up Hawaii's unique and diverse eco-system.

Some of the invasive plants and animals that now threaten Hawaii's unique eco-system arrived naturally as "hitchhikers" on horticultural and agricultural imports. Many, however, were introduced intentionally in what Lloyd Loope, research scientist at the USGS, Pacific Island Ecosystems Research Center, referred to in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on National Parks (August 2005) as a "barrage of invasive non-native species introduction." The threat from invasives is so severe that scientists are greatly concerned that Hawaii's national parks may be losing the race to protect and preserve their natural resources.

The Hawaiian Islands showcase the kind of detrimental impact human beings can have on their environment. Native plants and animals that flourished on these isolated islands for ages have, in the last 200 hundred years, fallen into precipitous decline due to the introduction of non-native invasives and feral animals. Humans brought some of these invasives to the islands unintentionally, while others arrived in quite deliberate fashion. As a result of the onslaught some populations of endemic plants have gone completely extinct.

The speed with which an invasive species can destroy endemic organisms is alarming and was highlighted earlier this year by the arrival of the *Erythrina* gall wasp. The gall wasp first appeared on Oahu in April 2005. This tiny insect has a voracious appetite for the native wiliwili seeds and in seven months has managed to take this "bullet proof" Hawaiian mainstay to the brink of extinction. The list of other endangered, endemic plants includes hala, hau kuahiwi, and Hawaii's `ohi`a trees, which constitute over 80 percent of Hawaii's "still-intact forest."

But even slow-moving invasives such as Miconia can have a devastating impact on the landscape. According to Defenders of Wildlife, Miconia is a shrub that was introduced on the islands in the 1960s as an ornamental. Today, Miconia infests over 11,000 acres of Hawaii, Oahu, Maui, and Kauai, growing in dense clusters with shallow roots that block sunlight and choke off endemic plants and grasses. Ground covered by Miconia is prone to erosion and the shrubs have caused some landslides.

The strategy of setting aside protected areas will no longer suffice as a mechanism for coping with invasives. In an age when planes, ferries, cargo ships, and automobiles can rapidly introduce and spread non-native species into all parts of the Hawaiian Islands, a defensive strategy based on reacting to new threats is the easiest way to lose the struggle against non-native species. Prevention of the spread of invasives must begin outside park boundaries and be accompanied by aggressive removal of feral animals and non-native plants followed by the reintroduction of native species.

This approach is, however, quite resource intensive and requires that Park Service resource management teams be given the authority to join or develop partnerships outside park boundaries, and provide financial assistance to support such initiatives aimed at eradicating invasives. Greater cooperation from other federal agencies, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Department of Homeland Security, must also be increased, as these agencies help control ports of entry and enforce health and safety regulations on imports.

Battling Invasives at Haleakala and Hawaii Volcanoes

Park friends groups are already providing the Park Service with a margin of support in the battle against invasive species. The Friends of Haleakala National Park offer regularly scheduled service days and overnight service trips where volunteers can help rid the park of invasives such as plantago. But their capacity falls well short of what is needed to effectively deal with exotic species management.

At Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, the struggle to protect the park against invasive species has taken on new dimensions with the acquisition of the Kahuku Ranchland. Hawaii Volcanoes was the 12th addition to the National Park System when it was established in 1916. The park protects the Earth's most massive volcano, Mauna Loa at 13,677 ft., and its most active volcano, Kilauea. The unique ecosystem found within the park and the intriguing Hawaiian

culture that has long been associated with the ever-changing landscape contributed to the park's recognition as an International Biosphere Reserve in 1980 and a World Heritage Site in 1987.

In 2004, Hawaii Volcanoes expanded by 115,788 acres or 56 percent. The addition of the Kahuku Ranchland opened areas that had been closed to the public for over 100 years and allowed the National Park Service to assume management authority over territory containing numerous endangered and invasive species. Acquisition of the Kahuku Ranchland District was the largest conservation deal in the history of the state. Lost in the magnitude of this important addition to the park was the presence of fountain grass, in increasing numbers, in the Kahuku district.

Fountain grass is an invasive exotic that the Park Service has been battling for the last 15 years. The grass is a very aggressive, drought resistant weed that was declared "noxious" by the state Department of Agriculture. This invasive is so adaptable that it has even been spotted growing in young lava flows.

Fountain grass can quickly whither and even more rapidly regenerate. As new grass fills in the dead plant material accumulates and forms dangerous fuel for wildfires. According to the *Honolulu Advertiser*, the cause of an August 2005 brush fire that burned 25,000 acres and forced the evacuation of thousands of residents from Waikoloa, was fountain grass. Managers in Hawai'i County spend more than $500,000 a year to eradicate this dangerous invasive.

Park Service staff at Hawaii Volcanoes believed encroachment by fountain grass had been a manageable problem. Although 50,000 to 100,000 acres of parkland is covered by fountain grass, the weeds tend to grow in low-density, isolated clusters. Park staff monitored the location of fountain grass stands by aerial surveys, and efforts to reduce the invasive have led to a sharp drop in the fountain grass population at Hawaii Volcanoes. Then came the new acquisition and additional stands of fountain grass.

The Kahuku Ranchland purchase provided the Park Service with a wonderful opportunity and huge challenge. The acquisition of 116,000 new acres meant the agency gained the authority to design and implement resource management protocols to eliminate fountain grass and other exotic invasives on lands previously off limits to the agency. The challenge is that the park must tackle the fountain grass problem while facing a $5 million (or 37%) operations shortfall (recorded for FY 04) that limits the resources (staff, money, and time) that the Park Service can devote to resolving the issue.

Hawaii Volcanoes needs increased funding to manage the threat posed by fountain grass and other invasive species. Otherwise, the acquisition of the Kahuku Ranchland will become less a legacy, than an inheritance of weeds.

According to NPCA's 2005 *Faded Glory: Top 10 Reasons to Reinvest in America's National Park Heritage* report, the National Park Service, since 1999, has effectively controlled exotic plant species on more than 167,000 acres-but 2.6 million acres remain infested.

Recognizing the need to strengthen funding for natural resource management in the parks, Congress established the Natural Resource Challenge in 1999. The program was meant to help fund initiatives addressing the most critical threats to national parks, including encroachment by non-native and invasive species. Unfortunately, the Natural Resource Challenge, like many aspects of the Park Service budget, at $81 million, remains chronically underfunded. In the meantime, invasive species overrun our national parks and, as has been demonstrated in Hawaii, destroy the natural resources that make these places unique.

Crowded Vistas and Sinking Memorials Mar the Visitor Experience

Haleakala has an approximate base operations budget of $4 million and a staff of about 68 FTEs. The park, which recorded 1,455,477 recreational visits in 2004, suffers from overcrowding at top attractions, such as the summit at sunrise, and a staff shortage, especially in public interpretation of this breathtaking park.

At the park's summit, which is 10,000 feet in elevation, bus and vanloads of tourists arrive in the pre-dawn hours to watch the sunrise. The temperatures can be surprisingly cold and many are poorly dressed for the weather. Some visitors, bussed directly from cruise ships, don't even realize that they are in a national park. Parking space is limited and the crowds can be large – as many as 1,000 people crowding onto the summit at one time. Nonetheless, the park can only afford to keep one law enforcement ranger at the summit during peak hours.

After the sunrise, the crowds depart in a mass exodus. Many descend from the summit on rented bicycles provided by tour companies. These descents can be chaotic with tourists careening down steep, winding mountain roads that are often wet and treacherous. Many Native Hawaiians attach a deep spiritual meaning to watching the sunrise at Haleakala. Overcrowding the summit at daybreak and then setting loose scores of riders bent on racing to the bottom greatly undermines experiencing this culturally significant site.

To address the crowding and its impacts on the resources (trampling of vegetation at the summit, medical emergencies, etc) the park has instituted an interim operations plan to limit the numbers of busses and vans bringing up visitors each morning. But a longer term, practical solution is necessary. Certainly, increasing Haleakala's budget so that the park could increase the number of staff available to manage traffic congestion in the parking lots, educate visitors, and better protect their safety would be a good step.

National Parks Air Tours Management Act Background

Congress passed the National Parks Air Tour Management Act of 2000 more than two years ago. This groundbreaking legislation was sponsored by Senator John McCain of Arizona and cosponsored by Senator Daniel Akaka of Hawaii. The Act instructs the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the National Park Service to work together to develop air tour management plans for parks where commercial air tours occur. The FAA is the lead agency responsible for implementing the Act, although the Park Service is a designated cooperating

agency and the Park Service director must co-sign, with the FAA Administrator, the Record of Decision for every parks air tour management plan.

The National Parks Air Tour Management Act was groundbreaking legislation based directly on the recommendations of the National Parks Overflight Working Group, an advisory group composed of general aviation, air tour, environmental, and American Indian representatives. This consensus-based solution introduced a proactive, system wide, cooperative process to enable FAA and the Park Service to manage the increasing activity of commercial air tours, which can detract from park values and disturb park visitors.

However, in the more than five and a half years since the passage of the Parks Air Tour Management Act, the FAA and Park Service have not yet completed a single air tour management plan. The delay in implementation was disturbing enough to Hawaii's Senator Akaka and a number of his fellow senators that they asked the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to investigate the FAA and Park Service's work to date on the parks air tour act. The GAO has passed a draft of this report to the FAA and the Park Service and expects to issue a final report early in 2006. The findings of that report could have a significant impact on Hawaii's national parks.

Air Tours in Hawaii's National Parks

The parks in Hawaii, which experience some of the highest volume of air tour overflights in the park system, were the first units to start the air tour management planning process and are in the midst of it currently. Hawaii Volcanoes completed the scoping for an Environmental Impact Statement in September and Haleakala and Kalaupapa are re-issuing an Environmental Assessment for their air tour plan. While these planning processes are not yet complete, the operators who were flying air tours over these parks when the law was passed in 2000 are able to continue operating under Interim Operating Authority (IOA).

It was clear that Congress created Interim Operating Authority to ensure that pre-existing air tour operations would not be interrupted during the park air tour management planning process. Congress likely did not contemplate, however, that so many years would pass before any parks completed air tour management plans. At the current rate of progress, most parks are likely to be operating under IOA for years to come.

According to the Air Tour Management Planning and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Scoping Notice for Hawaii Volcanoes issues on August 1, 2005, there are currently 14 existing operators providing commercial air tours over and within a half-mile of the boundary of the Hawai'i Volcanoes. As of July 15, 2005, these 14 existing operators have Interim Operating Authority to conduct a maximum of 28,441 commercial air operations annually. According to the scoping notice for the air tour management planning and NEPA process of Haleakala National Park, issued in March of 2004, there are currently ten existing operators who provide commercial air tours over and within a half-mile outside the boundary of the Haleakala National

Park. Together, these ten air tour operators over Haleakala claim to fly approximately 26,325 commercial air tour operations each year.

We are alarmed at these very high numbers of overflights being claimed over Hawaii Volcanoes and Haleakala. If these overflight numbers at each park are accurate, Hawaii Volcanoes is experiencing an average of 77 air tour overflights a day and Haleakala experiences an average of 72 air tour overflight a day. As is noted in the scoping document, the Park Service staff at Hawai'i Volcanoes indicate that the number of operations reported in IOA applications is vastly different from the number of operations observed by the agency. In fact, the number of overflights claimed by operators is much greater than the number of overflights that operators are currently reporting under the standing overflight fee arrangement in place at each park.[1] One explanation for this discrepancy could be that the existing fee agreement requires payment only for air tour overflights that fly directly over that park and the air tour management act applies to airspace directly above and within one half-mile of the parks boundary, but NPCA feels more investigation is necessary on the part of the FAA and the Park Service.

This raises an air tour management issue about which NPCA has deep concerns: When determining what number of air tours to authorize over a park, whether under the Interim Operating Authority or the final air tour management plans, the FAA is relying mainly on the unverified claims air tour operators. The FAA has never required air tour operators to keep records of their flights over national parks so there is little, if any, data that can be used to corroborate the claims of overflight numbers over parks that many operators are making now.

In order to gather more information on overflight numbers, the FAA posted in the Federal Register the numbers of air tour overflights being claimed over every park in the Park System that is covered by the Air Tour Management Act. The comment period for this notice closed recently, and it may yield information that will allow the FAA and Park Service to amend the numbers of overflights permitted under current IOA. But the public and the park visitors who seek natural quiet and peaceful refuge in these parks are at a distinct disadvantage in this process. They have no way to verify independently the true existing number of air tours over these parks, and therefore have no point of reference on how to gauge what level of air tour operations is causing the noise and visual impacts they may be experiencing on the ground. If the National Parks Air Tour Management Act is going to be effectively enforced at the Hawaii parks and at more than 100 other parks throughout the country where air tour overflights are reported, the FAA and the Park Service must strive to find a more reliable and open way to determine the number of air tours currently occurring over parks.

[1] For both Hawai'i Volcanoes and Haleakala National Parks, commercial air tour operations conducted over the parks are assessed a fee by the NPS under authority provided in 16 U.S.C. 4601-6a (n)(5)(B). The fee assessed per entry is $25.00 per aircraft with a passenger capacity of 25 persons or less and $50.00 per aircraft with a passenger capacity of more than 25 persons. This fee is only assessed on air tour operations that enter the airspace above the park (within the park boundary). Commercial air tour operations that are conducted in the vicinity of the park but which do not cross the park's boundary are not assessed this fee.

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

Another large area of concern for NPCA is the issue of the determination of air tour overflights' impacts on park visitors and park resources. The 2000 law clearly states that the FAA and the Park Service are to retain their jurisdictions in this process. The FAA ensures the safety of the skies, showing air tour pilots exactly where and when they can fly and the Park Service must protect every parks unique resources and the right of every park visitor to experience an unimpaired park.

In other words, the Park Service cannot tell the FAA how to fly a plane and the FAA cannot tell the Park Service how to protect the parks. But unfortunately, the question of which agency has the ultimate say in determining whether an air tour overflight is having an adverse impact on a park, and what level of impact it may be having, is one that has impeded cooperation between FAA and the Park Service. If Congress wants to ensure that the original intent of its forward-looking park air tour law is followed, FAA must publicly recognize the Park Service's authority to determine if and how air tours are impacting national park resources and visitors.

The planning for management of commercial air tours of Hawaii Volcanoes and Haleakala is a complex issue that is costing the parks and the Park Service much time and effort. Both parks offer fascinating sites for visitors on the ground and air tour passengers; and both parks have rare natural and cultural resources to protect, their significance to native Hawaiian beliefs being one of the most critical to Hawaiians.

The slopes and summits of Mauna Loa and Kilauea Volcanoes, two of the world's most active volcanoes, dominate Hawai`i Volcanoes attract many commercial air tour overflights every day. Mauna Loa is the world's largest volcano, measuring more than 56,000 ft from sea floor to the summit. (From sea level to the summit it is 13,699 ft tall). The other volcano, Kilauea, is the most active volcano in the world today and is considered by Native Hawaiians to be the home of the fire goddess Pele, who believe that her presence is manifested throughout the park.

Historically, Native Hawaiians have an association with the area now encompassed by the park that pre-dates park establishment by nearly 1500 years. This association is demonstrated through Native Hawaiian traditions, beliefs, practices, lifeways, arts, crafts, and social institutions, which have been passed down through the generations. Kilauea has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places for its association with Native Hawaiians, in addition to the volcano's association to science. Native Hawaiians consider red lava to be sacred; however, the Native Hawaiian association extends beyond the land. In Native Hawaiian thinking, the sacredness of a place is not only found on the ground on which one walks, but also includes the heavens above. There are nine specific terms designating the divisions of air space. Native Hawaiians are also deeply aware of the sounds of nature. Natural sounds of the ocean, winds, birds, rain, trees, etc., play a very important part in Hawaiian poetry, chants, and contemporary music. For example, the serenity and peacefulness of the rainforest or the caldera are some of the attributes that make those places special. Proactive and careful management of commercial air tours is crucial to protecting the sanctity of these sites.

In addition to the cultural reasons impelling protection of these parks from air tours, park visitors who seek out solitude in these parks also desire better management of noisy overflights. More than a third of the park's 333,000 acres are designated wilderness actively managed by the NPS (NPS Management Policies 2001) to take into account wilderness characteristics and values, including the primeval character and influence of the wilderness; the preservation of natural conditions (including the lack of human-made noise); and assurances that there would be outstanding opportunities for solitude, that the public would be provided with a primitive and unconfined type of recreational experience, and that wilderness would be preserved and used in an unimpaired condition. Lands within the Kahuku District have not yet been evaluated for wilderness designation.

Conclusion

With the 100th birthday of the National Park System approaching in 2016, 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. NPCA recently compiled a list of the Top 10 Reasons to Reinvest in America's National Park Heritage. But we really need only one; America's national parks, including the crown jewels of the Hawaiian Islands, are the legacy we leave to our children and to future generations.

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

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Protecting Parks for Future Generations

Hawaii National Parks Operations

Hawaii National Parks Operations										
	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	Increase	%	FY 2006	Increase	%	Change	%
NPS Unit	Enacted $	Enacted $	Estimate $	FY 04-05	Increase	Request $	FY 05-FY 06	Increase	FY 03-FY 06	Change
Haleakala NP	3,879	3,858	4,083	225	5.5	4,171	88	2.1	292	7
Hawaii Volcanoes NP	5,511	5,450	5,558	108	1.9	5,714	156	2.7	203	3.6
Kalaupapa NHP	2,493	2,471	2,536	65	2.6	2,585	49	1.9	92	3.6
Kaloko-Honokohau NHP	1,439	1,442	1,753	311	17.7	1,787	34	1.9	348	19.5
Pu'uhonua O Honaunau NHP	1,362	1,355	1,393	38	2.7	1,423	30	2.1	61	4.3
Puukohola Heiau NHS	592	590	607	17	2.8	626	19	3	34	5.4
U.S.S. Arizona Memorial	2,458	2,443	2,755	312	11.3	2,806	51	1.8	348	12.4
TOT					6.3			2.2		7.9

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

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much. Our next witness is Ms. Suzanne Case, executive director of the Nature Conservancy, and also in the interest of disclosure, do you know anybody on this panel?

Ms. CASE. My brother.

Mr. SOUDER. I heard wonderful things about you, and I assumed it was from a non-partisan source.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. It was non-partisan.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for coming, as well as the leadership of the Nature Conservancy both here and across the country.

STATEMENT OF SUZANNE CASE

Ms. CASE. Thank you, Congressman Souder, and thank you for holding this hearing. Thank you also, Congressman Abercrombie and Congressman Case, for joining us today. I'm Suzanne Case. I'm the executive director of the Nature Conservancy's Hawaii Chapter. And as you know, we have uniquely valuable National Parks here in Hawaii protecting our Nation's natural and cultural heritage. And so we greatly appreciate your support in Congress to assure that park needs are met.

Along with the privilege of enjoying our magnificent natural environment, we humans bear a tremendous stewardship responsibility for the impact we've made on it. Our experience as a conservation land manager for over 25 years in Hawaii has shown that the single greatest threat is survival of Hawaii's natural environment, including areas under National Park jurisdiction is the damage done by invasive, non-native species that are introduced either intentionally or inadvertently by humans. Virtually all conservation field work in Hawaii is directly connected with invasive species, whether it's feral animals, like pigs and goats or sheep, or overgrazed native habitat in the Kahuku section of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, or super weeds like Miconia. And some funding and policy measures pending in Congress can help address these threats.

Regarding control of the invasive species already in Hawaii, the Natural Resources Protection Cooperative Agreement Act will resolve a longstanding problem by providing the Park Service with the needed authority to expend resources and work with partners to control threats to National Parks from invasive species that are still outside park boundaries. The Public Land Protection and Conservation Act creates an excellent framework of Federal granting authority to assist States with assessment and response to invasive species and to foster partnerships to control pests on and adjacent to Federal land.

But while controlling pests already in our parks is necessarily a top priority, by far the most effective and cost-effective way to deal with invasive species threats is to prevent their introduction in the first place. Now, invasive species prevention such as inspection and quarantine activities at ports of entries in Hawaii may not be directly within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, but it is an area of critical importance to any entity trying to manage invasive species threats, including our National Parks.

And as a result of—directly from National Park Service leadership, there's a model for prevention currently being realized at

Kahului Airport on the island of Maui. Recently retired Haleakala Superintendent Don Reeser early on insisted on preventing new pest introductions that might result from a proposed airport runway extension, and the end result of a collaborative process will be more inspectors and a modern enclosed inspection facility at the airport.

But formidable challenges remain to developing a truly effective prevention system, and these challenges go right up to including the U.S. Constitution and the free market principles on which this Nation is founded. For centuries this country has promoted the important ideals of free trade and open borders to Congress. The Constitution's Commerce and Supremacy Clauses together with specific preemption provisions of the Federal Plant Protection Act prevent States from being more restrictive than the Federal Government in regulating the movement of plants and plant products in foreign and interstate commerce.

The State of Hawaii runs directly into this Federalpreemption if it wishes to implement stricter State quarantine regulations in order to protect the islands from invasive species introduction. This can involve a long and laborious process of securing restrictions on a species-by-species basis from the Secretary of Agriculture, and to address this problem the Hawaii Invasive Species Prevention Act, H.R. 3468, has been introduced in the House. This bill would establish an expedited review process for the State of Hawaii to impose greater restrictions on the movement of invasive species. It would allow the State to impose limited emergency restrictions on invasive species and mandate the Federal quarantine to protect Hawaii from new pest introductions, and allow for Federal enforcement of State quarantine laws. These provisions will help greatly in decreasing the risk of new invasive species threats to our National Parks.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on these issues which are critical to our National Parks, and I would suggest that perhaps invasive species prevention systems and sufficient resources for control could be a priority goal for the 2016 National Park Service.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Case follows:]

Testimony of Suzanne D. Case, Executive Director
The Nature Conservancy, Hawai'i Program

Field Hearing on National Parks in Hawai'i
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources
U.S. House Committee on Government Reform
December 1, 2005

INTRODUCTION

Congressman Souder, thank you for hosting this hearing and for the opportunity to testify on important issues facing Hawaii's precious national parks. My name is Suzanne Case, and I am the Executive Director for The Nature Conservancy of Hawai'i.

The mission of The Nature Conservancy is to preserve the plants, animals and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on Earth by protecting the lands and waters they need to survive. With the support of approximately 1 million members, The Nature Conservancy has protected more than 120 million acres around the world.

The Hawai'i Chapter of the Conservancy manages a network of 12 preserves encompassing about 32,000 acres across the main Hawaiian Islands. In addition to our core field work on our own preserves, we work with public and private colleagues throughout the state to organize and operate partnership entities that help protect and manage the islands' globally unique, but extremely fragile natural resources. The National Park Service in Hawai'i plays a leadership role in these public-private collaborations through their participation in the watershed partnerships and invasive species committees that seek to protect resources both inside and outside park boundaries.

INVASIVE SPECIES

Background

In 1967, well before we had a staffed program here, the Conservancy's first project in Hawai'i was the acquisition and donation of Kipahulu valley to Haleakala National Park. Kipahulu remains one of the most pristine native forest areas in Hawai'i, but the discovery a few years ago of a single *Miconia calvescens* plant in this remote valley is a wake up call to the vulnerability of the park to this habitat altering super weed.

Last year, with the leadership of the entire Hawai'i Congressional delegation, the Conservancy acquired and transferred the 115,000-acre Kahuku Ranch to Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park. Sought after for more than two decades and ultimately ranked as the Park Service's top land acquisition priority, the Kahuku addition expanded the Park by one-half and is the largest single conservation land acquisition in the history of the State. While the Kahuku parcel boasts globally significant natural, geological and cultural resources, the Park Service is undertaking a major effort to control previously introduced game animals that otherwise will cause serious harm to those very resources the Park is working to protect.

Our experience as a conservation land manager over the last quarter century demonstrates that the single greatest threat to the survival of Hawaii's natural environment is the damage done by non-native, invasive species. Virtually all of our field work and that of our conservation partners like the National Park Service in Hawai'i is directed to preventing, detecting, controlling, or otherwise addressing the

threat of invasive species, both plants and animals, that alter and ultimately devastate the islands' natural environment.

For example, the National Park Service has been a leader in protecting globally significant resources from non-native feral animals, including pigs, goats and sheep. The Conservancy has been proud to be a partner of the Park Service in several key projects in Hawai'i and California's Channels Island National Park. In fact, many of the techniques that are considered standard conservation and invasive species management practices throughout Hawai'i today were originally developed by Park Service personnel.

As you know, the threat of invasive species is not just an environmental problem. We are finding strong allies across a wide variety of sectors including the visitor industry, health care, agriculture, and real estate as we all try to figure out how to deal with pests ranging from alien algae that blanket coral reefs, mosquito borne diseases, fire ants and stinging caterpillars, forest-choking weeds, ear-splitting coqui frogs, and costly crop diseases.

We have been working hard over many years to physically control invasive species once they have arrived and become established. However, it is only in the last 10 years that we have undertaken an organized effort in Hawai'i to affect public policy with respect to invasive species. Our work at the county, state and federal levels includes efforts to enhance recognition of the ecological, economic, health, and lifestyle threats from invasive species, to secure more funding to address these threats, and to support improved government policy in this area.

Rapid Response and Control

Measures pending in Congress can improve policy and assist the Park Service and states in addressing some of the most pressing invasive species issues.

The Natural Resource Protection Cooperative Agreement Act (S. 1288) will help with a very practical problem that has challenged the National Park Service. This legislation addresses the fact that no authority now exists to allow a park to expend resources or enter into partnerships to control imminent invasive species threats outside park boundaries. The provisions of S. 1288 would simply and effectively resolve this problem, as well as provide additional authority for the Park Service to enter into collaborative relationships that will benefit park resources. The Administration has supported this legislation. It is a practical application of the principles underlying the President's Executive Order on Cooperative Conservation. This legislation will directly assist Haleakala National Park as it works with its partners in the Maui Invasive Species Committee and the East Maui Watershed Partnership to keep *Miconia* from invading the park.

The Park Service has the expertise to provide significant national leadership in this area. For example, using the teams that fight wildfires as a model, the National Park Service established Exotic Plant Management Teams (EPMT) across the country to serve as a highly-trained, mobile strike force that now protects hundreds of National Parks from the threat of invasive plants. A Pacific Islands EPMT is devoted to proactively managing aggressive weeds in all the national parks in Hawai'i, protecting rare native communities from invasion.

In addition, the Public Land Protection and Conservation Act (S. 1541) creates an excellent framework for Interior Department grants to assist states with assessment and rapid response to invasive species threats, and to foster partnerships to control pests on and adjacent to Interior and Forest Service lands. This bill would provide an important additional source of revenue to leverage existing state and local

funding for invasive species, including funding for rapid response programs to eradicate incipient invasions before they become widely established.

Prevention and Quarantine

We can and will spend vast amounts of time and money battling pests that become established in Hawai'i and elsewhere in the United States. However, the most effective, especially cost effective, way to deal with invasive species is to prevent their introduction in the first place.

The Conservancy supports the National Aquatic Invasive Species Act (NAISA) (H.R. 1591/1592 and S. 770), which is a comprehensive legislative approach to the threat of aquatic invasive species. Provisions for the pre-screening of intentional introductions and the establishment of an early warning system, coupled with rapid response capability, are important new authorities that would protect all of our nation's aquatic resources, whether in the Great Lakes, trout streams, bayous, or coral reefs. The need for NAISA is demonstrated by existing invasions of national parks like the New Zealand mud snail, which was accidentally introduced into Yellowstone National Park by recreational fishermen. This tiny snail is now alarmingly abundant and could prove to have major effects on some of the most pristine streams in the country. Likewise, the hitchhiking zebra mussel has spread to Wisconsin and is now smothering rare and endangered native mussels in the NPS-administered St. Croix National Scenic Riverway.

Another major threat to the resources of many National Parks is the existing and potential effects of introduced forest insects and diseases. The most noticeable missing tree in the Appalachians is the American chestnut, which was virtually eradicated during the early 1900s by the introduced chestnut blight. The hemlock woolly adelgid pest is killing the towering hemlocks that form unique and important ecosystems in the Great Smoky Mountains and Shenandoah National Parks, the Blueridge Parkway, and several smaller national historic parks. Sudden oak death is killing oaks and infesting other trees in Redwoods National Park and Point Reyes National Seashore and can easily be spread by the movement of nursery stock. If the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Protection Service (APHIS) does not prevent such transmission, sudden oak death could infect oak trees in the Great Smoky Mountains and other locations, as well as the rhododendron shrubs that contribute so much to spring floral displays. White pine blister rust is killing nearly all of the high-elevation five-needle pines in Glacier, Yellowstone, and Crater Lake National Parks. This disease was recently found in the mountains above Great Sand Dunes National Park and will continue to threaten pines as it spreads through the Rocky Mountains.

Much of the National Park Service' current effort to combat introduced forest insects and pathogens is funded through the USDA Forest Service Forest Health Management Program. Chairman Charles Taylor of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee has provided key Congressional leadership to increase funding for this program. However, the agency responsible for preventing introductions of forest pests and eradicating those that evade border controls is USDA APHIS. Unfortunately, APHIS has not received adequate funding to carry out effective eradication programs targeting even the pests which pose the greatest risk and whose populations are still small enough to be eradicated successfully, such as the emerald ash borer and Asian longhorned beetle. Congress and the governors of affected states have urged the Administration to provide emergency funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation, but the Administration has not yet met the level of funding needed to address these threats.

Turning more directly to the issue of prevention and the threat of new pest introductions in Hawai'i, I would like to offer some specific comments on inspection and quarantine activities at ports of entry. As a direct result of National Park Service leadership, a model for prevention is being realized on the island

of Maui where we are all benefiting from improved understanding of pest risks and enhanced quarantine and inspection capacity at Kahului Airport. These enhancements will include additional inspectors and a modern and secure inspection facility that will soon be constructed at the airport.

This process, which began with a proposed runway extension, was not easy for anyone involved, particularly on an island that relies heavily on visitor and cargo arrivals to support its economy. However, the model now being established at Kahului airport is the product of hard work and understanding by a number of individuals and agencies like the National Park Service, the Federal Aviation Administration, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, the Hawai'i Department of Transportation Airports Division, the Hawai'i Department of Agriculture, and others.

The important progress at Kahului airport traces back to Haleakala National Park leadership, particularly recently-retired Superintendent Don Reeser, who insisted on the importance of protecting against new pest introductions. The Park Service's position was primarily for the protection of Haleakala National Park's globally unique resources, but it also was based in the much broader appreciation of the role of natural landscapes on Maui and across the island chain. After all, Hawaii's natural environment is what drives our visitor economy, provides the year-round climate for our diversified agriculture industry, delivers the most basic necessities like clean fresh water from healthy forested watersheds, and allows us the lifestyle that all residents and visitors enjoy.

Federal Preemption

Even with this spirit of collaboration and example of success at Kahului Airport, there are formidable challenges to developing a truly effective prevention system—right up to and including the United State Constitution and the free market principles this nation is founded upon. For centuries this country has promoted the important notions of free trade and open boarders to commerce.

The Constitution's Commerce Clause (Art I., Sec. 8, Clause 3) and Supremacy Clause (Art VI, Clause 2) set that stage by giving Congress the authority to regulate commerce with other nations and between the states, and confirming that federal law is the supreme law of the land. In the area of pest prevention, the federal Plant Protection Act takes it a step further by specifically preempting states from being more restrictive than the federal government in regulating the movement of plants and plant products. (7 USC § 7756) The federal government is not so preemptive with respect to regulating the movement of animals, both terrestrial and aquatic.

The differences in Hawai'i state law regarding the introduction of plants and non-domestic animals (Hawai'i Revised Statutes §§ 150A-6.1 and -6.2) directly reflect the preference for movement of plants through federal preemption of state regulatory regimes. Basically, Hawaii uses a black list (noxious weed list) approach to plants, and a white list approach to animals. What this means is that virtually all plants are allowed to be introduced to Hawai'i unless on a very short noxious weed list (~80 identified plants). Conversely, no non-domestic animals are allowed entry into the state unless on one of two short approved lists.

The State of Hawai'i runs directly into federal preemption if it wishes to strengthen its statutes regarding plants or implement stricter state quarantine regulations. The only available choice is a long and laborious process of securing approval for heightened restrictions on a species-by-species basis from the Secretary of Agriculture. (7 USC § 7756(b)(2)(B))

With this problem in mind and recognizing Hawaii's unique risk from invasive species, a bill has been introduced in the House of Representatives that would provide Hawai'i with additional federal support

on incoming quarantine inspections and establish an expedited process for the State to implement regulations to protect itself from pest threats. In particular, the Hawaii Invasive Species Prevention Act (H.R. 3468) would:

- Mandate federal quarantine protection for the State of Hawai'i to prevent the introduction of invasive species, including a system of post-arrival protocols for all passengers and cargo;
- Allow for federal enforcement of State quarantine laws;
- Establish an expedited review process for the State of Hawai'i to impose restrictions on the movement of invasive species or diseases that are in addition to federal restrictions; and
- Allow the State of Hawai'i to impose limited emergency restrictions upon the introduction or movement of a pest or disease.

PARK SERVICE FUNDING

The Conservancy would like to express our appreciation, Congressman Souder, for your work to bring attention to short falls in Park Service funding and to resolve this situation by the 2016 National Park Service Centennial.

As you know, Americans want to fund conservation. In 2005, a total of 136 state and local conservation spending measures were on the ballots in 17 states. Of these, 79% passed, creating $1.7 billion in new funding for land conservation. Previous years have had similar results. In 2004, for example, state and local voters approved 75% of the 217 conservation measures on ballots nationwide, generating $4 billion in new conservation funding. This rate of success has been consistent all across the country for the past ten years.

In addition to funding shortfalls affecting National Parks, other federal land management agencies are also challenged to robustly confront threats from invasives and other management threats. The Administration and the Congress, collectively, need to provide the resources necessary to effectively manage our federally protected conservation areas and also provide support to private land owners seeking to manage their own lands for conservation purposes.

CONCLUSION

Thank you again for this opportunity to offer The Nature Conservancy's comments on Hawaii's national parks and the critical issues related to invasive species policy. The global economy and our ability to quickly and efficiently move people and goods around the world benefit all of us. However, these same modern advancements are exponentially elevating the potentially catastrophic threats of invasive pests and diseases. The natural and historic treasures that are contained within our national parks are under enormous threat from introduced pests.

Perhaps an important goal to add to the 2016 National Park Service Centennial is to prevent all new harmful invasive species introductions to our parks, and work to eradicate or implement significant control measures for all invasive species currently threatening national park resources.

Congressman Souder, we appreciate your work on this issue and your willingness to take a leadership role in enhancing federal policies and resources to address this problem.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.
Mr. Sullivan.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE SULLIVAN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Congressman Case and Congress Abercrombie, thank you for joining. My name is George Sullivan. I'm the chairman of the Arizona Memorial Museum Association. We've been the cooperating association with the National Park Service for the USS Arizona Memorial since 1979. We're non-profit, and our primary reason for existence is to assist the National Park Service in education and interpretation. We think we do this very well.

Just a couple of examples that I would like to take the time to mention, because similar things came up earlier. We have a witness to history program that we're doing with the schools on the mainland. We do a video teleconference into those schools. They come up with a schedule and set up video teleconferencing from here to the school. The Navy has been exceptionally cooperative in letting us use their equipment. We have a Pearl Harbor survivor participate, historian at the park participates. The children are able to get a virtual tour of Pearl Harbor, and then they're further able to ask questions of a survivor. Both the children and the survivors love it.

Last year and the year before last we ran a teacher's workshop. We got a grant from the National Endowments for the Humanities that provided us the money to bring out 100 teachers. We did this in conjunction with the East West Center. Teachers spent a week in training, getting educated on Pearl Harbor. The events took place on December 7th throughout the entire island. Last year we conducted a similar workshop for 26 teachers from the mainland and we included 6 teachers from Japan to join that teacher's workshop. The first time we ever did that.

Mr. SOUDER. Can I ask you a quick question?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Sure.

Mr. SOUDER. Have you ever looked at hooking that up online so other teachers around the country could participate in the workshop even if they weren't part of it?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, we have had multiple hook-ups on that with other schools. We hope to be able to do that on an online basis and get away from the video teleconferencing, because that is expensive and not all schools have it, so we're working toward that.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you.

Mr. SULLIVAN. The teacher's workshop last year was very effective and the teachers from Japan enjoyed it very much. This year the National Endowment for the Humanities just awarded us another grant. We'll be able to bring out 40 teachers for two sessions for 2 weeks in August, and we'll also ask the Japanese—our contacts in Japan to see if we can get some Japanese teachers here as well. Recently, in fact, the day before yesterday, I met with the American Consul General—excuse me, the Australian Consul General and we discussed interface with the museums in Australia, and we're starting to work there with the Australians because they have a common interest in the same history that we have, Pacific war.

Briefly I'll mention about the visitor center, the new visitor center. First, I'd like to mention the one we have today. It was originally envisioned by my colleague here, Mr. Sandy Saunders, and he was the one that pushed it through back in the 1970s. We had lines at that time and Sandy figured the best way to overcome those lines was to build a visitor center, and he got the help of many of his colleagues in the State to do that. Today we have the same lines because at that time we were looking at 750,000 visitors and now we're looking at 1.5 million. So the new visitor center will be a much larger footprint on the property than exists today, and we hope to be able to accommodate many more visitors.

We'll also look at other methods of reducing the lines, such as advanced ticketing, which was mentioned earlier. We'll go on line with that system as soon as the National Park Service is able to get that system worked out and we're waiting for that.

We also have to overcome the perception of people coming—people believing that they have to be there at 7 a.m. to get a ticket, or earlier, as the case may be. So we would like—and I suggested to the superintendent that we open earlier, like at 6:30 a.m., to reduce the lines outside, because we can accommodate them inside for the people who have bought. And they are going to go to that starting January 2nd. They'll be going to what they call summer hours all year long, open the park actually at 7:45—the first movie will be at 7:45. The park will still open at 7:30.

So we're doing a lot of things to accommodate the visitor in our planning for the new visitor center, and we think we can reduce the lines and make the visitor experience much better. Thank you for giving me the time to talk about this.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. Ms. Jarman.

STATEMENT OF CASEY JARMAN

Ms. JARMAN. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Abercrombie, Congressman Case. My name is Casey Jarman, and I'm a board member of the Friends of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. And I'm starting my second year as the member of this board. We are a community-based organization whose mission is to support and promote restoration, protection, understanding, and appreciation of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. We support the park in three important ways: philanthropy to augment park resources, offering educational programs to supplement the programs offered by the park, and providing volunteers for park projects.

In our written testimony I've listed some of our recent activities, so I won't detail them today. If you'd like a complete listing, we can provide them sometime in the future for the record as well. I'd like to take my time here today to mention two key issues that were raised in our testimony. First, the Friends has been working closely with the park in providing the public opportunities to visit the new Kahuku District addition to the park. Because operating funds were not included with the $22 million appropriations to buy the Kahuku District addition, the park can offer very limited public access to this new area of the park, and this is—if you—I don't know if you've had a chance to visit there, but this is an incredibly, incredibly special place.

We fervently urge Congress to fund improvements for the Kahuku District so the public can have access to this incredible historical, natural, and cultural area in the park that Congress was so wise to put our tax dollars into funding and granting for us.

Second, our Friends group has recently moved into the philanthropic arena and plans on increasing those efforts in the future. We now have a development committee which is currently putting together a fundraising plan for the next 5 years that includes, among other things, trying to approach major—potential major donors for gifts. We believe the job will be easier when the park formulates its new general management plan. As was mentioned earlier, the park is now operating under a 30-year-old master plan.

And as you also saw from the newspaper article, we just lost 30 acres of the park. This is a very dynamic park. We now have a new addition, and updating the management plan, I think, is a critical project for the park. And having an updated management plan, I think, will help us as we go out and approach major donors to let them know what the vision of the park is for the next 50 years and to help them see how they can enable the park to reach that vision.

And with relief, I make a short personal statement outside of my hat as a member of the board. I live a mile from Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. I consider myself one of the most fortunate people in the world to live there, and for many of us who live there we live in the same ecosystem that the park is. I have the same forest around my house as there is in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, but yet I go into the park a couple times a week. It's just the most amazing, incredible place. I send people there all the time. When visitors come, I don't just say, go to the park. I say, let me take you into the park, and that's how important it is.

And I think for a lot of people who live there and for our visitors, it's not just a natural place, historic place, cultural place. It's really a place of the heart. It's—I don't know, I guess you have to have been there to describe it. But this is—everybody used the word crown jewels, and I used that in my testimony, but for lack of a better word to describe what Hawaii Volcanoes National Park is, and that's one of the reasons I'm on the Friends board, because that park means so much to me.

And finally, we'd like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and other Members of Congress who have been advocates for the National Park system, including Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. Thank you, also, for the opportunity to testify this morning, and I'll be happy to answer any questions or provide any additional information you might need. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Jarman follows:]

Statement of Casey Jarman, Board Member, Friends of Hawai`i Volcanoes National Park, Before the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the House Government Reform Committee
Oversight Hearing on National Parks of Hawai`i
December 1, 2005, in Honolulu, Hawai`i

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and other members of the Subcommittee. My name is Casey Jarman. I am here today representing the Friends of Hawai`i Volcanoes National Park. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to give testimony on key issues facing the National Park Service in Hawai`i, in particular Hawai`i Volcanoes National Park. Within the approximately 333,000 acres of Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park, visitors have the opportunity to experience a spectacular array of environments that range from sea level to over 13,000 feet above sea level at the summit of the Mauna Loa Volcano, and including its most famous feature -- Kilauea, the world's most active volcano. With over half of the Park designated as wilderness, the Park is a showcase for Hawai`i's unique natural, archaeological and cultural landscapes.

As federal Park budgets have grown tighter, partnerships with 501(c)(3) not-for-profit charitable organizations, such as the Friends of Hawai`i Volcanoes National Park (hereinafter "Friends"), have become a way for parks to do more with less. Originally incorporated in 1997 as The Friends of 'Ainahou, (a ranch within the Park), the Friends' expanded role in supporting activities and projects throughout the Park is reflected in their re-designation as the Friends of Hawai`i Volcanoes National Park.

Currently, the Friends is a community-based, volunteer organization working as a partner with the Park under a cooperative agreement to augment Park resources by offering educational programs, administering grants, raising funds for agreed-upon Park projects, and providing a volunteer workforce for specific Park projects. Specifically, the Friends' organization offers an annual series of small, high-quality, educational seminars that expand the Park's educational capacity. Among the grant projects it has administered are the National Park Service's *Parks as Classrooms* program; Hawai'i Tourism Authority (HTA) grants for annual Cultural Festivals; and Hawai'i Council for the Humanities funds for the publication of *Oral Histories of 'Ainahou Ranch*. In 2005, the Friends raised the requisite matching funds to obtain a $15,000 grant from the National Park Foundation to produce educational materials for the Park's Junior Rangers' Program and another $3,000 to purchase tents for public events at Kahuku. The Junior Rangers' Program is fully funded by non-federal monies raised by the Friends. In addition, volunteers regularly assist in maintaining the 'Ainahou ranch house and grounds, as well as in removing invasive species in critically endangered areas of the Park. In these ways, the Friends consistently support their mission: ***To support and promote restoration, protection, understanding and appreciation of Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park.***

The Friends' organization, with the active support and involvement of the Park, is rapidly growing in membership, scope and capacity. What started as a small group of volunteers who set out to save a treasured historic ranch within the Park, has evolved into an organization with a vision matching the potential of this International Biosphere Reserve and World Heritage site. In just three years, the membership has grown exponentially from 40 to more than 160 members.

The Board too has expanded both in number and in the range of talents and interests brought to bear upon our mission.

One section of the Park in which the Friends anticipate a growing collaboration is the 116,000-acre Kahuku District. Congress wisely spent $22 million to acquire this property; however, because Congress failed to provide operating funds for Kahuku, the public has extremely limited access. While it is the Friends'intention to engage in fund-raising for Park projects in the Kahuku District, it is imperative that Congress provide sufficient funds to allow the Park to effectively manage and provide meaningful public access to this unique natural, cultural, and historical area acquired by the public's tax dollars.

As noted earlier in my testimony, the Friends' group works in partnership with the Park to support its mission. The Board has recently expanded its role to include a significant philanthropic component. As the Friends' Board approaches potential major donors, it is important that we be able to demonstrate that their money will be wisely spent. To that end, we believe that Congress needs to provide the Park with sufficient funding to replace their 30-year old Master Plan. With a new General Management Plan, we would be able to share with potential donors the Park's vision for the 21st Century and suggest ways in which they can be part of this exciting and important enterprise.

The Friends anticipates a growing collaboration with the Park in the development of the Kahuku District, in providing increased educational opportunities, in fostering local and global stewardship of the Park, in seeking and administering grant funds, and in direct fund-raising to enhance and support the efforts of Park administration and staff. We encourage Congress to ensure that the Park receives sufficient funding to operate the Park as one of our nation's crown jewels. In turn, the Friends' group is prepared to continue to be a vital part of the future of the Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate being invited to give testimony at this important hearing and thank you for your interest and that of this subcommittee in supporting Hawai`i Volcanoes National Park. I will be happy to answer any questions you or other members of the subcommittee may have.

Respectfully Submitted,

_____

Casey Jarman on Behalf of the
Friends of Hawai`i Volcanoes National Park

Mr. SOUDER. I know I have lots of questions, but I'm going to—I know Congressman Abercrombie and Congressman Case are feeling time pressures here, and I hope you all realize that getting three Members of Congress in one place for more than 10 minutes does not happen. Our staff have electric shock sticks, and if we're in one place more than 5 minutes, we're gone. So I thank them for taking the time today.

Do you have anything you want to say?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Quickly, one or two. Ask Mr. Sullivan, are you content with the pace of the—I'm going to say negotiations, but the discussions to try to integrate all of the activities that will have to come around with the establishment of the new visitor center?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, Congressman, I believe it is moving along satisfactorily. We had a meeting with Admiral Vitale on Monday this week—Tuesday, I guess it was—and as Frank Hays had mentioned, all the cooperative associations, all the museum associations were there, and it was a great discussion. I think the timetable that Admiral Vitale has set up and the National Park Service has set up I think will work.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Has there been any discussion yet or has anybody come in from the city or from the consultant that's working on the timetable for the presentation of a rail transit proposal for the city? Has that come into discussion yet?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We haven't discussed it. Admiral Vitale brought the subject up, and we will work with the city.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. So you're aware of it and it's going to be incorporated.

Mr. SULLIVAN. That's correct.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Do you agree that could make a big difference in terms of visitor accessibility and those kinds of things?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Certainly.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. OK. Fine. Thank you very much.

Mr. SOUDER. Will you work with us for some followup questions to the city and to the Navy? And we'll get it on record here because they can be responsive in some development, and the report will take a couple months to get out.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I had one other thing on the question of invasive species. Do we have—I think we have at this time a clear understanding of what we're talking about, right, in the various areas, not just the parks? My point being is in order to deal with the invasive species question, aren't we going to have to have it coordinated island by island, which would incorporate dealing with National Parks, but also, by definition of the nature of the difficulty, it will have to involve multiple jurisdictions.

Ms. CASE. Absolutely. And it's actually one of the successes stories, I think, and one that we can be really proud of, is that the partnerships that are in place among the various land management/land owning agencies in the forest areas—there are two significant groups, the Watershed Partnerships and the Invasive Species Councils, and those are both cooperative groups. The Nature Conservancy is a member of them. The National Park Service is a member of them. And those have a lot of—those focus on invasive species control in the upland forest, and there's a lot of cooperation in them. I would say we have a lot of threats, and they focus in

on invasive species control. I think the prevention issues are more statewide, policy-wide issues.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Do we—is it a question, then, of funding and coordinating of funding?

Ms. CASE. Funding is absolutely an issue. You can only do as much invasive species control——

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. So the game plans are there for being able to get into the control side. What we need now is the funding for it.

Ms. CASE. Yes. I mean, I think probably there's always a new threat, so you have to——

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Yeah.

Ms. CASE [continuing]. Come up with a new plan, but a lot of planning in place and a lot of coordination in place, and it's resource dependant.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Thanks. Thank you very much.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Case.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Mr. Obey, you have kind of a unique position here. You work in this area. You've been to a lot of National Parks throughout the country. You are focused on policy issues in Washington. Now, taking a look at some of our parks here, just—so you have perspective which none of the rest of us have, except perhaps Chair Souder and some of our guests. Are there special challenges that you perceive here in Hawaii that maybe we aren't seeing, and also special opportunities, special things we're doing right in Hawaii versus the rest of the country where we could particularly weigh in on the national debate we're having over our National Park system on the contribution side, as well as make sure we're factoring them in on the what-we-have-to-fix side that may not be caught up in the debate if you go into Carlsbad or Lassen or, you know, wherever?

Mr. OBEY. Starting with what you're doing right, I think the work that Hawaii parks are doing with native communities is terrific, and it's something that the Park Service in general has been getting better at over the years. And I think places like Hawaii and some places like Glacier Bay, Alaska, they're really at the cutting edge of doing some very creative things.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. You're talking about cultural preservation.

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely. I think in terms of the challenges, my sense is that the challenges here are not necessarily all that different from the challenges elsewhere. They may be different in scale. I think the invasives problem here—it's a problem that you face all over the place, but here it's magnified. Half of the species that have gone extinct that were listed under the Endangered Species Act were from Hawaii. So it's really—this is ground zero for that issue, and I think it's something that could also help inform much of the rest of the parks system.

And the kinds of things—when I was at Volcano yesterday, I went around and went to an interpretation and he was explaining some of the partnerships that the park has worked out. He talked about what they've done with the goats, and you can't do that alone. You've got to—Mr. Abercrombie's point, you've got to really engage everyone you can.

So I think—I guess the last thing I would just add is a lot of those challenges come down to resources. And what we see contin-

ually in park after park after park is interpretation gets hit and the visitor experience gets hit. The ability to acquire new lands has been diminishing more and more every year. It's been evaporating. So there are enormous challenges that are faced across the system, and I think some of the things that you're experiencing here in Hawaii are really excellent examples for why we need to do more in park operations.

Ms. JARMAN. May I add? One of our board members is actually one of the entomologists for the State Department of Agriculture and someone in the previous panel mentioned the rust problem on the ohia trees, and he told me a few months ago that if that rust gets to the Big Island, it could kill all of the ohia trees basically in the forest in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. The ohia tree is the first tree that regenerates in a lava field once the lava has taken over an area, and that's stunning. If that were to get to the Big Island, it's just indescribable to imagine what that park would look like and what the area that has ohia trees—which is a good portion of the side of the island would look like.

So something needs to be done about that. And I encourage the bill to deal with problems outside the National Park, because that will come into the park, but by the time it gets to the park, it's going to be too late. So it's got to be dealt with while it's on the islands other than the Big Island. Thank you.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Well, we have a perfect example of that with Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, which Ms. Orlando pointed out when Frank Lucas came down to tour with us a few years ago, of a wasp, as I recall, getting off of a container ship in Hilo. Now, the National Park system has nothing to do with container ships in Hilo, has no jurisdiction, yet that wasp is now in the National Park killing off the birds that we're trying to protect. Frankly, that species of bird is probably history from that wasp. So that's a pretty good example of how if you want to talk about protecting our National Parks, the comment that we've got to look beyond the borders of the National Parks from an invasive perspective is dead on.

Can I just stay with Ms. Jarman? And I want to focus on philanthropy, because it seems inescapable to me that we're going to have to look to the private sector much more, really a realistic matter to do what we need to do. And there are many people that want to help the National Parks. And I've always tried to find the way to provide a greater level of contribution. Obviously if I'm somebody contributing money—the chances of my contributing money to the general fund of the United States are pretty low, just as a general principle, but if I know I can contribute to invasive protection at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park or to the expansion of the park into Ka'u, etc., that makes a lot of sense. And I think a lot of people want to help from that perspective.

So the question is as you get into philanthropy and into people being ready to give but not necessarily willing, what obstacles exist to them actually giving and what can we do from a national, legal perspective, Federal statutory perspective to provide the encouragement for them to give to the National Parks, to a specific park? You mentioned, for example, the linkage, which I hadn't considered, between a management plan and the willingness to give. We also obviously have tax deductions available for charitable con-

tributions, and that all exists from a matter of general principles. I get a contribution if I give it to you or the National Park. But what else can we do to encourage people to give either to the general fund or to the park system or specifically to a particular park or particular activity?

And in the same breath, can you just answer the question, can you expand on the linkage between willingness to give and having an adequate management plan?

Ms. JARMAN. In terms of the latter question, if I were as wealthy as some of the donors that we're hoping to tap, I would want to know that the money that I am expending is going to be consistent with what—I want the goals and the values of the park to be consistent with my goals and values for the park, and that's what the management plan reflects. It reflects what are the priorities for that park, what does that park want to do, where does it want to put its resources, what does it want to look like. And so I can say, look, here's the vision for the park. The vision for the park is to—and, say, in terms of invasive species, we want to eradicate the X from Y part of the park, and then the park also then has plans in their invasive species plan through the resource management plan about how they can do that, but they need the resources to do that.

And we can say the Federal Government is unable to provide sufficient resources. If they were able to get X, Y, and Z, they would be able to do this. We need the money for that. And of course we all follow the Director's orders, because the Friends groups cannot—I don't think are allowed to build toilets or roads, those kinds of things. There are limits to what the Friends group can raise funds for.

But that helps us to put our requests for dollars in the context of really what the park needs and what the values are. And if I know that you're interested in acquisition and trying to improve the overall ability of our National Park system to include more areas, and if there is a way that funds can somehow be put to that use, that's what I can talk to you about, and I can show you how that's consistent with what the park plans to do. And that's why the general management plan, I think, is so important for philanthropy.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. It's a marketing tool to get people to give. Maybe it's time to revisit some of the basic restrictions that you were talking about. You know, why can't the Friends group go out there and, you know, contribute sweat equity to construction of a bathroom.

Ms. JARMAN. To the extent that the park is allowed to have volunteers to put in something, we probably could do that, but we couldn't go in and ask X person, would you donate so much money for the construction of this, I'm pretty sure.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. I think that's the point.

Ms. JARMAN. There are certain restrictions on the types of fundraising, and Superintendent Orlando has more expertise on that.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. But those restrictions come from somewhere. They come from within the national—I guess the point I'm making is maybe it's time to think about whether—I mean, just as an open question. We can deal with it later on, but, frankly, I think a lot of people would be willing to do a lot more sponsorship, con-

tributions for a lot of things if they knew that's where it was going to go. So maybe that's a productive place for us to go in terms of a big picture consideration.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Case, could I just add to that. Actually right now the Park Service is rewriting what's known as Director's Order 21. That Director's Order relates to philanthropy and what philanthropists can and cannot do, what the Park Service can and cannot do in relation to that. So that's something that I would suggest that you take a look at, but that's something that's live right now that you might want to look at.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. We actually, just for the record, have a State law here in Hawaii that allows people to designate contributions to the State or to a county government for the specific purpose of acquiring a piece of property that is available for purchase, under eminent domain or otherwise, and the quid pro quo is I'll contribute as long as I know that's what you'll use the money for. I won't do it otherwise. Now, I know about that State law because it was one of my only original ideas in 20 years of public service. To my knowledge, it's never been used in the State. Nonetheless, it's sitting there. I think it's a pretty good example of what could be done to facilitate people with contributing.

OK, I'm going to ask just one more question and then pass back to the chair.

Ms. Case, we talked a little bit about conservation easements, and that's the whole other part of this, because we're obviously kind of having a problem in terms of bringing that in. So there has to be a much broader level of participation in terms of private, non-Federal government entities either acquiring to hold or acquiring to protect the intention of transferring. Maybe you could just kind of, for the record, describe the Nature Conservancy's conservation easement efforts in Hawaii, which I think goes back several decades.

Ms. CASE. Sure. The Nature Conservancy has made extensive use of conservation easements in our preserves. We have a dozen preserves in Hawaii, starting about 20, 25 years ago. Waikamoi Preserve, which is adjacent to Haleakala National Park, is a conservation easement. The underlying fee owner is Haleakala Ranch. Kamakou Preserve on Molokai is a conservation easement. The underlying owner is Molokai Ranch. We have a long-term conservation lease from the Campbell Estate for our Honouliuli Preserve in the Waianae Mountains on Oahu.

We have—and some of those are donations. We have several conservations easements on west Maui from Amfac, A&B, Maui Land & Pineapple, on Lanai from Castle & Cook, and these are all creation of preserves. Some of the early ones were purchased. The later ones were donated. Particularly as we became increasingly aware of the management expense, it became much more important to kind of hold our privately raised dollars for management, and we were able to work with some generous land owners to donate conservation easements.

And in south Kona, or Kona Hema Preserve, which is adjacent to the Kahuku addition of Volcanoes National Park, we did it cooperatively with the U.S. Forest Service under its Forest Legacy Program. We used Forest Legacy Easements on the three adjacent

parcels. And we plan to use that mechanism elsewhere in Hawaii because we think it's a fantastic one to add federally protected areas with a private partnership component.

We have an easement going back to the late 1960's, we've helped with the Kipahulu extension at Haleakala National Park, and we have several parcels that are still in the works in various stages for donation to the park. One of them is a conservation easement which we hold. It's in a buffer area that was transferred out to a private landowner. So it's easement restrictions so that it protects the view plane, and we hope to be able to transfer the easement to the park so that it is, you know, part of the protected area.

I think that in terms of the—when you do a conservation easement, particularly if one is purchased, you're going to go through a series of analyses of what restrictions are important to have in that easement and what's left for the landowner. And of course the more restrictions you have, the more expensive the easement is or the higher the donation. And at some point it becomes more cost effective and simpler from a management perspective to just buy it outright, or, you know, best case, have it donated outright. So you're always weighing that factor.

I have often thought that there may be some cooperative mechanism in here that could help with acquisitions and land management at the same time, that we're able to either work something creatively that is consistent with current law or perhaps some changes in law, for instance, if someone is willing to donate or sell land for acquisition on the condition that there be management money set up from another source, maybe another public source, maybe another private source, or if there's acquisition money from a public source and the landowner is willing to take the—to sell the property and take those funds and put it in a conservation trust fund for the long-term management, there might be some ways to work together to solve both the acquisition side of it and start some long-term management capability. So I think that is one opportunity we have to look at.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me start with your last point and work in some other things, and let me ask Mr. Obey first, just to kind of help us when we get back to Washington to start working with the legislation, and not only the Centennial Act but other potential things we can do either in the short term maybe as part of the 90th or in the 100th, pursuing this question of donations and endowment. Ms. Case raised an interesting question here. In our Boston hearing, and also in what they're doing up in Arcadia, and when I visited there later, their carriage roads came with endowment.

Is it conceivable that we could—to some degree, this runs counter to the whole tax simplicity argument, but at the same time individuals involved in this could understand some of this. Is there a way that, A, we could target some of what we're trying to do with the Centennial Act into an incentive with endowment? And as we look, at the very least, at how any kind of legislation has to be put through, that there could be some match or greater ties, if it includes an endowment, as opposed to if it doesn't include an endowment.

Because I know where the problem comes in is that if land donations and easements come tied to the actual fund, which is a great

idea, in one sense, so it isn't going to be drained out of what we have for the existing operations for the parks, unless it comes with money for the parks, which you can't bind Congress to Congress. Could you kind of kick around to—you know, like there's got to be some way that we can be—endowments for management are clearly going to be one of the things that enables us to absorb more land and try to get around this question of new lands.

Mr. OBEY. I think that's an interesting thing to explore. Clearly money's been evaporating, and that's why we need to do something. I think what I wouldn't want to have happen in that context would be for there to be an expectation that you weren't going to acquire. I think that could be working against the goal. But I think certainly that's something worth exploring.

The question of endowments overall, they were extremely successful, and that's being replicated at Golden Gate, as you know. I think endowments—I'm not sure if you're thinking of endowments strictly on the private sector side or also on the public sector side of funding. On the public sector side, my experience has been that the appropriators tend not to be crazy about funding endowments because they'd rather just appropriate the money. but on the private side that's a source to think about.

Mr. SOUDER. What I wrestle with, and nothing's worse than to come out with an MBA in management and go into Congress, because first off, you can't do long-term planning in Congress. In social issue areas it's the biggest nightmare, but the parks aren't too far behind. We're putting more management systems in, but it is a nightmare to work through. Because what I would like to think is that you look across the Nation, and that there would be a logical ranking of here are the things that we really need to acquire, you've got a certain amount of points there, if somebody has a willing donation, you factor that in, and if they have an endowment, you factor it in, and that something that's No. 6 may get bumped up if it has money tied to it, and then you have an urgency loss risk to the system analysis.

And I think variations of this occur at the park level, variations occur at the regional level, but then we kind of subdivide this nationally and say so much money is going to go to each region so it's not really a national vision, it becomes equity-based regional divisions. There's a fundamental unwillingness to some degree in institutions like the Park Service to make judgmental decisions because, well, every building ought to be preserved, every species ought to be preserved, every variation of every species ought to be preserved.

And when you're unwilling to make qualitative judgments, then what happens is each of us earmark, and then you go down through the bill and you find that individual Members of Congress, based on their seniority or power or access or whatever, get this or this for their district, as opposed to having a rational plan. And I'm trying to sort through are there certain things we could put in, financial incentives, that would tip a little bit of that balance, understanding that these are risky tradeoffs?

Because what happens is areas where there's wealth or where people retire, like Arcadia or San Francisco or potentially parts of Hawaii, I think would be in a tremendous advantage over other

parts of the country in adding things if we do it just by endowments and people who give. It also would be—in effect you could have, which I raised in Boston and informed—Director Kennedy acknowledged, look, it's a tough question. In effect, then, very wealthy people get to manage what direction the Park Service goes. It's no longer a democracy. Those who have the money to donate certain things, can do that.

Now, as a practical matter, however, if we don't have enough funds in the public sector to do it, were it not for the donors, we would be up a creek right now. And along that line, I would like to talk a little bit about the nature conservancy. And I think we've had one other hearing, maybe two, but I would like to develop a little bit from your perspective.

First off, I presume you've been having some discussion about proposals in potential tax legislation that would restrict land gifts. Do you want to comment on that?

Ms. CASE. I don't know what the current status of those discussions are but, you know——

Mr. SOUDER. It would be crippling basically.

Ms. CASE. Tax deduction restrictions on donations of land would be crippling to conservation.

Mr. SOUDER. And that if we didn't have Nature Conservancy stepping in many times to purchase these lands or get them donated, what percentage, in your experience—you named a whole bunch of things where you have easements and conservancy lands. Do you expect at a certain point a number of those things to fall under either Park Service or one of the Federal agencies and being able to leverage the dollars to come back into other——

Ms. CASE. I would say that roughly speaking half of the land acquisitions that we have done have been what we call cooperative transactions where the ultimate landowner is going to be an agency, particularly the National Park Service and National Wildlife Service, and we're able to step in and help the negotiations and advance funding. Funding comes ultimately from the appropriation and about the other half is from privately raised money, private or donated land to be held as private reserves.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Can I just amplify that point just for a second? Let's document this for the record in Hawaii. Run the list here. We just had a huge addition—incredible addition at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, which we call Kahuku. That wouldn't have happened unless private entities—it might have happened, but the Government wasn't going to buy it outright. So that one might have been lost.

Haleakala National—well, let's stay on the Big Island. Pu'uhonua Honaunau just had a major expansion which was held against development pressures. That wouldn't have happened unless the mechanism was in place. I forget Kaloko-Honokohau, I think an element of that was similar.

On Haleakala National Park, Kipahulu, the Seven Sacred Pools were worked on by the Nature Conservancy first to kind of consolidate clear title. We have a brand new addition coming in soon, I don't think it's there yet, to the Haleakala National Park which was acquired, held not by the Nature Conservancy but by another entity until basically it could be absorbed into the National Park.

Over on Kauai right now the Fish and Wildlife Refuge is under expansion of the Kilauea Point National Wildlife Refuge. And so this is, for Hawaii, invaluable. This entire mechanism of donations, of private holding, of private consolidation, of partnership with the National Park Service is key to what we have here in Hawaii. And, you know, we want to expand it, not contract it. So that's just Hawaii. I'm forgetting a few examples somewhere.

Mr. SOUDER. I'm worried that in charitable tax reform we're going to have an unintended bite. I think it's interesting because, quite frankly, this process has been abused in some cases where individuals will get a charitable foundation set up, put their kids in it, and in effect get a tax deduction for their kids with 80 percent going to the utilization of staffing and not a foundation. And in trying to address some of these kind of things in some debated, highly publicized cases around the United States, I'm worried about something slipping through unless we illustrate and understand exactly how these holding patterns are occurring in the National Park Service around the United States, because our ability to add land is at best incremental in these fights. And without the Nature Conservancy and other groups' ability to do that, of which part of the fundamental question is how critical is the tax code on that? And my assumption is pretty critical. If it was capped or put restrictions—and look, some of it is self-serving. I mean, the celebrated case that the New York Times has highlighted is David Letterman getting all the land around him in effect privatized so he can have protection around his estate, but, hey, if it kept land on Long Island free, I'm willing to let him have a protective buffer to his house because we'd never be able to have that land undeveloped if we hadn't done it that way. And the question is how can we document this?

Ms. CASE. Landowners still give up value. They may be adjacent to a protected area, but they give up significant development rights when they do that. So without tax incentives, it would be significantly crippling to private conservation as well as cooperative conservation, and I can provide some examples.

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. If I could add just one more ingredient here, and that is regarding condemnation, and all this, that, and the other important tax advantages for many private land owners, the key is condemnation, which has tax advantages. Now, that's not an adverse seller. That's a willing seller, as long as it's a—but if they get the umbrella of condemnation, they have a tax advantage which works for them and works for the Government. So that's another area that under the current perspectives might be targeted because it's got condemnation in it, but that's not exactly what's happening, but it's a benefit for the National Park Service.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you know if the Nature Conservancy has lands that you would be reluctant to give over to the National Park Service because of public access?

Ms. CASE. Can you explain your question a little more.

Mr. SOUDER. In other words, does the Nature Conservancy have lands that they've purchased that if they gave them or sold them to the Park Service, might then allow visitor access and wouldn't be as wild? Have you ever had land swaps where you've said, look,

this has to be wilderness, treated as wilderness, and not to go into the Park Service?

Ms. CASE. Well, the transactions we assist on are comfortable that the long-term conservation needs are going to be met. There may be public access provisions, and in some cases for a National Park that's extremely appropriate. And that's just a matter of figuring out how to plan for access appropriately so it doesn't harm the natural resources, but it's important to get the public into the wilderness as long as you can protect the wilderness from any associated threats.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me move to Ms. Jarman, and Mr. Obey may have a comment on this too. Do you know, do Friends groups—are there any organized, say, conferences on either fundraising or shared best ideas that you have together in teleconferencing materials that are provided through NPS or do you have a national group? Do you ever do Internet conferencing?

Ms. JARMAN. We belong to what's called the Friends Alliance. Our president of our Friends board for the past 2 years has been to their meeting, and that—the purpose, I think, of the Friends Alliance is to help—particularly we're—this is our—we've only had 1 year of philanthropy. This is our second year in philanthropy, and Superintendent Orlando has been very supportive in encouraging us in this arena. And she's the one that has gotten us in touch with the Friends Alliance. And we can provide you—I haven't been to their meetings, but certainly we can provide you with more information on what they do, but I know the president came back and reported a wealth of information, a wealth of ideas.

And those Friends boards that have been in existence for a much longer time and have been very successful at fundraising are now in the position where they're actually working with the younger Friends boards to help us develop fundraising plans and to be able to do more. And workshops on Director's Order 21 is a—that document in and of itself is—I'm a law professor. I read that and I still—my eyes go crossed. And one of my fellow board members said, you know, you've got to read that and summarize it, because I read it and it makes no sense to me whatsoever, and I said, well, it makes a little sense to me, but we can do that. But those things end up being very complex. But these meetings, they teach you what are the basics of the Director's Order and what you can and you cannot do. So that mechanism is in place and we are beginning to take advantage of it.

Mr. OBEY. It's my understanding that the Friends Alliance isn't actually an incorporated entity as it is more a loose affiliation of Friends groups that come together that have been holding these conferences, and actually when I was at Hawaii Volcanoes yesterday, the staff I talked with had just been to that same conference and talked about how enormously valuable it was for him because they're trying to figure out how they can engage in some real innovative work with folks outside of the park. So he was able to get some ideas there.

Mr. SOUDER. Is the National Park Service itself allowed to coordinate meetings of these groups? I would think it would give National Park Service great benefits to have these groups formed and

know about the technicalities of law, how to do it, sharing brochures, sharing videos, best practices, how to work a list.

Mr. OBEY. I think that's actually the goal of the Friends Alliance. I think it was prompted by the National Park Foundation.

Mr. SOUDER. So work under the National Park Foundation and have that portion to followup with that particular angle, how to interconnect, because clearly that is a good supplement. Part of the reason there's concerns about how—which we heard in San Francisco this week about what the Friends group can fund is that we don't want the Friends groups to take over basic responsibilities inside the Park Service that the Federal Government should be doing. We've got to figure out how to have them be added components. And people would be willing to do that. If we don't have any other choice, I think that may be the case, but we've got to be a little bit careful to say this is what the public sector is going to do. Here's what the private sector can add to it. Otherwise, in effect, even more privatize the park question, but——

Ms. JARMAN. In addition to the Friends Alliance, Superintendent Orlando has assisted us in getting access to workshops on board development, you know, for non-profit boards. So we had one, what, a year ago and another one coming up sometime after the first of the year in February that we as the board didn't have those resources, and Superintendent Orlando has been able to help us avail ourselves of those. So I believe within the different Friends groups that's possible as well.

Mr. SOUDER. Could you—the Friends group in your area might be—Hawaii Volcanoes would be a very interesting model question here. What percentage of your Friends group lives on your island? Could you get that?

Ms. JARMAN. We can get you that information.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you think it's 20 percent?

Ms. JARMAN. I think it's much higher than that.

Ms. ORLANDO. Probably closer to 100 because that's a resource that we haven't tapped is off island and the second homeowners.

Ms. JARMAN. Two of our——

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Court Reporter, how do you want to handle like when Ms. Orlando just responded there? Do you want us to repeat what she said?

The COURT REPORTER. No, that's fine. I was able to hear what she said. Thank you.

Ms. JARMAN. Maybe we should have Superintendent Orlando up here.

Mr. SOUDER. We may if we—go ahead.

Ms. JARMAN. One of our board—we have two board members now on, one just went off, who own property in Volcano but live on Oahu. And they come to Volcano when we have our board meetings, etc., but I think—we can get you those numbers, but I'm sure the vast majority.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you see yourself soliciting part-time residents of the island and visitors to become part of your Friends group?

Ms. JARMAN. Well, our membership committee now has a goal of 500 members in the next 3 years. We're at 160 right now, and that committee is developing a plan to expand our membership base and to expand it not only beyond Hawaii island but beyond Hawaii.

I mean, we get so many visitors from around the United States and around the world who come to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and find a way to tap those as well.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you see yourselves doing a letter in conjunction with the park to those members to build support base on needs both public and private?

Ms. JARMAN. I'm not on the membership committee, and so I'm not sure what they're planning, but I could ask them to get that information to you. We're also putting up a Web site, talking about technology, and we're finally putting up our first effective Web site. And we're expecting that through our Web site—part of it is going to be people can join the friends board through the Web site. We're going to try to make that easy and seamless for them, and we think we're going to be able to expand our membership considerably that way as well, and offer some of our seminars in a way through our Web site so people don't have to be in Volcano National Park to come to the seminar.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Sullivan, I presume your group has broad—I mean you have a very unusual Hawaiian accent yourself. I assume you have a lot of diverse membership in the United States in your organization.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Well, we do from the standpoint of donors, no question, across the country. And our membership is made up of, for the Arizona Memorial Museum Association that membership is from visitors that come to the park and choose to join on as a member. I might add that I did attend the Friends group meeting last year in Portland. There was another one just recently back in Gettysburg, I believe, and I didn't get a chance to go back to that but the meeting in Portland I thought was very good. One of the problems, Friends group do not generally have a lot of money. So to send a person to that meeting is expensive for them, as I understand. But I think there's a lot to be gained from that meeting, and the National Park Service is represented there as well as National Park Foundation.

Mr. SOUDER. Would you see yourself participating if something like this could be fed over the Internet from a main location with certain speakers and interactive? I mean, we're moving to wireless and teleconferencing in all sorts of organizations and universities around the country. I'm sure the universities here in Hawaii have locations. We usually go in where anyone can go in and interact without having all the travel expenses. Would you find that kind of thing useful? Would you go to things like that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, I think so, and of course the cooperative associations with the National Park Service have their own umbrella organization. It's called APPL. I forget what the A stands for, but it's Partners for Public Lands. That group meets annually. In the spring it's meeting in Little Rock, and the workshops that were just talked about are provided during the course of those 3 or 4 days, several workshops go on for development, how you get a capital campaign, etc. So that's all laid out, and the members of the cooperative associations attend those and their board members attend. So they come away with a pretty good education of what to do.

Mr. SOUDER. In an association like yours, do you find—obviously all association's memberships are going to be older than the population as a whole, because people will tend—and it's not like it dramatically is going to change and people 21 are going to join the History Association. What you hope is you have a steady replenishment of those organizations.

Pearl Harbor just went through a very historic anniversary. Many of the distinguished veterans, like Mr. Saunders, may not be around for many more huge type of anniversaries like that. Not that you're not going to live to be 120, just saying statistically the odds are decreasing. And this is a big question on our World War II type memorials. Do you see younger people coming into your association, younger being—I'm 55—45 to 50, coming in to replace kind of the tier of the so-called Greatest Generation?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have a Board of Directors in the association and we have 18 members of the board. We just increased that. Originally, a few years ago, about 5 years ago, we only had seven members. Then they increased it to 15 and we went to 18. So the members we just brought in are much younger than the ones that were there. So, yes, we're finding we're able to attract board members that are younger.

Mr. SOUDER. Maybe we could have Mr. Saunders briefly tell your personal story and then why you think a memorial like this is so important.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Personal story gets rather involved. My ship was stationed here at Pearl Harbor about November 1940. In the middle of 1941 I went home on leave, vacation, and I didn't—I had my 30 days and I came back and reported in to San Diego for transportation back to Pearl, and they put me to work jerking sodas, working in the soda fountain. And they didn't want to let me go, and I kept asking the lieutenant in charge, I needed to get back to my ship. Well, this started in July when I went. Then I reported in there early August. Here it was September, October.

November decided, hey, I'm really tired of sitting there, you know, not being able to get back to the ship and not wanting to do what they had me doing. So I sat down and wrote the flag lieutenant a letter, and it wasn't very long after that this lieutenant comes down, and, Seaman Saunders, how long will it take you to get ready to go aboard ship for transportation? I said, Lieutenant, my sea bag is packed. I'm all set to go. I can be there. You got 15 minutes. I'll be there. OK.

They put me aboard the Shaw, USS Shaw, and so I was on there for transportation. We pulled into Pearl Harbor on December 4th, and of course you know when that happened. That's how come I was back here December 7, 1941. The ship went into dry dock. The Shaw went into dry dock, and they had to pump the water out and get the thing settled. And as soon as the thing was settled, I'm standing on the quarterdeck with my sea bag over my shoulder, and I saluted the Lieutenant and requested permission to leave the ship. And I saluted the colors and walked off the ship.

I looked back and waved at some of the fellows that I had been visiting with for the past 6, 7 days. Didn't know them really well, but they had an idea what I was doing. So when I'm walking away, I'm waving at these fellows, little knowing that 3 days later the

USS Shaw would have her bow broken off. The bow was blown plum off of that ship, and some of the fellows were killed that I didn't know real personal but some of the people were killed on the ship.

Well, I'll come back to the Shaw a little later. I got in what they called—they had a big long—about as long as this table, I guess, and about the same width—was one of these mules that you use in the shipyard that were pulling things around. They were pulling this trailer. It was real low to the ground where you just step up into it, had benches all over here, and that was the transportation they used around the shipyard.

So I went to Ten Ten dock, got over there, and I went on board the boat and went out to the equipment. I was attached to the staff, and the staff was on board the USS Rowley. That's my ship of record. I never tied the boat, never lived on it. Waited, took somebody from there to someplace else. But the morning of December 7th I got checked in and I got down to my boat and back on the job, and I was there. I was so happy. And the fellows in the boat were just glad to have me back because they had been shorthanded for about 4 months. And so we tied our boats up at Aiea Landing. That's where the CINPAC 3 boathouse is now. I don't know if you two gentlemen know. I know Congressman Case knows about that.

But at that time the landing was just a finger pier going out into the water. Later on after the war started, quite a while after, they built this fancy boathouse on there and that became the CINPAC boathouse. But we used to go in there and tie up at night, and there would be maybe 8 or 10 boats. You put 12 on one side of the pier and you could put 6 more on the other side. That's the most boats there at one time, but the boats, we tie up there and we have a man that would watch the ship, blinker lights at night.

And so it was unusual for the airplanes to come over because they had been having mock race. From the time I got out here in 1940, every weekend you'd have a mock race, planes would come from Kaneohe over to Pearl Harbor. They'd come from Wheeler Field, which was Army at that time. We didn't have an Air Force. We had what you called the Army Air Force. And they would come down to Pearl, or Pearl Harbor had our office out at Ford Island and they would be off at Schofield or wherever else. So every weekend they had all these planes around.

Then December 7th happened here. All those boats were lined up there and we were about—I think we were tied up to the pier and had two other boats out. And I'm sitting—I had just got through washing some clothes and wringing them out and putting them in my scrub bucket, and I had on my swimming trunks and all hell broke loose. Explosions were coming from every place, and even when they come from the harbor there, they were ricocheting up in the mountains and echoing back. Sounded like you were right in the middle of the damn thing, you know, the explosion was right where you were at. It was really terrific. It was hell, that's all.

Anyway, I'm watching the battleship over there and the airplanes—well, I saw the Arizona, and I saw some of the other ships get hit. And from where we sat, where the landing is, you had a clear view of Battleship Row. There was no bridge there then, no

buildings in between you or anything. So you could look from the landing right across all the way the full length of Battleship Row.

When the explosions went off, I'm looking across Ford Island and here's an aircraft hanger up in the air. I could see daylight underneath it. The explosion just picked it up off the ground and set it back down. I heard later that it almost went back on its foundation but it was off just a little bit. Am I still all right here?

Mr. SOUDER. If you can finish, and then I want to ask you some questions.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Finish? I told you it's a long story. Anyway, these planes are coming over and one of them come across the landing where we were at toward Aiea and over in the cane fields. That's what it was then. There's a city up there now. At that time it was cane fields. And then they come by. I'm standing up there gawking, looking up at them in my swimming trunks, and he tilted over like this and he was firing his machine gun and one bullet went plunk about 20 feet out from the pier on one side, then the next one went plunk on the other side, and I'm in his line of fire here, you know. But we never saw that plane again.

Then about that time the place cleared out. Nothing was coming in, and so our man in charge of the boats, name was Vansteinberg. Now, that was his full name. I forget what his name was, but everyone called him Van. But Van said—somebody says, hey, this is a funny mock race. Van looked up and said, mock race hell. See the rising sun on the side of that zero? Japan is attacking us. Boom, everyone knew.

He said, OK, let's get out in the boat and go out and see if we can pick up some of the men, because he had seen them blown right off the ship, you know. So we got the boat on the way and went out there, but by the time we got there the water—there was oil all over the water. And we never did pick anybody up. There was nobody close to where we were at. And we got out about as close as the Arizona and another boat had gone in and had some people in it that they picked up and it was headed back to the landing. It had a hole in the side of the boat about, oh, 18 inches long. One of the planks had just blown out, got hit by a piece of shrapnel. And he was really making knots making back to the base.

And then we were just about even where the Arizona was and we looked up and here's a bunch of high flying bombers coming over Hickam across the Navy yard toward the battleships again. So we get there and then when we saw those bombers, he said, we're going back to the landing. This boat is already ahead of us and maybe just follow them into the landing.

When we got there there was a fellow standing there and he had his—all he had on were his shorts and his undershirt and his shoes, and he was talking up a storm. And we tied the boat up and we were listening to him and he says, I was blown off the ship. He was a warrant officer off of one of the battleships. I never did figure out which one he was off of, but here he is standing there in his underclothes. He says, I lost all my clothes, and he says, I lost my socks, but I still got my shoes on. The damn explosion had busted the islets on his shoes, took off his socks, and these little strings from the islets of the shoe strings was hanging out.

And so about that time Van says, hey, that's our recall. We got to go back to the ship. So we all got in the ship. I'm still in my damn swimming trunks. And picked up my bucket of clothes and put them down in the forward part of the boat. We slept right there in the boats. You had four bunks in the boats. You had 35-footers and 40-footers, nothing like the boats you see today. But the Navy had barges and so forth. Anyway, we get in the boat and get underway and go out to the Raleigh. We operated from the Raleigh as well as the Whitney. The staff command was split up between the two ships, and we operated mostly from the Whitney because we were the supply officer's boat. He was a full commander, name was Shaddocks, Commander Shaddocks. Our boat was assigned to him.

So—excuse me just a second. I'll be all right. I got in the boat and we went out to the Raleigh. Now, the Raleigh and the Battleship Utah were tied up stern to stern, and we had to go between the two sterns to get around to the officer's gangway. And when we approached the ship, the enlisted gangway was underwater. The ship sunk right down. It had taken a torpedo underneath the liberty launch full of people and went right into the fire room and exploded in the fire room. But the kid on watch was—in the fire room was—had hauled up the patch and had his arm in the hatch. When the explosion took part, it just lifted him up and set him on his okole. Excuse me, rear end. That's a Hawaiian word. Set him on his okole on deck.

Nobody on the Raleigh was hurt. They took a bomb down through the turret, through the magazine, out the side of the ship, underneath the quays it was tied up to, and exploded out there. So there were no fires on the Raleigh. It just settled down and there were no casualties on the Raleigh.

So we took the boat and we went between the two ships, and as we're passing between the two ships there's a guy on the bottom of the Utah, go get a cutting torch, go get a cutting torch. There's a man on the bottom of the ship. We need a torch. So went up the officer's gangway, told the OD what we needed. It was no time at all that we had a shipfitter down in the hole with his cutting torch, striker, and the whole bit, put him in—right in where the officers ride in the back there with his bottles and all. You know, this was all nice, had white covers in there and fancy macrame lace all around in there, and we put this man down in there.

Now, we backed up. We helped the ship fitter out of the boat and get on the bottom of the Utah and helped with getting his bottles up there and all of this gear, and we left him there and backed up and went back to the gangway to pick up our passenger, a lieutenant. I don't remember his name or—I just remember he was on the staff and he wanted to go to the Whitney. So we took him on over to the Whitney.

Now, we found out later that they did get a hole cut in the bottom of that ship and they got that man out of there and he—he's living in California. There's a town there—city up in Canada with the same name. Well, that's beside the point. Anyhow he's still living there, and I have never been able to contact him. We had the Pearl Harbor Survivors Association meeting out here one year and he came, but I never could catch up with him. So I've never been

able to see him to tell him I was one of the guys that was involved in getting him out of that boat.

Mr. SOUDER. How old were you at this time?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I was 23 years old. I had 6 years in the Navy when they bombed Pearl Harbor. I'm 87 right now. I joined just a—like a little less than a month after I turned 18.

Mr. SOUDER. When you go back to the current site, does it bring back a lot of these memories?

Mr. SAUNDERS. Oh, yeah. I'm OK—if I take somebody out to the Memorial, a guest, which I do quite frequently, friends or family or somebody that's been sent to me from one of my kids over there—I've got five children—or had five children. They're all adults now. The youngest one's 47. The oldest one's 60.

Mr. SOUDER. They're probably adults now.

Mr. SAUNDERS. So they're all adults, and three in between them. So when I go out there, I'm OK. But if I go out there when they're having a service, I get all shook up. I get real emotional. I just get—I just can't hardly wait to get away from that. It's really touching and it bugs me. I didn't know anybody on the Arizona, but I saw it go down, and it's—gentlemen and ladies, it's hard to talk about this. I do it occasionally, but I'm really worked up. I'm sorry.

But we got the passenger and went back between the two ships and we went over to the Whitney and we let him off and we laid off—we laid off from the gangway. We're out there floating around waiting for him to recall us. So we did that and then he wanted to go to Ten Ten Dock. Took him over there and waited for him and brought him back. And that boat engine was not turned off at all that whole day. It kept running continually. Good thing you had two 45-gallon tanks of diesel fuel to keep it going, but we—every time we went by the Arizona it seemed to be settling just a little deeper, a little deeper in the water.

And so we finally went back to—we didn't get back to Aiea Landing for about 2 weeks. We were busy running all over the harbor and laying off wherever we could. So we went back in there about 2, 3 weeks later. And they had turned Aiea Landing into a morgue. That's where they took all the bodies from the ships, and they had a whole stack of pine boxes, used them for coffins, and stacked up over on one side of the landing. And we were trying to pick up some of our gear, because we had a big tent up at the head of the landing, and we do our laundry and go in there with our ironing board and iron and so forth and do all our clothes in there. And sometimes some of the guys might sleep up there, but we got that done.

But here's one of these boxes and they've got a body in there, a sailor, and they had dug him out of the Oklahoma. He was off the Oklahoma, and here he was laying down, his arms folded. And, folks, that man's skin was as white as that paper, so help me God. It was completely white, and he wasn't—he wasn't swollen. He wasn't bloated or anything. He was just—I guess the saltwater must have bleached him out. Cut him out of one of those compartments. Oh, man. Please excuse me. I'll get the rest of it out.

We went back and done what we did. One of the things I noticed on December 8, 1941, they had a little barge running around, oh, about half as big as this, from here back, and had a big tank on

it and the engine, and it was propelled, self-propelled, and they called it the Juicy Lucy. And this thing—they run it—suck all the oil they could off the water and put it in this tank and then it would go over and be pumped out of the tank. And before they—when they got full, they'd open it a little, because all the saltwater settle in the bottom and they would drain that out, because they would get some water with this big vacuum cleaner that they would use to suck up the oil there. I only saw one, but later on they had 8 or 10 of them because, hey, Pearl Harbor was black all over, all around the beaches. The oil was just thick on top of the water. I don't know how long it was before they finally got it cleaned out. I know for a long, long time it was there.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Saunders, I need to move on to a couple of other things, but I appreciate you——

Mr. SAUNDERS. That's almost all of it anyway.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to get this into the record because a lot of times the history and cultural resources are lost in the debate over the National Park Service because we think of them as natural resources and all the beauty and the big buildings, and quite frankly at Gettysburg, PA, at our hearing there, and Faneuil Hall in Boston, had we had somebody come forth to tell their personal story, we'd have known they were a fraud, because those battles are much older in American history, but to have the opportunity at one of our hearings to have somebody here to give eyewitness testimony to what they saw at one of our most treasured sites was, I think, good to get into the record, and I appreciate the emotional difficulty of your recalling that and your willingness to share that.

And you were talking about the importance of sharing it with your kids and friends and being willing to go back to the site. One of our challenges in the Congress is how we can keep this site adequately funded and let people see it, what Mr. Sullivan's group is working with. And do you feel and does Mr. Sullivan feel that the site, as it's presently constituted, gives enough of the accurate feeling that this can be passed on like Gettysburg and Faneuil Hall in Boston and other sites?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think when we complete the new visitor center that we'll be able to do that, because we're going to increase the size of the museum by more than twice. And we'll have a space that is climate conditioned, and right now we don't have that. And we have many of the memorabilia and artifacts in another building because we don't have the space to put it in. So that will help us immensely once we get the new building, and we'll also have an educational center with library resource capabilities there. We're going to build an amphitheater outside so the students when they come, particularly, or any groups park, rangers will be able to give lectures as well as the survivors, as long as we have that national treasure. So I think that the visitor center will be——

Mr. SOUDER. Will you be incorporating some of their video testimonies like they do at the Holocaust Museum and so on?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes. We have done a tremendous amount of oral histories, and in fact the Arizona Memorial Museum Association has produced a DVD-Rom with many of the oral histories on that DVD-Rom, and it includes a—you put it in the computer and you can bring up a map of Oahu and you can click on Schofield Bar-

racks and the survivor will appear and tell you exactly what went on at Schofield barracks. You can do the same thing at Wheeler and other places on the island, and then all of the oral histories are all there in the DVD-Rom for the teachers to use.

Mr. SOUDER. Thanks. Mr. Saunders.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Just a short word. I'm sure that we've got everything laid out to where the history of Pearl Harbor will be perpetuated for many, many years.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you feel—I assume you saw the movie Pearl Harbor. Like Saving Private Ryan—Saving Private Ryan captured a lot of the chaos at the beach and no movie had been that realistic. Do you feel that the movie Pearl Harbor captured some of the chaos you felt that day on the water or is there still a need to kind of fill that——

Mr. SAUNDERS. I didn't like that movie too well.

Mr. SOUDER. Too much romance.

Mr. SAUNDERS. Well, it was—it was all right. Some of the—most of the stuff was OK, but if you really want the true picture of Pearl Harbor, see Tora Tora Tora. That's the one that tells you everything. That is the actual—as far as I'm concerned, it's the closest to actually being there. Tora Tora Tora, that's the movie to see. Pearl Harbor's a nice movie. It was interesting, but I didn't——

Mr. SOUDER. Didn't capture it.

Mr. SAUNDERS. I didn't feel that it done Pearl Harbor justice, OK? I hope those people don't get that message there. I'm talking about the movie people. What do they call that place? Oh, Hollywood.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Obey, in your written testimony—and it's something I neglected to ask in the first panel, but since you didn't get a chance to go over it in the abbreviated verbal, I think we should explore it now, and that's the air tours. Can you describe a little bit of that, what you had in your testimony. We have it written in, but much like the bikes, do you know the status of air tours or how that works currently?

Mr. OBEY. The Air Tour Management Act passed 5 years ago and the Park Service and FAA have yet to produce a single air tour management plan. That is a real issue in Hawaii. The parks in Hawaii were the first ones to start to embark on this. They probably—I would guess Volcano and Grand Canyon are among the tops in air tours in the country.

Right now operators are operating under an interim operating authority. And basically what they—what they're able to do is the FAA has them estimate—give them what their numbers are in air tours that they run. The experience of the Park Service has been somewhat different in terms of what they observe as the numbers, and there are questions about why that is. And that's something that's worth exploring, but overall there's a real need to jump start this process. And the Park Service runs parks. FAA deals with planes, and the two need to communicate together about both of those things and about being sure that parks are protected.

When I was at Hawaii Volcanoes yesterday and along the Chain of Craters Road, I walked out onto the lava to look at the lava tube. Great day to be there. And I was walking back, suddenly here's—it was dead silence, just phenomenal. I was the only person

out there, sitting there all alone, and then suddenly comes a helicopter. It's jarring for people in that setting. I have taken—I've actually taken an air tour in Hawaii. I was here in 1995 during the Government closures. It was the only way I could see Haleakala was to go on a helicopter at that point, and safe to say I probably didn't disturb anybody on the ground in the park.

But these are things that need to be managed, managed appropriately, and what's happening is because of the delay is that they're not managed appropriately. And we really need to get our arms around that, and I think Congress really needs to reengage it.

Ms. Jarman, do you have comments on this? Obviously this is a huge tourism question.

Ms. JARMAN. I think there's two other issues that go along with the noise and disturbances in the park. One is the safety issue. Helicopters seem to go down at an alarming rate here in Hawaii. It's astounding, much more than you ever see planes going down. So I think the safety issue again, working with the FAA. And then outside of the park issue, people who live between where the helicopters take off and where they go in the park experience incredible, you know, daily noise pollution from the helicopters going over. So I think that's another issue that ought to be looked at, and hopefully Congress will work with the FAA and get the FAA to look at that. And, again, if the park can push that issue, and, again, look at the communities outside the park that are impacted as well.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Case, I'm sorry because I'm getting older and I can't remember what the witnesses in the first panel said. The invasive species, these forms that we fill out on the airplane as we come in were designed to protect California, not Hawaii; is that what I understood?

Ms. CASE. Coming into Hawaii you fill out a form that's for the Department of Agriculture to inspect plants, but they're really inspecting for plant pests. They're not inspecting for the invasiveness of the plant itself. So there's a whole system missing here that we need to be able to prevent invasive plants from coming in. And there are computer-based interview questions now and data bases that you can predict whether something's likely to be invasive in about 6 hours with the right resources. So we have the tools in place to prevent new things if we can have the systems in places.

Mr. SOUDER. Who's the major opponents of being able to do this? I'm too unfamiliar with the issue. What would prohibit us from implementing it? Cost? Is it sellers of exotic pests, certain types of plants, retail associations?

Ms. CASE. First of all, I don't think there's a lot of opposition to this kind of concept. There's a lot of expense associated with putting up the right prevention systems, but it's far cheaper—it's expensive, but it will cost way less than having to control those things. Later some of the landscape industry people want to make sure that their businesses aren't, you know, harmed greatly by restrictions on what they can bring in, and that is, in my mind, why it's so—such a good opportunity that we have this new review system, that it won't take a lot of time. Not all plants that come into Hawaii are invasive. I would say a minority are. And so we just

want to be able to screen out the ones that are going to be the next Miconia or the next fountain grass or pampas grass.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you have any comments?

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. A comment on California, just to make clear what's happening. When anybody comes into Hawaii, there are certain regulations about what can and can't be brought. Although it's a—what's the converse of a likeness? A non-likeness. It's—you can't bring these in but everything else you can bring in. So, first of all, it's letting a bunch of stuff in that shouldn't be coming in anyway. Second, there's no effective enforcement of what comes in, either on a cargo basis or a tourist basis. The only thing that happens to you when you come on a plane is you fill out that form. If you choose not to fill out that form or you fill out the form inaccurately, nobody's going to inspect anything when you get to the airport.

When you go to the airport tonight, or whenever you're going, and you check your bags—well, assume you check your bag, you would have to go through a USDA inspection procedure, which lasts about—I don't know, it's not an inconvenience—in which USDA would actually look inside your bag to determine whether you're bringing in plant material.

Mr. SOUDER. Why isn't that done coming in?

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. There's no good reason why it isn't done. It just wasn't ever done that way, and we never focused on in-coming inspection versus out-going. The mainland wants it because we have some agricultural pests here that if they got to the U.S. mainland, would be harmful to the U.S. mainland agriculture, and that's the reason for the USDA.

Mr. SOUDER. And I'm in favor of that. Being in the midwest, I mean, we get all sorts of things that just devastate us. I'm wondering why the islands, being vulnerable——

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. Because we haven't done it. That's the only reason. We haven't focused on it. We need to say, let's do it, because we have a lot—we have just as much at stake. And who is opposed to it? As Suzanne said, really, the vast majority of people are not opposed to it. There are certain industry segments that are fearful of it, initially, because, frankly, they would be inspected and probably identifying invasives which are coming into our system. But it would be pretty straightforward, the same way we inspect outgoing. And financed from the airport fee, just as the outgoing stuff is financed. It could be put in place pretty fast. So that's a pretty basic start to protect our National Parks as well as the rest of Hawaii.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Obey, let me ask one. I know this has gone on long. I'm going to wrap up my part here in just a second.

You've heard me talk a number of times about the Internet and how to view this. Have you ever heard—or if we outfitted parks with the advance in technology, is there any—have you ever heard of, other than certain technology purposes, any reason why, for example, ranger talks couldn't be broadcast over the Internet, including with video? If you had a certain amount of investment capital in each park, where you could at your home tap into the computer, maybe hook it up to your big screen TV—and who knows, 10 years

from now where we're going to be with this, but that you could look that tonight there's this ranger talk.

You don't get the smell of the camp fire. You don't get being out in the woods, or paradise, or Old Faithful Lodge, but what we've seen from use of the Internet—much like books on tape or video rentals, the theory was that it was going to destroy the visits, you know, to the library, it would destroy book clubs, but in fact people who go to the library go to book clubs and they go to bookstores. But it probably would increase park attendance, not decrease park attendance if you could go on the Internet and say, wow, I have a choice of 150 ranger talks tonight at 7 p.m. live. Any of this type of stuff, is it done? Have you seen why that couldn't be done, other than a technological thing? And we're down to the point where we can do this technologically for $2,000.

Mr. OBEY. I think there's so much more that the Park Service and other agencies can be doing through the Internet. One example, I spent the last 3 years, up until the end of the last Congress, working to expand Petrified National Forest in Arizona. David Jillet, who is a paleontologist with the museum in Arizona there who worked with—did a dinosaur dig where they had hook-ups with schools from around the country. That may have been international. I'm not sure. But thousands and thousands of kids. And they were prepped in their classes in advance. They had wonderful questions. Dave said that when he would—when kids would be asking questions—it was interactive. They could actually ask questions. He'd hear other kids cheering in the background. They were so excited by this experience. And it's just something that you can't—you can't even begin to quantify, you know, how important that is.

You know, when you talk to people about what got you interested in National Parks, you know, 98 percent of them are going to say it happened when I was a kid. And kids use the Internet more effectively than probably any of us, and it's something that really needs to be done more. It can never and it shouldn't ever be thought of as a replacement for visiting a park and getting that total experience, but it's something that can draw people in. And I think it could.

Both that and David Macalla always talks about history and how historically illiterate we are as a Nation, and he's done a great deal with the parks in trying to bring history alive for kids. When it's taught in the classroom, it's by and large one of the classes kids find dull as can be because just the dryness of the textbooks that they get. And when you can walk into Addams House or visit a Pearl Harbor and get that experience and gain a fuller understanding of this is where these people lived, this is where they walked, this is where the bombs fell, or whatever it may be, it brings it alive and it makes it tangible and connects you to something that's very important about your own history, about American history. I think what we can do through the parks, through the Internet, through overall technology is bring that into the classroom.

Mr. SOUDER. Because looking at one relatively small event could conceivably, through either public access in a meeting or through schools, reach as many people as Pearl Harbor has visit in the entire year. 1.5 million wouldn't even be an extraordinary number for

hitting some kind of—particularly as each of these channels get five variations on the channel and they start looking for unique programming to offer, and through satellite television this is going to explode, the demand for youth programming.

And what we're sitting on in the Park Service are resources that could just—you take a category of volcanoes, a category of World War II history, a category of—pick an animal. You know, the military bases that are going into the Park Service, and just the diversity of the Park Service is overwhelming, that there are so many different angles.

One thing that I was thinking from the first panel and this panel is the training of teachers that Pearl Harbor did through the NEH, that our subcommittee also has jurisdiction over NEH and the Department of Education, and maybe looking at a Washington version of this where we pull a number of the different agencies in with the Park Service, pull them in together and say, look, rather that stovepiping each year, how are you cooperating together? And if we could figure out—much like we've talked about the arts in the parks and when we—the National Gallery highlights the Park Service and the Library of Congress with their materials, to do a massive rebuild toward this 100th anniversary. What can we do to extend the range of this?

Mr. OBEY. I think it would be worth having that conversation.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you have any additional comments or questions?

Mr. CASE OF HAWAII. No.

Mr. SOUDER. Maybe if each of you would like to make a closing statement also. Think of where you have any thoughts, given what you heard today, where we should be pushing, and then additional thoughts on the 90th and the 100th birthday. Start with you.

Mr. OBEY. I think these hearings are a great start, frankly. They're helping to bring attention to this issue. I think relevancy is incredibly important. Brian O'Neill at your San Francisco hearing I thought just gave a terrific response to this question, talking about the need for parks to be inspirational to people and for excellence and to have parks really be—that ultimately when you go to a park you expect the best of the best and it inspires you to bring it home, make it a part of your life, a part of your community. I think that's a terrific message about the National Parks to make them relevant for people in their daily lives and connect them longer term to what we need to do, why we need to preserve these things, and not just as an attraction, but something that really matters.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Case.

Ms. CASE. I just want to thank you again for holding these hearings. I think it's a great example of dedication to making our parks really the lasting heritage they are. I think personally my commitment to conservation in Hawaii draws very deeply from my childhood experiences at Hawaii Volcanoes National Park and Haleakala National Park, and that kind of experience is invaluable. It's a value for environment. I think there are significant acquisition opportunities and opportunities to stem the tide on invasive species. There are certain things, if we can't do them now, we will have a much harder time, and I think those are the things

we want to focus on in particular so we can have a great celebration in 2016.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. SULLIVAN. A couple of things, Mr. Chairman. Iwould be remiss if I didn't recognize the East West Center and the University of Hawaii in cooperation with us on the teachers workshop. They're very, very helpful. The other point I would want to make is we are also a cooperative association with the War of the Pacific Museum in Guam and the American Memorial Park in Saipan. A visitor center opened there this past Memorial Day, and they'll open a bookstore there as well. And we're also over in Kalaupapa. We have bookstore there and open about 2 hours a day. And our employees are two of the patients there.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Saunders, do you have anything?

Mr. SAUNDERS. I'd just like to finish here. I mentioned that I had come back to the—what happened to the Shaw. They put a false bow on the Shaw, and this was right from the bridge, if you understand what I'm talking about, that whole front of the ship was gone. They just blanked it off with a sheet of metal, welded it in, and it went back to the shipyard in San Francisco. And when they got the ship there the yard had already rebuilt another bow and they married it up, and 2 weeks after the ship got to Hunter's Point in San Francisco, 2 weeks after it got there it was back out to sea again and it finished the war. I don't know what happened after that, but I thought that might be to your interest.

Mr. SOUDER. Yeah, that's amazing. It's amazing that you remembered that you didn't finish the Shaw part. Pretty good memory. Ms. Jarman.

Ms. JARMAN. I'd also like to express our appreciation to you for taking the time to come out to Hawaii, and you and Congressman Abercrombie for actually attending the hearings as well. I'd also like to say that I've been fortunate enough to work with both Superintendent Bell and Superintendent Orlando, and I'd like to say for the record they are excellent people to work with. They are stars as Federal employees, and I just would like to commend them on the record for the work that they do and how wonderful it is to work with them.

And finally I'd like to address Congressman Case's issue about adding areas to the park, and the problem—we have Kahuku, but there's not enough funds to manage it. But another way of thinking about it is to try to enter into cooperative agreements with nonprofits to help manage. My significant other is working with the State to manage an area that the State owns down below Waiohinu, and it's one of the areas I know you're interested in including in Federal partnership. And the State doesn't have the resources to manage it, and it's just this incredible coastal plant communities down there and very little visitorship because of where it is. And they're going to pay the Wildlife Fund $1 a year to actually manage to try to get rid of the invasives and keep the plants.

So another thing I think to look at is going to cooperative agreements. We have Adopt-a-Highway, Adopt-a-Stream programs, why not Adopt-a-Hiking Trail in the park? And you can use your community groups and student groups to help deal with some of the invasive species and other issues. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, I thank you all. With that, the subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional information submitted for the hearing record follows:]

Additional Testimony of Suzanne D. Case, Executive Director
The Nature Conservancy, Hawai'i Program

For Field Hearing on National Parks in Hawai'i, December 1, 2005
Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources
U.S. House Committee on Government Reform

Congressman Souder, thank you for hosting the December 1, 2005 field hearing on National Parks in Hawai'i. You requested additional comments on the role of The Nature Conservancy in federal acquisitions, the importance of tax deductibility for landowners in conservation transactions, and benefits accruing to the federal government from tax benefits to the landowner passed on to the government

In numerous conservation transactions nationwide The Nature Conservancy has received a donation, or bargain sale at less than fair market value, of fee title to conservation land or a conservation easement, and has passed on the benefit of that donation or discount to the National Park Service and other federal agencies. These are important conservation acquisitions for our country which neither conservation organizations nor federal agencies would be able to do to this degree without the tax benefits that accrue to the landowner. We might say that for every dollar of tax benefit accruing to the donor or bargain seller in a conservation transaction which The Nature Conservancy carries out for ultimate transfer to a federal agency for our country's parks, refuges and other federal protected areas, there is approximately 70% of savings on the purchase price passed on to the government because the government avoids having to pay out cash for that portion of the value of the conservation land. Without the tax benefits to the landowner, these transactions would cost significantly more for the government and many of them simply could not be done.

In Hawai'i, The Nature Conservancy has worked cooperatively with the federal government on a number of important conservation transactions for parks and refuges over the past forty years. Our cooperative work has included the K pahulu additions to Haleakal National Park and the 116,000-acre Kahuku addition to Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park for the National Park Service, the creation of Hakalau National Wildlife Refuge and O'ahu Forest National Wildlife Refuge for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the first Forest Legacy conservation easements at Kona Hema on the Island of Hawai'i for the U.S. Forest Service. Some of these were acquired by The Nature Conservancy by donation or bargain sale, and the dollar benefit of these were passed on to the federal government, including over 3,000 acres of fee land at K pahulu and over 8,000 acres of conservation easements at Kona Hema.

In addition, a number of preserves of The Nature Conservancy in Hawai'i were created by donation or bargain sale of conservation easements by the landowners. These preserves of The Nature Conservancy, now totaling over 32,000 acres on all the main islands, form the basis of The Nature Conservancy's work in public-private watershed partnerships protecting native upland forest on all the main islands. The National Park Service is a key player in a number of these partnerships as well as over 60 other federal, state, county and private landowners working together to conserve nearly a million acres of Hawai'i's native forests. Without tax benefits to landowners for donations of conservation protections to many of these very important native

lands, much of the conservation work in Hawai'i's native forests would not be proceeding at the pace and with the exemplary public-private cooperation currently happening in Hawai'i.

The incentives for landowners to make such donations would be substantially reduced if the Joint Committee on Taxation's proposal to substantially reduce substantially the amount of the tax deduction for qualified real property donations were enacted into law. Current law permits landowners to deduct 100% of the fair market value of qualified real property donations, either by outright contribution or through a bargain sale. The Joint Tax Committee has proposed that the amount of such a charitable deduction would be reduced to 33% of the fair market value of such contributed property.

Another proposal by the Joint Tax Committee that would sharply reduce incentives for charitable contributions of real property is the recommendation that the donor's basis in the property, rather than its fair market value, would be the limit of the charitable deduction.

Finally, in recent years, The Nature Conservancy has also been an active partner with the National Park Service to acquire a 97,000 acre ranch that enabled Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton to establish Great Sand Dunes National Park, as well as significant acquisitions at Pinnacles National Monument, the Obed Wild and Scenic River, Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve and Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve.

Thank you again for this opportunity to offer The Nature Conservancy's additional comments on our conservation work with federal agencies.

○