AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE NATIONAL PARKS: WILL THEY SURVIVE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS?

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

MARCH 14, 2005

Serial No. 109–55

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

23–039 PDF WASHINGTON : 2005

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

TOM DAVIS, Virginia, *Chairman*

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

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

BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont (Independent)

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND HUMAN RESOURCES

MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana, *Chairman*

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

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

EX OFFICIO

TOM DAVIS, Virginia
HENRY A. WAXMAN, California

J. MARC WHEAT, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
MARK PFUNDSTEIN, *Professional Staff Member*
MALIA HOLST, *Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on March 14, 2005	1
Statement of:	
McIntosh, Robert W., Associate Regional Director, Planning and Partnerships, Northeast Region, National Park Service	9
Thornburgh, Richard, president, the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation; David Booz, Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg; Joy Oakes, director, National Parks Conservation Association; and James Lighthizer, Civil War Preservation Trust	34
Booz, David	44
Lighthizer, James	74
Oakes, Joy	53
Thornburgh, Richard	34
Letters, statements, etc., submitted for the record by:	
Booz, David, Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg, prepared statement of	47
Lighthizer, James, Civil War Preservation Trust, prepared statement of	77
McIntosh, Robert W., Associate Regional Director, Planning and Partnerships, Northeast Region, National Park Service, prepared statement of	14
Oakes, Joy, director, National Parks Conservation Association, prepared statement of	56
Souder, Hon. Mark E., a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of	5
Thornburgh, Richard, president, the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation, prepared statement of	37

THE NATIONAL PARKS: WILL THEY SURVIVE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS?

MONDAY, MARCH 14, 2005

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:11 a.m., in room 260 of the College Union Building at Gettysburg College, Hon. Mark Souder (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representative Platts.

Staff present: Mark Pfundstein, professional staff member; and Malia Holst, clerk.

Mr. SOUDER. Subcommittee will now come to order. Good morning, and thank you all for joining us. This hearing is the first in a series of hearings about budget and management issues facing the National Park Service given budget shortfalls.

The Committee on Government Reform is the oversight committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. As such, it is the mandate and the duty of the Government Reform Committee to scrutinize the workings of the U.S. Government. House Rule X, clause 4(c)(2) states that the Government Reform Committee may "at any time conduct investigations of any matter without regard to committee jurisdiction." The Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources has oversight jurisdiction over issues outlined in its name, as well as a large swath of the Federal Government not explicitly named in its name, including the National Park Service.

The mission of the National Park Service is to "promote and regulate the use of the national parks, which purpose to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

In its nearly 90-year history—by the way, our subcommittee—our full Committee on Government Reform, is 100 years old. In its 90-year history the National Park Service has grown substantially from 36 units in 1916 to 388 units today. There are 57 units called national parks, the so-called crown jewels of the National Park Service. Other commonly used titles include the national historic sites, 77; national monuments, which are 74; national historical parks, which are 41; national memorials, of which there are 29; national recreation areas, which there are 18; and national preserves,

of which there are 18. Each unit is distinctive, and each unit has its own unique problems and challenges. Moreover, as the National Park Service has grown, the demands on its resources have also grown. This is the first of a series of hearings examining each type of Park Service unit, or at least most of the types, and various aspects of park operations as they relate to the National Park Service's mission.

The National Park Service is one of the most recognized and appreciated government agencies. Each year millions of people visit the 388 units of the National Park Service. They expect to see the friendly faces of park rangers dressed in their familiar green uniforms greeting them at the gate and assisting them throughout the park.

I began my visits to the National Park when I was very young and in my lifetime have visited parks all over the country, from Alaska to Florida to Hawaii and everywhere in between. I have no National Park Service units in my district, but I fight for better National Park Service every chance I get.

As a member of the House committee—as a former member because I took leave this year to go back to Education for 2 years—as a former member of the House Committee on Resources, I have been able to focus a great deal of attention on the National Park Service. Under the capable leadership of Resources Committee Chairman Richard Pombo of California, the problems facing National Park Service have been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives. I hope the fresh perspective of my hearing bring to this issue will build on whatever the committee has accomplished and result in a better National Park Service.

We will continue to work with the Resources Committee, because anything that comes out of our hearing would have to go through Chairman Nunes' subcommittee and then the full Committee on Resources. These are oversight hearings to generally look at the problem in a systematic way.

Each and every park is different. Each and every park I have visited tells a different part of the story of America. Although there are vast differences from park to park, the desire to preserve and protect our natural, cultural, and historic heritage remains constant.

The preservation of our natural, cultural, and historical heritage is of the utmost importance so that future generations will know the history of their country and be able to enjoy the natural grandeur of God's creation. As the Park Service budget has come under greater pressure, the parks have suffered. If these pressures continue to grow, I believe that the National Park Service's ability to adequately achieve their stated mission may be in doubt.

In the recent past President George W. Bush has devoted more money toward alleviating the maintenance backlog. Congress has boosted National Park Service funding, particularly in the last fiscal year. We have done a letter—Congressman Lewis and myself and many others have supported additional funding, and we have been able to increase that funding at a time when all the government funding has been relatively flat.

But while this interest in the Park Service is deeply appreciated, ongoing and constant attention must be paid to this problem. This

series of hearings will examine the National Park Service's fulfillment of its mission. Over the course of the 109th Congress this subcommittee will conduct a series of hearings—both in Washington, DC, and around the Nation, that examine the state of the national parks, the fulfillment of their mission, and the reasons behind it.

Our plan is to study all kinds of parks in all the regions of the country. The hearing at Gettysburg National Military Park will focus on historical parks, particularly Civil War-related units, and parks in this region. We will also look at public-private partnerships.

We have a variety of witnesses here today, including a representative of the National Park Service. Also present are the Honorable Richard Thornburgh, former Governor of Pennsylvania, now of the Gettysburg Museum Foundation; David Booz of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg; Joy Oakes of the National Parks Conservation Association; and a Mr. James Lighthizer of the Civil War Preservation Trust.

Joining me today on the dais is Congressman Todd Platts, in whose congressional district we currently sit. He is also a member of the Government Reform Committee and also a great friend of the National Parks. We appreciate his interest in this topic and his presence here today. We also want to thank Gettysburg College for being our wonderful host and allowing us to do this.

For those of you who aren't familiar—I mentioned the Government Reform Committee does oversight on a wide variety of topics. Our subcommittee spends about 50 percent of its time on narcotics issues, although we do a wide range, our committee, since the time I have been in Congress since 1994, has done a wide variety of oversight hearings including the first Travel Office allegations in the last administration in that and the FBI files and tribal gaming questions, which many people in the Interior are familiar with as well on those issues, issues related to—probably the most prominent that you may have heard of the last few days is Thursday we subpoenaed seven Major League baseball players for a steroid hearing. Those are the things that our committee does.

It is unusual because we also have subpoena power, as Major League Baseball is learning. We also have the ability to prosecute witnesses for perjury, which we have done. And we have the ability to ask for all emails and phone records, which is why our committee is substantially different, as you will see today. Each witness is sworn in, unlike what happens in most committees because Congress has devised to have an Authorizing Committee, of which resources and the park is to set the laws and the guidelines for how we function.

Then you have an Appropriations Committee, which is to implement and fund those. And then the executive branch takes what Congress has passed and funded to implement the programs. The oversight committee then says, is this being done the way Congress intended it to do? Is it adequate for what Congress intended it to do? And then reports back to the Authorizing and the Appropriating Committee to start the process again.

Hence why we have the right, for example, in the case of Major League Baseball, their whole financial structure and whole leagues

are based on the Anti-Trust Exemption of Congress. So theoretically, if they aren't implementing steroid policy and their whole TV advertising, radio advertising, financial structure, ability to get public stadium financing is based on the will of Congress, we would actually have the right to write legislation demanding an independent, outside steroid testing.

But those things will be discovered through our committee; then, it would go back through the legislative process, and another committee will implement it if those would be the conclusions from our hearing this week.

Well, in the Park Service a similar-type thing is we go through, look at what we see around the county in the Park Service, any proposals, then we go over to the Resources Committee, then to be funded by the Appropriations. Although in many of these cases—or least some may be able to be accomplished through the administration. So that kind of is the overview of what we are doing with these hearings and why we are here today.

I now would like to recognize Congressman Todd Platts for an opening statement. He is also a chairman of a subcommittee of the Government Reform Committee on Government Management, Finance, and Accountability. And just last week we moved one of his bills to his credit, something he has been working on for some time. I would like to yield to my friend and colleague, Mr. Platts.

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

Opening Statement
Chairman Mark Souder

"Preserving and Maintaining the National Parks"

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

March 14, 2005

Good morning, and thank you all for joining us. This hearing is the first in a series of hearings about budget and management issues facing the National Park Service given budget shortfalls.

The Committee on Government Reform is the Oversight committee of the United States House of Representatives. As such, it is the mandate and the duty of the Government Reform Committee to scrutinize the workings of the United States Government. House Rule X, clause 4(c)(2) states that the Government Reform Committee may "at any time conduct investigations of any matter without regard to [committee jurisdiction]." The Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources has oversight jurisdiction over the issues outlined in its name as well as a large swath of the Federal Government not explicitly named in its name, including the National Park Service.

The mission of the National Park Service is ***"...to promote and regulate the use of the...national parks...which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."***

In its nearly 90 year history, the National Park Service has grown substantially from 36 units in 1916 to 388 units today. There are 57 units called national parks, the so-called "crown jewels" of the National Park Service. Other commonly used titles

include national historic sites (77), national monuments (74), national historical parks (41), national memorials (29), national recreation areas (18), and national preserves (18). Each unit is distinctive and each unit has its own unique problems and challenges. Moreover, as the National Park Service has grown, the demands on its resources have also grown. This is the first of a series of hearings examining each type of Park Service unit and various aspects of Park operations as they relate to the National Park Service's mission.

The National Park Service is one of the most recognized and appreciated government agencies. Each year millions of people visit the 388 units of the National Park Service. They expect to see the friendly faces of park rangers dressed in their familiar green uniforms greeting them at the gate and assisting them throughout the park.

I began my visits to the National Parks when I was very young. Over my lifetime, I have visited parks all over the country from Alaska to Florida to Hawaii and everywhere in between. My goal is to visit each National Park unit. I have no National Park Service units in my district, but I fight for a better NPS every chance I get.

As a Member of the House Committee on Resources, I have been able to focus a great deal of attention on the National Park Service. Under the capable leadership of Resources Committee Chairman Pombo, the problems facing the NPS have been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives. I hope the fresh perspective my hearing bring to this issue will build on what his committee has accomplished and result in a better National Park Service.

Each and every park is different. Each and every park I have visited tells a different part of the story of the America. Although there are vast differences from park to park, the desire to preserve and protect our natural, cultural, and historic heritage remains constant.

Preservation of our natural, cultural, and historical heritage is of the utmost importance so that future generations will know the history of their country, and be able

to enjoy the natural grandeur of God's creation. As the Park Service budget has come under greater pressure, the parks have suffered. If these pressures continue to grow, I believe that the NPS' ability to adequate achieve their stated mission may be in doubt.

In the recent past, President George W. Bush has devoted more money toward alleviating the maintenance backlog. Congress has boosted NPS funding, particularly in the last Fiscal Year. While this interest in the park system is deeply appreciated, ongoing and constant attention must paid to this problem.

This series of hearings will examine the NPS' fulfillment of its mission. Over the course of the 109th Congress this Subcommittee will conduct a series of hearings, both in Washington and around the country, that examine the state of the National Parks, the fulfillment of their mission, and the reasons behind it.

Our plan is to study all kinds of parks in all regions of the country. The hearing at Gettysburg National Military Park will focus on historical parks, particularly Civil War-related units, and parks in this region. We will also look at public-private partnerships.

We have a variety of witnesses here today, including a representative of the National Park Service. Also present are The Honorable Richard Thornburgh of the Gettysburg Museum Foundation, David Booz of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg, Joy Oakes of the National Parks Conservation Association, and O. James Lighthizer of the Civil War Preservation Trust.

Joining me today on the dais is Congressman Todd Platts, in whose congressional district we currently sit. He is a Member of the Government Reform Committee, and a great friend of the National Parks. I appreciate his interest in this topic, and his presence here today.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to first just thank you for beginning your series of hearings on the importance of investing in our National Park Service here at Gettysburg. We certainly are proud to have you here at this historic site and also appreciate Gettysburg College hosting this hearing.

I want to affirm my support for the National Park Service and their critically important mission and your efforts in trying to raise awareness of the needs of the Service and meeting that mission. I say that professionally, but I also say it personally. My wife and children and I have enjoyed the national parks for many years and regularly each summer get out to at least one or more parks for some tent camping, although my wife seems to be—maybe she is ready for something other than a tent out there.

But we have enjoyed the parks, and I think the mission today is to help raise awareness of the needs of the Park Service so that future generations can also enjoy the parks, as we have, and past generations. So I appreciate your efforts and look forward to working with you on the needs of the Park Service.

I do want to say up front that we are delighted to have all the witnesses and look forward to the testimony. I want to say I am especially honored to be here with Governor Thornburgh presenting. My first official job out of college was as an information writer for the Governor in 1984 and honored to be in his presence once again. So, Governor Thornburgh, great to have you.

So thank you, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to our testimony.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. And I would now like to recognize President Will to give us a greeting. I should have done that before my statement. I apologize.

Ms. WILL. Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning, everyone, and welcome to Gettysburg College. I am Kate Will; I am the president. And I would like especially to welcome Congressman Mark Souder of Indiana; Pennsylvania Congressman Todd Platts, of whom you have already heard from; former U.S. Attorney General and Pennsylvania Governor Dick Thornburgh; and I would also like to welcome representatives of our national parks, who are here today to testify, and all of you from the general public who have also shown interest and come today. We are very happy to have you at the college.

And Gettysburg College was founded in 1832, which, of course, was before the historic battle that occurred here. And we really are on hallowed ground. If you look out that window, you will see the national park. It is visible right from here.

I invite all of you to look around campus. As you know, it is a historic place. There are several Civil War buildings here. In fact, my office is in Pennsylvania Hall, which served as a hospital during the battle here in Gettysburg. And, of course, you are all welcome to take a look and see our beautiful town, our beautiful college, and, of course, the battlefield.

This is a place that calls to people. It called to me. And part of the reason that I came to Gettysburg College is because of this amazing park that is here. It is such a place to learn, it is an inspirational place, and, in fact, it calls to over 2 million people who come here to visit every year.

So I am very proud to say that through partnerships, Gettysburg College is working with the national park and with the borough, and we are all working hard together in a collaboration to preserve what we think is one of the most special places in America.

So thank you again for being here. We welcome our Congressman for this hearing, and please enjoy Gettysburg and Gettysburg College. Thank you very much.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your welcome. Before proceeding I would like to take care of a couple of procedural matters first. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to submit written statements and questions for the hearing record, 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 Members present be permitted to participate in the hearing. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Our first panel is composed of Robert W. McIntosh, Associate Regional Director for Planning and Partnerships, Northeastern Region of the National Park Service. As an oversight committee, as I mentioned earlier, it is our standard practice to ask all our witnesses to testify under oath. So would you stand and raise your right hand?

[Witness sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let the record show the witness responded in the affirmative. Now we have a light system for 5 minutes, but being a field hearing, I am not going to hold it as tight. So if you want to add to that, otherwise we will draw out in the questions as well. In any statements that you make or any references to other materials, as I mentioned, will also be in the official hearing record. Thank you very much for being here today.

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Thank you, Congressman. Before I start let me thank you and Congressman Platts for taking the initiative, taking the leadership on this very important subject concerning the status of budgets and the health of our national parks.

The topic today from my comments will focus principally on Gettysburg National Military Park, Eisenhower National Historic Site, and Independence National Historical Park.

The 2005 appropriation provided an increase of $63.9 million for operation of the National Park System, a net increase. We are obviously pleased the Congress appropriated this level of funding. The average increase for park budgets this year is approximately 6 percent. Gettysburg received an increase of 6 percent; Eisenhower, an increase of 2½ percent; and Independence National Historical Park, an increase of over 4 percent. Importantly, the President's budget in 2006—recommended budget includes an additional increase of about $50½ million above the 2005 enacted level, importantly allowing for many things, but including increases for pay and benefits and other fixed costs.

The Park Service mission at Gettysburg is to preserve and protect the resources associated with the Battle of Gettysburg and the Soldiers' National Cemetery and to provide an understanding of the events that occurred here within the context of American history.

The park was established in 1895, includes the cemetery and 6,000 acres of historic farm houses, barns, fences, orchards, earthworks, roads, woodlots, and other key features of the battlefield.

The top three priorities for the Gettysburg and Eisenhower are to implement the partnership agreements with the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation to construct a new Visitor Center and rehabilitate portions of the Gettysburg battlefield; and to continue partnership efforts with the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg and others to rehabilitate the battlefield landscapes by bringing back missing features that affected the fighting in the major battle action areas throughout the park; and finally, to implement the Borough of Gettysburg Interpretive Plan with partners to restore and enhance historic assets in the town of Gettysburg and to bring more park visitors into the town.

Gettysburg is the most visited Civil War site in the National Park System and has attracted an average of 1.79 million visitors per year over the last 8 years. Over the past 4 years the park has received operating increases. Operational funding for Gettysburg has increased from $5.069 in fiscal year 2001 to $5.483 in fiscal year 2005. In addition, the park has received funds through the Natural Resource Challenge with an increase from $24,000 in 2001 to $113,000 in fiscal year 2005.

The Superintendent at Gettysburg also manages Eisenhower National Historic Site, and the two parks share staff and resources. At Eisenhower, the National Park Service mission is to protect and preserve the resources associated with Eisenhower National Historic Site and to promote the understanding and appreciation of the life and work of Dwight David Eisenhower. The 690-acre site consists of the home and farm of General and President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Visitation to this site is approximately 72,000 visitors in 2004, and the operating budget for the site steadily increased from $1.036 million in fiscal year 2001 to $1.07 million in fiscal year 2005.

Gettysburg and Eisenhower meet or exceed 50 percent of their 53 Government Performance and Results Act performance goals in fiscal year 2004. Goals that were exceeded including removal of exotic species, improved condition of historic structures, museum collections, educational programs, diversity, and donations. In addition, the park has instituted many management reforms, including the elimination of two supervisory positions, the site manager and the chief of maintenance at Eisenhower, with these duties being assumed by Gettysburg supervisors; and the conversion of three positions from the Park Service employees to private sector services in custodial work, painting, and architecture; and the consolidation of the Personnel Services Office functions with Gettysburg now covering Gettysburg, Eisenhower, Ft. McHenry, Hampton National Historic Site, and Assateague Island National Seashore.

In the past 4 years $20.6 million in appropriated project funding has been provided to Gettysburg National Military Park in Eisenhower in line-item construction, repair/rehab project funding. Congress earmarked $11.9 million of these appropriated funds for the restoration of the Cyclorama Painting and the preservation treatment of the park's artifacts and archival collection, the $6.6 million for the rehabilitation of the Wills House in downtown Gettysburg, which is a recent addition to the park. Cumulatively, from 2001 through 2005 the park has received $3.3 million in funds for repair and rehab in addition to the base operating budget increases and another $689,000 for ongoing maintenance need.

Much has been accomplished at Gettysburg since the Park Service began the implementation of the park's General Management Plan, which was approved in 1999. The GMP calls for the restoration of the battlefield and sets forth clear goals for operating the park. Recent implementation efforts including the removal of the Gettysburg Tower, the restoration of historic vistas, the replanting of historic orchards, the restoration of numerous monuments, and the acquisition and restoration of historic landscapes.

The Park Service has been the fortunate beneficiary of generous donations from local partner groups and other resources. Funds and services from the Friends of the National Park at Gettysburg, Eastern National, and other sources over the past 4 years have proved approximately $1½ million.

Gettysburg includes a major partnership with the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation for fundraising, design, construction, and operation of the new Museum/Visitor Center for the park. The new facility will solve longstanding park problems associated with the preservation of the park's museum collection, preservation and display of the Cyclorama painting, and the provision of a museum complex to provide visitors with an understanding of the significance of the Battle of Gettysburg within the context of the cause and consequences of the American Civil War, and finally, the removal of two outdated visitor facilities and the restoration of historic battle landscapes where the buildings currently reside.

The partnership will provide infrastructure funding at Gettysburg amounting to $68.3 million, which is the total cost to design and construct the Museum/Visitor Center facility, including the museum exhibits. Conservation of the Cyclorama painting is currently underway and is estimated at $9 million. The Museum Foundation's total fundraising goal is $95 million. They have secured $67.4 to date, including the $11.9 million of Federal funds appropriated by Congress in fiscal year 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005. Under the agreement signed by the Park Service and the Museum Foundation, all operation and maintenance cost of the Center will be covered by the Foundation for the next 20 years. Groundbreaking is tentatively scheduled for June 2005, assuming the Foundation has raised the $68.3 million by that time. And the hopeful opening of the Center will be 2004 or early 2008.

An older National Park Service non-profit partner is the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg. Founded in 1889, the Friends is a multipurpose support organization with 25,000 members and supporters from all over the world. Since its inception, the group

has donated more than $6 million to the park at Gettysburg, and the Friends members have logged in more than 15,000 volunteer hours. The Friends have acquired historically significant battlefield lands, and in many cases clearing the way for the National Park Service to remove non-historic buildings and rehabilitate the landscape, and most notably, the fields of Pickett's Charge and along the Emmitsburg Road Ridge. They have also acquired conservation easements in the Battlefield Historic District.

As the park's primary partner in battlefield rehabilitation—an effort to bring back missing features that affected the fighting at Gettysburg in 1863—the Friends purchased the orchard stock for the replanting of five historic orchards on the battlefield in November 2004. Friends have converged on the battlefield to rebuild historic fences, help visitors get a better picture of the obstacles the soldiers faced during the heavy fighting. The Friends also acquire and donate artifacts for the park's museum.

Finally, Gettysburg and Eisenhower's active volunteer programs include visitor services, Adopt-a-Position volunteers, Park Watch patrol volunteers, Civil War living history volunteers, Senior Ranger Corps, and others.

At Independence, the purpose of that park is to preserve and protect the historical structures and properties of outstanding national significance associated with the American Revolution and the growth and founding of our Nation.

The park was established in 1948 and includes Independent Hall, the Liberty Bell, and other national historic landmarks. It encompasses 55 acres in downtown, city center Philadelphia. In 2004 nearly 1.9 million visitors visited the Liberty Bell.

The top three priorities of Independence are to finalize the long-term security plans for the Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, especially in light of the city's decision to reopen Chestnut Street, and to complete construction of the landscape treatment of Independent Mall and to complete the President's House Site Interpretation and Commemoration.

Funding for Independence has increased from $15.18 million in fiscal year 2001 to $21.856 million in fiscal year 2005. These increases primarily funded additional visitor services and security costs following the attacks of September 11th. Augmenting these base funds were $2½ million from 2001 to 2005 for ongoing repair and rehabilitation.

Congress has addressed the infrastructure needs of Gettysburg by appropriating $17 million in the past 4 years in line-item construction and repair/rehabilitation projects. $6½ million of this was for the rehabilitation of Independence Square, and $6.6 million was for the utility and exhibit work at the Second Bank of the United States. Funding was also provided to continue work on Independence Mall landscape project and to replace hazardous walkways elsewhere in the park.

Independence and the Liberty Bell have been designated by the Secretary as key resources that merit special anti-terrorism security measures. Since September 11th the budget for the park's law enforcement operation has increased by approximately $5.2 million, from $2.4 to $7.6 million.

Independence has been at the forefront in establishing effective partnerships to provide high-quality services to the visiting public. Most notably, these efforts include the jointly operated Independence Visitor Center, which recorded about 1.9 million visitors in 2004. The new National Constitution Center, which saw almost 800,000 visitors in 2004, and Historic Philadelphia, Inc., which provides costumed actors throughout the park. In addition to these, there are about 40 other different partnerships in the park. In fiscal year 2003, 211 volunteers logged about 13,000 hours in contributions to the park.

Once again, let me thank you both for being here and conducting this hearing. And I would be pleased to answer any questions you might have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McIntosh follows:]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT W. MCINTOSH, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR FOR PLANNING AND PARTNERSHIPS, NORTHEAST REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE, CONCERNING THE FUNDING STATUS OF GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

March 14, 2005

I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity to appear today to discuss the status of Gettysburg National Military Park, Eisenhower National Historic Site, and Independence National Historical Park. First, on behalf of the National Park Service, I would like to acknowledge and thank Congress for its continuing support of these three areas as well as the entire National Park System.

The FY 05 Appropriation provided a net increase of $63.9 million for operation of the National Park System. We are pleased that Congress appropriated this level of funding. The average increase to park budgets this year is approximately 6 percent. Gettysburg National Military Park's increase is 6 percent, Eisenhower National Historic Site's increase is 2.5 percent, and Independence National Historical Park's increase is over 4 percent. The President's FY 2006 budget continues the large increases from last year and includes an additional $50.5 million above the 2005 enacted level, allowing for, among other things, increases for pay, benefits, and other fix costs.

Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site

The National Park Service mission at Gettysburg National Military Park is to preserve and protect the resources associated with the Battle of Gettysburg and the Soldiers' National Cemetery and provide an understanding of the events that occurred here within the context of American history.

The park, established on February 11, 1895, includes the Soldiers' National Cemetery, and 6,000 acres of historic farmhouses, barns, fences, orchards, earthworks, roads, woodlots, and other key features of the battlefield.

The top three priorities for the Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site are to implement the partnership agreement with the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation to construct new visitor facilities and rehabilitate portions of the Gettysburg battlefield; to continue partnership efforts with the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg and others to rehabilitate Gettysburg battlefield landscapes by bringing back missing features that affected the fighting in the major battle action areas throughout the park; and to

implement the Borough of Gettysburg Interpretive Plan with partners to restore and enhance historic assets in the town of Gettysburg and to bring more of the park's visitors into the town.

Gettysburg is the most visited Civil War site in the National Park System, and has attracted an average of 1.79 million visitors per year over the past eight years. Over the past four years, the park has received operating increases. Operations funding for Gettysburg has increased from $5,069,000 in FY 01 to $5,174,000 in FY 04 to $5,483,000 in FY 05. In addition, the park has received funds through the Natural Resource Challenge, which increased from $24,000 in FY 01 to $113,000 in FY 05.

The Superintendent of Gettysburg National Military Park also manages Eisenhower National Historic Site and the two parks share staff and resources. At Eisenhower, the National Park Service mission is to protect and preserve the resources associated with Eisenhower National Historic Site and to promote understanding and appreciation of the life and work of Dwight David Eisenhower. The 690-acre site consists of the home and farm of General and President Dwight D. Eisenhower. Visitation to the site was 72,000 in 2004. Operations funding for the site also steadily increased from $1,036,000 in FY 01 to $1,045,000 in FY 04 to $1,071,000 in FY 05.

Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site met or exceeded 50 of their 53 Government Performance and Results Act performance goals in FY 04 (94%). Goals that were exceeded included removal of exotic species, condition of historic structures and museum collections, educational programs, diversity, and donations. In addition, the parks have instituted many management reforms including the elimination of two supervisory positions, the Site Manager and the Chief of Maintenance at Eisenhower National Historic Site, with the duties assumed by Gettysburg supervisors; the conversion of three positions from National Park Service employees to the private sector (a custodial worker, a painter, and an architect); and the consolidation of the Personnel Servicing Office function with Gettysburg National Military Park now covering five parks (Gettysburg, Eisenhower, Ft. McHenry National Historic Site, Hampton National Historic Site, and Assateague Island National Seashore).

Congress has been generous in addressing infrastructure needs. In the past four years, $20.6 million in appropriated project funding has been provided to Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site in line-item construction, and repair/rehabilitation project funding. Congress earmarked $11.9 million of these appropriated funds for the restoration of the Cyclorama Painting and the preservation treatment of Gettysburg National Military Park's artifact and archival collections and $6.6 million for the rehabilitation of the Wills House, a recent addition to the park. Cumulatively from FY 01 through FY 05, the park also received $3.3 million in funds for repair and rehabilitation as an addition to its base operations budget, and another $689,000 for ongoing maintenance needs.

Much has been accomplished at Gettysburg since the National Park Service began the implementation of the park's General Management Plan (GMP) in 1999. The GMP calls for the restoration of the battlefield and sets forth clear goals for operating the park. Recent

implementation efforts include the removal of the Gettysburg Tower, the restoration of historic vistas, the replanting of historic orchards, the restoration of numerous monuments, and the acquisition and restoration of historic landscapes.

The National Park Service has been the fortunate beneficiary of generous donations from local partner groups and other sources. Funds and services from the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg, Eastern National, and other sources over the past four years have provided approximately $1.5 million a year.

The Gettysburg GMP includes a major partnership with the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation for fundraising, design, construction, and operation of a new Museum/Visitor Center for the park. The new facility will solve long-term park problems associated with (1) preservation of the park's museum collections, (2) preservation and display of the Cyclorama painting, (3) provision of a museum complex to provide visitors with an understanding of the significance of the Battle of Gettysburg within the context of the causes and consequences of the American Civil War, and (4) removal of two outdated visitor facilities and restoration of the historic battle landscapes upon which the buildings currently reside.

The partnership will provide infrastructure funding at Gettysburg National Military Park amounting to $68.3 million, which is the total cost to design and construct the Museum/Visitor Center facility, including museum exhibits. Conservation of the Cyclorama painting is currently underway and is estimated to cost $9 million. The Museum Foundation's total fundraising goal is $95 million. They have secured $67.4 million to date, including $11.9 million in federal funds appropriated by Congress in FY 02, FY 03, FY 04, and FY 05. Under the agreement signed by the National Park Service and the Museum Foundation, all operations and maintenance costs for the Museum/Visitor Center will be covered by the Museum Foundation for the next 20 years. Groundbreaking is tentatively scheduled for June 2005, assuming the Foundation has raised the $68.3 million by that time, with a projected date for opening in late 2007 or early 2008.

An older National Park Service non-profit partner is the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg (Friends). Founded in 1989, Friends is a multi-purpose park support organization with 25,000 members and supporters all over the world committed to assisting the Gettysburg and Eisenhower parks with mission-related projects in the areas of land preservation, monument preservation/ cannon-carriage restoration, education, battlefield rehabilitation and museum artifacts.

Since its inception, Friends group has donated more than $6 million to the National Parks at Gettysburg, and Friends members have logged more than 15,000 volunteer hours. Over the years, Friends of Gettysburg has acquired historically significant battlefield lands, in many cases clearing the way for the National Park Service to remove non-historic buildings and rehabilitate battlefield landscapes, most notably the fields of Pickett's Charge and along Emmitsburg Road Ridge. They also have acquired conservation easements on historic properties in the Battlefield Historic District.

As the park's primary partner in battlefield rehabilitation – an effort to bring back missing features that affected the fighting of the Battle of Gettysburg in 1863—Friends purchased the orchard stock for the replanting of five historic orchards on the battlefield in November 2004. For years, Friends volunteers have converged on the battlefield to rebuild historic fences, helping visitors get a better picture of the obstacles the soldiers faced during heavy fighting. Friends also acquire and donate artifacts to the park's museum collections.

Ongoing Friends events and programs like Doors Open Gettysburg, seminars, traveling trunks, and the cannon carriage restoration shop advance the mission of the park to preserve the resources associated with the Gettysburg battlefield and the Soldiers' National Cemetery and improve the visitor's understanding of the significance of Gettysburg. These partnership efforts benefit the parks and deepen the connection of the public to our national parks and monuments.

Finally, Gettysburg and Eisenhower's active volunteer programs include visitor services volunteers, Adopt-a-Position volunteers, Park Watch patrol volunteers, Civil War living history volunteers, the Senior Ranger Corps, and others. Volunteers provide interpretive services, assist with maintenance and preservation projects on the battlefield, and provide Civil War living history encampments and historic weapons demonstrations, and other activities.

Independence National Historical Park

The National Park Service mission at Independence National Historical Park is to preserve and protect historical structures and properties of outstanding national significance associated with the American Revolution and the growth and founding of the United States.

The park, established on June 28, 1948, includes Independence Hall, the Liberty Bell, and other national historic landmarks. It encompasses 55 acres on 20 city blocks within the City of Philadelphia.

Independence is one of the most visited cultural resource sites within the National Park System. In 2004, nearly 1.9 million visitors saw the Liberty Bell, and the park recorded a total of nearly 7.3 million combined visits to all of its buildings.

The top three priorities for Independence National Historical Park are to finalize the long-term security plans for the two icons, Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, in light of the City of Philadelphia's decision to re-open Chestnut Street; to complete construction of the landscape treatment for Independence Mall in accordance with the approved Mall Master Plan; and to complete the President's House Site Interpretation and Commemoration as required in previous appropriation bill language.

Over the past four years, operations funding for Independence has increased from $15,180,000 in FY 01 to $21,016,000 in FY 04 to $21,856,000 in FY 05. These increases primarily funded additional visitor services and security costs following the attacks on 9/11. Augmenting these base funds were $2.5 million from FY 01 to FY 05 for ongoing repairs and rehabilitation of facilities.

Congress has addressed the infrastructure needs of Independence National Historical Park by appropriating $17 million in the past four years in line-item construction and repair/rehabilitation project funding. $6.5 million of this was for the rehabilitation of Independence Square and $6.6 million of it was for utility and exhibit work at the Second Bank of the United States. Funding also was provided to continue work on the Independence Mall landscape project, and to replace hazardous walkways elsewhere in the park.

Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior as key resources that merit special anti-terrorism security measures. Minimum staffing levels at these two icons have been established by the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior's Office of Law Enforcement Services. Since 9/11, the budget for the park's law enforcement operation has increased by approximately $5.2 million from $2.4 million to $7.6 million. These funds have been utilized to institute screening and perimeter security measures at both of these icons. This funding also provided increased visible law enforcement presence through additional park rangers and contract guards.

Independence has been at the forefront in establishing effective partnerships to provide high-quality services to the visiting public. Most notably, these efforts include the jointly operated Independence Visitor Center, which recorded about 1.9 million visitors in 2004, the new National Constitution Center, which saw almost 800,000 visitors in 2004, and Historic Philadelphia, Inc., which provides costumed actors throughout the park at no cost to the NPS. These three are among the forty different partnership entities who work closely with Independence to provide quality visitor and educational services.

The Volunteer in Parks (VIP) program at Independence helps to educate visitors about the national significance of the park and contributes to the preservation of park resources. In Fiscal Year 2003, 211 volunteers logged over 13,000 hours, the equivalent of more than 7 full-time employees. The net financial benefit to the park of this volunteer effort has been estimated to be almost $200,000.

Once again, I thank you for this opportunity to testify before the committee on the status of funding at Gettysburg National Military Park, Eisenhower National Historic Site, and Independence National Historical Park. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. I will start with some questions, and some of these may be more detailed than you are prepared to handle today. And if so, could you indicate and we will submit them as written questions. I want to put some of them on the record even knowing that because it is kind of fundamental to the information that we are seeking in the hearings. I am going to address a few that will include Gettysburg and some about Gettysburg, although I may go a little broader and into some of the other parks in a little bit more detail, because the second panel will be almost exclusively—or at least for the most part focused on the Gettysburg Military Park and Civil War Parks.

Could you clarify for the record that your regional office—what territory you cover.

Mr. MCINTOSH. The northeast region encompasses 13 States, Maine to Virginia, West Virginia.

Mr. SOUDER. And for purposes of today's hearing, since we are planning at least at this point to do something most likely in the Boston area—we will separate New England—so basically—and any materials I request or questions would be New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, District of Columbia, West Virginia region. You said that there are approximately 1.7 million people who go through Gettysburg National Military Park, about 1.9 million at the Liberty Bell. Do you know from their statistics you had 7.2 million, I think, for the whole—all the buildings at Independence——

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is correct.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Does anybody—what percent don't go to Liberty Bell? Would you say the Liberty Bell is pretty well a barometer of the——

Mr. MCINTOSH. I think that the way the security operation operates now that the Liberty Bell tour includes the Independence Hall as well, so it is—I think that is the—from the tourism, you know, destination, that is the majority of visits, but there are a lot of other assets in the park that attract visitors, many in some respects more local, recurring visitors. So there is a number much more significant and——

Mr. SOUDER. So——

Mr. MCINTOSH [continuing]. I am not sure exactly how it is counted, but that number does exceed the 1.9. And the——

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, so maybe 2½ or something like—because if I went to three or four sites, I would be counted three or four times in the——

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is what——

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. System.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. Is the largest attendance in your area the Gateway? Is it around——

Mr. MCINTOSH. The recreation area?

Mr. SOUDER. Isn't it like 12 to 14 million, something——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes, the—yes.

Mr. SOUDER. Which is an interesting challenge for the Park Service because Golden Gate, Gateway, Santa Monica are actually now five times bigger than the biggest single park in attendance. Now at Gateway is that predominantly because of the beach there? Is that the No. 1 attended——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Most of the visitation at Gateway is day use at the beaches. That is correct.

Mr. SOUDER. Because that makes it very hard to figure out how to use attendance and how to qualify attendance when we are looking at it in terms of budget. For example, Natchez Trace Parkway is seventh, but that is because people use the road.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. SOUDER. The danger here is because some of my questions are going to be—and I want to put that on the record so people understand the complexity, and that we understand the complexity, of when we get into a budgeting process, do you look at attendance—how do you determine when you are allocated funds internally or you are making recommendations from the regional area? Do you look at something like Gettysburg National Military Park as opposed to, say, the Eisenhower site or as opposed to several others that you have clustered together here in this region where you have, for example, Ft. McHenry and Hampton, do you look at—that there are 1.7 million at Gettysburg and 70,000 at Eisenhower in your budgeting requests? What kind of tradeoffs do you have in making decisions about what backlog you are going to fund, what land you are going to add, and can you go through a little bit of that process?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, I think that the numbers, as far as visitation are concerned, indicate impact on the resources. And be it a day visitor to Gateway Beach or a visitor to a historic house, the continuation of those visits obviously impacts the resources. But the primary factor that we use in determining the allocation of money is not the visitor, but the condition of the resource. So that while there may be a contribution of condition as far as visitor use is concerned, that is not as important to us—it may be a causal effect in terms of condition—but the real budgetary criteria falls in the condition of the resource. So even though we had low visitation, if a nationally significant resource was in danger, we would certainly give that its appropriate place on the priority list.

Mr. SOUDER. So, for example, when something like the Wills House came up where Lincoln stayed with the Gettysburg Address, what would be some measurements of how you would determine whether that would become on a request list as opposed to something at a site that may not get as much visitation or may not be as nationally significant——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well——

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. That needs maintenance, for example?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right. Well, first of all, the, you know, the multiple factors that we use in project justification and condition of the resource is, generally speaking, the primary one. At the park level the park needs to make a decision as to what its priorities are, and then that is through the region and then into a national priority setting analysis. We use it across the board annually to try to set or readjust our annual priorities.

So the condition of the resource is a factor in the budget analysis that we use. The cost of repair is also a factor. So it is a balancing act, obviously, between condition of resource and how much it is going to cost, and we try to set the priorities in that respect.

Mr. SOUDER. So when you would—you see yourself in the regional office speaking for the Park Services, predominantly looking at how to maintain what you have the best, not looking at historic resources outside the park that would be important to add to the system?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I am not sure if I——

Mr. SOUDER. In other words, when I use the example of the Wills House, let us say before the Wills House came into the system, would you look at something like that in Gettysburg and say adding that to our system is more critical than, say, taking down and replanting the peach orchard on the battlefield, maintaining a monument from a given state? I am trying to sort this out.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, I mean, that question directs us to the general management lending process. And through that process we try to do, you know, maybe on an average of, say, 10 to 15 years for every park. We have the opportunity to look at the resource that exists within the boundary, and in certain cases we look at important resources that may have not been appreciated at the time the park was originally established, but over a historical work or public appreciation or otherwise, become more important to us. And we look at what the opportunity or what the appropriate role for the National Park Service is in protecting those resources. And in many cases you will find that our General Management Plans result in minor boundary modifications where important resources should be protected within the park's resources.

The tradeoff sometimes is restoration work of an orchard can wait because nothing is being lost particularly in that sense. You are recreating a scene as opposed to a historic structure that, if the roof isn't fixed or the foundation or whatever the problems may be, that structure could be lost permanently. So that clearly is a tradeoff factor that gets very serious consideration.

Mr. SOUDER. Let me ask you a couple of technical things if you can provide them for the committee if you don't have it. Do you believe the park budgets of the last 3 years have eliminated the shortfalls identified in the business plans? In other words, as you have laid out these business plans, the funding hasn't kept up with those plans. What percentage of the gap has the supplemental covered?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, I can't answer the question specifically in terms of what the supplemental gap has been recovered. I think the General Management Plans and the business plans present the service with an interesting opportunity to get a comprehensive snapshot of the condition of a park, and it provides the park the opportunity to develop what we call the investment strategies, which may not—and in many cases do not—rely solely on appropriated dollars.

The example here in the testimony with respect to Gettysburg and the partnerships with the Friends and the partnership with the Foundation are key elements to implement the General Management Plan are to work toward solving some of the problems that were identified in the business plans. The percentage of gap, I am not sure if that is an answer that has a real black-and-white answer, but if you would like us to followup on that, we could do that.

Mr. SOUDER. Actually, rather than that, let me ask you these two questions I would like followup on, and just arbitrarily pick a small number of parks so we don't have a huge paperwork question. Let me pick Gettysburg, Independence, Valley Forge, Antietam, and Ft. McHenry to pick a pretty wide range. Actually, rather than Ft. McHenry, let us do Gateway because it is the biggest. And of those, what I would like is the percentage of rise in the fixed cost; that is, the salary, the benefits, etc., in the parks and the budget—how the budget of the parks has risen so we can see the proportionate shift, which shouldn't be too hard to get because sometimes Congress makes all these long questions with lots of detail, but that should be fairly simple.

And then second, if you can give me the actual raw number at those parks of the permanent and seasonal staff that were there 4 years ago, and how many they each have today. Now, I want to say up front that this is happening across the board of the government. In other words, every place has had to make adjustments. And that isn't—I think it was the case of whether there was overstaffing before or understaffing today, but we need to have the raw data. And by showing—we need to get a feeling for how fixed costs are changing to the variable costs, which is impacting the backlog, and also what this means for actual numbers of staff in the park.

Clearly Gettysburg, Independence, and Valley Forge are three very significant parks here in Pennsylvania, and if we do that Antietam as another Civil War site and Gateway, that gives us somewhat of a range. Now, I would like to——

Mr. MCINTOSH. In terms of the span of time, we will use 2001 to 2005?

Mr. SOUDER. Yes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. OK.

Mr. SOUDER. Or whatever works. 2000 to 2004, I don't—might not have 2005——

Mr. MCINTOSH. OK.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Platts.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to maybe continue a little bit on the same line. And, Mr. McIntosh, I first want to just thank you for your service and efforts on behalf of the national parks and especially the Northeast region. I have had the pleasure of visiting many of the sites in your region, last summer up in Boston in Constitution and Lexington, Concord——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Excellent.

Mr. PLATTS [continuing]. And it is just a great resource, not just for us adults, but especially for our children and for my son and daughter. It is so great to go experience history through those sites. Here at Gettysburg, I guess probably every member who has the privilege of representing a national park who believes theirs is the most important—or one of the most important. I certainly feel that way about Gettysburg and the key role that this battle here played in our Nation's history.

In what manner does the Park Service go about prioritizing funding from a historic and cultural significance within the Park Service? In other words, within the general budget of the Federal Government, we have set our priorities of what we have funds to spend on. We are going to, you know, make decisions about what we can

spend money on and what we can't within the specific Park Service.

Is there a, you know, additional weighting given to, say, Gettysburg because of the huge historical significance of this site versus some other sites in the Park Service itinerary?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, the first rule of thumb is that every park is a crown jewel, so it doesn't make for easy decisionmaking as far as priorities are concerned. The large blocks of our funding are not generally distributed through natural or cultural, and primarily because you cannot go to a "natural resource park" and not find cultural resources and the vice versa. So within the line-item construction program, which is probably the biggest block of funds that goes toward rehabilitation of historic structures, that is followed by what we call the repair and rehabilitation fund program.

Those projects are individually competed on the status or the condition of the specific resource in that park. So if it is Independence Hall or the Wills House or something in San Francisco in the Presidio, they are independently competing on the conditions of those particular resources. And time and again you will find special initiatives within our budget.

Vanishing Treasures was one of them where we had longstanding issues with adobe structures in the Southwest, and that was a special category of funding that was set up. It was receiving several million dollars a year over many years.

So there are certain situations in which there is particular response, but in general, it is individual resource against resource.

Mr. PLATTS. Is there any thought that you may add in a way—Park A has the most deteriorating, you know, most at-risk structure, but compared to Park B, a structure that maybe isn't in as bad of shape, but it has a greater historical significance to our Nation, is there any thought of giving that type of weighting?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Those independent factors are in the evaluation system, but it is not Gettysburg versus Independence; it is the historic house versus the historic house.

Mr. PLATTS. The commitment—I look at Gettysburg as a Subcommittee Chair for Government Management, Finance, and Accountability, I spend a lot of time on GPRA and didn't maybe know a whole lot about GPRA 3 years ago before I became subcommittee Chair and now know a lot more about the process.

And you reference Gettysburg in the 94 percent of the time where they met or exceeded the 53 GPRA goals, and I think that is a testament to our Superintendent John Lassiter and his great staff. It says we are doing a pretty good job here at Gettysburg with the resources provided.

And the challenge is the level of resources. And I appreciate there have been—and I think in your words—steady increases, but I think it is important that we have a frank dialog about what those increases really mean.

And the chairman kind of alluded to while we have seen increases in money, we, at the same time, are seeing reductions in staff because those increases really don't amount to current value increases when you factor in inflation, fixed cost increases, salaries being mandated by us, and we are not keeping up.

And my understanding in just one may be a snapshot of what the chairman was talking about on permanent staff is that we went from 90 permanent staff in 2002 here at Gettysburg to 80 permanent staff in 2005. So 1/9, 11 percent reduction if my numbers are correct while we saw "steady increases."

The request—I believe it is $50 million in this year's budget—is that, in essence, to just hold the status quo to keep up with, in essence, inflation but not really start to reverse the trend we have been seeing?

Mr. MCINTOSH. To my understanding of the 2005 and the request at 2006 is basically to try to stabilize against that erosion. That is correct.

Mr. PLATTS. Because the challenge is that we were blessed with great rangers and staff throughout these parks, and I will use the experience of visiting the Oregon Caves National Monument two summers ago and just had a wonderful visit and tour through the cave and a great seasonal ranger who was guiding our group. And I wasn't identified as a Member of Congress. I was just a dad there with my wife and children until afterwards I actually then identified myself when we were all done and had a frank conversation with the ranger. And I was saying my daughter, who is 3½, just by a couple of curls of her hair made the height restriction to get into the cave. But when we got done we had a conversation with the seasonal ranger, and what came through to me is we were asking one heck of a lot of these individuals and the sacrifices they are making because of their desire to serve, whether it be our permanent positions or our seasonal positions.

And the importance of us kind of leveling off, hopefully, and reversing that trend, and my hope is that the Park Service will really be pushing Congress to meet the needs of those staffing requirements, because we clearly have a long way to go.

In your identifying priorities at the parks, I want to give you an opportunity to talk about the top three priorities at Gettysburg as well as at Independence. And the items you talk—these certainly are critical items, but one of the ones to me that was missing in the sense of what I would hope you were looking at is the everyday experience of a visitor is that day-to-day operating and that day-to-day funding. Because most of what was identified are capital efforts that are important and we must go forward with and prioritize, but nowhere do you mention just the visitor coming out there. And it relates to a specific percentage.

And my understanding is that today, because of staffing levels, only 5 percent of visitors to our parks are able to access a ranger program or to have the services of a ranger because of the limited number out there. Is that accurate?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I couldn't answer that specifically to my knowledge. I mean, the reality is that a lot of visitors have a very limited interaction with a ranger, and in many cases those services are supplemented by volunteers or supplemented, as in Gettysburg, with Gettysburg tours and other providers. But over the years the ability of the service to maintain a ranger presence, a very visible and active ranger presence, has declined.

Mr. PLATTS. And as one who has benefited again from those interactions, I think that needs to be a priority and would hope

that in the front office in the region that while we look at those capital needs, we make a priority of the day-to-day experience of a visitor. We certainly, I think, are doing that at the local level with our park superintendents and rangers.

But, again, their ability to fulfill that mission is guided by how much money they have, how many people they have. And when you go from 90 to 80, 11 percent reduction, that greatly impacts it.

I want to touch on a specific item, and it relates to the importance of the partnerships. Because we are blessed here in Gettysburg with great partnerships with the Friends, with the Foundation. And if you look at the dollars contributed and the man hours contributed since 1989 by the Friends, tremendous investment in this treasure here at Gettysburg.

And with the Foundation, looking at the capital investment of tens of millions of dollars, it is going to be so important to the future experience of visitors. But as we promote those partnerships here at Gettysburg, one of the issues that, I guess, is of concern to me if I understand this issue correctly, with the new Visitor Center moving forward with the plan—groundbreaking as of—now, I guess, in June of this year and hopefully maybe 87 and opening, one aspect of that partnership between the Friends and the Foundation and the park itself and the Borough is an ability for visitors to experience Gettysburg in total through a transit system.

And I wonder if you have any specific information on funding that was to be provided for the shuttle system that was going to kind of be a key cog in this partnership here in Gettysburg that my understanding is not going forward as planned within the Park Service budget. And I would appreciate your commenting on that.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Congressman, I don't have any real specific information on that. We can followup as a question and provide you that information.

Mr. PLATTS. If you could—actually, on both items, the last two questions, one is if you have any information about visitors' interactions with rangers and if there is any internal review that has been done and how that has been impacted by the budgeting of staff positions.

And then on the specific issue of funding for the shuttle system here and providing information to the committee, that would be very helpful. Because I raise that not just because it is the park I represent, but it is an issue here, and it is important because as we get close to 2 million now visitors to Gettysburg, getting them to come downtown because if they don't, they are going to miss one heck of a big part of the picture of the Battle of Gettysburg and the role the Borough played in the battle—and the sites here, Wills House and the train station and other historic aspects of the Borough.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I would add that we have had some very recent—in the last 4 or 5 years—success at Acadia, in which we have joined with the State and the local communities, and together with donations as well from the private sector operate the Island Explorer, which has many routes throughout the island, but connects the community and the park and takes the cars off the road and gives people a——

Mr. PLATTS. It is a win-win——

Mr. MCINTOSH [continuing]. Much better experience.

Mr. PLATTS [continuing]. I think from—I mean, getting all the vehicle traffic out of the park to better preserve that scene and from convenience—I know you have done it at Zion——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Zion.

Mr. PLATTS [continuing]. Where we have camped and camped there many years ago before it was in place, have camped there since—when it has been in place and think it is a win for the parks and for the visitor of being able to easily access the sites. But is also important that we keep the commitments in. I see the funding for the shuttle system here in Gettysburg—one of those commitments between all the partners, the Foundation, the Friends, the park——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. PLATTS [continuing]. And the borough, and that we on the government's side keep our side of the commitment. And I would welcome some specifics on where that funding stands for the shuttle system here at Gettysburg.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I will followup on that.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. I want to followup with a few more detailed questions. In the question of Independence Hall and the reopening of Chestnut Street.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. Is that the street that goes on the Mall side?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Between the Independence Hall and the Mall, yes.

Mr. SOUDER. There has been a lot of pressure on the city to open that for some time. Did they account for the fact—I mean, one of the things we have been trying to do is not have more traffic go right through the heart of parks. When was that decision made? How recent?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Immediately following September 11th the Chestnut Street was closed. It was closed for some period of time, and then—I would have to research to give you the specific date but——

Mr. SOUDER. It was a year ago.

Mr. MCINTOSH. A year ago. There was a decision on the part of the city to reopen Chestnut Street between the fifth and sixth block, which is the block that runs immediately in front of Independence Hall. That is, you know, it was of concern to the city in terms of the flow of traffic and business, and it certainly continues to be a concern to the National Park Service.

That decision on the part of the city has resulted in the Department of the Interior, the Park Service risk analysis coming back to indicate that is probably the most vulnerable icon in the system because of that decision.

Mr. SOUDER. With the additional rangers that you have had to put there, did you draw those in from other parks?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Originally that was the plan in which we addressed concerns at all the icon parks. More recently, we have changed that venue and actually have contract service security people.

Mr. SOUDER. So for the funding of the contract service security for Independence, was that in addition to the budget or did that come off of that park's budget?

Mr. MCINTOSH. No, Independence received—I don't remember the number exactly. It is in the testimony——

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, I saw that.

Mr. MCINTOSH [continuing]. Of 5 million or so for significant increases, and part of that was for increased——

Mr. SOUDER. And when——

Mr. MCINTOSH [continuing]. Security cost.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. The Park Service came up with that Homeland Security dollars with which to do the—was that part of a national icon budget? Did you have other icons in your region that received supplemental Homeland Security funds——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. As well?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. Did that come out of a pool of money that you each submitted, then, proposals for? How did that work?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That was a national service-wide assessment of what the needs were. For our region that includes the Charlestown Navy Yard where the U.S.S. Constitution is, even though that ship is an active ship in the Navy we hosted at the Navy yard. That includes the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island and Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell. Operating funds as well as capital dollars were provided sort of at the top of the budget for a couple of years to provide that supplemental funding.

Mr. SOUDER. We will followup on whether we want 2000, 2004—2001 to 2005. Can you show us the dollar and the fixed cost? What I am trying to identify is whether, when your region got an increase, how much of that increase went for pensions, health care costs, and staffing, and how much of that went for Homeland Security, and whether, if you take out those two categories, your region actually had a net reduction in funding? So what I think I am seeking is just the total funding for the region——

Mr. MCINTOSH. OK.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. And the total funding of the fixed cost—personnel cost for the region or other fixed cost, and then the Homeland Security costs, and to see, for example, if you have a 3-percent increase, did, in fact, those two things chew up 7 percent? That clearly there has been some backlog addressing, but there has also been—as we will probably discover because we have seen it all over the Nation—a reduction in the number of permanent and part-time personnel, and to some degree, in spite of putting additional dollars at the backlog, we have not had a net gain on the backlog because when one thing gets fixed, another thing is coming along——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Stream. So it is a challenge in trying to figure out, as Congress, how we balance that in tradeoffs. And by the way, I want to make it clear again that I believe there are some efficiencies. The question is how we identify and work these efficiencies. Now, addressing that question, have you—in the Pacific Northwest they have had some networking among the parks

in order to save costs, and so have you done that in your region as well?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes, sir, absolutely. In the "good old days" everybody had to have one of those, but with the ability of the electronic services of things like personnel actions, budget documenting, and payroll expenses, and all that type of stuff, is automated and you can achieve great efficiencies by—as in the case of Gettysburg being the personnel servicing office for several parks in a cluster around this part of the region.

Mr. SOUDER. So you have consolidated certain personnel and administrative functions. Have you worked as they have in the West? And I don't know whether—I am trying to think whether you would have any parks in your area where you have national forest—we don't have much BLM land east of the Mississippi—where you have done joint operations with Fish and Wildlife or with other Department of Interior or Forest Service agencies for campgrounds, for example, and other things?

Mr. MCINTOSH. We don't have that opportunity as much in the East and the Northeast as they do obviously in the West. The park in our region that is surrounded most by national forest lands is—and it is not contiguous either—is Shenandoah in the Western Virginia.

But there is a lot of—at the local level, at the park level—there is a lot of work with other public lands, State or local, and even private operators in trying to achieve a balance of service delivery and understanding whether or not more campgrounds are needed in the park or less, and those types of decisions.

But it is not as—you go to Yellowstone, and there are three property owners on your boundary, and they are the Forest Service and the Jackson Hole and the Official Wildlife Service. In this part of the world you have hundreds on——

Mr. SOUDER. So you think like us at——

Mr. MCINTOSH [continuing]. One side.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Delaware Water Gap?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, there is no Federal land adjacent. There is significant State land. And I know we work pretty hard with both State Departments of Transportation and certain visitor facilities and——

Mr. SOUDER. And one of my frustrations from the time I got involved as a Member of Congress was—before I was a Member of Congress frustration as well, but it is—as a management person—is to why we don't thematically cluster certain parks, both for cross-promotional purposes at the parks—Lewis and Clark was kind of our classic——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. And now—partly because it crossed multiple agencies, but we were kind of forced into it as we have moved toward a long-term planning—but enables the system-wide to look at it and say, here are some parts that are significant that need to be preserved. Here is where the upgrades are. And to look at it across zones and across parks, because much of what you described earlier was internal inside a park prioritizes and then the park gets a budget, but there is no kind of cross-prioritizing. Even in some of the personnel that I believe your testimony listed that

you had a fairly diverse group of parks that have been consolidated for management purposes.

Do you have anything that—because clearly in the Revolutionary War period with the exception of some of us in Indiana and—with George Rogers Clark, there wasn't much activity in the Revolutionary War.

Do you look in your zone—do you have a Revolutionary War management subgroup that would be looking simultaneously at things like Valley Forge, Brandywine, Independence, the Boston parks, Washington Crossing?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Yes, we look at it two ways; we look at it geographically. Most recently we have established the National Parks of New York Harbor, which would include the Manhattan sites, which is several historic—about a half-dozen historic sites in Manhattan—Gateway, the Statue of Liberty, Ellis Island, and the new national monument at Governor's Island. We have established a senior position in New York to oversee that group, and the whole thrust there is that my experience in New York in the 1980's was I was this column over here and there were three or four other columns. We talked but we didn't really work that actively together.

This approach will underscore opportunities in terms of philanthropy. We will underscore better transportation opportunities, or at least try to evolve better transportation opportunities given the potential of the harbor and water-born transportation to move people as we do now, obviously, from Manhattan and New Jersey to the Statue of Liberty, but to provide water access to the beaches as well as the historic sites throughout the park. We also look thematically.

Maybe almost 10 years ago we convened the Civil War Parks—on their own initiation convened a symposium. That resulted in a document called "Holding the High Ground." That spoke to impacts of land use adjacent to battlefield parks. It spoke to issues of interpretation. It spoke to issues of battlefield preservation, landscape preservation, and so on. So that has been a very successful effort that has helped give visibility and some momentum in terms of a budget response to those issues.

There is a parallel effort. We are approaching the 225th with respect to the American Revolution. There is a parallel effort underway involving the Revolutionary War parks. There is a report being finalized—a parallel report to the Civil War Battlefield Commission Report. Congress asked us to do the same thing for the Revolutionary War battlefields. That is substantially completed at this point, so we should see the results of that pretty soon.

So there are activities, but on the other hand, our budget formulation process is still more or less oriented on a park-by-park basis. So there is some evolution that could take place there.

Mr. SOUDER. On the Valley Forge Visitor Center, could you elaborate? Apparently the Park Service has some concerns about the proposals on the table, and how do you see this working through? Could you——

Mr. MCINTOSH. The opportunity there manifested in the discussions between the park and then the Valley Forge Historical Society. We obviously have the park, the park has a collection, the Valley Forge Historical Society had a significant collection that was

99.9 percent in storage. And the conversations between us evolved into the concept of a new Museum Visitor Center for the park. That effort has been in discussion approximately 10 years.

The concept is the creation of a museum to be operated by the non-profit partner, the American Revolutionary War Center, and it to be a self-sustaining project. The estimates for construction are in the order of $80 million. The estimates for the annual operating cost are in the order of $10 million.

And I think the issue—there is several issues, but the issue centers most directly on the financial feasibility of the operation. As well all know, it is easy to raise the capital dollar, but sustaining a $10-million-or-so operating budget is the challenge.

And there is concerns on the part of the Park Service, and there is concerns on the part of the Appropriation Committee that if, you know, all the projections are good, but if they fail, what is the risk and exposure to the National Park Service after you have built an $80 million building? That project is being very actively worked on. It has the direct attention of one our Deputy Directors, Don Murphy. We are now at a stage in which we are doing two things very specific to the budget question; one, undertaking a fundraising feasibility study; and two, we have some third-party interests looking at the pro forma in terms of the operating cost, the revenue streams, the potential revenue streams, and the operating costs, be it from revenues in the museum, be it from donations, or be it from appropriated dollars though the National Park Service.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, I have lots more questions, but I will submit the rest for the record. And before I yield to Mr. Platts I want to do one followup with that. A number of years ago—because I understand the concerns about long-term when we—the public-private partnerships are clearly the way we are going with Visitor Centers, Gettysburg being a classic example.

And let me reiterate, we have to address the transportation question because one of our major selling points that we had for moving the Visitor Center off the grounds was how to integrate into the community.

And I actually, by then, remember Mr. Goodling spoke to one of the retail merchant's groups because he was getting so much heat, and said no, this was how we were going to do it. And we need to figure out how we are going to address that.

Now, some of them need to be public-private partnerships. And the town needs to probably help with this too, and we need to figure out—because these transportation systems—Zion is working reasonably well, Bryce has had multiple problems, Rocky Mountain has been up and down, and Grand Canyon and Yosemite are wild cases that we are trying to work through. Acadia has been no piece of cake.

And as we do this, we have to figure out how we are going to fund it, given the fact that Congress isn't given adequate funds into the park's maintenance budget, let alone for new transportation systems.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. SOUDER. Yet it is absolutely critical, and we made a promise there in this pledge.

But coming back to the Valley Forge Visitor Center that I really don't have a dog in the hunt on the Visitor Center because I am concerned too that these things—if we can raise the capital—how we are going to maintain these given the fact of what we are likely to see as we go through the series of hearings on the staff reductions.

And there is only so much volunteering that is going to be able to cover the gaps. But I am very concerned about historic collections. And my understanding—because we saw what happened at the Adams Historic Site as the private group lost the patience and they split up Adams. And now we will never get it back together.

And then that came into question of what can we do to at least purchase certain things; how can we keep in storage? Somewhere around 8 years ago when I went up—the Bennyhoff collection was in a little museum next to the church on the grounds. Is that the collection that was there?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is a private collection, and the society's collection was in the building at the church.

Mr. SOUDER. Did they get kicked out——

Mr. MCINTOSH. I wouldn't——

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Or are they still there?

Mr. MCINTOSH [continuing]. Put it in those terms, but they have agreed to relocate, yes.

Mr. SOUDER. I think that they did get their lease renewed, which is a nice way of saying it. But they had diaries that were not protected.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Absolutely.

Mr. SOUDER. They had, I think, one of Washington's uniforms. They had the pewter cups from Anthony Wayne, Alexander Hamilton, Von Steuben, De Kalb, all in one place. It was, even at its best, a dusty, musty, little place that probably has the largest collection of Revolutionary War materials in the United States. If this deteriorates and is lost while we are trying to figure out how to do a Visitor Center, what can be done in working with the group to make sure that the artifacts aren't ruined by the time we get a visitor center worked out?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Well, that is a very important question. In the Northeast region we have approximately 25 percent of the collection of the National Park Service. There is another 25 percent in the intermountain region. So between those two regions, which is about 160, 170 parks, are those collections. We were fortunate with Congress's help about 15 years ago to start the real investment in our collections. And as a result of that, you know, step one obviously is the inventory, and whatever number we thought we have is more than has gone out of sight. Because as we tried to count or did count under professional standards, the numbers just continued to get bigger and bigger. You know, somewhat because of new sessions, but probably more importantly, because of our new standardized professional counting, in this region we have a 13-percent growth in our documented collections between 1999 and 2004.

And discoveries in this process—startling discoveries are made every day. In the Longfellow home—the Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's home in Cambridge, MA, only the students of that site know that was also Washington's headquarters during the Revolu-

tionary War when he was in Boston. In the basement, in the shoebox, we found documents signed by George Washington that had survived through generations and fortunately have not been harmed. And the point you raise is a critical, critical point.

We have a collections management plan for the region that is being updated as we speak. We meet about 73 percent of our standards across the region, some parks in very good shape, some parks needing a lot of help. We did a project, again, starting about 10 years ago in the archival conservation of the Olmstead drawings at the Olmstead sight in Brookline, MA. Here we found these drawings, not in the tube to be protected but just roles of paper in the basement in a vault that had two exterior walls. And over time the damp and deterioration of those documents was significant. We were able to set up a conservation lab and preserve them—or conserve them. And we just completed that last summer.

So there is a steady stream of activity, but nonetheless, there are certainly collections in peril in certain locations. The collection at Valley Forge is stored in the administrative buildings at Park Headquarters. It is also stored in some of the houses and buildings throughout the park because of inadequate space that meets professional standards.

The project as it is being developed now would include a territorial storage facility that would house the Park Service's collection, the collection from the Historical Society, and Mr. and Mrs. Bennyhoff have pledged to donate their collection to the park as well. But certainly, they won't do it unless the standards that they would ascribe to are achieved.

So I am not sure what the interim strategy is. I know we continue to monitor our collection and take those safeguards that are necessary, but certainly in the long-term, we are not meeting the standards that we should.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, I really appreciate that the National Park Service has worked hard for kind of the last—certainly 4 or 5 years to get the first standards of how you make these kind of decisions, evaluation of the inventory structures, starting to make some kind of baby steps to, pulling together clusters like Lewis and Clark, like the Lincoln Cemetary, like Civil War battlefields have always been actually a step ahead because the private sector has been so active.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. SOUDER. They need this in the Revolutionary War; we need it for the other major developmental periods of the United States. As someone who sat on park hearing after park hearing where we move many relatively obscure but regionally important or even State important sites into the Federal system——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. And then have a blind eye when formative documents are being destroyed that are foundational to our republic——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Where we have cities and towns across America named after the individuals and where we wouldn't even have all the other here if we didn't have those foundational principles. That somehow there needs to be a hierarchical ranking in-

side the system of primary importance versus kind of mid-tier versus things that are regionally important. And how that regional story fits into the national story is important——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. But not if the national story falls apart. And somehow we have to have some of that kind of effort.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I should add a thought that came to my mind while you were speaking. Thanks to Congressman Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, we were able to achieve in the 2004 budget, I think, approximately $3½ million for the rehabilitation of the museum at Morristown National Historical Park, which is significant because it houses that park's collection, which was definitely in peril.

Mr. SOUDER. I am a little more sensitive than others because those of us in the Great Lakes area basically came right after the formation of the American Republic, and when I see these different things that are at Valley Forge or in some of the Revolutionary War period, and I come from the town of Ft. Wayne, which is named after Anthony Wayne. I have—Hamilton is a town in my district, Steuben County is in my district, De Kalb County is in my district. The map reads like Valley Forge and the Revolutionary War——

Mr. MCINTOSH. Right.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Section, and if you lose kind of the foundational things, they are gone. Mr. Platts, do you have additional questions?

Mr. PLATTS. Just a brief comment. As a native of York, PA, the first capital as those of us in York claim with the Articles of Confederation having been signed there, the first official document uniting us all, your focus on the Revolutionary War history is one that is, well, appreciated by those of us here in the 19th District—and those collections—whether they be the collections here at Gettysburg or the Revolutionary War.

My request is that you take back a message, really, to the Central Office, because there are a lot of issues in Washington that are politicized to a great degree of republican versus democrat. The National Park Service, I believe, is one that has well embraced the importance of it by all Members of the House and less politicized I would hope.

But what is important—because we are pushing you and what you are, you know, representing service and what—you are generating funds for Gettysburg or Independence and all the different sites, but the more frank the Park Service is with Congress in the needs and the examples—some of the examples, because we are lucky here today to have a chairman who has such a passion about these issues and a knowledge. That is not the case with every Member of Congress. But when they hear examples of these collections of our Founding Fathers that are at risk and being lost, not just at risk but have been lost, that is going to hit home.

So my request is that you encourage the Central Office to be very frank, and say yes, we have increased funds in past years, but here is what that really means: we lost staff. We have more for capital investment, but here is what we didn't preserve because of not acting quickly enough. The more frank the Park Service is with Congress in total, especially Appropriations hearings, you know, the

more beneficial it would be to our shared mission here and doing right by the Park Service and all of its assets. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. Thank you for your testimony, and we will be following up with some additional questions. But I gave you a few that would be very helpful.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Good, thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you. If the second panel could now start to make their way to the stage, the Honorable Richard Thornburgh, former Governor and attorney general who is representing the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation; David Booz, Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg; Joy Oakes, Director of the National Parks Conservation Association; O. James Lighthizer, Civil War Preservation Trust. Now that everybody is seated, we will have you stand again for the oath. Will you each stand and raise your right hands?

[Witnesses sworn.]

Mr. SOUDER. Let the record show that each of the witnesses responded in the affirmative. Thank you. I will wait a second. We are moving a little fast, and I want to make sure we get the pictures for the new Visitor Center there for the Governor's testimony. We thank each of you for coming today. This is a unique opportunity.

I know for the NPCA testimony, we will cover more of the whole region, but a great opportunity to look at Gettysburg is kind of the keystone of the Civil War battlefield.

And then I will also look at the area where we have, at least thematically, driven by the outside, started to look at the Park Service as a—looking at a theme as a whole.

So first, we will start with Governor Thornburgh. Thank you for coming today.

STATEMENTS OF RICHARD THORNBURGH, PRESIDENT, THE GETTYSBURG NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD MUSEUM FOUNDATION; DAVID BOOZ, FRIENDS OF THE NATIONAL PARKS AT GETTYSBURG; JOY OAKES, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION; AND JAMES LIGHTHIZER, CIVIL WAR PRESERVATION TRUST

STATEMENT OF RICHARD THORNBURGH

Mr. THORNBURGH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for your attention to this very significant challenge that we face in our country. I am particularly pleased that you are accompanied by Congressman Platts, a fellow alumnus of Pennsylvania State government.

My name is Dick Thornburgh. I am the former Governor of Pennsylvania with a long-time interest in preserving our historic heritage. I appear today as a member of the Board of Directors of the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation. A copy of my biography is attached to my written testimony, which I ask be made part of the printed record.

With me today is Bob Wilburn, president of the Foundation.

In his Gettysburg Address Abraham Lincoln talked of a new birth of freedom. I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear

before you today on behalf of the Gettysburg Museum Foundation to discuss our partnership with the Gettysburg National Military Park in what I believe is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for a new birth for Gettysburg.

This subcommittee is familiar with the challenges that confront the Gettysburg National Military Park. Today I would like to spend my time here reviewing our partnership with the National Park Service, our progress, and how our efforts can help address the park's financial needs.

First, let me tell you of some of the goals we plan to accomplish through out partnership with Gettysburg National Military Park. First, we want people to have a rewarding experience, to stir their emotions, and imagine what it was like for the soldiers who battled on Gettysburg's fields and hills in those first days of July in 1863. Second, we want people to leave Gettysburg with a deeper, more lasting appreciation of what exactly happened here. Third, we want to create a connection with the events of 1863 and to extend that connection to the community, its architecture, its history, and its people.

To accomplish these goals we are seeking to raise a total of $95 million to restore and preserve this national treasure for future generations. Together with the dedicated staff at Gettysburg National Military Park, we will provide the American people with a new, state-of-the-art Museum and Visitor Center, we will ensure high quality interpretation and educational opportunities, restore and fully protect the historic Gettysburg Cyclorama painting, protect and provide for proper display of the artifact and archival collection, and return significant portions of the Battlefield now paved over and covered with buildings as closely as possible to their state during the battle in 1863.

Through our partnership we have the opportunity to accomplish something that the National Park Service would likely never be able to do on its own. As partners, we can provide the time, the resources, and the talent that ensures the Gettysburg experience reaches its full potential.

I might say that the Foundation considers it a genuine privilege to play a role in providing for the future of this historic site.

That is our vision. And now a brief report on our progress. In January 2002 the Foundation released the conceptual design for the new Gettysburg Museum and Visitor Center. The new building will showcase the battlefield, invite visitors to walk the land and more easily appreciate the significance of what happened here.

Teams from the Foundation, the National Park Service, our Advisory Committee of distinguished historians, licensed battlefield guides, and exhibit design consultants have developed plans for the museum's main exhibit galleries, which we organized to help visitors understand and appreciate three major themes. First, the unfinished work of the Declaration of Independence, the causes of the Civil War, and the war itself until June 1863. Second, the actual battle and campaign of Gettysburg, which will comprise about 2/3 of the exhibit galleries. Third, the Gettysburg Address and the Civil War from Gettysburg to Appomattox, reconciliation, and the consequences of the war.

In addition to the new Museum and Visitor Center, the partnership is designed to enhance roads and infrastructure, acquire land, restore the Gettysburg Cyclorama painting, rehabilitate historic landscapes, preserve and enhance display of the park's collection of Civil War artifacts, and equip and furnish the new facilities. The Museum Foundation will operate the new Museum and Visitor Center and after 20 years will donate the land, building, and facilities to the Park Service.

In this regard I should note, in light of the subcommittee's legitimate interest in the financial needs of the park, that this partnership's objectives will do more than provide necessary funding to address significant infrastructure needs of the park.

Since the Museum Foundation will operate at its own expense, the new Museum and Visitor Center for the Park Service for a period of 20 years, the Foundation also will alleviate any additional operating costs the park would otherwise have incurred.

Of our $95-million campaign goal, $68.3 million represents the cost to design and build the new Museum and Visitor Center, including museum exhibits and restoration of the Gettysburg Cyclorama painting.

Last year the foundation announced that we wanted to have in hand $75 million in funding commitments before we actually broke ground. This would ensure that we have sufficient funds to complete the new facilities, while at the same time accounting for gifts and expenses that support the overall project, but not necessarily the Museum and Visitor Center component.

As of today, I am pleased to report that the Foundation has identified $69.4 million toward our $75-million goal, and we will break ground on the new facility on June 2 of this year. Of the total, 17 percent—$11.9 million—has been appropriated by the Congress; 29 percent—$20½ million—comes from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is investing in the project through its Capital Assistance Program. The remaining 54 percent—$37 million—comes from the private sector with $12 million of that to be borrowed from commercial lenders, and the remainder already in hand or pledged from private foundations, corporations, and individuals. Our partnership with Gettysburg National Military Park is an opportunity to help the park address its infrastructure needs and to put in place funding sources that will alleviate future expenses the park will incur.

But more than that, we consider this effort the opportunity of a lifetime to build something of lasting significance. By bringing to light the experiences of 1863, we can help Americans better see the links between the struggles of the Civil War and the challenges we face today.

Nearly 142 years ago, President Lincoln came to Gettysburg to honor the dead. On that occasion in his Address, he urged Americans to be dedicated here to the unfinished work of freedom and democracy. Preserving the battlefield at Gettysburg and making it a classroom of democracy is certainly one way to advance to unfinished work that Abraham Lincoln laid before us.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here today.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Thornburgh follows:]

TESTIMONY OF THE HONORABLE DICK THORNBURGH, MEMBER, GETTYSBURG NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD MUSEUM FOUNDATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES, HOUSE GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

CONCERNING FUNDING NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL PARKS AND THE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK AND THE GETTYSBURG NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD MUSEUM FOUNDATION

March 14, 2005

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee:

My name is Dick Thornburgh. It is an honor to appear before you today as the former Governor of Pennsylvania and as a member of the Board of Directors of the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation. I am beginning my fifth year of service on the Foundation's Board and am pleased to have this opportunity to share with you information about the partnership we enjoy with Gettysburg National Military Park.

(A current biography is attached at (1).)

With me here today is the Foundation's president, Robert C. Wilburn.

The mission of our partnership is to tell the story of the Gettysburg Campaign, to restore and properly preserve the sacred ground - and the significance - of America's most revered Civil War battlefield, to preserve and exhibit Gettysburg's priceless collection of artifacts and archives, including the historic Gettysburg Cyclorama painting, and to give visitors a deeper, more lasting appreciation of what happened here. To accomplish this mission, the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation will raise the necessary funds to restore significant portions of the battlefield to their 1863 appearance and to design, build and operate new Museum and Visitor Center facilities to enhance the Gettysburg experience for the nearly two million visitors who come to Gettysburg National Military Park each year.

(Attachment (2) lists members of the Foundation Board of Directors, the distinguished historians who are members of our Gettysburg Museum Advisory Committee and the members of our National Council who have agreed to work closely with us to support our fundraising and outreach efforts.)

On a personal level, I appreciate your interest in the Foundation's efforts to enhance the Gettysburg experience, and how those efforts serve to address the financial needs of Gettysburg National Military Park. I am delighted to have the opportunity through this Subcommittee to inform the Congress and the American people about our progress, our hopes and our goals. The Foundation appreciates the responsibility it has been granted to share in the preservation and enhancement of our national treasure at Gettysburg. We also are very proud of the progress we have made and our ongoing partnership with the National Park Service.

Before responding to your questions, I would like to spend a few moments discussing our vision for the Museum and Visitor Center and the Gettysburg experience. I also would like to talk about Gettysburg's importance to America, especially at a time when our commitment to freedom and democracy is once again being put to the test.

The Vision and the Challenge

In the Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln talked of a "new birth of freedom." Today, the Foundation believes that the public-private partnership with the National Park Service at Gettysburg offers a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for a "new birth" for Gettysburg.

The heart of our effort is the new Gettysburg Museum and Visitor Center, which will enhance the resources of Gettysburg National Military Park and enable us to protect the sacred ground of our most revered Civil War battlefield. By properly restoring and preserving the battlefield and the park's collection of objects, artifacts and archival materials, we can give visitors a deeper, more lasting appreciation of the events and the meaning of Gettysburg and help them connect that battle with America's continuing commitment to freedom around the world.

Through this partnership, the Foundation can help to ensure that Gettysburg's programs and exhibits invite exploration of our history. That they help us better understand the forces that shaped our national character, and move us to recommit ourselves to the principle that people can govern themselves.

(Attachment (3) is an op-ed I wrote for the Harrisburg Patriot-News several years ago that describes in greater detail my thoughts on the symbols of American freedom that dot the Pennsylvania landscape, as well as the opportunity - and obligation - we all share to commit ourselves to their success.)

Let me tell you some of the goals we want to accomplish through our partnership with the National Park Service:

- We want to educate and to inspire; to promote learning by creating the kind of excitement that makes people thirst to know more.
- We want people to leave Gettysburg with a deeper, more lasting appreciation of what happened here.

- We want people to have a rewarding experience, and also to stir their emotions and enable them to imagine what it was like for the soldiers who battled on Gettysburg's fields and hills in those first days of July in 1863.
- We want to create a connection with the events of 1863 and to extend that connection to the community – its architecture, its history and its people. For the fullest understanding, visitors should know the town of Gettysburg as well as the battlefield.

To achieve those goals, we are seeking to raise a total of $95 million to restore and preserve this national treasure for future generations. Together with the dedicated staff at Gettysburg National Military Park, we will:

- Provide the American people with a state-of-the art Museum and Visitor Center
- Ensure high quality interpretation and educational opportunities
- Restore and fully protect the historic Gettysburg Cyclorama painting
- Protect and provide for proper display of the artifact collection
- Return significant portions of the battlefield, now paved over and covered with buildings, as close as possible to their state during the battle in 1863
- Acquire additional battlefield land to expand the park's buffer area and provide a "decompression zone" to give visitors a better sense of what Gettysburg was like 142 years ago
- Create a permanent endowment to support ongoing annual building maintenance and preservation of the park's collection.

Today at Gettysburg, we have the opportunity to accomplish something that the National Park Service would likely never be able to accomplish on its own. Together, as partners, we can provide the time, money, and talent necessary to ensure the Gettysburg experience reaches its full potential. The Foundation considers it a privilege to have a role in helping to provide for the future of this historic site.

A Progress Report

That is our vision. Let me begin my progress report with a quick summary of the history of the Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation and our partnership with the National Park Service at Gettysburg..

The Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation was established in 1998 to address the needs of the Gettysburg National Military Park, as outlined in the park's General Management Plan. From the beginning, the Foundation believed that a partnership with the National Park Service would be the best way to address the challenges facing this historic treasure. Toward that end, we created an advisory board of noted Civil War scholars to assist us in developing the interpretive plan.

In addition to a new Museum and Visitor Center, the partnership is designed to enhance roads and infrastructure, acquire land, restore the Gettysburg Cyclorama painting, rehabilitate historic landscapes, preserve and enhance display of the park's collection of Civil War artifacts and equip and furnish the new facilities. The Museum Foundation also agreed to operate the new Museum and Visitor Center and, after 20 years, to donate the land, building and facilities to the National Park Service.

In this regard, I should note, in light of the Subcommittee's interest in the financial needs of Gettysburg National Military Park, that this partnership's objectives will do more than provide necessary funding to address significant infrastructure needs at the park. Since the Museum Foundation will operate - at its own expense - the new Museum and Visitor Center for the National Park Service for a period of 20 years, the Foundation also will alleviate any additional operating costs the park would otherwise have incurred.

Following several years of public hearings and comment, the Foundation appointed Bob Wilburn its president in October 2000. Since then, the Foundation has recruited a dedicated board of directors who serve as public ambassadors for the project, developed and implemented a successful fundraising strategy that has enabled us to begin to restore the historic Gettysburg Cyclorama painting and will enable us to break ground for the new facilities in June, and convened design teams to develop the concepts for the new building and museum exhibit galleries.

In July 2001, following a nationwide search, the Museum Foundation, again in partnership with Gettysburg National Military Park, engaged the architectural firm of Cooper, Robertson & Partners, whose work includes Monticello, the city of Charleston, SC, the Museum of Modern Art in New York City and Lincoln Center. We also selected the exhibit design firm of Gallagher & Associates, which has provided similar services for the Smithsonian, the visitor center at Yellowstone National Park, the Museum of Jewish Heritage and the Maryland Museum of African American History and Culture in Baltimore.

In January 2002 we released the conceptual design for the new Gettysburg Museum and Visitor Center. The building blends into the rural Pennsylvania landscape while at the same time taking advantage of state-of-the art exhibitry to tell the Gettysburg story.

(Renderings of the conceptual design for the building, as well as a ground-floor rendering of the building interior, are at Attachment (4).)

The new building will showcase the battlefield, invite visitors to walk the land and more easily appreciate the significance of what happened here. Exhibits will immerse visitors in stories of the Civil War era, as well as the battle. These stories will be told - in the words of the participants - from four important perspectives:

- Commanders, including Abraham Lincoln, George Meade, Jefferson Davis and Robert E. Lee
- Common soldiers, each of whom had his own reasons for fighting

- Civilians, especially the citizens of Gettysburg, whose small crossroads town was overrun by 165,000 soldiers -- the conflict literally entering their homes
- Correspondents, through whose eyes most of America viewed the war.

The new Museum and Visitor Center will give Gettysburg sufficient space to educate. New programs will be put into place, giving visitors a deeper view of what Gettysburg means to our country. The new museum also will include a Cyclorama Gallery, Electric Map/theaters, classrooms, research center, a book and museum store and food service.

Expanded exhibit space and open storage facilities will enable visitors to see more of the park's collection of Civil War artifacts and archives than ever before. With more than 38,000 historic artifacts and 700,000 text documents, maps and photographs, the collection is one of the most extensive in the world. Each object and every document tells a story — of duty, sacrifice and reconciliation.

Teams from the Foundation, the National Park Service, the advisory committee of historians, licensed battlefield guides and exhibit design consultants have developed plans for the museum's main exhibit galleries, which will be organized to help visitors understand and appreciate three major themes:

- The unfinished work of the Declaration of Independence, the causes of the Civil War, and the war until June 1863
- The Campaign and Battle of Gettysburg, which will comprise about two-thirds of the exhibit galleries
- The Gettysburg Address, the Civil War from Gettysburg to Appomattox, reconciliation and the consequences of the war.

These new facilities also will enable Gettysburg to expand its programs to respond to Congressional mandates that the battle be interpreted "in the larger context of the Civil War and American history, including the causes and consequences of the Civil War and including the effects of the war on all the American people" and that Civil War battlefields "recognize and include" in their programs "the unique role that the institution of slavery played in causing the Civil War."

Expansion will not mean an end to the stories the park has always told. The central story of Gettysburg will always be that of the battle - the tactical movements, decisions of the generals and the heroism and valor of the soldiers, both Union and Confederate.

Gettysburg Community Embraces the Project

However worthy our vision for Gettysburg National Military Park, we cannot truly fulfill our objectives without the involvement and support of the citizens of Gettysburg. With that in mind, the Foundation continues to keep interested local citizens, community and business leaders, and public officials in the greater Gettysburg community informed about our progress and to solicit their input. Our board and advisory committees include representatives from the community; we also are an active partner in the Main Street

Gettysburg coalition. We view the project for which we have responsibility as an important component of a variety of programs and activities underway to enhance the Gettysburg experience for our visitors.

One cannot fully experience the battlefields without also experiencing the town, which itself was a site of military action where soldiers camped, fought and died. We want to extend visitors' stays in Gettysburg, to encourage them to experience the community and to return for repeat visits. We support the National Park Service's plans to develop an improved transportation system that will reduce traffic backups and move visitors more easily and efficiently from the new Museum and Visitor Center to the town and back.

Fundraising Update

To accomplish our goals, the Foundation is conducting a nationwide fundraising campaign, with $95 million as our goal. Of the total, $68.3 million represents the cost to design and construct the new Museum and Visitor Center, including museum exhibits and restoration of the historic Gettysburg Cyclorama painting. Last year we announced that we wanted to have $75 million in funding commitments prior to groundbreaking. This total would ensure that we have sufficient funds to complete the new facilities, while at the same time taking into account gifts and expenses that support the overall project, but not the Museum and Visitor Center component.

As of today, I am pleased to report that the Foundation has identified $69.4 million toward our $75 million goal and plans to break ground on the new facility on June 2. Of that total:

- Seventeen percent - $11.9 million - has been appropriated by Congress. These funds include $9 million earmarked for the restoration of the Gettysburg Cyclorama painting and an additional $2.9 million earmarked for preservation of the park's collection of artifacts and archives.

- Twenty-nine percent - $20.5 million - comes from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is investing in the project through its Capital Assistance Program. The Commonwealth recognizes the significant economic impact that Gettysburg's tourism industry has on the state and the Foundation is pleased they have joined us as partners in this project.

- The remaining 54 percent - $37 million - comes from the private sector, with $12 million of that to be borrowed from commercial lenders and the remainder already in hand or pledged from more than 234 private foundations, corporations and individuals.

Just a few weeks ago, the Foundation announced receipt of more than $5.5 million in gifts and grants, including: $1 million from The Pew Charitable Trusts in Philadelphia, also with offices in Washington, D.C.; $1 million from the McCormick Tribune Foundation in Chicago; $1.5 million from an anonymous donor in New York; and more

than $1 million from other individuals, corporations and foundations, including $500,000 from an anonymous donor in western Pennsylvania. Also, two organizations that had previously contributed $500,000 - a foundation in the Baltimore area and Gettysburg Tours - each increased their commitments to $1 million.

A Classroom of Democracy

Through our partnership with the National Park Service, we have the opportunity to help Gettysburg National Military Park address many of its infrastructure needs, and to put in place sources of funding that will alleviate some future expenses. But on a larger scale, we have the opportunity to do much more.

We consider this the opportunity of a lifetime to build something of lasting significance. Preserving and enhancing the Gettysburg National Military Park is a responsibility that we all assume for future generations. If we make the most of this opportunity, the restoration of the battlefield and the new Gettysburg Museum and Visitor Center will enable us as partners to better fulfill our educational mission and ignite in our visitors a passion to learn. By bringing to life the experiences of 1863, we can help Americans better see the links between the struggles of the Civil War and the challenges we face today.

Nearly 142 years ago, President Lincoln came to Gettysburg to honor the dead. On that occasion, he urged Americans to be "dedicated here to the unfinished work" of freedom and democracy. Today, another generation has picked up that torch. Preserving the battlefield of Gettysburg and making it a classroom of democracy is one way to advance "the unfinished work" that Abraham Lincoln laid before us.

Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much. Mr. Booz.

STATEMENT OF DAVID T. BOOZ

Mr. BOOZ. Thank you, Chairman Souder and Congressman Platts, for this privilege to speak with you today. My name is Dave Booz, and I am the executive director of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg. We work hand-in-hand with the park. Our job is to help supplement and support the operational needs of the national parks at Gettysburg.

Earlier in some of the comments Congressman Platts made questioned the efforts and the everyday routines. Much of our work goes a long way to helping with interpretation and understanding of the visitors when they come here.

We believe this to be hallowed ground. We believe this to be a place where the souls of thousands of people have gone through a great struggle, and it is our job, our duty, and our sacred trust to honor that struggle.

As we all know, this battlefield is a place where over a million people come every year. Our mission, the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg, is to honor, support, protect, and enhance the resources associated with that site. To that end we have given over $6 million to the national parks and more than 15,000 volunteer hours. The vast bulk of that service has come since 1994.

We greatly appreciate Dr. Latschar's comments when he says that the Friends are the margin of survival for the park. And our efforts continue to make sure that people come to this park and get a first-class interpretation and experience.

We have done a great deal to paint fences, barns, sheds, build fences, things that are very visible to visitors once they understand the battlefield. If you go across this battlefield and you see a white fence, it has been painted by the Friends. Headstones in the cemeteries, you know, we sort of think they are there forever, but Congressman Souder, as you pointed out, these artifacts, these treasures disappear very easily, and we have done a great deal in repairing and working with those.

The peach orchard, as was mentioned earlier, well, when you think of Gettysburg, the peach orchard is always Sherfy's Peach Orchard, but there were a number of peach orchards here in 1863. We have donated trees to the parks so that these peach orchards can be maintained. The peach orchard will be reworked, I believe, starting in October, and our membership is donating the money to buy the trees so that the new Sherfy Peach Orchard will be a place that really does represent 1863.

We have been involved in land preservation. We have worked in partnership with the National Park Service and its excellent staff to try to identify and purchase and then donate land to the parks. Over the time that we have been here, over 400 acres have been donated to the parks.

One of the ones that we are most proud of was the Home Sweet Home Motel, which was right on the edge of the Pickett's Charge field along Emmitsburg Road. This structure in partnerships with other organizations was purchased and then cleared and donated to the park. If you were here at a time when the motel was here and look at it now, I believe you can see a great improvement.

The first shot marker, which many people weren't even aware of, we were able to see to it that was preserved and brought into the National Park Service.

We can go through a large number of plots of land, but I think the important point is that, as a private institution, we have tried our best to support the park. Even now we are in the process of donating a 9.3-acre parcel of land to the park.

We have worked extensively with monument rehabilitation. The Pennsylvania Monument, which is one of the largest and most famous on this battlefield and I believe any, underwent almost a $2-million rehabilitation effort, and we were instrumental in leading that.

The cannons that are on the park, well, there are over 400, and for years they were never maintained because the money just wasn't there. We rent a facility and provide volunteer hours to rehabilitate those cannons. And if you ever have a chance to visit the cannon shop and go through that process, believe me, you will come away amazed. It is 144 hours on each carriage after it has been sandblasted. So the gentlemen who worked that particular project do a fantastic job. Unfortunately, once those cannons are back onto the field, they must be maintained again. So we have a new problem that we are pleased to deal with.

We also have worked with other monuments on the field, and unfortunately, sometimes monuments are damaged. So we are active in trying to support the efforts of the park police and the local police agencies in apprehending the criminals.

Education is a major part of our job as well as the National Park Service. And we have, at the Rupp House, a history center in which we present an interpretation of this battle and what it did to the community. We believe that is extremely important.

We also sponsor seminars and conferences so that people will better understand what happened here, the actual battle as well as the ramifications. Often people think that everything ended on July 3rd, and that is grossly untrue.

We support a number of programs that the park has, such as the Military Park "sleepovers" and the Junior Ranger Program. We have a Traveling Trunk Program where we send trunks filled with reproduction artifacts across this Nation so that people can better appreciate the life of the everyday soldier and civilian.

One of the things that we are most proud of is that we were able to help, along with a number of other organizations, in burying the utility lines along the Emmitsburg Road and the Mummasburg Road. These lines were definitely a blight on the scene, and through a large number of people's efforts, we were able to have those buried. The National Tower, which I know that you are familiar with, was demolished, and we had a hand in that along with others.

I could go on for a long time; however, what I think the important part is we spend a great deal of effort helping to provide the operational needs of this park. Dr. Latschar and his staff do a superb job. I am amazed at the dedication and the professionalism of these people.

The Friends of the National Parks have that same kind of dedication and interest to make this place into a place where people

come and never forget. We work with the town; we work with the park to try to make an experience that we all can be proud of.

Sir, we thank you very much for your efforts because what you are doing is absolutely essential in the success of the Park Service and in preserving our heritage. I know that if you would spend time—if you could have the luxury of spending time here on this hallowed ground, before long you would have the feeling of many ghosts—and not ghost tours—but the experiences of the past and understand completely how much this means to the United States. So thank you for your efforts, sirs.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Booz follows:]

STATEMENT OF DAVID T. BOOZ, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE FRIENDS OF THE NATIONAL PARKS AT GETTYSBURG, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY AND HUMAN RESOURCES OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE, CONCERNING THE FUNDING NEEDS OF GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK.

MARCH 14, 2005

Mr. Chairman, my name is David Booz and I am the Executive Director of the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg. I wish to thank this committee for the privilege of speaking to you today. The Friends have approximately 25,000 members and supporters across this nation and have been in operation since 1989. We strongly support the concepts that are the foundation for the National Park Centennial Act.

Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg

Gettysburg is one of the most hallowed places in American history. The Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg is honored to be one of the foremost guardians of this special place and its enduring legacy.

It is the Friends' mission—on behalf of all generations of Americans—to honor, support, protect and enhance the resources associated with the Gettysburg National Military Park, the Battle of Gettysburg and the Eisenhower National Historic Site.

Founded in 1989 by a small group of concerned citizens, the Friends to date has donated **more than $6 million** to the National Parks at Gettysburg. Friends' members have logged **more than 15,000 volunteer hours** on behalf of the National Parks, which has been much-needed support due to funding shortfalls that have impacted the Park's ability to carry out its mission. Dr. John Latschar, Superintendent of Gettysburg National Military Park, has commented that the Friends are the Parks' "margin of survival," providing funding for crucial projects that would otherwise be unfunded—including funding or helping to fund landscape rehabilitation and preservation, the upkeep of historic structures (buildings, monuments, cannon, fences) and the museum and archive collections, all of which have suffered because of funding shortfalls.

Volunteer Work

Since 1989, the Friends has donated more than 15,000 hours of volunteer service to the National Parks at Gettysburg, and several of these volunteer efforts have focused on maintenance projects throughout the Parks, including:

- Repeated fence painting at historic farms including McLean, Klingel, Codori, Blocher, Spangler and Sherfy—these routine maintenance projects greatly assist the National Park Service which, due to the backlog, is not able to get to these types of things in a timely manner. These projects are extremely necessary to preserve the integrity of the battlefield.
- Repeated barn and outbuilding painting at McPherson, Codori, Klingel and Spangler farms—these are, again, routine maintenance items that take the burden off of the National Park service. This painting is absolutely necessary to preserve the historic and structural integrity of these buildings.
- Headstone and fence painting at the Soldiers' National Cemetery—the appearance and integrity of these items regularly deteriorates due to exposure to the elements.

The Friends is pleased to complete this task every few years to help the Park preserve these tangible connections to the monumental struggle that occurred here.

- Earthworks surveys—Friends' members have volunteered time to help the National Park Service find the remnants of battle earthworks.
- Sherfy Peach Orchard program—Friends' members provided upkeep for the peach trees in the historic Peach Orchard, holding a peach-picking event when the fruit was viable.

Land Preservation

The Friends has been instrumental in helping the National Park Service acquire key land resources related to the Battle of Gettysburg, within the Gettysburg National Military Park or within the Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District. The partnership between the Friends and the National Park Service has proven to be a useful and cost-effective way for the National Park Service to acquire vital pieces of land that would otherwise be financially impossible to acquire. Since the Friends' inception in 1989, it has preserved more than 400 acres of relevant land, including:

- Home Sweet Home motel—this structure, across the National Park Service Visitor Center, was the last remaining commercial structure on the field of Pickett's Charge. The Friends and its partners were able to help the National Park Service acquire this 1.5-acre property and remove the modern structures. The Park Service would not have had the funds to purchase this property without the Friends' help.
- First Shot Marker site—this 4-acre property is approximately two miles west of Gettysburg along the Chambersburg Pike and has on its site the First Shot monument in honor of the first shot fired in the Battle. The Friends was instrumental in helping the National Park Service acquire this property.
- Hoffman farm, East Cavalry Field—the Friends worked closely with community partners to secure an easement on 60 acres of this historic farm, adjacent to the Park's East Cavalry Field.
- 20th Maine Company B marker site/Weikert Farm—the Friends was able to preserve this important 6-acre piece of property on the east side of Little Round Top.
- Blocher farm, Barlow's Knoll (modern intrusion removed)—the Friends was able to acquire this property (for the Park) and remove a modern structure from this 24-acre farm site.
- Shields house, Mummasburg Road—the Friends was able to help the Park remove a modern structure and return the ground to its 1863 appearance.
- Baltimore Pike residences (2)—the Friends was able to remove modern structures from a key approach corridor.
- Shea Farm easement (East Cavalry Field)—this 45-acre property, adjacent to the Park's East Cavalry Field, was preserved via an easement secured by the Friends and some of its community partners.
- Black Horse Tavern easement—this 66-acre property, within the Gettysburg Battlefield Historic District, was the site of key Confederate movement on July 2, 1863. The Friends was able to partner with several preservation organizations to secure an easement on the property, ensuring that modern development will never intrude on the historic integrity of the property.

- Kump property—the Friends recently acquired this 9.3-acre parcel of land at the southern end of the battlefield near the base of Big Round Top. It was the site of heavy fighting on July 2, 1863. The property was privately owned, and the Friends will soon officially donate the property to the National Park Service. The land will then be rehabilitated to its 1863 appearance.

Monument & Cannon Carriage Preservation/Rehabilitation

Gettysburg National Military Park contains more than 1,300 monuments and markers and more than 400 cannon—this is one of the largest collections of outdoor sculpture in the world. Each of these monuments, markers and cannon have a story to tell and serves as an important memorial, both visual and interpretive. These items, many of which were placed here by the veterans themselves, help guide visitors around the battlefield and lead to a better understanding of the important events that took place on these fields.

These monuments, markers and cannon are an invaluable historic resource associated with the Gettysburg National Military Park, and the Friends has taken a leading role in caring for these precious memorials. Friends' work has included:

- Pennsylvania Memorial—the Friends assumed project-management duties for the rehabilitation of this monument—the largest on the battlefield at Gettysburg. At a cost of close to $2 million, the Friends successfully restored the structural integrity of the monument, ensuring that these efforts would protect the monument well into the next century.
- Eternal Light Peace Memorial—the Friends was able to secure $65,000 of funding to have this monument rehabilitated and preserved.
- Regular maintenance—the Friends has provided regular maintenance (cleaning, grounds upkeep, other repairs) for several monuments, including the New York State Memorial, the General Sedgwick equestrian monument, the General Slocum equestrian monument, the 44th-12th New York monument, the Texas State monument, and the Pennsylvania monuments.
- Soldiers' National Cemetery headstones—the historic headstones in the Cemetery suffer from deterioration from exposure to the elements. Friends' members periodically (every few years) paint and clean the headstones to keep them from deteriorating beyond repair.
- Power-washing program—It is necessary in the normal course of monument's existence to power wash the monument to remove build up from the elements. The Friend has periodically funded this cleaning, and Friends' volunteers have carried out the cleaning.
- Cannon-carriage restoration program—Approximately 400 cannon are in place at Gettysburg National Military Park; most were placed on the field between 1895 and 1915 today are essential interpretive tools and staunch reminders of the stunning events of 1863. The carriages placed on the field in 1895 are made of iron (carriages used during the battle were made of wood), and the iron, after more than 100 years of wear and exposure, has started to deteriorate. The weight of the cannon barrels causes the iron to crack; the paint, having been layered and layered over the years, can no longer bond to anything except previous layers of weathered paint. Also, the old paint was lead-based, and it is necessary for the cannon to be completely stripped and repainted according to modern standards. In 1996, the National Park Service started its cannon-carriage restoration program

and was able to restore six cannon per year. In 1999, the Friends began funding a cannon-carriage shop for the National Park Service. Due to this effort, it is possible for 40 cannon per year to be restored.

- Reward fund: monument damage—the Friends recently added $1,000 to a reward fund established for information leading to an arrest and conviction of people responsible for monument damage at Gettysburg National Military Park.

Education

The Friends realizes that in order for people to feel the need to preserve something, they first have to understand its significance. As such, the Friends, since its organization, has remained committed to education—for its members, Gettysburg visitors and on behalf of the National Park Service. The Friends works closely with the National Park Service to educate people about the events that took place in Gettysburg and about Gettysburg National Military Park's preservation needs. Friends' efforts have included:

- Rupp House History Center—the Friends realize that people will recognize the need to preserve something only if they understand that thing's significance. As such, the Friends in 2003 opened the Rupp House History Center to, through hands-on, interactive exhibits, help people understand what happened in Gettysburg and educate them about Gettysburg National Military Park's preservation needs.
- Gettysburg National Military Park educational satellite broadcast—This broadcast now reaches approximately 8 million students across the country; the Friends has repeatedly helped fund this important educational tool of the National Park Service. The Friends and the National Park Service received Telly Awards in 2001 and 2002 for this program.
- Traveling Trunk program—the Friends commitment to education is seen all across the country as its fleet of traveling trunks makes its way to students as far away as Alaska. Through the hands-on activities of the trunks, students who are not able to travel to Gettysburg are able to learn about the battle and about soldiers' lives.
- Gettysburg National Military Park Junior Ranger program/Eisenhower National Historic Site Junior Secret Service program—designed as fun, educational activities for children, these programs help youngsters explore the battlefield as a Park ranger. The Friends has regularly helped fund these programs.
- Gettysburg National Military Park "sleepover"—the Park presents this annual program to Gettysburg-area elementary students. Students spend the night in the Visitor Center and are "mustered" into the army to learn what life was like for soldiers—and civilians—during the battle of Gettysburg. Friends' donations regularly help supply food, activities and volunteers for this popular program.
- Gettysburg National Military Park Seminar—the Friends is pleased to repeatedly offer funding support to this biannual educational seminar.
- Summer Scholar program

Battlefield Rehabilitation

The Friends is Gettysburg National Military Park's primary partner for battlefield rehabilitation. The Park's rehabilitation efforts will return the landscape, as closely as possible, to its 1863

appearance, thereby enhancing interpretation of the battlefield. As the Park's primary partner, the Friends has taken on and completed several significant projects, including:

- Utility line burial along Emmitsburg Road and Mummasburg Road—Utility lines for years marred the view shed along two of the battlefield's most traveled thoroughfares. In one of the organization's largest projects to date, the Friends successfully buried the utility lines, allowing for more thorough interpretation of key battle areas.
- National Tower demolition—a national reporter called this structure "the ugliest commercial structure ever to intrude on the sanctity of a national park." In 2000, the Friends provided support to the National Park Service to have the tower removed and the landscape returned to its 1863 appearance.
- Copse of Trees restoration (along Cemetery Ridge)—long believed to be the focal point of Pickett's Charge on July 3, 1863, this copse of trees along the Park's Hancock Avenue is a popular visitor destination. The Friends has helped fund its restoration.
- Historic fence re-creation at Spangler, Codori and Trostle farms, along United States Avenue and along the fields of Pickett's Charge—during the Battle, many fence lines dotted Gettysburg's landscape to delineate farm fields. These fences became important landscape features during the battle, as they became obstacles to soldiers moving rapidly from place to place. Fences, at times, meant the difference between life and death. Historic fence reconstruction is part of the Park's battlefield rehabilitation efforts, of which the Friends is the primary partner.
- Native tree and shrub purchase and replacement, Codori-Trostle area—the Codori-Trostle thicket was a demonstration area for battlefield rehabilitation, and, thanks to the Friends, native trees and shrubs are now thriving in this area, which was key battle ground.
- Soldiers' National Cemetery and Culp's Hill area tree trimming
- Historic orchard re-planting—the Friends has recently purchased $6,000 worth of orchard stock, which the National Park Service has begun to plant. These plantings will recreate orchards that were present during the battle, making for more thorough interpretation.

Museum Artifacts

Gettysburg National Military Park's museum contains 42,000 artifacts, and the archives house 700,000 documents relevant to the Battle of Gettysburg. These items offer rare, tangible links between current generations and generations past. In the interest of enhancing and protecting resources associated with the Park and with the Battle, the Friends has helped acquire several key Gettysburg artifacts and assisted with the preservation of these artifacts. The Friends has provided to the museum archival shelving, textile treatments, preservation supplies (provided matching funds for this "Save America's Treasures" grant).

The Friends have been instrumental in adding the following artifacts to the museum at Gettysburg National Military Park:

- Bachelder papers and tintype
- Gettysburg broadside—reinterment of battlefield dead
- Confederate bayonet and tintype
- Louisiana belt plate die
- Collection of Captain Clark, U.S. Signal Corps

- Officer's Commission of Lieutenant Bayard Wilkeson
- Union officer's coat
- Eisenhower-style tunic and jacket
- Camp Letterman surgeon's box
- German-language enlistment poster
- *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, 1st edition
- John Brown execution broadside
- Collection of Lieutenant William Fisher, 10th U.S. Infantry
- Numerous broadsides, Union and Confederate
- Rare books replacement for Gettysburg National Military Park library

Miscellaneous Projects

Over the years, the Friends has assisted with several projects related to the preservation of Gettysburg and has worked with other community organizations on several tasks. These projects have included:

- Battlefield Historic District nominations
- Sach's Bridge restoration (with Adams County)
- Economic impact study (with Adams County Chamber of Commerce)
- Wills House exhibit
- House site restoration in Soldiers' National Cemetery with Gettysburg Battlefield Preservation Association
- Eisenhower Skeet Range preservation
- Archaeological studies
- Drinking fountains for physically impaired (at Gettysburg National Military Park)
- Rose bushes and garden equipment for Eisenhower National Historic Site

Once again, I thank you for this opportunity to testify before the committee to discuss the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg's assistance to and support of the Gettysburg National Military Park and Eisenhower National Historic Site. The Friends is honored to help the National Park Service preserve the American legacies that these two Park's represent. If this bill becomes reality the Friends, and other non-profit groups, can focus on helping to improve our Parks and get beyond the maintenance stage. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have. Thank you.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much, Mr. Booz. I will go to Ms. Oakes.

STATEMENT OF JOY M. OAKES

Ms. OAKES. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Platts, thank you for the opportunity to speak before you today. I am Joy Oakes; I am the mid-Atlantic Regional Director of the National Parks Conservation Association. Since 1919, the nonpartisan NPCA has been the leading voice of the American public speaking out on behalf of America's National Park System. I will briefly summarize my remarks and ask that the entirety be included in the record.

Our 300,000 members nationwide thank you for holding these extraordinary hearings and oversight hearing on the critical and chronic funding needs of the National Park System. It is extraordinary. Thank you so much. And for your leadership on the Centennial Act, working with a bipartisan group of your colleagues to address the maintenance needs in the national parks.

Americans from all walks of life and from the spectrum of political belief can and are rallying around the cause of protecting, restoring, and fully funding America's national parks. Approximately one of every five national parks are right here in the mid-Atlantic. Many are icons of America's democracy like Independence, Valley Forge, Gettysburg, of course. Others preserve ancient geology, rich biodiversity, spectacular landscapes, and endangered species.

And as we have heard, parks are living classrooms. I brought my fifth-grader here to Eisenhower last year when he was doing the report on the President, and walking through the sunroom where President and Mrs. Eisenhower entertained Nikita Khrushchev and other cold war leaders and gazing at that rural landscape that the President painted from that very sunroom, made the Eisenhowers and their times come alive in a way that is very difficult, even in the best of textbooks, to understand.

My remarks will focus on how this $600-million annual operation shortfall, the enormous maintenance backlog, and the scarcity of lands money place out in the national treasures in this region.

Here we are at Gettysburg, the world's classroom on the American Civil War. This park has 63 cents for every dollar it needs for day-to-day operations, reasonable, routine maintenance, resource protection, interpretation, law enforcement. The world's classroom on the Civil War holds a lottery every September to determine which of the requests for ranger-led tours it will respond to from school groups. And last year, one out of every four requests were denied.

While the park's budget has, in fact, increased in absolute dollars, as we have heard, over the last few years, since fiscal year 2002, their purchasing power has actually declined. And you can see that in the additional loss of staff positions, 19 FTE's just in the last 3 years. Two of those include the maintenance specialist on the cannon restoration, making the Friends' volunteer work even more important.

Despite the maintenance and project money that has been talked about, the maintenance backlog here at the park actually grew in the last few years. Gettysburg saw a decrease in its purchasing power in fiscal year 2005 of more than $60,000 despite the admira-

ble efforts the Congress made to try to get additional funding, and actually getting absolute dollars to the parks, their purchasing power declined. This decrease in purchasing power is a result of a number of unfunded mandates, which has been discussed today.

The last time Gettysburg received land acquisition funding was fiscal year 2001. And this despite about 20 percent of the land inside the park's designated boundary is owned by others. Just in the last few months, two inholders have approached the park asking if they are interested in talking about selling. But the park has been unable to respond because there is no money in their land acquisition account for this park.

With 80 other parks in the region, I should talk about a few of the others very quickly. Shenandoah National Park also did a business plan just as Gettysburg has done. Their analysis is very similar. That park has 65 cents for every dollar it needs for routine operations. Of particular concern, Shenandoah has employed the budget cost projection model that the Park Service is using to assess what its purchasing power will be in future years. And that analysis, through fiscal year 2009, shows that, in fact, appropriated moneys should continue to increase in absolute dollars, but the budget gap at Shenandoah is predicted to continue to increase also to the tune of $2.6 million. Shenandoah is one of the most polluted parks in the country, yet it has left open its air resources specialist positions since 2003 due to tight budgets.

Delaware Water Gap recreation area in New Jersey and Pennsylvania is a four-season recreational park with a two-season budget. Its business plan analysis showed the park has 56 cents for every dollar it needs for annual operations. Its staff collectively drive about 800,000 miles each year in vehicles that are almost 14 years old on average on roads that are in some of the worst condition of any parks in the Northeast region of the Park Service.

George Washington Birthplace in Virginia: Congress expanded the boundary 2 years ago in order to include privately owned land at the agreement of the owner, land that is surrounded by the park and the Potomac River. It is a hole in the donut, and yet it hasn't gotten the lands money to be able to make a deal. And so now that land is on the commercial real estate market. I was just looking at the listing actually.

A high profile battle at Valley Forge in recent years concerning the Waggonseller farm really shows—is a great illustration of just how critical the lands money is here in the mid-Atlantic. Development is knocking at the doors of these parks.

Throughout the region and throughout the system, you can find countless examples of extraordinary leadership and dedicated, mission-driven staff, who leveraged limited resources to get the job done. At Petersburg Military Battlefield in Virginia, that staff leveraged $8,000 in fees to accomplish a $30,000 restoration of the Dictator, the largest weapon used in the siege and defense of Petersburg. And they did a very nice job.

But even the best elastic can only stretch so far. Even with all the creative thinking, the strategies for revenue enhancement, the leveraging, the partnering you have heard about, the volunteering, big gaps remain. And Gettysburg is one of many poster children. Even with two of the most effective Friends groups in the region

and possibly in the country with skilled fiscal managers, they have a long list of park needs.

More and more Friends groups are providing and philanthropy is providing not the margin of excellence for our national parks, but the margin of survival. And that itself may not be sustainable.

In closing, we would like to thank you for this unprecedented series of hearings that you are holding, for your leadership on the Centennial Act. We hope your colleagues will allow Americans to donate all or some of our tax refunds to invest in our national heritage. We also hope your colleagues will approve an increase in the annual operations budget for the parks, $100 million more than what the President's budget has proposed. We hope you will be generous, that your colleagues will generous in providing lands funding. Nothing less is at stake than the future of our national parks. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Oakes follows:]

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Protecting Parks for Future Generations

Testimony of
Joy M. Oakes, Regional Director
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

March 14, 2005

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. I am Joy Oakes, director of the National Parks Conservation Association's mid-Atlantic region. 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. As the only national, independent membership organization dedicated to preserving the park system, NPCA protects our land and landmarks by partnering with Americans who understand that preserving our national parks also preserves our heritage as a nation.

Today, NPCA has 300,000 members across the country who care deeply about the well being of our national parks. NPCA greatly appreciates your commitment to conducting an extensive, nationwide, in-depth examination during the next two years of the funding challenges facing our National Park System. Your willingness to devote such significant personal effort to this issue, together with your recent introduction of H.R. 1124, the National Park Centennial Act, along with Representatives Baird, Platts, Cummings and such a strongly bipartisan group of legislators, are heartening at a time when the stresses faced by our beloved national parks are so significant. We hope that the attention you bring to the need to better protect our national heritage will help our national parks not merely to survive, but also to thrive.

My testimony will focus first on the purpose of our National Park System and the American legacy it preserves for future generations. I then will describe the funding challenges that are jeopardizing that heritage in the major areas for which the National Park Service receives federal

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

funds—operations, maintenance (transportation and non-transportation), and land acquisition—and cite specific examples in the mid-Atlantic region.

Why We Have National Parks

Our national parks include icons of democracy such as the Statue of Liberty, the home of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the battlefields of Palo Alto, Fort Necessity, Little Bighorn, Gettysburg, and Valley Forge. They include inspirational places such as the cliff houses at Mesa Verde, the vast chasm of the Grand Canyon, and the hallowed ground of Antietam National Battlefield. They provide extraordinary settings for our families to enjoy campfire stories at places like Tuolumne Meadows in Yosemite, marvel at the giant trees in Redwood National Park, and learn about the birth of our nation at Independence Hall.

National parks are places that inspire us as a nation, teach our children about America's history and the wonders of the natural world, and realize the dreams of our forefathers that "the parks contain the highest potentialities of national pride, national contentment, and national health." The national parks provide incredible opportunities to connect all Americans, but especially youth with our collective history and to train the next generation of scientists. Education that links classroom learning with field experiences produces better results. Visiting a park brings history to life. My fifth-grade son and I visited Eisenhower National Historic Site last winter. Standing in the sunroom where President and Mrs. Eisenhower entertained Soviet Premier Khrushchev and other Cold War leaders, gazing at the rural landscapes the President painted from that sunroom, walking into the adjacent living room to examine the ornate coffee table that Mrs. Eisenhower prohibited the president from propping his feet upon, the Eisenhowers became real to us in ways that cannot be reproduced through even the best of textbooks.

Approximately one of every five of America's 388 national parks are found in the mid-Atlantic states of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. Most were set aside for their rich historical and cultural values. Places like Jamestown at Colonial National Historical Park in Virginia, Independence National Historical Park in Pennsylvania, Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine in Maryland, Appomattox Court House National Historical Park in Virginia, Maggie L. Walker National Historic Site in Virginia, and, of course, Gettysburg, are living reminders that even America's democracy is a work in progress.

And parks like Assateague Island National Seashore in Maryland, Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, New River Gorge National River in West Virginia, and Shenandoah National Park in Virginia, remind us that much of our nation's early history in the mid-Atlantic was made in landscapes of spectacular beauty, preserved today in national parks that protect fascinating ancient geological features,[1] significant biodiversity,[2] some of the rarest endangered species,[3] and some of the most beautiful scenery in the system.

Defining the Funding Problem

NPCA recently released *Faded Glory: Top 10 Reasons to Reinvest in America's National Park Heritage* to bring attention to the multiple resource challenges that face the national parks. That report, which I would like to provide for the record, illustrates the many kinds of funding shortfalls that are tarnishing the luster of some of our nation's most special places.

Faded Glory underscores that the chronic lack of adequate funding poses very real risks for the National Park System—poaching that could eliminate 19 species from the parks; crumbling historic buildings and structures, two-thirds of which are in need of repair; unsafe roads; the theft of precious artifacts of American history; loss of critical habitat to invasive species; and many more challenges. Insufficient funding also means a lost opportunity to excite, educate and inspire the schoolchildren who could be the next Thomas Edison, Martin Luther King, Jr, or Stephen Mather.

Budget shortfalls affect the quantity and quality of public education programs and school outreach that national parks have historically been able to provide. During fiscal year 2004, Shenandoah National Park offered 800 fewer ranger-led programs than it did just two years before. The museum exhibit at Gettysburg contains a wealth of items that tell the story of the battle and offer a glimpse into the life of a Civil War soldier, but more than half of the items in the Park Service museums and archival collections have yet to be catalogued or shared with visitors. These are just two examples of how insufficient funds for the parks affects the American experience.

---

[1] Exposed rocks at Old Rag Mountain and Mary's Rock tunnel at Shenandoah are of ancient granitic and metamorphic-volcanic origin on the order of a billion years old.
[2] More than 1,300 species of vascular plants, 50 mammal species, 51 species of amphibians and reptiles, 30 fish species, and more than 200 bird species are resident or transient at Shenandoah.
[3] The Shenandoah salamander is endemic to high elevation talus slopes in the central part of the park and is federally endangered.

Managing the National Park System is an enormous undertaking. The 388 units that comprise the National Park System include more than 30,000 structures and 80 million artifacts. The Park Service's portfolio includes 8,000 miles of roads, 1,500 bridges, 5,385 housing units, 1,500 water and wastewater systems, 200 radio systems, 400 dams and more than 200 solid waste operations. These are all integrated into one of the most awe-inspiring repositories of our collective American heritage.

Today, despite the strong support of the American people and increasing recognition in Congress that there is a problem in our parks, the National Park Service lacks the funds to do the job that Congress requires, visitors expect, and our national heritage demands. The parks are short more than $600 million each year in the vital operating funds they need to serve the public and protect our national treasures. Little if any progress has been made in reducing the size of the maintenance backlog for historic structures and transportation infrastructure, with estimates continuing to range between roughly $4 billion and $7 billion. And funding has been drying up for the acquisition of important lands that should be part of our National Park System.

Operations Funding

An analysis of business plans completed by the National Park Service demonstrates that the annual shortfall in operational funding for the National Park System exceeds $600 million. That shortfall has, for a variety of reasons, grown over a long span of time. In recent years, the parks have been stretched increasingly thin by unbudgeted cost-of-living increases, unreimbursed storm damage, and insufficient funding for new homeland security needs, which contribute to and compound the burden of the annual operating deficit. From fiscal year 2002 to fiscal year 2004, unfunded mandates cost the Park Service approximately $170 million. And between fiscal years 1984 and 2002, Park Service staffing costs, which more than doubled in that timeframe, were underfunded by $419 million.

Three major events explain the shortfall in staffing costs between fiscal years 1984 and 2002: the annually mandated cost-of-living adjustment that was instituted in 1975; the conversion of the federal benefits program for federal civilian employees in 1984; and the introduction of the ranger careers initiative in 1994 which resulted in a general increase in grade levels for Park Service rangers. Improving the professional status of these mission-driven public servants was extremely important,

but it came with unavoidable financial impacts that have had a profound effect on individual park units. On a cumulative basis, staffing costs increased $636 million in this time frame, and the National Park Service (NPS) received only $217 million to cover these costs, resulting in an accumulated shortfall by 2002 of $419 million.

Last fall, after a public outcry about service cutbacks in the national parks, congressional appropriators responded with the largest-ever park-by-park increase in operations funding. However, only a small fraction of the initial 5 percent across-the-board increase for the parks has actually improved the bottom line for each park. Two across-the-board cuts reduced the increase, which was further eroded by unfunded mandatory cost of living increases and other uncontrollable costs at the park and regional levels. These costs affect every park and region differently. But the bottom line for parks like Gettysburg, for example, was still an erosion in purchasing power by roughly $60,000 from fiscal year 2004.

As a park's purchasing power decreases, productivity and services decline. Park managers downgrade open positions, extend hours for some staff, add some tasks to other staff's workload, and determine that some tasks will simply go undone until a crisis forces the issue. At Petersburg, for example, the park is operating without an IT support person. Most of us understand the importance of dependable computer equipment. Without it, productivity plummets.

The landscape is not entirely bleak. This year, the administration budgeted for most of the expected cost of living increase for fiscal year 2006 and also budgeted for uncontrollable costs. However, of the proposed 3 percent operational increase of $50.5 million, only $22 million would go to the actual base operating budgets of individual parks. That amount does not come close to meeting the parks' needs for programmatic increases to pay for resource protection and visitor services. This is why NPCA recommends that Congress add $100 million to the President's request for fiscal year 2006. Without a more meaningful increase, the parks will see little if any improvement in their ability to protect park resources, maintain park facilities, and provide visitors with the kinds of memorable experiences they expect.

Homeland Security Demands

The Park Service's operational woes are being compounded by unfunded demands related to homeland security. Examples of these costs include the protection of key assets and operational

security at icon and border parks, radio communication upgrades, and the temporary relocation of staff on detail to protect parks during elevated threat levels. Since September 11, 2001, the Park Service has spent $26 million from its operating budget for security needs, primarily in border and icon parks. The National Park Police have spent an additional $14 million, for a total expenditure of $40 million. The Park Service now estimates it spends an extra $63,000 every day the nation is at code orange alert. In 2003 alone, the Park Service was forced to use nearly $8 million in fee receipts for increased security demanded by three code orange periods, but this amount barely scratches the surface when it comes to genuine fiscal impacts of unfunded homeland security demands on the parks. For example, construction costs associated with increased security needs at five locations—Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument, and Jefferson Memorial in Washington, DC, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St Louis, and Organ Pipe National Monument in Arizona—have totaled $48 million since September 11, 2001. The Park Service does not receive any compensation from the Department of Homeland Security for the costs it incurs and is forced to pay the bills by reducing resources devoted to core operational needs like resource protection and visitor services.

Maintenance Backlog

The maintenance backlog continues to be an intractable problem. According to the National Park Service's recent report, *Partnering & Managing for Excellence*: "This backlog has had a profound effect on the visitor experience, and the public's ability to appreciate and enjoy our national parks' natural, historic, and cultural wonders."

As you know, in 1998 the General Accounting Office estimated the maintenance backlog to be approximately $6.1 billion based on Park Service data from 1993. However, $1.2 billion of this estimate was for the construction of new facilities, leaving approximately $4.9 billion for existing facility maintenance and construction. GAO's most recent estimate of the backlog continues to cite a range between $4.1 and $6.8 billion. As a consequence, historic structures continue to decay, and many park roads deteriorate to the point where they are unsafe.

Transportation Infrastructure

Visitor enjoyment of parks depends upon safe and enjoyable access. Two-thirds of park roads, however, are in either poor or fair condition and 56 bridges are deficient. The Park Roads

and Parkways program provides the majority of the funds for road renovation and maintenance in parks. Currently funded at $165 million per year, the program provides only one-third of the estimated $450 million that would be needed to bring 75 percent of park roads and bridges up to "good" condition. Unfortunately, the transportation reauthorization bill that just passed the House provides only an average of a 25 percent increase in annual Park Roads and Parkway funding through the six years of the bill. At that level, the maintenance backlog as well as risks to visitor safety and enjoyment will continue to grow.

Roads and bridges are not the only components of park transportation systems that are suffering. Alternative transportation systems such as shuttle buses, trolleys, trams, ferries, and bike and pedestrian pathways are struggling to find the maintenance and operation dollars to keep them up and running. No one disputes the fact that these systems, now in place at more than 100 parks, have had a profoundly positive effect on the visitor experience. At Acadia National Park alone, shuttle buses have removed more than 88,000 cars from the roadways. Yet, these systems do not receive the funds they need. A recent congressionally authorized study by the Department of Transportation of the public transit needs on public lands revealed that the National Park System alone will need $1.6 *billion* over the next 20 years to provide the alternative transportation systems necessary to accommodate increasing numbers of visitor.

The NPS Alternative Transportation Program has received on average over the past six years $11 million annually, however, this year it will receive only $6 million from the Park Roads and Parkways account. And none of that is available to assist parks with operations and maintenance of the systems. Although the House transportation bill creates a Transit in the Parks pilot program, it provides only a total of $80 million for six years—far short of the estimated $*360 million* that will be needed over the six years to plan, develop, operate, and maintain these vital visitor transportation systems. These systems are not merely visitor conveniences; they can be vital to the protection of park resources and visitor enjoyment. Two-thirds of the National Park System units in Pennsylvania either already have some form of alternative transportation or are planning to institute one. The success of the new management plan for Gettysburg, for example, will depend on the expansion of the existing shuttle bus system at an estimated cost of more than $1.4 million—or more than one-quarter of the fiscal year 2006 budget for the entire alternative transportation program for the entire

park system. Similarly, Eisenhower National Historic Site needs nearly $1 million for its shuttle system.

Gettysburg National Military Park & Eisenhower National Historic Site, Pennsylvania

Established in 1895, Gettysburg National Military Park, the world's classroom on the American Civil War, preserves and protects resources related to the July 1863 battle during which Union forces repulsed the second Confederate invasion of the North, and where President Abraham Lincoln delivered his famous address in November 1863 to dedicate the Soldiers National Cemetery. Established in 1969, Eisenhower National Historic Site protects and interprets the only home owned by President and Mrs. Eisenhower. The Gettysburg superintendent also manages the Eisenhower site, and the parks share resources including staff.

With more than 2 million visitors each year, Gettysburg is the most visited Civil War site in the park system. With limited funds, the park holds a lottery each fall to determine which requests for ranger-led tours by school groups it will honor. In fiscal year 2004, the park offered 240 such programs, denying one of four requests.

A business plan analysis of the parks' fiscal year 2001 budget, completed in 2002 in partnership with NPCA, showed an operations and routine maintenance annual shortfall of nearly $3.6 million, compared to an actual budget of just over $6.1 million in fiscal year 2001--a 37 percent shortfall. Strategies identified in the plan for reducing costs included combining some administrative positions for Gettysburg and Eisenhower, consolidating offices from nine buildings throughout the park to common office space, and funding battlefield rehabilitation through the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program. Strategies for increasing non-appropriated revenues included expanding the park's partnership with the Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg, increasing Licensed Battlefield Guide annual fees, increasing interpretive fees for the Electric Map and Cyclorama programs, and recovering costs for providing human resources services to area parks.

Since the fiscal year 2001 business plan, the parks' financial situation has not improved. The parks saw an overall increase in operations funding from $6.16 million in fiscal year 2002 to $6.45 million in fiscal year 2005, yet experienced a decline in their purchasing power of $734,900 during

that period. To meet the budget, park managers have reduced staff from 141 permanent and seasonal full time equivalent (FTE) positions in fiscal year 2002, to 122 in fiscal year 2005.

More than $22 million has been appropriated in project funding in fiscal years 2002-2005 through line-item construction, repair/rehabilitation funds, and other projects to address infrastructure needs, yet the maintenance backlog at the park has grown from $37.8 million in fiscal year 2002 to $49.7 million in fiscal year 2005. One small example of how this shortfall manifests itself at the park is that Gettysburg has been unable to repair and restore the historic iron fence around the cemetery, a line-item request since fiscal year 1998.

Two major park partners help the park meet both operational and maintenance needs. The first is *The Friends of the National Parks at Gettysburg*, which has provided more than $6 million since the organization's founding in 1989. The Friends have acquired historically significant battlefield land and conservation easements, and have assisted in battlefield restoration. Volunteers managed by the Friends and by the park provide approximately 20 percent of the labor at the park, on average 27.3 FTE per year in fiscal years 2002-2004.

The park's other partner is the *Gettysburg National Battlefield Museum Foundation*, which has raised more than $65.4 million towards a $95 million goal to build and operate a new Museum/Visitor Center that also will serve as a multi-modal transportation hub. Groundbreaking is scheduled for June 2005, with an opening date in late 2007 or early 2008. This effort will solve long-term park problems by preserving the park's historic collections, protecting and restoring the Cyclorama painting, managing traffic on high-visitation days, and restoring historic battlefield landscapes.

Shenandoah National Park, Virginia

Established in 1935, Shenandoah is world-renowned for its majestic waterfalls, more than 500 miles of trails including the Appalachian Trail, and the Skyline Drive's scenic vistas of the northern Blue Ridge Mountains, one of the oldest mountain ranges in the world. It is globally outstanding for its biological complexity and is one of the world's richest broadleaf temperate forests. Its nearly 200,000 acres are more biologically diverse than all of Europe, providing a home to more than 2,000 native species, including black bear and bobcat. The park has since 1984

attracted an average of 1.6 million visitors each year and includes 363 historic buildings and structures, such as President Hoover's summer retreat.

In fiscal year 2003, Shenandoah needed $19.6 million to fund operations, but received only $12.8 million from all funding sources, an operating shortfall of $6.8 million. Years of tight budgets have forced the park to reduce mission critical operations, including air pollution monitoring, visitor safety services, and wastewater treatment systems maintenance. Based on the Budget Cost Projection module recently adopted by the National Park Service, and using Shenandoah's fiscal year 2004 appropriated budget of $10.1 million as the base, the park anticipates its base appropriations will grow to $10.4 million in fiscal year 2009, while delivering the same menu of services will actually cost $13.1. The operations shortfall will continue to grow by $2.6 million, leading to even more dramatic cuts in visitor services and resource protection.

The park's inflation-adjusted base budget has increased 14 percent since 1992. However, during that same time personnel costs increased 21.3 percent, despite a reduction in staff time of more than 15 percent. In fiscal year 2003, 81 percent of the park's operations funding came from base funding sources. The park's dependency on non-base funds poses a threat to the park's future, because non-base funding can fluctuate dramatically and should not be used for fixed costs such as permanent personnel and utilities.

Both air pollution and invasive species make Shenandoah one of the system's most threatened ecosystems. An analysis of National Park Service data for ground-level ozone, haze, and acid rain for 1999-2003 by NPCA and two partners found Shenandoah to be the third most air-polluted park in the country.[4] Yet, the Air Resources Specialist position has been vacant for nearly two years because of funding shortfalls, and there is no sign that the air pollution that plagues the park will abate anytime soon. From 1987 through 2000, Shenandoah staff reviewed nearly 80 air pollution permit applications for new or expanded industries, including power plants, more than twice the workload of any other national park. Since 2001, the park has reviewed at least 15 more applications.

In addition, the park expends many of its resources combating aggressive, non-native plant species. This silent green invasion in Shenandoah and other national parks crowds out and even kills

---

[4] *Code Red: America's Five Most Polluted National Parks*, June 2004. http://www.npca.org/codered

native species. A new non-native plant management team based in Shenandoah was created in fiscal year 2003 to serve Shenandoah and ten other parks in the NPS Northeast Region. Although Shenandoah benefits from this team, unfortunately, staffing it came at the expense of another vital position that remains unfilled today because of a lack of funds. The new supervisor for the SWAT team had been employed at Shenandoah in insect pest management control and environmental assessment and compliance.

Budget constraints also reduce visitor services at the park. Ranger-led walks and talks -- in my experience among the most memorable highlights of a national park visit -- have been drastically reduced because of budget shortfalls. None was offered in the spring of 2003, and summer offerings were down to 27 per weekend in 2003, from 38 per weekend in 2000. Shenandoah offered nearly 800 fewer interpretive programs in fiscal year 2004 (1,032) than it did in fiscal year 2002 (1,824).

Finally, Rapidan Camp, formerly known as Camp Hoover, is a National Historic Landmark.. Located at the headwaters of the Rapidan River, Rapidan Camp was President Herbert Hoover's summer retreat from 1929-1933. Time and neglect led to the loss of several of the buildings at the camp. Using fee demonstration money, the Park Service has invested more than $300,000 to restore the remaining camp structures to their 1931 appearance. The park provided ten staffed van tours to the camp per week in the summer of 2004, but does not expect to maintain that level of service this summer. Volunteers who live in one of the cabins unlock the buildings for visitors who are not on the van tours, but do not provide the interpretive stories that make the camp come alive.

Shenandoah's business plan identifies a number of strategies to reduce costs. For example, the park may assign certain tasks currently performed by the park to a concessionaire. In addition, the park anticipates saving up to $30,000 by replacing trash cans along Skyline Drive overlooks with bear proof dumpster and recycling container clusters. Strategies to generate non-appropriated revenues include establishing a Shenandoah National Park Trust to raise private funds for high priority investment projects and critical operational shortfalls, and to launch a specialty license plant program.

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, New Jersey/Pennsylvania

Established in 1965, Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area preserves relatively unspoiled scenic and historic lands along both the New Jersey and Pennsylvania sides of the Middle Delaware River at a famous gap in the Appalachian Mountains. It is a popular four-season recreation area, with activities ranging from hunting to horseback riding to canoeing. It is one of the ten most visited parks in the system, with more than 5 million visitors each year.

But this four-season park has a two-season budget. The park's business plan analysis based on fiscal year 2002 identified $15.9 million in needed annual operations funding, requiring 238.4 FTE. But the park had an $8.9 million total budget, and 134.6 FTE, leaving a funding and staffing shortfall of $7 million, and 103.8 FTEs. Most of the funding covered personnel costs, leaving approximately half a million dollars for all other needs, including utilities, supplies, vehicle costs, and materials. The fiscal year 2005 budget increased approximately $325,000, with $250,000 covering personnel costs.

The park's fleet drives more than 800,000 miles per year to accomplish mission-critical tasks such as maintenance, law enforcement, resource management, and interpretation. Its approximately 90-unit fleet (owned by the Department of the Interior) in fiscal year 2005 had an average age of 13.9 years. The park would like to switch to GSA vehicles, in order to achieve a more reliable and flexible fleet and a more professional image. However, a switchover would add annual costs of $430,000 and consume the park's entire annual allocation of discretionary funds.

Delaware Water Gap's business plan analysis showed a fiscal year 2002 shortfall of $2.1 million and 27 FTE just for routine maintenance programs. At that time, the deferred maintenance backlog for the park was estimated at $39 million, a large portion of which involved roads.

A report issued by the Federal Highway Administration (FHA) in 1998 stated that Delaware Water Gap had the worst roads in the Northeast NPS region. According to recent studies by the FHA, the park's roadways are in fair to poor condition. Several roadways are experiencing sharp increases in traffic volume due to rapid development in the region. The park has successfully fended off "demolition by neglect" of many structures, but has not been able to move beyond stabilization.

The park's 1999 Trails Plan to develop an integrated system of trails with visitor support facilities, signage, and interpretation has not been implemented because of the lack of resources.

Most of the maintenance of backcountry trails that is accomplished is achieved via agreements with nonprofit groups, but many trails are in poor shape and are not interconnected.

Since 2003 Delaware Water Gap has implemented policies to increase fee collection from concessionaires and tractor-trailer traffic through the park. Annual income from canoe liveries increased from $1,800 to $18,000, and the park increased fees on each truck traveling Highway 209 from $7 to $18.

Fort Necessity National Battlefield, Pennsylvania

Established in 1931, Fort Necessity in southwestern Pennsylvania is the only park system site specifically dedicated to commemorating the French and Indian War, which set America on the path to independence from Great Britain. Here a 22-year-old George Washington led his troops against the French and their Indian allies in the first battles of the French and Indian War. Washington was forced to surrender, the only such time in his military career. The park commemorates the battle and educates visitors about the war's critical significance to the nation's heritage.

The park's fiscal year 2004 operating budget of $1.22 million was the same as the park received ten years earlier in fiscal year 1994. According to the Consumer Price Index, a 1994 dollar was worth 79 cents in 2004, so the actual purchasing power of the park's budget eroded by $221,000 over that decade

A noteworthy public-private partnership begun in 1994 and led by the National Park Service and the Pennsylvania State Heritage Parks Program has raised nearly $11.5 million[5] to build a new Visitor and Interpretive Center for Fort Necessity and the National Road. This facility is expected to open in June or July of 2005. However, the $495,000 needed to operate this state-of-the-art center and to offer educational programs was not allocated for fiscal year 2005 and is not expected in fiscal year 2006, requiring the park to stretch resources even more thinly.

Project funding has allowed the park to deal with the invasive honeysuckle that was taking over the historic landscape at the Great Meadow. However, that work will be in vain without the money to replant the forest line and to continue to monitor this aggressive plant.

---

[5] $3 million in private funds, $4.5 million in state funds, and $4 million in federal funds

As reported in an NPCA State of the Parks report on the park released in June 2004, Fort Necessity staff manages 30 historic structures listed on the Park Service official List of Classified Structures, with 57 percent in good condition, 33 percent in fair condition, and 10 percent in poor condition. But its deferred maintenance backlog was estimated in 2004 at $3.2 million and climbing, which bodes ill for the future condition of those historic structures.

Despite the funding challenges faced by the park, Fort Necessity's full-time curator has catalogued all of the park's 3,600 archival and museum objects. This is the only park assessed by NPCA's State of the Parks program that possesses fully catalogued collections, which allows staff to more easily monitor the condition of its collection and safely make it available to researchers.

Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia

Petersburg National Battlefield in southeastern Virginia protects lands associated with General U.S. Grant's 9.5-month siege and the Confederate defense of Petersburg from 1864-65, the eventual Confederate collapse, and the final events leading up to the end of the American Civil War. President Abraham Lincoln spent two of the last three weeks of his life here, discussing potential terms of surrender with Grant.

In fiscal year 2001, 87.1 percent of Petersburg's operations budget of $2.38 million supported nearly 40 FTE. In fiscal year 2004, 92.1 percent of its operations budget of $2.4 million supported 35 FTEs. Since January 2001, the park actually has lost an interpretive ranger, an historian, an auto mechanic, a GIS specialist, and an information technology specialist shared with Richmond National Battlefield Park. From fiscal year 2001-2004, Petersburg lost $265,775 in its purchasing power.

In fiscal year 2005, the park received line-item funding to upgrade its existing maintenance facility. However, the park's auto mechanic position is open, and the park lacks the funding to fill it. Until the park can hire a mechanic, that function will remain unstaffed, with the park attempting to meet those needs via collateral duty assignments.

Dedicated park managers across the region engage creative strategies to leverage their limited dollars to get the job done, with remarkable results. For example, Petersburg National Battlefield pulled together a variety of partners to restore and then re-set one of its most dramatic assets: the "Dictator," a 13-inch seacoast mortar and the most powerful weapon used during the

siege and defense of Petersburg. The park hired experts at the Mariner's Museum in Newport News, Virginia, to restore and preserve this mortar., supplementing their work with that of volunteers. Despite wartime demands, the U.S. Army base at Fort Lee provided soldiers and special equipment to hoist the 17,000-pound gun tube from its old carriage and to re-set it. This partnership leveraged $8,000 in the park's Fee Demo funds to complete a project in fiscal year 2004 that was valued at more than $30,000.

Land and Water Conservation Fund

For land acquisition, the National Park Service relies on funds provided through the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). Several parks in this region have been authorized to buy lands critical to their protection but received insufficient funds for it. Others have an opportunity to buy critical lands that could mean the difference between preserving the park as it was intended or losing these valuable lands forever.

Unfortunately, the funding the federal government provides to acquire new parkland has been under steady attack in recent years. While the federal side of LWCF, which funds national park acquisitions, achieved a high watermark of $130 million in fiscal year 2002, Congress appropriated only $55 million for the program last year, and the administration's request for this year is $53 million.

Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania

Of the 5,989 acres inside Gettysburg's congressionally-designated boundary, nearly 20 percent -- 1,154 acres -- remains privately owned. In fiscal year 2005, the park already has been approached by two in-holders interested in selling to the park, but with no funding in hand, the park service has not pursued even relatively small, low-cost but high-return opportunities. Gettysburg last received LWCF funding in fiscal year 2001 for acquisition of the infamous viewing tower.

Valley Forge National Historical Park, Pennsylvania

Without the $7.5 million Senator Specter was able to obtain in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 , the Park Service would have been unable to buy the historic Waggonseller farm. Instead, that area of Valley Forge, where local farmers sold goods and services to General George Washington's

troops, now would bea 62-acre luxury subdivision. Instead, future generations will see that historic ground much as General Washington and his troops did during the bitter winter of 1777-1778. Senator Specter also secured a $1.5 million appropriation in fiscal year 2005 towards future acquisitions that Congress has already authorized at Valley Forge, but with more than 10 percent of the land inside the park boundary today owned by others, much more will be needed before we can complete this national shrine.

Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia

Today one of the most exciting opportunities for protection of our Civil War history is at Petersburg. NPCA is extremely pleased that the Park Service's new General Management Plan for Petersburg supports the goal of expanding the park's boundary by 7,238 acres, and expanding its interpretive themes, especially the proposed inclusion of more information about the roles of African Americans and of women in the Petersburg Campaign, and in the siege and defense of Petersburg.

This boundary expansion is of fundamental and urgent importance to the park's future. In 1993, at the request of Congress, the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission reported that 23,000 of the more than 100,000 acres of lands associated with the Petersburg campaign retained their integrity. In the decade since, some of these lands have been lost to suburban, commercial, and industrial development. And development pressures in southeastern Virginia continue to escalate. In only a few years, pressures at Petersburg likely will be comparable to those now faced by Valley Forge, Fredericksburg, and Harpers Ferry, each of which has faced high-profile, high-stakes, expensive battles against proposed development on sacred ground in the recent past. LWCF funding will be essential to protect as much of this historic landscape as possible for the benefit of future generations.

George Washington Birthplace National Monument, Virginia

Established in 1932 to preserve the history and legacy of George Washington, one of America's greatest icons, the monument recreates an excellent example of an 18th century plantation. Rich in plant and animal life, the majority of the monument is woodlands, open fields,

and beach. On a brief visit there in 2001, I saw a bald eagle flying above Pope's Creek's confluence with the Potomac River and a flock of turkey foraging at the edge of the woods.

Legislation sponsored by Senator John Warner and Representative Jo Ann Davis in the 107th Congress expanded the park's boundary by 112 acres to include two privately held tracts that have been described as the "hole in the doughnut." This is farmland surrounded by parkland, with frontage on both Pope's Creek and the Potomac River. But the opportunity to complete the park and acquire this land from willing sellers is at risk, with both tracts now listed for sale by a commercial broker. When the expansion was approved in 2002, the Congressional Budget Office estimated the costs of acquisition at between $1 million and $2 million—a small price to pay to protect the birthplace of the father of our country.

New River Gorge National River, West Virginia

Established in 1978, New River Gorge protects 53 free-flowing miles one of North America's oldest rivers. More than 1 million visitors travel here each year to enjoy this world-class climbing and whitewater boating destination, camp, hike the wooded trails, and enjoy wildlife and scenic beauty.

Congress expanded the park in 2002 to 72,189 acres to include approximately 1,260 acres across the river from Diamond Point, a popular scenic viewpoint. The lands in the expanded boundary now are threatened by a 2,200-unit housing development proposed inside and alongside the park boundary. Congress allocated $2 million in fiscal year 2005 for land acquisition at the park, but this may not be sufficient to acquire the lands that are at risk.

Conclusion

The fiscal shortfalls our national parks are experiencing are not sustainable if we wish to protect our national legacy for future generations. Half-measures will no longer do. As Shenandoah superintendent Douglas Morris said in 2003, "I try to spread the pain [of budget cuts] so that no one service disappears entirely. So restrooms are cleaned fewer times per day or week. There are fewer talks per week. There are fewer ranger patrols. All of this is diminishing the experience." But this statement speaks only to a few of the visitor services responsibilities of park staff, and not to the long-term consequences of funding shortfalls on natural and cultural resource protection. When 15

leaky roofs need repairing, the 5 that don't get patched will just keep on leaking until the roof caves in and the house falls down.

The stakes of the funding debate for our national heritage are enormous. As some have observed, if the Smithsonian Institution is the nation's attic, the national parks are the rest of the house. We are grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for helping us ensure that this great house of ours remains standing for generations to come.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your testimony. Our clean-up witness is Mr. Lighthizer. Thank you for coming.

STATEMENT OF JAMES LIGHTHIZER

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. Mr. Chairman, good to see you again, Congressman Platts. My name is Jim Lighthizer; I am president of something called the Civil War Preservation Trust. It is an organization of some 70,000 members nationwide. We are non-profit. And we have as our primary mission to preserve as much important and significant Civil War battlefield land that is unprotected in the time remaining with the emphasis on important Civil War land, which is documented, and in the time remaining, recognizing that this will be the last generation that will have any real opportunity to preserve that part of our national heritage.

It gets interesting, gentlemen, that probably the first effort to preserve Civil War battlefield land was done right here. I think it was 1864 when a private individual from this community bought some land along Cemetery Ridge, and, of course, it expanded from there. And later the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania bought some land for the cemetery. So it, in a sense, the battlefield preservation movement started right here over 140 years ago. And the Civil War Preservation Trust continues that tradition in the sense that the private sector is vitally involved.

Now, our organization, which is the product of a merger in 1999, has saved about 15,000 acres around the country of Civil War battlefield land. That land is land that has been identified through a Congressional Civil War Studies Advisory Commission Report, which was done in 1993, commissioned by the Congress in 1990. And it identified 384 battles around the country that were "determinative of the outcome of the conflict." The vast majority of that land is not within the confines of the National Park Service boundaries, as you gentlemen well know. And, in fact, speaking of the boundaries, of course, the first movement started with individuals to save battlefields.

In 1895 the Congress created the Battlefield of Chickamauga, which was the first wholesale purchase of land on a battlefield. After that, I believe, came Antietam and then Gettysburg, all in the 1890's. In the 1920's and 1930's the U.S. Government got serious again about saving battlefields, places around Spotsylvania and Chancellorsville and other very significant areas.

But, interestingly enough, they developed a plan of preservation that involved, in part—it is called the Antietam Plan, and what it did was—they only bought land around monuments and around areas that they deemed important, for example, trenches at Chancellorsville and the Wilderness. And right now those trenches are preserved, but about 6 feet on either side is still in the private sector. And, of course, the thinking was back then that the land would never be developed. It would always remain woodland or rural or farmland. And that was true for about 50 years or so, and then in the 1980's it all changed.

And what you see now—and Mr. Chairman, I believe you are a student of the war and I am sure you have been to battlefields. As you can see trenches in the Wilderness with 4 feet away you can see a sandbox and a swing set because it is the backyard of some-

body's house, which certainly does detract, if not denigrate, what happened there because men fought and died for reasons that were very, very important to them and our country.

So that land, as well intentioned as it was 60 or 70 years ago, simply is not helpful today. And while the U.S. Government, through the National Park Service, has purchased land and continues to purchase land, it is nowhere near keeping up with the pressure of development.

Now, we have estimated that there is a maximum of 20 years left to save the important land. And I am not just talking about anything that had something to do with the Civil War, but significant core battlefield land. And if you look at places like Virginia, around Richmond or Fredericksburg or the Valley, that timeframe is really more in months. It is no more than 4 or 5 years. And then the issue is going to be decided. And it is not going to be decided as to cost. It will either be saved or paved over, one or the other. And it is a general proposition, and there are one or two notable exceptions, but as a general proposition, once the land is developed, it is gone forever. And the opportunity to save it and gain a full appreciation of our heritage is gone forever. So we are really in a race against time.

The Congress in 1999, to their credit, through by the way the use of an earmark created a program that funds something called the American Battlefield Protection Program, which is a small unit of the Park Service. And what it does is provide money to groups like myself can compete for, and it provides at least a 50/50 match. In other words, for every Federal dollar in this fund, 50 percent has to be raised from somewhere else, non-Federal money.

Over the last 5 years approximately $26 million have been appropriated and about $20 million has been obligated. But what that fund has done—and I invite your comparison, gentlemen—that fund has saved over 13,000 acres of land outside of the National Park Service boundaries. Now, if you do the math, that is about $1,500 or $1,600 an acre of Federal Government money. Compare that to Stuart Hill, which in 1988—it is a little bit before your gentlemen's time—but was a highly controversial land development that was about 550 acres at Manassas, extremely important ground. A developer was going to pave it over for a shopping center, and the Congress did a congressional taking—very unusual. But it cost over $120 million or $220,000 an acre. Now, I know you gentlemen agree that not even the U.S. Government can afford that kind of significant or continuous expenditure of moneys for land.

So my point is the Land and Water Conservation Fund that Congress created by the way and that President Bush, to his credit, has included in his budget the last 2 years, has saved a significant amount of ground for a very reasonable price—historic ground. And that effort, with the support of the Congress hopefully will continue.

And by the way, just as an aside, the $20 million that has been obligated, $1 million of that went to fight forest fires out west. So it is really $19 million. But I digress just a little bit.

Let me just conclude, gentlemen, by saying this: that I hope that you all in the National Park Service will look inward as well as

outward when it comes to funding that part of our national heritage. Certainly, the money is needed to buy land within the Park Service boundaries, as Joy mentioned. But there is also a great deal of land outside of the boundaries that is just as important, just as significant, just as hallow that the Civil War Preservation Trust, a private group, is saving in partnership with the U.S. Government.

Once again let me just compliment both you gentlemen for having the interest and caring in bringing the focus on this overall very important subject. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Lighthizer follows:]

Testimony of Civil War Preservation Trust President James Lighthizer Before the House Government Reform Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources

Monday, March 14, 2005
Congressional Field Hearing, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is James Lighthizer, and I am president of the Civil War Preservation Trust (CWPT), a 70,000-member nonprofit organization dedicated to preserving America's remaining Civil War battlefields.

I come before you today to state our views on the future of America's Civil War battlefields, particularly those protected at least in part by the National Park Service (NPS). As several speakers on this morning's agenda have already indicated, protecting these national treasures is a matter of the utmost urgency.

The primary mission of the Civil War Preservation Trust is to "buy dirt." To this end, the Civil War Preservation Trust has saved 21,300 acres of hallowed ground in 19 states, including historic parcels right here in beautiful Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Although the Trust has protected land inside National Park Service boundaries, our principal focus is battlefield properties outside those boundaries.

To understand the modern Civil War battlefield preservation movement, it is helpful to briefly examines its 140-year history. To a large extent, it began right here, when the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania purchased land for a National Cemetery at Gettysburg. In the decades immediately following the Civil War, veterans of Gettysburg and other Civil War conflicts took the lead in acquiring small parcels of land to place monuments – memorials that commemorated their fallen comrades as well as the heroic deeds of their youth.

It was only later, beginning in the 1890s, that the federal government became actively involved, creating national battlefield parks here at Gettysburg, at Chickamauga and Chattanooga in Georgia and Tennessee, and Antietam in Maryland. Later, in the 1920s and 1930s, there was a flurry of federal activity that resulted in the establishment of several additional national battlefield parks.

Although well meaning, these federal efforts to protect battlefield land were woefully inadequate. They were based on the false assumption that most battlefield land would remain agricultural, and that the government only needed to save small parcels where monuments and physical remnants of battlefields were located (this is referred to in National Park Service circles as "the Antietam plan"). The legislative boundaries at many NPS-protected Civil War battlefields are also based on this erroneous assumption. As a result, today thousands of historic acres still remain outside National Park Service boundaries and are extremely vulnerable to development.

For decades, these inadequacies were a ticking time bomb for America's Civil War battlefields. However, it was not until the mid-1980s that it became clear that the bomb was ready to explode. Two high-profile preservation threats – at Manassas and Brandy Station, Virginia – served as a wake up call to both Congress and the preservation community that immediate action was needed if these and other Civil War battle sites were to be preserved.

In particular, it was the impending threat of commercial development on part of the Manassas Battlefield that revealed to Congress the true nature of the threats confronting these hallowed battlegrounds. In order to prevent a shopping mall from being built on 558 acres of historic property known as "Stuart's Hill," Congress voted to condemn the land and turn it over to Manassas National Battlefield Park. As a result, land that originally cost the developer $2 million wound up costing the federal government an estimated $123 million. Clearly, there was an urgent need to find a more cost effective method of preserving battlefield land.

In 1990, Congress addressed this need by establishing the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC), a blue-ribbon panel that was given the task of identifying the most important Civil War battlefields, determining the threats to those sites, and proposing fiscally responsible methods to protect them. In 1993, the Commission released the results of its work in a report that identified 383 Civil War "priority" battlefields considered worthy of preservation. The Commission also recommended that Congress establish a $10 million a year "emergency" matching grants program for battlefield land outside National Park Service boundaries.

Although it took it Congress another five years to act upon CWSAC's recommendations, it is this "emergency" funding program that has evolved into the most effective mechanism for protecting battlefield land outside National Park Service boundaries. In FY 1999, Congress first funded what has become the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program in the amount of $8 million available for a period of three years. In 2002, Congress enacted the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act, officially authorizing the matching grants program recommended by CWSAC in 1993. To date, Congress has appropriated $26 million for the program.

The success of the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program has been remarkable. More than 13,000 acres of battlefield land outside NPS boundaries have been acquired from willing sellers as a result of the program. To date, of the $26 million appropriated by Congress, $20 million has been obligated. This means the average cost per acre to the federal government is just $1,538. This compares very favorably with the previously mentioned land condemnation at Manassas, which cost the federal government $220,000 per acre.

Because sites are identified in the 1993 CWSAC report, the program is one of the few federal land acquisition programs that has a list of measurable, priority sites. In addition, the program requires a non-federal match, which promotes state, local, and private sector investment in battlefield preservation. The Civil War Preservation Trust is the principal nonprofit advocate for this program, as well as the primary nonprofit source of non-federal matching funds.

In addition, the Civil War Preservation Trust utilizes two other federal matching grants programs for battlefield preservation: the Transportation Enhancement Program and the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program.

The Transportation Enhancement (TE) program provides matching grants to state and local governments from automatically available funding. The program offers a 20 percent non-federal match, and can be used for both fee simple purchases and conservation easements. The TE program was first authorized in 1991 as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), and then again in 1998 as part of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). Ten states currently use the TE program for battlefield preservation. Nearly $20 million in TE grants has been allocated for Civil War battlefield preservation since 1992.

Farm and Ranchland Protection Program (FRPP) comprises matching grants from automatically available federal funding. FRPP requires at least a 50 percent non-federal match for permanent conservation easements. This program was first authorized in 1996 to provide federal financial assistance in the form of matching grants to keep working farms in existence. When the program was reauthorized as part of the 2002 Farm Bill, it included a new provision encouraging the preservation of historically important farmland. The 2002 Farm Bill also significantly increased the amount of grant money available (at total of $985 million over 10 years). Since 2002, $1.3 million in FRPP grants has been awarded to save 1,343 acres of Civil War battlefield farmland in five states. Among those sites are two associated with the Gettysburg Campaign: East Cavalry Field, which is partially protected by the National Park Service, and nearby Fairfield Battlefield, where two Medals of Honor were awarded to Union troopers.

However, these effective and important federal programs cannot keep up with the growing threats to Civil War battlefields, both inside and outside National Park Service boundaries. Just a few weeks ago, the Civil War Preservation Trust released *History Under Siege*, our annual report on America's most endangered battlefields. The report identified 25 battlefields currently threatened by development, among them Manassas National Battlefield and Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park in Virginia; Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield in Georgia; and Wilson's Creek National Battlefield in Missouri. At each one of these battlefields, sprawl is the principal threat to the site's integrity.

The situation at Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park is typical of the threats faced by many Civil War national parks. This particular park is responsible for maintaining and interpreting five battlefields: Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Salem Church, the Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House. These five battlefields are located in Spotsylvania County, one of the fastest growing counties in the nation (the county was ranked 13th in the nation in 2003 and 19th in the nation in 2004). The Salem Church battlefield is all but lost to sprawl.

The Civil War Preservation Trust estimates that at least 1,500 acres of historic properties associated with these battlefields need to be protected in the next 3 to 5 years, or they will be lost forever. This is blood-soaked ground, which if lost can never be replaced. However,

because of land values in the region, acquisition of these properties will require $20 million – a staggering sum. Sadly, similar situations exist at several other Civil War national parks throughout the nation.

It is important to note that battlefield preservation is enormously popular with the public. Recent public opinion polls commissioned by the Civil War Preservation Trust indicate that voters in communities with Civil War battlefields overwhelmingly support preservation of these historic resources. Just last month, surveys in Franklin, Tennessee and Charleston County, South Carolina found that seven out of ten voters support preservation of the Franklin and Morris Island Battlefields (74 percent in Franklin and 71 percent in Charleston County). In both cases, more than 70 percent of Franklin and Charleston residents indicated they would be more likely to support public officials who advocate preservation (71 percent in Franklin and 77 percent in Charleston County).

Part of the reason for this popularity is the growing acknowledgement that Civil War battles have enormous potential as tourist attractions. I like to refer to Civil War battlefields as "low impact economic engines," because tourists who visit these sites spend money on lodging, gas, food and trinkets, but place little or no demand on local government services or school budgets.

Last fall, the Civil War Preservation Trust released the first of a series of reports on the economic benefits of battlefield preservation. We analyzed seven battlefield parks, including three national battlefield parks: Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park in Virginia; Gettysburg National Military Park here in Pennsylvania; and Shiloh National Military Park in Tennessee.

Together, these seven sites generated $22.4 million in local and state tax revenue and an additional $156 million in visitor expenditures. These battlefields also supported 3,406 jobs in the surrounding communities. In every case, the vast majority of tourists cited the battlefield as the primary reason for visiting the locality where the battlefield is located.

It should come as no surprise that Gettysburg dominates other Civil War battlefields in generating revenue from tourism. According to our study, the Gettysburg battlefield generates 1.5 million out-of-town visitors annually – and nearly all of them (95 percent) come here because of the battlefield. Each year, these tourists spend $121 million in the area, generating $17 million for local government coffers and supporting 2,600 jobs. The Gettysburg Area Chamber of Commerce summed it up best when it stated that "[Gettysburg Battlefield is] truly one of the most important business enterprises in Adams County."

In conclusion, the plight of America's Civil War battlefields poses enormous challenges for both the public and private sector. Many communities are anxious to work with nonprofit organizations to save the historic properties in their midst. If Congress can continue to support matching grant programs like the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program, the Transportation Enhancement Program, and the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program, we may yet be able to save substantial battlefield land still vulnerable to development.

Fully funding the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program to its authorized amount of $10 million per year would enable the preservation community to save approximately 3,500 additional acres annually. If Congress fully funds the program, I will personally commit the Civil War Preservation Trust to matching that amount dollar-for-dollar, through a combination of private donations from our members and matching grants from state and local governments.

Mr. Chairman, preserving Civil War battlefields – both inside and outside National Park Service boundaries – is a task that cannot be left to future generations. Time is against us. We must act now.

Thank you for the opportunity to address your committee.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you very much for your testimony. Mr. Platts, before we scheduled this hearing, had a commitment that he had made, so I am going to yield to him first so he can do his questioning.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I unfortunately won't have the time to get into questions. I have a veterans group at noon in York that I committed to address some veterans' issues and do have to run to keep that appointment.

But I want to first just thank each of you and through your respective organizations for your tremendous work. Specific to here at Gettysburg were two organizations and then in a broad sense to all of our parks out there and to the Civil War in particular and with the Preservation Trust. I hate to think of where we would be but for each of your organization's efforts, both in dollars and volunteer hours and public awareness of the challenges.

And each of you gave important testimony, and Ms. Oakes, your frank assessment of Gettysburg in particular and then in a broad sense is what we need to hear. And, you know, to Mr. McIntosh, that was my message I hope he takes back because Congress needs to hear these frank examples. When you hear one out of four school groups not being able to get—you know, and because that is what we want to encourage, that experience.

The purchasing power as we talked about with Mr. McIntosh, 53 cents on the dollar here at Gettysburg, 57 cents—your example of the 14-year-old vehicle, when I was at Lexington in Concord in driving with the superintendent there, I think it was about a 20-year-old vehicle, and I think a Dodge K-car or something. I wasn't so sure about the safety of the vehicle as we traveled.

But the one that hit me especially was your example of your fifth-grade son and you standing in the sunroom, two summers back we were—my kids had the pleasure—by good timing we were at Ft. McHenry on my wife's birthday. To celebrate her birthday we visited Ft. McHenry, and my kids got to lower the flag with 20 other guests there. It was, you know, the huge flag—and to participate in that lowering and folding of the flag. A month later we were at Ft. Clatsop and had the privilege in there because of a very small crowd at the closing, my son and daughter got to help lower and fold the flag at Ft. Clatsop and understand some of the history of Lewis and Clark.

That is what this is all about, is our children getting to experience the history and the beauty of our Nation. And each of your organizations is doing a great job. Here at Gettysburg, Governor Thornburgh with the Foundation and with the Friends working hand-in-hand, what we will have in the years to come—as one who grew up not far from here in York, my parents were very wise. With five kids they said, where can we go where there is lots of open space where the kids can learn and maybe give us a little break from the noise of five kids? And Gettysburg was the spot we came to regularly.

The first time—my mother-in-law is from Buffalo—was in the area, and I was excited and brought her over here to Gettysburg. And we went into the Visitor Center about 10 years ago, and I was excited for her to experience the Visitor Center and the Electric Map. My emotional tie to the Electric Map growing up here was

little different than her experiencing what she expected to find at Gettysburg and—as a visitor.

And the opportunities we will have in the years to come when I bring her back when the new Visitor Center is done and truly a world-class experience for her and the visitors to come will be exceptional. And just really encourage you to go forward with your efforts in working with the Park Service and look forward to not just that ground-breaking, but ultimately that opening.

I apologize that I need to run and don't have a chance to give any questions, but certainly will do my utmost to support Chairman Souder in his efforts working with the Park Service and each of your organizations in the months and years to come. And we hopefully together will achieve success for the future generations. So thank you. So, then, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do apologize. I need to run.

Mr. SOUDER. Thanks a lot. But first let me say to Mr. Thornburgh and Mr. Booz that I wish we had this in every park in the United States. I mean, what you have done here is extraordinary, and clearly part of our national challenge as we lean more on private sector and public sector cooperation is that it is easier for Yosemite or Grand Canyon and Gettysburg than it is many of the others. That said, it is still hard.

And I wondered, Governor, if you could maybe for the record—let me ask a more directed question rather than at first a general question. As we look at the difficulties of the public-private partnerships—because clearly if we are going to expand and build new Visitor Centers given the fact that we are having difficulty covering staffing dollars, given the difficulty that we have in inholdings, let alone new purchases, but even lands inside the park that could be sold—that visitor services are becoming much more difficult.

One of my first things when I went onto the Parks Committee was the process that we were going through with this Visitor Center. And I am curious how some of this was resolved. I think it is extraordinary design, absolutely beautiful, absolutely the model, and I am kind of curious, and if you could talk a little bit about how some of this was resolved.

I remember that one of the criticisms was that moving the Visitor Center away from the heart of the battlefield would isolate it, and visitors might not get involved in the town and how that relates to the transportation questions, the Wills House, and other things, and how you see that in relationship.

Another was that the proposal was to make this public, private, and self-funded. At one point it was going to be the largest Civil War bookstore and a huge cafeteria. Then Congress more or less mandated that those had to be reduced and then complained that it wasn't going to be self-funding. Can you talk about some of the tradeoffs as to how you work through inside the community and the potential competitive pressures; at the same time how to make these things financially viable so the taxpayers as a whole don't have to do it; and how you put together a team to develop a Visitor Center like this.

Mr. THORNBURGH. I would be glad to, Mr. Chairman, but my testimony would be secondhand, and I would like to ask Dr. Wilburn to deal in detail with your questions since he has been right on the

firing line. But let me first say how important it is, both from the point of view of participation and support, that organizations like the Foundation and like the Friends are involved in this process of upgrading and refurbishment of this important site.

We have an unprecedented and unique-in-the-world tradition of philanthropy and volunteerism in this country. And I think the work of the Foundation and the Friends represents the finest tradition in that regard in making an important contribution to the preservation of our history for future generations. And I think both David and I are proud to be part of that in terms of Gettysburg. But let me get to the question——

Mr. SOUDER. And let me—may I say——

Mr. THORNBURGH. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. First that having public figures like yourself willing to come forth and be part of the fundraising effort that many individuals who are history buffs may not have the connections or the ability to gain the media attention that flow from people like yourself being willing to take a leadership role on something like this, and that should not be underestimated.

Mr. THORNBURGH. That is very kind.

Mr. SOUDER. It has been really interesting for me to kind of go from this kind of history buff all of a sudden to a public position. But in watching many of the people, when you get to be in a public position, let alone a Governor or attorney general like yourself, you meet different people and can do more matchmaking than the people who necessarily are burrowed into the project. And I know that has been critical part of this——

Mr. THORNBURGH. Well——

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. You and the other leaderships. So don't downplay your——

Mr. THORNBURGH. I hope that is——

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Role in this.

Mr. THORNBURGH [continuing]. Useful, but my wife refers to me as a Gettysburg nut.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, good.

Mr. THORNBURGH. So that is——

Mr. SOUDER. You are both——

Mr. THORNBURGH [continuing]. Really——

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Two halves.

Mr. THORNBURGH. That is the real genesis of my interest in this.

Mr. SOUDER. OK, well——

Mr. THORNBURGH. Bob, why don't you step up to the——

Mr. SOUDER. I am going to need to swear you in, so if you will raise your right hand.

[Witness sworn]

Mr. SOUDER. Spell both your first and last name for the record because the other witnesses all had it in their testimony.

Mr. WILBURN. Robert Wilburn, W-i-l-b-u-r-n.

Mr. SOUDER. Now my question was a little bit on the evolution that you are well aware of and know what we battle through and how you resolve some of those questions as we look at other public-private partnerships.

Mr. WILBURN. And you mentioned specifically some of the criticisms or concerns I should say in terms of the interaction with the town and moving the Visitor Center some distance from town——

Mr. SOUDER. And second, on the funding because obviously, to pay for operating costs for 20 years, as you are proposing to do, you have to have a source of revenue. When you have a source of revenue——

Mr. WILBURN. Right.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Is it a zero-sum game or do you think there will be a bigger pool of revenue from which to pull?

Mr. WILBURN. Right. OK. OK, first of all, in terms of the relationship to the town, I think everybody involved with the project is committed to the concept that you can't experience the battlefield without experiencing the town and that we want to make sure that visitors go to the town. And so I think the fact that we are developing at the same the Wills House—not we as a foundation, but the Park Service and the community is developing the Wills House and the train station—is going to add to this flow of visitors between the town and the Visitor Center.

The Visitor Center is only moving about a half a mile from the current site. So it is not being moved that far away. Also important to this is the shuttle system that we are working on in trying to make sure that there will be a shuttle system that will go between the Visitor Center and the town.

And then finally, the third thing that we are working on is to make sure that there is not development around the Visitor Center so that we are not going to create another sort of place for visitors to go. And we have been acquiring strategic properties and making sure that there would not be development along Baltimore Pike.

So the combination of all those things have, I think—I believe that people in town now appreciate the fact that we have a real commitment to making sure that visitors experience the town, and that it is not becoming an isolated place some distance away from town, but rather an integral part of the entire experience.

In terms of the long-term operating cost, the actual—and we are convinced—we have done our pro formas—that it will be self-financing. We have limited the size of the bookstore and we have limited the size of the restaurant facility. But there will be some revenues that will come from the restaurant facility. There will be revenues that will come from the bookstore.

And, in addition to that, we expect a significantly larger amount of revenues coming from attending the film experience that will be there as well as the Cyclorama. Co-locating the Cyclorama and the film experience together in and of itself is going to generate an additional considerable amount of revenues, because now, while you have 600,000 people each year, for example, go to the Electric Map Program, only half that many go to the Cyclorama, and part of that is just the fact that they are separate and more difficult to do both. By bringing them together, we believe that we are going to increase revenues rather sizably, which will also help in the financing of the building so—I mean, I am sorry, in the financing of the operating costs going forward.

We are convinced that the operating cost will be sufficient, not just to cover the cost of running the facility, it will also be suffi-

cient to provide for reserves for the building, to make sure that it is maintained in top condition, also to have reserves for keeping the exhibits fresh, as well as to return not just the funds that are now going from these activities to the Park Service that we think will be actually additional funds in the future.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you foresee, then, at the Visitor Center in seeing the operating funds, what kind of management—since you are paying the operating, does that not include the rangers that are present? What is the interrelationship that you see at the Visitor Center?

Mr. WILBURN. OK. I mean, the rangers would continue to be funded, we assume, by——

Mr. SOUDER. Yes.

Mr. WILBURN [continuing]. The Federal Government. We are talking about just covering the actual costs of the building.

Mr. SOUDER. The maintenance of the building.

Mr. WILBURN. And the staff that would be necessary to run the facility, you know, the maintenance of the facility itself.

Mr. SOUDER. So that would be——

Mr. WILBURN. There is still a significant amount of Federal moneys that are necessary——

Mr. SOUDER. Right.

Mr. WILBURN [continuing]. To pay the salaries of the rangers and the staff of the National Park Service.

Mr. SOUDER. So, for example, where rifles would be stored or anything in storage——

Mr. WILBURN. We would still have curators from the National Park Service that would——

Mr. SOUDER. But the——

Mr. WILBURN [continuing]. Be responsible.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Cost of the storage facility, maintenance, temperature control, for example, would be borne——

Mr. WILBURN. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. By the——

Mr. WILBURN. We would bear that cost, right.

Mr. SOUDER. For 20 years?

Mr. WILBURN. Right.

Mr. SOUDER. And that the—is it Eastern National that they have the concessionary contract? Or would this now be under the Visitor Center or how does that work?

Mr. WILBURN. At the current time Eastern National has the contract for the bookstore.

Mr. SOUDER. And would they continue as a—is that a bid process or the people who bid the center now would have that contract?

Mr. WILBURN. The agreement with the National Park Service gives the Foundation the right to determine who would run the bookstore. We are currently having discussions on going with Eastern National to see if we can work on agreements acceptable to all parties, for them to do it.

Mr. SOUDER. And then you would get the percentage of revenue that comes from the contract to go toward covering your operating?

Mr. WILBURN. Right, with a couple of conditions that have been—as part of the original agreement. As you, I am sure, are aware, Gettysburg has been a very successful bookstore operation

in the past and has provided funds to other parks around the country. That has been capped at $420,000 of dollars that go from Gettysburg to support other parks. We have agreed to continue at that level to provide that support for other stores, or other parks. But with that condition and with the understanding that the Park Service would continue to get the same amount or more income than they currently get from the operations, those are the restrictions we have on it.

Mr. SOUDER. So the Park Service would continue to get the same that they were getting more——

Mr. WILBURN. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. So you are banking on additional revenues to be able to cover that?

Mr. WILBURN. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. The Governor mentioned that the 17 percent that was Federal, which included mostly money for the Cyclorama. Did that cover all the Cyclorama cost?

Mr. WILBURN. The first three appropriations total just under $7 million, and those are exclusively for the Cyclorama. The last appropriation was for $5 million, which was to cover the remaining cost of the Cyclorama painting as well as any additional funds were to go to the care of the collections. There may be some support for the Cyclorama that comes from private sources, but essentially, it is covered in its entirety, if necessary, by Federal funds.

Mr. SOUDER. So in effect, since the Federal Government paid for moving the Cyclorama and the artifacts, they put nothing into the actual center itself? Or minimal?

Mr. WILBURN. Minimal amount into the Visitor Center. There will be some addition between the total cost of the Cyclorama and the $12 million.

Mr. SOUDER. I mean, this is a fascinating case.

Mr. WILBURN. Right.

Mr. SOUDER. Each public-private partnership and visitors centers are slightly different. But clearly, as we head this direction, Mesa Verde has one of the huge problems in the National Park System because they have all these historic artifacts in trailers right now for the most part, if they are protected at all.

And they are looking at building a new public-private Visitor Center. Should it be on the park land? Should it be right outside of the park land? Luna Moore's wife has been one of their key fundraisers to try to put this together. Similar questions at Valley Forge, how big, how you do the balance, and all these tradeoffs.

Rocky Mountain had a private developer built the Visitor Center, which uses a model by the National Park Service. Until I went there I couldn't figure out why this person decided to do it, but clearly, when you go to find a restroom, you have to go through all the eating places and through the gift shops to get to the restroom, but hey, it saved the taxpayers millions of dollars.

And we don't have these dollars to put out right now when you are talking about, do you give Medicaid to a poor individual who doesn't have healthcare? Do you make sure that you are safe going to the airport? I mean, these are tough budget decisions we are working through right now. In the degree we can leverage them the better we can.

Mr. WILBURN. Sure.

Mr. SOUDER. And you are a very interesting model of how to do that, and that was why I was trying to get into the——

Mr. WILBURN. I think that the most important thing that is done—and you mentioned it when you talked about Governor Thornburgh—is getting the right Board of Directors and the right people to be working with you. And I can't stress how important it is to have individuals who do open doors for you and make it possible to go places where you otherwise couldn't go.

But I would add to that everyone that we have recruited to our Board of Directors, without exception, is not only can they have access to individuals, but they are totally committed to what we are trying to do at Gettysburg. And it is a combination of those two things, of having people that care about preserving our past and making sure that it is told as effectively as it can be told, as well as having the ability to bring others sort of into the fold, if you will. Both of those things are so important. And we have been very successful.

Governor Thornburgh also chairs our Nominating Committee for our Board of Directors. And I think if you looked at our Board of Directors, you would see that we really do have a very distinguished group who are not just able to open doors, but also care deeply about what we are doing.

Mr. SOUDER. We shouldn't neglect to mention the State which is a huge partner.

Mr. WILBURN. Absolutely.

Mr. SOUDER. And also Pennsylvania has been a model, because at Independence Hall, the Visitor Center for that park——

Mr. WILBURN. Right.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. State and city had been involved because the other Visitor Center is at a ramp that never came, and going to Independence it is always hard to find where the Visitor Center is. So there is another example where the State put up a lot of dollars. And to a degree, I believe that in addition to the prioritization of what is historically important, part of it ought to be what is the level of support that community has shown, the State has shown——

Mr. WILBURN. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. An ability to do that, because to a degree we can leverage these funds if things are relatively even in importance. It is a very valuable thing.

Mr. Booz, one of the debates that you alluded to in a couple of places in yours, and without groups like yours, as the Friends, I don't know how we would do interpretive-type questions and other types of things. A fundamental question of—and I would be interested—in the record this relates in funding and prioritization and management of parks quite a bit—is how you view integrity of battlefield questions.

This became a big question where the Visitor Center was on the angle, and what is ground versus historic structures because where the Cyclorama was was a historic structure.

But I want to get into another question of how much should a battlefield look like, and how much of our money should be spent

to make it look like the battle so that people who come can get a sense for the battle.

How can that be balanced with the question of the vistas aren't the same because there is private property up some and maybe having trees there makes you feel more like it was the battle than if you didn't have the trees blocking, say, this swing set next door.

And in particular, obviously the peach orchard was one of the questions here. Vicksburg is a huge question because when you go through Vicksburg it is like, well, if you can imagine the cannon shot through that group of trees but we wanted to preserve the drive—the role of monuments, which is a somewhat debated question, although kind of moderated now. Could you comment on a few of those questions?

Mr. WILBURN. Well, they are very good questions. And your Vicksburg comment, I agree with you on that one for sure. There is a general management plan to restore the battlefield as closely as possible to the 1863 existence. And the Friends of the National Parks are firmly in agreement with that.

Currently, a large number of trees have been cut down near what we call the Sedgwick Monument if you are familiar with that, on the southern end of Big Round Top. And when those trees are gone, the interpretation is so much different than it was 5, 10, even 50 years ago.

It is absolutely crucial I believe and the Friends believe that we create as realistic as possible of a setting and an interpretation for visitors. In order to do that we have to have input from virtually every possible source.

The town, you know, the town of Gettysburg needs to have input, the local governments, the State government, and National government, people who are interesting in this area. The reason being, whatever we do is going to cause controversy. So we have to form coalitions to get as much support as possible. The money that is needed, quite honestly, has to come from a variety of sources.

We have always felt that we will do our part and then some if at all possible to help with that. As a historian and an ex-history teacher and, you know, background for a long, long time trying to convince people of the importance of history and correct interpretations, I firmly believe that we need to restore this ground.

The peach orchards, for instance, and I mentioned that there were seven of them around this town in 1863. Now we cannot knock down half of this college to make it look like it did in 1963. And we can't, you know, destroy a large number of properties and all that. There has to be reason. There has to be logic.

But once we create a plan, we need to follow through with it. And the plan that was created a few years ago is really a good one. So I don't know what else I could tell you.

Mr. SOUDER. Would you—and I am going ask other witnesses as well—maybe you can—Ms. Oakes, Mr. Lighthizer can comment on this too—is that when we have a question in a somewhat zero-sum game—not appears zero-sum, but a somewhat zero-sum game of inholdings, additional purchases, preservation of assets and of them looking at this question of trying to get the battlefields to look as much like the battlefields, where would you put the prioritization?

And more particular, let me ask this question about the inholding question that was raised about Gettysburg. In certain places we do these land use questions where we can negotiate a 50-year land use—this is usually more used in rural settings—but I am wondering how this can be used in cultural and historic parks as well for limited change of the landscape in return.

Is that a way to leverage some of the funds? Has that been looked at at Gettysburg? And how do you prioritize these kinds of tradeoffs? Because in real dollars Gettysburg has a management plan. Other places are developing those. Others haven't even—we haven't even added to it.

So it is more of a philosophical question, how it has been resolved at Gettysburg, but you have some questions inside Gettysburg as well. What is your advice on something like that? And has it been done here, to keep a vista that somebody would keep their land and negotiate it for half of the price of what it would cost to buy the land? This is what we did with Elkhorn Ranch in North Dakota on Teddy Roosevelt's farm.

Mr. WILBURN. We have tried some things like that and are in the process. Some of the programs that the Federal Government has where they provide matching funds, they just don't apply here because when we are looking for land that is within the park boundaries or contiguous to the park, we can't find those funds. But we have tried living estates with some folks.

I think the most crucial point is that we need to pick the properties that are going to be the most beneficial to a good interpretation and then try to secure them. If you were on the first day's battlefield and you looked across that broad field, much of it is safe, much of it as close to the 1863 scene as possible.

But there are a few spots that need to be adjusted. If we could find programs that would allow either Federal or State money to be matched with privately raised money, that would be a great help. You have a difficult task, an extremely difficult task to weigh all of these issues. We weigh them on a smaller scale of simply trying to find the money. We actually need some more sources for government funding for places like Gettysburg.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Oakes, do you have any comments?

Ms. OAKES. Well, a few thoughts. Having been involved in the Toll Brothers controversy at Valley Forge, it is so much better if you can make the funding available before the rezoning gets done, before the land is platted, because the price just goes up. And I am so happy that Congress expanded the boundary of Harpers Ferry, this last Congress, and area people moved to Jefferson County, West Virginia because they can't afford housing prices in metro D.C. and so that is on kind of the leading edge of being proactive.

But some of the land inside the expanded boundary already has its perk test done, so we are not ahead of the curve entirely there. One place we can get ahead of the curve or at least stay even with it is Petersburg where the park has gone through a very meticulous analysis of the historic significance, the existing integrity of land identified by the Commission 10 years ago now, and come up with a very reasonable proposal for expanding. My feeling is that, just as been mentioned, you put asphalt on it, it is likely gone forever. If it is not gone forever, it costs you a lot more to get it back.

And so taking advantage of those opportunities, being proactive, is critical. And also providing funding to take care of the assets you have, to fix the leaky roofs. One of the maintenance backlog keep growing is because the parks don't have the maintenance staff to do the day-to-day maintenance, to fix the shingle this year instead of having to fix half the roof next year.

And so that is critical, and that is why expanding the pot a little bit through the Centennial Act is so important.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, Mr. Lighthizer.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, you had mentioned inholdings. We have land also inside the park boundary that isn't necessarily an inholding in the sense that it is not surrounded by federally owned property. We do that all the time. We have done it at Gettysburg. In fact, Bob will tell you we went and bought some property right near where the new Visitor Center is proposed to protect it from development, not so much because it was historically significant.

We are talking right now down at Fredericksburg about a piece of property that is in the park service boundary that is looking in the $6 to $8-million range, real money. And Joy mentioned the park boundary extensions. That cuts both ways for us because once it becomes part of the—boundary has expanded, we can't use that land in water conservation money, as you probably know, Mr. Chairman, for purchases inside the boundaries.

So we have to go it alone or we have to find other Federal or State money to match it, which is significantly more difficult.

And last, she mentioned Petersburg. Petersburg has presently—the current government owns about 2,700 to 2,900 acres of land. We will buy, outside of their boundaries over a 6 or 7-year period starting from 3 years ago to about 4 years from now, we will buy about that same amount of Petersburg core battlefield as the Federal Government presently owns now. The Civil War Preservation Trust will. And we will do it largely through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, matching money, that you all created. But it—we do it all the time.

I think probably the main mechanism in the county other than the National Park Service for buying land within Park Service boundaries.

Mr. SOUDER. Do you use the easements?

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. Oh, yes, sir. We use both. In fact, we did easements at Fairfield here and in East Calvary Field where we used—interesting enough, in Fairfield, the western part of the battlefield, the cavalry engagement, we used Farm and Ranchland Protection money that the Congress authorized to buy the developer rights still in the private sector—private hands.

Mr. SOUDER. And how long did the easements generally last?

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. That is forever.

Mr. SOUDER. OK, so that——

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. That is——

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. That is a long time.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes. That generally will work.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. Because sometimes there are times—it is just time-delayed.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. But the cost varies based on that. And kind of if I can go through—I am going to finish with Ms. Oakes on a broader question. But in your magazine that listed your most endangered sites that I went through last night, you also had some that didn't have some detail, and one of those was Glorieta, which is the far western battlefield in the Civil War, Mr. Lighthizer. Do you know why that was listed in particular, Glorieta Pass?

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me right, I think there is a significant road expansion there.

Mr. SOUDER. OK.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. That is my recollection.

Mr. SOUDER. OK. That is right out of Santa Fe I think.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. I haven't been there.

Mr. SOUDER. But that was interesting because it was this one battle that was the far western battle and also is——

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. I think it was the last Confederate victory, too.

Mr. SOUDER. Is it? I think it is part of Pecos National Park, which has a mix of different things, but that is a road question there predominantly. That in this fund that you use for the matches, if it was bigger, would you get more dollars to match? Is it predominantly a limitation of—you said there are 26 and you have used 20. Is that because you don't have enough demand or match dollars, or if the fund was bigger, would more be preserved?

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. If the fund was bigger, we could easily match it. Mr. Chairman, the authorization bill is for $10 million a year over 5 years. And the first year the President put $2 million in, the Congress approved it. Last year it was $5 million and the Congress approved it. This year it is back to $2 million. I am telling you if it was all $10 million every year we would easily match it. I absolutely guarantee. And the other groups besides us compete for that money. We are not the only ones, although we tend to get the lion's share because we are the only national group.

But the answer to your question is that sole limitation is what Congress appropriates. If they did $10 million, we would do $10 million. We would match it. If they did $15 million, we would do $15 million. Because it is a tremendously great selling tool to be able to tell a private sector donor or a State or a local government, would you like to double your money or triple it or quadruple it?

Mr. SOUDER. Now it just seems to me from a budget standpoint that things that have matches should be sought out by us. What are some of the downsides of what that would do in a prioritization system? In other words, if we move more dollars to matching programs, assume that you are in a relative zero-sum game—I am not saying the budget wouldn't go up a little, but it is not going to go up as much as you would be by moving it—would then you get which battlefields are most popular, which are by big metro areas, who has a particular wealthy person who is willing to donate to that fund, that could distort the preservation of history to some degree, and is that not—since a lot of this is value judgment, is that not how democracy works to some degree and the government can fill it in?

Could you walk that through what that might do to Civil War battlefields if some of the dollars actually went out of—instead of an increase in the actual what goes to the parks but to the land acquisition fund that is matched 50/50.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. Yes, I think the Park Service worries about that. First, we only buy from willing sellers, so that is defined by the free enterprise system and the market.

Second, with all due respect to the Park Service, we move a lot faster. And we don't have the restraints that a government has.

I used to be in government. I was an elected official once, and we don't have the constraints that governments have, so we can move faster. Sometimes we can get it for a better price. There is a lot of things we can do that they can't. I would like to think that it wouldn't be a zero-sum game in the sense that anything we get, the Park Service wouldn't.

But certainly, the Congress, who represented, of course, the citizens and the taxpayers, is getting a greater bang for their buck if they can double their money or triple their money or quadruple their money. And that certainly is the case here. We have the advantage of the tax laws as a nonprofit. You can make a charitable donation for part of the purchase price, as you know, and get if off your taxes, whether it is State and Federal. And we use those.

I mean, for every $1 of our member's money, we multiply it by seven. And some of it is Land and Water Conservation, some of it is the tax law, some of it is State money, but it is a huge multiplier. And that is a historic fact, and it is documented.

But I would hope that the National Park Service wouldn't look at our gain and leverage and the taxpayer's gain as their loss.

Mr. SOUDER. And one of the difficult things, as the Governor would certainly say, is that while it is not a perfect zero-sum game, in fact, the parks gain to some degree means somebody may not get a flu shot or a soldier doesn't get an armored Hummer as quick. I mean, that is what we have to do is decide how much do you put into preservation of things. If they are lost, they aren't going to be there. How much do you put into the education of a ranger at a park, and we have to figure out how to leverage the dollars.

But to do that we have to have adequate information for what tradeoffs we are actually making, which sometimes, because nobody wants to show us the actual numbers and what is happening, it is very difficult to make a real tradeoff. Clearly, it doesn't matter whether Republicans or Democrats are in control in any given State or at the Federal level right now, everybody is feeling the budget crunch, and all sorts of programs are under pressure.

I happen to believe that the parks need more money because if you lose them, you don't get them back. And the cultural resources, much of the natural, and you have an obligation to pass that on. But we also have to be very wise stewards of the dollars.

Another very, very difficult and explosive and emotional question is ranger interpretation and education. Clearly, we cannot provide the same levels as the public demand increases if you look at it in decade periods as opposed to incrementals of where a park may go up and down in a given period.

But looking, Mr. Lighthizer and Mr. Booz, in particular, at the Civil War parks, I know, for example, this interpretation question, the number of—Ms. Oakes, can I ask you—you said basically three of four are getting the tours and one of four are being left out? Is that the way I understood—and that to some degree even that is a skewed figure because, for example, I know that school trips coming from my district into Washington, DC, if they even knew it was offered, would, alone, take up the entire year's ranger supplies. That I only learned about this when my son, when he was back in the fifth grade at Antietam, they said they were going to stop at Antietam, and could we set up any type of thing? And I learned then that there was a ranger program.

But generally speaking, the park's ranger programs orient to the school districts around them unless somebody discovers it. It is not possible, quite frankly, if one congressional district in northeast Indiana could take up all the rangers who do education at Gettysburg or Antietam to meet all that school demand.

So the question is, how do we creatively provide this, because we are investing all this taxpayer money in these parks, which are both cultural and scientific, that I believe there ought to be more on the Internet; I believe there ought to be more for teachers' aids; I believe there ought to be pacts that the teachers can do some of this. It becomes, then, a ground management as opposed to an education management.

But how do you see the volunteer groups at the various parks doing this? Are there things that we can do to give incentives there? Do they get tax deductions for mileage, tax deduction for volunteer time? Should there be a standardized training program if it is a supplemental program? What can we do to make the education experience as accurate as possible without losing a qualitative and have the rangers—where we are never going to meet the public demand, but have them be an integral part of the training and key programming and making sure that there is historically accurate presentations rather than kind of very partisan interpretations, which I know from time to time get into even Civil War history. Not Republican/Democrat, but certainly different people have strongly divergent views of the same battle.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. My response is that I guess certainly you have hit the nail on the head as far as the Internet goes. Our organization is free to any teacher. We have a curriculum for different age groups or different grades and age groups that is on the Internet that is free to any teacher. And that certainly a teacher that was going to take his or her kids to Antietam as an example can go and get smart real quick if that is the only way they can do it.

Mr. SOUDER. Is there any attempt by your organization to integrate with what the Park Service does? Or is it up to the teacher to read samples over here and samples over here and sees which one they like?

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. To my recollection we don't integrate real close with the—as far as teaching goes. I mean, the second part of our mission is education, and part of that is teaching teachers how to teach the war. And we have teachers conferences, etc., but Mr. Chairman, I can't think off the top of my head where we work specifically with the national parks.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Booz.

Mr. BOOZ. In one of my previous lives I was a high school principal, so that question is very meaningful to me. I would encourage my teachers to apply for the program. On the first day that we knew it was available, they sent in the applications, and we were in Central Maryland, half an hour from here. We never got in because there was such a demand. So I don't know that it matters whether you are from Pennsylvania, Maryland, Illinois, Indiana, you know, it is just such a demand.

The conference that Jim referred to for teachers, one of my teachers went there, regarded it as one of the most outstanding conferences and educational experiences he had ever had. And he was a 30-year veteran with plenty of accolades.

I believe that Gettysburg is real fortunate in that we have the licensed battlefield guides who do a superb job of enlightening people. But we could also expand that. The volunteer programs like the Friends would be thrilled to be involved.

I doubt that the Park Service will ever be able to provide enough rangers or enough guides for the park when the real heavy tourist season comes in. I believe it would be extremely helpful to create a plan where a volunteer organization such as ours could help out. We have hundreds of members who would love to do that. However, the training would have to be, you know, a good training where people needed to go through it so that we don't get the extremists that you are talking about. And the demand is there.

Mr. SOUDER. As we kind of look at it nationally, this is—and you kind of take the subparts out—how we are going to do Visitor Centers, how we are going to do land acquisition? Education and information is a huge component of this. And it has been very interesting because this battlefield is arguably the most studied and written about of anything that we have in the National Park Service. And if it can't work here, how is it going to work elsewhere?

But I have run into just—in wandering around through the Park Service, this is a huge question. In New Orleans they are having this argument right now because they have had these populous tours that go through, and if you take those, you would think that it is basically brothels and ghosts. And the Park Service would like to have it be somewhere in the buildings and some other things including brothels and ghosts. And how do you balance that?

In the Klondike Gold Rush there is a similar type of thing that wants to happen there because there, the cruise ships come in, and they want to sell their tours on the cruise ship. And to get the attendance they jazz it up. And the history becomes less precise as they go through because they are trying to sell more tours. And so the question comes, as we privatize in trying to leverage this, what are we going to lose in the quality of the history, and at the same time realize that it is something that is inevitably going to happen to a degree?

Is there some kind of a way, if the Park Service says no, only our guides are going to provide the tours, this isn't sustainable. Even if we increase the budget, it isn't going to be sustainable. How can we get some kind of a marrying here, and your system here has to be a model because if it can't work here, I don't know how we are going to work it in New Orleans and the Klondike.

Mr. BOOZ. The Friends have our headquarters in the Rupp House, and we have the Rupp House History Center. When that was created—and the History Center has been opened—this will be its third year I believe—when that was created we worked very closely with the park and with the plans, you know, that the park had to make sure that our interpretations were appropriate. And even in the last 3 weeks we have made some revisions because we have come up with some more information that would help the interpretation. So, you know, we are trying to do what I think you are asking.

Mr. SOUDER. Yes, not to mention I remember at Saratoga being told that there was a Pentzler's operation, and now we are finding out that it was a bluff. So history is not necessarily locked in place either. Ms. Oakes, you covered the broader region in addition to the Civil War parks, and I wanted to go through—you have some of this in written testimony, but I wanted to draw it out a little bit more. In Gettysburg you said 63 cents for every dollar. Could you explain what the gap is and elaborate on that a little bit?

Ms. OAKES. Right, and in fact we could provide a copy of the Gettysburg business plan that was completed in partnership with MPCA. That gives all the detail you would want. But we found that in each of the five basic areas of park services there were shortfalls. So visitor services, resource protection, the law enforcement, maintenance, there were shortfalls in each one. The details aren't in my head, but I am happy to provide that for the record.

Mr. SOUDER. I would. And for each of the places you refer to is if you could——

Ms. OAKES. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Give us a more detailed——

Ms. OAKES. Absolutely.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. Because when we publish, the record of course will have a—each one will be a little book on each region, in effect.

Ms. OAKES. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. And then we hope to combine them into a final report that is more abbreviated, and then what my former boss—when I worked for Dan Coats—referred to as the 1–5–20 rule. The memo reads 1 page; if he gets a little interested he reads 5 pages, and then if he gets real interested he reads 20. Well, this would be a more elaborate version of that. But he wanted to know that we had the 20 each time we did a 1 even if he never looked at the 20, because we need to be able to sustain the details of the arguments that are made in the shorter part.

Ms. OAKES. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. But if I understood your statement that, in fact, it is made up a number of series of areas, and then you look at that and say the shortfalls are each of those areas. When you define a shortfall, is that a combination as a principle? Now, not Gettysburg in particular. As a principle, how did you determine what the dollar level was? What the needs are stated in the business plans as goals? Is there a rating of the severity of—in other words, is it based on they used to have this many rangers; now they have this many rangers? And to keep it funded at that level, that added to the dollar. Is it they had backlog that was deteriorating, needed to

be done? Does it also include, for example, a row that they would like to have or the land acquisition of inholding that they would like to have as well?

Ms. OAKES. Right, for Gettysburg, the 63 cents that they have for every dollar they need is based simply on the annual operations, although the plan does identify the major maintenance backlog projects and does not—I don't believe, but we can check that—identify the land acquisition needs in dollar amounts, probably in acreage amounts. And I think I mentioned it is about a 20-percent private ownership.

But that annual operations budget is based on really taking the budget apart and putting it back together in a process that was vetted by PriceWaterhouseCoopers that we worked—when the MPCA was directly involved in producing these plans, we would hire graduate students from the top business school in the country—Wharton, Harvard, Stanford, etc.—and they would live in the park for 2 or 3 months working on a daily and sometimes hourly basis with the park financial managers to take that budget apart and look at given Park Service standards, given visitorship, given the assets in the park, what are the needs. And the students, their basic question was why. I mean, their job was to challenge and analyze everything, and that is what they did.

Mr. SOUDER. What would be helpful, and I know you have done a thorough examination in that basis, and that should be a core, because one of the things we are looking at, how do we keep up the basic operating——

Ms. OAKES. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. But then, as we have discussed, as we have looked at the funding question, there is—to the degree that doesn't take into consideration backlog, because this isn't going to be possible to do for every park, but if you can pick a couple—this is kind of as we move through the hearing process that are not kind of outrageous examples, throw out the biggest here and the lowest here and kind of give what is a pattern. What are the opportunities that we may be missing as well, and if there are certain backlog things in that. Because it is one thing to argue to Congress, look, the basic operating is not being covered.

And there are several possible ways to address that. One of which I have been advocating with the Appropriations Committee is Homeland Security ought to be treated as a separate line item. I saw the—out of Homeland Security not in the parks budget. That others are similarly making that argument.

I saw in this morning's newspaper that the airports are making this argument—that we ought to be not charging the airports for homeland security. Other agencies are having the same challenge, but in the Park Service, particular with icons, disproportionate—their budget, I believe, they are being hit, and they don't have the means with which to pass through—like on an airline ticket—for users.

To the degree that there are, I am one who believes the demonstration fee, building fees, and the people who are using the park should pay a portion of it just like I believe people who use the airports should pay a portion of it, but that is not always easy to collect.

At Apostle Island, for example, 80 percent enter the islands there don't go through a Visitor Center anywhere, so how in the world would Apostle Island be funded? Different parks have an easier time of that. But the other tradeoff is while we are looking at the operating, we don't want to get everybody so obsessed just on the operating that we miss huge opportunity costs because we say look, we are so far behind on maintenance, we are so far behind on operating, we can't add this piece of land that then gets paved over, and we can never do it.

There is a very interesting balance here that we are trying to work through when we look at the funding question because, to some degree, our philosophy thus far has been grab the land, we will worry about staffing it later. Now we are finding out we don't have the dollars with which to staff it because we have grabbed so much.

And then we have had this kind of—other than boundary adjustments, very minimal adding at critical places, particularly in areas where there are inholdings with right to sell. For example, there was one little piece—my argument was at Grand Teton—that because everything else was gradually taken over in the area, we increased the value of that inholding beyond of which it used to be valued, and now it is millions of dollars. But they can put up apartments right in the middle of—I think it is by Jenny Lake.

And, you know, while we have to get that one—or the example at Manassas where it is $220,000 an acre, that because he got a zoning ability by that, it gets outlandish if you don't act. And then your kind of goose is cooked so to speak when you get to the end and how to do this tradeoff.

But clearly, we have a lack of understanding in Congress about the basic maintenance. And that is one of the things that we are trying to illustrate here. You mentioned a number of parks in the region. Do you see these as being—you picked these because they were relatively typical. Have you looked at the budget pressure of some of the—what colloquially call "postage stamp" parks?

Ms. OAKES. The little bitty ones. Well, Fort Necessity would be one that is an example—fairly small part in southwestern Pennsylvania. And their actual budget remained the same from fiscal year 1994 to fiscal year 2004. And we all know the cost of living didn't stay the same in those 10 years.

And in fact according to the Consumer Price Index a 1994 dollar bought you 79 cents worth in 2004. And so the purchasing power of that park eroded more than $200,000 during that time period, so that meant, you know, less ability to do that day-to-day maintenance, and do interpretation.

And that is a park where—it is very interesting because despite all that, they have done some really fabulous things. They have a full-time curator who has actually cataloged all of their artifacts. And so they know what they have; they can make it available to the public. There are such benefits from that kind of being on top of your collection. And they have done that, this little park that is losing purchasing power every year.

They also have a really extraordinary public-private partnership that, again, the Commonwealth as well as the Park Service and private citizens stepped up to build an $11½-million Visitor Center

that should open later this year. But surprise, surprise, the operating funding is a concern. And the building is several times larger than the existing Visitor Center, which was very small and is high tech, state-of-the-art. Lots of electricity will go through that building even though it is built to be efficient. And they need a bump up in funds in order to staff this state-of-the-art jewel that will be open to the public in a few months.

Mr. SOUDER. Would your position at MPCA, at least within your region, be that if we have these difficult tradeoffs to make—because obviously, even if we increased from 3 to, say, 6 percent, which I am not holding my breath we are going to do— that would move us, what, from 63 cents on the dollar to, say, 66 cents on the dollar—are there certain units or pieces of parks that you would see us all turning over to States or trying to look at different management things? Because quite frankly, one of the problems with the Park Service from the very beginning has been that individual Congressmen make a decision that they want to put something in the Park Service.

Sometimes—I know former director Rydenhower, who came up with this whole idea of heritage areas to keep us from adding new parks, and now watch the heritage areas start to take the money from the parks, even more loosely defined, but, for instance—which we do—my response was yes, well, that was two of the first four parks in the Park Service. That is not new.

And in fact, Mackinac Island was one that is no longer a National Park. Do you think that is a justified look in the Park Service as we look at the budget to say look, is Grant's Tomb really something—not to pick on that one—that should be an integral part given the operating costs of the tradeoff of what that means for Gettysburg or other parks?

Ms. OAKES. Well, that is quite a tough question. I think it is reasonable to ask a question like that. I am not sure what the answer would be. I think there are a lot of tradeoffs that aren't obvious at the beginning of answering that question that could have detrimental impacts from taking a unit out of the system. And so it is a reasonable question to ask, but I hope we would be very careful and thoughtful and analytical in how it would be answered.

Mr. SOUDER. It is a very, very difficult question, but as we look at challenges such as we don't have very many Asian history things in our park system, as we look at Hispanic-type things. If we just get into frozen history—and by the way, I am not one who believes that—I don't want to overstate this point because as a conservative Republican and somebody who believes that individual leaders are a key part of history and we shouldn't just give up because the bulk of the early leaders were White males to use what I often hear—the fact is, is that individuals do have extraordinary decisions on a battlefield, and those decisions, for example, may determine which way the course of the country went, and I am not against that type of thing. But I do believe that we need to look at other types of categories that aren't covered in the system.

And if we are never willing to step back and say, did we get too strong in one area? We get ourselves in an intolerable budget situation, even as somebody who is advocating huge increases in the Park Service. Governor.

Mr. THORNBURGH. I just wanted to add one thought, Mr. Chairman, that when it comes to either making up a shortfall or deciding upon the desirability of an expansion, either a physical expansion or service expansion, that the checklist for making those determinations always include the question of whether or not there is an opportunity to establish a public-private partnership that relieves some of the budget pressure on the agency in question, in this case, generally the Park Service.

I think there are a lot more opportunities out there that are being availed of at the present time. And if that kind of item was included on such a checklist, you have an opportunity, I think, to kind of draw out community resources to participate in these projects and maybe dampen some of the negative effect that comes from limited dollars in the public sector.

Ms. OAKES. If I may, I think parks are looking more at opportunities for enhancing revenues; for example, Shenandoah is looking at having a license plate that at the Smokies, I believe it was, has generated several hundred thousand dollars. And that is real money for that park. So they are also looking at automated fee collection at some of the access points. Of course, you can walk in from neighboring property and other ways, but there are a number of roads that transect the park, and there are some places to have those fee collections that would increase revenue in addition to a number of strategies. And a lot of parks are looking for that.

So, you know, the questions include how do we make the pot a little bigger? And obviously the Centennial Act would help with that. But also, with these partnerships—and the Museum Foundation here at Gettysburg is a great example—they are building the building and they are raising an endowment for that. And that is fundamentally important for future such partnerships.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. That is particularly true with respect to land acquisition. As I said, my organization in 5 years has done over 15,000 acres. That is far, far more, my guess is, than the National Park Service has done as far as battlefield. And the vast majority of that land will never be owned by the National Park Service or controlled by it or administered by it. You know, that land will be in State parks, local parks, or we will own it, or other individuals.

So certainly when it comes to land and as the Governor mentioned, facilities related to that, there is just almost an infinite variety of opportunities for the private sector. Because these things are popular. I mean, they haven't raised $69 million by accident and most of it in the private sector. It is because people care.

And we haven't raised the tens of millions of dollars that we have from the private sector by accident. It is because people really care about this stuff.

Mr. SOUDER. One of the things—I know this is my MBA temperament, it drives me crazy that coming from the business sector and into government and first coming in in social issues, it bothered me there too.

And then looking at the parks it is the same way, that it almost appears from the budgeting standpoint forward, it is a cash-management decision that is looked at park level then geographically rather than thematically. And that visitors come at the parks in two ways: both geographically and thematically.

If you are interested in the Civil War, you are going to go to Civil War sites—if you are interested in the Revolutionary War. And it would seem to me from a management standpoint of prioritization as well in budgeting that you would then look at it thematically and say if it is Lewis and Clark, we don't need to have every interpretive center in the United States tell the entire story of Lewis and Clark. You have a major, major center of Lewis and Clark; you have here how these different things go in. It drove me crazy going through the Lewis and Clark that I could go into multiple National Park Service Centers and not see, if you want additional information on the Lewis and Clark, go see Ft. Clatsop over here up in where they wintered in the Mandan area over here, go down to the arch for the launch—that there is not even a concept of integration well across the region. They may even be out of State, that not thinking like the consumer who is paying for it.

But also then saying, what are our holes in the management system? What are we missing? How do we make the decision whether this collection is more important than this decision? Because if the decision is being made within each park and then within each region, it is not being made as part of a category.

And in a budgeting standpoint, to me that would seem to be missing a key element. When you are looking at the battlefields, for example, in the Civil War, how do you balance off Pea Ridge and Glorieta Pass with additional space at Gettysburg? How significant was it? If that is not occurring, all you are doing is doing a regional cash management decision, which Congressmen can get something written in.

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. You are deciding it in a vacuum, which is not the way to decide it. In the case of the program I am talking about, Land and Water Conservation Program that you all fund, there are performance measures that the Office of Management and Budget applies to that program. How efficient is it? How much needs to be saved? How do you define what needs to be saved? What kind of bang are you getting for your dollar? Where is the leverage, etc. So performance standards, in addition to looking at it from the big picture, like you say somatic, is also important.

Mr. SOUDER. Are the Civil Wars looked at thematically in the system? Do you see that any?

Mr. LIGHTHIZER. I don't think so.

Mr. SOUDER. Ms. Oakes, do you see that in other categories, not just Civil War, but for example authors, former presidents, Asian, Hispanic? There has been some attempt on Hispanic because it is a rising tourism category. That categorically to look at this—I know more or less the Lewis and Clark Caucus forced it on the Lewis and Clark.

Ms. OAKES. Right, well, one of the park brochures that I have bought a lot of and given to my friends with kids my son's age is a Park Service brochure on the Civil War, "Civil War at a Glance" and they pack a lot in to one brochure, but it does give you a sense, both of how the war played out geographically, and also the actual conduct of the war. So that is a small thing.

There has been a lot of controversy, I think, over the recent years about interpretation of Civil War battlefields. Some folks wanted just to hear military tactics because if you don't hear them on a

battlefield, where else are you going to hear them? The superintendent of Gettysburg, in fact, has been one of the leaders in advocating to his peers that the causes and consequences of the war be interpreted not only at Gettysburg but other sites.

So that is something else that is going on. Another initiative in this region that you may know about is the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network, which is a truly fabulous effort that we are hoping that at some point there will be one or more new units of the National Park System in the Chesapeake Bay region.

But for now, what that does is exactly what you are talking about, is linking interpretation and themes. You can go on that site, and if you are interested in Civil War history, among the units that have signed up for the Gateway System, you can find that out. If you are interested in African American history, you can find that out. So that is something happening right here in part because of the leadership of the just-retired regional director of the Park Service in the Northeast.

Mr. SOUDER. Well, I thank you all for your input. Is there anything anybody wants to add? We may do some individual followup questions. One of the things we are doing is looking at the—but not precisely, we are not the Appropriations Committee at the funding. We are looking at the management structure, how it is set up, is there adequate funding, can we preserve it.

But also internally, obviously you get into all sorts of decisions on the role of public-private partnerships, the role of demo fees, the role of outside groups and interpretation, all sorts of supplemental things that go into the pieces of that budget and how you meet the difficult dollar questions.

It is important in these hearings that we look not only at the shortfall, which is one of the primary things to illustrate the fact of what I have been hearing at the grassroots, that there are adequate dollars to even keep the parks at the current level of interpretation and environmental sensitivity and the road upkeep no matter whether it is visitation or scientific and environmental.

At the same time it is to look at, in addition to Federal funds, can we do public-private partnerships? The first time I went to Yellowstone as a furniture retailer my background was—do you have licenses for this furniture to go out and get some additional revenue?

And this has been one of my pet causes, and if any of you have any suggestion, we are stumbling over how to do it, but there is a lot of receptivity as we look at the demonstration fees and making more fees on whether it is a vehicle, whether it is a tour guide, whether it is all this type of stuff.

And I believe, basically, that our national parks pass needs to go up in dollars. But how to give a basic cost breakthrough for the fees for low-income families, because that is the only argument. Will it make it the upper/middle income and rich people's playground?

And we have talked about whether if you have submitted in your taxes whether it could just be a straight credit off, but even whether the low-income target groups would save the receipt until they get to the year to put that in, because that would be the simplest way to do it: save any receipt you have at a Park Service, submit

it. Rather than a deduction it would come straight off as a credit. In other words, you get the full dollars back if you are below a certain income.

What would be another way to do this? Because to me that is the only real fundamental question underneath the fee structure. The fees are so minor compared to the cost of going to the movies, compared to going to amusement parks. That is not the fundamental question. The question is, access for people where it may make a difference, at the margin.

And we have been toying around as the demonstration fee bill moves, is there a way—and there is basically agreement in concept to try to address this. An agreement in concept is different. I mean, is there something we give somebody at the gate, but then does that have a stigma to it?

It is not easily resolved, but it is one that as these costs go up, if it is $20 to get into Yosemite, it is a whole different ballgame than the old days.

Ms. OAKES. And if I can just add something to that. Shenandoah has a great record on collecting fee demo money and using it. They just invested about $300,000 in restoring President Herbert Hoover's home that he built at Rapidan Camp at the headwaters of the Rapidan River. And what that fee money doesn't provide, though, is the funding for the annual operations, for routine maintenance, and for the interpretation. They offer——

Mr. SOUDER. Right.

Ms. OAKES [continuing]. Ten ranger-led van tours from the Visitor Center last summer. They are not sure they are going to be able to provide that same level of interpretation this year. They have a series of volunteers that live in one of the houses there at Rapidan Camp who then can unlock the buildings and let the person who hikes in to actually see, but they are not providing the interpretive stories that rangers can provide that really make the place come alive.

Mr. SOUDER. If you have any suggestions such as that one in your region on the fee demo, the whole idea is to improve visitor services.

Ms. OAKES. Yes.

Mr. SOUDER. The second thing is, can it be used on maintenance backlog? And historically, there has been a prohibition on being used for maintenance. If we changed that, and a certain percentage could go to maintaining, what would that do for operations to the backlog? And would the backlog just get bigger proportionally? What impact would that have?

An argument would be, as a park goes, and particularly those who get bigger demo fees get their list presumably worked down from where it was.

On the other hand, of course, I think it was where I said had the most controversy because they used the demo fee, which they weren't supposed to do, to subsidize the transit system early on and then get called on it. But to some degree is that one place we got for certain—rather than do it broad for maintaining operations, could there be certain limited operations that it could be used for that we could experiment with and see how that works? I would be interested in any ideas on that because——

Ms. OAKES. OK.

Mr. SOUDER [continuing]. It is a huge category. Well, thank you all for your testimony and for coming this morning. And with that, this subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:25 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]