

H.R. 1606 AND H.R. 2388

LEGISLATIVE HEARING

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, RECREATION,
AND PUBLIC LANDS

OF THE
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

November 1, 2001

Serial No. 107-72

Printed for the use of the Committee on Resources



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/house>
or
Committee address: <http://resourcescommittee.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

75-982 PS

WASHINGTON : 2002

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

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah, *Chairman*
NICK J. RAHALL II, West Virginia, *Ranking Democrat Member*

Don Young, Alaska, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	George Miller, California
W.J. "Billy" Tauzin, Louisiana	Edward J. Markey, Massachusetts
Jim Saxton, New Jersey	Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
Elton Gallegly, California	Peter A. DeFazio, Oregon
John J. Duncan, Jr., Tennessee	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, American Samoa
Joel Hefley, Colorado	Neil Abercrombie, Hawaii
Wayne T. Gilchrest, Maryland	Solomon P. Ortiz, Texas
Ken Calvert, California	Frank Pallone, Jr., New Jersey
Scott McInnis, Colorado	Calvin M. Dooley, California
Richard W. Pombo, California	Robert A. Underwood, Guam
Barbara Cubin, Wyoming	Adam Smith, Washington
George Radanovich, California	Donna M. Christensen, Virgin Islands
Walter B. Jones, Jr., North Carolina	Ron Kind, Wisconsin
Mac Thornberry, Texas	Jay Inslee, Washington
Chris Cannon, Utah	Grace F. Napolitano, California
John E. Peterson, Pennsylvania	Tom Udall, New Mexico
Bob Schaffer, Colorado	Mark Udall, Colorado
Jim Gibbons, Nevada	Rush D. Holt, New Jersey
Mark E. Souder, Indiana	James P. McGovern, Massachusetts
Greg Walden, Oregon	Anibal Acevedo-Vila, Puerto Rico
Michael K. Simpson, Idaho	Hilda L. Solis, California
Thomas G. Tancredo, Colorado	Brad Carson, Oklahoma
J.D. Hayworth, Arizona	Betty McCollum, Minnesota
C.L. "Butch" Otter, Idaho	
Tom Osborne, Nebraska	
Jeff Flake, Arizona	
Dennis R. Rehberg, Montana	

Allen D. Freemyer, *Chief of Staff*
Lisa Pittman, *Chief Counsel*
Michael S. Twinchek, *Chief Clerk*
James H. Zoia, *Democrat Staff Director*
Jeff Petrich, *Democrat Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, RECREATION, AND PUBLIC LANDS

GEORGE P. RADANOVICH, California, *Chairman*
DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN, Virgin Islands *Ranking Democrat Member*

Elton Gallegly, California	Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
John J. Duncan, Jr., Tennessee	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, American Samoa
Joel Hefley, Colorado	Frank Pallone, Jr., New Jersey
Wayne T. Gilchrest, Maryland	Tom Udall, New Mexico
Walter B. Jones, Jr., North Carolina, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Mark Udall, Colorado
Mac Thornberry, Texas	Rush D. Holt, New Jersey
Chris Cannon, Utah	James P. McGovern, Massachusetts
Bob Schaffer, Colorado	Anibal Acevedo-Vila, Puerto Rico
Jim Gibbons, Nevada	Hilda L. Solis, California
Mark E. Souder, Indiana	Betty McCollum, Minnesota
Michael K. Simpson, Idaho	
Thomas G. Tancredo, Colorado	

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on November 1, 2001	1
Statement of Members:	
Christensen, Hon. Donna M., a Delegate to Congress from the Virgin Islands	2
Clyburn, Hon. James E., a Representative in Congress from the State of South Carolina	3
Prepared statement on H.R. 1606	5
Hefley, Hon. Joel, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado	7
Prepared statement on H.R. 2388	8
Radanovich, Hon. George P., a Representative in Congress from the State of California	1
Statement of Witnesses:	
Carlino, August, President and Chief Executive Officer, Steel Industry Heritage Corporation and the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, and Chairman, Alliance of National Heritage Areas, Homestead, Pennsylvania	29
Prepared statement on H.R. 2388	31
Response to questions submitted for the record	42
Roscoe, Dr. Wilma, Interim CEO and President, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, Silver Spring, Maryland	19
Prepared statement on H.R. 1606	21
Stevenson, Katherine, Associate Director of Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.	9
Prepared statement on H.R. 1606	11
Prepared statement on H.R. 2388	12
Waddell, Dr. John K., President, St. Paul's College, Lawrenceville, Virginia	26
Prepared statement on H.R. 1606	27
Additional materials supplied:	
Harris, Annie Clay, Executive Director, Essex National Heritage Area, Statement submitted for the record on H.R. 2388	37
Response to questions submitted for the record	43

**LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 1606, TO
AMEND SECTION 507 OF THE OMNIBUS
PARKS AND PUBLIC LANDS MANAGEMENT
ACT OF 1996 TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL
APPROPRIATIONS FOR HISTORICALLY
BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, TO
DECREASE THE MATCHING REQUIREMENT
RELATED TO SUCH APPROPRIATIONS, AND
FOR OTHER PURPOSES; AND H.R. 2388, THE
NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS POLICY ACT
OF 2001.**

**Thursdsday, November 1, 2001
U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands
Committee on Resources
Washington, DC**

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:20 a.m., in Room 2212, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. George Radanovich [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. RADANOVICH. Welcome to the hearing on the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation & Public Lands, and thank you for taking the time to find the right building in the new building, and I appreciate that everybody is here.

I am going to go right into my opening statement, and then we will go right into the first panel on the hearing.

So the Subcommittee will come to order, and this morning the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation & Public Lands will hear testimony on two bills, H.R. 1606 and H.R. 2388. Our first bill is H.R. 1606, introduced by Congressman James Clyburn. Welcome, Mr. Clyburn of South Carolina.

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you, sir.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Which would amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to authorize additional ap-

appropriations for historically black colleges and universities and to decrease the matching requirements related to such appropriations.

Our other bill is H.R. 2388, introduced by our Subcommittee colleague, Congressman Joe Hefley from Colorado. Joe, welcome, and would establish uniform criteria for designating national heritage areas by defining the circumstances under which a region warrants national heritage area designation, and by further defining standards for managing and maintaining that status.

At this time I would like to ask unanimous consent that Congressman Clyburn be permitted to sit on the dias following his statement and/or testimony. Without objection, so ordered.

I would also like to thank our witnesses for being here to testify on these bills, especially Mr. Carlino who has come to Washington twice to testify on H.R. 2388, only to be turned away due to the tragic events of September 11th, and then again on October 18th, when the Longworth Building was closed due to the anthrax matter. So your timing is not very good, but you are very welcome, and we are glad we actually have a meeting you can make.

I now turn the time over to Mrs. Christensen for her opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. DONNA M. CHRISTENSEN, A
DELEGATE FROM THE VIRGIN ISLANDS**

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to again commend you and the staff, both of our staffs, for making sure that the work of the Subcommittee continues despite just about all of us being out of our homes in Longworth and the Ford Building.

Our meeting today will receive testimony on two important initiatives, H.R. 2388, which establishes a policy for the study and designation of national heritage areas, and H.R. 1606, which provides for the preservation of historic buildings on the campuses of historically black colleges and universities.

On H.R. 2388, I am glad that we were able to reschedule this hearing for yet again the third time. Hopefully the third time is the charm. This bill was introduced by our friend and former Subcommittee Chair, Mr. Hefley, and I remember some of the issues included being concerns brought up at other hearings that our Subcommittee had.

National heritage area policy has not been a new issue for the Subcommittee. H.R. 2388 is the latest version in a line of legislation that goes back nearly a decade. Mr. Hefley has been working with all interested parties, and while each of those involved have issues and concerns with the bill as it is written, it nevertheless has provided us with a good starting point from which we can hopefully craft consensus legislation.

The other bill before the Subcommittee this morning is H.R. 1606, which I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of. It would provide a very important initiative which builds upon the work started in 1996 with the passage of the historically black colleges and universities historic preservation program. That program has been the catalyst for the preservation of historic structures at these institutions of higher learning, including the one in my district, the University of the Virgin islands. Now because we had

these funds to help restore a historic plantation great house on the St. Croix campus, we have a home for our school of nursing which before had been scattered all over the island. We could never have done this without the help of this program.

The money, though, has never measured up fully to the need, and so it is extremely unfortunate that all of the existing authorized funding has been used up while there are still many listed on the National Register of Historic Places, which despite the other fund-raising activities of these institutions, are still in need of the funding that this program brings to fully restore the national treasures that are on their grounds.

Many of the buildings that are in line to be assisted by this program are integral elements of the school campuses, and as in our case, their preservation will not only preserve the history and spirit of these pioneering institutions, but provided needed classroom and other space as well.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, for many reasons our colleges and universities, all of which have made unique contributions to the history and the present of our nation, do not have the large endowments that some of their counterparts do. Yet many of them, when surveyed, had already fully or partially restored those buildings which had been identified as having special historic significance.

The assistance which this program provides is critical, as is the requested change in the match. Without it, many of these properties which tell a history of the institutions themselves, but also of our country, would be lost.

I want to take the opportunity to welcome the former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, himself a proud graduate of an HBCU that I had the opportunity to attend the homecoming for last weekend, and as well as our other witnesses today, and I look forward to their testimony.

I also want to welcome Congressman Bobby Scott of Virginia who is here with us this morning.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mrs. Christensen. Any other opening statements from anybody else on the panel? If not, we will get right to it.

Again, the first part of the hearing is on H.R. 1606, which is a bill to amend section 507 of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, to authorize additional appropriations for historically black colleges and universities.

Mr. Clyburn, welcome. And as we have taken care of earlier, you are more than welcome after your testimony to set with us on the dias.

STATEMENT OF THE HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You are so kind. I am pleased to do that.

Thanks to you, Chairman Hansen, with whom I worked for a long time on this legislation, and to the members of the panel for allowing me to be here today.

I want to express my gratitude to all of you for holding this hearing today. I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify on be-

half of my legislation to expand an authorization for the Historical Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program.

As a former school teacher, I have always possessed an acute appreciation for history, and have enjoyed its study for many years. That is one reason I was so pleased you introduced the legislation establishing the South Carolina National Heritage Corridor. Many of you who were on the Committee at that time may remember my good friend, Congressman Lindsey Graham, joined me in testimony before this Committee in support of that legislation, which Congress authorized in 1995.

I worked to appropriate funds for a 3-year study of the Gullah culture along the sea islands of South Carolina and Georgia. This is a culture very unique and very much at threat of extinction, and hopefully this will give us recommendations on how to preserve and interpret what most scholars say is the closest African roots of any native-born Americans.

I worked very closely for many years on many issues with Dick Moore, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and was overjoyed when the National Trust, acting on the nomination of the Southeast Regional African-American Preservation Alliance, listed one of the three HBCU campuses as a category on his 1998 list of the 11 most endangered historic sites in the country.

I tell you these things so you can know how very important historic preservation is to me personally. But of all the things I have worked on in preservation, I am most proud of HBCU Historic Preservation Program. Many of these campuses date back a century or more. The history contained within the hallowed halls of these institutions is as rich and diverse as the students who pass through them.

Dr. John Waddell is here today and will testify as to the profound impact this program has had on Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina.

I want to tell you what it meant to me as a student of history, to see a treasure such as Arnett Hall on Allen's campus brought back from the brink of destruction. This structure was designed by an African-American architect, built by the students themselves, and completed in June 1891.

The time we were authorizing the original \$29 million for this program, the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, our State's SHPO, listed Arnett Hall as the most endangered historic site in South Carolina. I am happy to report today the building has been saved, preserved to the Secretary of the Interior's standards, and shines as a beacon in that part of Columbia. And the same is true for Ministers Hall on Claflin University's campus in Orangeburg, South Carolina, and will soon be true for Massachusetts Hall on the campus of Voorhees College in Denmark.

In 1997, the Congressional Black Caucus requested the GAO to conduct a study to determine the projected cost of preserving all threatened historic sites at the 103 HBCUs. I was asked to coordinate that study with the GAO. I worked very closely with Dr. Wilma Roscoe, who you will be hearing from very shortly, to get that study done.

The study took one solid year to complete, but it was very comprehensive, and very objective. The GAO identified 712 historic

sites on the campuses, with a projected preservation cost of \$759 million. That's a lot of money, even in this town. But the need has been documented.

The bill before you today would authorize 70 percent of that total. The vast majority of these colleges have had a very difficult time raising a dollar-for-dollar match. Consequently, many of these college presidents would prefer a grant, but I believe it is important for the schools themselves to feel vested in the project. So my bill requires a 30 percent match. As you may know, the Park Service allows 70 percent of funding for planning and survey projects funded by the Historic Preservation Fund, so there is a precedent for this ratio, and it is a formula that is sorely needed.

Now I know that there are those who question why we should authorize a program at such a large amount over what the Preservation Fund has authorized. I have three responses to such a question.

The first is fundamental. I firmly believe the Preservation Fund is underauthorized and I know it is underappropriated. If it were up to me, the Preservation Fund would be authorized and appropriated at \$500 million a year.

My second response is that this program has proven its merit, the need has been documented and, most important, without this program's expansion we as a nation will lose many, many historically and architecturally significant treasures. This money is just not available to save them.

But my third and paramount response, Mr. Chairman, is this authorization will allow the campuses, the structures identified for preservation, to do strategic planning. If these schools were able to point to the Federal Government's commitment to cover 70 percent of the preservation costs, alumni and potential donors would be more amenable to contributing the matching funds for the projects.

Mr. Chairman, should this bill become law, it would be unrealistic for anyone to expect full appropriations in the near future. It will take many years and a strong commitment to meet the need the GAO has documented. But without this bill, we cannot even begin.

Mr. Chairman, I know the Subcommittee's support for preservation is strong, and I pledge to stand shoulder to shoulder with you to do all we can for the historic preservation community. And I want you to know that there is no issue of jurisdiction before this full Committee that is more important to the Congressional Black Caucus, and to me personally, than H.R. 1606. I will be happy to respond to any questions you or members of the Committee may have. And I thank you for allowing me to be here.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Clyburn follows:]

**Statement of the Hon. James E. Clyburn, a Representative in Congress
from the State of South Carolina**

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my gratitude to you and Chairman Hansen for holding this hearing today. I very much appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of my legislation to expand the authorization for the Historically Black Colleges and Universities Historic Preservation Program.

As a former schoolteacher, I have always possessed an acute appreciation for history and have enjoyed its study for many years. That is one reason I was so pleased to introduce the legislation establishing the South Carolina National Heritage Corridor. Many of you who were on the Committee at the time may remember that my

good friend Congressman Lindsey Graham joined me in testimony before this Committee in support of that legislation which Congress authorized in the 1995 Poseidon Bill.

I worked to appropriate funds for a three-year study of the Gullah culture along the sea islands of South Carolina and Georgia. This is a culture very unique and very much at threat of extinction, and hopefully, this study will give us recommendations on how to preserve and interpret what most scholars say is the closest African roots of any native born Americans.

I have worked very closely for many years and on many issues with Dick Moe of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and was overjoyed when the National Trust - acting on the nomination of the Southeast Regional African American Preservation Alliance - listed the 103 HBCU campuses as a category on its 1998 list of the 11 most endangered historic sites in the country.

I tell you these things so you can know how very important historic preservation is to me personally. But of all the things I have worked on in preservation, I am most proud of this HBCU Historic Preservation Program. Many of these campuses date back a century or more. The history contained within the hallowed halls of these institutions is as rich and diverse as the students who passed through them. Dr. John Waddell is here today and will testify as to the profound impact this program has had on Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina. But I want to tell what it meant to me, as a student of history, to see a treasure such as Arnett Hall on Allen's campus saved from the brink of destruction. This structure was designed by an African-American architect, built by the students themselves, and completed in June 1891.

At the time we were authorizing the original \$29 million for this program, the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, our state's SHPO, listed Arnett Hall as the most endangered historic site in South Carolina. I am happy to report today the building has been saved, preserved to the Secretary of the Interior's standards, and shines as a beacon in that part of Columbia. The same is true for Ministers Hall on Claflin University's campus in Orangeburg, South Carolina, and Massachusetts Hall on the campus of Voorhees College in Denmark.

In 1997, the Congressional Black Caucus requested the GAO to conduct a study to determine the projected cost of preserving all threatened historic sites at the 103 HBCU's. I was asked to coordinate that study with the GAO. I worked very closely with Dr. Wilma Roscoe, who you will be hearing from very shortly, to get that study done.

The study took one solid year to complete, but it was very comprehensive and very objective. The GAO identified 712 historic sites on the campuses, with a projected preservation cost of \$755 million. That's a lot of money, even in this town. But the need has been documented.

The bill before you today would authorize 70% of that total cost. The vast majority of these colleges have had a very difficult time raising a dollar for dollar match. Consequently many of these college presidents would prefer a grant, but I believe it is important for the schools themselves to feel vested in the project, so my bill requires a 30% match. As you may know, the Park Service allows 70% of funding for planning and survey projects funded from the Historic Preservation Fund, so there is a precedent for this ratio and it is a formula that is sorely needed.

Now I know there are those who question why we should authorize a program at such a large amount over what the Preservation Fund is authorized. I have three responses to such a question.

The first is fundamental—I firmly believe the Preservation Fund is under authorized and I know it is under appropriated. If it were up to me, the Preservation Fund would be authorized and appropriated at \$500 million a year.

My second response is that this program has proven its merit, the need has been documented, and most important, without this program's expansion, we as a nation will lose many, many historically and architecturally significant treasures. The money is just not available to save them.

But my third and paramount response, Mr. Chairman, is this authorization will allow the campuses with structures identified for preservation to do strategic planning. If these schools were able to point to the federal government's commitment to cover 70% of the preservation costs alumni and potential donors would be more amenable to contributing the matching funds for the projects.

Mr. Chairman, should this bill become law it would be unrealistic for anyone to expect full appropriation in the near term. It will take many years and a strong commitment to meet the need the GAO has documented. But without this bill becoming law, we cannot even begin.

Mr. Chairman, I know the Subcommittee's support for preservation is strong, and I pledge to stand shoulder to shoulder with you to do all we can for the historic

preservation community. And I want you to know there is no issue of jurisdiction before this full Committee that is more important to the Congressional Black Caucus, and to me personally, than H. R. 1606. I will be happy to respond to any questions you or the committee may have.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Clyburn, for your opening statement, and again please feel free to join us on the dias.

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you.

Mr. RADANOVICH. It is kind of a strange thing, but we are going to be dealing with both bills at one time. So the next two panels will be speaking to your issue as well as the next issue, so if there are questions for Mr. Clyburn, then we are going to go on to Mr. Hefley, who will do his opening statement regarding H.R. 2388, which is the National Heritage Areas Policy Act of 2001, and then we will invite our next two panels up to deal with both bills at the same time.

So, Mr. Hefley, welcome.

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. JOEL HEFLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF COLORADO**

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for your patience, and thank you for rescheduling. And I want to thank again, as you did, Mr. Clyburn for coming again. I was embarrassed to invite him back. We had one of our witnesses who had come twice before all the way from Boston, and was here actually on the 11th, and bless her heart, it took her 30 hours to get home, or something. So this has been a bit of a struggle to get this bill before the Committee, but I am very appreciative that you were tenacious enough and we did it.

I also would like to give credit to my predecessors with this. Mr. Vento, who was Chairman of this Committee, was a great champion of this, and piqued my interest in it as I was a member of the Committee during his reign here, and also Mr. Hansen, who worked very hard on this subject over the years.

I guess today's hearing is just the latest chapter in a long story because the heritage areas really emerged, I think, in the mid-1970's as an invention of local groups and cooperative appropriators, and properly done, heritage areas proved to be a way that state and local groups could access the expertise and prestige of the National Park Service to preserve areas of unique national interest.

Illinois and Michigan Canal and the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridors are two examples of areas which have not only preserved important natural and historical resources, but which have improved local economics through tourism. But as these heritage areas proliferated, the Park Service continued to deal with them one at a time in the complete absence of any kind of a uniform policy. As one Park Service official said, we don't really know what these are.

By 1991, it was estimated that 100 state and local heritage areas existed nationwide. Today the figure is closer to 150. At the national level Congress has achieved some semblance of a policy through a gentlemen's agreement between Chairman Hansen and Mr. Regula, the former Chairman of the Parks Appropriation Subcommittee.

Simply stated, that agreement states that the national heritage areas are limited to 10 years and \$10 million in direct Federal involvement and local control. These stipulations mirror heritage legislation that Mr. Vento and I worked on many years ago.

As we shall hear today, areas which have followed these guidelines have worked pretty well, and some of the areas which have been created without these guidelines have not done nearly as well.

We will also hear from one of the witnesses today of the importance of business planning and national significance in creating these heritage areas. In Pennsylvania, prospective heritage areas are required to submit a business plan as part of their proposals. This ensures the champions of such areas take a realistic, long-term view of their proposals.

Further, we will hear discussion of the issue of national significance. As I said, there are 150 or so heritage areas nationwide. A relatively small percentage of those are national ones, and this is probably as it should be. These areas that carry the national title should preserve something meaningful to the entire Nation.

Former Park Service Director Roger Kennedy said of park units that every park proposal is important to someone. And, yes, but we shouldn't pay, probably, for all of them. I want to see us codify the Hansen-Regula agreement as a policy which has worked.

The bill before us today is a result of almost 7 years of work and was crafted with the help of the Park Service and many interested groups. We have tried to consult, Mr. Chairman, with everybody we can think of.

Let me state that we are or should not be in the business of economic development. That is not the reason you should create these things, although that is a byproduct of them sometimes.

We also shouldn't be in the business of making Members of Congress look good because they took something back home in the form of a heritage area. But we are in the business of preserving our history and culture in this country, and heritage areas are one of the ways of doing this. We simply need a logical process for getting this job done, and that is what this bill seeks to do, and I look forward to the witnesses today, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hefley follows:]

Statement of Hon. Joel Hefley, a Representative in Congress from the State of Colorado

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank you for scheduling this hearing today on my bill, H.R.2833, the National Heritage Areas Policy Act.

Mr. Chairman, when I first introduced this bill five years ago I was roundly denounced by people and groups I usually count among my supporters. The Pacific Legal Foundation questioned why we needed a heritage area policy at all and suggested my bill would lead to runaway government spending and land acquisition. Chuck Cushman of the League of Private Property Voters said I was establishing a new government program that would give legitimacy to the heritage area concept. "We'll fight them one at a time," he vowed.

Well, that was 1996. Since that time, this Congress has established at least nine national heritage areas. Mr. Cushman and his colleagues have fought—and lost—all of them over the past five years.

When I introduced this bill five years ago, conventional wisdom set the number of state or regional heritage areas at 100. Today, that number is estimated at 150. The state of Pennsylvania alone has 11 and there are at least four such proposals in my home state of Colorado. This concept is not going to go away nor, I am sure, should it. There are heritage areas around the country which have revitalized the local economy while preserving those areas' unique flavor. There are also some

which has been dismal failures. Those are largely areas which were the result of political wish lists instead of grassroots support-building.

There has been a change in the heritage area concept over the past five years. Beginning with those eight bills in 1996, heritage areas began to resemble what I'd outlined in my 1996 heritage areas bill—10 years, \$10 million, limited Park Service involvement, local control and planning, periodic renewals of local support. And, as we will hear from some of our witnesses today, that "non-policy" has worked for everyone. The most recent heritage areas have thrived while keeping government spending at a minimum.

To a large degree, this uniformity has been the result of a gentlemen's agreement between this subcommittee and its appropriations counterpart. My fear is, What happens when that agreement no longer holds? My guess is we will go back to the glorious days of individually crafted heritage areas, each specifically tailored to the needs of their congressional sponsors, with no limits on federal involvement or spending. "Unique" heritage areas which can swallow almost half-a-billion dollars over 15 years or masquerade as national parks. Areas which may go years after their authorization without a single constructive step toward fulfilling their mission.

The bill before you builds on our past work on this subject and was developed with the cooperation of the Park Service and other interested groups. What I would like to see is codification of the formula that has served us so well for the past three years—10 years, \$10 million, local control, limited federal involvement. I'll be willing to make whatever changes are necessary to bring that about.

Some time ago, I lobbied a few of my western colleagues to support this bill. I pointed out the growth of these areas and Chairman Hansen mentioned that heritage areas "could bleed us white." In the absence of a federal policy, they could indeed. We are shirking our duties if we do not frame such a policy. Fighting them one at a time sounds good but is a recipe for losing.

With that I'll close, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to hearing today's testimony.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Hefley. And now I would like to introduce Ms. Katherine Stevenson, Associate Director of Cultural Resources, Stewardship and Partnerships of the National Park Service, of course in the Department of Interior. Good morning, Ms. Stevenson. Welcome.

Ms. STEVENSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Welcome. And you certainly may begin your testimony. If you would be mindful of—I am not a real hard-core guy on these time clocks, but if you could kind of keep yourself around 5 minutes, that would be great.

Ms. STEVENSON. Yes, sir, I would be pleased to do that.

STATEMENT OF KATHERINE H. STEVENSON, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, CULTURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND PARTNERSHIPS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Ms. STEVENSON. First, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here before you to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 2388 and H.R. 1606.

With your permission, I would like to summarize my testimony and submit the entire text for the record.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Surely.

Ms. STEVENSON. The Department sincerely appreciates the efforts of the Committee staff, and particularly Mr. Hefley's staff, to work with the National Park Service on the Heritage Areas bill. You know that we agree that a bill to create—that meets the needs of the heritage areas across the country is a very important bill indeed.

You all have been very willing to discuss various alternatives and have integrated many of the changes that we have recommended into this bill.

It is clear that we share the same goal, the goal of creating a framework for the establishment and management of national heritage areas. The bill makes great strides to accomplish this goal.

With that in mind, we have a couple of concerns about language in the bill. This may reflect our misunderstanding of intent, and we would welcome further discussion.

First, we worry about the complexity of the approval process. While we fully support inclusiveness and recognize that heritage areas cannot be successful without broad local support, we are concerned about the many steps proposed for the approval process. We worry that increased approval steps may overly complicate the process.

As an example, in the Hudson River Valley area, were this bill in effect, it would require the approval of approximately 290 municipalities of the feasibility study, the management plan, and the local coordinating entity, resulting in almost 900 approvals.

Second, we are unclear about the intended role of the National Park Service. I believe some of the most successful heritage areas are those with a full partnership with the National Park Service. This permits the heritage area and the National Park Service and other partners to work toward mutual goals, broaden the involvement, and facilitate connections to other heritage areas, to parks, and other Federal agencies.

This bill as written appears to limit the role of the National Park Service to a pass-through grant provider, rather than a convener, a partner or a mentor. We would like to continue to work with the Committee to clarify these and some other relatively minor issues.

H.R. 1606 authorizes the Secretary to make matching grants of \$530 million to HBCUs to preserve and repair historic buildings. Regrettably, the Department must oppose this bill. We are concerned that when dollars are apportioned to carry out the act, it will reduce the modest amount available for States and Indian tribes to distribute according to need as they identify that need.

Since 1966, the Department has been strongly committed to the principle that the States and the tribes know their historic resources and are best suited to determine the priorities for allocation of grant funds.

Second, we believe that the provision to lower the non-Federal matching share is unnecessary. Presently the Secretary has the authority to waive or to adjust the share on a case-by-case basis.

One HBCU has already supplied the requisite explanation and has been approved for a lower matching share. We anticipate other data submissions and likely other approvals for a reduced match.

Finally, the National Park Service has worked very closely with HBCU since 1995 to identify their highest priority needs and to support their efforts to preserve historic structures. Since 1995, 34, or fully one-third of all HBCUs, have received allocations from the Historic Preservation Fund. The bureau and the Department commit to continue technical assistance directly to HBCUs to assist the universities and colleges in preserving their historic structures.

In addition to this continued assistance on the grant side, we will assure that the HBCUs receive special notice of any other NPS grant funds, especially the Save America's Treasures grants, for which they may apply.

This concludes my prepared testimony. I would very happy to answer any questions that any of you might have. Thank you.

[The prepared statements of Ms. Stevenson follow:]

Statement of Katherine H. Stevenson, Associate Director, Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships, National Park Service, Department of the Interior on H.R. 1606

Thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on H.R. 1606, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make matching grants of \$530 million to historically black colleges and universities to preserve and repair buildings listed on, or eligible to be listed on, the National Register of Historic Places under the authority of Section 507 of Public Law 104-333. The bill also includes a provision that would permit the non-Federal matching share to be reduced from 50 percent to 30 percent of total costs of the project.

The Department opposes H.R. 1606, because it would place large, new financial obligations on the Federal Government to take care of non-federal facilities at a time when funds are limited and demands to maintain existing federal facilities are growing. We appreciate efforts to preserve significant historic buildings on the campuses of historically black colleges and universities and the dedicated work of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus on this bill, but the Department's priorities are protecting and preserving national parks, monuments, refuges, public lands, and Indian schools.

Background

In 1988, the National Park Service cosponsored a survey and assessment of historic properties on the campuses of historically black colleges and universities. The intent of the survey was to identify, assess, and prioritize historic properties and initiate a coordinated effort to support the restoration of the properties that were deemed the highest priority. Building on this survey, the General Accounting Office conducted a study in 1997-98 to identify historic properties at the 103 historically black colleges and universities, and to provide cost estimates for these restorations. Respondents identified 712 historic properties (mostly buildings), of which 323 were already on the National Register of Historic Places. According to the information provided, an estimated \$755 million is needed to restore and preserve the 712 historic properties.

In Section 507 of Public Law 104-333, Congress authorized \$29 million, which was eventually appropriated for the preservation and restoration of historic buildings at historically black colleges and universities, and specified that of the amount to be appropriated, \$23 million in grants would be earmarked for thirteen particular colleges and universities. Since this law was passed, the Administration included funding for this program in its annual budgets. Funding provided in the fiscal year 2001 Interior Appropriations Act, Public Law 106-291, completed the 12 ongoing projects authorized in the 104th Congress.

Legislation

The Department has major concerns with H.R. 1606. First, we are concerned that when funds are appropriated to carry out this Act, it would reduce the overall amount of funds available from the Historic Preservation Fund to States and Indian tribes. The Department strongly supports the principle that States not the Federal government are best suited to determine the highest priorities for awarding grants under the Historic Preservation Fund. Under the current competitive process, the Department allocates funds to States and Indian tribes who approve grants to projects that meet certain criteria. There are many very worthy projects, including numerous other historic buildings, in need of assistance from the Historic Preservation Fund.

Second, the Department believes that the provision to lower the non-Federal matching share under H.R. 1606 is unnecessary. The 50 percent non-Federal matching share for grants under the Historic Preservation Fund is required under the National Historic Preservation Act. We recognize that, in some cases, raising a 50 percent non-Federal matching share can be difficult. In fact, under Public Law 104-333, the Secretary currently is authorized to waive the matching requirement on a case-by-case basis if the circumstance is an extreme emergency or such a waiv-

er is in the public interest. To date, only one historically black college or university has submitted a specific proposal for a waiver of the matching requirement from the Secretary. The school demonstrated that it had a viable project that was in the public interest, and thus, the Secretary granted the waiver. We believe that this case-by-case approach is more appropriate than a general reduction in the matching requirement.

Third, we note that previously appropriated funds have been expended at a very slow rate, suggesting that applicants have not been able to find sufficient matching funds. Of the \$29 million authorized by Public Law 104-333, only \$7 million has been expended thus far. The National Park Service has worked closely with each applicant throughout the process. Site visits also have been conducted at each college and university that has an approved historic grant. Many of the colleges and universities that have approved grants are now ready to move forward with raising the non-Federal matching share and hiring contractors to begin preliminary site work. We plan on contacting each of these colleges and universities to discuss ways that the National Park Service can assist them in spending the \$22 million that has already been appropriated.

For the above reasons, the Department opposes H.R. 1606.

There are other sources of funding for historic preservation work that could be available to historically black colleges and universities. One example is the Save America's Treasures program that awards grants for preservation and conservation work on nationally significant intellectual and cultural artifacts and nationally significant historic structures and sites. We will work with historically black colleges and universities to ensure they receive special notice on when the application process begins on the fiscal year 2002 Save America's Treasures competitive grants program and provide any needed guidance and assistance.

The Department recognizes that historic buildings on these campuses are important national historic treasures worthy of our care and attention. We would be pleased to work with the Committee to address the concerns outlined in our testimony.

This concludes my prepared testimony, Mr. Chairman. I would be pleased to answer any questions you or other committee members may have.

Statement of Katherine Stevenson, Associate Director, Cultural Resource Stewardship and Partnerships, National Park Service, Department of the Interior on H.R. 2388

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department on H.R. 2388. This bill creates a definition and a structure for the study, designation, management, funding, and sunset of national heritage areas.

The Department sincerely appreciates your efforts to work with the National Park Service to create a bill that meets the needs of heritage areas across the country. You have been very willing to discuss various alternatives and have integrated many of the changes the National Park Service recommended into this bill. The Department supports the creation of a framework for the establishment and management of national heritage areas as proposed in H.R. 2388. Such a framework is needed to maintain a rigorous standard, so that future national heritage areas meet all the appropriate criteria. We also believe it is important that heritage areas continue to be initiated and supported at the local level. The Administration will follow up with suggested amendments to encourage the establishment of locally supported heritage areas.

Heritage areas implement that part of the National Park Service's mission statement that speaks to cooperation and partnership "...to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world." Heritage areas embody partnerships that blend education, cultural conservation, and resource preservation, recreation and community revitalization, which are all integral parts of our work.

Interest in heritage areas and corridors is growing. In the past two years, the number of national heritage areas has increased from 18 to 23. In the 107th Congress so far, nine bills have been introduced to study the feasibility of heritage area designation or to actually designate a region. In addition, the National Park Service has nine feasibility or special resource studies already underway related to potential heritage areas including the Upper Housatonic River Valley in Massachusetts and Connecticut, and the Crossroads of the American Revolution in New Jersey. It is important to emphasize, however, that funding for heritage areas is limited, so new areas can only be funded to the extent that established areas become self-sufficient

and no longer need the same level of financial support. Finally, there has been a positive growth in state heritage programs including newcomers like Maryland, Louisiana, and Utah.

Interest in the heritage areas is growing because they work. The heritage area strategy is based on a shared vision for the future grounded in the best of the past. At their best, these heritage partnerships engage local governments who have never planned for the future around a shared past. At their best, they bring together a host of federal, state, and local partners to remediate brownfields, reinvigorate main streets, institute educational curriculum that draw from local history, and demonstrate that environmental lessons are just outside our back door. Heritage partnerships encourage regional interpretation and reinvigorate local tourist offerings with real and authentic experiences.

The recent National Park System Advisory Board report “Rethinking the National Parks for the 21st Century” hails heritage areas for their Federal and local partnerships to conserve and commemorate distinctive regional landscapes. It recognizes the benefits in preserving resources outside of park boundaries by the people who live there with the assistance of the National Park Service.

For these reasons, we believe that generic legislation would be valuable as a way to provide for the development and designation of national heritage areas. A number of provisions of H.R. 2388 reflect our cooperative effort to develop such a program, including the contents of a feasibility study, the need for public involvement throughout the process, the elements of a management plan, and the need to effectively identify a management entity or local coordinating entity. All of these principles would provide useful guidance to communities in developing a strategy to create a heritage area and to Congress in evaluating an area for designation or funding. H.R. 2388 provides some good, solid building blocks for a program, but more could be done to ensure the process maintains high standards for new areas and relies on the support and initiative of local communities.

The National Park Service has been looking at the issue of heritage conservation for many years and is now engaged in various levels of management and technical assistance in heritage partnerships located all around the country. In the past, we worked with members of Congress and communities on legislation similar to H.R. 2388 that, if enacted, would have provided general guidelines for the establishment and management of national heritage areas. We believe that it is a valuable goal to establish a national program that enforces these guidelines while encouraging communities that take the initiative to protect their natural, cultural, historic, scenic, and recreational resources.

The Administration would like to follow up in writing with specific recommendations on H.R. 2388. For example, we would like to clarify that the role of the National Park Service in the heritage area program is to assist—not lead—communities in assessing their resources and in planning for their conservation and interpretation. As well, we would like to clarify the obligations of other federal agencies under section 11(b) and reconcile the tension between the language of sections 13(a) and 13(b).

We strongly believe that attention must be paid to maintaining standards for future heritage area designations. In our work with heritage area studies and designations, we have begun to incorporate provisions found in H.R. 2388, such as basing our feasibility studies on criteria outlined in the bill. We very much appreciate the interest of this committee and look forward to working with you to identify the parameters necessary to make heritage areas successful and accountable.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to comment. This concludes my prepared remarks and I will be happy to answer any questions you or other committee members might have.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Ms. Stevenson.

The regular order of things is that I get 5 minutes and then Mrs. Christensen gets 5 minutes. I am going to defer to, since we have both sponsors of the bills here, my questions to both Mr. Clyburn and Mr. Hefley in my 5 minutes. I am not sure how we want to do this, but I want to make sure that you have the opportunity. But that has to be with the consent of the full Committee to ask the questions, so if there is no objection, then I guess we will do it this way. I will give Mr. Hefley 5 minutes and then Mrs. Christensen will give Mr. Clyburn 5 minutes. And again I am not,

you know, a real tough guy on this thing, but stick to 5 minutes, if you can. Mr. Hefley.

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. STEVENSON, thank you for being here today, and your testimony, and thank you for working with us on this, because we have tried to work with the Park Service on it. And you point out two very important areas, I think, that we do want to solve before this bill moves forward.

We certainly don't want to throw up artificial barriers to creation of heritage areas. If it is something significant that should be preserved, then we want it to be done, and not make it so difficult that people throw up their hands in frustration. And what you described in the Hudson River Valley, we don't want that.

Do you have suggestions on both of these? Also part of the reason for this bill is to define the role of the Park Service, so if we are not doing that correctly, we want to do that.

Ms. STEVENSON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. HEFLEY. Will you, either now or later, have specific suggestions about how we can solve your concerns about this?

Ms. STEVENSON. Yes, sir, we do. We will be happy to provide them to you. We want to make sure that they are absolutely correct before we bring them up there.

Mr. HEFLEY. Okay.

Ms. STEVENSON. Some of them are extremely technical in nature, and would bore everybody to death, and others reflect changes we think would correct these two issues that we identified.

Mr. HEFLEY. Okay. Well, we certainly want to work with you on that.

Ms. STEVENSON. Thank you, Mr. Hefley.

Mr. HEFLEY. Also, does the Park Service feel that the chief executive in a State, and the State itself, should have a major role in these designations?

Ms. STEVENSON. A major role, absolutely.

Mr. HEFLEY. But as a partner?

Ms. STEVENSON. As a partner. It is hard to define—the emphasis has to come from the local community. Our experience has been if the local community doesn't support a heritage area, it falls of its own weight. What we don't want is for there to be a conflict between the local area and the chief executive, perhaps different parties, perhaps different intentions, and not have the opportunity for them to work it out without a veto power because the Congress and the local groups usually have a very good sense of what is going to be successful. So we want to see that be able to work out without undue animosity.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that is all the questions I have at this point. I will give back some of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Clyburn, or Mrs. Christensen. I am not real good on procedure.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I will yield to my colleague to begin the questioning.

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you very much, Madam Ranking Member, and Mr. Chairman, thank you so much.

I was kind of hoping that Chairman Hefley would give me his time because I do have some questions.

[Laughter.]

Mr. RADANOVICH. Well, you can ask on both bills, if you want to.

Mr. CLYBURN. Thank you very much. I am very, very concerned about the historic corridors, as you know. I do have some questions for Ms. Stevenson.

Ms. STEVENSON. Sure.

Mr. CLYBURN. Ms. Stevenson, are you aware of how many historic buildings have been saved by this program?

Ms. STEVENSON. I have a list of all the universities, sir, but I don't have a list of every building that has been assisted in every university. I could provide that for you.

Mr. CLYBURN. Well, I do have the list, but I am trying to get some stuff in the record here.

Ms. STEVENSON. I see.

Mr. CLYBURN. I would ask you, though, what importance do you place on this kind of historic preservation?

Ms. STEVENSON. I think it is clear by our assistance to the HBCUs that we consider them of great significance.

Mr. CLYBURN. Would you then say that the level of significance could very well be determined by the level of commitment on resources?

Ms. STEVENSON. This is a very complicated situation, and partially we are driven by the fact that there are literally thousands of historic resources nationwide that are in need of help. For us to single out a single class of resources and recommend that the Congress assist one and not be able to assist another makes us very uncomfortable. And that has been our position for years and years.

We have recommended and have worked very closely with the States since 1966 to ask the States to work within their areas, or asked the tribes, when it is a tribal area, to identify the resources they consider to be not only the most significant but the most in need. That way the Federal Government doesn't have to come in and make a determination that overrules that of the States. That process has worked extremely well with the States and with the tribes, and we don't want to deviate from that process.

Mr. CLYBURN. Well, being from South Carolina, Ms. Stevenson, my roots in South Carolina go back a long, long way, and I know my State's history, and I think you are aware of my State's history. I don't believe that you would testify today that South Carolina State University, of which I am a product, founded in 1896, as a land grant college, has a history of being treated fairly by my State.

Ms. STEVENSON. Point well taken.

Mr. CLYBURN. So, then, before I next my question, I want to give you a little bit of background. I have worked very closely with this administration since January on various things. One of the things I have worked very closely, meeting with the President personally on this issue, has been the need for us to do remedial stuff because of our history.

In fact, my January meeting with President Bush, I think, is partly responsible for the fact that Solicitor General Olsen on yesterday went before the Supreme Court in support of the program initiated by the Congressional Black Caucus on the highway program, and this administration supports that. And Mr. Olsen made

it very clear as to why he was supporting that. And I would suggest that the same principles apply to this program here today.

Now it is my understanding that when this original \$29 million was appropriated, a couple of things took place. One of them is that you wanted to divert this funding from this to other purposes, and I would like to know why. Was there some misunderstanding as to Congress' intent as to why you would make this suggestion?

Ms. STEVENSON. I am not at all familiar with that, sir.

Mr. CLYBURN. Well, let me ask you this. In reading your testimony that you have submitted for the record, you indicated in your testimony that only around \$7 million of the authorized \$29 million has been expended.

Ms. STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLYBURN. And you testify in there that this is some indication of the schools' inability to raise the money.

Ms. STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLYBURN. Yet you also testify in the very next paragraph that you would oppose lowering the match. That is one reason I am suggesting that we lower this match, because all of us know that these schools have tremendous difficulty. I have established at my alma mater, South Carolina State University, an endowed chair for me and my wife. The school was founded in 1896. They have never, in the history of that school, had an endowed chair. Never.

I would like for you to think about that, because that is what we are here today to try to preserve and protect the tremendous history of Arnett Hall, completed in 1891, built by the students themselves. Can you imagine what it was for black kids on that campus in 1891? And that building sat there since the 1950's, boarded up, until we came through with this program. Now that building stands there as a tremendous edifice and brought back that entire area of Columbia in a way which I cannot explain to you how emotionally that has captured the people of that area.

I think that Congress would be doing a tremendous disservice if we did not take advantage of the fact that this long history, this great culture, is not preserved, and to allow these buildings to crumble simply because these schools have historically not been able to raise monies. And if we had this kind of authorization—nobody is asking for the funding here. We are asking for this authorization, so these schools can be armed with this authorization and go out here and go to the various foundations and go to the alumni who right now don't support a program where they don't think there is a commitment to do it. But if they knew that the Federal Government was committed to doing something, I believe it would be easier for these schools to raise the money and that objection that you have would go by the wayside with the signing of this legislation.

Ms. STEVENSON. Actually, sir, our point is that the Secretary already has the authority to change the level of match, and so that the authority rests in the Secretary at present, so we don't need new authority. And, in fact, she has already exercised that authority with Rust University. They requested a lower matching share and, in fact, that has been approved.

Mr. CLYBURN. That is true, and I have talked to Secretary Norton about this legislation, and I think she is tremendous. I appre-

ciate that she has done that. But she will not always be Secretary, and I am not too sure what the next Secretary's attitude is going to be. And so I want this Congress to do it so that as Secretaries come and Secretaries go, so that this formula will be in law so that every Secretary will know what Congress' intent is, and was, at the time.

So though I congratulate the Secretary and I thank her very much for Rust College, I also remind you that we lost the money for Selma University in Alabama because they were not able to do the match.

Ms. STEVENSON. That is correct, but it was also allocated to other HBCUs.

Mr. CLYBURN. Absolutely. But I do believe that Selma needed the money, because you all made them a priority. They were there in line because you put them in line. So when they were not able to raise the money, somebody else replaced them. But if we had a 70-30 match, they may have been able to keep their place in line.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADANOVICH. You are welcome, Mr. Clyburn. Anybody else wishing to question the witness?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. STEVENSON, like all of my other colleagues who have priorities in our districts, we all have large backlogs in funding in these units, and so we can really appreciate that the Secretary sets as a priority eliminating some of those backlogs.

However, I am sure you would agree that it is the prerogative of the Congress to set new priorities, if it is our wish to do so. And if this bill should become law, this would be a new priority. And I also wanted to underscore that this bill would authorize the funding would come later, but we hope that you would reconsider in light of the very poignant comments of Congressman Clyburn, the Secretary and the Department's objection to this legislation.

You said that only \$7 million had been expended, but yet 12 projects that have been authorized have been completed within that \$7 million?

Ms. STEVENSON. There are two different pots of money. One was authorized in 1995, and the other one later. And I have and can submit for the record a complete explanation of what money has been appropriated and expended by each of the universities covered, colleges and universities covered.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate if we could get that information submitted for the record.

Mr. RADANOVICH. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. You also said that—you indicated that the expending of the dollars was moving very slowly, and I agree with Congressman Clyburn that the match is a big obstacle. But in the interest of maybe looking at other ways that we can help to move that funding more swiftly, has the Park Service identified any other obstacles or barriers that we could look at addressing?

Ms. STEVENSON. Originally the United Negro College Fund assisted the universities and colleges in raising money, and they assisted not only universities and colleges that were within their purview, but they assisted others as well. They were very successful in assisting fund raising.

With the new appropriation, they were really stretched beyond their ability to help. But many of these colleges and universities don't have the expertise for fund raising that the United Negro College Fund has, and maybe other fundraisers.

Secondly, in the second lump of appropriations, although we have had a National Park Service employee visit each and every one of the universities and talk to both their university president as well as the staff on board, some of the schools have not yet developed their plans and specifications. And it takes a while to develop those.

So some of the money that you see that has not been expended may be money that is in the pipeline ready to be expended. We just don't know that at this point, or at least I don't know this. Some of our staff may.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. So you don't know how much of it is obligated?

Ms. STEVENSON. Yes, I do know how much of it is obligated and I know how much has been expended. What I don't know is how far down the line some of the plans are at some of the specific schools.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. But I think again the first reason that you cited with regard to the fund raising also supports the request for the change in the match. You also said that the Secretary had granted a waiver. I, like my colleague, would want to establish the match and not leave it to a different Secretary that may not be so inclined to have to make a decision on that waiver. But you said that one waiver had been approved. How many had been requested? Were others requested?

Ms. STEVENSON. Several, and I don't have the exact number here in front of me, several requests, very general requests, came in just at the end of the last administration, and we wrote back to all of them and told them that we needed additional information. And Rust College has been the only one that I am aware of that submitted the additional information, and they were approved on October 4th.

I am not aware of any others in the pipeline right now.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Okay. But there have been others that have made the request, but none of them have really supplied you the information that you asked for?

Ms. STEVENSON. Correct.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. So that indicates that again the inability to meet the 50-50 match requiring a waiver, which makes that part of this legislation, you know, so much more important.

I don't have any further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mrs. Christensen. Anybody else have any questions? Mr. Udall?

Mr. UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did want to also add my voice to those we have heard with regard to this legislation. I think my colleague, Mr. Clyburn, makes a very compelling set of arguments that we should do all we can to support the historical black colleges and universities. I would note that there are 103 of these campuses that are rich in diversity, and we should do all we can to support them.

I thought the most compelling argument that is made in the testimony was the strategic planning aspect of this for all these universities. I think we could play a very, very important role in helping these universities leverage dollars if we support Mr. Clyburn's proposal.

I would also, if I could, since I have the floor, just thank you for holding a hearing in regards to my colleague Mr. Hefley's bill on the national heritage areas. He has offered an important piece of legislation. I would support him in moving that.

I would also like to just mention that I have a piece of legislation on state heritage areas and for which I request a hearing and hope that at some point we could also do that. I think there is an opportunity for real synergy with the Federal Government and states. I thank you for the Chair's indulgence, and I look forward to working with you.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I, too, look forward to working with you on those issues as well, Mr. Udall. Thank you for your comments on both bills. And if there are no further questions of Ms. Stevenson, thank you very much for your testimony.

Ms. STEVENSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And then we will call our next panel.

All right, thank you very much for coming to testify. We have on this next panel Mr. August Carlino, who is the president of the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area and chairman of the Alliance of the National Heritage Areas in Homestead, Pennsylvania. Welcome for the third and lucky time, Mr. Carlino. Thanks for being here.

Mr. CARLINO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Also Dr. John Waddell, who is president of Saint Paul's College in Lawrenceville, Virginia. Doctor, welcome to the hearing.

Mr. WADDELL. Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. RADANOVICH. We look forward to your testimony. And also Dr. Wilma Roscoe, who is the interim president of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education from Silver Spring, Maryland. Welcome, Dr. Roscoe.

Ms. ROSCOE. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you for being here. What we would like to do is just start off with your testimony. I am not going to do the clock. I am sick of it. But if you could kind of hang around 5 minutes on your testimony, that would be great, and then we will open it all up to questions after you are all done giving your testimony. Dr. Roscoe, if you would like to begin. Please use the microphone. And welcome to the hearing.

STATEMENT OF WILMA ROSCOE, INTERIM PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION, SILVER SPRING, MARYLAND

Ms. ROSCOE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and to the distinguished lady from the Virgin Islands and other members of the Committee, I want to thank you for convening this important hearing. Not only is this historic, but it is very much necessary and needed.

As a daughter, granddaughter, great-great-granddaughter of the great State of South Carolina, I want to also acknowledge Mr. Clyburn and to thank him for his effort in working to secure funding for the historically black colleges and universities, and to lead the way for the priorities for the future of our Nation's historically black colleges and universities, which are also referred to as HBCUs.

The legislation that he introduced in partnership with Representative Clement from Tennessee, H.R. 1606, will authorize the expenditure of Federal funds that are needed to address the severe historic preservation needs of our Nation's HBCUs.

Moreover, as a graduate of an HBCU and as interim president of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, known as NAFEO, I would like to say that it does my heart proud, as we say back home, to see and to witness the Congressional leadership that is being displayed today in bringing this issue to the forefront.

The vast majority of the schools and structures that are the focus of this hearing were built in the 1800's. Today there are 103 Federally-recognized HBCUs that have served as centers of learning and can claim responsibility for educating between the 1800's and now over 70 percent of the Nation's African-American professionals.

Regrettably, the very mission and existence of these schools are in jeopardy of forever being lost because they are in critical need of repair. The severity of the situation has been well documented by public and private authorities since 1988. In 1988, the Department of Interior, through the National Park Service, began to assess the historic preservation needs of HBCUs and eventually launched an initiative that listed 11 HBCUs as endangered.

Eventually Congress, the General Accounting Office, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation confirmed that many of the historic structures located on HBCU campuses were at risk of being lost and required significant funding to be saved.

For example, in 1996, Congress, under the Parks and Public Lands Management Act, authorized \$29 million for restoration of historical properties at selected HBCUs.

Two years later, in 1998, the General Accounting Office conducted a survey and found that there were about 713 properties on the 103 HBCU campuses that needed repairs or renovation. GAO estimated that \$755 million would be needed to address these historic preservation needs.

The Subcommittee should note that almost 15 percent of the historic preservation needs or structures identified by GAO, approximately \$262 million, are located in States represented by almost half of the members on this Subcommittee, in fact, 10.

Also, in 1998, the National Trust for Historic Preservation took the unprecedented step of placing all of the nation's 103 HBCUs on the list of America's 11 most endangered historic places, and concluded, and I quote, that "immediate action must be taken to preserve not just the structures, but the important legacies of HBCUs."

The legislation you consider today, H.R. 1606, would go a long way toward finally addressing the needs that have been recognized for so long. Many of these historic buildings house classrooms, dor-

mitories, administrative offices, laboratories, libraries, and provide other uses that are necessary components of providing a successful higher education experience. The current condition of many of these sites presents some serious health and safety concerns, and seriously impede the HBCU community's, and ultimately the Nation's, ability to catch up, keep up and step up to the challenges we have inherited over time, as well as the ones we face.

Specifically, under H.R. 1606, \$530 million is requested for the National Park Service HBCU historical preservation account. We recognize that the full amount would not be appropriated in 1 year. It would take some time to address all these needs. But working together, there is much that we can accomplish.

I would just like to also add a personal note, that for the past 40 years I have worked at historically black colleges. I have worked with programs for historically black colleges, and the testimony that was just presented today is somewhat of a reversal of policy originally initiated during the Bush and Reagan administrations. The Department, independent of Congress, took the lead in establishing this initiative. I was a part of that initiative, at least the planning, and remember the history quite well.

Secondly, let me say that Congress similarly has endorsed this type of effort through the 1996 Park bill as well as legislation that was passed to protect historic women's public colleges and universities.

This will conclude my statement. I have submitted a more detailed statement for the record, and I thank you, and I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Roscoe follows:]

Statement of Dr. Wilma Roscoe, Interim CEO & President, National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

Today, 103 Historically Black Colleges and Universities across the nation continue to serve as centers of learning and catalysts for social change. Sadly, they are also victims of a lack of funding which has left many historically significant buildings inadequately maintained and desperately in need of repair . . . Immediate action must be taken to preserve not just the structures themselves, but the important legacy of HBCUs—the dreams they fulfill through the educations they provide.

National Trust for Historic Preservation
June 15, 1998

Introductory Remarks

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members of the subcommittee, I am Dr. Wilma Roscoe, the Interim Chief Executive Officer and President of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO). Even more notably, not only am I a proud native of South Carolina, the home state of Congressman James Clyburn, but I am also a graduate of an HBCU, Livingstone College, located in Salisbury, North Carolina. So, it truly is a cherished and esteemed honor to have an opportunity to testify before this particular congressional subcommittee, as you address the relevance and needs of the historic properties and facilities that are located on HBCU campuses. Your leadership in convening this hearing is unprecedented, and is a necessary step in preserving facilities that currently are classified as "national treasures." Moreover, the consideration and ultimate passage of H.R. 1606, a bill which will amend section 507 of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to authorize additional appropriations for HBCU historic preservation efforts, urgently is needed to protect the legacies and longevity of historical institutions that have been and will forever be necessary and indelible contributors to our success as a nation.

In preparing for today's testimony, I asked my staff to summarize the number of HBCUs that are located in the states represented by members of this subcommittee.

In reviewing the data, we found that about half of the members of this subcommittee (10) have HBCUs in their home states. Three have HBCUs located in their congressional districts. Even more surprising, the HBCUs located in the states represented by these Members have about \$263 million in historic preservation needs, representing about 35 percent of the \$755 million in needs reported by a General Accounting Office study that will be discussed later. A chart providing a summary of this information is attached to my testimony and I ask that it be included in the record.

Background

With this in mind, if I may, I would like to begin by providing a brief background statement on the mission and work of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO). NAFEO is the national umbrella and public policy advocacy organization representing the nation's 118 predominately and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Our mission is to champion the interests of HBCUs through the executive, legislative and judicial branches of federal and state government and to articulate the need for a system of higher education where race, ethnicity, socio-economic status and previous educational attainment levels are not determinants of either the quantity or quality of higher education. The organization takes lead responsibility for the development and dissemination of public policy, programmatic efforts, and strategic and educational materials that: (1) enhance the role of HBCUs generally, and (2) promote minority student enrollment and attainment specifically. NAFEO is comprised of institutions of higher education that represent a broad spectrum of interests public and private, large and small, urban and rural, liberal arts, agricultural, research, scientific and technology development. Of all of the HBCUs that belong to NAFEO, approximately 46% are public and 54% are private. The organization's membership is comprised of 2-year and 4-year institutions, as well as schools that offer advanced and professional degrees.

NAFEO was founded in 1969, at a time when the nation had before it overwhelming evidence that educational inequality in higher education remained manifest. The 1954 Supreme Court decision, *Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education*, and its progeny, focused national attention on the dual and unequal primary and secondary education systems nationwide and spurred two decades of litigation and legislation designed to redress the inequalities. But the initial debate neither paid much attention to the inequalities in higher education nor focused on the nation's HBCUs as equal opportunity institutions; thus, a solution to some of the nation's higher education issues was eluded. NAFEO's establishment occurred in response to the need to have an organizational mechanism in place that would keep these issues at the forefront of national policy discussion and development.

Since the organization's inception in 1969, NAFEO has played a key strategic role in expanding access to higher education for African Americans, and in more recent years students from other racial/ethnic groups. In fact, NAFEO institutions historically are responsible for educating the vast majority of African Americans. Today, while NAFEO institutions enroll approximately 18 percent of all African American college students, they confer about 30 percent of all bachelors degrees awarded to African Americans nationally. In some disciplines, such as engineering and teacher education, the number is significantly higher. Moreover, these schools produce the largest number of African American baccalaureate recipients who eventually go on to receive doctorate degrees, especially in the sciences.

Consider, for example that eight of the top 10 producers of African American engineers are HBCUs. Additionally, 42 percent of all the Ph.Ds earned each year by African Americans are earned by graduates of HBCUs; 18 of the top 23 producers of African Americans who go on to receive science-related Ph.Ds are HBCUs. NAFEO institutions are situated in every quarter of the country: in fourteen Southern states, six Northern states, three Midwestern states, one Western state, the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands. They enroll approximately 500,000 undergraduate students and 50,000 graduate, professional and doctoral students. Our alumni rosters include Mary McLeod Bethune, Booker T. Washington, Althea Gibson, Thurgood Marshall, Oprah Winfrey, Andrew Young, Jr., Ronald McNair, Martin Luther King, Jr., Vernon Jordan, Walter Payton, approximately half of the Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and scores of other notable leaders.

Statement of Need

Even with this notable history of accomplishments that have strengthened the economic, political, and cultural foundation upon which our nation has been built, many structures on HBCU campuses are in severe need of repair. The situation is so severe, that in 1998, the National Trust for Historic Preservation took an unprec-

edented step and included 103 HBCUs on its list of America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places. In announcing this historic designation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation concluded the following:

Of the 103 HBCUs in the United States, most are showing serious signs of neglect. Campus landmarks are decaying and college grounds are badly in need of attention. Most were constructed during the second half of the 19th century using the finest materials and craftsmanship available, and built, in many instances, with the help of the students themselves. Their architectural styles are as distinctive and varying as the years in the time-span in which they were built. The excellent education provided within these walls proved indispensable in the 1950s and 1960s, when the HBCUs became the training ground for the Civil Rights movement.

The findings of the National Trust for Historic Preservation are consistent with findings that have been made by the Department of Interior, Congress, and the General Accounting Office.

For instance, in 1988 the Department of Interior, National Park Service established the HBCU Historic Preservation Initiative. As a part of that program, 11 historically significant and critically threatened structures were identified. Federal and private resources were secured to fund these projects. The Department of Interior contributed \$13 million to this initial effort. Consistent with the findings and efforts of the Department of Interior, under the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management (OPPLM) Act of 1996, Congress authorized and ultimately appropriated \$29 million in funding for the restoration of historic properties at selected HBCUs. Only those historic properties on the National Register or which were determined eligible for listing on the National Register as a result of state historic preservation officer (SHPO) surveys were eligible for federal grant assistance under the National Historic Preservation Act or the OPPLM Act of 1996. The amounts authorized in the 1996 bill have been fully appropriated, and the authorization has expired.

Two years after funding was authorized in the OPPLM Act, an pursuant to a congressional request submitted by Representative Clyburn, the General Accounting Office (GAO) conducted a study of historic preservation needs at HBCUs entitled *Historic Preservation: Cost to Restore Historic Properties at Historically Black Colleges and Universities* (GAO/RCE-98-51, February 1998). GAO concluded that 712 properties on the 103 HBCU campuses surveyed were in need of repairs or structural renovations. Of these 712 properties, 672 (94.4%) are buildings, with the remainder being sites, structures or objects, such as smokestacks and courtyards. An estimated \$755 million is needed to address these historic preservation needs. The report noted that approximately 8 percent of the total amount had already been set aside to pay the restoration costs for specific properties.

The needs at many of the facilities consist of making the properties more accessible to people with disabilities, replacing leaky roofs, removing health threats such as asbestos and lead-based paint, or wiring for new technologies. It should be noted that in recognition of their historic and present importance, the Park Service in June of 1998 listed all 103 HBCUs on the National Register of Historic Places. This action makes each of the properties identified by GAO eligible for historic preservation funding.

The Department of Interior did note that the magnitude of the repair cost estimates reported by the schools is substantial in terms of the limited level of appropriations available from the Historic Preservation Fund for matching grants available to HBCUs pursuant to the OPPLM Act of 1996. Additionally, any funding for increased appropriations for grants to HBCUs in furtherance of this effort would be subject to authorization. As a result, there are legislative challenges that must be addressed when considering the restoration of historic properties at these schools.

Recommendations

In order to effectively address the legislative hurdles that must be cleared before we can move forward in rectifying the HBCU historic preservation needs that have been documented by authorities at every level, we respectfully request the expeditious consideration and passage of H.R. 1606. Any further delay promises to jeopardize the legacy and future, the very existence, of national treasures that have been classified as endangered by experts on the subject for more than a decade. Moreover, if HBCUs are to survive and successfully compete with larger, more heavily endowed schools, congressional action is needed now. Our institutions need to preserve and renovate their historic facilities, not only because they are a part of American history, but also because they also need to update and upgrade a deteriorating infrastructure needed to educate students and attract quality faculty who

must have the tools to meet the complex challenges presented by the new century, many of which are technology-based. Many of these historic buildings house classrooms, administrative offices, dormitories, laboratories, libraries and provide other usages that are necessary components of having a successful higher education experience. The current condition of many of these sites present serious health and safety concerns, and seriously impede the HBCU community's ability to catch-up, keep up and step up to the challenges we have inherited over time, as well as the ones presented by a new and highly technological millennium.

Passage of H.R. 1606 and the ultimate provision of sufficient, long-term funding for the National Park Service's Historic Preservation account would enable a significant number of HBCUs to begin preservation activities on the most dilapidated campus facilities. Specifically, under H.R. 1606, \$530 million is requested. This is significantly less than the cost estimates included in the GAO report, mainly because the legislation would require HBCUs to provide 30 percent of the project costs in matching funds. Additionally, while we seek and support a multi-year authorization, we recognize that the full amount would not be appropriated in one year. Surely, it will take some time to address these needs. However, with your help and support, there is much we can accomplish.

This concludes my statement for the record. Again, on behalf of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify before this subcommittee.

[An attachment to Dr. Roscoe's statement follows:]

**HBCU HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUNDING CHART REPRESENTING STATES OF
HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, RECREATION AND PUBLIC LANDS
MEMBERS**

STATE	REPRESENTATIVE ON SUBCOMMITTEE	HBCU(S) IN STATE	RESTORATION COST
American Samoa	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	None	None
California	Elton Gallegly George Radanovich (Chair) Hilda Solis	Compton Community College	None
		Charles R. Drew University	None
Colorado	Joel Hefley Bob Schaffer Mark Udall	None	None
Idaho	Mike Simpson	None	None
Indiana	Mark Souder	Martin University	None
Massachusetts	James McGovern	None	None
Maryland	*Wayne Gilchrest	*University of Maryland – Eastern Shore	3,160,000
		Bowie State University	390,000
		Coppin State College	0
		Morgan State University	12,895,000
		Sojourner Douglass College	None
Michigan	Dale Kildee	Lewis College of Business	0
		Wayne County Community College	0
Minnesota	Betty McCollum	None	None
New Jersey	Rush Holt	None	None
	Frank Pallone, Jr.		
New Mexico	Tom Udall	None	None
North Carolina	Walter Jones (Vice Chair)	Elizabeth City State University	22,788,000
		Fayetteville State University	1,346,000
		North Carolina Central University	19,220,000
		St. Augustine's College	12,627,000
		Shaw University	6,382,000
		Winston-Salem State University	9,292,000
		Barber-Scotia College	3,434,000
		Bennett College	14,300,000
		Johnson C. Smith University	14,555,000
		Livingston College & Hood Theological Seminary	26,363,942
NC A & T State University	10,014,000		

Subcommittee Chart Cont'd.			
Nevada	Jim Gibbons	None	None
Puerto Rico	Anibal Acevedo-Vila	None	None
Tennessee	*John Duncan	*Knoxville College	10,357,000
		Fisk University	10,942,000
		Meharry Medical College	22,474,000
		Tennessee State University	21,052,000
		Lane College	2,271,000
		LeMoyné-Owen College	4,043,000
Texas	William Thornberry	Jarvis Christian College	850,000
		Wiley College	1,102,000
		Southwestern Christian College	501,000
		Texas College	None
		Huston-Tillotson College	3,000,000
		PrarieView A&M University	11,037,000
Utah	Chris Cannon	None	None
U.S. Virgin Islands	*Donna Christian-Christensen (Ranking Democrat)	*University of the Virgin Islands	18,404,200
Total	23 Members	34 Schools	\$262,800,142

*Has an HBCU in their district

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Dr. Roscoe. Dr. Waddell, thank you very much. You may begin your testimony, too. If you could please keep it to 5 minutes, that would be great. I will set the clock.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN KENNETH WADDELL, PRESIDENT,
SAINT PAUL'S COLLEGE, LAWRENCEVILLE, VIRGINIA**

Mr. WADDELL. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Committee members. Thank you for allowing me to be here today. It is with great pleasure that I testify as a part of H.R. 1606, Congressman Clyburn's bill to expand authorization of the HBCU historic preservation program.

As the former president of Allen University in Columbia, South Carolina, I have seen first-hand the tremendous national, State and local impact this appropriation has facilitated with the restoration of Arnett Hall, a 113-year-old treasure which sat empty for approximately 35 years.

The building, the first on campus, was the pride and cultural centerpiece for the campus and the intellectually acclaimed Old Waverly African-American community. From inception, it was utilized as a kindergarten, elementary school, high school, law school, dormitory, and meeting place for many alumni, neighbors and friends of the college.

In addition, like many historically black institutions, the campus sits in one of the prime commercial corridors in Columbia, South Carolina, the State capitol. It is located less than one mile from Main Street, the major business and banking centers, and the state legislature. Arnett Hall, its federally restored jewel, is situated in a pivotal location with an excellent view of the entire area.

The scope and impact of Federal funding for this initiative cannot be measured in purely dollars and cents. Prior to this appropriation, the death knell for Allen University had been sounded.

The student population had dropped from a high of 1000 in the early 1960's to 237 in 1997.

The institution also faced 78 recommendations and suggestions from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Low morale, dilapidated buildings, deferred maintenance and run-down streets surrounding the campus were unfortunately the norm, rather than the exception.

Concurrently, public appreciation for past tradition had quickly eroded, and ugly rumors of its demise were prevalent. There were fears that the college, with its cultural significance, community relationships, and a long-term record of having more graduates in the South Carolina state legislature than any private college in South Carolina, would be lost forever.

However, immediately upon receipt of the appropriation, the direction changed. The institution moved from a posture of lifelessness to the perception of a college with hope and a compelling future. The board of trustees, led by Congressman James Clyburn and Bishop John Hurst Adams, articulated the funding as a foundation for a larger vision and an outline for a New Allen of which the entire South Carolina community would be proud.

And that is exactly what happened. A phoenix arose from the ashes and the community, state and National pride in the college was reborn.

The new strategic plan was implemented, and alumni giving, teacher education accreditation, a \$1.1 million gift from the Lilly Foundation for programmatic activities within the building followed.

The board of trustees, through strategic planning, also leveraged and complemented the gift with the restoration of a \$7.5 million bond issue with Bank of America, the substance of which allowed the institution to build a new multi-purpose \$4 million gymnasium and the remainder was used for deferred maintenance and to help get the reaffirmation of the college.

Moreover, the beauty of Arnett Hall stimulated a spark among local neighbors to upgrade their homes and grounds. City roads were suddenly repaved, and community groups leased campus facilities at an all-time rate. As the media attention continued, Chamber of Commerce groups and other economic development entities began including the institution in its plans.

In closing, the scope and impact of this program is truly magnificent. The appropriation made a significant difference. It not only spurred institutional progress and saved a 130-year-old institution, but also renewed community pride and state interest in historic preservation and economic development. It continues today. This is a prime example of Federal dollars making a difference for the public good.

Please, please, please support Congressman Clyburn's bill and lower the match. These treasures are critical for the communities served, the States and the Nation. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Waddell follows:]

Statement of Dr. John Kenneth Waddell, President, St. Paul's College

It is with great pleasure that I testify in support of HR 1606, Congressman Clyburn's bill to expand authorization of the HBCU Historic Preservation Program.

As the former President of Allen University in Columbia, SC, I have seen first hand the tremendous national, state, and local impact this appropriation has facilitated with the restoration of Arnett Hall, a 113-year-old treasure, which sat empty for approximately 35 years.

This building, the first on campus, was the pride and cultural centerpiece for the campus and the intellectually acclaimed "Old Waverly" African-American Community. From inception, it was utilized as a Kindergarten, Elementary school, High school, Law school, dormitory and meeting place for many alumni, neighbors, and friends of the college.

In addition, like many historically black institutions, the campus sits in one of the prime commercial corridors in Columbia, South Carolina, the state capitol. It is located less than one (1) mile from main street, the major business and banking centers and the state legislature. Arnett Hall, its federally restored jewel, is similarly situated in pivotal location with an excellent view of the entire area.

Thousands of tax-paying citizens pass each day exclaiming the beauty of the restored structure. This has been documented by numerous media sources and an award from the South Carolina Historic Preservation Society.

The scope and impact of federal funding for this initiative cannot be measured in pure dollars and cents. Prior to this appropriation, the deathknell for Allen University had been sounded!

This institution, a state icon and cultural treasure, had drifted passively for approximately four decades and faced a multiplicity of challenges ranging from enrollment and accreditation and credibility issues.

The student population had dropped from a high of 1,000 in the early 1960's to 237 (FTE) in 1997. The institution also faced seventy-eight (78) Recommendations and Suggestions from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Low morale, dilapidated buildings, deferred maintenance and rundown streets surrounding the campus were unfortunately the "norm rather than the exception".

Concurrently, public appreciation for past tradition was quickly eroding and ugly rumors of its demise were prevalent. There were fears that the college, with its cultural significance, storied history, community relationships and a long-term record of having more graduates in the state legislature than any private college in South Carolina, would be lost forever.

Immediately upon receipt of the appropriation, the direction changed. The institution moved from a posture of lifelessness and dormancy to the perception of a college with hope and a compelling future.

Campus constituencies, the media, community leaders, elected officials, corporate entities and accreditation officials immediately took notice. The Board of Trustees led by congressman James Clyburn and Bishop John H. Adams, articulated the funding as a foundation for a larger vision and an outline for a "New Allen" of which the entire statewide community could be proud.

This is exactly what happened. A phoenix arose from the ashes and community, state and national pride was reborn.

Other unexpected but possible but positive changes occurred. A new confidence and collaborative efforts were inspired between federal, state and campus officials. Led by Mr. Cecil McKithian in Atlanta, officials from the National Park Service conferred with state historic preservation on a consistent basis.

State officials were also highly impressed with the thorough survey and study conducted by the General Accounting Office (GAO) and the college's detailed architectural/ Master Plan and cost study required by Congressman Clyburn to move forward. This effort also brought persons to campus that did not previously have interest or stake in its future but quickly became new fans and supporters.

Also internally, changes occurred quickly. As construction progressed, student, faculty and alumni pride grew. Alumni purchased bricks and contributions increased to the Alumni and Annual Funds by 25%. Enrollment soared from 237 to 550 and the colleges went from empty classrooms to being forced to place a hold on new admissions until further housing space could be located. Traffic on campus increased threefold and where once, parking spaces were abundant, a new campus Parking and Ticketing system had to be established.

The appropriation also spurred new sources of revenue and academic enhancements. The Lilly Foundation gave a gift of \$1.1 million dollars to the college for new technological upgrades and programmatic activities in Arnett Hall. The State Department of Education moved forward with its hold on accreditation of the Teacher Education program primarily due to the lack of an appropriate facility to house the program. After a tour by state officials, an agreement was struck to house the program in the restored building and the program was accredited.

The Board of Trustees also complemented the restoration with the completion of a \$7.5 million dollar Bond issue with Bank of America. The substance of which al-

lowed the institution to build a new, multipurpose \$4 million dollar Gymnasium with an Olympic-sized swimming pool adjacent to the restored facility. The remainder was used for deferred maintenance and to pay off old debts, which increased public confidence in the college's financial condition. The accreditation agency (SACS) also removed the institution from negative (Warning) status and reaffirmed the institution's ten (10) year accreditation.

Moreover, the beauty of Arnett Hall stimulated a spark among local neighbors to upgrade their homes and grounds. City roads were suddenly repaved in the area and in the community groups leased campus facilities at an all-time rate. As media attention continued, local Chamber of Commerce groups and other economic development entities began including the institution in its discussions for the area and highlighted the building on its placards.

Also, longtime low-income residence of the community would simply stand at the perimeter of the beautiful courtyard and gaze. Subsequently, in tears, stating, "that they or their parents had great memories of attending school or some activity in the building but had given up on it's restoration, the college and the community". It was also common for persons from all persuasions to walk in without notice and write a check, acknowledging its beauty, transformation and revival of the downtown community. Their gift, symbolic of their desire to be an active supporter of this initiative.

In closing, the scope and impact of this program is truly magnificent! The appropriation made a significant difference! It not only spurred institutional progress and saved a 130-year-old institution but also renewed community pride and state interest in historic preservation and economic development. It continues today. This is a prime case of federal dollars making a difference for public good.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, Mr. Waddell. Before we go to our next witness, I want to welcome Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas to the panel, and ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to join us on the dais. There certainly being no objection, so ordered.

Now here to speak on our second bill, which is 2388, is Mr. Carlino, who is again president of the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area. Welcome, Mr. Carlino.

Mr. CARLINO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And if you could kind of keep your testimony to 5 minutes.

STATEMENT OF AUGUST R. CARLINO, PRESIDENT AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, RIVERS OF STEEL NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA, AND CHAIRMAN, ALLIANCE OF NATIONAL HERITAGE AREAS, HOMESTEAD, PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CARLINO. And thank you for extending the invitation for me to appear here today again. I appreciate it, and I know my colleague, Ms. Harris, sends her regrets that she was unable to appear, but I know you have her testimony that is going to be submitted for the record.

As you know, I am president of Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, located in Homestead, Pennsylvania, just outside of Pittsburgh. I am also chairman of the Alliance of National Heritage Area, a coalition of the 23 congressionally designated national heritage areas and their partners working in heritage development across the country.

And as Mr. Hefley has pointed out, indeed, heritage areas have grown over the past two decades, from a fairly nebulous concept when it was first proposed back in the 1980's to one now that has more than 150 heritage programs or projects across the country. But I think that is being done because heritage areas come up with a number of development strategies that work in partnership to

preserve the Nation and the States and local communities' history in unique ways that doesn't rely on a single source of funding from one unit of local government or even from a private partner.

Heritage areas, and national heritage areas, are special places in America. They merge community resources to promote conservation and community and economic development, or what we call heritage development.

Heritage areas harness a wide range of community assets and interests, from historic preservation to outdoor recreation, museums and performing arts, folk life and crafts, scenic and working landscapes, and grass-roots community-building activities that, when they are all combined, create a sum that is greater than their parts.

All heritage areas have some basis and root in community activity. Mine in Pittsburgh, in southwestern Pennsylvania, is not unique. In fact, we were created because there was a coalition of community groups and local governments and foundations concerned about the demise and loss of the steel industry in Pittsburgh and southwestern Pennsylvania in 1988, and that effort grew out of an opportunity to save a part of a closing mill. That is still a very important program that we are working toward in our organization, one that Congressman Doyle has introduced legislation on to designate as a new national park. But out of that grew the effort to create a national heritage area that celebrates and commemorates the complexity of the industry for steel-making in southwestern Pennsylvania, and that is one that has worked remarkably well over the past 12 years.

But since we have been designated as part of the Omnibus Parks bill in 1996, I just wanted to point out to you some statistics on our organization.

Not counting this year's appropriation that just passed in the conference Committee, the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, the parent organization of the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, has received a little under \$4 million in appropriated funds through NPS, Department of Interior monies.

We have been able to leverage directly almost \$23 million, a little over \$23 million, in other public or private funding for projects.

We also work with partners in the communities in the heritage area, and they, because of that money that we regrant and work to put into programs, they have been able to raise approximately \$25 million more toward projects.

This success exists because the money that we get through the heritage area program that the Congress gives us is money that we are able to use as seed financing and work toward that.

Boy, 5 minutes goes quickly, doesn't it?

[Laughter.]

Mr. CARLINO. If I can jump to the points of the bill, if I may, I think you see a lot of the things of heritage areas, as it says in my statement, are, as Mr. Hefley's bill indicates, are things that we think are important to have. There needs to be a consistent policy and program, and Mr. Hefley's staff, particularly Larry Hojo, has been extremely open in working with us, and we appreciate that, and thank the Congressman and Larry for his work.

Some points I would like to make. At least in my experience, I think the heritage area should not be designated as national heritage area until all planning is completed. That includes both the feasibility and the management plan.

I think that the limitations that the bill suggests, as Ms. Stevenson pointed out, to have the consent of all units of local government could be cumbersome to the point of not being able to be achieved. Like Hudson River, our region in southwestern Pennsylvania has a number of local government units. In Allegheny County, there are 137 units of local government, of which the city of Pittsburgh is one. We cover seven counties. We would spend all of our time trying to get every single unit of local government to support it. I think there are other things that we can do that show through our experience that units of local governments can be added into the process.

I think the grant program creates a hierarchical approach that would become bureaucratic and too burdensome to the heritage areas to function. The way the program works right now through direct appropriations to the heritage areas allows not only the heritage areas to work with the communities and develop the projects that need funding each year, but also allows the communities to remain in contact directly with their government in expressing the needs and priorities of their local communities.

I think that the program also, in limiting the funding to the heritage areas each year to 3 years of administration, is a little bit too short. With a good management plan, those heritage areas will be able to succeed.

I also would point out to you that I believe strongly that the National Park Service should be allowed to use and gain appropriations from this for using its staff to provide continued technical assistance to the heritage areas, although the amount of funding we think is a little bit—or is arbitrarily capped at \$10 million.

And finally we are concerned that the bill has some retroactive language in it that affects the 23 heritage areas as they exist. Some of that has been cleaned up in previous drafts. We just hope that there could be some cleaning up of the remaining issues and allow those heritage areas to work under their organic acts.

Thank you. And I apologize for extending beyond my limit.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Carlino follows:]

Statement of August R. Carlino, President & Chief Executive Officer, Steel Industry Heritage Corporation and the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, and Chairman, Alliance of National Heritage Areas

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Subcommittee, my name is August R. Carlino, and I am the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, developers of the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area located in and around Pittsburgh and parts of southwestern Pennsylvania. I am also here today testifying in my capacity as Chairman of the Alliance of National Heritage Areas, an organization whose membership includes 22 of the 23 congressionally-designated NHAs, along with other organizations and partners. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee today to discuss H.R. 2388, the National Heritage Areas Policy Act of 2001.

In the last two decades, heritage areas have grown from a nebulous concept to a powerful national movement. Heritage areas span a wide spectrum of activities. They can range from a single effort to save a group of historic buildings to a multifaceted approach to community conservation, preservation, tourism and economic revitalization. Heritage areas can be located in one neighborhood, or they can be

multi-jurisdictional, crossing the boundaries of counties and even states. Heritage areas can be fostered by the philanthropy of an individual, or by the collective participation of foundations, businesses and governments in a regional project. Our latest estimate indicates that heritage areas have sprouted in more than 150 places throughout the U.S. This "niche" in the preservation industry has become the catalyst for the creation of investment and economic development strategies in a number of states and through the federally-sponsored initiatives with our partner, the National Park Service, in the National Heritage Areas.

These National Heritage Areas are special places in America. NHAs merge community resources to promote conservation and community and economic development or heritage development. They harness a wide range of community assets and interests - from historic preservation, outdoor recreation, museums, performing arts, folk life and crafts, and scenic and working landscapes, to grassroots community-building activities, that when combined create a sum greater than its parts.

NHAs celebrate the special character and culture of places, and have a strong sense of place and identity. They are neither urban nor rural and often include communities and sites throughout a region. Typically, NHAs work to protect historic and cultural resources while encouraging development for tourism and other economic opportunities. NHAs illuminate the history and culture of a region so those people within the region feel proud of their heritage and those who visit come away with an appreciation of the cultures of the region.

Pittsburgh and southwestern Pennsylvania maintain an important role in the story of America, with a history of extraordinary industrialization, forged by steel and related industries. Steel production spawned a spectacular wealth of physical, social and cultural legacies that distinguish the region on a state, national and international level. Pittsburgh and southwestern Pennsylvania wear this heritage proudly, with life in the region still dominated by industry, ethnic tradition, and communities. A strong central framework for linking these resources exists in the rivers and river valleys. This background, supported by all of the region's existing resources, served as the basis for the establishment of the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area in 1996 (P. Law 104-333).

In 1988, a coalition of community groups, businesses, labor organizations and local foundations came together to save a part of Pittsburgh's rapidly disappearing steel heritage. That effort grew into a regional community-based task force that, in working in partnership with the National Park Service and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, developed the necessary feasibility studies and management plans to create both the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation and the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area. Rivers of Steel covers seven counties in southwestern Pennsylvania and works to conserve, interpret, promote and develop the industrial, cultural, natural and recreational resources of the region, making them critical elements of community revitalization and heritage tourism.

Rivers of Steel has succeeded because of its true partnership structure, and grassroots organizational and management objectives. Communities in southwestern Pennsylvania have formed a regional coalition unlike any before; one in which local constituencies, with the technical assistance of professional staff of SIHC, partner with local, state and the federal governments to commemorate their heritage while working to make their communities better places to live, work and play. These communities are in charge of the projects and programs in the heritage area, and each community knows it must work to support and strengthen its neighboring communities' projects to be successful. This success has translated into more than \$43.4 million SIHC has risen in the past nine years for projects in the Rivers of Steel region. As significant as this number is, it becomes more significant when I illustrate what designation as a NHA has meant. Since our authorization in 1996, SIHC has received \$3.988 million in National Heritage Area funds. This has leveraged more than \$23.5 million in other public or private funding (590 percent). This exists only because the heritage management entity, SIHC, and its partnering communities have the responsibility as granted by the Congress in P. Law 104-333 to develop the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area. In addition, Rivers of Steel has a true partner in the current relationship with the National Park Service, providing guidance and expertise in projects and programs. If the NHA designation would cease without any ability for reauthorization and additional funding, this leveraged funding would cease to exist. I believe you will find this to be true for most NHAs as well.

To be successful, NHAs not only have to work with communities to develop projects and to raise funds, they also have to develop partnerships to carry out work. In all that we do, our most significant, and most important partner to our efforts is the National Park Service. After all, NHAs exist because their historical, cultural, recreational and natural resources have been determined to be nationally

significant. NHAs extend the breadth of the National Park Service's mission, and broaden the public's awareness of the Service's responsibility and commitment to the nation's heritage. As one of my colleagues, an NPS Superintendent, stated, National Heritage Areas are successful, too, "because they are where people and the government can come together to preserve a piece of America's heritage and do it in a way that unites a region." National Heritage Areas are fully consistent with the National Park Service's mission to protect the nation's natural, cultural and historic resources. NHAs have been successful in developing and implementing preservation strategies and in bringing communities together to protect resources, and I believe, from my work with the Northeast Region, in particular, that National Park Service believes in and desires to enhance and encourage such local endeavors.

To that end, the National Park Service and the National Heritage Areas should have a continuing relationship in their larger partnership to protect the resources of America. NHAs are not just important to the public, they are important to the NPS in meeting its conservation and education goals. NHAs enable the NPS to involve communities first-hand in protecting resources and understanding and promoting the nation's heritage. Working together, NHAs and the NPS tell the stories and protect the resources that are the backdrops of many of the nation's national parks, national historic sites, national monuments and national battlefields. Together, they build constituencies that support each other's work, and support the national parks. But this is a reciprocal relationship as NPS provides local groups with the needed resources, experiences and expertise that help NHAs succeed in ways beyond most peoples' expectations and imaginations.

Before I discuss the specifics of H.R. 2388, I wish to make some general statements regarding NHAs. First, much to the contrary of some people's belief, NHAs are not a drain on the budget of the National Park Service. The investment that that Congress provides each year to the designated NHAs actually helps extend the reach of the NPS and furthers its mission in places where it might not be financially feasible if a project were to be otherwise solely funded by NPS dollars. The record shows that NHAs are greatly successful in brokering the Interior Appropriations funds each year by using that money as seed investment to attract money to projects from other federal, state, local and private sources. NPS funds are, therefore enhanced. The additional money leveraged from other sources is that much more that remains available in Interior funds for projects within the national parks.

Second, NHAs continue to be proposed and created because they are successful conservation strategies. They draw national and international attention to the benefits of locally driven initiatives, committed communities, and NPS partnership and funding as new, innovative ways provide for the interpretation and protection of our nationally significant resources. NHAs should be looked at as ways to extend the National Park Service's mission and meet its obligations in the nation.

Lastly, just as NHAs can enhance NPS's role and the national park that they are near, the establishment of national park units within NHAs can further enhance the heritage area. It concerns me greatly, and I believe we must avoid at all cost, the belief that just because a NHA has been established means that no historic resource within the boundary of the NHA is eligible for designation as a unit of the National Park Service system. NHAs offer new approaches to conservation and protection of the nation's history but the fundamental roles and responsibilities of the National Park Service still exist, and it must continue to act as the ultimate protector of our nation's most valued historic and cultural resources.

In 1999, this Subcommittee convened a hearing on this same subject and many of our partners, including the National Park Service, presented testimony an earlier version of this legislation. Let me start by saying the Alliance of National Heritage Areas, and my organization Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area is grateful for the support we have received from members and the staff of this Subcommittee. I am particularly grateful to the openness you and your staff have demonstrated in the drafting the National Heritage Areas Policy Act.

At that hearing Denis Galvin, Deputy Director of the National Park Service, indicated in his testimony the critical steps necessary to designate a National Heritage Area. They are:

1. completion of a feasibility/suitability study;
2. public involvement in the study process;
3. demonstration of widespread public support among heritage area residents for the proposed designation; and,
4. commitment to the proposal from the appropriate players, including governments, business, private and non-profit organizations, and the local citizenry.

At that same hearing, the Alliance of National Heritage Areas founding Chairman, Dan Rice of the Ohio and Erie Canal National Corridor, reiterated the need for strong public participation, not only in the study process, but also throughout

the implementation of the goals and objectives of the NHA. I would add one other critical element that needs to be completed before Congress considers an area for designation. All prospective NHAs should be required to complete a detailed management plan. I am very pleased to see the addition to H.R. 2388 that specifies the management plan as part of the planning process. Designation by Congress of a NHA should come only after the management plan is completed.

Overall, the Alliance believes there needs to be policy in place that governs the steps required before a region can be designated as a National Heritage Area. The difficulty is often getting all parties to agree on the specifics. The language of H.R. 2388 has changed in many ways since it was first drafted to include the comments and suggestions many people have provided. I believe that with a few more adjustments, this bill could gain the support of the Alliance and the other partners in the heritage area industry.

Specifically, the follow issues within H.R. 2388 are still of concern to the Alliance of National Heritage Areas:

- The bill requires congressional designation at both the feasibility study phase and after the completion of a management action plan. We believe congressional designation should come upon completion of the management plan, and no area should be designated a National Heritage Area before all of the plans are completed.
- The bill requires a “preponderance of units of local government” to approve the local coordinating entity and the proposed heritage area before designation. The term “preponderance” we believe is unnecessary and unclear. If the planning process is carried out properly, local community and government support should build for the heritage area. In the planning process, a coordinating entity will emerge that has the support of all of the partners involved in the process. If not, the weakness of the plan and the coalition of partners if they exist at all will be evident to the Secretary and to the Congress when they review the plan and its recommendations.
- If designation of NHAs, and subsequent funds, are not made until all planning, including the management plan, is completed, then the language providing a three-year eligibility for new area for funding is unnecessary (Section 6.G.2).
- We believe the grant process as delineated in Section 6 to be damaging to the whole process of National Heritage Area programming. The process of a prioritized list of grants submitted to the Congress by the Secretary removes from the process one of the fundamental elements that NHAs create the direct link to establishing funding priorities in the NHA by the public/private partnership and that partnership’s ability, as it exists now, to communicate those needs directly to their members of Congress. NHAs are successful because they connect people to their government and the to the process of obtaining government funding for projects they feel are important to their communities. To sever this tie now, and make funding for NHAs available only on a grant process as determined by the Secretary undercuts the spirit of involving the citizenry in, and instilling in them the responsibility for, the development of their NHA.
- Furthermore, Section 6 requires a pre-prioritization from the Governor of each state where a NHA is located, increasing the complexity of the funding process and further limiting the citizens ability to determine and make known the importance of funding for specific projects in their heritage area. If this procedure were to be enacted, we fear the process would become long, drawn out, cumbersome and intensely bureaucratic, and cripple the ability of NHAs to effectively undertake projects.
- The Alliance and its members have strong concern for the limitation to the first three fiscal years of the use of NHA funds for operational expenses. The basic realities are that all granting entities, whether government or from private, must permit a necessary percentage of funds to be used for operations and administration, otherwise no one could be employed to oversee the project for which funding was received. NHAs, if properly managed and with strong management plan will, over time, become more self-sustaining; however, withdrawing necessary financial support too early would be more damaging than beneficial.
- We believe the funding cap of \$10 million per year to the National Heritage Area program to be inadequate considering that there are 23 NHAs, all of which conceivably could receive \$1 million each fiscal year. The proposed funding cap is even less than the proposed funding amount in Interior Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2002. Under the proposed scenario, the average amount per area would be considerably less than the current appropriation for almost all of the existing NHAs. This funding cap would irreparably harm the NHAs and their programs.

- The Alliance is concerned that the bill as currently written, still contains a number of elements that would be retroactive to the 23 NHAs and their organic acts, or re-authorizations. We hope that this language can be clarified, so that our organization and its members will support this legislation.

Finally, I believe that no program within the government can properly function without adequate support from the professional staff of the agency that oversees the program. NHAs have been incredibly successful, in part due to the determination and cooperation of the partners within each area. The NHAs have succeeded, too, because of the strong support they receive from the National Park Service, both in Washington and in the regional offices. For the National Heritage Area program to continue, funding must be provided on an annual basis to the NPS for staffing and technical support to both the existing NHAs and those that will continue to be created. Thus I would suggest language in the bill that authorizes an amount necessary each year to carry out the work of NPS within the NHAs.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the National Heritage Areas represent a successful, new approach to governing that defines the role of all the partners. The nation's historic and cultural resources are further protected when an involved and educated citizenry, working with the National Park Service, become stewards of these resources, and champions for their continued conservation and interpretation. There is tremendous enthusiasm in the public for the National Heritage Area program, and for the continued role of the National Park Service as a strong, effective partner in this process. While I understand that achieving consensus on general policy and legislation might be a difficult undertaking, we stand prepared to work with you to continue making the National Heritage Area program successful. We may find that some of these principles may not need to be instituted through legislation. Nonetheless, I know that you agree with me that any new legislation should look to what is successful today, and set into policy those elements that will permit this program to flourish.

Again, thank you for your invitation to appear before the Subcommittee. I appreciate your interest in our work, and I am available to answer any questions you have.

Mr. RADANOVICH. That is okay. It is just all the bells and whistles mean we have a vote in about—we have 15 minutes to get to the Floor, so what I am going to try to do is wrap it up, if we can, and so for that reason, if there is no objection, I want to put the emphasis on the sponsors of the bill, and the questions that they might want to ask, so I am going to start with Mr. Hefley. Joel, if you have got questions of Mr. Carlino or of Drs. Waddell or Roscoe, then please feel free to do that, and then we will go on.

Mr. HEFLEY. Well, I know we are limited on time, and I won't take much time. Mr. Carlino, again thank you for your patience, and you have been very helpful in helping us craft this piece of legislation. Your suggestions that you made, we would like to address, so we will continue to work with you. Particularly the retroactivity is something that we want to make doubly sure does not affect existing heritage areas in a negative way, so please help us with that.

Mr. CARLINO. Thank you. I will do that, and I appreciate that, Congressman.

Mr. HEFLEY. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back. I know we are on a real time schedule.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Forgive me, but I appreciate that, and thank you, Mr. Hefley. Mrs. Christensen? Shall we defer to Mr. Clyburn?

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Yes, I will yield some time to Mr. Clyburn.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman, Madam Ranking Member, this may come as a big surprise to you, but I really would like to take my time to say thank you to Dr. Waddell and Dr. Roscoe, both of whom have been very, very much aware of how important this program is and has been. And I would like to emphasize one thing that Dr. Roscoe mentioned, and that is that what we attempted to

do with this legislation was to continue a policy put in place by the previous Bush administration and the Reagan administration. What Ms. Stevenson said here today is a tremendous departure from the past three administrations, and I would hope that will not hold. But I really want to say to Mr. Hefley how much I appreciate his attempts to bring some standards to the heritage areas' legislation.

South Carolina, as you know, is one of the original 13, and of course there is a lot of heritage in that State. In fact, when we established the South Carolina heritage corridor, then governor of South Carolina, David Beasley, has said that that legislation would bring an additional 700,000 tourists to South Carolina annually, and we used the old Hamburg-to-Charleston railroad to establish that corridor, and I want you to know that—and I think I read in my history at one point that the old Best Friend locomotive ran on that railroad, and I want to say to you that that railroad, that corridor, is not in my district. But South Carolina is important to me; history is important to me; heritage is important to me. And so I sponsored that legislation because I knew what it would do to the heritage and the culture of that state, irrespective of the fact that it was not in my congressional district.

And so your legislation is very, very important to me, and I would hope that we can work together to address the issues that are raised here today, because that to me is what the country is all about.

Thank you so much, Mr. Hefley, for introducing the legislation.

Mr. HEFLEY. Well, thank you for your kind words. And although I am not from South Carolina, we love South Carolina and vacation there every year at Edisto Island south of Charleston.

Mr. CLYBURN. That is in my district.

[Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLEY. Well, for a week each year you are my congressman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Very good.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I want to make sure everybody gets their opportunity.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. I just had some comments. I want to thank the panelists as well, Dr. Roscoe also, for reminding us how far back this goes, and this is not a partisan issue, as it should not be. And Dr. Waddell for adding—you know, we realize the importance of preserving the structures, of making them available for our students, enhancing the educational environment, but also the economic value to the communities, which is something that was not brought up. And, Mr. Carlino, thank you for coming back again, and not only for that, but just for the input that you are providing into the legislation. I am looking at hopefully doing a heritage site, heritage area in my district, and we really appreciate your input.

Mr. CARLINO. Thank you, Mrs. Christensen.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you. Mr. Kildee, any comments?

Mr. KILDEE. I just thank the panel. I had a conflict in schedule today, but thank you very, very much for your testimony.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you. Mr. McGovern?

Mr. MCGOVERN. I just want to briefly thank Dr. Roscoe and Dr. Waddell for their testimony, and I support Mr. Clyburn's legislation. And Mr. Carlino, I have three questions I want to put to you. You are not going to be able to answer them, but maybe you could submit the answers in writing for the Committee for the record.

Mr. CARLINO. Absolutely.

Mr. MCGOVERN. You touched on some of these things in your testimony, but I think they are important to kind of clarify for the record.

First, with regard to H.R. 2388, you know, what is the effect of changing the current system of direct appropriations to national heritage areas to a grant system of projects prioritized by the governors and approved by the Secretary? You touched on it a little bit. I would appreciate a more kind of detailed response.

Second, is the proposed amount in the bill of \$10 million per year adequate for an annual national heritage area program?

And thirdly, what is going to be the effect on the local management and the community partners in the national heritage area if this bill passes?

And if we did not have a vote, I would like to sit and hear your answers, but I think it would be helpful to the Committee if we could get those responses from you, which I think would be very important.

Mr. CARLINO. I would be happy to do that and, Mr. Chairman, if anyone else has questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Absolutely. In fact, I ask unanimous consent to allow 30 days for written testimony for answers for these and other testimony that might be written regarding both these bills. If there is no objection, so ordered. And finally, Ms. Johnson, thank you for joining us.

Ms. JOHNSON OF TEXAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this Committee. I appreciate this hearing. I am very supportive of this legislation. As Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I want to say that on behalf of the Caucus, we all support it. Not all of us are products of historically black colleges and universities, but we know their value. My grandmother and her sisters and one of my sisters and our brother are products, and it goes to indicate just how old they are and how much they are still very current and needful to our population.

Thank you so very much.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you very much. And Dr. Roscoe, Dr. Waddell, and Mr. Carlino, thank you very much for attending this hearing. And with that, the hearing is ended.

[Whereupon, at 12:33 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

[A statement submitted for the record by Annie Clay Harris, Executive Director, Essex National Heritage Area follows:]

[Responses to questions submitted for the record follow:]

**Statement of Annie Clay Harris, Executive Director, Essex National
Heritage Area**

Chairman Congressman Radanovich and distinguished members of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands, thank you for asking me here today to testify on H.R. 2388 an Act "to establish the criteria and mechanism for the designation and support of national heritage areas." I regret that I am unable to appear before you due to the postponement of this hearing following the

acts of terror perpetrated against the United States on September 11 and followed by the further disruptions that closed the hearing room on October 18. I am honored to be asked to present testimony to this subcommittee and regret that I cannot do so in person as I had planned on the two previous hearing dates. In light of the extremely unfortunate and unusual events of the last month, I have added to my original testimony a brief summary of the key points that I would like to bring to the committee's attention.

Executive Summary:

The National Heritage Area program provides the National Park Service with a unique opportunity to preserve and enhance thousands of important historic, cultural and natural resources at a fraction of the cost of a traditional national park. Designated by Congress, the National Heritage Areas are "partnership parks" between local citizen organizations and the National Park Service. The twenty-three National Heritage Areas that exist today provide some of the best examples of public-private partnerships in this country and serve to build community spirit at a time when it is most needed.

The key to their success lies in the close working relationship that is established between each heritage area and the local/regional units of the National Park Service. The success of the National Heritage Areas is due to the immediacy and accountability that occurs because local management entities are empowered to take action under the guidance and oversight of the National Park Service. Through this unique relationship, the preservation of nationally significant historic and natural resources is performed by local organizations; federal funds are matched and are usually far exceeded by non-federal funding; educational and interpretation programs based on Park Service themes are enhanced by local educators; and important cultural resources are saved for future generations.

HR 2388 would radically change this system. This bill creates a different method for designating new areas and for funding both new and old areas. It requires that a "preponderance" of local units of government, the chief executive officers of the states, and the Secretary of the Interior play new, expanded roles in establishing and approving Heritage Area management plans and in determining the funding for all heritage areas existing and new. It will sever the direct relationship that now exists between legislative authorization, Park Service oversight and individual heritage area's plans and programs. The initiative will be moved away from the local citizens who must perform the work and raise the non-federal matching funds. Instead program and funding decisions will be made by governmental entities that are empowered to decide but that do not have the means or mandate to perform the implementation. If the local entities become isolated from the priority setting process then community support, matching funds and the essential public-private partnerships will disappear.

Testimony:

My name is Annie Clay Harris and I am the Executive Director of the Essex National Heritage Area, a Congressionally designated heritage area located in Essex County, Massachusetts. For the past 12 years I have worked with businesses and local governments to promote community based, economic development partnerships. For several years, I directed the highly successful public-private Salem Partnership located in the City of Salem, Massachusetts and more recently I have headed up the activities of the Essex National Heritage Area. I also serve as the volunteer treasurer of the Alliance of National Heritage Areas. Prior to these positions, I worked for 16 years in real estate development and finance. Based upon these years of experience, I can say without reservation that I believe that partnerships between businesses and non-profits, between local governments and social organizations, between large Federal agencies like the National Park Service and grassroots community groups are essential to building and maintaining a civil society in America. Seldom can one sector of our society accomplish as much as a partnership of organizations. The Federal government and local municipalities, corporations and business organizations, regional arts associations and local non-profit grass-roots groups - all offer important perspectives and contributions. Working together small initiatives can lead to big changes.

Clearly, this point of view underlies many of the programs supported by President Bush and this administration. His faith-based initiative is just one example of the concept that small, strategically placed, public investment in local, grassroots organizations is one of the most effective ways to bring about change. In my experience, national heritage areas are another excellent example of this idea in action.

In its most basic form, a national heritage area is a "partnership park," a close relationship between the National Park Service, community based organizations and

local government. Heritage areas are often able to help the Park Service meet its mission without requiring that new lands be acquired or new personnel be hired. In the National Park System Advisory Board's recent report "Rethinking the National Parks for the 21st Century", the Board directs the National Park Service to: "embrace its mission, as educator...encourage the study of the American past...advance the principles of sustainability,...[and] encourage collaboration among park and recreation systems at every level—Federal, regional, state and local..." (pg 3). The report specifically recommends that heritage areas are one of the ways to meet these goals and states that "the National Park Service should...foster them" (pg 9). For a fraction of the cost of a federally owned National Park, heritage areas can meet many of the goals of the National Park Service while helping the Service "reach broader segments of society in ways that make them more meaningful in the life of the nation." (pg 1). If we, as a nation, are serious about preserving our past for our future while at the same time remaining fiscally responsible, then the future of the National Parks lies in building effective partnerships and not in creating new parks.

Heritage areas are one of the most effective ways to manage important historic resources, unique cultural institutions and special natural resources for the benefit of the public without incurring significant public cost. For example, the Essex National Heritage Area was authorized in 1996 and has received \$1,000,000 each year for 3 years. Last year, we matched this federal investment with more than twice as much in direct non-federal funding (audited) and more than five times as much in indirect investment. Our experience has been that, using a small amount of public funding, we can leverage a tremendous amount of non-federal investment and produce substantial community and economic benefits.

In addition to leveraging significant non-federal investment, National Heritage Areas accomplish a great deal more. Most are actively involved in education, in community based economic development, and in heritage tourism as well as in preserving our National resources for future generations. Again, by way of illustration, let me briefly describe some of the programs that the Essex National Heritage Area is managing or sponsoring. Essex received federal designation because of the three significant historic themes that are represented by hundreds of nationally important sites and resources located within this region. These include: a great number of 17th century buildings (more first period structures than any other region in this Nation); the oldest, continuously operating museum in America; and the last remaining 18th century maritime complex of wharves, warehouses, and related structures. To preserve and interpret this multitude of resources, we run a very active annual partnership grants program that has leveraged substantial non-federal investment. We provide site based teacher training, web-based curriculum development, a summer teacher institute, and an after-school program that links new immigrant children to their common history. We work to promote cultural tourism and its economic benefits by fostering partnerships and cooperative programs between small sites and museums. We assist in the preservation of the region's important historical records not just because they are historically valuable but also because access to records is crucially important to municipal governments, to the legal system and to the medical community. We seek ways to reach agreement on open space conservation while recognizing the need to build affordable housing, and we work to preserve scenic by-ways while supporting the economic necessity of growth and development. We celebrate the contributions of our community leaders and the volunteers who donate so much time to improving the quality of our lives. We do all this in consultation with the National Park Service and with their oversight, and we do it at a fraction of what it would cost if we were a "unit" of the National Park system.

Is this true of all the existing national heritage areas? Are they all running successfully? The short answer is no. A few of the 23 nationally designated areas are still not fully operational. To be successful heritage areas must be managed by dynamic, dedicated local partnerships and, like marriages, partnerships are unique to each area and its people. Some national heritage areas have established more effective relationships than others. However, the real question that needs to be asked here today is this: what is the public cost for those areas that are not working up to their potential yet? The cost is very little because each federal dollar that is spent by the National Park Service in a heritage area must be matched with non-federal funds. Those areas that do not have strong local support and have management problems cannot generate the non-federal match and, therefore, are not eligible for the federal funding. To date, I am only aware of two or three areas that are struggling and to the best of my knowledge none of them have received funding under the current heritage partnership program. Altogether, in fiscal year 2001, the 23 existing national heritage areas received on average only \$462,000 from the National

Park Service's "Heritage Partnership Programs" while they leveraged millions of dollars in non-federal matching funds. This is an excellent return on investment by any standard.

Heritage areas are effective economic development tools and they support the goals of the current administration. Therefore, I applaud the purpose of HR 2388. Its goals—"to provide for recognition of areas; to encourage...governments, nonprofit organizations, and the private sector to...conserve and manage resources; and to encourage...a broad range of economic opportunities" and to do all this by establishing rational criteria and defining the responsibilities of the Federal government—are very worthwhile.

In light of the success that we have had in the Essex National Heritage Area, I will outline some of the factors that have been crucial to our achievement and that I believe should be included in any discussions about national heritage areas:

1. Annual cooperative agreements between the National Park Service and individual heritage areas ensure the best public oversight. Almost all of the existing heritage areas receive federal funds from an annual appropriation. These funds are disbursed to the areas by the National Park Service through cooperative agreements. Cooperative agreements not only establish an area's obligations to the Park Service, but also provide an outline of the area's annual work program. Through these contracts, the National Park Service units that are closest to the heritage area are able to closely monitor their heritage area partners. Additionally, these cooperative agreements foster partnerships between the Park Service and the area that usually extend far beyond their specific contractual obligations. In the Essex National Heritage Area, I am in weekly contact with our local National Park Service superintendent and his staff. He serves as the National Park Service representative to the Essex National Heritage Commission, and he participates in all of the major decisions in our area. Our close contractual and working relationship maximizes the National Park Service's oversight of our heritage area. HR 2388 changes the method of funding heritage areas to a system of grants that are prioritized by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the chief executive officer of the state. It appears that this grant system may make it far more difficult for the National Park Service to tailor the heritage area's work program to meet their mission. I believe that the current system of cooperative agreements is a crucial element in the success of the program. These agreements enable those with local knowledge and a true understanding of the most effective ways to stimulate private investment to set the area priorities through a process of negotiation and trust.

2. The annual federal funding to the national heritage area program should be expanded. There is no question that the national heritage area program is a success. In addition to the Essex National Heritage Area, other areas such as Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, Ohio & Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor, Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area, John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor and South Carolina National Heritage Corridor stand as remarkable examples of the success that these public-private partnerships can achieve. Not only do these areas produce substantial social and economic benefits, but they also further the National Park Service's mission. Therefore, I urge this committee to expand the federal funding to this program. By limiting funding to national heritage areas to an annual maximum of \$10,000,000 and including the existing areas as well as new ones under this cap, this Bill sets the funding limit lower than the program's current level.

3. The period of eligibility during which a heritage area can receive funding should be at least 15 years. The current legislation for most heritage areas authorizes them to receive funding over a 15 year period. This relatively long period of time is essential to building effective partnerships. There needs to be time to allow effective programs grow from the ground up; time to include multiple partners and their various points of view; and time to listen and develop relationships of trust. Equally important, a longer cycle for "seed" funding often leads to increased private investment and foundation support because these sources typically prefer to fund after the first "seed" investments have produced tangible results. A longer eligibility period, also, means that heritage areas that are still working on their local partnerships often choose to seek less funding in the initial years so that they have more time to improve their management skills and build their organizational relationships. Conversely, shorter grant eligibility periods may result in areas applying for the federal grants before they are ready, a process that can hinder rather than help build the success of new areas.

4. Federal oversight and financial accountability are already built into heritage area legislation; NPS contracts and OMB requirements are effective methods to ensure that the federal investment is protected. At the Essex National Heritage Area, every year we file quarterly and annual reports with the National Park Service as

part of our regular reporting procedures under the cooperative agreement. Each year, since our area first received federal funding we have also undergone a rigorous federal audit following the requirements of the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 and OMB Circular A-133 to ensure that we are in compliance with all applicable federal laws and regulations. Furthermore, to ensure regular public involvement, we hold public commission meetings at least twice a year and frequent sub-committee and informational meetings. All of our business is transparent to the public and every grant made to us or by us is for the benefit of the public and the purpose it was intended. However, the language in HR 2388 stating that each grant may "result in a right of the United States to (seek) compensation from the beneficiary of the grant...(and) a schedule for such compensation"(Section 6 (f)) appears to be an open invitation for unscrupulous litigation and unreasonable damages. For example, the Essex National Heritage Area makes small "seed-money" grants to organizations seeking to rehabilitate historic structures for public use. While these properties are currently in public use, we realize that in the future, fifteen or twenty years from now, the use of these properties may change, and our grant recipients may be forced to sell or reprogram the activities at these sites. This new language may have a chilling effect on owners, matching partners and, most especially, on other funders who may decide that they do not want to participate in any projects with the heritage area if they might be held liable in the future to pay compensation to the US Government.

5. Heritage areas are successful when they have broad-based, community support. Extensive public involvement and support from citizens and local units of government are critical components to achieving successful partnerships in the heritage areas. However, attempting to achieve unanimous consensus can prevent the creation of successful partnerships. In fact, a variety of opinions and points of view within a framework of cooperation are key elements in creating and sustaining these vital heritage area partnerships. Furthermore, because heritage areas do not have any regulatory powers and cannot impinge on private property rights or local and state governments' abilities to govern, they can operate successfully even before their benefits are fully understood by all of their citizens. Broad-based support from local residents and units of government is very important, but trying to achieve unanimous consensus can be counterproductive. There are some phrases in this Bill such as "endorsement by each participating unit of government" (Section 8) that I believe could deter the successful development of new areas, and trying to achieve this level of agreement could result in no action.

6. This Bill should exclude the existing 23 heritage areas. The vast majority of the existing heritage areas already have in place complex networks of partnerships with community organizations, local units of government and private funders. In many cases these partnerships have taken years to nurture. Including existing areas within this Bill will change the way they are currently doing business and put at risk the non-federal funding that is a result of these relationships. Therefore, I urge caution when looking at changing the rules under which the existing areas operate. Partnerships, non-federal investment and matching funds, community resources and local units of government do not respond quickly to change. The tremendous leverage that most of the heritage areas have achieved—matching their federal appropriations with millions of dollars in non-federal investment—could be severely set back if the rules are changed in mid-stream.

In closing, I would like to thank Congressman Hefley for his determination and foresight in proposing legislation to define the parameters of the National Heritage Areas Program. The goals stated in this legislation are of utmost importance to foster effective partnerships between the National Park Service and the citizens of this country. The heritage area program is a very effective tool that will greatly assist the National Park Service in meeting its goals for the 21st century. While I agree with the purposes stated in this Bill, my experience in the Essex National Heritage Area leads me to urge you to consider some of the modifications that I have outlined above.

I would like to thank Chairman Radanovich and this subcommittee for the opportunity to testify on my experience in the Essex National Heritage Area and the success that we have achieved in our working partnership with the National Park Service.

**Response to Questions Submitted for the Record from August R. Carlino,
President & CEO of Steel Industry Heritage Corporation and Chairman
of the Alliance of National Heritage Areas**

Questions from Hon. James P. McGovern

What is the effect of changing the current system of direct appropriations to the National Heritage Areas to a grant system of projects prioritized by the governors and approved by the Secretary?

Answer: All NHAs are created through a public process that requires a plan to be submitted that the Secretary of Interior and Congress approves. This plan includes a list of projects, complied with partners and communities, to be completed over the life of the plan, along with a proposed funding outline for the projects. Each year the NHA management entity prioritizes its projects for the coming year and makes those projects a part of the request submitted directly to the Member(s) of Congress representing the NHA. The communities and local partners often inform their individual Member of the project and the specific funding needs. Typically then the Member, having evaluated the support in the community for the projects seeking funds, will request an earmark in the Interior Appropriations bill for the National Heritage Area to carry out the specified projects.

The proposed change would institute a bureaucratic process that would require the NHAs to submit projects each year to the governor of their state—which, if he/she has more than one NHA in the state, will prioritize the projects and then submit them to the Secretary. The Secretary will then approve a selected list of projects. This process would slow the funding of NHA projects down to a crawl, and would remove from the community the direct relationship of the constituents to their members in asking for funds. The members would have no input into what projects get funded in their districts, and NHAs would be hamstrung by not being able to raise necessary match, as they would not know which projects were going to receive funds until the process played out.

Even more detrimental to the process would be the imposition, through the proposed language, of decisions being made by an employees in the Department who have absolutely no knowledge or understanding of the project, the community or the specific needs of the NHA. The NHAs were created to relieve administrative burdens on the National Park Service in the development and implementation of these projects. If the NPS were to step in and begin to make these decisions, then the NPS would need to have adequate staffing in each NHA, leading to the need for hiring more NPS personnel to conduct this work, and expanding the size of the Federal government.

Is the proposed amount in the bill of \$10 million per year adequate for an annual NHA program?

Answer: No. The Department of Interior Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2002 as passed by the Congress provides \$13.2 million for the designated NHAs. If the H.R. 2388 were enacted as written, that amount would be cut by over \$3 million, and each NHA might receive less funding than it currently does. This bill also creates a system by which more NHAs could become designated, but the level of authorized funding for the programs would remain constant. If new NHAs were authorized and the amount of appropriations was not increased to meet those new obligations, the program would become crippled and die as less money would be available to each individual NHA each succeeding year.

It is the position of the Alliance of National Heritage Areas that the legislation should limit the funds available to each NHA to the current policy of \$1 million per year. Congress, based upon the track record of the NHA in previous years, should make the final decision as to whether a NHA should receive the full appropriation.

What is going to be the effect on the local management entity and the community partners in an NHA if this bill passes?

Answer: All control for project development and funding within an NHA would rest in the hands of the National Park Service and the governors of each state. The NHA and the communities, as the intended stewards for the projects, would have little role, if any. NHAs work because they create partnerships through the management entity, with the community, local governments, the states and the NPS. There is a role for NPS in NHAs, but even the NPS would admit that they see themselves as facilitators and partners, not as the body responsible for the day-to-day management of the NHA. If the role of the NPS were to change in the NHAs as proposed in H.R. 2388, the NPS would need more staff assistance to perform the added work, increasing the size of the Federal government, and decreasing the responsibility of the management entity and the local partners.

**Response to Questions Submitted for the Record from Annie Clay Harris,
Executive Director, Essex National Heritage Area**

Questions from Hon. James P. McGovern

Question: What is the effect of changing the current system of direct appropriations to the NHAs to a grant system of projects prioritized by the governors and approved by the Secretary?

Answer: The effect will be to stifle the local heritage area partnerships and to restrict the amount of non-federal funds that they can leverage. The local management entities will be forced to change priorities from year to year, never knowing ahead of time which grants will be approved for which projects. Under the current system most NHAs are allowed to seek up to \$1.0 million annually in appropriations. Within this ceiling they are able to plan their yearly work program according to the priorities of their partners, to their ability to raise non-federal matching funds and to the compatibility of their programs with the goals and oversight of the National Park Service. A competitive grant system such as the one proposed in HR 2388 will take the decision making away from the local entities and give it to the state and federal officials. It is the antithesis of the cooperative public-private partnerships that NHAs are so effective in building.

Is the proposed amount in the bill of \$10 million per year adequate for an annual NHA program?

Answer: No. This amount reduces the program by 24% from its current level of \$13.2 million. Since the bill is designed to create new NHAs as well as to regulate existing ones, both new and existing NHAs will be severely under-funded if this budget cap is approved.

What is going to be the effect on the local management entity and the community partners in an NHA if this bill passes?

Answer: If this bill passes in its current form, it will greatly inhibit the highly effective local public-private partnerships that form the core of the NHAs. These partnerships, and the non-federal funding and projects that they leverage, are the most successful aspect of the NHAs. This bill takes the management and financial control away from the local entities and community partners and gives it to the governors, the National Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior. It substitutes a complex system of competitive grants, prioritized by remote state and federal executives, for the present system that allows for direct negotiations between the National Park Service and the NHAs management entity and local partners.

