

**THEME STUDY TO IDENTIFY SITES OF COLD WAR; STUDY
SITES IN BEAUFORT, SC; McLOUGHLIN HOUSE IN OREGON
CITY, OR; BOUNDARY OF GLEN CANYON RECREATION
AREA; AND SAN GABRIEL RIVER WATERSHED RESOURCE
STUDY**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE
ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 452

S. 630

S. 500

H.R. 519

S. 601

H.R. 733

S. 612

H.R. 788

MAY 13, 2003



Printed for the use of the
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

88-040 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2003

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 ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

PETE V. DOMENICI, *New Mexico, Chairman*

DON NICKLES, Oklahoma	JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado	BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming	BOB GRAHAM, Florida
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee	RON WYDEN, Oregon
LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska	TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
JAMES M. TALENT, Missouri	MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
CONRAD BURNS, Montana	EVAN BAYH, Indiana
GORDON SMITH, Oregon	DIANNE FEINSTEIN, California
JIM BUNNING, Kentucky	CHARLES E. SCHUMER, New York
JON KYL, Arizona	MARIA CANTWELL, Washington

ALEX FLINT, *Staff Director*

JAMES P. BEIRNE, *Chief Counsel*

ROBERT M. SIMON, *Democratic Staff Director*

SAM E. FOWLER, *Democratic Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

CRAIG THOMAS, *Wyoming, Chairman*

DON NICKLES, *Oklahoma, Vice Chairman*

BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado	DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee	BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
CONRAD BURNS, Montana	BOB GRAHAM, Florida
GORDON SMITH, Oregon	MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
JON KYL, Arizona	EVAN BAYH, Indiana
	CHARLES E. SCHUMER, New York

PETE V. DOMENICI and JEFF BINGAMAN are Ex Officio Members of the Subcommittee

THOMAS LILLIE, *Professional Staff Member*

DAVID BROOKS, *Democratic Senior Counsel*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Bennett, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator from Utah	4
Boxer, Hon. Barbara, U.S. Senator from California	9
Hollings, Hon. Ernest F., U.S. Senator from South Carolina	2
Masica, Sue, Associate Director for Park Planning, Facilities and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior	11
Reid, Hon. Harry, U.S. Senator from Nevada	3
Smith, Hon. Gordon, U.S. Senator from Oregon	6
Solis, Hon. Hilda L., U.S. Representative from California	8
Thomas, Hon. Craig, U.S. Senator from Wyoming	1
Wyden, Hon. Ron, U.S. Senator from Oregon	4

APPENDIX

Additional material submitted for the record	23
--	----

**THEME STUDY TO IDENTIFY SITES OF COLD
WAR; STUDY SITES IN BEAUFORT, SC;
McLOUGHLIN HOUSE IN OREGON CITY, OR;
BOUNDARY OF GLEN CANYON RECREATION
AREA; AND SAN GABRIEL RIVER WATER-
SHED RESOURCE STUDY**

TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2003

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m. in room SD-366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Craig Thomas presiding.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. CRAIG THOMAS,
U.S. SENATOR FROM WYOMING**

Senator THOMAS. We will start. It is 10 o'clock and we have a number of things to do. Senator Bennett has another obligation, so I want to welcome you here.

We are talking eight different bills before the subcommittee today and they are various kinds of bills that have authorizations for studies, authorization for the expansion of some territories, and so on. So I will not bother to go through those right at the moment, but I do want to say that as we look at all these new things we are talking about in terms of heritage area studies, and so on, I think we have always a responsibility to make sure that what we are doing fits into the role of the Park Service and that we become aware of the difficulty sometimes to manage the things we have now, and we want to make sure that as we make additions they have an additional—add to the value of our Park Service.

So why don't we go right ahead to—let us see here, Senator. This is—what bill is this? S. 612, okay. Yes, I see. It revises the boundary of Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona.

Thank you for being here, Senator, and if you would like to go ahead, please.

[The prepared statements of Senators Hollings, Reid, and Wyden follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, U.S. SENATOR
FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

I would like to thank Chairman Thomas and Ranking Member Akaka for holding this hearing today and reviewing S. 500, the Beaufort Study Act. This legislation was considered by the Subcommittee in June of last year and received unanimous support by the Subcommittee, Full Committee and on the Senate floor. Unfortunately, due to time restraints in the 107th Congressional Session, the House was unable to act on the legislation.

The period of Reconstruction immediately following the Civil War is one of the least understood periods in American History. Understanding this pivotal era is essential to understanding America's history of race relations. This is a largely unrecognized period of our history that should be included in our National Park System. Many prominent American historians recognize Beaufort County as the best location for telling the story of Reconstruction and the beginning of a black history in a free America. I would like to submit a copy of my testimony from last year's hearing for the record. Again, I appreciate your taking the time to consider this legislation.

I am here before you today to testify on behalf of black history and the foundations of freedom that began on St. Helena Island in Beaufort, South Carolina at the Penn Center.

The Reconstruction Era is recognized as a painful, divisive and controversial period in our nation's history—particularly in the South. Perhaps this is why the Congress and the National Park Service have avoided focusing on the preservation or interpretation of historic sites related to the Reconstruction Period and African American history from that period. I see Reconstruction as the foundation of unification—not only the unification of North and South, but the unification of black and white—and the vision for equality, unity and hope. The nationally significant events that turned the tide for the Union and Confederate forces in the Civil War began in the capture of the Beaufort Lowcountry. Likewise, the events of the Port Royal experiment and establishment of the Penn Center turned the tide of emancipation, freedom, and civil rights. Until we acknowledge our history, our heritage, our mistakes and our successes, we will never overcome the racial divide that has continued to plague the unity of this nation.

As a young legislator, I had the good fortune to work with a man named Esau Jenkins, an African American from the Sea Islands. I can see him right now in my office when I was a young lawyer. Esau never had a formal education. He taught himself—and taught himself to speak Greek, of all things. Not only was he an inspiration of self-help and innovation to so many in his community, he was a leader with a vision for equality.

He once said to me, "You've got to understand, education is our only chance."

I said, "What do you mean, Esau?"

He said, "Ignorance Hollings. Ignorance is the greatest prison there is. My people have been imprisoned."

Plantation owners systematically deprived their slaves of literacy and education. As my friend Esau so eloquently pleaded, not only were slaves imprisoned by their owners, they were imprisoned by ignorance. When tutors came to teach the little white children, the black children were never able to participate because the way to make for a good slave was to make sure their minds were never unsettled, their curiosity was never inflamed.

The abolitionists knew that without education, emancipation would be a false promise to black Americans. Likewise, newly freed slaves in the 1860s saw a clear link between education and freedom. The Sea Islands of Beaufort, South Carolina is where it all began. The first reading of the Emancipation Proclamation was at Old Fort Plantation. The Beaufort Arsenal was where freedmen voted for the first time. Mitchellville on Hilton Head Island was the first Freedman's Village. And, most notably, the Penn Center on St. Helena Island was the first school for freedmen.

Quaker missionaries came to Beaufort in the wake of the Union Army's capture of the Lowcountry in South Carolina in 1862. They came to a strange land, to a downtrodden people, with a mission of education and advancement. The Penn Center was at the heart of the Port Royal Experiment—the famous "proving ground for freedom." That experiment succeeded. Penn Center's work with the 10,000 Freedmen of this area became a model—a model for similar schools elsewhere, and a model that Abraham Lincoln looked to in shaping his Reconstruction policies.

Penn Center has always been a jewel in the crown of South Carolina's cultural life. But, heretofore, it has been one of South Carolina's best-kept secrets. I can think of no better place to start the exploration into our Reconstruction heritage than at the Penn Center. From 1862 to this day, the Penn Center's great gift—its

great message—to African Americans is that education matters, education can transform. By educating the nation on the foundations of freedom and civil rights during Reconstruction, we will also help future generations understand our cultural diversity, overcome the ignorance of racism and make another significant stride toward national unity.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. HARRY REID, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEVADA

The Cold War, which lasted 50 years, was the longest war in United States history, and the most expensive, costing trillions of dollars. At its conclusion, America emerged as the only remaining superpower in the world.

Because we faced an enemy with tremendous nuclear capabilities, it was the most dangerous conflict our country ever faced. The threat of mass destruction left a permanent mark on American life and politics. Those that won this war did so in obscurity.

What is often overlooked is that hundreds if not thousands of Americans died during the Cold War as America built its strategic nuclear arsenal and flew thousands of reconnaissance missions over enemy territory. Those who gave their lives in the Cold War have never been properly honored.

In February, I introduced with Senator Ensign a bill that requires the Department of the Interior to conduct a study to identify sites and resources to commemorate heroes of the Cold War and to interpret the Cold War for future generations. Identical legislation that I introduced last year was favorably reported by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the Senate passed the bill by unanimous consent in the waning moments of the 107th Congress. However, the House failed to act on the bill prior to the adjournment of the Congress.

My legislation directs the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, State historic preservation offices, State and local officials, Cold War scholars, and other interested parties to oversee the inventory of Cold War sites and resources for potential inclusion in the National Park System; as national historic landmarks; or other appropriate designations.

Obvious Cold War sites of significance include:

- Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles;
- flight training centers;
- communications and command centers (such as Cheyenne Mountain, Colorado);
- nuclear weapons test sites (such as the Nevada test site); and
- strategic and tactical resources.

Perhaps no other state in the Union has played a more significant role than Nevada in winning the Cold War. The Nevada Test Site is a high-technology engineering marvel where the United States developed, tested, and perfected a nuclear deterrent which is the cornerstone of America's security and leadership among nations.

The Naval Air Station at Fallon is the Navy's premiere tactical air warfare training facility. The Air Warfare Center at Nellis Air Force Base has the largest training range in the United States to ensure that America's pilots will prevail in any armed conflict.

In testimony before this committee last year, Steve Ririe, Chairman of the Silent Heroes of the Cold War National Memorial Committee, recounted the story of 14 men who perished in a plane crash on Mount Charleston in Nevada nearly half a century ago.

These men were involved in a top-secret project, developing the U-2 reconnaissance aircraft, the most advanced spy plane the world had ever seen. Their success was critical to ensuring the United States would be ready to face the challenges of a destabilized world. Experts have credited the U-2 with avoiding World War III. The U-2 is still vital to the American military today, and is being used to protect our interests around the globe.

This story is just one of thousands of stories of men and women who worked in secret to bring us safely through the Cold War conflict. Our nation needs to recognize the veterans of the longest war in United States history—a battle which also had the highest stakes.

I urge my colleagues to support this long overdue tribute to the contribution and sacrifice of those Cold War heroes for the cause of freedom.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. RON WYDEN, U.S. SENATOR FROM OREGON

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for holding this hearing for the McLoughlin House National Historic Site, S. 601, and I offer my support for the passage of this legislation. Senator Smith and I are pleased to see this bill up for consideration.

This bill would make the McLoughlin House and the nearby Barclay House, located in Oregon City, part of the Fort Vancouver National Park Service administrative site, highlighting the interwoven connection between Fort Vancouver, the fur trade and the beginnings of the Oregon Territory. Dr. John McLoughlin is known officially and fondly, as the "Father of Oregon." His compassion and generosity played a critical role in the settling of the Northwest by the Oregon Trail Pioneers.

I thank Clackamas County, particularly John Salisbury and the McLoughlin Memorial Association, for all of their hard work to preserve this Oregon treasure. Additionally, I thank Tracy Fortmann with the National Park Service at Fort Vancouver for her advocacy on behalf of the McLoughlin House. Mayor Alice Norris and the former mayors of Oregon City who have worked together to bring this legislation to the attention of the Oregon delegation deserve our thanks as well.

I would also like to submit for the record, letters of support from the North Clackamas County Chamber of Commerce, the McLoughlin Memorial Association, the City of Oregon City, the City of Gladstone, the Sons and Daughters of Oregon Pioneers, the City of Vancouver, and the Canadian Consulate General.

Finally, I thank Representative Hooley for having the foresight to introduce this legislation in the House of Representatives in the 107th Congress and again in the 108th.

Mr. Chairman, I, along with Senator Smith, thank you again for today's hearing and look forward to working with the Committee to pass this legislation.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT F. BENNETT, U.S. SENATOR
FROM UTAH**

Senator BENNETT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your courtesy and your promptness in scheduling this hearing, and I will be so bold as to say this is probably the least controversial piece of legislation you will deal with this year.

Senator THOMAS. That is good.

Senator BENNETT. Because this is one where the Park Service gets a piece of land that it covets and a private entity, the landowner, Page One LLC in Utah, gets a piece of land that it covets, and the taxpayers on an accounting basis get a two-and-a-half times financial benefit. That is, the land that is being transferred to the Park Service is worth two and a half times as much money as the land that is being transferred to the private individual or private corporation.

The reason the private corporation is willing to do that is part public-spirited, because they recognize that the land they are transferring in the land swap to the Park Service has a tremendous tourist value. It is a viewscape of Lake Powell. They do have the rights to develop this land in its current boundary. They could put a 7-11 or a strip mall or anything else on it. It is right on Highway 89 that runs from Utah to Arizona, and they could get some benefit to it.

But, frankly, it would spoil the view that the tourists get as they drive by and would seriously, seriously hamper the total experience as you are driving through that area looking towards Lake Powell.

Page One does have some other commercial properties, development opportunities, in the area of the land they will be getting. So even though the appraiser says the land that they are giving is worth two-and-a-half times as much money on a straight land appraisal value, in terms of the economic potential the land that they are getting is more convenient to land that they currently own.

So it is very much a win-win on both sides. It is supported as far as I know by everybody who has looked at it—the local community, the county officials. Not only the official elected people in the State of Utah but the various groups involved with the Park Service who are out to support Park Service activities that we would think of as part of the environmental community are also supportive because they want the viewscape that would be made available.

I am told the Park Service is in favor of this. It to my knowledge has no opponents and as a win-win opportunity—I go back to my opening statement that it is probably the most noncontroversial item that you will take up.

I want, as a matter of record, to pay tribute to Congressman Chris Cannon, who has worked hard to get this done on the House side, and I think if the Senate moves in an expeditious manner that it will pass the House and go on to the President without much difficulty.

The map is available to you that shows the location of the land, and if you have any further questions about it I will be happy to do my best to respond.

[The prepared statement of Senator Bennett follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT F. BENNETT, U.S. SENATOR FROM UTAH

I thank Chairman Thomas and Senator Akaka and the Subcommittee on National Parks for holding today's hearing on S. 612, the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area Boundary Revision Act. I appreciate the Senate's consideration of this legislation, which will authorize a land exchange and revise the total acreage within the National Recreation Areas's (NRA) boundary while protecting the scenic view of Lake Powell as seen by those traveling along U.S. Highway Route 89. Additionally, I appreciate Representative Cannon's sponsoring of H.R. 788, the House companion bill to S. 612.

As enacted into law, the enabling legislation for the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area inaccurately reflected the acreage within the NRA boundary. This legislation would correct the acreage ceiling by estimating the acreage within the NRA to be 1,256,000 instead of 1,236,880.

Secondly, this bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange 320 NRA acres for 152 acres of privately owned land in Kane County, Utah. Currently, Page One L.L.C. owns 152 acres between U.S. Highway 89 and the southwestern shore of Lake Powell. This private land provides a breathtaking view of Lake Powell from Highway 89, which is the main viewshed corridor between the highway and the lake. This land also encompasses three highway access right-of-ways and a developed culinary water well. In an effort to protect this viewshed and better manage its boundaries along its most visited entrance, the National Park Service (NPS) has been negotiating with Page One to exchange 370 acres of NRA lands for these 152 acres. The approximate value of the NRA lands is \$480,000 whereas the private land's appraised value is \$856,000. Page One has declared its intention to donate the balance of the appraised value to the NPS.

I commend Page One for their willingness to donate the balance of the appraised value to the NPS. This generosity is truly laudable and serves to further highlight the high level of support for the goals of this bill. While this land exchange would result in a significant benefit to the federal government because of the donation, it should be noted that this level of generosity is not a prerequisite for a land exchange to be deemed in the public interest.

By authorizing this land exchange, this bill will allow the NPS to preserve and better manage the corridor between the park and Highway 89, which affords such a scenic view of Lake Powell. This boundary change would not add any facilities, increase operating costs, or require additional staff and as such, it will not add to the NPS maintenance backlog.

Because of the common interest in preserving this scenic corridor from development, this legislation has garnered the support of the administration, the Kane County Planning and Zoning Commission, the National Parks Conservation Association, and the Southern Utah Planning Advisory Council. In light of the benefits pro-

vided by and community support for this proposal, I look forward to working with my Senate colleagues and the administration to pass this legislation this year.

Senator THOMAS. All right, sir. Well, we certainly thank you. It does sound like it moves us forward and is something most everyone who participates in benefits.

Was there also a correction of acreage within the NRA in your bill?

Senator BENNETT. The original assumption was that the private landowner would receive 320 acres—it is actually 370—and that the Park Service would receive I believe 120. It is going to be 122 acres.

Senator THOMAS. I see.

Senator BENNETT. So there is some correction in that, but it is not major and does not change the nature of the deal in any way.

Senator THOMAS. I guess I had the information that this legislation in a separate kind of an issue, but in the same bill, actually corrects the total acreage in the resource. It is just a correction, I believe.

Senator BENNETT. Yes, it is a correction. The map demonstrates how the current national recreation boundary gets changed.

Senator THOMAS. Right.

Senator BENNETT. It gets changed along Highway 89 so that now the boundary of private land stops at Highway 89 and that which is to the north and the east of Highway 89 then goes to the Federal Government.

Senator THOMAS. All right, sir. Thank you very much. We will seek to move this along and I appreciate your efforts at trying to strengthen and improve our Park Service.

Senator BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate your cooperation.

Senator THOMAS. Let us see. We had thought that we would have some other members and I suspect they may come in later. And in fact, we have one right now. Senator Smith, did you have a bill here, I believe. Would you care to go ahead and share your statement with us?

**STATEMENT OF HON. GORDON SMITH, U.S. SENATOR
FROM OREGON**

Senator SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding today's hearing on a range of bills, but specifically including S. 601, the McLoughlin House National Historic Site Act.

Senator Wyden and I jointly agreed to introduce this legislation where, when we were out on our own version of the Oregon Trail, we have held joint town hall meetings throughout Oregon, but in Oregon City specifically this bill or this issue was raised to us. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the McLoughlin House National Historic Site in Oregon City, Oregon, for inclusion in the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

I see no more fitting tribute for the man named the father of Oregon. Dr. John McLoughlin is a revered figure in my home State. He is one of the two Oregonians honored in Statuary Hall. He was the superintendent of the British Hudson Bay Company at Fort Vancouver in Washington State in the early 1800's. The Hudson Bay Company was the largest trading center west of the Rockies

prior to the California Gold Rush. In that role, Dr. McLoughlin provided the first America pioneers arriving on the Oregon Trail with supplies that helped them survive their first winter.

When the provisional government was first established by the settlers in the Willamette Valley, Dr. McLoughlin was the undisputed governor of the vast area bounded by the Rocky Mountains on the east, the Mexican territory, now California, on the south, the Pacific Ocean on the west, and the Russian settlements on the north.

Dr. McLoughlin later moved to Oregon City, welcoming and provisioning missionaries and settlers, encouraging school and church instruction, and providing the only medical services in the region. His early services as mayor of Oregon City, in addition to his many other contributions, allowed him to define the Oregon country. Our State today is a reflection of his founding service.

To preserve Dr. McLoughlin's legacy, the McLoughlin Memorial Association was created in 1909 to preserve his home. In 1941, Congress designated the McLoughlin House as a national historic site, the first in the West.

I am joined by all the members of the Oregon Congressional delegation, as well as Senator Cantwell, in supporting the McLoughlin House National Historic Site Act. We should protect and promote Dr. McLoughlin's legacy of economic development and local charity.

Linking the McLoughlin House to Fort Vancouver gives a more complete picture of the life of the father of Oregon and will provide more resources for people to learn from a man whose benevolence should be emulated today.

Without objection, I would like to offer into the record several letters provided by Oregonians supporting this legislation, including the president of the McLoughlin Memorial Association and the Mayor of Oregon City.

Mr. Chairman, along with Senator Wyden, we thank you for holding today's hearing and hope to gain the committee's support for this legislation.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you very much, sir.

From information we have, I am not certain. The house now has been operated as a historical site by a private organization?

Senator SMITH. Correct.

Senator THOMAS. This proposal would direct the Park Service to purchase the building, is that it?

Senator SMITH. Yes, and have it as part of several sites on both sides of the Columbia River to be a part of the whole story, Fort Vancouver being the other side.

Senator THOMAS. So it would be managed then by the Park Service?

Senator SMITH. Right.

Senator THOMAS. Do you know the cost of the purchase? There seem to be two different numbers in our background material.

Senator SMITH. Yes, it is about \$400,000.

Senator THOMAS. \$400,000. And that would be to purchase it from the group that has—

Senator SMITH. The association.

Senator THOMAS. The association. Okay.

Senator SMITH. And it is today in a fairly dilapidated state, I am afraid, because they simply lack the resources to maintain it as, frankly, it ought to be maintained.

Senator THOMAS. Someone gave me a picture of John McLoughlin. I think by looking at that one would not say no to John McLoughlin.

[Laughter.]

Senator SMITH. A stern visage.

Senator THOMAS. I should say.

All right, fine. Thank you, sir. We appreciate that.

Oh, Representative Solis, great. Thank you for joining us.

Ms. SOLIS. Thank you.

Senator THOMAS. Did not see you come in.

Ms. SOLIS. Yes.

Senator THOMAS. Are you prepared to go ahead with your statement, please?

**STATEMENT OF HON. HILDA L. SOLIS,
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA**

Ms. SOLIS. Thank you, Chairman Thomas. It is great to be here again this year to speak to you about the San Gabriel River Watershed Study Act that has now been introduced by Senator Barbara Boxer as S. 630. I am the House sponsor, as you know, of the companion bill that we presented to this committee I believe some time ago, and it did pass our House unanimously in March.

The bill directs the Department of the Interior to study ways for more than 2 million people that reside around the San Gabriel Valley and the length of the upper portion of the river to preserve, restore, and create recreational space. The open and green space will not only improve the environmental landscape, but it will improve the health and surrounding communities for future generations. I say that because the San Gabriel community there that I represent has different challenges—a lot of blighted areas, low income. Many of our residents there have higher incidence of asthma, diabetes, infant mortality, birth defects, and even cancer. In Los Angeles County, where this area is located, neighborhoods back in the 1990s averaged around \$20,000 a year, and it was known that less than half an acre park land was available for every 1,000 residents.

So you could imagine how hard and difficult it is for families and children to be able to have an open park space available for them to convene on their Saturdays or Sunday afternoons. Very little of it—most of the community there is paved over with cement.

Of course, this is not the case with the higher income communities that surround the area. Incomes above \$40,000 and higher have much more access to open space. So it is somewhat of a lopsided situation there with respect to socioeconomic background as well as ethnicity.

What I would like to say today is that the bill that we passed in the House is identical to the Senate bill that is now being presented to you today. We did go through some major changes in terms of modifying the bill so that now we are looking primarily at what kind of resource study could be done on this particular area.

We also kind of bifurcated the program so that we do not go into areas of the river that are cemented over, so to speak. So we are looking at the soft-bottom part of the San Gabriel River, which for many purposes is still natural, where you can still see wildlife roam and there is still natural habitat to be seen there. I would ask for your consideration of this proposal and thank the gentleman, Senator Barbara Boxer, for her leadership and commitment to support this piece of legislation.

[The prepared statement of Representative Solis follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. HILDA SOLIS, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE
FROM CALIFORNIA

Thank you Mr. Chairman, I am here today to testify in support of S. 630, the San Gabriel River Watersheds Study Act, introduced by Senator Barbara Boxer. I am the House sponsor of the companion bill and am pleased to inform you that it passed the House unanimously in March.

This bill directs the Department of Interior to study ways for the more than 2 million people that reside in the San Gabriel Valley to preserve, restore and create recreational space. Open and green space will not only improve the environmental landscape, it will also improve the health of the surrounding communities and future generations. For example, urban centers, similar to the San Gabriel Valley, tend to have greater incidences of cardiovascular disease, asthma, diabetes, infant mortality, birth defects and cancer.

Even our open space tends to favor wealthier neighborhoods. In Los Angeles neighborhoods where household income averaged less than \$20,000 in the 90s, there was less than a half-acre of parkland for every 1,000 residents. The ratio was more than 40 times higher—21.2 acres for every 1,000 people—in neighborhoods where household incomes were \$40,000 or higher.

Park access was similarly lopsided when broken down by race. Majority white neighborhoods had 95.7 acres of parkland for every 1,000 children, compared with 5 acres in Latino areas, 2.9 acres in African-American neighborhoods and 6.3 acres in Asian-American areas. It is time for us to look at ways to make sure that everyone has access to open and recreational space regardless of their socioeconomic background and ethnicity. An identical bill was passed out of this committee and on the Senate floor during the 107th Congress as part of a California Omnibus Parks package.

Unfortunately, because another unrelated section of the omnibus bill did not mirror the House passed version, the bill was not sent to the President. I am hopeful that this committee will again favorably report this bill in the near future so that the study can begin and we can start planning for the future of open and green space in the San Gabriel Valley.

Finally, I want to thank my good friend, Senator Boxer, for her leadership on this issue. Thank you, Chairman Thomas and Ranking Member Akaka.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you very much.

Speaking of the Senator, here she is.

Senator BOXER. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THOMAS. Go right ahead.

**STATEMENT OF HON. BARBARA BOXER, U.S. SENATOR
FROM CALIFORNIA**

Senator BOXER. Sorry I am running just a tad late.

It is very nice to see Congresswoman Hilda Solis. I am proud to work with her on this legislation. S. 630 is a companion to H.R. 519. I have a very brief statement, knowing your schedule. I will just take a breath.

Senator THOMAS. You need the open space so you can breathe.

Senator BOXER. We need a lot of open space instead of the stairs here.

Hilda has shown tremendous leadership in helping move this important bill, which will greatly benefit our constituents. S. 630 au-

thorizes the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with other appropriate Federal, State, and local government agencies, to conduct a 3-year study of the San Gabriel River watershed, which includes the San Gabriel Mountains.

The study would make management recommendations on how best to preserve and protect the river, conserve wildlife habitat, and improve water quality. These recommendations would enhance recreational opportunities and improve downstream water quality. Although the Lower San Gabriel runs through a very congested urban area, this river provides important habitat for mammals and hundreds of resident and migratory species. It is one of the few open spaces available to over 2 million people.

I do not know—I did not hear Congresswoman Solis's point. I am sure she made it. This is in her heart. She grew up around there and remembers it so well when she was a child. Mr. Chairman, I think you know—I am sure you visit Los Angeles—it is teeming with people and we have so little to really turn to near an urban area, and that is why this is so important.

During consideration of the legislation last year, this committee made several changes, largely for the purposes of clarification. The bill before you reflects those changes that you made last year.

Mr. Chairman, there has been strong bipartisan support for the San Gabriel River Watershed Study Act. At the State and local level, numerous officials have endorsed the legislation. In March of this year, the House of Representatives unanimously passed this legislation, and I know that you know that in the House if everybody gets together it is a rare moment in history, and they did it over this piece of legislation. So therefore I strongly urge you to report this bill favorably again and allow it to move forward as soon as possible. And I do appreciate the time that you are taking to hear from us today.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you very much.

Senator BOXER. Thank you.

Senator THOMAS. What would you think of a unanimous agreement in the Senate?

Senator BOXER. A what?

Senator THOMAS. That would really be rare, would it not?

Senator BOXER. Well, that would be remarkable and I would look forward to it. Anyway, thank you so much for your concern.

Senator THOMAS. You are very welcome.

Senator BOXER. Nice to see you, Senator.

Senator THOMAS. Now, this does include a number of kinds of lands, is that right—private, State, Corps of Engineers, forest?

Senator BOXER. Yes.

Senator THOMAS. All these things.

Senator BOXER. All the stakeholders, and that was outlined in detail very thoroughly because we wanted to make sure that everybody had a voice at the table.

Senator THOMAS. I see. And this is a study?

Senator BOXER. Yes.

Senator THOMAS. And they would come back with it?

Senator BOXER. Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THOMAS. I see. Well, I have to say that certainly your needs for open space and recreational space in California are quite

different than they are in some other States because of the numbers of people that you have. So I appreciate your interest in causing us to do that. We will certainly look at it, and thank you for being here this morning.

Senator BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. SOLIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THOMAS. Why don't we go ahead and move forward. If more members appear, why, we will be more than happy to involve them. But waiting for that, we have the Associate Director of Park Planning, Facilities and Lands with us this morning, Sue Masica. How do you say it?

Ms. MASICA. "MASS-ick-uh."

Senator THOMAS. "MASS-ick-uh." Welcome.

**STATEMENT OF SUE MASICA, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR
PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK
SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

Ms. MASICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator THOMAS. We are very glad to have you here and I hope that you will comment and give us, to the extent that you can, the agency's position on these bills.

Ms. MASICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since you have our written testimony and it will be provided in the record, I will briefly summarize our position on these eight pieces of legislation.

Senator THOMAS. Great.

Ms. MASICA. S. 452 directs the Secretary to conduct a Cold War theme study of sites and resources associated with this period in our history, and we support the bill. The bill as introduced does include changes that were recommended by the administration in the last Congress. The Department of Justice has raised some concerns regarding the recommendations clause and language in section 1(b) directing the Secretary to identify sites for which potential inclusion in the National Park System should be authorized.

S. 500 directs a study of sites in Beaufort, South Carolina, related to the Reconstruction era and it includes both a special resource study for Beaufort and then a broader theme study for the Reconstruction era, and we support that legislation also, with two suggested amendments: one to clarify that the special resource study should be for the county, not just for the historic district, because some of the sites that are identified are for the county as well, are broader than the historic district; and then also to make the special resource study provisions consistent with what we do for other special resource studies, to add that we should look at national significance as well as suitability and feasibility.

S. 601 authorizes acquisition of the McLoughlin House National Historic Site in Oregon City to be included as part of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, and we support that legislation also, with two clarifying amendments: one, that we do not have a national historic site within a national historic site; and the second to reference a revised map.

The proposal on the McLoughlin House is consistent with the general management plan revision that is currently under way at Fort Vancouver and anticipated to be completed later this year.

S. 612 authorizes a boundary adjustment for Glen Canyon National Recreation Area and corrects the authorized acreage of the park, as discussed by Senator Bennett, and we support that legislation also and believe that it is a good benefit to all the parties involved.

The last piece of legislation is S. 630, the special resource study for the San Gabriel Watershed in California. We also support that legislation, but believe the bill should be amended to authorize a joint study with the Department of Agriculture since a significant portion of the study area encompasses the National Forest System lands in the Angeles National Forest.

With that, I will be happy to respond to any questions that you might have.

[The prepared statements of Ms. Masica follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENTS OF SUE MASICA, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR PARK PLANNING,
FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

S. 452

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 452. This bill would require that the Secretary of the Interior conduct a theme study to identify sites and resources associated with the Cold War and to recommend ways to commemorate and interpret that period of our nation's history.

The Department supports this legislation as we believe that it is wholly appropriate for the National Park Service to undertake a study that will help ensure that the history of the Cold War era is preserved for future generations of Americans.

S. 452 would require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a National Historic Landmark theme study to identify sites and resources in the United States that are significant to the Cold War. The bill specifically provides that the study consider the inventory of Cold War resources that has been compiled by the Department of Defense and other historical studies and research on various types of military resources. It also requires the study to include recommendations for commemorating these resources and for establishing cooperative arrangements with other entities.

We want to note that the study would not cover every resource that may be significant to the history of the Cold War as it affected our nation, since it would not include sites outside the United States such as U.S. installations in Germany or South Korea. It is necessary to limit the scope of the study to sites and resources within the United States, as S. 452 does, because we do not have the authority to identify resources that are beyond our borders for potential National Historic Landmark status.

In addition to authorizing the theme study, S. 452 would require the Secretary to prepare and publish an interpretive handbook on the Cold War and to disseminate information gathered through the study in other ways. S. 452 would authorize appropriations of \$300,000 to carry out the legislation.

National Historic Landmark theme studies are funded from a variety of sources including, in some cases, the special resource study budget, which is about \$1 million in FY 2003. There are 29 studies previously authorized by Congress that are being funded from the special resource study budget, nearly half of which will have at least some funding needs beyond Fiscal Year 2003. We transmitted 6 special resource studies to Congress in Fiscal Year 2002, and we expect to transmit about 15 this fiscal year or early next fiscal year. Our highest priority is to complete pending studies, though we expect to start newly authorized studies as soon as funds are made available.

The National Historic Landmarks program was established by the Act of August 21, 1935, commonly known as the Historic Sites Act (16 U.S.C. 461 et. seq.) and is implemented according to 36 CFR Part 65. The program's mission is to identify those places that best illustrate the themes, events, or persons that are nationally significant to the history of the United States and that retain a high degree of integrity. Potential national historic landmarks are often identified through theme studies such as the one that would be authorized by this legislation.

Theme studies are not the same as special resource studies, which assess the suitability and feasibility of adding a site to the National Park System. Theme studies may identify sites that may be appropriate candidates for special resource studies,

but these studies themselves do not evaluate sites for possible addition to the National Park System. Therefore, theme studies do not have the potential to lead directly to new operation, maintenance or other costs for the National Park Service.

For example, in 2000, the National Park Service completed and transmitted to Congress a National Historic Landmark theme study on the history of racial desegregation of public schools, which was authorized by Public Law 105-356, the Act that established the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site. Federal, state, and local officials across the country are now using this study to identify and evaluate the significance of numerous properties. So far, properties in nine states and the District of Columbia have been recommended for consideration as national historic landmarks. Currently the National Park Service is conducting several other theme studies, including one related to the history of the labor movement, another on the earliest inhabitants of Eastern North America, and another on sites associated with Japanese Americans during World War II.

At the moment, the history of the Cold War has some presence in the National Park System and on the two lists of historic sites maintained by the National Park Service. The National Park System includes one unit related to the Cold War, the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in South Dakota, which Congress established in 1999 to preserve and interpret the role of Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles in our nation's defense system.

Out of 2,342 designated national historic landmarks, five recognize civilian or military aspects of Cold War history, and out of approximately 76,000 listings on the National Register of Historic Places, 17 (including the five landmarks) are related to the Cold War. The relatively small number of recognized sites is due in large part to the fact that the Cold War has only recently been viewed as historically important. With or without a theme study, these numbers would likely increase over time, and the Department of Defense could take steps on its own to identify these sites under their jurisdiction.

National Historic Landmark program regulations require consultation with Federal, state, and local governments; national and statewide associations; and a variety of other interested parties. Through partnering with a national historical organization, using a peer-review process, and consulting with appropriate subject experts as well as the general public, the National Park Service would ensure that the broadest historical perspectives are represented in any study it undertakes.

In addition, we have been informed by the Department of Justice that the provisions of the bill that would require the Secretary of the Interior to make recommendations to Congress concerning federal protection for Cold War sites appear to violate the Recommendations Clause of the Constitution, which reserves to the President the power to decide whether it is necessary or expedient for the Executive Branch to make legislative policy recommendations to the Congress. The Administration would be pleased to provide language to remedy the bill's constitutional defects.

S. 500

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 500. This bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to study certain sites in the historic district of Beaufort, South Carolina, relating to the Reconstruction Era of United States history.

The Department supports S. 500, with the amendments described in this testimony. On June 20, 2002, the Department testified in support of S. 2388, a similar bill, with suggested amendments. Several of the amendments were adopted and S. 500 is almost identical to S. 2388 as passed by the Senate in the 107th Congress.

The cost of the studies should be \$350,000 for the theme study and \$250,000 for the special resource study, although the final cost of the special resource study may be less due to some degree of examination that the Beaufort area sites would receive as a part of the larger theme study. National Historic Landmark theme studies are funded from a variety of sources including, in some cases, the special resource study budget, which is about \$1 million in FY 2003. There are 29 studies previously authorized by Congress that are being funded from the special resource study budget, nearly half of which will have at least some funding needs beyond Fiscal Year 2003. We transmitted 6 special resource studies to Congress in Fiscal Year 2002, and we expect to transmit about 15 this fiscal year or early next fiscal year. Our highest priority is to complete pending studies, though we expect to start newly authorized studies as soon as funds are made available.

S. 500 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of historical sites in the historic district of Beaufort, South Carolina, relating to the Reconstruction Era. The study would evaluate the sites' national significance and

the suitability and feasibility of designating them as a unit of the National Park System. The bill specifies that the study be conducted in accordance with P.L. 91-383 (16 U.S.C. 1a-1 et seq.), which contains the criteria for studying areas for potential inclusion in the National Park System, with the study to be completed within three years after funds are made available.

In addition, the Secretary is authorized to conduct a national historic landmark theme study to identify sites and resources in the United States that are significant to the Reconstruction Era. The study will include recommendations for commemorating and interpreting sites and resources that should be nominated as national historic landmarks and sites for which further study for potential inclusion in the National Park System should be authorized. This study is also to be concluded within three years after funds are made available. Although historians generally view the Beaufort sites that would be studied under S. 500 as historically significant, the National Park Service has not determined how significant these sites are in comparison to other sites associated with Reconstruction. The theme study would help provide that information.

The Reconstruction Era is generally considered to be the period between 1863, when the Emancipation Proclamation took effect, and the withdrawal of Federal troops from the South following the Compromise of 1877 that resolved the contested presidential election of 1876. The term "Reconstruction" reflects both the literal rebuilding of the war-ravaged South and the more metaphorical rebuilding of the Union following the divisive and destructive conflict. It was a controversial, difficult, and violent period in American history characterized by the adoption of new constitutional amendments and laws, the establishment of new institutions, and the occurrence of significant political events all surrounding the efforts to reincorporate the South into the Union and to provide newly freed slaves with political rights and opportunities to improve their lives.

The Beaufort, South Carolina area contains a number of sites that are associated with events and individuals significant to the Reconstruction Era. Among these are the Penn School on St. Helena Island, the location of an important educational experiment in that era; the Freedmen's Bureau, located at Beaufort College, where the Federal Government conducted official business regarding emancipated slaves; the Freedman's Village of Mitchellville on Hilton Head Island; and sites associated with Robert Smalls, an African-American who served in the U.S. House of Representatives during the Reconstruction Era.

The Department recommends some clarifying amendments to S. 500. We recommend that the title, Section 1, and the definition for Study Area in Section 2 be changed to reflect that the study would center on sites in Beaufort County, South Carolina, rather than the historic district of Beaufort. As drafted, the bill defines the study area as sites in the historic district of Beaufort, but then it identifies several sites to be studied that are outside of the city of Beaufort.

We also recommend that the special resource study be required to determine the "national significance" of the area as well as its suitability and feasibility for inclusion in the National Park System. This change would be consistent with P.L. 91-383, as amended by the National Park Service Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-391).

The text for these recommended amendments follow.

Proposed Amendments, S. 500

Page 1, Line 4, insert "County" after "Beaufort".

Page 2, Line 3, strike "the historic district of".

Page 2, Line 3, insert "County" after "Beaufort".

Page 2, Line 22, strike "assess the suitability" and insert "assess the national significance, suitability,".

Amend the title to read, "To direct the Secretary of the Interior to study certain sites in Beaufort County, South Carolina, relating to the Reconstruction Era."

S. 601 & H.R. 733

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 601 and H.R. 733, similar bills that would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the McLoughlin House National Historic Site in Oregon City, Oregon, for inclusion in the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site in the state of Washington. H.R. 733 passed the House on April 8, 2003.

The Department supports both S. 601 and H.R. 733, if amended in accordance with this statement. We believe that the McLoughlin House National Historic Site, which is currently an affiliated area of the National Park System, would be an appropriate addition to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, but we think that the

legislation should be clarified with respect to the name change that would need to be made to the McLoughlin House if it is acquired by the National Park Service.

The McLoughlin House is located in Oregon City, Oregon, southeast of Portland, along the dramatic Willamette River Falls. It was the home Dr. John McLoughlin built and lived in from 1847, after his retirement from the Hudson's Bay Company's operations at Fort Vancouver, until his death in 1857.

John McLoughlin is one of Oregon's most revered historical figures. Known as the "Father of Oregon," he played a major role in the transformation of Oregon Country from British-controlled fur-trapping territory to United States-controlled agricultural settlement lands in the early to mid 19th Century. Born in Quebec, McLoughlin moved west, became involved in the fur trade, and came to preside over the vast territory claimed by Hudson's Bay Company and its operations headquartered at Fort Vancouver, in what would become the state of Washington. McLoughlin served as Chief Factor of Fort Vancouver from 1825 until 1845, and under his leadership the fort became the center of political, cultural, and commercial activities in the Pacific Northwest. He was instrumental in maintaining peace between Great Britain, which claimed the territory, and the settlers who came to Oregon Country from the United States, and the Native American tribes in the region.

As the fur trade declined and American settlers began arriving to settle in Oregon Country in large numbers, McLoughlin turned his attention to providing aid and supplies to them. These migrants had reached the end of their arduous journeys along the Oregon Trail, and many were sick, starving and ill-equipped to begin a new life. He aided them despite the Hudson's Bay Company's policy of discouraging agricultural settlement in the region.

When McLoughlin retired from the Hudson's Bay Company in 1845, he bought land he had claimed for the company across the Columbia River, in Oregon City, which was beginning to emerge as a center of industry and commerce. He built an elegant home where he and his wife Marguerite continued to help new settlers in need. Because of McLoughlin's generosity, his house became known as the "house of many beds." After becoming a U.S. citizen in 1851, McLoughlin became Mayor of Oregon City and increased his acts of philanthropy throughout the region.

The McLoughlin House has retained its historic integrity as one of the earliest examples of its architectural style in the Pacific Northwest. It was moved from its original location elsewhere in Oregon City nearly a century ago because of industrial encroachment and now sits on land McLoughlin donated to Oregon City. The McLoughlin House National Historic Site, which also includes the home of Dr. Forbes Barclay, an associate of McLoughlin's, serves as a focal point for education and tourism in the Portland area and is used to teach students about the early European settlement of the Pacific Northwest. The site continues the story that begins at Fort Vancouver of the settling of Oregon Country facilitated by John McLoughlin.

The McLoughlin House was designated a national historic site in 1941 by the Department of the Interior, making it the first such site in the western United States. That same year, the Department entered into a cooperative agreement with the McLoughlin Memorial Association, which had owned and managed the site since 1909, for operation of the home. In 1966, the responsibility for providing assistance to the site was delegated to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The house and grounds maintenance, as well as curatorial assistance, at the McLoughlin House is currently provided by staff at Fort Vancouver.

Although we are unaware of any formal action that designated the McLoughlin House an affiliated area of the National Park System, the National Park Service has considered this site one of its affiliated areas for many years because of the 1941 designation and cooperative agreement. Affiliated areas are significant properties that are neither federally owned nor directly administered by the National Park Service but which receive technical or financial aid from the National Park Service. Some have been designated as affiliated areas by Congress; others, like the McLoughlin House, have been designated national historic sites by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935.

As part of the General Management Plan revision for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, the National Park Service studied the possibility of adding the McLoughlin House National Historic Site to Fort Vancouver and found that because of the strong thematic connection to the fort and the feasibility of managing this unit, it would be an appropriate addition. There is broad support for this action. The proposal to add the McLoughlin House to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site was generated during public scoping meetings on the General Management Plan held in Oregon City. Support is also evident from the comments the National Park Service received earlier this year during the public comment period on the Draft General Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. We expect to finalize the revised General Management Plan by the end of this year.

If S. 601 or H.R. 733 is enacted and funds are made available for acquisition of the McLoughlin House, the National Park Service would acquire the site and the contents of the McLoughlin House and Barclay House. The estimated acquisition cost of the historic site real property is \$445,000. The furnishings and artifacts from the two houses, estimated to be worth more than \$200,000, would be donated to the National Park Service by the McLoughlin Historical Association. Oregon City, which owns the land used for the McLoughlin House site, would donate a permanent easement to the National Park Service in order to provide the Service with the access needed for the management, protection, and public use of the site. A proposal for this donation, incidentally, was approved through a 2001 referendum supported by more than 80 percent of the Oregon City voters. We estimate that operation and maintenance of the site would add \$285,000 to Fort Vancouver's approximately \$1 million annual operation and maintenance costs, an increase of about 28 percent.

The McLoughlin Memorial Association would continue to play an important role at the McLoughlin House site. The Association plans to use most of the proceeds from the sale of the house, not including a small portion needed to pay off debt, to establish an endowment fund to assist in the long-term preservation of the site and development of educational programs throughout the Portland/Vancouver region. The Association also plans to pursue private-sector support for educational programming, site preservation, and other activities to support the site.

While we support the intent of both bills, we recommend amending the legislation to ensure that once the McLoughlin House National Historic Site is added to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, the McLoughlin House no longer has "national historic site" in its title. We are concerned that without a clarification in the language, we would be creating a national historic site within a national historic site. Along with the clarifying language, we would like the legislation to reference a revised map for the McLoughlin House. We would be pleased to work with the committee to amend the bill's language.

S. 630 & H.R. 519

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department's views on S. 630 and H.R. 519. These bills, which are virtually identical, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the San Gabriel River Watershed in Southern California. H.R. 519 passed the House on March 19, 2003.

Special resource studies assess resources in the study area, determine whether they meet the criteria for addition to the National Park System, and offer alternative recommendations for their protection. S. 630 and H.R. 519 would authorize the study of the San Gabriel River Watershed, which runs south from the San Gabriel Mountains through a heavily urbanized part of Los Angeles County. The Department supports studying this area. However, because the study area includes a significant amount of United States Forest Service lands, we believe that the bill should be amended to authorize a joint study with the Department of Agriculture.

At first glance, many may view this river as simply a concrete-lined ditch, however, it provides an important opportunity for low-impact recreation for many urban residents. Several successful efforts have already been undertaken to provide bikeways and hiking areas along the banks of the San Gabriel. Additionally, small tracts of green space have been acquired to provide playgrounds, picnic areas, bicycling and walking trails. Native vegetation has been restored, repairing habitats and beautifying the landscape in many areas.

The study area specified by S. 630 and H.R. 519 includes the San Gabriel River and its tributaries north of and including Santa Fe Springs, and the portion of the San Gabriel Mountains that lies within the jurisdiction of the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy (RMC). The study would assess low-impact recreation and educational uses, access to urban open space, habitat quality, wildlife and habitat restoration and protection, and watershed improvements within that area.

The watershed of the San Gabriel River contains important natural resources, which are disappearing throughout Los Angeles County. Continuous greenbelt corridors provided by the river serve as habitat for breeding, feeding, resting or migrating birds and mammals, which allows migration to take place through developed areas. The rugged terrain of the higher reaches of the watershed contains different habitats including rock outcroppings and vegetation native to the Pacific coast foothills.

This area also has a rich cultural heritage, which is evident by the large number of historically significant properties within the proposed study area. Among them

is the Mission San Gabriel Archangel, founded in 1771 by the Spanish missionaries who were moving up the coast of California.

The San Gabriel River Watershed contains part of the Angeles National Forest and several state, county and local parks. The proposed study would look at opportunities for establishing recreational trails between these natural areas and the communities in the region. The estimated cost of the study is \$375,000. In FY 2003, about \$1 million was provided for special resource studies. There are 29 studies previously authorized by Congress that are being funded from the special resource study budget, nearly half of which will have at least some funding needs beyond FY 2003. We transmitted 6 special resource studies to Congress in FY 2002, and we expect to transmit about 15 this fiscal year or early next fiscal year. Our highest priority is to complete pending studies, though we expect to start newly authorized studies as soon as funds are made available.

Recognizing the limitation of federal resources for acquiring and managing land, the study would have to examine a number of alternatives for protecting resources in the area. Alternatives to federal management of resources that are often considered in a special resource study for this type of area include national trail designations, national heritage area designations, and the provision of technical assistance to state and local governments for conservation of rivers, trails, natural areas, and cultural resources. A study of an area where land ownership and jurisdictional boundaries are as complex as they are in the San Gabriel River Watershed would likely emphasize public-private partnerships.

In conducting the study, the National Park Service would work closely with the RMC, which was established in 1999 as an independent agency within the Resources Agency of the State of California. The RMC has brought diverse groups together to work in partnership to protect the valuable resources within the area under their jurisdiction.

Consideration of the issues and options available for protecting resources in a large, heavily populated area with stakeholders at all levels of government calls for extensive public meetings, comment periods, and analysis. On April 8, 2003, the Senate passed S. 347, which would authorize a study of the Rim of the Valley Corridor, also in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. That proposed study and the proposed San Gabriel River Watershed study, both of which would affect large, diverse constituencies, would be similar studies conducted in relative close proximity. If both bills are enacted in a close timeframe, the National Park Service would want to coordinate the two studies to achieve efficiencies in costs and staff resources, and to minimize public confusion.

S. 612 & H.R. 788

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 612 and H.R. 788. These bills would revise the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona.

The Department supports S. 612 and the companion House legislation H.R. 788. The legislation would amend Public Law 92-593 and give the Secretary of the Interior the authority, through an exchange, to change the boundary of Glen Canyon National Recreation Area ("Park") by adding approximately 152 acres and deleting 370 acres in Kane County, Utah. The current owner of the private property to be exchanged, Page One, LLC. ("Page One"), initiated this proposal and although the National Park Service ("Service") has not yet appraised the parcels involved, the owner's appraisal indicates that the Service will receive lands with a higher value than those the Service would exchange, which should remove the need for any land acquisition funds.

The bills would also revise the authorized acreage of the park from 1,236,880 acres to 1,256,000 acres. This change would correct the total acreage within the park boundary that was incorrectly identified in the park's enabling legislation. Correction of the authorized acreage ceiling would not add any new facilities, increase operating costs, or require additional staffing.

Since House passage of the H.R. 788 last March, we have learned through additional surveys, conducted by Page One, that the Page One exchange parcel identified as the Shoppman Land Exchange Parcel on the map entitled 'Page One Land Exchange Proposal' number 608/60573a-2002 dated May 16, 2002 is closer to 122 acres than 152 acres. The acres that the Service would acquire are located east of Highway 89, approximately 5 miles south of Big Water, Utah and are contiguous to the existing park boundary. Both the Page One and Park exchange parcels are accurately reflected on the map. The lands that the Service would be authorized to exchange are located west of Highway 89 and are adjacent to privately owned lands.

Although within the boundary of the recreation area, the 370 acres are physically and visually isolated from the rest of the recreation area by topographic features.

Page One, the owner of the private land has had an appraisal completed on the lands that are proposed for exchange. If this legislation is enacted, the Service would conduct its own appraisal on the two parcels. However, the owner's appraisal determined that their parcel (\$5,500 per acre for a total appraised value of \$671,000), which the Service would receive, was worth approximately two and one half times more than the appraised value of the land within the NRA Land Exchange Parcel identified on the map (\$750 per acre for a total appraised value of \$277,500).

S. 612 and H.R. 788 would also correct the acreage ceiling error stated in Public Law 92-593, the 1972 enabling legislation for Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. Public Law 92-593 incorrectly estimated Glen Canyon National Recreation Area's acreage within the boundary to be 1,236,880 acres. Using the same boundary identified on the map referenced in the 1972 enabling legislation, application of modern map reading and geographic information system technologies have determined that 1,256,000 acres more accurately reflects the amount of land within the 1972 boundary.

S. 612 and H.R. 788 enjoy a broad cross section of support. The nearest communities to the lands proposed for exchange, Big Water, Utah and Page, Arizona, recognize the importance of protecting the National Recreation Area. Also, this exchange would provide an opportunity for private development at one of the main access points to lands held by the Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration ("SITLA"). Such private development could enhance the 40,000 acres held by SITLA and is supported by the State of Utah and Kane County, Utah.

As the House has passed H.R. 788 and the legislation is identical to S. 612 we would recommend passage of H.R. 788, in order to move this legislation expediently.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. I would be pleased to answer any questions you or other members of the subcommittee may have.

Senator THOMAS. All right. Well, thank you. You are very supportive today. That is good.

Just a couple of questions on some of them here, like the Cold War study. Do you have any idea of how many sites? It seems like that is an awfully broad subject.

Ms. MASICA. We do not have a good idea on the number of sites specifically. One of the things that the study would do would establish sort of the registration requirements to help the researchers identify which sites tell them significant stories associated with the Cold War, and how many sites would potentially be eligible for a national historic landmark is one of the things that the study would enable us to do.

Senator THOMAS. I see. Have you had an opportunity to comment, receive comments, or ask for comments from Department of Defense or other agencies that would be involved?

Ms. MASICA. That is done within the administration in the process of the clearing of the testimony and so the Department of Defense did see the testimony and raised no objections to our position.

Senator THOMAS. I see. In broad terms—and I understand they have to be broad—as we expand the role of the Park Service in historic landmarks or historic sites or historic places and so on, have we been able to come up with some sort of a criteria, some sort of a standard? Is there any limit to how many of these things could be the responsibility of the Park Service? Is there any concern about that, and how do we know what might be eligible for that kind of a listing?

Ms. MASICA. Certainly I think the requirement that Congress enacted a couple of years ago now on special resource studies for potential units to be included in the system, the requirement that the study has to be authorized before we can proceed with the study,

I think is an important threshold that requires us to then look at the three major criteria that we look at in that study process are national significance, the suitability of the resources that are there for inclusion, and then the feasibility for inclusion as a unit of the system.

So that has certainly contributed to a pretty consistent scrutiny of proposed units to the Park System.

Senator THOMAS. Well, those are very broad descriptions, though. Suitability, what is the criteria for suitability? And I understand it is difficult, but frankly I am concerned that we need to define those things that have national significance in some manner, as opposed to rather localized things that perhaps ought to be done on a different level.

I guess I do not expect you to know the answer, but I think we ought to give a little more thought to that, especially when we grapple every day with, well, from the Park Service we do not have enough resources to keep up the things that we have. Yet I do not know of any studies that have not been supportive, do you? Any studies that have said no, this does not qualify.

Ms. MASICA. Actually, I think the information I have in front of me says that during the past 2 years we have transmitted 12 studies to Congress and only 4 of those 12 made a positive finding about eligibility for some type of national designation. So it is not definitely a "make it a unit of the system" every time we study.

Senator THOMAS. I would like—would you give us a little more information on those numbers, just what they were and so on?

Ms. MASICA. Sure. Can we provide that for the record, Mr. Chairman?

Senator THOMAS. Fine, thank you.

I have got some more questions, but, Senator Smith, do you have any?

Senator SMITH. No, thank you.

Senator THOMAS. This Beaufort study, South Carolina, this is S. 500. What is the Park Service role in the historic district currently?

Ms. MASICA. Right now we do not have any sort of a management role or operational role in that historic district. There are some properties that are in that district that are on the National Register, so with our authorities for managing the National Register program we might monitor them, but it is not an ongoing operational kind of role.

The other activity that is under way in that area is that we were authorized and are conducting a special resource study of the low country Gullah culture, and some of that is in that Beaufort area. But again, that is not an operational or a management role.

Senator THOMAS. So this, the current role then, is simply basically to have listed these areas as sites?

Ms. MASICA. Correct.

Senator THOMAS. But no responsibility for financing them or managing them?

Ms. MASICA. That is correct.

Senator THOMAS. Do you anticipate that further sites would be handled in the same way? What do you anticipate to be the end product here?

Ms. MASICA. Again, I think that is part of what the study would enable us to investigate further, as to what the order of magnitude would be. I think the legislation, I think it is six or seven specific sites that we are supposed to look at for the special resource study. But the theme study is a much broader, encompassing.

Senator THOMAS. What would the cost be for this study, do you know?

Ms. MASICA. The estimate for the special resource study is about \$250,000 and the estimate for the theme study is \$350,000.

Senator THOMAS. When do you think that would take place?

Ms. MASICA. The fiscal 2004 budget request for our study activity is \$500,000 in total nationwide, and we have others that we have not started yet that have been authorized.

Senator THOMAS. So if you were limited to the studies that would come under the \$500,000, you would have probably less than two studies?

Ms. MASICA. I do not have the specifics right in front of me, but the total cost estimates for the number of studies that we have outstanding exceed the money that we will devote to studies in fiscal 2004.

Senator THOMAS. Do you know what that is, your estimate?

Ms. MASICA. I do not know if I have a specific. Estimates to complete currently authorized studies are about \$910,000, so that is before any new ones are authorized.

Senator THOMAS. And there are several right here.

Ms. MASICA. That is right.

Senator THOMAS. What is the role of the Park Service in the McLoughlin House National Historic Site now?

Ms. MASICA. Presently it is a designated national historic site and it is managed as an affiliated area. So our role is some maintenance and curatorial assistance.

Senator THOMAS. Is there some management advantage to having the management of the house be done by the Fort Vancouver Historic Site group or is that the potential?

Ms. MASICA. That is I think the potential and what the proposal is. My recollection is that last year it was proposed that this would be—McLoughlin House would be a totally separate unit of the Park System, and we said from an operational efficiency and a management perspective it would be far smarter to combine it with Fort Vancouver on the other side of the river, and that is what the legislation proposes to do.

Senator THOMAS. So this is sort of an efficiency move?

Ms. MASICA. Yes, sir.

Senator THOMAS. In terms of management.

Ms. MASICA. Yes, sir.

Senator THOMAS. Okay. Glen Canyon; is there any opposition to this exchange? It seems like it is a benefit pretty much around.

Ms. MASICA. That is my understanding also. I am not aware of any opposition.

Senator THOMAS. How did they miss the acreage in the unit by 50,000 acres?

Ms. MASICA. Some people have said the Park Service does not know how to count and that might be yet another example of it. I do not know.

My understanding is it has to do with the topography and the filling of the lake, and beyond that I will exhaust my technical capacity to answer that question.

Senator THOMAS. So that addition is simply an adjustment of a number that is inaccurate?

Ms. MASICA. Right, it is not adding any acreage. It is fixing the number from what was legislated in the early 1970's.

Senator THOMAS. Okay. Then the San Gabriel Watershed study. Is this sort of a different kind of a study for you to undertake? It seems like normally you sort of study something that is a little bit defined before you begin. Here it appears to be a rather broad concept.

Ms. MASICA. It certainly is an area that has multiple resources, but that is not unique for what we sometimes are asked to do. I think the Rim of the Valley one, which you have seen not that long ago this year, is in a similar situation. I think the important thing from our perspective is that one of the important values from special resource studies can be to help local communities identify what the resources are and what alternatives exist for protecting them and saving the resources and managing them in a way that fits the needs of the local community, and not just automatically assuming that the National Park Service is the answer to everything.

Senator THOMAS. You had I believe an estimate on one of your other studies. Do you have a cost estimate on this one?

Ms. MASICA. This one, the estimate I have been given is \$375,000.

Senator THOMAS. Did I misunderstand? This is a longer study? Or one of them was. Wasn't it a 3-year study or something?

Ms. MASICA. Three years tends to be what most of them are, about what they take by the time we do the deploying the resources on the ground and getting the study under way and then allowing for all the appropriate consultation and communication with folks.

Senator THOMAS. And you have contacted the Department of Agriculture with regard to the Forest Service aspect of it?

Ms. MASICA. That is my understanding is part of the testimony clearance process, that that was the recommendation that was made, that they be involved also. I personally have not talked to them, but that is my understanding.

Senator THOMAS. And apparently the Corps of Engineers is involved as well?

Ms. MASICA. They would not be a co-lead on the study, but they would certainly be one of the affected parties that we would make sure we touch base with.

Senator THOMAS. Well, these probably are not the most controversial set of proposals that we have ever faced, but there is certainly merit in them. I appreciate that very much.

Senator Smith, anything you would like to add?

[No response.]

Senator THOMAS. Well, thank you very much. I think we have broken a record here this morning, I think, on time. But that is probably good. Thank you so much and we will look forward to working with you.

Ms. MASICA. Thank you, Senator.

Senator THOMAS. The hearing is adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

STATEMENT OF HON. CHRIS CANNON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM UTAH

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for considering S. 612 and its House companion, H.R. 788. I am grateful for the opportunity to come before the subcommittee today to express my strong support for this bill.

Before I commence with my testimony, I want to take a quick moment to thank Senator Bennett for his leadership and hard work on this issue. As I'm sure the Members of this panel are aware, it would be hard to find a Senator more highly esteemed than Senator Bennett. The Senator's vast knowledge, deliberative demeanor, and quick wit are greatly appreciated by each Member of the Utah delegation. I want to publicly thank Senator Bennett for his dedication and tireless efforts on behalf of the State of Utah and for helping to move this legislation forward.

S. 612 has two purposes. First, it revises the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area by exchanging 152 acres of land owned by Page One LLC for approximately 370 acres of land within the National Recreation Area. This exchange will enable both entities to consolidate their properties and will make it possible for the Park Service to protect the scenic viewshed of Lake Powell from Highway 89.

The second purpose of the bill is to increase the acreage ceiling for the National Recreation Area. The park's enabling legislation incorrectly identified the total acreage within the park boundary. This bill will correct that error.

S. 612 is the result of years of discussion and negotiation between Page One and the National Park Service. The Park Service has been involved from day one. The local communities have also voiced their support for this bill. In addition, the Kane County Planning and Zoning Commission, the Southern Utah Planning Advisory Council and the National Parks Conservation Association all endorse this land exchange.

It is in the common interest of the Glen Canyon community, the landowners, the National Park Service and the general public to preserve the view between Lake Powell and U.S. Highway 89 along this entrance corridor.

I want to thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to testify in favor of this bill today. With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

STATEMENT OF HON. DARLENE HOOLEY, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM OREGON

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer my support for the McLoughlin House Preservation Act, S. 601 or H.R. 733, which I introduced in the House. This historic house stands today as a reminder of the great contribution Dr. John McLoughlin made to the settlement of the Oregon Country.

At six feet four inches, Dr. John McLoughlin cast a giant of a shadow on the early development of the Oregon frontier. For twenty-one years his powerful voice was the only influence of law and order over an empire two and a half times the size of Texas. He had absolute control, and he maintained it peacefully and profitably with a balanced sense of justice.

With an overwhelming sense of compassion and generosity beyond reproach, it is little wonder that Native Americans regarded him as, "The Great White Eagle." John McLoughlin did indeed, walk taller and cast the greatest shadow that ever fell so humbly on the changing face of Oregon.

Born in 1784 near Quebec, Canada, McLoughlin began his medical apprenticeship at age 14. In 1803, by the age of 19, he was granted his license to practice surgery and pharmacy. Soon after, Dr. McLoughlin was appointed medical officer for the North West Company, fierce competitor of the Hudson's Bay Company in the fur

trade. He continued there until 1821, until its acquisition by Hudson's, for whom he continued working.

In 1824, Dr. McLoughlin was sent to Fort George, now Astoria, Oregon, near the mouth of the Columbia River. Charged with establishing an administrative headquarters and supply depot for the expanding fur trading company, he also was tasked with creating a mercantile arm of the British government, with the goal of monopolizing the fur trade and maintaining peace among the numerous Indian tribes.

Upon arrival, he found the existing facility to be run down, the farmland to be poor, and a location that was, in general, unsuitable for his responsibilities. To remedy these deficiencies, he moved the site northwest, and build a new settlement at Belle Vue Point, in what is now Washington State, and named it Fort Vancouver.

The new fort was an imposing presence, at 750 feet by 450 feet and a 20-foot stockade. It contained all of the necessities for the settlement, with a school, library, pharmacy, chapel warehouses, smithy, and the largest manufacturing facility west of the Rockies. To the rear of the fort were fields of grain, vegetables, and an orchard for fresh fruits.

Dr. McLoughlin maintained friendly relations with the local Indians, and, in 1829, when a visiting ship brought a terrible fever that spread like wildfire, he spent countless hours tending to the ill, trying to ease their suffering as much as he could. Despite his best efforts, the fever devastated the tribes, and killed more than 30,000 over the next 4 years.

Meanwhile, though, Fort Vancouver flourished under the guidance of Dr. McLoughlin. Even though he had no military forces, he was able to maintain peace and order through his personality and hard work. His good relations with the local Indians kept the peace on that front, and it was not until his departure that any unrest developed from that quarter. As a reward for his enlightened stewardship, Queen Victoria knighted him at Buckingham Palace in 1841.

During the 1840s, the British came to the realization that preventing American settlers from homesteading in Oregon was all but impossible, but they tried their best to discourage settlers from beginning the trip. Tall tales of fierce Indians, unproductive land, and terrible weather conditions were spread far and wide.

Though it violated Hudson's Bay Company policy, McLoughlin sympathized with the overwhelmed and often unprepared settlers. He extended credit so that they could purchase supplies, clothing and seed for planting; offered food to those who were hungry; and cared for those who took ill. This personal decision by Dr. McLoughlin, and the compassion that he showed to these settlers, proved critical to establishing American settlers and solidified U.S. claims to the territory.

By 1845, Dr. McLoughlin's disgust for Hudson's policy towards American settlers was so great that he was unable to stay with the company. After his resignation, he purchased the company's land claim at Willamette Falls in Oregon City, and built an elegant white clapboard home for his family (The McLoughlin House), and took up residence there in 1846.

McLoughlin remained a public figure during his retirement, and became a U.S. citizen in 1849. He donated land for a jail and female seminary, and in 1851 he was elected mayor of Oregon City. He died in his home only six short years later.

In 1941, the McLoughlin House was designated a National Historic Site, the first one in the west, and in 1957, Dr. John McLoughlin was named "Father of Oregon" by the Oregon State Legislature.

Clearly, Fort Vancouver and the McLoughlin House have a long and storied history together. The intent of my legislation is to see that history continued by expanding the boundaries of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site to include the McLoughlin House National Historic Site.

Currently, the McLoughlin House National Historic Site is maintained and managed by the non-profit McLoughlin Memorial Association. When this historic residence faced demolition in 1909, the Memorial Association was formed and money was raised to move the house to a public park atop the bluff, where it opened as a museum one year later.

For nearly 100 years, the association has done admirable work to preserve and maintain this historic treasure that thousands of people visit annually. However, over the past several years, the association has been unable to raise the funds required to provide the needed maintenance and upkeep of the property that is now in jeopardy of falling into disrepair.

The McLoughlin House National Historic Act would do what should have been done 60 years ago: include these properties as part of the National Park System (NPS). Rather than creating a new unit of the NPS, this legislation simply adds this historic treasure to the existing Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, which is already administered as part of the National Park System. I believe this addition will

preserve in perpetuity the cultural, educational, and historical benefits of this historic site for future generations.

I am proud of the wide-ranging support that this legislation has garnered: numerous city and county officials, the McLoughlin Memorial Association, and the entire Oregon Congressional delegation. The importance of this historic house to the community was demonstrated when the citizens of Oregon City approved, by more than 80 per cent, a ballot measure that grants the National Park Service an interest in the city property on which the McLoughlin House now sits to allow the NPS to administer the house.

In closing, I would again like to thank everyone who has contributed to making this legislation possible, and I feel certain that this legislation will move swiftly through both Houses of Congress and to President Bush's desk. I look forward to the day when he signs this bill and the house of Oregon's Founding Father is preserved for our children and beyond.

STATEMENT ON S. 500, RECONSTRUCTION HISTORY PARTNERSHIP

The Reconstruction History Partnership in South Carolina writes to support passage of S. 500, legislation that directs the Secretary of the Interior to study certain sites in the area of Beaufort, South Carolina, relating to the Reconstruction Era to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a unit of the National Park System.

In January 2001, the Reconstruction History Partnership, composed of the Penn Center, University of South Carolina Beaufort, City of Beaufort, Town of Hilton Head Island, and Beaufort County, officially adopted a "Mission Statement" affirming the partnership's intent to provide a cooperative framework to assist its citizens, institutions, and visitors in retaining, enhancing and interpreting the significant history and places of the Reconstruction era. The eminent Reconstruction scholar Eric Foner has encouraged us and has stated on a number of occasions that the best place in the United States to interpret the Reconstruction era is in the Beaufort area.

The Reconstruction History Partnership has met regularly for over two and a half years and has received a grant from the South Carolina State Humanities Council to assist in developing an inventory of historic resources, to develop educational materials, and to hold a series of public forums. The Partnership has worked to gain the support of the board community and has received letters of support from: County Council of Beaufort County, City of Beaufort, Town of Hilton Head Island, University of South Carolina Beaufort, Penn Center, Institute for Southern Studies of the University of South Carolina, Historic Beaufort Foundation, Chamber of Commerce of Hilton Head Island, Coastal Discovery Museum on Hilton Head Island, Greater Beaufort Chamber of Commerce, Greater Beaufort-Hilton Head Economic Development Partnership, Inc., Lowcountry and Resort Islands Tourism Commission, Main Street Beaufort, USA, South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism. There is a broad consensus locally and nationally that Beaufort County retains significant historical and archeological sites associated with Reconstruction. These include: the Penn School for former slaves founded in 1862 and located on St. Helena Island; the Old Fort Plantation, on the Beaufort River on the grounds of the United States Naval Hospital, where the first African-Americans assembled on January 1, 1863 to hear the reading of Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation which set them free; the Freedmen's Bureau housed in the recently restored Beaufort College; the first Freedmen's Village of Mitchelville on Hilton Head Island; and many noteworthy historic buildings and archeological sites associated with the Civil War hero and Reconstruction leader, Robert Smalls.

There are certainly other places in the United States where events central to Reconstruction took place. However, there is no other place in the United States that offers the potential for interpreting so many varied components of the Reconstruction experience. The Reconstruction History Partnership has identified four themes that can ably be developed with the historic resources in the Beaufort area. These reconstruction themes are: the beginning of reconstruction in America; the political revolution and accompanying conflict; the social, economic, and demographic transformation; and education for all. Since the National Park Service has no current unit that is specifically focused on interpreting all of the varied facets of this important period that shaped modern American, we are most hopeful that S. 500 will receive your support.

STATEMENT OF ERIC FONER, DEWITT CLINTON PROFESSOR OF HISTORY,
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

I write to support S. 500, the Beaufort, South Carolina Study Act, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a special resource study on the feasibility and suitability of establishing a new unit of the National Park Service in the Beaufort, South Carolina area to interpret the Reconstruction Era. I have spent much of my scholarly career researching and writing about Reconstruction.

My book, "Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution" (1988), was awarded the Bancroft Prize, Los Angeles Times Book Prize, and several other awards. I am convinced that the best location for telling the story of this pivotal era in American history is the area of Beaufort, South Carolina.

Reconstruction, the era that followed the American Civil War, is one of the least understood periods in American history. An accurate understanding of Reconstruction, based on the best recent scholarship, is essential to America's understanding of the history of race relations in the United States as well as of the enduring impact of the Civil War. Reconstruction was the period when for the first time, the principle of equality before the law for all citizens, regardless of race, was written into our law and Constitution.

It was the first time that African Americans in significant numbers were allowed to participate in American democracy. The period also laid the foundation for the modern black community, with schools, churches, and families no longer subject to disruption as under slavery. For white Americans, too, it was a time of dramatic change. The Beaufort area is the most appropriate site for a Reconstruction unit. Because it saw little fighting during the Civil War, many buildings of historical importance remain intact.

The area contains the homes of several prominent Reconstruction-era leaders, plantations where the transition from slave to free labor took place, and the Penn School, established by northern aid societies to teach and assist the former slaves. The Beaufort area was the home before the war of one of the most prominent parts of the planter class. It witnessed some of the pivotal events of the Reconstruction period—the early arming of black soldiers; an experiment in emancipation during the Civil War; the election of one of the era's black Congressmen (Robert Smalls). All Americans would benefit from the establishment of a National Park unit that would preserve historic sites in this important place, and make available an up-to-date understanding of the role of Reconstruction in American history.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, ORGANIZATION
OF AMERICAN HISTORIANS, AND THE NATIONAL COALITION FOR HISTORY

The Organization of American Historians, the American Historical Association, and the National Coalition for History join today in urging passage of S. 500, the Beaufort, South Carolina Study Bill of 2003, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a special resource study on the feasibility and suitability of establishing a new unit of the National Park Service in the Beaufort, South Carolina area to interpret the Reconstruction Era. This period marks one of the most significant turning points in American history for it was the time when the country made adjustments for the transition from slavery to freedom of a large percentage of the American population.

The National Park Service has approximately thirty sites that interpret the Civil War; however, there are none in the National Park System that are devoted primarily to Reconstruction. The Andrew Johnson National Historical Site in Greeneville, Tennessee tells part of the political story and the Nicodemus, Kansas National Historical Site focuses on the establishment of a freedmen's town. However, there are no units of the National Park Service that try to deal with all of the political, social, cultural, and economic aspects of the Reconstruction Era.

We strongly support the area of Beaufort, South Carolina for interpreting the Reconstruction Era because that is where the initial experiment with Reconstruction occurred, as the Union troops began occupation of this area at the end of 1861. In 1862, several humanitarian and missionary organizations began to send teachers from the North to Beaufort and the Sea Islands to undertake a massive education program. At the same time, the federal government initiated programs in the Beaufort area to assist in preparing the ex-slaves for inclusion as free citizens in American public life. These combined efforts have been called the Port Royal Experiment.

Beaufort County retains significant historical and archeological sites associated with Reconstruction. Two National Historic Landmark Districts are in this area the campus of the Penn School for former slaves founded in 1862 and located on St. Helena Island, and the historic portion of the town of Beaufort where many of Recon-

struction policies evolved and were implemented, including the recently restored Beaufort College where the Freedmen's Bureau was housed. Additionally there is a very significant National Register of Historic Places Camp Saxton Site at the Old Fort Plantation on the Beaufort River. This is where the first African-Americans in the country assembled on January 1, 1863 to hear the reading of Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation which set them free. An estimated 5,000 people gathered for the three-hour ceremony and full day celebration. Colonel Thomas Wentworth Higginson of the newly-organized infantry of African American soldiers wrote in his diary of the January 1 events "So ended one of the most enthusiastic and happy gatherings I ever knew." Other historic resources of note are the first Freedmen's village of Mitchelville on Hilton Head Island. There are also many buildings associated with the African American Reconstruction leader, Robert Smalls, who represented the Beaufort area in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The program that emerged out of the Beaufort experience surfaced elsewhere as America's Reconstruction policies developed and evolved. But Beaufort (location of the Port Royal experiment) was unique because it was the first and most highly publicized of these "rehearsals for Reconstruction." It was also unique because it took place in a much more compact setting than occupied Louisiana or the Mississippi Valley, and because it was a unique grassroots effort by former-slaves and their northern allies to develop a vision of American freedom. While northern schoolteachers, missionaries, and philanthropic entrepreneurs streamed into Beaufort, military officials were the dominant decision-makers in occupied Louisiana and the Mississippi Valley and implemented more centrally designed policies, which were constrained by larger resisting populations. As a result, these other locations established important precedents for postwar labor relations and political alignments, but they did not match the range of ideas that kept Beaufort at the forefront of national attention. For example, the Beaufort area's educational initiatives and the programs of job training and land distribution make it a compelling part of the Reconstruction story.

For many years our professional historical organizations have worked closely with the National Park Service in providing input and advice on the planning and management of historic sites including many potential new national park areas. Since the National Park Service has no unit that focuses primarily on interpreting the Reconstruction Era, we believe that S. 500 addresses a glaring gap in the National Park System and merits your support.

STATEMENT OF BERNT W. KUHLMANN, PRESIDENT OF PAGE ONE, LLC,
A UTAH LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to provide this written statement presenting the views of Page One LLC ("Page One") on S. 612 and H.R. 788.

Page One is the developer of the Page One Project ("Project") which it anticipates will be located on approximately 1,800 acres of land in Kane County, Utah situated to the southwest of U.S. Highway 89. It currently has under ownership or option the portions of Sections 6, 31 and 32 which it anticipates will be included in the Project.

Page One is also desirous of including a portion of Section 5 in the Project (the "GCNRA Parcel") which is currently included within the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area (the "Area"). In order to obtain the GCNRA Parcel, Page One is willing to exchange it (the "Exchange") for the portion of Section 32 which it owns situated to the northeast of U.S. Highway 89 (the "Page One Parcel").

S. 612 and H.R. 788 authorize the Exchange. The approximate locations of the GCNRA Parcel and the Page One Parcel are identified on the map entitled "Page One Land Exchange Proposal" number 608/60573a-2002 dated May 16, 2002.

Independent appraisals obtained by Page One conclude the value of the Page One Parcel is in excess of two and one-half times the value of the GCNRA Parcel. Page One is willing to forfeit the excess appraised value as a donation to the National Park Service ("Service").

The Project is owned by the developers of Dunton Hot Springs, a boutique-style, luxury resort near Telluride, Co (www.duntonhotsprings.com). The Project is a master planned, low density resort and residential development. The resort will be managed by an acclaimed luxury hotel operator who has established a track record with the creation of unique, life-style hotels located in Asia, Africa, Europe, North America and Mexico.

The Project, which is located in a somewhat economically disadvantaged area, will add value and provide commerce through job creation and the attraction of addi-

tional development. It is endorsed by the Kane County Planning and Zoning; Commission and the Southern Utah Planning; Advisory Council.

The Exchange is in the common interest of the Service, the entire Glen Canyon community, and the general public. The Page One Parcel being added to the Area represents a scenic view corridor between Lake Powell and U.S. Highway 89 which will result in a more manageable boundary for the Service at its most visited entrance. In addition, the Page One Parcel contains three established highway access rights of way.

While important to the development of the Project, the GCNRA parcel as presently configured consists of topographically isolated land with no vehicular access, no right-of-way, no water rights, and no site improvements,

As the House has passed H.R. 788 and the legislation is identical to S. 612 we would recommend passage of H.R. 788 in order to move this legislation expeditiously.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks, and I request they be submitted for the record. I will be pleased to make myself available to answer the Committee's questions should the need arise.

○