AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

MISSING WEAPONS AT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE: MISMANAGEMENT AND LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY

JOINT OVERSIGHT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

AUGUST 2, 2013

Serial No. 113–54
(Committee on Oversight and Government Reform)

Serial No. 113–39
(Committee on Natural Resources)

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.fdsys.gov
http://www.house.gov/reform
http://naturalresources.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

82–717 PDF WASHINGTON : 2013

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) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

DARRELL E. ISSA, California, *Chairman*

JOHN L. MICA, Florida
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
PATRICK T. MCHENRY, North Carolina
JIM JORDAN, Ohio
JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah
TIM WALBERG, Michigan
JAMES LANKFORD, Oklahoma
JUSTIN AMASH, Michigan
PAUL A. GOSAR, Arizona
PATRICK MEEHAN, Pennsylvania
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee
TREY GOWDY, South Carolina
BLAKE FARENTHOLD, Texas
DOC HASTINGS, Washington
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS, Wyoming
ROB WOODALL, Georgia
THOMAS MASSIE, Kentucky
DOUG COLLINS, Georgia
MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina
KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO, Michigan
RON DESANTIS, Florida

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland, *Ranking Minority Member*
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
WM. LACY CLAY, Missouri
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
JACKIE SPEIER, California
MATTHEW A. CARTWRIGHT, Pennsylvania
MARK POCAN, Wisconsin
TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois
DANNY K. DAVIS, Illinois
TONY CARDENAS, California
STEVEN A. HORSFORD, Nevada
MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, New Mexico

LAWRENCE J. BRADY, *Staff Director*
JOHN D. CUADERES, *Deputy Staff Director*
STEPHEN CASTOR, *General Counsel*
LINDA A. GOOD, *Chief Clerk*
DAVID RAPALLO, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY, HOMELAND DEFENSE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS

JASON CHAFFETZ, Utah, *Chairman*

JOHN L. MICA, Florida
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
JUSTIN AMASH, Michigan
PAUL A. GOSAR, Arizona
TREY GOWDY, South Carolina
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS, Wyoming
ROB WOODALL, Georgia
KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO, Michigan

JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts *Ranking Minority Member*
CAROLYN B. MALONEY, New York
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
JACKIE SPEIER, California
PETER WELCH, Vermont
MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, New Mexico

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

DOC HASTINGS, WA, *Chairman*
PETER A. DEFAZIO, OR, *Ranking Democratic Member*

Don Young, AK
Louie Gohmert, TX
Rob Bishop, UT
Doug Lamborn, CO
Robert J. Wittman, VA
Paul C. Broun, GA
John Fleming, LA
Tom McClintock, CA
Glenn Thompson, PA
Cynthia M. Lummis, WY
Dan Benishek, MI
Jeff Duncan, SC
Scott R. Tipton, CO
Paul A. Gosar, AZ
Raúl R. Labrador, ID
Steve Southerland, II, FL
Bill Flores, TX
Jon Runyan, NJ
Mark E. Amodei, NV
Markwayne Mullin, OK
Chris Stewart, UT
Steve Daines, MT
Kevin Cramer, ND
Doug LaMalfa, CA
Jason T. Smith, MO

Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, AS
Frank Pallone, Jr., NJ
Grace F. Napolitano, CA
Rush Holt, NJ
Raúl M. Grijalva, AZ
Madeleine Z. Bordallo, GU
Jim Costa, CA
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, CNMI
Niki Tsongas, MA
Pedro R. Pierluisi, PR
Colleen W. Hanabusa, HI
Tony Cárdenas, CA
Steven A. Horsford, NV
Jared Huffman, CA
Raul Ruiz, CA
Carol Shea-Porter, NH
Alan S. Lowenthal, CA
Joe Garcia, FL
Matt Cartwright, PA
Vacancy

Todd Young, *Chief of Staff*
Lisa Pittman, *Chief Legislative Counsel*
Penny Dodge, *Democratic Staff Director*
David Watkins, *Democratic Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION

ROB BISHOP, UT, *Chairman*
RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, AZ, *Ranking Democratic Member*

Don Young, AK
Louie Gohmert, TX
Doug Lamborn, CO
Paul C. Broun, GA
Tom McClintock, CA
Cynthia M. Lummis, WY
Scott R. Tipton, CO
Raúl R. Labrador, ID
Mark E. Amodei, NV
Steve Daines, MT
Kevin Cramer, ND
Doug LaMalfa, CA
Jason T. Smith, MO
Doc Hastings, WA, *ex officio*

Niki Tsongas, MA
Rush Holt, NJ
Madeleine Z. Bordallo, GU
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, CNMI
Pedro R. Pierluisi, PR
Colleen W. Hanabusa, HI
Steven A. Horsford, NV
Carol Shea-Porter, NH
Joe Garcia, FL
Matt Cartwright, PA
Vacancy
Peter A. DeFazio, OR, *ex officio*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on August 2, 2013	1

WITNESSES

Mr. Robert A. Knox, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of the Interior	
Oral Statement	5
Written Statement	7
The Hon. Jonathan B. Jarvis, Director, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Ms. Kim A. Thorsen, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Safety, Resource Protection, and Emergency Services, U.S. Department of the Interior, and Ms. Teresa Chambers, Chief of the United States Park Police Force, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior	
Oral Statement	10

APPENDIX

The Honorable Jason Chaffetz, a Member of Congress from the State of Utah, Opening Statement	40
The Honorable John F. Tierney, a Member of Congress from the State of Massachusetts, Opening Statement	43
U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Letter to Representatives Rob Bishop and Jason Chaffetz	45

MISSING WEAPONS AT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE: MISMANAGEMENT AND LACK OF ACCOUNTABILITY

Friday, August 2, 2013

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, JOINT WITH THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittees met, pursuant to call, at 9:00 a.m., in Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Jason Chaffetz [chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security] presiding.

Present from the Subcommittee on National Security: Representatives Chaffetz, Duncan, Bentivolio, and Tierney.

Present from the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation: Representatives Bishop, Tipton, Smith, Southerland, Grijalva, Tsongas, and Shea-Porter.

Also Present: Representative Norton.

Staff Present from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Brian Blase, Senior Professional Staff Member; Molly Boyl, Parliamentarian; Daniel Bucheli, Assistant Clerk; Caitlin Carroll, Deputy Press Secretary; Linda Good, Chief Clerk; Mitchell S. Kominsky, Counsel; Mark D. Marin, Director of Oversight; Ashok M. Pinto, Chief Counsel, Investigations; Sang H. Yi, Professional Staff Member; Devon Hill, Minority Research Assistant; Julia Krieger, Minority New Media Press Secretary; Elisa LaNier, Minority Deputy Clerk; and Brian Quinn, Minority Counsel.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. The committee will come to order.

I would like to begin this hearing by stating the Oversight and Government Reform Committee's mission statement.

We exist to secure two fundamental principles: First, Americans have a right to know that the money Washington takes from them is well-spent. Second, Americans deserve an efficient, effective government that works for them. Our duty on the Oversight and Government Reform Committee is to protect these rights.

Our solemn responsibility is to hold government accountable to taxpayers, because taxpayers have a right to know what they get from their government. We will work tirelessly, in partnership with citizen watchdogs, to deliver the facts to the American people and bring genuine reform to the Federal bureaucracy.

This is the mission of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

We appreciate you being here in a joint effort with the Natural Resources Committee to conduct a very important oversight hearing today entitled, "Missing Weapons at the National Park Service: Mismanagement and Lack of Accountability."

I would also like to welcome Mr. Grijalva, who is here and joining us on the dais. I know that Mr. Tierney and Mr. Bishop of Utah, my colleague also involved in these two committees, will be joining us here shortly.

I am pleased to hold today's hearing jointly with my friend and gentleman from Utah, Representative Bishop. He is the chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation. And I look forward to working with him on an ongoing basis on these issues.

Today's proceedings result from a need to further address questions and concerns raised in a June 27th report from this year issued by the U.S. Department of Interior's Office of Inspector General entitled, "Review of U.S. Park Police Weapons Accountability Program."

In the report, the OIG made some very serious charges, including finding insufficient: "accountability, accuracy, and oversight" of the U.S. Park Police's firearms program. During the course of the OIG's investigation, the OIG found: "credible evidence of conditions that would allow for theft and misuse of firearms and the ability to conceal the fact if weapons were missing.".

Moreover, despite requirements to maintain an accurate firearms inventory, the OIG found that U.S. Park Police firearms inventory records were inaccurate and failed to account for hundreds of firearms. If these findings are accurate, the lack of accountability is completely unacceptable.

Given the OIG's glaring findings about the U.S. Park Police's lack of accountability for their weapons program, I am also interested to learn whether the ammunition used by the U.S. Park Police is properly accounted for.

The Subcommittee on National Security previously conducted an oversight hearing on April 25th of this year entitled, "Oversight of the Federal Government's Procurement of Ammunition," in which we found that the Federal Government, in some cases, has not procured ammunition efficiently or effectively.

Based on the seriousness of the charges in the OIG report, the findings warrant further examination where the report fell short. There are a number of questions that would be helpful to explain the findings. Are there examples where U.S. Park Police weapons were actually stolen or misused? How did the OIG arrive at the "hundreds of weapons used" number? Were simple typographical errors or poor data entry the main cause of the unaccounted firearms? These are all legitimate questions.

As a result, today's hearing provides an opportunity to discuss the findings by the OIG and to assess the extent of accountability issues within the United States Park Police.

It is also important to further examine the weapons procurement process. The OIG site reviews of U.S. Park Police's field office armories discovered approximately 1,400: "extra," weapons, with a

force of only 640 officers. These extra weapons consisted of 477 military-style automatic and semiautomatic weapons.

According to the OIG: "We also discovered a number of weapons that, according to USPP officials, fulfilled no operational need." It is my understanding that the undetermined number were awaiting destruction. We need to discuss that.

I am also concerned about OIG's finding regarding senior management's supervision of the weapons program, specifically that; "staff at all levels, from the firearms program managers to their employees, had no clear idea of how many weapons they maintained due to their incomplete and poorly managed inventory controls."

Moreover, the OIG reported that firearms managers: "accepted verbal assurances that firearms inventories were completed correctly rather than taking personal responsibility for accuracy." Unverified verbal assurances about the accuracy of the Park Police firearms inventory is simply not tolerable.

The reported lack of accountability over the U.S. Park Police weapons program has been documented as a longstanding issue, I believe starting in 2003. But certainly in 2008 and 2009, the OIG found a lack of oversight of the weapons accountability program, but the problems persist still today.

One of the main reasons that we are gathered here today and that I called this hearing, in conjunction with these other Members, is that this continues to evidently be an ongoing problem. Unfortunately, after the reports issued in 2008 and 2009, it does not appear, at least from the surface, that these problems were resolved. And we are talking about firearms. It is very important, and that is why we are here again today.

I want to take a moment to emphasize that the hard work and dedication of the Park Police officers is greatly appreciated. We have great men and women who dedicate their lives, put themselves on the line in support of a very patriotic duty in serving their Nation and protecting some of our Nation's greatest assets. We need to ensure that our law enforcement officers are properly trained and equipped to efficiently and effectively do their jobs.

That said, the vandalism that recently occurred at the Lincoln Memorial, the National Cathedral, and the Smithsonian Castle all raise concerns about whether taxpayer dollars are being spent effectively in light of these shortcomings. I find it hard to believe that, given the prominence of the Lincoln Memorial, that we don't have somebody 24/7 watching, guarding, taking care of the Lincoln Memorial, that somebody could come and do that and then simply be able to walk away.

I am particularly interested to learn what the U.S. Park Police is doing to ensure that our national monuments will not be defaced, vandalized, or become prime targets of terrorism.

I look forward to hearing from all the witnesses today. And today's hearing will focus on the need for proper inventory procedures, improved oversight of firearms management, and we will be touching on the recent defacing of some of our Nation's best assets.

The committee seeks to ensure that the U.S. Park Police appropriately addresses the OIG recommendations outlined in the June 27th, 2013, report.

Again, I thank you all for being here.

And I greatly appreciate the work I do with my ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Tierney. And I now recognize him for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In the interest of time this morning, I just ask unanimous consent that my opening remarks be placed upon the record.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Without objection, absolutely. We appreciate that.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Grijalva, we appreciate you being——

Mr. TIERNEY. Hopefully, we set a trend.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Hopefully, we set a trend, yes.

We appreciate your being here today.

Mr. Grijalva from Arizona is the ranking member, Public Lands and Environmental Regulation Subcommittee in the Natural Resources Committee.

We appreciate you being here today. I now recognize you.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I think the problems identified in the Interior Department's Office of Inspector General require serious consideration. We should try to understand the allegations in the report and not overstate or politicize them.

I would like to acknowledge that the Fraternal Order of Park Police has serious concerns with the methodology used by the Inspector General and the allegations made in the report.

The title of this hearing, "Missing Weapons at the National Park Service," that is—there is no reason to believe that weapons are missing or that weapons were ever in the hands of unauthorized personnel. An Interior Department task force was able to account for all weapons, with the exception of a few weapons assigned to officers who are overseas or on extended leave. The Department has determined that 98 percent of its weapons were already in the official system.

And there is a whole litany of issues, but following the trend set by Mr. Tierney——

Mr. TIERNEY. Almost.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Almost following the trend set by Mr. Tierney, if I may, Mr. Chairman, if there is no objection, enter the letter from the United States Park Police Fraternal Order as part of the record for this hearing?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much.

Mr. GRIJALVA. The rest of my statements, which were eloquent and well thought out, will be submitted for part of the record. Thank you.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. All Members will have 7 days to submit opening statements for the record.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. We will now recognize our first and only panel.

Ms. Kim Thorsen is the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Public Safety Resource Protection and Emergency Services at the United States Department of Interior. The Honorable Jonathan B. Jarvis is the Director of the National Park Service. Ms. Teresa Chambers is the Chief of the United States Park Police. And Mr. Robert Knox is the Assistant Inspector General for Investigations with the Of-

fice of Inspector General for the United States Department of Interior.

We again appreciate all of you being here side by side to have this discussion.

Pursuant to committee rules, all witnesses will be sworn before they testify.

If you will please stand and raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Thank you. You may be seated.

Let the record reflect that all witnesses answered in the affirmative.

In order to allow time for discussion, we would appreciate you limit your testimony to 5 minutes. My understanding is we have a consolidated opening statement, which we greatly appreciate.

But we will now recognize Mr. Knox first for his opening statement.

WITNESS STATEMENTS

STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. KNOX

Mr. KNOX. Good morning, Chairman Chaffetz and members of the subcommittees. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today about a recent Office of Inspector General report on the accountability and accuracy of the United States Park Police firearms inventory.

In short, we found ample evidence that United States Park Police's firearms management requires immediate attention to address the multitude of problems we found, which range from fundamental errors in recordkeeping to glaring nonfeasance by senior command officers.

We initiated our review after receiving an anonymous complaint. We initially set out to determine if the United States Park Police could account for all military-style weapons in its inventory, whether the United States Park Police had failed to perform inventories due to missing weapons, and whether officers may have used United States Park Police weapons for their personal use.

Our efforts to definitively address the allegations were hindered by the inability of the United States Park Police property and firearms custodians to provide a reliable baseline inventory and accounting of firearms. The conditions of the United States Park Police inventory were such that would allow for theft and misuse of firearms and the ability to conceal any missing weapons.

Having found the firearms inventory program in disarray, we discontinued our efforts to prove or disprove the complainant's allegations and changed our approach to focus on the overall management of the United States Park Police firearms inventory program.

Following a consistent history of inaction and indifference on the part of United States Park Police leadership and management at all levels, we again found that the basic tenets of property management and supervisory oversight were missing in their most fundamental forms. Commanders, up to and including the chief of police, have a lackadaisical attitude toward firearms management. We

found evidence which indicates this indifference is a product of years of inattention to administrative detail and management principles in their most basic form.

In 2008 and in 2009, the Office of Inspector General conducted reviews that included aspects of United States Park Police operations, including firearms inventory controls. In our 2008 report, we had a recommendation regarding property management. In 2009, we focused on firearms inventory controls for all law enforcement programs at the Department of the Interior, which included the United States Park Police. At that time, we found and reported on strikingly similar conditions as we note in our current report: firearms custodians were unaware of the number of guns in their inventory or of the origin of these guns, and that guns physically present were not listed on the inventory.

In the end, we have little confidence that the United States Park Police has the managerial commitment to implement a professionally responsible firearms management program without direct and frequent oversight from the National Park Service, the Office of Law Enforcement and Security, and the Office of Inspector General.

Among the 10 recommendations we make in our report is a recommendation to initiate quarterly firearms inventories and provide the Office of Inspector General with the results. We intend to conduct a series of future reviews and inspections to ensure that the United States Park Police has implemented our recommendations and that they maintain the level of accountability expected of a law enforcement entity the size and stature of the United States Park Police.

Chairman Chaffetz, this concludes my testimony today. I would be happy to answer any questions you or other members of the subcommittees may have.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. Appreciate that.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Knox follows:]

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT A. KNOX
ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR INVESTIGATIONS
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY
AND THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AUGUST 2, 2013

Chairman Chaffetz, Chairman Bishop, and members of the Subcommittees, thank you for the opportunity to testify today about a recent Office of Inspector General (OIG) report on the accountability and accuracy of the United States Park Police (USPP) firearms inventory. In short, we found ample evidence that USPP's firearms management requires immediate attention to address the multitude of problems we found, which ranged from fundamental errors in recordkeeping to glaring nonfeasance by senior command officers.

We initiated our review after receiving an anonymous complaint. We initially set out to determine if USPP could account for all military-style weapons in its inventory, whether USPP had failed to perform inventories due to missing weapons, and whether officers may have used USPP weapons for their personal use. Our efforts to definitively address the allegations were hindered by the inability of the USPP property and firearms custodians to provide a reliable baseline inventory and accounting of firearms. The conditions of the USPP inventory were such that would allow for theft and misuse of firearms, and the ability to conceal any missing weapons.

Having found the firearms inventory program in utter disarray, we discontinued our efforts to prove or disprove the complainant's allegations, and changed our approach to focus on the overall management of the USPP firearms inventory program.

Following a long history of inaction and indifference on the part of USPP leadership and management at all levels, we again found that the basic tenets of property management and supervisory oversight were missing in their most fundamental forms. Commanders, up to and including the Chief of Police, have a lackadaisical attitude toward firearms management. We found historical evidence which indicates that this indifference is a product of years of inattention to administrative detail and management principles in their most basic form.

In 2008 and 2009, the OIG conducted reviews that included aspects of USPP operations, including firearms inventory controls. In our 2008 report, we had a recommendation regarding property management, which we have reiterated in the subject report of this hearing. In 2009, we focused on firearms inventory controls for all law enforcement programs at the Department of the Interior, which included the USPP. At that time, we found, and reported on, strikingly similar conditions: firearms custodians were unaware of the number of guns in their inventory or of the origin of these guns, and that guns physically present were not listed on the inventory.

In the end, we have little confidence that USPP has the managerial commitment to implement a professionally responsible firearms management program without direct and frequent oversight from the National Park Service, the Office of Law Enforcement and Security, and the OIG. Among the 10 recommendations we make in our report is a recommendation to

initiate quarterly firearms inventories, to include serial number verifications, and provide the OIG with the results. We intend to conduct a series of future reviews and inspections to ensure that the USPP has implemented our recommendations and that they maintain the level of accountability expected of a law enforcement entity of the size and stature of the USPP.

Chairman Chaffitz and Chairman Bishop, this concludes my testimony today. I would be happy to answer any questions you or other members of the Subcommittees may have.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. My understanding is we have a consolidated opening statement. Would that be you, Mr. Jarvis?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. You are now recognized for 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. JONATHAN B. JARVIS

Mr. JARVIS. Okay.

Chairman Chaffetz, Ranking Members Grijalva and Tierney, and members of the committee, thank you for the invitation to appear today before you to discuss the findings of the Inspector General's firearms accountability within the United States Park Police.

My name is John Jarvis, and I am the Director of the National Park Service. And I would like to submit our full statement for the record and summarize, really, our views here.

The U.S. Park Police is the Nation's oldest uniformed Federal law enforcement agency. The Park Police provides law enforcement services to designated areas within the National Park Service, predominantly in Washington, D.C., New York, and San Francisco. The members of the Park Police are professional police officers and dedicated public servants who help us protect millions of visitors each year and protect some of our most valued national icons, including the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial, the Statue of Liberty, and the Golden Gate Bridge.

On June 27th, 2013, the Inspector General issued its review of Park Police weapons accountability. The Inspector General's review raised serious, significant concerns regarding Park Police firearms management.

The accountability of weapons used by our law enforcement personnel is of critical importance, and we take the issues raised here very, very seriously. The IG report provided a number of important recommendations to address those issues, and we appreciate the IG's efforts. We are committed to implementing these recommendations, which will improve the accountability in this critical area.

In the last 30 days since the issuance of the IG's report, we have taken immediate actions to address the IG's recommendations. The first priority was to conduct a thorough physical inventory of all government-owned firearms in Park Police custody, in accordance with Recommendation 3 from the IG report.

To conduct this physical inventory, we created a team of senior officials from the National Park Service and the Department's Office of Law Enforcement and Security to personally contact all officers within the Park Police and to personally inspect every Park Police firearm, whether issued to an officer or secured in a Park Police facility. The team visited Park Police facilities in San Francisco, New York, and Washington, D.C. With the exception of three officers who are currently either deployed overseas on a military assignment or on extended leave, the team has met with each police officer.

The team has ensured that each inspected firearm has been entered into and tracked in the Department's new property accountability system. The initial assessment of the team is that approximately 98 percent of the physical inventory of firearms in the custody of the U.S. Park Police were previously entered into this sys-

tem. We are continuing our efforts to complete the inventory, including any reconciliation with existing records.

The team is also reviewing the Park Police's approach to administrative oversight, training, and coordination. We are committed to ensuring the members of the Park Police maintain the highest standard of accountability with its firearms inventories.

With regard to the other recommendations from the IG report, we either have already addressed or are in the process of addressing each one of them. For example, we are in the process of reviewing all Park Police guidance to confirm that it complies with Park Service and departmental regulations, policies, and procedures. The Park Police has ceased using informal property accountability systems, and we have transitioned all of the firearms to our new property accountability system. And the Park Police now has a schedule to ensure quarterly inventories of all firearms. And the Chief of Park Police will personally approve all firearms purchases. That is already in place.

In addition, the National Park Service has asked the Park Police to detail all the work that has been done to date on all of the IG recommendations and the actions planned to successfully address the ones that have not been completed.

The Department's Office of Law Enforcement and Security, which is responsible for policy development, coordination, evaluation, and support of the Department's programs concerning law enforcement, will work with the National Park Service and the Park Police to provide additional oversight. The office periodically audits the Department's bureaus for compliance with the Department of Law Enforcement policies. Currently, the office is conducting a program compliance assessment on bureau firearm programs.

We want to assure the committees that the Department, the NPS, and the Park Police take very seriously the accountability of weapons used by our law enforcement personnel. We will work together to monitor compliance with the IG's direction on this matter.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue. We are happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Normally when we schedule a hearing at 9 o'clock in the morning, we are in safe territory until 10:30 or so. Today being an exceptional day, Members are advised that there is a vote on the floor. It has 13 minutes on the clock. Given that necessity and priority, this committee is going to stand in recess until the conclusion of the votes. And as soon as we have Members back in appropriate numbers, we will resume this hearing.

We are guessing that that is an hour and a half, an hour and 15 minutes. It is certainly not any sooner than, say, 10:30. We will resume no sooner than 10:30, but when we have our votes and we have Members back, we will resume.

This committee stands in recess until then.

[Recess.]

Mr. CHAFFETZ. The committee will come to order.

Thank you. We appreciate the time as we had to take to do voting. And there will be voting later on, as well.

I will now recognize myself for 5 minutes.

The OIG, Inspector General, has issued a report. Ms. Thorsen, Mr. Jarvis, Chief Chambers, do any of you take issue with any of the findings in that report?

Mr. JARVIS. I will start.

We appreciate the IG's report, and we take all 10 recommendations—they are spot-on, and we are taking every one of them seriously.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. But are any of the findings—do you take any issue with any of the findings? I appreciate your implementation of the recommendations; we are going to talk about that. But any of their findings, did you take issue with any of those?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, their findings indicated a snapshot, essentially a photograph, of the conditions of inventory of weapons at the Park Police facilities at that moment. I consider them accurate, but they do not indicate the real behind-the-scenes. They backed out and said, go do an inventory. And that is what we are doing now.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. They took a snapshot in 2008, and they took one in 2009. We had similar problems and challenges. Were those accurate back then?

Mr. JARVIS. I am not that familiar with those reports because I was not in this role at that time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. And I guess that is one of the concerns, is that when the Inspector General offers recommendations, they take snapshots, we worry that some report gets put on some shelf. I think that is in part why we are here today, is the repetitive nature of these challenges.

Chief Chambers, according to the National Park Service Handbook 44, an inventory is supposed to be taken twice a year. Does that happen?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir, it does.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Did you sign this memo of August 31st saying: "I certify that all weapons inventories for which I am responsible have been completed and all weapons records have been reconciled"?

Chief CHAMBERS. I did, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. What did you base that on?

Chief CHAMBERS. A number of conversations with folks in the chain of command, including the firearms custodian himself.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So merely conversations? Did you ever review any of the records? Did you ever look at any of the physical material?

Chief CHAMBERS. I reviewed the records, but I did not physically touch all of the weapons that are in the inventory. But I did ask probing questions. I asked how it compared to the previous inventory, to ensure that there were no anomalies. And I asked if everything could be accounted for, even——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Who did you have that conversation with?

Chief CHAMBERS. With whom, sir? Deputy Chief Chapman, Sergeant Dave Whitehorne, and perhaps the captain in training at that time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So why the discrepancy on what Mr. Knox was able to find versus what you found?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, during the period of time he came in, we were actually between two effective computer systems. One had been shut down; the other was not back up and running. And so

we were left to use Excel spreadsheets, which, frankly, were better than nothing, but not able to quickly ascertain where items were or get a quick count on how many of anything there was. That has all changed since then. But, in that snapshot of time, we were limited in our capability to be able to quickly review.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Ms. Thorsen, why was this the case? Why the discrepancy between the two?

You have an OIG report. You have somebody saying they certify and sign this. They are obviously not reconciled. So I give you an opportunity to say, were there any issues with the findings of the Inspector General? You didn't say a word, so——

Ms. THORSEN. Chairman, I have no issue and the Department has no issues with the findings in the IG report. I think the 10 recommendations are——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. But they are in dispute. Somebody is wrong. You have Chief Chambers saying that the weapons inventories for which I am responsible had been completed and all weapons records have been reconciled, and the Inspector General is saying, no, that is not the case. I am trying to figure out from the three of you, why is that?

How does the Chief of the Park Police say they are reconciled, the Inspector General says, no, they are not, they are not even close? I give each of the three of you an opportunity to question or dispute any of the claims or findings from the Inspector General. You didn't say anything. So put yourself in my shoes. What is the right answer here?

Ms. THORSEN. Well, I am not particularly familiar with the memos and what the Chief did. She is——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Why not? What is your relationship with the Chief? Like, what responsibility or oversight or——

Ms. THORSEN. The Office of Law Enforcement Security, which reports to me, has responsibility at the department level to develop policy, departmental-level policy, coordinate with the bureaus, and provide oversight. The accountability and responsibility——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So do you feel a responsibility for what happens or doesn't happen in the Park Police?

Ms. THORSEN. The accountability and the responsibility for, in this instance, firearms rests at many levels. Starts with the officer, supervisors, the Chief, the Director of the Park Service, whom she reports to directly. And then my office has a responsibility periodically to go in and ensure that, actually, all of the law enforcement programs in the department follow department policy, departmental policy. So that is our role.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So, Mr. Jarvis, we have a dispute here. Explain to me how we can have two totally different conclusions. Who messed up here? Is it Chief Chambers? Is it the Inspector General?

Mr. JARVIS. The way I see it, Mr. Chairman, is that we have an inventory management issue. And that is exactly what the IG found. They came in; they could not reconcile the weapons that they saw in the U.S. Park Police possession against what should be a computerized database. There was no reconciliation. And so they backed out.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Chief, were you or were you not able to reconcile the weapons inventory?

Chief CHAMBERS. At the time that the IG was there, we were not in a position to say with certainty. But we can say now that it has been reconciled.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. When were you there? When were you doing this, Inspector?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, we——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Microphone, please. If you can just turn on the microphone. Thank you.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, we conducted our inspection from February 11th to February 13th and continued——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Of which year?

Mr. KNOX. Of 2013.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. And you are saying that they were reconciled on August 31st, 2012. And then, within 6 months, it was in disarray. Is that what you are saying?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, I am saying we couldn't prove or disprove whether the records were accurate, because at that moment in time we had Excel spreadsheets, several of them, to try to bring this compilation. The weapons were there, but there was no way to reconcile it. We can do so now.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I have more questions about this, as do other Members. I am way over time.

I now recognize the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Grijalva, for 5 minutes plus another minute or 2 if he so chooses.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me start with kind of a basic question, given the report and the recommendations. Has the Park Police accounted for all these weapons?

Ms. Thorsen, do you believe that all the weapons have been accounted for? That same question for Director Jarvis and for the Chief and for Mr. Knox.

If you wouldn't mind starting, Ms. Thorsen. Do you believe all the weapons have been accounted for?

Ms. THORSEN. At this point in time, our office in conjunction with the Park Service have conducted the physical inventory of the Park Police weapons, and at this point in time 98 percent of them we have accounted for. There are three, as mentioned by the Director, that we have not put our eyes on. Okay, so that is not complete. So there are three outstanding at this point in time. So, other than that, yes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you.

Mr. JARVIS. I would agree with that. We are not satisfied until we put our physical hands on every weapon that is in the inventory. And we are still missing three that are assigned to individual officers who are not on duty at the moment but will be very soon.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Chief?

Chief CHAMBERS. And, likewise, sir, just those final three that we know we have to touch.

And then just as a safeguard, we have another step to do. We are going to go back and look at acquisition and property records to make certain that things that we have purchased or acquired over the last 5 to 10 years are actually in that new computerized database. I am confident that they are, but I want that additional assurance.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you.

Mr. Knox?

Mr. KNOX. Congressman, the IG takes no position as to whether they have full accountability of all the weapons possessed by the U.S. Park Police or not.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Okay, Mr. Knox, if I could follow up just a second. So when the inspection was going on, there was a spot analysis that you talk about in your report. So there was no follow-up investigation on the part of your office to go deeper into that issue?

Mr. KNOX. No, sir. As we began our assessment, we realized that the condition of accountability was in disarray.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Okay.

Mr. KNOX. There were not good, clear records of what weapons should be available, what records should be on their accountable records. And so we took a position of looking at the weapons that were physically present in the locations we visited.

And the reason for me saying we don't take a position on the accountability today is that, although we are confident the National Park Service is doing all they can to inventory the weapons that are currently present within the control of the U.S. Park Police, there is still another step, as the Chief points out, to take, which is to go back in time and identify the weapons that had been acquired either through transfer or purchase or other means and ensure that all of those weapons are accounted for, as well.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yeah.

Let me go to another question having to do with the mission of the Park Police: to provide quality law enforcement, to safeguard lives, to protect our national treasures and symbols of democracy, and preserve natural and cultural resources entrusted to the American people and to the Park Service and the Park Police.

Let me begin with you again, Ms. Thorsen. Do you believe that the mission of the Park has been compromised as a result of the report and—or as a result of the issues described in the report?

Ms. THORSEN. No, I don't, sir.

Mr. GRIJALVA. If you don't mind, Director Jarvis, I would just like to get this——

Mr. JARVIS. No, sir, I do not believe there has been any compromise to our responsibilities.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Chief, if you don't mind?

Chief CHAMBERS. Our mission has not been compromised, sir.

Mr. GRIJALVA. And I go back to you, Mr. Knox. Do you feel that that essential mission, as a consequence of your recommendations and snapshot view, has been compromised?

Mr. KNOX. Sir, the OIG assessment related to the accountability of weapons alone. And we did not look at the impact that had on the operational mission of the U.S. Park Police.

Mr. GRIJALVA. That is a neutral position?

Mr. KNOX. It is a neutral position as to the operations as you described them. We feel that the accountability of weapons is a part of their duty and operations and that those were severely lacking.

Mr. GRIJALVA. In the limited time, if I may, Mr. Knox, your report uses words like "inaction," "indifferent," "nonfeasance," "lackadaisical attitude" to describe the ways the senior management at

the Park Police handled this weapons accountability. Can you elaborate on why those strong words are justified in the report?

And then, Chief Chambers, do you believe that the Inspector General was justified in saying that Park Police senior management has a lackadaisical attitude toward weapons management and accountability?

I ask that question because, going back to the question I just asked, it is about the integrity of that function, the police function, and the confidence that the public has in it. But that is why these questions are important.

So those words are pretty strong words, and your justification for using them is my question.

Mr. KNOX. Congressman, we looked at numerous factors when we came to deliberately choose those words.

I would begin with the series of incidents where the Chief of the U.S. Park Police had been advised of the serious conditions regarding weapons accountability at the U.S. Park Police. There was a memo authored by the force firearms custodian to the Chief of Police in 2011 that actually demonstrated an inventory variance of 120 weapons that was brought to her attention.

Again in that year, the Audits and Evaluations Unit, part of the Office of Professional Responsibility for the U.S. Park Police, issued a memorandum based on their weapons accountability assessment, and they indicated a critical failure in the weapons accountability posture of the U.S. Park Police.

And later a memo—I am sorry, a meeting regarding the force firearms custodian memo was held, where discussions about the content of that memo occurred. Later, a subsequent meeting with Deputy Chief Chapman was held in 2012 as a follow-up to those discussions.

And then I would point out that, even as we concluded our field work on February 13th of 2013, I personally briefed the Chief of Police for the U.S. Park Police on February 15th of this year, advising her of our findings and urging her to take immediate steps to begin an inventory and get a handle on what the actual weapons count for the U.S. Park Police weapons inventory was. And we found no meaningful efforts taken until after the publishing of our report.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in the overage of time, could the Chief respond?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Yes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you.

Chief CHAMBERS. Thank you for the opportunity.

While I would certainly have chosen different words and not characterized it with words that may be so emotionally driven, I do appreciate the feedback nonetheless.

Only because Mr. Knox mentioned several memos, I will touch on them. At each step along the way, extreme action was taken—dialogue, trips to the field offices by our force firearms custodian.

But I must put on the record that the audits memo that talked about the critical failure was a new memo to me. I had never heard of it. And the only record that the Inspector General's Office could produce was one that was still in draft mode. It still had the track

changes, it wasn't signed on letterhead, it had no recommendations. That memo never made it to my office.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Appreciate the extra time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Knox, I will give you an opportunity to respond to that.

Mr. KNOX. I can't say for sure whether the Chief of Police received the memo from the force firearms custodian. But I would point out the multiple events that occurred between 2011 and 2013. And it is the position of the Office of Inspector General that at least some of those should have alerted the senior leadership, including the Chief of Police, of the serious conditions of loss of weapons accountability at the U.S. Park Police.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you.

Mr. KNOX. Some action——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I now want to recognize Chairman Rob Bishop from Utah for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you for the opportunity of being part of this hearing.

In some respects, I feel like I am dealing with Syria policy; I don't really know who the good guys are out there. In fact, I think there is failure on every level that has gone through here. So I appreciate it. I appreciate the questions Mr. Grijalva asked.

And, Ms. Chambers, I am going to follow up on that in a minute, but I want to go to Mr. Jarvis first.

The IG report focuses exclusively on failures within the Park Police, for which you have ultimate jurisdiction. Is there something about the relationship or the autonomy of the Park Police that allows them to fall outside of department policies on firearms?

Mr. JARVIS. No, Mr. Chairman. I believe that all of our departmental and National Park Service policies apply directly to the U.S. Park Police.

Mr. BISHOP. So the rest of the Park Service, you also have armed law enforcement in the rest of the Nation outside of these three cities?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. So how do you compare the accountability in place for those weapons, opposed to what we found here in the Park Police?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, with all of our managers who have line responsibilities for controlled property such as weapons, we have a policy of inventory. I have a policy of trust but verify, which means I expect them to do their audits and report deliberately on their inventory as well as any missing weapons. And——

Mr. BISHOP. So I appreciate the concept of verify; that is extremely important. But have you investigated—what have you done to investigate the concept of park-wide, firearms Park Service-wide, not just with the Park Police?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, we have periodic audits, where we do send in our agents to do spot audits on the weapons inventory. When I was a superintendent, we would have independent audits done specifically. And I can remember one specific case where we did find a missing weapon that was not recorded, and I removed that employee's law enforcement commission immediately and permanently.

So we do have that kind of oversight and auditing going on throughout the Service.

Mr. BISHOP. So you are confident that this problem only exists within the Park Police, that it is not systemwide?

Mr. JARVIS. It is not systemwide.

Mr. BISHOP. Can I ask you why you weren't on top of what was happening, then, in the Park Police?

Mr. JARVIS. I was only made aware of this when I was briefed by the IG. That is the first time, and that was in June of this year. That is when I was made aware.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. Well, we will get more into that in detail.

I have one other issue with you, though. In 2010, the Park Service sent guidance to the field that the Springfield Armory Historic Site would no longer accept firearms for destruction. So I am assuming that these historic arms are just sitting somewhere under your jurisdiction.

Do you have any responsibility to bear for these unused weapons piling up over with the Park Service police?

Mr. JARVIS. It took us 3 years to get a new contract for weapons disposal. And so the Springfield Armory shut down on their weapons disposal responsibilities; it took us 3 years to get a new contract. So there are approximately 500 weapons in the inventory at the U.S. Park Police that are due for disposal and destruction.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. Chambers, is that an accurate number?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. BISHOP. And are any of these of historic value?

Chief CHAMBERS. I don't know, sir. I could find out for you.

Mr. BISHOP. Really?

Do you have any policy for allowing historically valuable weapons to be saved, something other than being destroyed, Mr. Jarvis?

Mr. JARVIS. Absolutely. At the Springfield Armory specifically, which is the storage repository for historic weapons——

Mr. BISHOP. Wait, you mean they are taking them now?

Mr. JARVIS. I don't know the answer to that question. But let me just say that before we do complete destruction on the weapons that have been accumulated, we will see if there are any historic weapons that are valuable for display or museum storage.

Mr. BISHOP. Do we know how many are?

Mr. JARVIS. I do not know that.

Mr. BISHOP. Do you know, Ms. Chambers, how many are?

Chief CHAMBERS. I do not, sir. I know——

Mr. BISHOP. Shouldn't you?

Chief CHAMBERS. I have that information at my disposal but not here today, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. Look, I am over by 40 seconds here. I am not as longwinded as Raul or Jason, but I definitely have second-round questions for some of the rest of you.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you.

We will now recognize the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C., Ms. Norton, for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to say I have some questions about the report, but I do want to take this opportunity to thank the Park Police. The Park Police are the only—we have, as the saying goes, fifty-eleven

police forces in the District of Columbia. Every little agency has a police force. This is the only city-wide—indeed, it is a region-wide police force. And it is often underappreciated.

I remember, after 9/11, the Capitol Police were quickly reinforced with new police. And it took some time to get around to the Capitol Police, which has much larger territory throughout the District of Columbia and the entire region. So I have watched the Capitol Police very closely. They have jurisdiction for, for example—except for the Metropolitan Police Department, they are the only police department that can go anywhere. Most of the police, unless they have signed memoranda of understanding pursuant to a bill I got passed about a decade ago, can't even leave the premises.

So when we are talking about after Boston, we are talking about all the parades and the people who can go and really protect people in this town, you are talking about, when it comes to Federal police, only the Park Police. And I want to thank the Park Police for what looks to be a quick capture of the person who may have been, is alleged to have been defacing monuments.

I want to ask you—I also want to thank you for somehow finding a way to make sure that the Park Police were not on furloughs. That seemed to me to be particularly absurd. When we have had furloughs in the Federal Government, we have always exempted law enforcement officers. And we were putting the entire city at risk, with all of the officials and all of the ceremonies. And you found the funds.

Are you able to fill vacancies in the Park Police, Chief Chambers?

Chief CHAMBERS. We are not currently hiring, ma'am.

Ms. NORTON. So if someone were to leave because of the sequester or the cuts, those positions could not be filled?

Chief CHAMBERS. At this moment, we do not have a class schedule. We will be looking closely at the fiscal year 2014 budget as we get closer to that.

Ms. NORTON. Well, I will be interested to know whether you are able to keep a force in place during this time.

If I could ask Mr. Knox, apparently—and believe me, because I represent the District of Columbia, I was pleased that apparently no weapons were stolen, weapons were not found to be taken home for personal use, no weapons were ever seized in a crime.

Could this have happened without some kind of monitoring? Did this just happen by chance? Those would have been the worst, it seems to me, of the results, and yet none of that occurred. Why not?

Mr. KNOX. Well, Congresswoman, we didn't examine—our assessment of weapons accountability at the Park Police did not find instances of weapons being stolen. We found instances of weapons not being accounted for properly, either in that we found weapons on hand which were not indicated on the property records or we found property records for weapons which were not physically present.

Ms. NORTON. So are you assured that all the weapons are accounted for? Are there recommendations of the IG for how to do this without taking a lot of time and effort, especially now in per-

sonnel, especially now when that personnel, of course, would not be available?

Are there examples from other either Federal police or other police of ways to do this that you could recommend to the Park Police so this would not become a paperwork exercise but would be geared to just the kinds of things you have not just found? You have not found yet stolen weapons, people taking weapons home when they shouldn't be or ending up in a crime.

So does somebody have a streamlined way to do this that you could recommend to the Park Police?

Mr. KNOX. Well, Congresswoman, we made 10 recommendations in this assessment which we feel, if complied with, will enhance their weapons accountability posture a great deal. Our expectation would be that they can account for all their weapons, and that would be typical behavior in most police agencies.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you.

I will ask unanimous consent to allow Mr. Southerland of Florida, who is on the Natural Resources Committee, to also join us in this hearing.

Hearing no objection, so ordered.

I now recognize the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Bentivolio, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Based on the IG report, the lack of accountability here is very disturbing. I think about how the government holds civilians accountable for the firearms they own as private citizens through registration and licensing procedures. But here we have government firearms, paid for by taxpayers, left in your care, with a total lack of accountability. The IG discovered hundreds of handguns, rifles, and shotguns not listed on official Park Police inventory records.

Where is the failure here that periodic and accurate inventory records were not maintained? Is there any legitimate excuse for this lack of accountability? Should there be more frequent audits and inventories?

Chief Chambers, in the Army, we are required to hold periodic weapons inventories. Each soldier was held accountable for the weapons they were assigned. And like most all instances in the military, the most senior person is responsible to ensure that his subordinates do what they are supposed to do.

Ms. Chambers, as the Chief of the Park Police, who is ultimately responsible for the firearms inventory at the Park Police?

Chief CHAMBERS. It is me, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. The IG report indicated that a board of survey should be conducted whenever an item is lost or stolen. I imagine that in the case of firearms, which are sensitive government property, like in the military.

And this is even more important. The IG report also stated that when asked about a board of survey, you were not aware of what a board of survey was and whether it was required to be conducted for missing weapons. Can you explain why this was not clear to you?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir. I had never personally heard the term. That did not mean that my team did not. In fact, we have reissued

the memo, identifying the members of various boards of survey. It had been an ongoing practice. Just coming from municipal government, it was a term that was foreign to me.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Knox, are you aware of any disciplinary actions at the Park Police taken as a result of the IG findings?

Mr. KNOX. No, sir, I am not.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Jarvis, nice to see you again.

Who should be held accountable for these shortcomings? What type of disciplinary actions will be taken?

Mr. JARVIS. We are still in the investigative phase on this. The first step was Recommendation 3, which is a full physical inventory. As I indicated in my earlier testimony, we are almost done with that. We still have three officers that we want to put our hands on those weapons and look at their serial numbers.

Then there is a forensic, sort of, analysis of the previous procurements. So, when were those guns brought into the U.S. Park Police? When were they purchased? When were they transferred from other agencies? We want to compare that to the inventory, and then we will see whether or not there are any weapons truly missing or stolen.

And then and only then, would we take a disciplinary action if we found that there was true mismanagement. At this point, we have a inventory management issue, not a mismanagement issue.

And we have to get that completed over the next probably 60 days or so to get that second part of that, sort of, forensics done on the procurement. And then we will understand whether or not this is just a fact that we did not have them in the inventory and could not account for them in the computer system rather than there are actually missing weapons.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Well, if you can't account for them, it sounds to me like it is mismanagement or something else.

But I understand, according to testimony earlier, it has been ongoing for the past 5 to 10 years, correct? Did I understand that correctly, yes or no?

Chief CHAMBERS. I heard that. I wasn't aware of anything prior to 2011.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Well, I heard testimony of going back as far as 2008 and 2009.

Ms. Chambers, do you receive a bonus?

Chief CHAMBERS. No, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Do you, Mr. Jarvis?

Mr. JARVIS. No, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. In 2008, you never received a bonus?

Mr. JARVIS. No, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. 2010?

Mr. JARVIS. No, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. 2011?

Mr. JARVIS. My salary is fixed exactly. No bonus.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Thank you.

I yield back.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Will the gentleman yield to the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Jarvis, you gave a nice spin there, but you didn't answer his question. His question is who is ultimately responsible, not what have you done. Who is ultimately responsible?

Mr. JARVIS. I am the Director of the Park Service. I am ultimately——

Mr. BISHOP. So you are ultimately responsible for this.

Mr. JARVIS. I am ultimately responsible.

Mr. BISHOP. What about Ms. Chambers? What culpability does she have in this chain of reaction?

Mr. JARVIS. She is the line supervisor, U.S. Park Police. She is also responsible.

Mr. BISHOP. Look, guys, there was a 2003 report that was given, 133 guns were missing, 2 ended up in a pawn shop; a 2008 report that showed problems; a 2009 report that showed problems. All of you were on the job then.

Mr. Jarvis, what specifically did you do to implement the findings of the 2009 report?

Mr. JARVIS. I was unaware of the 2009 report.

Mr. BISHOP. But it came under your watch.

Mr. JARVIS. I was not the Director until October of 2009.

Mr. BISHOP. No, you were the Director after this report was taken—this report was permitted. What did you do about it?

Even if it came after you took office, which it did not, what should you have done about it?

Mr. JARVIS. I should hold my line supervisors accountable to follow the procedure——

Mr. BISHOP. Just the line supervisors?

I mean, Ms. Chambers, you are throwing everyone in your department under the bus. How much accountability should you have for that? That was his question. It hasn't been answered. How much accountability should you hold?

Chief CHAMBERS. Full accountability.

Mr. BISHOP. Have you taken full accountability and responsibility for it?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir, I have.

Mr. BISHOP. What has your action been?

Chief CHAMBERS. We have—the most immediate has been to elevate the position of the firearms manager, sir, custodian manager——

Mr. BISHOP. What about your responsibility?

Chief CHAMBERS. —so that I have a more direct line of communication with that person.

Mr. BISHOP. So you are still blaming other people for it.

Chief CHAMBERS. No, sir. It is my responsibility.

Mr. BISHOP. I am going to yield back to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. The gentleman yields back.

We will now recognize the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Duncan, for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And both chairmen have started touching on this, but I read in this letter, it said, "This report further underscores"—the letter from the Deputy Inspector General Kendall—"This report further underscores the decade-long theme of inaction and indifference of

U.S. Park Police leadership. Basic tenets of property management and supervisory oversight are missing in their simplest forms. Commanders up to and including the Chief of Police have a lackadaisical attitude toward firearms management. Historical evidence indicates that this indifference is a product of years of inattention to administrative detail."

That is a very disturbing letter. And then it becomes even more disturbing when I read that the 2008 report and the 2009 report both have the same language.

"We found a disconcerting attitude toward firearms accountability within U.S. Park Police. In particular, we found that firearms custodians were unaware of the number of guns in their inventory or of the origin of these guns and that guns physically present were not listed on the inventory."

That is very disturbing, that this has been going on for, it says, a decade and that there was this report in 2008 and 2009.

Are we going to be back here 5 years from now and the situation is going to be the same? I mean, will each of you assure us that something is going to be done to straighten this out and change these lackadaisical attitudes about this, or are you just going to go back to your offices and laugh about this hearing?

Mr. JARVIS. I will respond to that.

Absolutely, I can assure you that we will not be back in here, other than perhaps to report on the final findings of this investigation. But I can assure you that we will, throughout the National Park Service, including the U.S. Park Police, ensure accountability throughout the organization.

Mr. DUNCAN. Ms. Chambers?

Chief CHAMBERS. I certainly echo the Director's remarks. Action has been taken and will continue to be taken. It is a continual improvement process, and we will get better at it with each day.

Mr. DUNCAN. Is it accurate, the report I have, that there are 640 officers that are in your department——

Chief CHAMBERS. Approximately, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. —in your force?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUNCAN. I mean, that is not a gigantic bureaucracy. It looks like to me like it shouldn't be this difficult to straighten this out and change these attitudes and this indifference.

So thank you very much. I yield back.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I thank the gentleman.

We will start a second round here. I will recognize myself.

Chief Chambers, in response to Chairman Bishop, you said that you were elevating this position or this person. What does that mean?

Chief CHAMBERS. Not the person, sir, the position. It has been a——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. When you say "elevate," what does that mean?

Chief CHAMBERS. Right now, it is in the hands—the firearms custodian position is handled by a sergeant who also is our range master. That is not appropriate. I need a person full-time who will devote all of his energy to the management of the firearms.

So a lieutenant is now being taken from another position. That lieutenant is being pulled out of the chain of command and going

right to the Deputy Chief, who sits next to my office, so that we——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So how many weapons, then, does the U.S. Park Police have? What is the current inventory?

Chief CHAMBERS. Approximately 2,500, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So you have 2,500 weapons. Why that number? Why 2,500?

Chief CHAMBERS. Well, sir, a patrol officer would have three weapons each: a firearm at his side, a pistol; a patrol rifle; and a Taser.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So the IG found that there were in their words, 1,400 extra weapons. What are these extra weapons?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, I would have characterized it differently but as I probed the extra weapons included things like serialized parts, firearms that had been cannibalized so that we could keep other firearms in working condition without incurring additional cost. Some of these were training weapons. Some, as we had already discussed, were those were set aside awaiting disposal once we were able to get a contract.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So you said 2,500 weapons is how many you have?

Chief CHAMBERS. Approximately, yes, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. You have 640 officers?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. You said that a person would have three weapons?

Chief CHAMBERS. A patrol officer would have three, yes, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Who has more than three weapons?

Chief CHAMBERS. It is likely that a SWAT officer may have an additional weapon depending on his assignment.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So you have 640 sworn officers, who have three weapons each, that is close to 1,900.

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. How do you account for the other 600 weapons?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, many are for training purposes. They include things like simunitions guns that you point at a screen, Tasers, things that——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. When can you provide to this committee—when I say "this" committee, both committees, Oversight and Natural Resources, the actual inventory?

Chief CHAMBERS. I'm sorry, you are asking for——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. A copy of the inventory.

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir, I would be glad to.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. When will I get that?

Chief CHAMBERS. If I could have a week that would be appreciated.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. One week sounds reasonable.

Chief CHAMBERS. All right, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. By next Friday, we look forward to seeing that inventory. I asked you if you took any issue with the idea with the findings of the OIG. He found that you had 1,400 extra weapons. Do you take exception to that?

Chief CHAMBERS. I do, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Why didn't you say that before when I asked you?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, I didn't want to interrupt. Others were speaking.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. No. I asked you that question. You weren't interrupting. How is it that there is such a disparity—how did you come up with the number 1,400 extra weapons?

Mr. KNOX. Chairman, during our assessment we physically examined over 1,350 or so weapons on hand. At the same time the force firearms custodian provided us a list indicating he had 1,450 essentially weapons on hand. There was a disparity in those numbers, and even as I listened to the Chief testify today, if each officer has a weapon and we have 1,920 weapons therefore issued, that would leave only 600 on hand for a total count of 2,500. But we counted twice that many. And granted they are a collection of——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Let me understand that. You counted how many weapons?

Mr. KNOX. 1,350.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. But when you said twice that many, twice of what? Explain that to me.

Mr. KNOX. If three weapons are issued to each officer, meaning a total of 1,920, and if 2,500 is the total sum of weapons in possession of the Park Police, we should have only been able to count 600 weapons when we went through the various facilities. But, in fact, we counted 1,350.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Chief? How do you answer that?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, many of those are patrol rifles that have not yet been issued. The patrol rifle program, it takes 40 hours for an officer to get fully certified. And at this moment, we don't have a range to use so we use those as we can get it. It will take several more years until every officer is certified to carry a patrol rifle.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Jarvis, do you concur with everything the Chief is saying?

Mr. JARVIS. I do, I do. I want to add one other factor though that they are in possession of some 500 weapons that are scheduled for disposal——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Would any of those disposals include the sales of those weapons?

Mr. JARVIS. I do not believe so, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Why not, why not sell the weapons? They are of value.

Mr. JARVIS. I think our policies are that those weapons go to disposal.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. That is a policy we need to revisit. My time is expired.

I now recognize the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Grijalva, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Knox, just for the sake of definition, it is my understanding that what triggered your investigation and your recommendations and findings was an anonymous tip or an anonymous complaint. That anonymity, is it for the sake of protecting a whistleblower under the statute, or is it indeed anonymous as the definition would be of anonymous?

Mr. KNOX. Congressman, in this instance, the complaint was received anonymously. We have no knowledge——

Mr. GRIJALVA. Was it in writing, a phone call?

Mr. KNOX. The complaint was received in writing.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Excuse me. I don't have that here with me. That particular complaint, that has been made available to the committee in writing?

Mr. KNOX. No, sir, I believe I don't believe it has.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, could we have that complaint in writing as part of the record?

Mr. KNOX. Are you asking me for the complaint?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yeah.

Mr. KNOX. I will have to consult with the Deputy IG on our policy relating to release.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. The committee would certainly appreciate that, not just the consultation but to comply with the ranking member's request.

Mr. KNOX. I understand. Thank you very much.

Mr. GRIJALVA. And excuse me. I keep and to all the witnesses—I keep asking the same question to people because I keep looking for a smoking gun, and I can't seem to find one. Pardon the pun.

The Fraternal Order of Police has concerns with the methodology and the allegations made in the IG report. They believe that law enforcement best practices were not followed and that the report unjustly put, places blame on the current agency administration for the failure of previous chiefs of police and that the report undermines the credibility of this and future IG assessments and indeed the credibility of the force itself.

Chief, your reaction to that assessment. And I will ask the same of you, Mr. Knox, if you don't mind.

Chief CHAMBERS. The Fraternal Order of Police's communication with you is, of course, on their own volition. The fact that one agrees or disagrees with how the IG's report may have been conducted is not as important to me as the value I find and I did find it valuable and the 10 recommendations are a great road map for us and I intend to see that they are fully implemented.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you.

Mr. Knox.

Mr. KNOX. Congressman, I received a copy of the Fraternal Order of Police letter just moments before while we were in recess. I've read it. I'm not sure what information they might be referring to. I take exception to their statement about undermining the value of OIG activity. In fact, our recommendations have been received well by the National Park Service, and we're pleased that they intend to implement them.

Mr. GRIJALVA. And I agree. I think that the fact that the reaction from the administration and the Department has been to be proactive and say, okay, let's look at these and make corrections and adjustments. But we keep looking for the root cause of all this. And so that is why I'm assuming we are having this hearing rather than giving it ample time for the recommendations to be implemented, to be corrected, and then to have a hearing on the assessment toward the end of the line as opposed to making some judgments now that are probably I think patently unfair when the process isn't done yet.

But given all that, there was a transition going on, Ms. Thorsen, from one system to another dealing with a reliable weapons inventory.

Do you believe that that transition to a new system is one of the reasons the Park Police could not provide the IG at that moment of the snapshot with the records upon request?

Ms. THORSEN. Without understanding the thorough assessment process that the IG used, they have their own methodologies in which they follow when they do their assessments, it appears that when they were looking for records and talking to the Chief they were unable to bring up records in the FBMS system. So that may have very well played into the fact that they could not produce at the time the electronic accounting records needed for verification.

FBMS is the financial and business and management system for the Department.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you. Not by act of Congress and by unfortunately a signature of the administration, we have guns in the parks, and the public can have that access. And I would suspect that maybe our committees' time would be well served to assessing how that's going, what stress is put on Park Police and employees, and what, if any, backlash has been in terms of public acceptance of that.

With that, I yield back. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. I now recognize Chairman Bishop for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

Ms. Thorsen, you're the person who oversees all the law enforcement programs in the Department. What is your responsibility to ensure the Department firearm policies are known and followed?

Ms. THORSEN. The office of law enforcement security in the Department is part of the tiered responsibility in the Department for firearms accountability. It starts with the officer supervisory chain, the Chief in this instance, the director of the particular bureau that the law enforcement program resides in. We have seven——

Mr. BISHOP. So is it your responsibility to make sure she knows what she's supposed to be doing?

Ms. THORSEN. We do that through compliance evaluations periodically, yes.

Mr. BISHOP. So if the Chief claims that she didn't know about some of these things, is that your responsibility for making that known? Is that your—has it been your office's failure in her not understanding what she was supposed to be doing?

Ms. THORSEN. No, I do not believe it is our office's failure.

Mr. BISHOP. That's your responsibility.

Ms. THORSEN. Our responsibility is to issue departmental policy, which we did after the 2009 report was issued.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. How do you follow up on that?

Ms. THORSEN. We follow up with periodic compliance evaluations and we are in the middle of doing a firearm assessment right now in all seven law enforcement programs in the Department.

Mr. BISHOP. The report—they started looking at this thing in February. You started counting in July. Why was there that disparity of time? Why did you wait so long to try and find out what the answers would be?

Ms. Thorsen, I'm still coming at you.

Ms. THORSEN. Actually we started our assessment in April and we are still in the middle of that.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Knox, you didn't do a baseline accounting, did you, of how many guns ought to be there, what is the number that should be?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, we could not do that. The records were not available.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. Ms. Thorsen, what has your office done to provide an accurate baseline accounting for firearms, not just within her department but across the Department?

Ms. THORSEN. With the park police we are part of the team that is actually out doing a physical inventory right now regarding the Park Police.

Mr. BISHOP. Are you doing a baseline?

Ms. THORSEN. We are doing a physical inventory at this point and——

Mr. BISHOP. Is somebody going to come up with how many weapons should be out there?

Ms. THORSEN. That's the next phase. As talked about earlier, we will be looking at, the Park Service in particular will be looking at purchasing records, transfer records and comparing those to the physical inventory and——

Mr. BISHOP. When is that going to happen? When will that be done?

Ms. THORSEN. I don't have an exact date but I'm hoping in the next couple months or two.

Mr. BISHOP. So are we. The Department's testimony says——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. BISHOP. Yes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Recommendation Number 6 says reduce the firearms inventory to no more than the minimum necessary to equip law enforcement, and that is to be done by October 2013. If you don't have a baseline, you don't know how many you're going to reduce it by, I worry that, do you even know what the recommendations are?

Ms. THORSEN. Yes, I do, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. All right, the Department testimony says the Office of Law Enforcement and Security will work with the Park Service to provide additional oversight. That suggests that OLES has not, in the past, been conducting adequate oversight of the department's law enforcement units in their firearm inventory? Did you or OLES conduct any oversight in response to the allegations of the 2009 report to ensure that recommendations were implemented?

Did you do anything for the 2009 report?

Ms. THORSEN. We issued a variety of policies in our firearms policy, and then we have since also looked and compared policies at the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement to ensure that they had policies in place that we, we in the Department, identified from the 2009 report.

Mr. BISHOP. So why wasn't he able to find any of that stuff?

Ms. THORSEN. Well, those were three different bureaus. The Park Police, the process for the Park Service and the Park Police with them, and that follow-up is scheduled in the next couple of months. We have, the capacity we have in the Department with seven law enforcement programs we are going through them systematically.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. So they are different than the others and I get that. But in 2009, it was supposed to be, the recommendation was OLES should revise existing policy to direct that lost or missing cached firearms must be reported and investigated similar to lost or missing assigned firearms. That was the responsibility in 2009. Why didn't you do it?

This is now 4 years later we find out it hasn't been done. Why wasn't it done?

Ms. THORSEN. We did issue policy, Chairman, to ensure that weapons lost, missing weapons were reported. Those are required to be reported up in to our interior operations center on a serious incident report.

Mr. BISHOP. But what good are those policies if no one knows about it and no one is following up on it? You have no follow-up on what you said you did after the two—there is no reason that this IG's report should have come out. There was already a problem in 2003 when all of you were involved. There was a report in 2008, and another one in 2009. It told you to do this. You say you issued policies but no one knows about them and no one followed up on them. Why not?

Ms. THORSEN. The bureaus do know about the policies we issued. We issued them to all seven law enforcement programs once they are issued from the Department. We also have ongoing conversations with the bureaus, the Bureau of law Enforcement Programs, in fact, while we are developing those policies and when we issue those policies. So they are aware of those policies.

Mr. BISHOP. Then why didn't you have the data? Why were these things missing? Why did the IG report find out so many problems that they labeled also as a lackadaisical action and a culture that takes place? Why wasn't this thing solved in 2009 if you actually did your job in 2009? If you actually followed the policies that were requested, and you say you do, why do we still have this problem 4 years later? And it was a perfect question by Mr. Duncan. Are we going to have the same thing happen in 5 years because of the attitude, lackadaisical attitude we have in the Department? Ms. Thorsen, this is your responsibility, why has it not been done? Why 4 years later are we still in a mess?

Ms. THORSEN. The responsibility and accountability for firearms rests partly with the Department, but also with, as I said earlier, the officer, supervisory chain, the Chief and the director of whatever particular bureau the law enforcement program falls in. And as the director spoke earlier to, they do regular inventories, yearly inventories and information assurances statements every year to ensure that those accountable property items are tracked. So my expectation is that the bureaus and their programs are executing those requirements through policies we issue and policies issued by the acquisition and property management staff.

Mr. BISHOP. All right, I'm way over time so I will ask this simple question. If you did everything right, who screwed up?

Ms. THORSEN. The Department issued policies for—actually the 2008 and the 2009 reports. The Park Police did not institute all of those policies, which we found out, and we are implementing those recommendations as we speak right now from the IG's report.

Mr. BISHOP. So Ms. Chambers screwed up?

Ms. THORSEN. There are many layers of folks that were not taking appropriate accountability.

Mr. BISHOP. So you all screwed up?

Ms. THORSEN. No, I would not say everybody screwed up, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. But somebody had to.

Ms. THORSEN. There are members, members of the force, members of the Park Service as identified by the IG in the report that apparently were not able to account for their firearms. So we take the recommendations to heart, we are implementing them to ensure that they are trained and that they are well aware of their personal accountability requirements when it comes to firearms.

Mr. BISHOP. All right, this is the last statement then. If you ordered, if you did the policies, you took the recommendations that go back 4 years ago and you did all of that, this IG's report should not have happened. Somewhere there was a failure. This IG's report should not have happened at all. Somewhere there is a failure, and someone needs to be responsible for that failure.

I'm sorry. I do have one last question. You said you elevated this new position to take care of this problem.

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, I have assigned it to rank one rank higher.

Mr. BISHOP. So someone got promoted to do this?

Chief CHAMBERS. No, sir. A current lieutenant has now been moved into this new position.

Mr. BISHOP. So someone on staff has been promoted into this new position?

Chief CHAMBERS. Not promoted, sir, moved laterally from his other assignment as a shift commander.

Mr. BISHOP. Was this person responsible for this—oh, never mind. I think you understand where I'm coming. Somebody got a new assignment because of this but that doesn't solve the problem. I'm sorry for going over.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. One of the challenges is everybody, oh, we take responsibility, but nobody is held accountable. Nobody is held accountable. That's the problem. Is anybody fired? Has anybody been fired? No. And we have this persistent problem, we're dealing with weapons. This is not an excusable, oh, sorry, I won't let that happen again.

If President Obama wants gun control, he should start with the United States Park Police.

Now a very generous 5 minutes for the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C., Ms. Norton.

Ms. NORTON. Well, the committee is and I thank you, Mr. Chairman, is right to be concerned about the IG report and what looks like difficulties of setting up a two system to keep track of guns. Anybody who has control of guns has a special responsibility. I'm going to say I find it also interesting that this committee is as interested as it is in the question since it has tried in the past to wipe out all the gun laws in the District of Columbia which would have given the Park Police a whole lot more work than it has now.

So I'm interested less in beating somebody up and finding out how to get this gun given the personnel issues that face every agency, including the Park Police.

Now did I understand you to say that you are not filling vacancies, Ms. Chambers?

Chief CHAMBERS. Not sworn vacancies, and civilian ones only on an as need basis and approved up the chain of command.

Ms. NORTON. So no matter how low, we have a lieutenant who was here in a line position that had to do with patrol of the Park Police throughout the region?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, ma'am. He was a shift commander.

Ms. NORTON. So somebody is going to have to do that job which has to do with law and order.

So I'm concerned that at a time when even officers of the Park Police when they leave the Park Police and create a vacancy cannot be replaced that we are talking about why people aren't doing what clearly they should have been doing in this climate.

All I can say, Chief Chambers, is in trying to get ahold of this inventory, an important responsibility of the Park Service and of the Park Police, I certainly hope that because you have heard so much at this hearing from Congress and that can always be intimidating, you will bear in mind that the public wants our monuments to be safe. Our public wants the 20 million visitors who come to this city from around the world to be safe, especially since most of them go to the monuments and to the Mall.

So I can only hope that your first priority, whatever the concern, and it is a legitimate concern, about these guns does not deflect you from the law and order, the law and order mandate of the Park Police.

Mr. Knox, is there any evidence that there has ever been a system to keep control of guns? I mean aren't we starting from the ground up?

Mr. KNOX. Congresswoman, the current state of accountability for weapons at the Park Police is in disarray.

Ms. NORTON. I understand that. I am saying it sounds to me as though no one ever invented one.

Mr. KNOX. Well there is no, as we say in our report we don't have a baseline from which to start. There's no point in time where we have any confidence in any inventory——

Ms. NORTON. So bear that in mind that essentially there is no record that the Park Police has ever in any administration at any time done anything but keep the guns from getting out of its control and apparently it has done that, but it has never had the kind of professional system that we would expect a law enforcement office to have. Of course the Park Police has been among the most unappreciated and least well staffed police forces, Federal police forces. And you know it shows.

So I understand this is an important issue. I represent this city. If the Park Police don't keep control of guns then, of course, in no small measure this city may be the first to feel the effects of it.

But we're asking the Park Police to create, invent a system that was never in place at a time when they will not be able to replace peace officers no matter how low the number gets when and if they leave. So I want to make it clear that there are mandates and

there are mandates. And I certainly hope nothing in this hearing makes you believe that there is any mandate more important than making sure that our monuments, our visitors and the people, our Federal employees, the people who come to this city in huge numbers every day, are safe.

Mr. Knox, this may not be done as fast as it should be but I assume you also would believe that their first priority should be the protective mandate of any police force.

Mr. KNOX. Congresswoman, of course we do. I do as well personally. But I would like to say that weapons accountability is a very fundamental task of a law enforcement agency and not a difficult one to achieve. It just takes leadership.

Ms. NORTON. Agreed. And I'm the first to agree to that. As I say. My district would be the first to feel the effects. But you're talking to people who cannot fill any position at any time and whose budget is going to go lower and lower each year unless we do something about it. I think everybody ought to put all the cards on the table, and that's the big elephant in this hearing room today.

And I yield back the balance of my time and I thank the chairman.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. And I thank the gentlewoman. I would remind the gentlewoman that the U.S. Park Service spends some $50 million a year acquiring new properties, acquiring new things. We can't even take care of what we have now. So if you share my commitment that we need the proper personnel, they need to be trained, they need to be supervised properly, perhaps the gentlewoman would join me in making sure that rather than acquiring new things and spending to the tune of $50 million a year doing so within just this one department, maybe we should take care of what we have here today.

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I recognize him for 5—I'm so sorry the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Bentivolio, for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me be perfectly clear. There's no doubt in my mind that I don't think our officers on the job are not doing that job and protecting the life and property of the United States Government as well as our visitors.

But Ms. Chambers, Chief Chambers, I'm still a little concerned. You said something earlier that you did not know what a report of survey was, what last year you just learned of it? Is that right?

Chief CHAMBERS. After the interview with the Inspector General's investigator, I then inquired of my staff, what is this term? What does it mean? And they provided me with all the background.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. And how long have you been in this position?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, I was reinstated in January of 2011.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Reinstated.

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. That means you held this position before?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. What years was that?

Chief CHAMBERS. 2002 and 2003, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. So you held this position before and you didn't find out what a report of survey was?

Chief CHAMBERS. I had never heard the term, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Do you have any military experience?

Chief CHAMBERS. No, sir, I don't.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Okay. You know, I could pretty much ask most privates and corporals and surely an E5 sergeant what a report of survey is and they will be able to tell you. And I'm a little bit surprised and disturbed that somebody at your rank doesn't understand that.

Now let me ask you another question real quickly. If I went and just stopped in one of your field offices where there were some rifles or pistols and I asked you and read the serial number, would you be able to tell me where it was acquired, when it was acquired, who had it or a chain if you will or, yes, somebody signed for it, a hand receipt for it, anything like that?

Chief CHAMBERS. Not knowing the capabilities of the financial business management system that we just got access to, I don't know that answer today, but I'd be glad to find out for you.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. So—let's say I'm an officer. Do I come in and say hey I would like to check out a rifle, I'm qualified, I was a master gunner for my unit, I'm SWAT trained, former military policeman, I know how this works.

How do I get that weapon?

Chief CHAMBERS. Actually we've got such a request right now. An officer would request to have one assigned to him so that he doesn't have to go to an arms room. It would be assigned to him each and every day to take out on patrol.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. What do you mean you don't have an arms room? If he signs it out every day you have to have a secure——

Chief CHAMBERS. It would be a secure area for him, yes, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. So these are locked up overnight when he is not on duty?

Chief CHAMBERS. Correct, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. And then he shows up in the morning, he is going on duty, does he sign for that weapon?

Chief CHAMBERS. He better. I don't know the answer——

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. He'd better?

Chief CHAMBERS. There are sign-out procedures.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Okay, well, there should be an armorer or somebody that hands that weapon over to him and he signs for it. Is that correct?

Chief CHAMBERS. That's correct, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. All right. Now if you're not doing that, I'm going to highly recommend U.S. Army veterans. Do you hire any veterans?

Chief CHAMBERS. We do, sir.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Well, you know, they know this stuff backwards and forwards. They know the procedure. Maybe you should consult somebody who has experience in this area other than somebody who, well, apparently doesn't know. Because there should be a chain of title or a chain that I can look at right now and see a serial number and ask you where that weapon is or find out immediately where that weapon is and who had it at all times at any moment.

And you know in the Army if you didn't do that in my unit, you'd be relieved on the spot, there would be a report of survey on the spot, five or six officers would have their heads rolling if they didn't get it fixed within hours.

Chief CHAMBERS. And that's certainly the ultimate goal.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. But nobody's head's rolling. Nobody understands. And I keep hearing 5 to 10 years, and apparently you didn't know what a report of survey was even back in 2002 when you held this position.

Chief CHAMBERS. That's correct.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time. Thank you.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you.

I will recognize myself as we wrap this up. I do have a few more questions.

Chief, how is it that somebody could walk up to the Lincoln Memorial, throw green paint on it, and walk away without anybody noticing? How does that happen?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, if a criminal is intent on committing a crime in the presence or outside the presence of a police officer's view, he or she can do it. Fortunately, we have got technology that has helped us gather the evidence needed in this case.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Why wasn't that person apprehended on the spot? Is there not a person there patrolling at the time?

Chief CHAMBERS. There is, sir. And he had just left that side of the statue and was actually on the back side at the moment that it occurred. I'm confident that it happened very quickly based on other witness statements.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I find it totally and wholly unacceptable that we don't have the adequate control on something so precious and so visible, so close to the White House as the Lincoln Memorial. It is just stunning. We will have to get into that further.

How much ammunition do you have?

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, we have approximately 500,000 rounds of ammunition, and we will be using about 200,000 of that here in the next few months for requalification. That happens twice a year.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. So 200,000 rounds for 640 people, I will have to work back and do the math, that seems like an awful lot actually as I kind of calculate it right off the top of my head here.

What I would like, and Mr. Jarvis, I would like this from you and Ms. Thorsen as well, all seven of the agencies, I hope you find it reasonable to ask for the current inventory. We've done this with other departments and agencies, we did it with the Social Security Administration, we have done it with others, it is not a new ask, to provide us a listing of how, the current inventory of all the weapons broken out by each of the seven agencies, the departments, whatever you want to call them, that would also include the inventory of ammunition.

And if you could also show us the historical purchases of both weapons and ammunition for the last 5 years, that would be very helpful.

And the final thing that I would ask is a projection on what you anticipate purchasing over the next 24 months. I know that crosses

a couple different fiscal years and what not but certainly you have some sort of projection. And Mr. Jarvis, is that a reasonable ask?

Mr. JARVIS. I think that the ask for the current inventory is very reasonable. I think we can supply that. At least I'm speaking for the Park Service, I can't speak for the other agencies, and also inventory weapons and ammunition. Projections—one caveat I would say going back and looking over the past 5 years of procurement, that will be, that's a big lift. As was indicated here a little bit behind the scenes, we have transitioned to a new accounting system——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Well, what's a reasonable time that you would get that to the two committees?

Mr. JARVIS. I will have to get back to you on what, how much time that will take. I don't want to overpromise and underdeliver on that, so I want to be able to tell you how long it would take.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Could we say September 7th; is that a reasonable time, over a month away?

Mr. JARVIS. That we could get back to you with how long it will take?

Mr. CHAFFETZ. No. No.

Mr. JARVIS. I cannot promise you that I can have 5 years of procurement data to you by September 7th. That is unreasonable.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Let's say this, by the end of August that you would get us the current inventory, which you supposedly have right at your disposable at this time, and we will give you an additional 30 days for the projection of procurement. Is that fair, the end of September for the procurement projections?

Mr. JARVIS. I would guess that our projection for procurement is probably the next 12 months, because we don't—fiscal year——

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Next 12 months is a start. That gives you almost 60 days to do the, I think that's reasonable. Ms. Thorsen, can we do that with all the agencies or all the departments under those time parameters?

Ms. THORSEN. Well, I also don't want to overpromise and underdeliver.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I'm asking you to make a commitment. You are the one in charge.

Ms. THORSEN. I will work with the other directors in the bureaus to ensure that they get the direction and that we move forward, absolutely.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. And that you will hit those dates.

Ms. THORSEN. Yes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Now I yield to or recognize the gentleman from Utah, Chairman Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP. I was just making sure when he said the gentleman from Utah he actually meant me.

Mr. Knox, you didn't go through an assessment of procurement or storage or anything else of ammunition, did you, in the report?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, no, we did not.

Mr. BISHOP. Were there anecdotal evidences or issues that you saw as you were going through the report?

Mr. KNOX. Anecdotally we observed as we moved through the various facilities conditions which could be enhanced for security,

all of which I should mention, sir, were known by the Park Police and something they are dealing with.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. Thorsen, you have a policy for missing weapons?

Ms. THORSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Knox, did Chief Chambers know that policy for missing weapons?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you whether she knew or did not know.

Mr. BISHOP. Isn't—the claim is that you were not aware of that policy, though, is that right, Ms. Chambers?

Chief CHAMBERS. I believe the report would make one believe that I did not know, but that is not accurate, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. You did know?

Chief CHAMBERS. Of course, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. That means you should have done something about it then.

Chief CHAMBERS. Sir, we have no evidence of missing weapons.

Mr. BISHOP. Right. There is a couple of last requests I'm going to have from everybody here.

Mr. Knox, this is something for which you are not responsible but we are going to call for it one more time, Miss Kendall's title is Acting IG, right?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, she uses the title Deputy IG, which is the position she held. She did act for a while but the vacancy act——

Mr. BISHOP. Is there an IG, a permanent IG?

Mr. KNOX. No, sir, we at the Interior Department do not have——

Mr. BISHOP. It has been about 4 years since we had one, right? I'm going to make this call one more time as our committee has previously. There needs to be a permanent IG appointed and it would give some more credibility to the reports that are coming out of your office. I want—we need to have a permanent IG. I appreciate that.

Mr. Jarvis, I do have some empathy for the position you have, especially when the Park Police has an autonomous streak to it, but the responsibility is still to come back with these reports. I notice that many of the recommendations we're asking to be done by October 1st, to be completed by October 1st.

I would like you to supply our committee with the evidence of what you have done by October 1st to implement all these recommendations. And I appreciate that.

Ms. Thorsen, it would be the same thing, if we can get by October 1st the implementation report from what you have been doing.

Ms. Chambers, are you a political appointee in this position or are you a merit?

Chief CHAMBERS. Merit, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. So you will stay there until you decide to retire?

Chief CHAMBERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. We need a better job. This is not acceptable from those who are under you. And that's all there is. This report should never have come out because in 2003 your entity lost 133 guns. They found them in pawn shops in Georgia, a couple of them. This

will not happen again. This should not happen again. It is your responsibility. Make sure it does not happen again.

And, Mr. Jarvis, we will hold you accountable for that as well.

Chief CHAMBERS. You have my commitment, sir.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. The gentleman yields back. We'll recognize the ranking member, Mr. Tierney, from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you.

Mr. Jarvis, in this particular instance, following this report, have there been any identification of lost weapons?

Mr. JARVIS. No, sir, there have not.

Mr. TIERNEY. No indication of people finding them in pawn shops or anything else?

Mr. JARVIS. No, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Knox, you did a weapons accountability overview on your report and recommended that they have a better system of weapons accountability, correct?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. And you base that on best practices in the law enforcement field?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. And that's reflected in your recommendations?

Mr. KNOX. It is in fact.

Mr. TIERNEY. Okay. Mr. Jarvis, you have looked at those eight recommendations, and you think they are reasonable?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes and there are 10 actually, I looked at all ten.

Mr. TIERNEY. And Ms. Chambers, you agree?

Chief CHAMBERS. I do, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. And you are in the process of trying to accommodate all of those 10 recommendations, correct?

Chief CHAMBERS. Some have already been completed. Many of the others are well on their way, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. And Mr. Knox, you have committed to having a constant overview of this progress?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, sir. As I stated in my opening remarks, we feel we must stay engaged and continue some reviews.

Mr. TIERNEY. How will you do that?

Mr. KNOX. We will schedule reviews and inspections after we receive results from the National Park Service on the implementation of our 10 recommendations.

Mr. TIERNEY. And if you feel that they're falling unreasonably behind the schedule for time you said you will notify the committees that are here today?

Mr. KNOX. Yes, sir, we will.

Mr. TIERNEY. And neither Mr. Jarvis or Ms. Chambers have any difficulty with that at all; you're set on that process? Do you feel that each of you has the personnel that's competent to carry out these recommendations?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, and we have drawn from the Department of the Interior as well to assist us in that work.

Mr. TIERNEY. And Ms. Thorsen, you are satisfied with that as well?

Ms. THORSEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you all for your testimony. I yield back.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you. We appreciate your attentiveness to this matter. We look forward to hitting those dates and those commitments that we have made, and the committee now stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:55 a.m., the subcommittees were adjourned.]

APPENDIX

Material Submitted for the Hearing Record

Opening Statement of Chairman Jason Chaffetz
Subcommittee on National Security
"Missing Weapons at the National Park Service: Mismanagement and Lack of Accountability"
August 2, 2013

Good morning, and welcome to today's hearing, titled, "Missing Weapons at the National Park Service: Mismanagement and Lack of Accountability."

I would also like to welcome Ranking Member Tierney, members of the Subcommittee, and members of the audience.

I am pleased to hold today's hearing jointly with my friend and the gentleman from Utah, Representative Bishop, Chairman of the House Committee on Natural Resources Subcommittee on Public Lands and Environmental Regulation. Chairman, I look forward to working with you to conduct oversight of this important matter.

Today's proceedings result from a need to further address questions and concerns raised in a June 27th report from this year, issued by the U.S. Department of Interior's Office of Inspector General titled, "Review of U.S. Park Police Weapons Accountability Program."

In the report, the OIG made some very serious charges, including finding insufficient "accountability, accuracy, and oversight" of the U.S. Park Police's firearms program.

During the course of the OIG's investigation, the OIG found "credible evidence of conditions that would allow for theft and misuse of firearms, and the ability to conceal the fact if weapons were missing."

Moreover, despite requirements to maintain an accurate firearms inventory, the OIG found that the U.S. Park Police firearms inventory records were inaccurate and failed to account for hundreds of firearms.

If these findings are accurate, this lack of accountability is completely unacceptable.

Given the OIG's glaring findings about the U.S. Park Police's lack of accountability for their weapons program, I am also interested to learn whether the ammunition used by the U.S. Park Police is properly accounted for.

The Subcommittee on National Security previously conducted oversight in a hearing on April 25th of this year, titled: "Oversight of the Federal Government's Procurement of Ammunition," in which we found that the federal government, in some cases, has not procured ammunition effectively.

Based on the seriousness of the charges in the OIG report, the findings warrant further examination, where the report fell short.

There are a number of questions that would be helpful to explain the findings:

- Are there examples where U.S. Park Police weapons were actually stolen or misused?

- How did the OIG arrive at the "hundreds" of weapons number?

- Were simple typographical errors and poor data entry the main cause of the unaccounted for firearms?

As a result, today's hearing provides an opportunity to discuss the findings by the OIG and to assess the extent of accountability issues within the U.S. Park Police.

It's also important to further examine the weapons procurement processes. The OIG site reviews of U.S. Park Police's field office armories discovered approximately 1,400 "extra" weapons for a force of only 640 officers.

These extra weapons consisted of 477 military-style automatic and semiautomatic rifles.

According to the OIG, "we also discovered a number of weapons that, according to USPP officials, fulfilled no operational need."

It is my understanding that an undetermined number were awaiting destruction.

I am also concerned about the OIG's finding regarding senior management's supervision of the weapons programs, specifically that "staff at all levels – from firearms program managers to their employees – had no clear idea of how many weapons they maintained due to their incomplete and poorly managed inventory controls."

Moreover, the OIG reported that firearms managers "accepted verbal assurance that firearms inventories were completed correctly rather than taking personal responsibility for accuracy."

Unverified verbal assurances about the accuracy of Park Police's firearms inventory is simply not tolerable.

The reported lack of accountability over the U.S. Park Police weapons program has been documented as a long-standing issue. In 2008 and 2009 the OIG found a lack of oversight of the weapons accountability program, but the problems persist still today.

I want to take a moment to emphasize that the hard work and dedication of Park Police officers is greatly appreciated. We need to ensure that our law enforcement officers are properly trained and equipped to efficiently do their jobs.

That said, the vandalism that recently occurred at the Lincoln Memorial, the National Cathedral, and Smithsonian Castle all raise concerns about whether tax payer dollars are being spent effectively in light of these shortcomings.

Particularly, I'm interested to learn what the U.S. Park Police is doing to ensure that our national monuments will not be defaced, vandalized, or prime targets for terrorism.

I look forward to hearing from all of the witnesses today, as today's hearing will focus on the need for proper inventory procedures and improved oversight for firearms management.

The Committees seek to ensure that the U.S. Park Police appropriately addresses the OIG recommendations outlined in the June 27, 2013, report.

I now recognize Ranking Member Tierney for his opening statement.

DARRELL E. ISSA, CALIFORNIA
CHAIRMAN

JOHN L. MICA, FLORIDA
MICHAEL R. TURNER, OHIO
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., TENNESSEE
PATRICK T. MCHENRY, NORTH CAROLINA
JIM JORDAN, OHIO
JASON CHAFFETZ, UTAH
TIM WALBERG, MICHIGAN
JAMES LANKFORD, OKLAHOMA
JUSTIN AMASH, MICHIGAN
PAUL A. GOSAR, ARIZONA
PATRICK MEEHAN, PENNSYLVANIA
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, TENNESSEE
TREY GOWDY, SOUTH CAROLINA
BLAKE FARENTHOLD, TEXAS
DOC HASTINGS, WASHINGTON
CYNTHIA M. LUMMIS, WYOMING
ROB WOODALL, GEORGIA
THOMAS MASSIE, KENTUCKY
DOUG COLLINS, GEORGIA
MARK MEADOWS, NORTH CAROLINA
KERRY L. BENTIVOLIO, MICHIGAN
RON DESANTIS, FLORIDA

LAWRENCE J. BRADY
STAFF DIRECTOR

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

2157 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515–6143

Majority (202) 225-5074
Facsimile (202) 225-3974
Minority (202) 225-5051

http://oversight.house.gov

ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, MARYLAND
RANKING MINORITY MEMBER

CAROLYN B. MALONEY, NEW YORK
ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JOHN F. TIERNEY, MASSACHUSETTS
WM. LACY CLAY, MISSOURI
STEPHEN F. LYNCH, MASSACHUSETTS
JIM COOPER, TENNESSEE
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, VIRGINIA
JACKIE SPEIER, CALIFORNIA
MATTHEW A. CARTWRIGHT, PENNSYLVANIA
MARK POCAN, WISCONSIN
L. TAMMY DUCKWORTH, ILLINOIS
ROBIN L. KELLY, ILLINOIS
DANNY K. DAVIS, ILLINOIS
PETER WELCH, VERMONT
TONY CÁRDENAS, CALIFORNIA
STEVEN A. HORSFORD, NEVADA
MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, NEW MEXICO

Opening Statement
Rep. John F. Tierney, Ranking Member
Subcommittee on National Security
Hearing on "Missing Weapons at the National Park Service: Mismanagement and Lack of Accountability"

August 2, 2013

Thank you, Chairman Chaffetz.

I would like to welcome our witnesses to today's hearing on a recent Inspector General report that identified problems in weapons inventory and accountability program at the U.S. Park Police. I look forward to hearing the witnesses' testimony on their actions and efforts to respond to the findings of the Inspector General's report and make the necessary improvements.

The U.S. Park Police have been on duty in our federal parks for more than 200 years. The force has jurisdiction in all National Park Service areas and provides law enforcement services to designated areas, primarily in the Washington, D.C., New York City and San Francisco, California metropolitan areas.

The IG identified failures in the Park Police's management of its weapons inventory program. While the IG did not find that Park Police weapons were stolen or misused, the lack of accountability left the weapons inventory potentially vulnerable to theft and misuse.

This is a serious matter for the Park Police that requires immediate attention. It is also an opportunity for the Park Police to take the necessary steps to address the accountability and management failures, preserving the integrity of the organization and preventing fraud or theft.

Since the release of the report the National Park Service established a task force that has initiated an exhaustive review of the Park Police weapons inventory, policies and procedures for accounting for weapons and training and oversight of all staff levels to ensure compliance. The task force review began by implementing one of the IG recommendations, conduct a complete inventory and verification of all firearms in Park Police custody. The Park Service has notified the Committee that the task force has accounted for almost all of the Park Police weapons.

The Oversight Committee has particular interest in rooting out and preventing waste, fraud, and abuse in government programs and operations. Established weapons accountability

procedures, adequate training in policies and procedures and effective management oversight all play a role in preventing and detecting fraud or theft of weapons in the government's custody.

While I am concerned that the Park Police allowed the failures in weapons accountability to get to this point, almost all of the Park Police weapons have been properly accounted for, and the Park Service appears to be correcting the problems identified by the IG and implementing their recommendations.

I hope that the Park Service and the IG can continue to work together to make the necessary improvements to the weapons accountability program. We on the Oversight Committee will be monitoring the progress and performance to ensure that Park Police can properly account for and monitor weapons acquired for agency use.

I think we all want to be sure guns are accounted for at all government law enforcement organizations. I think all of the parties here today -- the Park Police, National Park Service, Interior, the IG, and Congress -- have a role in achieving this goal.

I look forward to hearing from the witnesses to better understand their response to the IG findings and how they will work together to implement the IG recommendations to establish a professionally responsible firearms management program necessary for a premier police organization within the Federal Government.

Contact: Jennifer Hoffman, Communications Director, (202) 226-5181.

AUG 1 2 2013

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
1849 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20240

IN REPLY REFER TO:

AUG 9 2013

The Honorable Rob Bishop
Chairman
Subcommittee on Public Land and Environmental Regulation
Committee on Natural Resources
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Jason Chaffetz
Chairman
Subcommittee on National Security
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairman Bishop and Chairman Chaffetz:

At the August 2, 2013, hearing on the United States Park Police (USPP) weapons accountability program, several requests were made for additional information. This letter provides information related to the request for the current inventory of USPP firearms.

In response to the Inspector General's June 27, 2013, report, *Review of U.S. Park Police Weapons Accountability Program*, I appointed a team to immediately assess the USPP firearms inventory. Over a period of thirty days, the team, composed of representatives from the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service, worked with the USPP to conduct a physical, hands-on inventory of existing firearms. With the exception of two officers who are currently deployed overseas on military assignments or on extended leave, the team has met with each USPP officer and accounted for all government firearms under the control of the USPP. This inventory is now fully entered in the Department's property accountability system.

Firearm Type	Assigned	Unassigned
Handguns	719	536
Shotguns	118	153
Rifles	292	399
Specials (e.g., training, less-than-lethal)	59	273
Total Current	**1188**	**1361**

This inventory documented a total of 2,549 firearms, which includes 1,188 firearms currently assigned to USPP officers and 1,361 unassigned firearms. Of the unassigned firearms, 554 are currently awaiting destruction. When this process is complete, the total number of firearms owned by the USPP will be reduced to 1,995 firearms.

USPP officers may be assigned several firearms at a time. After graduating from the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center and completing appropriate proficiency training and qualification requirements, officers are assigned a single handgun. Throughout their career, they may be assigned additional firearms after completing stringent training and qualification requirements for each firearm. These additional firearms include shotguns and rifles. Officers assigned to distinctive units such as Special Weapons and Tactics, or S.W.A.T., may carry additional firearms appropriate for their unique and highly specialized duties.

The use of multiple types of firearms ensures that USPP officers are adequately armed and trained to respond to the full range of threats they may encounter. For example, a single officer may be assigned a handgun, a rifle, and a shotgun to address a variety of dangers to public safety. This approach is consistent with the best law enforcement practices across the country.

The 1,361 unassigned firearms includes firearms used for training and weapon familiarization purposes, firearms that will be assigned to officers as they complete required training and qualification processes, and serialized parts used to repair operational firearms.

I am committed to working with the USPP to fully implement all of the recommendations listed in the Inspector General's report and pledge to maintain an open and transparent process so that Congress and the public can maintain a high degree of confidence in the USPP.

Sincerely,

Jonathan B. Jarvis
Director

cc: The Honorable Raúl Grijalva, Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Public Land and Environmental Regulation
The Honorable John Tierney, Ranking Member
Subcommittee on National Security

○