

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

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

ON

S. 59	S. 155
S. 156	S. 219
S. 225	S. 228
S. 285	S. 305
S. 349	S. 371
S. 476	S. 486
S. 507	S. 615

APRIL 23, 2013



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

81-301 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2013

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

RON WYDEN, Oregon, *Chairman*

TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota	LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont	MIKE LEE, Utah
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan	DEAN HELLER, Nevada
MARK UDALL, Colorado	JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
AL FRANKEN, Minnesota	TIM SCOTT, South Carolina
JOE MANCHIN, III, West Virginia	LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware	ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
BRIAN SCHATZ, Hawaii	JOHN HOEVEN, North Dakota
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico	

JOSHUA SHEINKMAN, *Staff Director*

SAM E. FOWLER, *Chief Counsel*

KAREN K. BILLUPS, *Republican Staff Director*

PATRICK J. MCCORMICK III, *Republican Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

MARK UDALL, Colorado, *Chairman*

MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan	MIKE LEE, Utah
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware	LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
BRIAN SCHATZ, Hawaii	JOHN HOEVEN, North Dakota
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico	

RON WYDEN and LISA MURKOWSKI are Ex Officio Members of the Subcommittee

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Boxer, Hon. Barbara, U.S. Senator From California	3
Heinrich, Hon. Martin, U.S. Senator From New Mexico	2
Kolb, Ingrid, Director, Office of Management, Department of Energy	26
Manchin, III, Hon. Joe, U.S. Senator From West Virginia	3
O'Dell, Peggy, Deputy Director for Operations, National Park Service, Department of the Interior	5
Portman, Hon. Rob, U.S. Senator From Ohio	32
Udall, Hon. Mark, U.S. Senator From Colorado	1

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to additional questions	35
---	----

APPENDIX II

Additional material submitted for the record	41++++
--	--------

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

TUESDAY, APRIL 23, 2013

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:33 p.m. in room SD-366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Mark Udall presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. MARK UDALL, U.S. SENATOR FROM COLORADO

Senator UDALL. The Subcommittee on National Parks will come to order.

I have a short statement. I'll then turn to my colleagues who are here for any opening statements they might have. We're graced with the presence of Senator Boxer, and we look forward to hearing her remarks.

This afternoon the subcommittee on National Parks is holding a hearing to consider 14 bills. All but 1 of these bills were considered by the subcommittee in the last Congress. Because we already have a legislative record for these bills the format for today's hearing is a little more compact than usual as we only have witnesses representing the administration, who will testify today.

Our goal is to update the hearing record and allow committee members an opportunity to ask any questions they may have. Because of the large number of bills on today's agenda, I won't read through the list. But at this time I'll include a complete list of bills in the hearing record.

Senator UDALL. Before we begin, well, let me—I'm going to set that aside. These are my comments about Senator Portman, who is the new ranking member.

But I did want to say that our subcommittee historically has one of the busier legislative workloads. The key to working through the large number of bills is having a strong, bipartisan, working relationship. I worked with Senator Portman recently on his bill to establish a Peace Corps memorial in Washington, which the committee reported last month. I look forward to working with him on the many bills to come before the subcommittee during this Congress.

If I could take a minute of personal privilege, Senator Boxer, my mother enlisted in the Peace Corps at the age of 56. She went to Nepal. She served for 4 years. She worked on microloan projects for women.

Senator BOXER. Fabulous. Fabulous.

Senator UDALL. It involved a 2-hour walk to a distant village. She's, to this day, a heroine of mine for that public service spirit.

At this point let me turn to my colleagues if they have opening statements.

Senator Manchin or Senator Heinrich.

[The prepared statement of Senator Alexander follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. LAMAR ALEXANDER, U.S. SENATOR FROM
TENNESSEE, ON S. 507

The Manhattan Project is one of the most significant events in American history. Today it is impossible to imagine that in September 1942, in a valley in East Tennessee, 3,000 farmers and their families were told to leave their homes to make way for a "secret city" that would bring 100,000 men and women together to help end World War II and forever change the course of human history. The story of the Manhattan Project is not only about World War II, it is about the people who lived and worked at these sites, the scientific achievements they made, and the impact of their work on our Nation's history. I have long supported establishing a national historic park to protect the Manhattan Project sites because of the project's important role in our history, but also because of its importance to the history and people of Tennessee. Oak Ridge, which was not listed on a map until 1949, became the home for 100,000 scientists, engineers, machinists, operators and construction workers. Very few of the scientists knew what they were working on, and even fewer knew anything about uranium.

Many have asked how a valley in East Tennessee became the first Manhattan Project site. As Ray Smith, Y-12's Historian, would tell it, President Roosevelt needed to convince Congress to spend a large amount of money without knowing what it was going to be used for. President Roosevelt asked Senator Douglas McKellar, a Democrat from Tennessee, if this could be done. Senator McKellar is said to have replied, "Yes, Mr. President, I can do that for you . . . now just where in Tennessee are you going to put that thang?"

This is one of thousands of stories that tell a small part of a full story that communicates the importance of this event in American history. As Americans we have a special obligation to preserve and protect our heritage, and the Manhattan Project National Historical Park will ensure that all Americans learn about the significance of the Manhattan Project and how it continues to shape our history.

In 2004, I joined Senator Bingaman as a cosponsor of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park Study Act, which directed the Department of Interior to conduct a study of the Manhattan Project sites to determine the feasibility of including the sites in the National Park System.

In 2011, following public meetings, extensive assessments of potential park boundaries and assessments of the integrity of the historical resources, the Department of the Interior found that the park was feasible, that it met the suitability requirements for establishing a new national park and that the park should be established.

As part of the park's establishment the study recommended the creation of a Manhattan Project National Historical Park with units at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington. According to Secretary Salazar, Secretary of the Interior, "the Manhattan Project ushered in the atomic age, changed the role of the United States in the world community, and set the stage for the Cold War."

Support for the Manhattan Project National Historical Park Act is bipartisan, bicameral, and has the strong support of the Energy Communities Alliance and the National Parks Conservation Association.

I thank the committee for holding this hearing today and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as it moves forward. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN HEINRICH, U.S. SENATOR
FROM NEW MEXICO**

Senator HEINRICH. I just want to say, I want to recognize the work that Senator Bingaman did on the 2 bills relating to New Mexico today, Valles Caldera National Preserve and then obviously the Manhattan Projects relationship to Los Alamos. We wouldn't be

this far along if it weren't for all the good work that he put in on these two pieces of legislation.

Senator UDALL. Senator Manchin.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOE MANCHIN, U.S. SENATOR
FROM WEST VIRGINIA**

Senator MANCHIN. I would just like to thank you for the courtesy allowing me since I'm a co-sponsor of S. 486 with Senator Burr and Senator Hagan, I appreciate very much you allowing me to be here and also to be able to say a few words on behalf of S. 486.

Senator UDALL. We're glad to have you here, Senator Manchin. You're a member of the full committee. It's only the right thing to do to include you in today's hearing. So thank you for being here.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, Chairman.

Senator UDALL. Let me turn to the Chairwoman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, my good friend, Senator Boxer, for her remarks.

Senator Boxer, the floor is yours.

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

Senator BOXER. Thank you. Thank you for referencing your mom in that amazing story. She's, well I could just say, you certainly inherited that feeling of public spirit from so many people in your family. Enough said on that.

To say, Senator Heinrich, it's so nice to hear you mention Jeff because, you know, it's true that we're a government of laws, not men, or people, as I like to say. But people make a difference. That one over there just made a difference the other day. So it's important to remember that we stand on the shoulders of a lot of people, whether they're family or other colleagues.

I don't have a long statement. You'll be happy about that. You'll also be happy to know that S. 59, the Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial Act will not cost the Federal Government one slim dime. So that's good.

You'll be happy to know that it passed the House twice. So I'm here to kind of tug at your lapels a little bit and say, Mr. Chairman, this is kind of a no-brainer. We've got to get it done.

Let me tell you about this bill which I've introduced with Senators Feinstein and Nelson.

The purpose is very simple. It would designate the Distinguished Flying Cross Memorial at March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California. We'd make it a national memorial, not a national park, not a park, a national memorial to recognize members of our Armed Forces, who have distinguished themselves by heroism in aerial flight.

The Distinguished Flying Cross is America's oldest military award. I didn't know that until I got into this. It's the oldest military award for aviation. It's awarded to "service members and select civilians who perform acts of heroism" I'm quoting, "or extraordinary achievement while participating in aerial flight."

But unfortunately, believe it or not, our Nation lacks a national memorial to appropriately recognize these brave men and women. Now March Field Air Museum in California is currently the only

memorial in the country that honors recipients of the Distinguished Flying Cross. It was constructed entirely using private funds and was dedicated in October 2010.

I brought a photograph of the memorial to show to you. It's quite, quite, quite, beautiful.

My bill would simply designate this memorial as a national memorial in order to honor the bravery and the sacrifice of the thousands of Americans who've received this prestigious award. Let me reiterate, there is no other site in the country dedicated to these American heroes. Again this legislation would not cost the government a single dime. The memorial would not be a unit of the National Park System and no Federal funds could be used for any purpose related to the memorial.

So it's really a designation. That designation means a lot to the community and to the people who put this together. I'm so proud this bill has wide support within the military and veterans communities.

So I'll conclude by reading you some of those who support this.

The Distinguished Flying Cross Society.

The Military Officers Association of America.

The Air Force Association.

The Air Force Sergeant's Association

The Association of Naval Aviation.

The Vietnam Helicopter Pilots Association.

The China-Burma-India Veterans Association.

Again, the House of Representatives, overwhelmingly, passed this legislation in the 111th and 112th. So it is really time for the Senate to act. Unless someone comes up with some good reason why we wouldn't, I would think we could get this done via a hotline with your blessing and that of my colleagues who are here and hopefully Senator Portman and the others.

So unless you have any questions, I will let you do the rest of your work. I thank you.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Boxer.

Senator BOXER. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for drawing attention, again, to the importance of achieving this goal. It looks like a striking sight.

Senator BOXER. Yup.

Senator UDALL. A sight which would pay homage in honor of those who've served us.

Thank you.

Senator BOXER. It's beautiful. It's in Riverside, California. I welcome you to come see it with me, anytime, after we make it a national memorial.

Thank you very much.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Boxer.

As Senator Boxer departs, we could call our administration witnesses to the table. We will look forward to hearing your testimony.

So we have been joined by Ms. Peggy O'Dell, who is the Deputy Director of Operations for the National Park Service. Ms. O'Dell, nice to see you. You're not a stranger to the committee.

We've also been joined by Ms. Ingrid Kolb, Director of the Office of Management at the U.S. Department of Energy.

Ms. O'Dell, why don't I turn to you and the floor is yours.

We operate generally within a 5 minute timeframe, but there are 14 bills. If you need a little bit more time to express the variety of points of view that are appropriate, please take the time you need.

The floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF PEGGY O'DELL, DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR OPERATIONS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Ms. O'DELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you and the subcommittee to present the Department of Interior's views on the 14 bills on today's agenda.

I'd like to submit our full statements on each of these bills for the record and summarize the Department's views.

It's a pleasure to appear on the same panel with the Department of Energy's Office of Management, Director Ingrid Kolb, who is testifying on S. 507, authorizing the establishment of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park. We worked with DOE on the study for this proposal and look forward to continuing our partnership with DOE if this legislation is enacted.

The Department supports the following 9 bills.

S. 156, which would allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in Alaska.

S. 225, which would authorize a study to determine the most effective ways to increase understanding and public awareness of the critical role that the Buffalo Soldiers played in the early years of the National Parks.

S. 285, which would designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve in New Mexico as a unit of the National Park System.

S. 305, which would authorize the addition of 3 separate battlefield sites to Vicksburg National Military Park to tell the remarkable story of the Union Army's capture of the city of Vicksburg during the Civil War.

S. 349, which would authorize a study of river segments in the Wood Pawcatuck watershed in Connecticut and Rhode Island for their potential for designation as National Wild and Scenic Rivers.

S. 371, which would establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park in Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

S. 476, which would extend the authority to operate the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission until January 8, 2021.

S. 507, which would authorize the establishment of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Los Alamos, New Mexico, Hanford, Washington and Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The park would be administered in partnership with the Department of Energy.

Last, S. 615, which would authorize the establishment of the Coltsville National Historical Park in Hartford, Connecticut.

The reasons for our support for these bills are explained in our full statements. For several of the bills I just mentioned we are requesting that the committee make minor amendments to the bill language. Explanation of those are also contained in the full statements. We request the opportunity to work with the committee on those amendments.

The Department supports with—excuse me, the Department supports the objectives of S. 219 and S. 228, which would establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in Pennsylvania and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area in California, respectively. However, the Department recommends Congress pass National Heritage Area program legislation before designating any additional new areas.

Regarding S. 155, which would designate a mountain the State of Alaska as Denali, the department does not object to this bill and appreciates the long history and public interest for both the name Mount McKinley and the traditional Athabascan name, Denali.

Regarding S. 486, which would reinstate the 2007 Interim Strategy Governing Off-Road Vehicle Use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, the Department strongly opposes this legislation. The ORV management plan that took effect in February 2012 brought the Seashore into compliance with applicable laws, policies and executive orders after many years of non-compliance. This plan is accomplishing the objectives of allowing appropriate use and access at the seashore to the greatest extent possible while also ensuring protection for the wildlife there.

Regarding S. 59, which would designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California, the Department defers to the Department of Defense on a position since the purpose of the legislation is to honor military personnel at a site that is not under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. We're happy to take questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. O'Dell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PEGGY O'DELL, DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR OPERATIONS,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ON S. 59

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 59, a bill to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

The Department would defer to the Department of Defense for a position on S. 59 since the purpose of the legislation is to honor military personnel who have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross at a site that is not under the jurisdiction of the Department.

The Distinguished Flying Cross is awarded to a member of the United States armed forces who distinguishes himself or herself in support of operations by "heroism or extraordinary achievement while participating in an aerial flight." It is the oldest military award in the United States for achievements in aviation. We applaud the effort of the March Field Air Museum to create a suitable memorial to the honor, bravery, and sacrifice of members of our Armed Forces who have earned this medal.

This legislation explicitly states that this memorial is not a unit of the National Park System. As this language makes clear, the use of the title "national memorial" creates a reasonable expectation among the general public that it must have an affiliation with the National Park Service, which currently administers 29 national memorials across the country. This is not the first time this issue has arisen, nor is it likely to be the last, and the Department respectfully encourages only the most thoughtful and judicious designation of any future "national" memorials or other similar sites.

ON S. 155

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 155, a bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Denali.

The National Park Service appreciates the long history and public interest for both the name Mount McKinley and the traditional Athabascan name, Denali. The Department respects the choice made by this legislation, and does not object to S. 155.

Located in what is now Denali National Park and Preserve, the highest peak in North America has been known by many names. The National Park Service's administrative history of the park notes that, "The Koyukon called it Deenaalee, the Lower Tanana named it Deenaadheet or Deennadhee, the Dena'ina called it Dghelay Ka'a, and at least six other Native groups had their own names for it.

"In the late 18th century various Europeans came calling, and virtually everyone who passed by was moved to comment on it. The Russians called it Bulshaia or Tenada, and though explorers from other nations were less specific, even the most hard-bitten adventurers were in awe of its height and majesty.

"No American gave it a name until Densmore's Mountain appeared in the late 1880s, and the name that eventually stuck—Mount McKinley—was not applied until the waning days of the nineteenth century," a gesture of support to then-President William McKinley.

In 1975, the State of Alaska officially recognized Denali as the name of the peak, and requested action by the U.S. Board on Geographic Names to do the same.

In 1980, Congress changed the name of Mount McKinley National Park to Denali National Park and Preserve (P.L. 96-487, Section 202), but did not act on the name change for the mountain.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony, and I would be happy to answer any questions you or other members may have.

ON S. 156

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 156, the Huna Tlingit Traditional Gull Egg Use Act.

This legislation provides for the restoration of an important cultural connection to Glacier Bay by the Huna Tlingit, and provides for the environmentally preferred action identified in our studies. As such, the Department supports enactment of S. 156 with an amendment.

Glacier Bay National Park is the traditional homeland of the Huna Tlingit who harvested eggs at gull rookeries in Glacier Bay prior to, and after the park was established in 1925. Egg collection was curtailed in the 1960s as Migratory Bird Treaty Act and National Park Service (NPS) regulations prohibited the activity.

The Glacier Bay National Park Resource Management Act of 2000 (P.L. 106-455) directed the NPS to study whether gull egg collection could resume without impairing the biological sustainability of the gull population in the park. The NPS conducted the study, wrote an environmental impact statement, and in August 2010 issued a record of decision which found that collection under certain conditions would be sustainable. Those conditions, addressing the frequency of harvest and an annual harvest plan, are reflected in S. 156.

Section 2 (b) of the bill contains a condition for the Secretary of the Interior to develop an annual harvest plan jointly with the Hoonah Indian Association. To clarify that the Hoonah Indian Association's role is purely advisory, we recommend the attached amendment.

The Department appreciates the opportunity to testify on this matter. I will be glad to answer any questions.

AMENDMENT TO S.156

On p. 2, line 8, strike "jointly by the Secretary and the Hoonah Indian Association." and insert "by the Secretary in consultation with the Hoonah Indian Association."

ON S.219

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 219, a bill to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in Pennsylvania.

The Department supports the objectives of S. 219. The Susquehanna Gateway area has been found to meet the National Park Service's interim criteria for designation as a National Heritage Area. However, the Department recommends that

Congress pass program legislation that establishes criteria to evaluate potentially qualified National Heritage Areas and a process for the designation, funding, and administration of these areas before designating any additional new National Heritage Areas.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

Flowing for 441 miles, the Susquehanna River is the longest river on the East Coast and the largest contributor of fresh water to the Chesapeake Bay. The portions of the river flowing through Lancaster and York Counties in Pennsylvania exhibit exceptional natural and recreational value and traverse landscapes of historical importance to our nation.

The region of the proposed Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area was first inhabited by Native Americans who left evidence of their occupation in a myriad of archeological sites, as well as rock art at several petroglyph sites. When Captain John Smith journeyed up the Susquehanna River in the summer of 1608, he sent emissaries to the Susquehannock town located on the east side of the river near present day Washington Boro in Lancaster County. Tribal leaders there entered a trade alliance, opening to the English a trade network extending hundreds of miles.

In 1668, William Penn set the tone for religious tolerance in Pennsylvania and brought colonists who settled the great fertile valley of the Susquehanna Gateway region, beginning its long history as an abundant agricultural center. Serving as an important transportation corridor, the river provided opportunities for commerce and invention. It was here that John Elgar constructed the first iron steamboat in America. The birthplace of Robert Fulton, the original inventor of steam powered boats, is a National Historic Landmark in Lancaster County. Here, too, Phineas Davis designed and built the first practical coal burning steam locomotive, thereby revolutionizing railroad transportation.

The region is the home ground of the “Plain People”—the Amish and Mennonites. Their religious values, simple way of life, and well-tended farms speak to the deepest feelings that Americans have about ourselves and our national experience.

In this region, visitors also find evidence of our Revolutionary War past. Lancaster and York Counties served as venues for the Continental Congress when it left Philadelphia upon the British occupation of that city. In the courthouse in York, the Congress approved the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, the nation’s “first constitution,” and sent it forth to the states for ratification. In the summer of 1781, Continental Army General James Wood established Camp Security, housing more than a thousand British soldiers from General John Burgoyne’s army, which had surrendered at Saratoga.

The region also has an abundance of natural resources including migratory bird nesting sites, remnants of old growth forests, and areas of both ecological diversity and scenic quality. Ferncliff, known for its wildflowers, and the Susquehanna Gorge are both designated National Natural Landmarks. Recreational resources abound in the region, including the Kelly’s Run and Susquehanna River Water Trails, both National Recreation Trails.

S. 219 designates the Susquehanna Heritage Corporation, a non-profit organization, as the local coordinating entity for the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area. This organization has served as the coordinator for the state heritage area covering this region designated in 2001. The Susquehanna Heritage Corporation has demonstrated success in coordinating diverse partners in Lancaster and York Counties. Over the past nine years, the Corporation has been effective in facilitating preservation, interpretative, and educational projects and in leveraging community participation and funding. The heritage area has strong support from the public and from a myriad of state, local, federal, and non-governmental partners throughout the area. In 2008, the Corporation prepared a national heritage area feasibility study that was reviewed by the National Park Service and found to meet the interim criteria for potential designation found in the National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines.

If the committee decides to act on S. 219, we would like to recommend language to make the bill more consistent with other National Heritage Area legislation enacted most recently and also to simply the criteria for approval of management plans.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of the Interior's views on S.225, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of alternatives for commemorating and interpreting the role of the Buffalo Soldiers in the early years of the national parks, and for other purposes.

The Department supports S. 225. However, we feel that priority should be given to the 31 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic River System that have not yet been transmitted to Congress.

S. 225 would authorize a study to determine the most effective ways to increase understanding and public awareness of the critical role that the Buffalo Soldiers, segregated units composed of African-American cavalymen, played in the early years of the national parks. It would evaluate the suitability and feasibility of a National Historic Trail along the routes between their post at the Presidio of San Francisco and the parks they protected, notably Yosemite and Sequoia. The study would also identify properties that could meet the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or designation as National Historic Landmarks. We estimate that this study will cost approximately \$400,000.

President Obama recognized the legacy of the Buffalo Soldiers in issuing a proclamation on March 25, 2013, designating the Charles Young home in Wilberforce, Ohio, as a national monument. The Charles Young Buffalo Soldiers National Monument is now the 401st unit of the National Park System. The Presidential proclamation that established this national monument authorizes the NPS to complete a management plan that would include interpreting the struggles and achievements of the Buffalo Soldiers in their service to the United States. We note that, if S. 225 is enacted, there will be overlap with the Presidential proclamation, as this bill directs the NPS to complete a study to increase understanding and public awareness of the critical role that the Buffalo Soldier played in the early years of the national parks. However, this bill goes beyond the direction in the Presidential Proclamation by additionally authorizing a study of the suitability and feasibility of a national historic trail and identification of National Register of Historic Places National Historic Landmarks properties related to the Buffalo Soldiers. If enacted, the NPS will coordinate the completion of the study and the management plan.

African-American 19th and 20th century Buffalo Soldiers were an important, yet little known, part of the history of some of our first national parks. These cavalry troops rode hundreds of miles from their post at the Presidio of San Francisco to Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks in order to patrol and protect them. The journey across the state took sixteen days of serious horseback riding averaging over twenty miles a day. Once in the parks, they were assigned to patrol the backcountry, build roads and trails, put a halt to poaching, suppress fires, stop trespass grazing by large herds of unregulated cattle and sheep, and otherwise establish roles later assumed by National Park rangers.

The U.S. Army administered Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks from 1891 to 1914, when it was replaced by civilian management. The National Park Service (NPS) was not created until 1916, 25 years after these parks were established. Commanding officers became acting military superintendents for these national parks with two troops of approximately 60 cavalry men assigned to each. The troops essentially created a roving economy-infusing money into parks and local businesses-and thus their presence was generally welcomed. The presence of these soldiers as official stewards of park lands prior to the NPS's establishment brought a sense of law and order to the mountain wilderness. Lesser known, however, is the participation of African-American troops of the 24th Infantry and 9th Cavalry, the Buffalo Soldiers, who protected both Sequoia and Yosemite National Parks in 1899, 1903, and 1904. These troops and their contributions should be recognized and honored, and this bill does just that.

The most notable Buffalo Soldier was Colonel Charles Young, who served as a captain in the cavalry commanding a segregated black company at the Presidio of San Francisco. Born in Kentucky during the Civil War, Charles Young had already set himself a course that took him to places where a black man was not often welcome. He was the first black to graduate from the white high school in Ripley, Ohio, and through competitive examination he won an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1884. He went on to graduate with his commission, only the third black man to do so. Colonel Young's story and leadership are emblematic of the experience of the Buffalo Soldiers during difficult and racially tense times. When the new military superintendent arrived in Sequoia National Park in the

summer of 1903, he had already faced many challenges. Young and his troops arrived in Sequoia after a 16-day ride from the Presidio of San Francisco to find that one of their major assignments would be the extension of the wagon road. Hoping to break the sluggish pattern of previous military administrations, Young poured his considerable energies into the project. Young and his troops built as much road as the combined results of the three previous summers, as well as building a trail to the top of Mt. Whitney—the highest point in the contiguous United States.

The soldiers also protected the giant sequoias from illegal logging, wildlife from poaching, and the watershed and wilderness from unauthorized grazing by livestock. A difficult task under any circumstances, the intensity was undoubtedly compounded by societal prejudice common at the turn of the century. They also produced maps and assisted tourists in the area.

Although Colonel Charles Young only served one season as an acting superintendent of a national park, he and his men have not been forgotten. The energy and dignity they brought to this national park assignment left a strong imprint. The roads they built are still in use today, having served millions of park visitors for more than eighty years. The legacy they left extends far beyond Sequoia National Park, as they helped lay the foundation for the National Park System, which continues to inspire and connect people of all backgrounds to public lands and natural treasures to this day.

In recent years the NPS has made an effort to chronicle the achievements of these men. In the Presidio of San Francisco, Golden Gate National Recreation Area and the Presidio Trust have developed an education program using the historic stables that the Buffalo Soldiers actually used to house their horses. In Yosemite National Park, a park ranger portrays one of the U.S. Army's Buffalo Soldiers as part of his interpretation of Yosemite's history. Sequoia National Park has a giant sequoia named for Colonel Young in honor of his lasting legacy in that park. These isolated, but important efforts to educate the public on the important role of the Buffalo Soldiers could be heightened by this consolidated study.

There is a growing concern that youth are becoming increasingly disconnected with wild places and our national heritage. Additionally, many people of color are not necessarily aware of national parks and the role their ancestors may have played in shaping the national park system. The NPS can help foster a stronger sense of awareness and knowledge about the critical roles of African-American Buffalo Soldiers in the protection and development of some of our nation's natural treasures. As the 2016 centennial of the NPS approaches, it is an especially appropriate time to conduct research and increase public awareness of the stewardship role the Buffalo Soldiers played in the early years of the national parks.

ON S. 228

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 228, a bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area.

The Department supports the objectives of S. 228. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta (Delta) area has been found to meet the National Park Service's interim criteria for designation as a National Heritage Area. However, the Department recommends that Congress pass program legislation that establishes criteria to evaluate potentially qualified National Heritage Areas and a process for the designation, funding, and administration of these areas before designating any additional new National Heritage Areas.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

S. 228 would establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area within the counties of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo, in the State of California, with the Delta Protection Commission designated as the Heritage Area's management entity.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is a rare inland/inverse delta at the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Americas. Its vast size, unique shape, and geographic location in the heart of California have produced a heritage of habitat and community diversity, industry, innovation, and unique infrastructure.

After the last ice age 10,000 years ago, a rapid rise in sea level inundated the alluvial valley of the Sacramento River and formed the Delta, an extensive system of freshwater and brackish marshes, grassland, oak woodland, savannah, chaparral, and riparian habitat rich with wildlife. Native Americans built villages and trading posts, and early fur traders such as Jedediah Smith trekked into the region in search of otter, mink and beaver.

Then, gold seekers on their way from San Francisco to the gold fields in the Sierra Nevada recognized the fertility of the Delta's soils. Beginning in the 1880s, with significant contributions from Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, East Indian, Portuguese and Italian immigrants, and the development of innovative equipment, one of the largest scale reclamation projects in the United States converted the vast marshes into the landscape that characterizes the Delta today.

The Delta is the lynchpin of a vast watershed, linking waterways originating in the Cascade, Coastal and Sierra Nevada mountain ranges with the San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean. While the Delta today is predominantly agricultural, it also encompasses diverse habitats—intertidal, non-tidal, and seasonal wetlands, rivers, sloughs, riparian woodland, scrub, grasslands, floodplains—that support hundreds of species of flora and fauna. The Delta is a key stopover on the Pacific Flyway and an important anadromous fish corridor.

The Delta's heritage values are inextricably linked to its economic activities. As one of the most productive agricultural regions in the country, the Delta irrigates over seven million acres of the State's farmland, contributes billions of dollars to the California economy, and exports crops throughout the world. The Delta also supplies two-thirds of California's residents with drinking water.

Recreation and tourism are also important economic drivers, and a Delta National Heritage area has the potential to increase access to many resource-based recreational opportunities, such as boating and fishing, both for regional residents and large, nearby, urban populations in the San Francisco Bay area and Great Central Valley. Opportunities to watch wildlife are abundant on the Delta's quiet waterways, and many influential artists reside in the Delta, attracted by the slower pace of life. Planning for the Great Delta Trail is underway, and agritourism projects and programs—local markets, farm stays, and wineries—are springing up to showcase and share the region's agricultural traditions.

A Feasibility Study for a Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area was completed and published by the Delta Protection Commission in July 2012. The National Park Service conducted a review of the Commission's study for consistency with the interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines, found that it meets these criteria, and informed the Delta Protection Commission of this finding in a letter dated July 11, 2012.

The mission for the Delta National Heritage Area would be to recognize, enhance and promote "Delta as Place" to help cultivate and retain appreciation and understanding of the Delta as an ecological, agricultural, recreational, historical and cultural treasure. According to the feasibility study, "The center of the Delta's story is that of a young nation encouraging the reclamation of swampland to create some of the world's most productive farmlands in the center of California, from which spawned innovations, technologies, and infrastructure unique to the development of the State, as well as other parts of the nation and world."

The proposed National Heritage Area would promote a wide range of partnerships among governments, organizations and individuals to educate the public about "Delta as Place" and build more support for its preservation, protection and enhancement. It would support economic development by drawing visitors to designated partner sites and other recreation and visitor facilities. It would promote heritage tourism, ecotourism, and agri-tourism consistent with existing activities, infrastructure, and land uses in the Delta. As the proposed management entity for a Delta heritage area, the Delta Protection Commission is already working to establish partnerships and to further projects in the region compatible with a national heritage area, such as a historical resources and recreation inventories, development of the Great California Delta Trail, and a Delta narratives project. Through partnerships and community engagement it has the 3 potential to connect and unite citizens in the conservation and increased resilience of the natural, historic, scenic and cultural resources of the Delta, while sustaining the area's economic vitality.

If the committee decides to act on S. 228, we recommend that the bill be amended to address the following matters: 1) to change the bill's map reference to a map that is fully consistent with the feasibility study boundary recommendation; 2) to change "management entity" to "local coordinating entity" throughout the bill; and 3) to make the bill language more consistent with other National Heritage Area legislation enacted most recently.

1Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 285, to designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes. The Department supports S. 285 with an amendment described later in this statement. The Valles Caldera National Preserve (Preserve) has been found to meet the National Park Service's criteria for inclusion in the National Park System, and this legislation would provide a feasible plan for transferring management responsibility for the Preserve from the Valles Caldera Trust (Trust) to the National Park Service.

S. 285 would designate the Valles Caldera National Preserve in New Mexico as a unit of the National Park System and would transfer administrative jurisdiction of the Preserve to the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) for administration by the National Park Service (NPS). The bill would terminate the Trust 180 days after enactment unless the Secretary determines that the termination date should be extended to facilitate the transitional management of the Preserve. All assets and liabilities of the Trust would be transferred to the Secretary. The bill would also authorize the Secretary to coordinate management and operations of the Preserve with Bandelier National Monument and produce a management plan no later than three fiscal years after funds are made available. If S. 285 is enacted, we look forward to working with the Trust, the Secretary of Agriculture, Indian Tribes and Pueblos, State and local governments, and the public to develop a management plan and capitalize on the proximity of Bandelier National Monument for efficiency of operations, while applying Service First principles of sharing resources as appropriate with the surrounding Santa Fe National Forest.

S. 285 would authorize grazing, hunting, and fishing to continue within the Preserve. It would also require the Secretary to ensure the protection of traditional cultural and religious sites, including providing tribal access to the sites and temporarily closing specific areas of the Preserve to protect traditional uses, in accordance with applicable law. The NPS has a long history of consultation with Native Americans in the preservation and continuation of traditional practices.

Finally, S. 285 would require that eligible Trust employees be retained for at least 180 days from the date of enactment. The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to hire Trust employees on a noncompetitive basis for comparable positions at the Preserve or other areas or offices under the jurisdiction of the two Secretaries.

The Valles Caldera National Preserve is an 88,900 acre unit of the National Forest System located in the Jemez Mountains of north central New Mexico. The Preserve was established by Public Law 106-248, the Valles Caldera Preservation Act of 2000, and is managed by the Valles Caldera Trust, a wholly owned government corporation established under the Act. The Trust is charged with mixing elements of both private and public administration while working to achieve resource protection, public enjoyment, and financial self sufficiency goals. The Valles Caldera is considered to be one of the world's best intact examples of a resurgent caldera (the remains of a huge and ancient volcano with a prominent uplift at its center, in this case present-day Redondo Peak) and is of sufficient size and configuration to allow for long-term sustainable resource protection and visitor enjoyment. The geologic features of the Preserve retain a high degree of integrity and the Preserve's unique setting of expansive grasslands and montane forests provides outstanding scenic values and an array of opportunities for public recreation, reflection, education, and scientific study. The Preserve also would expand and enhance the diversity of volcanic sites represented within the National Park System.

The national significance of the geological resources of the Valles Caldera was formally recognized in 1975 when the area was designated a National Natural Landmark. Moreover, Valles Caldera offers the opportunity to illustrate the connection of human history in the region that is showcased at Bandelier National Monument with the geologic history that shaped the surrounding mesa and canyon landscape.

As early as 1899, the area around Valles Caldera was studied for national park designation, and the resulting report proposed that 153,620 acres be set aside for "Pajarito National Park." A portion of this area later became Bandelier National Monument, established in 1906. Additionally, the Valles Caldera was the subject of site investigations and new area studies that were completed by the NPS in 1939, 1964, 1977, and 1979. An Update Report on the NPS 1979 New Area Study was completed by the NPS in December 2009, at the request of Senator Tom Udall and former Senator Jeff Bingaman. All of these studies found that the Valles Caldera was nationally significant, suitable and feasible for designation as a unit of the Na-

tional Park System, and the 2009 Update Report reaffirmed the results of the prior studies.

Under S. 285, Valles Caldera would be managed in accordance with the 1916 Organic Act and other Acts that have guided the NPS for nearly one hundred years “to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations”, with recognition that the bill allows for continued, sustainable grazing, hunting, and fishing. The NPS has experience with these activities in our other nineteen designated preserves.

Based on current expenses for Valles Caldera and the cost to operate park units comparable in size and assets, we anticipate the annual cost to operate and manage the park would be approximately \$22 million for developmental costs and \$4 million for annual operational costs, although more complete cost estimates would be developed through the general management plan. In addition, our 2009 Update Report identifies five parcels of private property within the proposed park boundaries, totaling 40 acres. Although appraisals have not been completed, the expected costs to acquire this private property and any transfer costs are not expected to be great. Funds would be subject to the availability of appropriations and NPS priorities.

We recommend that the bill be amended to reference a map, which would provide certainty about the boundary and make the bill consistent with most other laws and pending bills designating new units of the National Park System. The NPS would be pleased to provide the committee with language for that amendment.

ON S. 305

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 305, a bill to authorize the acquisition of core battlefield land at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond for addition to Vicksburg National Military Park.

The Department supports S. 305 with a technical amendment, which is attached to this statement. This bill would enable the National Park Service to add three separate battlefield sites to Vicksburg National Military Park, which would each make significant contributions to telling the story of the remarkable campaign that resulted in the Union Army’s capture of the city of Vicksburg during the Civil War.

The battlefields at Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond are sites of military engagement associated with the 1863 Vicksburg Campaign. The campaign was a major milestone on the road that led to the final success of the Union army in the war and the ultimate reunification of the nation. The strategies and tactics of Major General Ulysses S. Grant during the campaign continue to be studied by modern military leaders as examples of excellence in generalship.

The proposed addition of campaign battlefields to Vicksburg National Military Park is based on the study authorized by Public Law 106-487, the Vicksburg Campaign Trail Battlefields Preservation Act. That law directed the Secretary of the Interior to complete a study to determine what measures should be taken to preserve Civil War battlefields along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail. The Vicksburg Campaign Trail Feasibility Study, transmitted to Congress in 2006, identified Champion Hill, Port Gibson, and Raymond as “Tier 1” sites, placing them among the 19 highest-ranked resources out of the more than 500 Vicksburg Campaign-related resources evaluated by the study. The study recommended Champion Hill and Port Gibson for addition to the National Park System. Raymond was viewed as adequately protected by the Friends of Raymond, a local non-profit group.

All three battlefields continue to exhibit a very high degree of historical integrity. Most essential features remain intact, and modern intrusions are limited. Acquisition of the battlefields would allow the National Park Service to ensure long-term preservation of the cultural landscape and other cultural resources, and to better interpret the stories of the Vicksburg Campaign. The renewed public interest in the need to protect Civil War battlefields that is being generated by Civil War Sesquicentennial activities makes this legislation particularly timely. In addition, this legislation would advance the vision of safeguarding our historic and cultural heritage that the President committed to through the America’s Great Outdoors Initiative.

The battlefield at Port Gibson marks the first engagement of Grant’s operations against Vicksburg after his army landed on Mississippi soil. After a day of battle, the Confederate army left the field and Grant secured his beachhead. The proposed boundary at Port Gibson encompasses about 3,810 acres. The State of Mississippi owns 14 acres in fee, and holds a preservation easement on 609 acres. The historic Schaifer House, a Civil War-era home, is extant on the property owned by the state. Many roads within the battlefield remain very similar in appearance to the mid-19th century and provide a strong sense of how Civil War troops moved.

Eleven days after the battle at Port Gibson, the Union and Confederate armies met again on the field at Raymond. After a day of heavy fighting, Federal forces again prevailed and General Pemberton's troops withdrew to Jackson. The proposed boundary at Raymond encompasses about 1,520 acres. The Friends of Raymond owns 140 acres of this land in fee, and holds a preservation easement on an additional 6 acres. The battlefield remains largely pristine, and holds high potential for interpretation.

Following the battle at Raymond and the subsequent occupation of Jackson, General Grant turned his army towards the west. On May 16, Union and Confederate forces met again, this time at Champion Hill. The battle was the largest, bloodiest, and most decisive engagement of the Vicksburg Campaign. By the end of the day, the Confederates were in full retreat towards Vicksburg. The proposed boundary at Champion Hill includes approximately 6,350 acres. The State owns 836 acres in fee, and holds a preservation easement on an additional 558 acres. The Civil War Trust also owns 60 acres in fee. The historic Coker House, a Civil War-era home, is extant on the property owned by the State.

In total, S. 305 authorizes the addition of up to 11,680 acres to Vicksburg National Military Park. The State of Mississippi, Civil War Trust, and Friends of Raymond cumulatively own about 1,050 acres in fee, and hold preservation easements on about 1,172 acres of land. Each of these entities has expressed the desire to transfer its interests to the National Park Service. Acquisition costs for these properties would be nominal, since they would be donated. Based on current assessed property values, the acquisition costs for other lands in these areas are expected to average between \$1,700 and \$3,000 per acre (depending on the presence, if any, of marketable timber), totaling approximately \$16 million to \$28 million, for acquisition in fee. The National Park Service would also seek to protect land through less costly means, such as conservation easements. Additional management planning involving public participation would be necessary to best determine the level of facilities needed to serve the visiting public and to identify important battlefield protection strategies for these new lands. The capital investment needed to support infrastructure and recurring operational costs, consequently, have not been defined in detail. In gross terms, annual operational costs have been estimated at \$1 million to \$1.5 million.

Under S. 305, the properties identified for potential acquisition by the National Park Service would not be added to the boundary of, or managed as part of, Vicksburg National Military Park unless and until they are actually acquired.

S. 305 enjoys strong local and national support. Mississippi Governor Phil Bryant and leadership at the Mississippi Department of Archives and History are on record as supporting the transfer of state lands to the National Park Service. The Civil War Trust and Friends of Raymond have expressed support for the legislation, as have elected officials and community leaders in Hinds and Claiborne Counties and the communities of Raymond and Port Gibson. This bill would help guarantee the preservation, protection, restoration, and interpretation of these important lands for current and future generations.

Proposed amendment to S. 305, Vicksburg National Military Park Battlefield Additions

On page 2, line 7: Strike "October 2010" and insert "July 2012".

Explanation.—This amendment substitutes a revised map of the three battlefield areas that would be eligible for acquisition by the National Park Service. The new map is substantively identical to the map referenced in the bill as introduced, but it shows more detail (i.e., more roads, public land survey lines) in order to provide more certainty about the lands that could potentially be acquired under this legislation.

ON S. 349

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 349, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Beaver, Chipuxet, Queen, Wood, and Pawcatuck Rivers in the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The Department supports enactment of S. 349. The river segments and tributary areas proposed for study, which comprise the Wood-Pawtucket Watershed, exhibit the types of qualities and resource values that would make it a worthy and important candidate for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. However, we feel that priority should be given to the 31 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage

Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic Rivers System that have not yet been transmitted to Congress.

S. 349 directs the Secretary of the Interior to study named segments of the Pawcatuck, Beaver, Chipuxet, Queen and Wood Rivers. The bill also specifies that the headwaters segments of the Wood and Queen Rivers include all tributaries, ensuring that virtually the entire Wood-Pawtucket Watershed is assessed. The bill requires the study to be completed and transmitted to Congress within three years after funding is made available for it.

Several segments of the Pawcatuck, Wood and Chipuxet Rivers are listed on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) as potential candidates for Wild and Scenic River designation. These NRI-listed segments were the focus of a 1980s planning and conservation study undertaken through the National Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program, which concluded in part, "The Wood and Pawcatuck Rivers corridor is Rhode Island's least developed and most rural river system. Its waters are the cleanest and purest and its recreational opportunities are unparalleled by any other river system in the state." The Queen and Beaver Rivers have been recognized for their pristine headwaters nature, critical to the high water quality and biological diversity of the upper Pawcatuck, and have been the focus of significant conservation efforts by the Nature Conservancy and Rhode Island Audubon Society, among others. In 2004, the legislatively-established Rhode Island Rivers Council classified the Wood-Pawcatuck watershed as "Rhode Island's premier freshwater recreational resource."

If enacted, the National Park Service intends to undertake the study in close cooperation with the affected communities, the relevant agencies of the states of Rhode Island and Connecticut, and interest groups such as the Wood-Pawcatuck Watershed Association through a partnership-based study approach. This is the approach that has been used since the 1980s for studies of rivers located in New England and other parts of the Northeast Region. The partnership-based approach is recognized in Section 10(e) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act as a means of encouraging state and local governmental participation in the administration of a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The partnership-based approach also allows for development of a proposed river management plan as part of the study, which helps landowners and local jurisdictions understand their potential future roles in river management should Congress decide to designate part or all of the rivers being studied.

ON S. 371

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 371, a bill to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, to dedicate the Park to John H. Chafee, and for other purposes.

The Department supports S. 371.

S. 371 would establish a new unit of the National Park System, the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park (Park) within the existing, bi-state, Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor (Corridor) that extends from Worcester, Massachusetts, to Providence, Rhode Island. The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to establish a park boundary after acquiring a sufficient amount of land or interests in land containing the historic resources to constitute a manageable park unit. The bill allows the Secretary to include in the boundary resources that are subject to a cooperative agreement with either of the two states or their political subdivisions. It authorizes the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with nonprofit organizations, including the coordinating entity for the Corridor, as well as state and local governments, for the purpose of collaborating on programs, projects, and activities that further the purposes of the Park. It also permits the acquisition of up to 10 acres in Woonsocket, Rhode Island for the development of facilities for the Park.

The bill directs the Secretary to complete a General Management Plan for the Park within three years after funds are made available. Among other things, the plan must seek to make maximum practicable use of certain named visitor facilities in the Corridor that are operated by Corridor partners, many of which were developed with significant investment of federal funds. The bill also allows the Secretary to provide technical assistance, visitor services, interpretive tours and educational programs to sites outside the boundary of the Park that are within the Corridor. And, the bill dedicates the Park to former Senator John H. Chafee and requires the Secretary to display an appropriate memorial to him.

Finally, the bill amends the authorization for the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor to provide for a non-profit organization, the

Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, Inc., to be the local coordinating entity for the Corridor. This entity would assume the responsibility for coordinating activities for the Corridor that have rested with the Blackstone River Valley Heritage Corridor Commission since the National Heritage Area was first established. The new coordinating entity would be eligible to receive National Heritage Area funding for through the end of fiscal 2016.

S. 371 reflects the findings of the special resource study that the National Park Service (NPS) completed in accordance with Public Law 109-338, which directed the NPS to conduct the study to “evaluate the possibility of (A) designating one or more sites or landscape features as a unit of the National Park System; and (B) coordinating and complementing actions by the [Corridor] Commission, local governments, and State and Federal agencies, in the preservation and interpretation of significant resources within the Corridor.” The NPS consulted with Native American tribes associated with the Blackstone River Valley in the preparation of the study.

The study evaluated a broad range of sites, features and resources throughout the Blackstone River Valley and concluded that the following meet the criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park System: Old Slater Mill National Historic Landmark district in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, the historic mill villages of Ashton and Slatersville in Rhode Island, and Hopedale and Whitinsville in Massachusetts; the Blackstone River and its tributaries; and the Blackstone Canal. The study also evaluated various management alternatives with different scopes and levels of NPS involvement. The preferred alternative was a new unit of the National Park System that consists of these sites and features, and that would partner with the coordinating entity for the Corridor and others to undertake the protection and interpretation of these resources.

If established based upon the management alternative recommended in the study, we estimate that the cost to create the Park would be \$6.1 million in one-time expenditures on research, planning, construction and/or rehabilitation, and exhibits. When the Park is fully established, operational costs are estimated to be \$3.5 million annually for salaries, supplies and equipment. All funds would be subject to NPS priorities and the availability of appropriations.

We would like to thank the sponsor, Senator Reed, and the committee for working with us in making changes to last Congress’ version of this legislation. We appreciate that this legislation now includes a matching requirement for the expenditure of Federal funds under cooperative agreements, authority to acquire land for administrative purposes in Woonsocket, where the NPS currently has office space, and an appropriate recognition for Senator John H. Chafee’s role in preserving the resources of the Blackstone River Valley that does not set a precedent in naming the park for a congressional sponsor, as the previous version would have done.

ON S. 476

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 476, a bill that would amend the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Development Act to extend the authority of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission.

The Department supports S. 476. The establishment of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (Commission) on January 8, 1971, stemmed in part from the unique nature of the canal. It is unlike most areas administered by the National Park Service as it is a linear park running along a 185-mile stretch of river shoreline and is flanked by the nation’s capital, suburban communities, and numerous small towns.

S. 476 would change the termination date of the Commission from 40 years to 50 years after the effective date of January 8, 1971. The Commission’s authority to operate terminated on January 8, 2011. S. 476 would extend the authority to operate to January 8, 2021.

The Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, begun in 1828 and completed in 1850, runs continuously 185 miles from Georgetown in the District of Columbia through Maryland and West Virginia to Cumberland in Maryland. Originally planned to link Washington, D.C., and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as part of this nation’s canal-building era, the canal was constructed to be a major commercial route. While the canal operated until 1924 when it was abandoned, competition from the newly constructed railroad and the National Road resulted in much less commercial success than its builders had hoped. In 1938, the United States purchased the narrow canal right-of-way from Georgetown to Cumberland, Maryland, and partially restored the lower end of the canal.

In 1961, the C & O Canal Monument was created by Presidential Proclamation No. 3391 but no funding was provided to develop the area or acquire adjacent lands.

A proposal to construct a highway along the canal's route met considerable public opposition led by U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas. His support for preserving the canal ultimately led to the establishment of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, running the length of the original canal.

When the park was established in 1971, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission was created. The 19-member Commission served to link the various jurisdictions along the length of the park. Under the 1971 legislation, the Secretary of the Interior or designee was directed to meet and consult with the Commission at least annually on general policies and specific matters related to the administration and development of the park.

The Commission performed a valuable service during its first 40 years in advising and assisting the National Park Service in the administration and development of the park. In the early years, the Commission served as the vehicle for public meetings in the development of the park's general plan and several site-specific development concept plans. In the years since, the Commission has served as the public forum for discussing implementation of plans along the 185 miles of the park.

The Commission represented not only the local park neighbors, but the national constituency as well. Many Commission members had a lifelong interest in the C & O Canal and the National Park Service. The Commission met quarterly and Commission members were only compensated for reimbursement of actual expenses for meetings. Individual members of the Commission served on various volunteer groups and participated in park-sponsored events throughout the year. The commissioners communicated directly with the park superintendent during meetings and individually throughout the year regarding park issues.

The need for the Commission continues because the park is spread across 19 political jurisdictions. The Commission assisted park staff in reaching out to these numerous constituencies and ensuring that all their views were heard. As the work of managing C & O Canal National Historical Park continues, the public connection to park management through the Commission should continue as well. We understand that the appointments for the existing commissioners have expired. If enacted, the Secretary would appoint or reappoint commissioners in accordance with the Act.

ON S. 486

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 486, a bill entitled "to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes."

The Department strongly opposes S. 486. This bill would reinstate the 2007 Interim Protected Species Management Strategy (Interim Strategy) governing off-road vehicle (ORV) use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore (Seashore).

The Department supports allowing appropriate public use and access at the Seashore to the greatest extent possible, while also ensuring protection for the Seashore's wildlife and providing a variety of visitor use experiences, minimizing conflicts among various users, and promoting the safety of all visitors. We strongly believe that the final ORV Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and special regulation are accomplishing these objectives far better than the defunct Interim Strategy. Contrary to some reports, there is not now and never has been a ban on ORVs at the Seashore. The great majority of the beach is open to ORVs, visitation is rising, and tourist revenues are at record levels. At the same time, beach-nesting birds and sea turtles are finally showing much-needed improvements.

The Seashore stretches for about 67 miles along three islands of the Outer Banks of North Carolina. It is famous for its soft sandy beaches, outstanding natural beauty, and dynamic coastal processes that create important habitats, including breeding sites for many species of beach-nesting birds, among them the federally listed threatened piping plover, the state-listed threatened gull-billed tern, and a number of species of concern including the common tern, least tern, black skimmer, and the American oystercatcher. Long a popular recreation destination, Cape Hatteras attracts about 2.3 million visitors a year who come to walk the beach, swim, sail, fish, use ORVs, and enjoy the ambiance of the shore. In the towns that dot the Outer Banks, a major tourism industry has developed to serve visitors and local beachgoers, including fishermen. In 2011, visitors to the three islands spent approximately \$121 million (an increase of \$13 million from 2010), and supported about 1,700 jobs.

Under the National Park Service Organic Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Seashore's enabling act, and National Park Service (NPS) regulations and policies, the NPS has an affirmative responsibility to con-

serve and protect wildlife, as well as the other resources and values of the Seashore. Executive Order 11644 (1972), amended by Executive Order 11989 (1977), requires the NPS to issue regulations to designate specific trails and areas for ORV use based upon resource protection, visitor safety, and minimization of conflicts among uses of agency lands.

The special regulation that went into effect on February 15, 2012, brings the Seashore into compliance with applicable laws, policies, and Executive Orders after many years of non-compliance. In addition to resource impacts, the approved plan addresses past inconsistent management of ORV use, user conflicts, and safety concerns in a comprehensive and consistent manner.

The Interim Strategy was never intended to be in place over the long-term. When it was developed, the Seashore had no consistent approach to species protection and no ORV management plan or special regulation in place. While the Interim Strategy took an initial step toward establishing a science-based approach, key elements such as buffer distances for American oystercatchers and colonial waterbirds, and the lack of night driving restrictions during sea turtle nesting season, were inconsistent with the best available science. The 2006 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) biological opinion for the Interim Strategy indicated that it would cause adverse effects to federally listed species, but found no jeopardy to those species mainly because of the limited duration of implementation (expected to be no later than the end of 2009). Similarly, the 2007 NPS Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Interim Strategy indicated the action had the potential to adversely impact federally listed species and state-listed species of concern, but found that a more detailed analysis (an EIS) was not needed because of the limited period of time that the Interim Strategy would be implemented.

After a lawsuit was filed against the Interim Strategy, a federal judge entered a Consent Decree for park management. The species-specific buffer distances and the night driving restrictions contained in both the Consent Decree and in the plan/EIS are based on scientific studies and peer-reviewed management guidelines such as the USFWS Piping Plover and Loggerhead Turtle Recovery Plans, and the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Open-File Report 2009-1262 (also referred to as the "USGS protocols,") on the management of species of special concern at the Seashore. Buffer distances for state-listed species are based on relevant scientific studies recommended by the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, USFWS, and USGS.

Under the science-based species protection measures of the Consent Decree, many of which are incorporated into the ORV management plan and special regulation, a trend of improving conditions for beach nesting birds and sea turtles has emerged. Although breeding success depends on a number of factors including weather, predation, habitat availability, and level of human disturbance, there has been a striking improvement in the condition of protected beach-nesting wildlife species. The Seashore has experienced a record number of piping plover pairs and fledged chicks, American oystercatcher fledged chicks, least tern nests, and improved nesting results for other species of colonial waterbirds. The number of piping plover breeding pairs has increased from an annual average of 3.6 pairs from 2000 to 2007 under the Interim Strategy to an average of 11.75 pairs between 2008 and 2011 under the Consent Decree. In 2012, the NPS documented 15 piping plover breeding pairs. The number of sea turtle nests also significantly increased, from an annual average of 77.3 from 2000 to 2007 to an average of 129 from 2008 to 2011. In 2012, sea turtle nesting in the Seashore climbed to an all-time high of 222.

Although the prescribed buffers have resulted in temporary closures of some popular locations when breeding activity was occurring, even at the peak of the breeding season there have generally been many miles of open beach entirely unaffected by the species protection measures. Under the Consent Decree from 2007 to 2011, annual visitation at the Seashore continued at a level similar to that of 2006 to 2007. In 2012, visitation increased 17 percent from 2011, and it was a 6 percent increase from the average visitation between 2007 and 2011. Dare County, where the Seashore is located, experienced record occupancy and meal revenues in 2012, as reported by the Outer Banks Visitor Bureau, despite the impacts of Hurricane Sandy that closed or substantially limited traffic along North Carolina Highway 12 to Hatteras Island from late October to late December 2012. This occupancy revenue has continued to climb over the last several years as follows: 2009 (\$318 million), 2012 (\$330 million), 2011 (\$343 million), 2012 (\$382 million through the end of November) while meals revenue has also increased as follows: 2009 (\$185 million), 2010 (\$188 million), 2011 (\$191 million), and 2012 (\$201 million through the end of November).

The final ORV management plan and regulation provide long-term guidance for the management of ORV use and the protection of affected wildlife species at the

Seashore. The plan not only provides diverse visitor experience opportunities, manages ORV use in a manner appropriate to a unit of the National Park System, and provides a science-based approach to the conservation of protected wildlife species, but also adapts to changing conditions over the life-span of the plan. It includes a five-year periodic review process that will enable the NPS to systematically evaluate the plan's effectiveness and make any necessary changes.

During the preparation of the environmental impact statement (EIS) for the management plan, the NPS evaluated the potential environmental impacts of long-term implementation of the Interim Strategy. The analysis determined that if the Interim Strategy were continued into the future, it would result in long-term, moderate to major adverse impacts to piping plovers, American oystercatchers, and colonial waterbirds, as well as long-term, major adverse impacts to sea turtles. Impacts to sea turtles and three species of colonial waterbirds had the potential to rise to the level of "impairment," which would violate the National Park Service Organic Act.

Moreover, if the Interim Strategy were to be reinstated, it could well be counter-productive to visitor access. Under the Interim Strategy, popular destinations such as Cape Point and the inlet spits still experienced resource protection closures. Several of the beach-nesting bird species at the Seashore may renest several times during the same season if eggs or very young chicks are lost, which is more likely when there is a higher level of human disturbance in proximity to nests and chicks. Under the Consent Decree, with its science-based buffers, there has been a noticeable reduction in the number of these renesting attempts for piping plovers and American oystercatchers, which means the duration of closures is typically shorter. Because the Interim Strategy allows smaller buffers and more disturbance of nests and chicks at these key sites, it increases the likelihood that birds will renest one or more time at those sites, and so even though the closures may seem smaller, they may be in place for a longer time than under the ORV plan or Consent Decree. This is even more likely to be the case now, because the number of nesting birds has increased significantly since 2007.

The Seashore has taken steps to enhance access in areas favored by beach fishermen. Specifically, a bypass below Ramp 44 allows ORV access to the eastern side of Cape Point and areas not closed during bird breeding season in the event of access blockage on the beach proper, whether from weather and tide events or resource closures. At Hatteras Inlet, at the end of Hatteras Island, a trail has been created and maintained to allow ORV access and the ability to park closer to what have traditionally been preferred fishing areas. In the proximity of Ramp 4, a pedestrian access trail adjacent to the Oregon Inlet Fishing Center to provide access for fishing in the ocean for those visitors without ORVs. Also, as a mitigation measure with the building of the new Bonner Bridge project, a new access ramp will be installed at approximately mile 2.5 that will expedite access to the northern end of the park. The Seashore is also in the final stages of completing an Environmental Assessment titled "Proposal to Construct New Development that Facilitates Public Access" which may include additional access points to areas that are traditionally closed off due to resource closure; these will enhance the fishing/beach driving opportunities.

In addition to reinstating the Interim Strategy, S. 486 provides authority for additional restrictions only for species listed as "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and only for the shortest possible time and on the smallest possible portions of the Seashore. This would conflict with numerous other laws and mandates including the National Park Service Organic Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Seashore's enabling act, the aforementioned Executive Orders, and NPS regulations implementing these laws, which provide for the protection of other migratory bird species and other park resources.

S. 486 also provides that the protection of endangered species at Cape Hatteras shall not be greater than the restrictions in effect for that species at any other national seashore. Species protection measures cannot reasonably be compared from seashore to seashore without considering the specific circumstances at each site and the context provided by the number and variety of protected species involved, the levels of ORV use, and the underlying restrictions provided by the respective ORV management plans and special regulations. Even though Cape Hatteras has a wider variety of beach nesting wildlife species than Cape Cod or Assateague, for example, its plan actually allows for a much higher level of ORV use on larger portions of the Seashore. It would be neither reasonable nor biologically sound for Cape Hatteras to use less protective measures if they were designed for a location where the level of ORV use is much lower to begin with. Nor does it appear that such an arbitrary approach could possibly comply with the "peer-reviewed science" requirement imposed elsewhere in the bill. The Cape Hatteras plan was specifically designed to be effective for the circumstances at Cape Hatteras. The bill would require, to the

maximum extent possible, that pedestrian and vehicle access corridors be provided around closures implemented to protect wildlife nesting areas. This concept was thoroughly considered during the preparation of the plan and EIS. The plan already allows for such access corridors when not in conflict with species protection measures. For example, under the current regulation, the Seashore works with the communities and has the ability to allow access around a turtle nest when the alternative route is between the nest and dunes but does not cause impairment to the existing dunes/vegetation.

Shorebird nesting areas are often close to the shoreline because of the Seashore's typically narrow beaches. A concentration of nests occur near the inlets and Cape Point, and access corridors cannot always be allowed without defeating the fundamental purpose of such closures: protecting wildlife. Several species of shorebirds that nest at the Seashore have highly mobile chicks, which can move considerable distances from nests to foraging sites. Inadequate resource closures in the past have resulted in documented cases of human-caused loss or abandonment of nests and chick fatalities. Corridors that cut through a resource closure area would essentially undermine the function of the closure and render it compromised or even useless.

Finally, the final ORV management plan/EIS and special regulation are the products of an intensive five-year long planning process that included a high level of public participation through both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and negotiated rulemaking, including four rounds of public comment opportunities. The Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee's function was to assist directly in the development of special regulations for management of ORVs and met from 2007 to 2009. Although the committee did not reach consensus on a proposed regulation, it provided a valuable forum for the discussion of ORV management and generated useful information for the NPS. The NPS received more than 15,000 individual comments on the draft plan/EIS and more than 21,000 individual comments on the proposed special regulation. In completing the final ORV management plan/EIS and special regulation, the NPS considered all comments, weighed competing interests and ensured compliance with all applicable laws.

Currently, the ORV management plan/EIS and special regulation are the subject of a complaint that was filed by a coalition of ORV organizations with the US District Court in the District of Columbia on February 9, 2012. The Memorandum of Order to transfer the complaint to the US District Court of North Carolina was issued on December 23, 2012.

ON S. 507

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 507, a bill to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, and for other purposes.

The Administration supports S. 507. The development of the atomic bomb through the Manhattan Project was one of the most transformative events in our nation's history: it ushered in the atomic age, changed the role of the United States in the world community, and set the stage for the Cold War. This legislation would enable the National Park Service to work in partnership with the Department of Energy to ensure the preservation of key resources associated with the Manhattan Project and to increase public awareness and understanding of this consequential effort.

S. 507 would require the establishment of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park as a unit of the National Park System within one year of enactment, during which time the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy would enter into an agreement on the respective roles of the two departments. The unit would consist of facilities and areas located in Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Hanford, as identified in the bill and determined by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, except for the B Reactor National Historic Landmark in Hanford, which would be required to be included in the park. The National Historical Park would be established by the Secretary of the Interior by publication of a Federal Register notice within 30 days after the agreement is made between the two secretaries.

The bill would provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the named resources in Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Hanford. It would also allow the Secretary to acquire land in the vicinity of the park for visitor and administrative facilities. The bill would provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with other Federal agencies to provide public access to, and management, interpretation, and historic preservation of, historically significant resources associated with the Manhattan Project; to provide technical assistance for Manhattan Project resources not included within the park; and to enter into cooper-

ative agreements and accept donations related to park purposes. Additionally, it would allow the Secretary of the Interior to accept donations or enter into agreements to provide visitor services and administrative facilities within reasonable proximity to the park. The Secretary of Energy would be authorized to accept donations to help preserve and provide access to Manhattan Project resources.

S. 507 is based on the recommendations developed through the special resource study for the Manhattan Project Sites that was authorized by Congress in 2004 and transmitted to Congress in July 2011. The study, which was conducted by the National Park Service in consultation with the Department of Energy, determined that resources at Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Hanford, met the National Park Service's criteria of national significance, suitability, feasibility, and the need for Federal management for designation as a unit of the National Park System. S. 507 assigns the respective roles and responsibilities of the National Park Service and the Department of Energy as envisioned in the study; the National Park Service would use its expertise in the areas of interpretation and education to increase public awareness and understanding of the story, while the Department of Energy would retain full responsibility for operations, maintenance, safe access, and preservation of historic Manhattan Project properties already under its jurisdiction, along with full responsibility for any environmental remediation that is deemed necessary related to the properties to ensure public safety.

Because the Department of Energy would maintain and operate, as they do currently, the primary facilities associated with the Manhattan Project National Historical Park, the study estimated that the National Park Service's annual operation and maintenance costs for the three sites together would range from \$2.45 million to \$4 million. It also estimated that completing the General Management Plan for the park would cost an estimated \$750,000. Costs of acquiring lands or interests in land, or developing facilities, would be estimated during the development of the General Management Plan.

The Department of Energy has not yet assessed fully the operational difficulties in terms of security and public health and safety, applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, and the potential new cost of national park designation at the sensitive national security and cleanup sites, which would be addressed with the context of the General Management Plan. The Department anticipates that the initial agreement between the two Departments likely would be fairly limited in scope, given the bill's one-year timeframe for executing an agreement that would enable the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park. We appreciate the language specifically providing for amendments to the agreement and a broad range of authorities for the Secretary of the Interior, as these provisions would give the National Park Service the flexibility to shape the park over time and to maximize the promotion of education and interpretation related to the park's purpose in coordination and consultation with the Department of Energy.

The flexibility is particularly important because managing a park with such complex resources, in partnership with another Federal agency, at three sites across the country, will likely bring unanticipated challenges. Some of the resources that may be included in the park may be near facilities that have highly sensitive, ongoing national security missions including nuclear weapons production and intelligence activities. Also, some of these sites may be on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's National Priorities List. If this legislation is enacted, these issues, among others, will be taken into consideration by the Departments in the development of an agreement and management plan. The National Park Service has already begun a partnership with the Department of Energy regarding the Manhattan Project resources through our coordinated work on the study. If this legislation is enacted, we look forward to building a stronger partnership that will enable us to meet the challenges ahead.

ON S. 615

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior regarding S. 615, a bill to establish Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut, and for other purposes.

The Department supports enactment of S. 615 with the amendments discussed later in this statement.

S. 615 would authorize the establishment of a new unit of the National Park System centered on the Coltsville Historic District in Hartford, Connecticut. Establishment of the park would depend upon the Secretary of the Interior receiving a donation of a sufficient amount of land to constitute a manageable unit; the owner of the East Armory property entering into an agreement with the Secretary to donate

at least 10,000 square feet of space in that building for park facilities; and the Secretary entering into an agreement with the appropriate public entities regarding compatible use and management of publicly owned land within the Coltsville Historic District.

The legislation also authorizes agreements with other organizations for access to Colt-related artifacts to be displayed at the park and cooperative agreements with owners of properties within the historic district for interpretation, restoration, rehabilitation and technical assistance for preservation. It provides that any federal financial assistance would be matched on a one-to-one basis by non-federal funds.

S. 615 also provides for the establishment of a commission to advise the Secretary on the development and implementation of a general management plan for the unit. The advisory commission would terminate ten years after the date of enactment of the legislation unless extended for another ten years by the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary).

The Secretary designated the Coltsville Historic District a National Historic Landmark on July 22, 2008. The manufacturing complex and associated resources constitute the site of nationally important contributions to manufacturing technology by Samuel Colt and the industrial enterprise he founded in 1855—Colt's Patent Firearms Manufacturing Company. It includes, among other resources, the armories where firearms and other products were made, the home of Samuel and Elizabeth Colt, Colt Park, and housing used by factory workers.

Samuel Colt is most renowned for developing a revolver design which revolutionized personal firearms. The Colt's Firearms Company is best known for its manufacture of the Peacemaker, a six-shot revolver. Colt was a major innovator in the "American System" of precision manufacturing, replacing the practice of individually crafting each component of a product with the use of interchangeable parts. After his death in 1862, his wife Elizabeth owned and directed the manufacturing complex for 39 years, becoming a major entrepreneur in an age when women rarely occupied positions of importance in manufacturing.

During both World War I and World War II, the Colt Firearms Company was one of the nation's leading small arms producers and made vital contributions to U.S. war efforts. The company applied its interchangeable-parts techniques to a wide variety of consumer products and the Colt complex became an "incubator" facility for other inventors and entrepreneurs. Coltsville is also noteworthy as a fully integrated industrial community that includes manufacturing facilities, employee housing, community buildings, and landscape features that were built largely under the personal direction of Samuel and Elizabeth Colt. Colt, whose labor practices were advanced for their time, attracted highly skilled laborers to his manufacturing enterprise.

Pursuant to Public Law 108-94, the Coltsville Study Act of 2003, the National Park Service (NPS) conducted a special resource study of the resources associated with the Coltsville Historic District. Based on Coltsville's National Historic Landmark designation in 2008, the study concluded that Coltsville meets the national significance criterion. An analysis of comparability to other units of the national park system and resources protected by others demonstrated that Coltsville is suitable for designation as a unit of the national park system. The study was unable, however, to conclude that Coltsville was feasible to administer at that time due to the lengthy duration of financial issues surrounding the site. In concert with the lack of feasibility, the study was also unable to determine the need for NPS management, or specifically what the NPS would manage.

The special resource study did not conclude that the site absolutely failed to meet feasibility criteria or require NPS management, but rather that that it did not meet feasibility criterion with the circumstances present at the time of the study and that it was impossible to determine, at that time, the need for NPS management of the site. In both cases, the uncertainty of public access and financial viability of the financial developer of the privately owned portion of the site were at issue.

Since the time of the study, much progress has occurred, showing significant promise for the future of Coltsville and preservation of the resources. During a visit in 2011, the Secretary noted the progress made in the area since the study was completed, while stating that "Coltsville again promises to be an economic engine, producing jobs and spurring growth in the Hartford area." Significant re-development has already begun. Several of the buildings have been rehabilitated and are occupied as educational facilities, residential housing, and businesses. Negotiations are underway between the developer and the city on an agreement for the East Armory building, which would serve as the focal point for park visitors. We have been advised the plan has designated benchmarks for the project as well as projected funding for the development.

The conditions in S. 615 for establishing Coltsville as a unit of the National Park System are intended to assure that the park is established only when the development is moving forward and there is certainty that the public will have the ability to learn about the manufacturing process that took place at the site. However, to ensure the viability of the park, we recommend that the conditions include additional requirements regarding the evaluation of the financial feasibility of the park's operations and management, including ownership and financing of Coltsville properties.

A 2008 Visitor Experience Study developed visitor service scenarios identifying a range of potential costs from a very basic scenario (small contact station, limited hours, and staff shared with a neighboring park unit) estimated at \$720,000 to a full site scenario estimated at \$9.3 million (four level East Armory development, cultural landscape plan implementation, and multimedia exhibit construction). If a park were established, a comprehensive planning process would assess the actual needs for visitor services and staffing, further defining the park's operational budget. In addition, there could be significant Federal costs in providing financial assistance to restore or rehabilitate the properties, as authorized in Section 4(c)(1). All funding would be subject to NPS priorities and the availability of appropriations.

We recommend that S. 615 also be amended to eliminate the establishment of an advisory commission. The management planning process required under section 5 already provides a forum to involve key stakeholders and provide a broad representation of interested parties, without the need for a commission. In addition, we note that the inclusion of an advisory commission in park enabling legislation is not as common as it once was. Other bills before this committee that would establish new parks, including the two parks honoring Harriet Tubman, the park composed of resources in the State of Delaware, the park commemorating the Manhattan Project, and the Valles Caldera park, do not provide for advisory commissions. This change can be accomplished by striking line 20 on page 8 and all that follows through the remainder of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony.

Senator UDALL. Ms. O'Dell, that was very helpful. I know Senator Manchin has a very busy schedule, as my colleagues always do. I wanted to recognize him for questions and comments, I think in particular on 486.

Ms. O'DELL. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. Senator Manchin.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you so much, Chairman.

Ms. O'Dell, if I may, I had a copy of your submitted testimony. That you state the Department of Interior supports allowing appropriate public use and access at the Cape Hatteras National Search, to the greatest extent possible, I think. While balancing the needs to preserve wildlife habitat.

I agree with you that we need to have a balance here. But the final plan that the National Park Service implemented in 2012, in my estimation and the reason for this bill, doesn't strike that balance. It's actually hurting the local economy and affecting the experience of vacationers. I would say like vacationers like the ones from West Virginia, who really have been going there for years. Things are changing drastically.

As I said at a hearing on this bill before, this committee last year when I spoke it is in this instance the Park Service is acting as an adversary and not an ally. I've always said government should be your partner and your ally, trying to find the balance between the economy and the environment. The people, I believe, that live there, the people that have always lived there, the people that make their living on tourism, are still wanting that balance. It doesn't benefit them to deteriorate or destroy the natural beauty they have.

I've joined my friends, Senator Burr and Hagan, as I did last year in co-sponsoring this bipartisan legislation of S. 486 because

I believe it strikes the appropriate balance of providing access to the seashore, but it also protects the habitat of sea turtles and the piping plover. Our legislation would reinstate the interim plan. I think you know about the interim plan. It would reinstate that plan that was backed by 113 page biological opinion issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

So what I would ask is, is your Department and how is your Department supporting access at the greatest extent possible when roughly 26 miles of the beach have been permanently closed to motorized beach access?

Ms. O'DELL. Sir, I would say that we have done our very best to create that balance and to find a way to accommodate all the interest at the seashore. We have had a year now operating under the ORV management plan. We are showing success in the numbers of birds that have come back, the numbers of turtles that have hatched. We're also showing that the visitor bureaus out in North Carolina reported an increase in revenues from both meal receipts and occupancy in that area for tourism.

So we are very hopeful that over time as this plan stays in place and we all use it appropriately that we are going to see continued improvement in all of those elements.

Senator MANCHIN. Do you think—

Ms. O'DELL. Because we want people to be—to have a great experience there.

Senator MANCHIN. Do you think it was a plan that was agreed upon when it was given to the locals at the time it was. They entered into it in a very hastily way, if you will. Then basically nothing had happened. There was the court ruling that decided this and put it in a whole and different light.

Ms. O'DELL. I know the interim plan, sir, was created hastily because the Park Service had been out of compliance for so many years. So the interim plan was put in place and the environmental documents that were created with the interim plan clearly stated that short term implementation of that plan would not do harm to the environment or to the protected species.

But long term use of that interim plan would potentially cause impairment for the National Park resources.

That would be like killing the golden goose if the park has no longer, have the wildlife values that people enjoy and go there to see, we would be harming tourism even more than some people perceive we are now.

Senator MANCHIN. You've closed so much of the beach they can't even fish. I think they went there more to fish than anything else.

Ms. O'DELL. There are still 41 miles of road open to AT—Off Road Vehicles out of the 67.

Senator MANCHIN. Twenty-six has been closed.

Ms. O'DELL. Sixty-seven are open to pedestrians full time.

Senator MANCHIN. Let me—I know you just said about the economic impact. If anything things are improving.

Have you talked to the local citizens? Have you really sat down with the people that live and operate there everyday because I just heard from them again yesterday? As a matter of fact they are sitting in the audience here.

They completely differ from what you're saying. They just get so—I mean they're to the point they're exasperated that you're not paying any attention to them. They're just asking for the balance.

You had a 113 page report which you all basically have neglected as far as in what they're saying. Can't you go back to the—

Ms. O'DELL. Sir, after that interim report we were operating under a consent decree by the court. That's what led to the creation of this new plan. So it was informed by locals. It was formed by people who, all across the country, who care about it.

We do have a very wonderful management team in place at Cape Hatteras, a new superintendent who is hopefully engaging well with the community. We continue to stress with him how important it is to be engaged with the local community so that we can continue to get feedback on this plan. The management plan does require us to take a—to review the plan every 5 years and to make adjustments to it. The adaptive management policies that we have will allow us to do that—

Senator MANCHIN. Are you really—and I'm so sorry, Mr. Chairman, but are you looking at just the Hatteras and Ocracoke areas that are tremendously affected? Directly to them and not to the entire, you know, if you look at the span that you're talking the 40 some miles. You've closed the most premium places that people, I know from West Virginia, would go. They're closed.

You want them to go where the fish aren't, I guess.

Ms. O'DELL. That would not have been our intent, sir.

Senator MANCHIN. But that's what's happened.

Let me ask you.

Ms. O'DELL. I would respectfully—

Senator MANCHIN. One final question.

Is other places in the country treated under the same parameters that this is being treated down in Hatteras and Ocracoke, the amount of, you know, the way you all have written the new rules, if you will or complied with?

Ms. O'DELL. The—

Senator MANCHIN. Let's up along the Eastern seaboard somewhere.

Ms. O'DELL. There are off road vehicle plans for other national seashores. They were crafted for those specific parks with the specific conditions that are present in those areas.

Senator MANCHIN. Does any of them have this amount of restriction?

Ms. O'DELL. I would not be able to answer that, sir. But I'd be happy to get you any kind of comparison you wanted.

Senator MANCHIN. Don't you think there should be a fairness to the system? There should be a balance and fairness.

Ms. O'DELL. It's the balance between what is needed to protect the wildlife values and what is needed to—

Senator MANCHIN. Whose determination is that? Yours or in conjunction with the people that basically live there?

Ms. O'DELL. It certainly has been informed by feedback from the locals and national visitors.

Senator MANCHIN. You know that we don't agree because we wouldn't be introducing the bill if we agreed with you.

Ms. O'DELL. That's correct, sir. I understand that.

Senator MANCHIN. OK. So we don't think that you're talking to the same people we are.

Ms. O'DELL. I respect your opinion on that, sir.

Senator MANCHIN. We just need enough votes now, that's all.

You're not going to fight this, are you?

Ms. O'DELL. Am I going to fight it?

Senator MANCHIN. Uh huh.

Ms. O'DELL. I don't have as much power as you all have in terms of deciding what happens with this bill, sir.

Senator MANCHIN. We want you to find a balance. So just meet with them. Find a balance—

Ms. O'DELL. We will continue to meet with the proponents down in the seashore. Our superintendent Barclay Trimble will be delighted to continue to meet with them.

Senator MANCHIN. You've got the complete—you have this complete handout and brochure showing you what you've really shut down?

Ms. O'DELL. I do not know that I have that.

Senator MANCHIN. Can I give this to you?

Ms. O'DELL. I would be—

Senator MANCHIN. Because I think it really is shocking to see how much of this seashore that we've enjoyed for tens and twenty and thirty and forty, fifty years ago that you have said, OK West Virginia, don't go to Hatteras or Ocracoke anymore because you can't use the areas you did.

Alright?

Senator UDALL. Senator Manchin, would you provide the committee with a copy of that document as well?

Senator MANCHIN. I would love to. It would be possible.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you.

Ms. O'DELL. Thank you, Senator.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Manchin.

I thought we'd turn now to Ms. Kolb. I know, Senator Heinrich, you've got a busy schedule, but I think her testimony is important to your concerns.

So, Ms. Kolb, the floor is yours for 5 minutes. We look forward to hearing your testimony.

**STATEMENT OF INGRID KOLB, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF
MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY**

Ms. KOLB. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Ingrid Kolb and I'm the Director of the Office of Management at the Department of Energy. I'm pleased to be here today to discuss only one bill. That bill is S. 507, for a proposed Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

The Manhattan Project National Park study act, Public Law 108-340, directed the Secretary of the Interior as well as the Department of Energy to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of designating one or more Manhattan Project sites as a unit of the National Park System. Following extensive public meetings and assessments of potential park boundaries and historical resources, the Department and the National Park Service agreed that a park

was feasible, that it met the sustainability and suitability requirements for creating a new park and that it should be established.

In October 2010, the National Park Director concurred on the study which contained the recommendation for a 3 site park at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Hanford, Washington and Los Alamos, New Mexico.

In March 2011, our Deputy Secretary, Dan Poneman, concurred on the findings of the study and provided assurances to the National Park Service that the Department would retain full control of its properties in accordance with its missions and security requirements.

The Department of Energy is proud of its Manhattan Project heritage and recognizes that this partnership with the public National Park Service would bring one of the most significant accomplishments of 20th century America to a wider public audience.

The establishment of a National Historical Park will represent a new era for the Department of Energy, particularly in certain areas of our sites that have been largely off limits to the public. The Department has not yet fully assessed the operational difficulties in terms of security and public health and safety and the costs. However, these issues will be addressed as we develop the general management plan that is called for in the legislation. We will develop this plan in partnership with the National Park Service.

So we welcome the leadership of you, Mr. Chairman, as well as the subcommittee in telling the important story of the Manhattan Project. We look forward to working with you as this legislation advances through the Congress.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to testify. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Kolb follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF INGRID KOLB, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the subcommittee, my name is Ingrid Kolb. I serve as the Director, Office of Management, at the U.S. Department of Energy. As part of our programmatic responsibilities, the Office of Management coordinates cultural resources and historic preservation activities across the Department and is the lead office coordinating DOE participation in the proposed Manhattan Project National Historical Park. I am pleased to be here today to discuss the proposed park and S. 507, a bill to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

The Manhattan Project National Park Study Act, Public Law 108-340, directed the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to conduct a special resource study to determine the feasibility of designating one or more Manhattan Project sites as a unit of the National Park System. A park, the legislation noted, would have to be compatible with "maintaining the security, productivity, and management goals of the Department of Energy," as well as public health and safety. In preparing the study, the Department's Office of Management was an active partner with the National Park Service, and its staff participated fully, providing information, input, and comments.

Following public meetings at the sites and extensive assessments of potential park boundaries and integrity of historical resources, the Department and the National Park Service agreed that a park was feasible, met the suitability requirement for creating a new park, and should be established. In October 2010, the National Park Service Director concurred on the study, which contained the recommendation for a three-site park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Hanford, Washington, and Los Alamos, New Mexico, in partnership with the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy would continue to manage and maintain its properties and control access to them. The National Park Service would provide interpretation and consult with the Department on preservation issues.

In March 2011, the Deputy Secretary of Energy concurred on the findings of the study and provided assurances to the National Park Service that the Department would retain full access control to its properties in accordance with its missions and security requirements. The Department of Energy is proud of its Manhattan Project heritage and recognizes that this partnership with the National Park Service would bring one of the most significant events in 20th century America to a wider public audience. In July 2011, the Secretary of the Interior recommended to Congress the establishment of a three-site Manhattan Project National Historical Park.

The establishment of a National Historical Park will represent a new era for the Department of Energy, particularly in certain areas of our sites that have been largely off-limits to the public to date due to national security concerns and potential impacts to our ongoing missions. The Department has not yet assessed fully the operational difficulties in terms of security and public health and safety, applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, and the potential new cost of national park designation at our sensitive national security and cleanup sites; but these issues will be addressed as we develop a general management plan with the National Park Service. Funding for any significant new costs will need to be provided through the budget process. The proposed legislation, S. 507, would give the Department of Energy and Department of the Interior the flexibility to establish the timeline, boundaries, and a suitable management plan for a National Historical Park that would allow us to ensure the continuance of public safety, national security, and the ongoing missions at our sites. We recommend that provisions of Section 5 be clarified so that other sites to be identified by the Secretary of the Interior within the city of Oak Ridge do not include properties managed by the Department of Energy, unless the Secretary of Energy concurs. We welcome the leadership of Chairman Udall and the National Parks Subcommittee in telling this important story, and we look forward to working with you as this legislation advances.

Again, thank you for this opportunity to testify before the subcommittee. This completes my prepared statement. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator UDALL. Thank you.

Before I recognize Senator Heinrich, I want to apologize for not correctly pronouncing your last name. Is it Kolb?

Ms. KOLB. It's Kolb, but Kolb is fine too.

Senator UDALL. Kolb. There are—

Ms. KOLB. I answer to both.

Senator UDALL. We'll make sure the record shows it's Kolb.

In Senator Heinrich's and Senator Barrasso's part of the world there are a couple of famous brothers, the Kolb Brothers, who were among those who first ventured down the Colorado River through all of its rapids and deep canyons.

Thank you for your testimony.

Senator Heinrich, I know these are topics of great importance to you and your State and to the country.

Senator HEINRICH. Thank you, Chairman.

Ms. O'Dell, I wanted to ask you a couple of questions regarding the Valles Caldera National Preserve just for the record.

Ms. O'DELL. Yes, sir.

Senator HEINRICH. One has to do with hunting and fishing on the preserve. That is one of the ways I've been able to enjoy the preserve over the years and just wanted to put on the record whether hunting and fishing will continue to be uses that the Park Service manages for as should this legislation pass.

Ms. O'DELL. Yes, sir. Hunting and fishing is common on the other preserves that we manage throughout the National Park System.

Senator HEINRICH. I think it's worth just stating that it's one of the reasons why the preserve model was so attractive to the community and New Mexico because that is one of the uses that really sets this particular unit on the map nationally is its values there.

I also wanted to ask you about the current situation and maybe the dichotomy in terms of costs into the future. The current body called there a Board of Trustees 2009 report said that the preserve currently spends about 20 times more per individual visitor than similar National Park Service units. I understand that the Park Service Feasibility Study also found that cost savings would be likely if the unit were managed under the Park Service in conjunction with nearby Bandolier National Monument.

Can you provide any additional details on what kind of cost savings we might be able to expect if this bill passes?

Ms. O'DELL. I can't give you specific figures yet. We don't really have that information prepared yet. But we certainly can expect to get some savings because we will be using many of the services out of Bandolier National Monument. Many of the administrative services, loaning some of the maintenance types of equipment instead of having to purchase, many kinds of economies like that would be able to be achieved.

Senator HEINRICH. Once again, I think this is one of the things that makes this attractive is the per unit cost of doing a national preserve as a one off has proven to be incredibly expensive. I think taking advantage of those economies of scale is very attractive as well.

Finally, the Valles Caldera includes a lot of sites that are sacred to native neighboring pueblo tribes. I wanted to ask if the Park Service would ensure that those sites are protected from inappropriate use to begin with and also accessible to tribal members for religious and cultural purposes.

Ms. O'DELL. We would welcome consultation with the tribes to understand their traditional uses of the land and work with them to ensure that those can continue.

Senator HEINRICH. I think that's going to be very important just to make sure that those kind of cultural traditions are preserved as part of the fabric of this preserve moving forward.

I'm going to shift gears real quickly and just ask you to elaborate on something that Senator Manchin brought up. Were the closures that Senator Manchin asked about, were they closures, complete closures to the public including pedestrians and including fishing or is it only a closure to off road vehicle use or motorized access?

Ms. O'DELL. The entire 67 miles remains open to pedestrians.

Senator HEINRICH. OK.

Ms. O'DELL. Fourty-three miles remain open to ORV use.

Senator HEINRICH. OK.

How much of that is open to fishing?

Ms. O'DELL. People can fish anywhere.

Senator HEINRICH. Anywhere? So even the areas that are closed to vehicular access are open to fishing?

Ms. O'DELL. Yes, sir.

Senator HEINRICH. Great.

Thank you very much.

Senator UDALL. Senator Heinrich, thank you for your questions and interest.

Senator BARRASSO is recognized.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. O'Dell, S. 486 supported by North Carolina, both Senators, Republican and Democrat and so both Senators support as well as Representative Walter Jones, Republican, who represents North Carolina's third district, home to Cape Hatteras. Here we have an example of an entire delegation, elected by the people who live and work and recreate in an area supporting the same legislation, bipartisan. When I see legislation like this with unanimous support for land management policy from the elected delegation, I believe it's significant.

Every effort, I believe, should be made by the Administration and Members of Congress to support the desires of the local people, the delegation. Do you believe a delegation's views should or should not be given particular consideration when determining land management policy within their home State and district?

Ms. O'DELL. Certainly they should be given consideration, sir.

Senator BARRASSO. OK.

The National Park Service currently reports a maintenance backlog of about \$11 billion. However, a number of the bills in front of the subcommittee today enjoy Park Service support despite the fact that these new units would increase liabilities and responsibilities. So I ask you, Ms. O'Dell, would you purchase 3 or 4 new houses if you couldn't afford the mortgage on your current home?

Ms. O'DELL. Personally, I probably wouldn't do that, sir.

Senator BARRASSO. So it just doesn't make sense then to me that and to many other Americans for the Park Service to support obtaining further properties, further expenses and liabilities when the Park Service can't open parks on time and can't maintain their existing parks. I mean, this is now happening in Wyoming with Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks.

Do you as the Deputy Director of Operations believe it's a sound financial decision for existing park units for the agency to acquire more land and more liabilities?

Ms. O'DELL. We make our position based on the fact that Congress has asked us to study these areas. All of these areas met the criteria for significance, feasibility and suitability for management of National Parks. With the economic benefit that comes to a community, we believe, that a national park is an investment in a community as well.

Senator BARRASSO. So is it time for the Park Service to begin prioritizing funding? What's a higher priority for the National Park System operating dollars to keep the existing parks open or adding to the park system?

Ms. O'DELL. We address that every year in the President's Annual Budget, sir. That's where the priorities are set by the Department for activities in the National Park Service.

Senator BARRASSO. So we have 4 new parks proposed here today. Are any of these parks a greater priority than the 11 billion dollars maintenance backlog?

Ms. O'DELL. Unfortunately it's all a priority, sir.

Senator BARRASSO. So which 1 of these 4? You say all 4 of these are a greater priority than the 11 billion maintenance backlog or equal or?

Ms. O'DELL. That's a very difficult question to answer at any moment in time. But we support the fact that they are nationally sig-

nificant. If Congress sees fit to pass a bill to put them into the National Park Service, we will do our best to set our financial priorities to support those assets that the Congress wants to see in the National Park Service.

Senator BARRASSO. It seems to me that the Park Service is supporting new units and they—I'm still trying to decide from—hear from you clearly, if they are or not a greater priority than the existing parks in the 11 billion dollar maintenance backlog?

Ms. O'DELL. I would say that they are all of priority to us, sir. As we have our budget and we dole it out every year. We try and distribute it appropriately to deal with the immediate priorities before any given park at any moment in time.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Barrasso.

I would for the record like to ask unanimous consent that Senator Alexander's statement on the Manhattan Project National Historic Park be included in the record.

Without objection, it shall be done.

Senator UDALL. I appreciate Senator Barrasso's comments.

I also want to point out that the legislation that's in front of us, I should say the 14 various pieces of legislation, have in many cases, almost every case been generated by those delegations, by those communities who see the value in the utility in additional designations. I do think it's important that the Congress take into account Senator Barrasso's concerns. But I also don't want to diminish the excitement and the interest that is generated in many of these areas when there's an opportunity to protect the national memorial that celebrates the Distinguished Flying Cross or the Valles Caldera. The list, of course, is a long one here today. But that's the—the committee has some work to do.

I'd also like to comment on the bill to designate Mount McKinley a National Monument. If you look at the history the State of Alaska has officially recognized Denali as the name of the peaks since 1975. Congress in 1980 changed the name of the National Park to Denali National Park. But we didn't act on the name change for the mountain.

I've had the great opportunity, although some people question my sanity, to actually climb Mount McKinley or Denali, depending on the way in which you want to direct the name toward it. I think the idea of designating Denali keeps faith with the native people. There's a long history and of course, Denali, with all due respect to President McKinley, means the "Great White One."

I know Senator Portman, I think hails from—I know he hails from Ohio, thinks President McKinley was an Ohioan. So we may have to work with Senator Portman and make sure that President McKinley continues to receive the kind of respect and attention that he deserves. I think this is a suitable step we could take.

That's my personal opinion. We'll see what the committee decides to do and the Senate as a whole.

Thank you both again for taking the time to be here.

Oh, Senator Portman has just arrived. I was about to adjourn. But I wanted to, as I'll let Senator Portman settle himself, thank Senator Portman for his willingness to serve as the ranking mem-

ber for what I believe, and I think he believes, is the most important subcommittee in the entire U.S. Senate.

Senator Portman has a long history of connection with the National Parks. He served on the Centennial Commission that looked at the 100 year anniversary of the National Parks and put forth some ideas as to how we celebrate and nurture and maintain and enhance the National Park experience. I'm very much looking forward to working with him.

I was pleased, as I said earlier, to be able to work with him on his Peace Corps Memorial effort. I know Senator Portman knows my mother's history, which I mentioned earlier, that is she served in the Peace Corps for 4 years. That's personal to me. It's an important memorial. It's, I think, one of America's best ideas, the Peace Corps.

With that I'd like to recognize Senator Portman for any remarks he might have, general or questions on the various legislative vehicles that have been in front of us.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ROB PORTMAN, U.S. SENATOR
FROM OHIO**

Senator PORTMAN. Great. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize that I'm late.

I got detained over in the Capitol. They were trying to get a lot of things done this week before we go on a recess next week. So I apologize not to be here sooner.

Thank you for convening this hearing. I talked to Senator Manchin, said he was here. I know you all have talked about some of the legislation that's before you. I think we have 13 bills before the committee. We appreciate getting the Administration's feedback on them.

I also want to thank Chairman Udall for being willing to take on this task. He is uniquely qualified to be the Chairman of the Park Subcommittee because he has climbed mountains in all of the parks that have peaks over about 5,000 feet. He's kayaked rivers in the other ones. So he understands the importance of our parks and the need for us here at the Centennial to ensure that we are providing the parks the resources they need and also expanding the number of people who can take advantage of the parks which is one of my reasons for being on this subcommittee.

I did enjoy being on the Commission for a short period of time before I got back into this business. Also when I was at OMB worked on the Centennial Initiative and the Centennial Challenge. The notion is, in part, to get even more people involved and interested in the parks.

We have a great urban park in Ohio, the Cuyahoga National Park which is, I think, top 10 in the country, maybe number 6 now in terms of visitation and partly it's because it's near an urban area. So I think that's part of the future of the parks is bringing more and more people in and more public/private partnerships as we try to do the Centennial Challenge.

Of the 14 bills that were before the committee today all have received hearings in the previous Congress, I'm told. Some were even marked up in full committee. So we do have a lot of momentum.

I want to just take a moment, if I could, Mr. Chairman, talk about 2 of them.

One you just mentioned which is the Peace Corps Commemorative Foundation that you and I introduced last year. This is again, to build a memorial to commemorate the mission of the Peace Corps here in Washington, DC, on Federal land. It's already passed out of committee by unanimous consent. I thank the members of our committee for their support in that.

But it does not involve additional Federal funds. It's something that I would hope that we could enact quickly working with the House where's there's also a strong interest in it, as I understand.

We're also reintroducing a bill to allow a plaque to be placed on the World War II memorial inscribed with the words of Franklin Roosevelt that he prayed with the Nation on D-Day, June 6 1944. This is legislation that Joe Lieberman and I worked through the system last go around. We didn't get it done.

It did pass the House with a large margin. We appreciate the Administration working with us on this, the Department of Interior and the folks on the Mall and the Commemorative Works Commission, as I recall. I do hope, again, that's one thing we can also get done this year and move forward. Again, it was a very major bipartisan victory in the House. It's something that I think deserves our support as well. Very inspirational words that Senator Lieberman and I spoke on the Floor of the Senate last year.

So again, thank the witnesses for being here. I don't have any additional questions for them. I don't want to hold you up, Mr. Chairman.

But again, thank you for holding this hearing. I look forward to our work going forward.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Portman. With that let me point out if there are no further questions I want to thank both of you for being here this afternoon. Some members of the committee may submit some additional questions in writing. If so, we may ask you to submit answers for the record.

We'll keep the hearing record open for 2 weeks to receive any additional comments.

Senator UDALL. With that the subcommittee is adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 3:10 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to Additional Questions

RESPONSES OF PEGGY O'DELL TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR MURKOWSKI

ON S. 155

Question 1. Most Alaskans refer to Mt. McKinley as Denali. While reviewing your written testimony I noticed that the National Park Service's official position on S.155 is that it does not object to the proposal. Can you outline the reasoning behind this position? Are there any changes to the legislation that I can make to get the Park Service to support this bill?

Answer. The National Park Service (NPS) appreciates the long history and local interest in the traditional Athabascan name, Denali. We also recognize that for many years, members of Ohio's congressional delegation have sought to retain the name Mount McKinley out of respect for President McKinley, a native of Ohio. The NPS respects both of these positions and therefore does not want to take a position on S. 155 more supportive than "does not object to."

S. 156

Question 1. The National Park Service assisted my staff in drafting this legislation. Can you please tell me why the National Park Service now feels the proposed amendment is necessary?

Answer. As testimony was being prepared in 2011 on the version of the bill introduced last Congress, the question of whether having the Hoonah Indian Association share equal authority with the Secretary in preparing the harvest plan was a Constitutionally improper conferral of Federal authority to a non-Federal entity was raised. To ensure that there would be no question about this issue, we recommended that Hoonah Indian Association's role be advisory.

Question 2. Wouldn't the proposed amendment weaken the position of the Hoonah Indian Association? The very folks who we are trying to work with and help with this proposal?

Answer. The NPS respects the importance of this traditional cultural activity. If this amendment is adopted, the NPS will endeavor to accommodate the wishes and concerns of the Hoonah Indian Association to the greatest extent possible while ensuring the sustainability of gull populations in the park.

Question 3. Once this legislation is adopted and passed into law, how long will it be before the first gull egg harvest takes place?

Answer. According to the 2010 Record of Decision, a first harvest could occur at each of the open sites on or before the 5th day following the onset of laying, as determined by NPS staff monitoring a reference site.

Maintenance Backlog

Question 1. Given our current state of affairs, there is no room for budget increases-in fact, hard cuts will have to be made across the board. However even with its current budget the Park Service is \$10 billion behind on projects needed just to maintain existing National Parks. What kinds of plans does the Park Service have to address this shortfall?

Answer. The NPS is addressing the \$11.5 billion deferred maintenance backlog through a variety of fund sources, including repair and rehabilitation, line-item construction, recreation fee revenue, and appropriations available to us through the Department of Transportation/Federal Highways Administration. We expect to con-

tinue our policy of requesting construction funding for critical life, health, safety and resource protection projects, many of which address deferred maintenance, and not for the construction of new facilities. With relatively limited funding available to address the maintenance backlog, our Capital Investment Strategy (CIS) focuses funding on our most important assets and pursues disposal of non-mission critical assets in serious disrepair.

Question 2. Are there other asset sales or transfers that could reduce this amount?

Answer. While sales or transfers are considered when assets are no longer needed, most are in very poor condition and in areas with limited access. If a sold or transferred asset were to remain within a park, it could create usage conflicts with the NPS mission or impose other costs. As an example, if an asset is sold and remains within the park, the owner would have access rights, creating infrastructure maintenance and law enforcement costs for the Federal Government.

Question 3. What are the largest maintenance projects on this list?

Answer. There are many large-scale projects on the NPS list of deferred maintenance needs. Starting with the FY 2014 budget request, the five-year line-item construction program totals \$415 million. Examples of the largest deferred maintenance projects currently identified for funding in the 5-year plan include: Grand Canyon National Park, Replacement of the Transcanyon Water Distribution Pipeline; Yosemite National Park, Correction of Critical Safety Hazards and Rehabilitation of the Historic Ahwahnee Hotel; and Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, phased Rehabilitation and Restoration of Canals and Locks. Work and funding for these types of large-scale projects are typically phased over a number of years.

Question 4. Are major maintenance projects regularly completed?

Answer. Yes, although some of the largest projects seem to take a very long time because they are usually done in phases. Phasing is utilized when possible in order to allow other critical projects to be accomplished at the same time. Examples of major completed projects include: safety upgrades and stabilization at the Statue of Liberty National Memorial (\$50 million); repairs to the Reflecting Pool at the National Mall and Memorial Parks (\$38 million); the preservation and rehabilitation project at Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site (\$28 million); and replacement of unsafe deteriorated utility systems at various parks. Many of the recent major maintenance projects were completed using the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding, which provided a one-time boost for NPS construction funding.

Question 5. Our National infrastructure is aging, as I imagine that many of our Park facilities are as well. Is this backlog expected to grow? What is the Park Service doing to limit this growth?

Answer. The maintenance backlog at parks will likely continue to grow. Currently, less than half of the amount needed annually to hold the backlog at a "steady state" is appropriated. However, the NPS uses available funding to target the critical systems of the highest priority (mission-critical or mission-important) assets; this strategy will maintain a large number of important assets.

Question 6. Is creating new National Park units a greater priority than the \$13 billion maintenance backlog? If not, should we then wait until the backlog is paid down before this new unit is created or we expand other National Park Units?

Answer. The mission of the National Park Service is to protect and preserve cultural and natural resources for the enjoyment of the public and future generations. There are many sites currently unprotected and vulnerable to development or degradation that may be as important to our American story as resources already under NPS protection. The proposed new national park units would be important additions to the National Park System. The \$11.5 billion deferred maintenance backlog is a significant concern to the NPS, but the designation of these new units should not have to be postponed because of the backlog.

Question 7. Can you please outline the costs associated with the creation of each of the new park proposals before us today?

Answer. Four new units of the National Park System would be established by bills under consideration at this hearing. The cost estimates for these parks are as follows:

Valles Caldera National Monument:
Operations: \$4 million annually
Development: \$26 million

Land Acquisition: undetermined, expected to be minimal

Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park:

Operations: \$2.6 million
 Development: \$6.1 million
 Land Acquisition: \$4.8 million

Manhattan Project National Historical Park:

Operations: \$2.4 million to \$4 million annually
 Development: \$750,000 (general management plan) and unknown costs for the Department of Energy
 Land Acquisition: undetermined

Coltsville National Historical Park:

Operations: undetermined
 Development: undetermined- potential range is from \$720,000 to \$9.3 million
 Land acquisition: undetermined

Question 8. What will the new annual operating costs for each of the parks be? Which maintenance backlog projects would these funds have gone to if this park were not created?

Answer. The anticipated operating costs are noted in the question above. However, in the initial years of operation, the parks would likely receive less than \$200,000 annually. Any proposed funding for newly authorized units of the National Park System, and any proposed funding for reducing the maintenance backlog, would be determined through the Administration's budget priority-setting process. Spending for new units would not necessarily offset spending for the maintenance backlog.

S. 285

Question 1. Can you give me an estimate on the amount of funds the Park Service has expended on the Valles Caldera National Preserve since 2000 in hard appropriated funding as well as services-in-kind work?

Answer. The National Park Service has not received any appropriated funding to directly support the Valles Caldera National Preserve (Preserve). The NPS does, however, provide in-kind support to the Preserve. The superintendent of Bandelier National Monument (NM) serves as a member of the current Valles Caldera Trust (Trust). In that role he attends meetings three times a year and consults with other board members regularly. In addition, Bandelier NM park staff participate in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program with local land managers including the Trust; the park's fire ecologist and fire management officer participate in a regional fire ecology group that helps to manage the regional fire management response; the park's chief of resources is a member of an ecology group, which is composed of staff from various federal agencies; and, there are other regional activities that involve local land management agencies and their interests. All told, it is estimated that the Bandelier NM staff have contributed roughly \$100,000 of in-kind work to the Preserve since 2001.

In addition, the NPS Intermountain Regional Office's Planning Division, in conjunction with various partners, including Bandelier NM, the Trust, and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) completed the Update Report on the NPS 1979 New Area Study in December 2009 at the request of Senator Tom Udall and former Senator Jeff Bingaman. This report cost the NPS approximately \$22,000 in employee time and travel.

Question 2. Can you give me an estimate on the cost of bringing the property up to Park Service standards, including the cost of new infrastructure such as a visitor's center, etc.

Answer. Based on current expenses for the Preserve and the cost to operate comparable NPS units, we anticipate the annual cost to operate and manage the Preserve would be approximately \$4 million, although more complete cost estimates would be developed through a General Management Plan. The costs to develop infrastructure, which may include a visitor center, a maintenance facility, trails, roads, parking, and exhibits, could be approximately \$22 million, but would depend largely on the planning process and public input into that process.

Question 3. Can you compare and contrast the Santa Fe National Forest's firefighting capabilities with that of the Bandelier National Park's firefighting capabilities?

Answer. Bandelier National Monument shares firefighting capabilities and has agreements in place with the Santa Fe National Forest, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico State Forestry, and other partners in the Santa Fe Zone to utilize interagency resources during fires.

The structure of Bandelier's fire management division is somewhat different from the Santa Fe National Forest. In addition to suppression resources, Bandelier hosts aviation, fuels management, a wildland fire module, and a fire ecology program, which supports a fire effects crew. The fire ecology program and fire effects crew are key contributors to basing our fire management objectives on science-based adaptive management. These functions all reside within the Bandelier NM Division of Fire Management and help integrate fire management activities within the monument and on an interagency basis.

For the past 10 years, Bandelier NM has been a key player in the Santa Fe Zone. Bandelier manages the Santa Fe Zone Interagency Fire Center Heliport and the Type 3 contract helicopter. The interagency 10-person crew that serve the Santa Fe Zone are assigned to this facility.

Question 4. Can you compare the fire fighting capability of the Forest Service to that of the National Park Service's fire fighting capability?

Answer. Federal wildfire response requires an interagency and intergovernmental response, and therefore, it is difficult to make comparisons between the firefighting capabilities of the two agencies. Both the NPS and the USFS are members of the National Wildland Fire Coordinating Group, which establishes standards for firefighters and firefighting assets. The NPS assets meet established national standards and training, as do all assets from Department of Interior agencies and from the USFS. In number, the NPS firefighting assets are only a fraction of the USFS assets; however, all of the land management agencies work across boundaries on an interagency basis. This coordination is critical to wildland fire management and safety.

Question 5. I understand that the best agency needs to manage the land for the mission involved, but clearly the mission for Valles Caldera is multiple use. I believe that many members of the Jemez tribe and northern New Mexico stockmen are in agreement and are concerned with potential NPS management, so please tell me what the NPS is a better choice to manage this land than the Forest Service?

Answer. Numerous studies, including the updated new area study completed in 2009, at the request of Senator Tom Udall and former Senator Jeff Bingaman, found that Valles Caldera meets the criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park System.

S. 59

Question 1. Are there any other examples of private museums being designated as "National Memorials?"

Answer. We are not aware of any private museums that have been designated by Congress as National Memorials. We note that the bill would not designate the March Field Air Museum itself as a national memorial, but rather it would bestow this title upon a memorial on the grounds of the museum.

Question 2. Is there any estimation of the financial benefits and increased patronage that will accrue to this private museum as a result of the designation?

Answer. As the March Field Air Museum is not affiliated with, nor proposed to have any relationship with, the National Park Service, we have not conducted any analysis or evaluation of the effects of the proposed designation.

S. 305

Question 1. This bill expands the size of Vicksburg National Military Park more than 6 times over. Why is this expansion necessary now, over 100 years after the creation of the original park?

Answer. The Vicksburg Campaign Trail Feasibility Study, completed by the National Park Service in 2005, recommended that the battlefields at Champion Hill and Port Gibson be added as units to Vicksburg National Military Park to protect and preserve sites connected with this turning point of the Civil War. The study also recognized the significance of the Raymond Battlefield, which was not recommended as an addition to Vicksburg National Military Park at the time of the study because the non-profit that manages the site had planned to continue to do so indefinitely.

It is not accurate that the bill would expand Vicksburg National Military Park by more than six times its current size. The bill would not allow any expansion of the park unless and until battlefield land is actually acquired by the NPS. The likelihood that all the acreage eligible to be acquired would be acquired is very small.

Question 2. Given the proximity of this land to established development, acquisition costs for this proposed addition must be very high. Do you believe that the estimate of approximately \$20 million is accurate?

Answer. Most of the land that would be eligible for acquisition is rural and remote from dense development. The value per acre has been estimated between \$1,700 and \$3,000. If the bill is enacted, the NPS expects to receive donation of the land held by the state of Mississippi, the Friends of Raymond, and the Civil War Trust.

The value presumes that the agency would acquire all private land within those identified areas in fee, which is the most costly approach. The NPS often pursues scenic easements and other less-costly options for protecting land. In addition, it often takes many years from the time the agency is given the authority to acquire land to the time funding is appropriated for that purpose.

APPENDIX II

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

STATEMENT OF MAUREEN FINNERTY, CHAIR, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, COALITION OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE RETIREES, ON S. 371

Mr. Chairman and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees on S. 371, a bill to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, to dedicate the park to John H. Chafee, and for other purposes. We are submitting this to be incorporated for the record with other testimony of your Hearing of April 23, 2013.

This is important legislation. We strongly support the enactment of S. 371. It would create a Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park based on its real significance to the nation, and sustained by mutually supportive partnerships.

It is the “wholeness” of the Blackstone Valley that makes it significant. It is the reason S. 371 is structured as it is. Few places exist where such a concentration of integrated historic, cultural and natural resources has survived and can be made accessible by interpretation, preservation and management strategies. This resource tells the story of a watershed that depicts every phase of industrial development and environmental interaction from colonial times to the present era of revitalization. Much can be learned here about what makes a landscape environmentally and economically sustainable. In one small area of approximately 700,000 acres between Worcester, Massachusetts and Providence, Rhode Island—a river basin of only about 45 miles long and 22 miles wide—you can still see on the landscape evocative layers of nearly every phase of American development in the Northeast.

The streams and tributaries of the Blackstone River descend 450 feet from the hills in and above Worcester, Massachusetts to the Narragansett Bay, or 10 feet a mile—a faster descent than the Colorado River through Grand Canyon National Park. Through the work of people and the power of this geography, the river and its tributaries became the first place in the United States to experience the widespread use of waterpower for industry; the Valley became the center of industrial innovation for the nation, the Silicone Valley of its time.

The first layer you can see along these waterways is evidence of Native American settlements, early transportation routes, and vocabulary of resource features highlighting the significance of the waterways. These waterways are fed by what The New Yorker magazine called “large and spectacular wetlands.”¹ Surrounding the wetlands you can see important concentrations of colonial rural landscape development including hilltop villages with village commons, and crossroad villages and colonial transportation systems. The industrial and waterpower period followed, with riverside industrial villages and cities, including large parts of the 2nd and 3rd largest cities of New England, and then continued layers to our time. You can see the affect of landscape on culture, and culture on landscape at every stage. You even can perceive a sense of the way forward toward the future, or at least the choices and the opportunities for the future.

The rolling farmlands lined with classic New England stone walls remind you that the dawn of industry led to the revitalization of farming—just one of many unexpected interrelationships this park will be able to illustrate and interpret. With the concentration of distinctive resources across an entire landscape, this park could be understood as a natural resource. With the unique survival here of representatives elements of entire 18th and 19th century production systems, this Valley can be seen as a machine—a watershed harnessed as one integrated machine. For many

¹ “. . . the Blackstone Valley (was) the first area in North America to be industrialized. The . . . Massachusetts part, which is bordered by large and spectacular wetlands, stayed mostly undeveloped, but in Rhode Island mill villages dotted the hillsides . . . Every town on the river was supported by a mill, and every waterall on the river had a mill next to it. . . .” The New Yorker magazine, “Encountering The Countryside,” August 28, 1989, pp. 37-63.

national historical parks with one or two primary resources a compact park and legislative framework may work best. For the Blackstone Valley, a combination of parkland administration and partnership collaboration is needed, as provided by S 371.

This reshaping of the river basin, its physical and social response, the creation of sustainable wealth and community, its economic and environmental decline and more recently its pathway to restoration is the major significance of the Blackstone River Valley. The story it tells of America is both compelling and potentially redeeming.

This Valley has high integrity, is compact, and capable of supporting the very best of interpretation and public programming in a living, working cultural landscape.

It is certainly much more, and much more interesting to visitors, than the probably-misnamed "Birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution." Describing these resources as exclusively industrial or of a narrow period of industrial history truly misses and seriously understates what makes the Blackstone River Valley significant on a national scale.

Rather than a park boundary to include the whole watershed—the complete resource—as we and others originally proposed, this bill is a brilliant solution to the key issue of landscape and boundary. Brilliant, in the sense of a more modest, efficient and cost effective framework while still centered on the "wholeness" of the Blackstone River Valley. S. 371 accomplishes this by relying on the local jurisdictions and private sector involvement, and especially on partnering with the surrounding National Heritage Corridor, to enable a much smaller park.

As called for by the Special Resource Study (SRS) the park would be anchored in the essential 5 representative historic districts and, as its spine and network, the Blackstone River with its tributaries and canal. S. 371 would enable the state of Rhode Island to donate the Blackstone River State Park within in the Ashton historic mill village, as needed in the opinion of the NPS to be the robust anchor of NPS administration and the link to other park partnership districts.

We recommend that the committee's report specifically state that the public overwhelmingly identified the river and tributaries as essential park resources because they are essential to the story of waterpower, they are the spine holding the Valley together, and they offer an important way to view and enjoy the park. They also represent the natural environment that always has been seen by the local public as the first purpose of the preservation efforts in the Valley, even as far back as the 1980's in the first survey conducted by National Park Service for the first management plan.

Therefore, we strongly urge the committee to include in the park all the key resource areas identified in the Special Resource Study, as are found in S. 371 as written.

We will say more at the conclusion about the goals of our Coalition, but at this point let me say simply that a primary responsibility of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees is to provide insight on how legislation and policy and practice REALLY affect things in the Field, where as everyone knows, the rubber meets the road. We appreciate how difficult it can be to get beyond theory and 'what if's' to what really can work.

To that end, our judgment is that the National Park Service is to be congratulated for the distinction and insight of the Blackstone River Valley Special Resource Study, the basis of this legislation. The Valley is as important and as complex a landscape as may be found, and the National Park Service responded with many elegant and essential resource preservation solutions in this SRS. In addition to the interests of multiple federal agencies, this park plan engaged two sovereign states and over 20 New England towns and cities and 40 historic villages. The SRS team did the work, worked with the public and really listened, and to be noted, they also read and assessed all the voluminous evaluations and analysis, the plans and their results that you find in the SRS Bibliography. It is a remarkable demonstration of strength that the team understood and articulated the special needs of this resource.

The SRS calls for NPS expenditures on the same order of magnitude as the last 20 years. As the Conservation Study Institute report demonstrates, if the existing energy and imagination and partnerships in the Valley from the NPS' past experience are incorporated into this new national park, the costs will be very modest. We believe that the higher vision established by S. 371 will attract motivated partners, and that unequivocally enabling collaboration will attract significant investments by the private sector, by State and local government, and by other federal agencies.

The National Park Service has demonstrated over the past 20 years that it and its partners have developed the right balance among the private sector, the local

governments and the federal government. None of the communities or businesses has raised concerns over any loss of authority. No community has ever asked to be deleted from the heritage area. In fact, other communities keep asking to join. During the public review of the SRS, the overwhelming community response was in support of the park, with nearly all those who spoke at the public meetings calling for including the river and its tributaries in the park. This comes from placing the public at the center of decision making, of getting the balance of incentives right, but above all by the power of the Meaning of the resource and power of an exciting park story people identify with. This legislation builds from those positive relationships.

The Coalition of National Park Service Retirees strongly supports the provision to dedicate the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park to the late Senator John H. Chafee. Senator, Chairman, Governor, Secretary of the Navy and Marine John H. Chafee will be as inspiring to park visitors as he is to us. He worked extremely well with all the other Massachusetts and Rhode Island Members of Congress in support of the Blackstone Valley. His successful efforts to revitalize the nation's air and water may be seen as a microcosm for the same in the Blackstone Valley. He knew that a healthy nation and a healthy economy require a healthy environment, as is also reflected in history of the Valley and the purpose of the National Heritage Corridor, now named for Senator John H. Chafee.

Thank you for considering this testimony of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees.

The more than 800 members of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees are all former employees of the National Park Service (NPS) with more than 26,000 years of stewardship of America's most precious natural and cultural resources. In their personal lives, CNPSR members maintain their professional outlook. Just as the national parks are supported by the broad spectrum of the American people, the CNPSR members reflect the broad spectrum of political affiliations. CNPSR members now offer their professional experience and integrity as they speak out for national park solutions that uphold law and policy. Our members also support the mission of the National Park Service through public education.

LOS AMIGOS, DE VALLES CALDERA,
Santa Fe, NM, April 23, 2013.

DAVID BROOK,
Counsel, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Washington DC.

Re: SB285

DEAR MR. BROOKS: As this bill comes up in front of the National Parks Subcommittee, we would like to reiterate some of our previous concerns (letter to Senators Bingaman and Udall, February 24, 2010, June 27, 2010 Testimony re SB3452, and letter to Sen. Bingaman May 10, 2011), as well as mention some new ones.

We are Los Amigos de Valles Caldera, a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization incorporated in New Mexico on September 30, 2006 by former members of the Board of Trustees of the Valles Caldera National Preserve and others. The Valles Caldera National Preserve, formerly the privately owned "Baca Ranch," is an 89,000-acre property located in the Jemez Mountains in northern New Mexico purchased by the federal government in 2000 under the Valles Caldera Preservation Act and placed under the management of the Valles Caldera Trust.

Los Amigos' mission is to support the Valles Caldera National Preserve for present and future generations through outreach, education, restoration, and collaboration.

Los Amigos currently has over 200 members. Los Amigos is supported by government grants, grants from private foundations, and individual contributions. These individual contributions have ranged from \$25 to \$1,000 and have come from a wide variety of people across the country. We have brought in over \$1 million in restoration funding.

Los Amigos was created to support the Preserve, and we plan to continue with that mission, no matter who is managing the Preserve. However, we have a number of concerns about the proposed legislation to transfer the Preserve from the Trust to the Park Service:

One.—The fourth and final criterion used by the Park Service in determining whether they should manage an important natural resource when it is already being managed by another federal agency was noticeably left unanswered in the NPS report regarding the Valles Caldera. According to National Park Service Management Policies 2006: "To receive a favorable recommendation from the Service, a proposed addition to the national park system must (1) possess nationally significant natural

or cultural resources, (2) be a suitable addition to the system, (3) be a feasible addition to the system, and (4) require direct NPS management instead of protection by other public agencies or the private sector. These criteria are designed to ensure that the national park system includes only the most outstanding examples of the nation's natural and cultural resources. These criteria also recognize that there are other management alternatives for preserving the nation's outstanding resources. . . . There are many excellent examples of the successful management of important natural and cultural resources by other public agencies, private conservation organizations, and individuals. The National Park Service applauds these accomplishments and actively encourages the expansion of conservation activities by state, local, and private entities and by other federal agencies. Unless direct NPS management of a studied area is identified as the clearly superior alternative, the Service will recommend that one or more of these other entities assume a lead management role, and that the area not receive national park system status." According to the letter transmitting the NPS report regarding the Preserve, "The scope of this report is limited to the first three criteria, and the need for NPS management is not addressed." So we wonder, how and in what way could they do a better job than the Trust? With all due respect, this crucial question needs to be directly faced and addressed. As articulated by the Park Service, this last criterion is not a political decision, but rather a matter of history, financial resources, and staffing of the Service itself.

Two.—The answer to the fourth criterion would have to take into account the Park Service's current budget problems. Under the Sequester, the NPS is taking a \$63 million cut, which they say will mean 900 positions will go unfilled. Even before this cut, the NPS budget has been cut several times since the original of this bill was introduced. It is common knowledge that the NPS is unable to meet its backlog of maintenance at its current units. This has been cited in articles in the press as well as in GAO reports. The Park Service indicated in their testimony in 2011 regarding the earlier iteration of this bill that \$32 million would be needed immediately after the Preserve went to the Park Service, for infrastructure. Then another \$4 million would be needed annually for administration. It is unclear how this could be accomplished under the cuts from the Sequester. The Los Alamos Monitor reported that there will be furloughs at Bandelier National Monument, and that they may be cutting off some access to the backcountry because of the Sequester.

The Trust is currently not having this problem. As they showed in the 2012 State of the Preserve, they have increased visitation (110,000 in 2012), revenue, and restoration. They are now "in the black" in the livestock program. They are obtaining 30 percent of their total operating costs through fees and donations. They will not be furloughing any employees under the Sequester, and they will not be eliminating programs.

Three.—Since the introduction of the original bill in 2010, the Preserve and its neighbors have been the victims of a large and devastating fire, the Las Conchas Fire of 2011. A third of the Preserve was burned, and although some of that was beneficial, a lot of it was not and still continues to have impacts on streams and wetlands. Therefore, everyone agrees that the most critical work to be accomplished on the Preserve in the foreseeable future is the restoration of the forest ecosystem to a manageable condition and the restoration of the wetlands damaged in part by the Las Conchas Fire.

The Southwest Jemez Mountains Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) Project has been funded by the Department of Agriculture. That project is designed to improve the resilience of ecosystems on the Preserve and on the Santa Fe National Forest to recover from wildfires and other natural disturbances and sustain healthy forests and watersheds by thinning and prescribed burning to restore more natural fire regimes.

If the Preserve goes to the Park Service, in the Department of the Interior, that money will be lost, along with our best opportunity to help prevent any further fires in the Preserve. This is a major concern to Los Amigos, the Trust, and the neighbors of the Preserve. If forest restoration is not significantly accomplished in the near future, the Preserve will be at great risk for a further catastrophic fire. We in New Mexico are beginning another dangerous fire season. The moisture at the Preserve is at only 65 percent of normal for this time of year. This is frightening, given the forecast for continued lack of significant precipitation in the area.

We hope that the subcommittee will consider these points. We feel that this may not be the best time for a change in management. The Trust seems to be making significant progress toward the goals set for it in the Valles Caldera Preservation Act. We hope that Congress will give them the time to meet all of those goals and to show the potential benefits from a new kind of public land management.

We appreciate the committee's ongoing willingness to consider our concerns. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

DOUG FRASER,
Chair, Board of Directors Los Amigos de Valles Caldera.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE DINI, MAYOR, CITY OF YERINGTON, NEVADA, ON S. 159

Chairman Manchin, members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to offer testimony in favor of S. 159, the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act introduced by Senator Heller, Cosponsored by Senator Reid, and supported by the entire Nevada Congressional Delegation.

I am proud to serve as the Mayor of Yerington, Nevada. I am joined today by Lyon County Manager Jeff Page on behalf of the Lyon County Commission, to jointly express the support of the 3,156 citizens of Yerington and 52,000 citizens of Lyon County and to urge the committee to pass this bill. This land sale represents the economic future of our City and County.

I also express the support of Nevada Governor Sandoval, and a multitude of local and regional support.

The City of Yerington is located in Northern Nevada in the Mason Valley and we have a long proud history of mining and agriculture. However, our current economy is in bad shape. Our unemployment in Lyon County has averaged over 15 percent during the past year and our citizens are suffering greatly. Over the past 10 years, we have been fortunate to receive over \$20 million in Federal funding that has been critical to maintaining our public infrastructure; however, this is not how our citizens want to survive as a community. We seek jobs and the ability to work hard to raise our families in a growing and vibrant community. We need long-term stable jobs for our citizens and an industry that will provide sustainable economic growth for decades.

S. 159 mandates the fair market sale of approximately 10,400 acres of federal lands—just 1 percent of 975,000 acres of federal lands in Lyon County—to the City of Yerington for economic development, a recreation events center and open space purposes.

The lands that will be conveyed have no current important uses. There is no threatened or endangered species habitat, no water resources, and no significant cultural resources. This is barren land that has few redeeming natural qualities.

The purchase of these lands will allow the City of Yerington to annex the Pumpkin Hollow Mine site, sell water and sewer services to the mine operation, benefit from taxes paid by the mine, allows the City to grow economically and benefit from greatly needed recreation, cultural and economic development lands.

The legislation also designates land for the Wovoka Wilderness, which is located in the South Pine Grove Hills. The land was identified as part of a local consultation process. In addition to wilderness, the legislation protects the County against a potential listing of the sage grouse on the Endangered Species List, protects existing grazing interests, maintains public access on existing roads, and provides continued access to recreation and hunting. On December 3, 2012, the Lyon Board of County Commissioners unanimously approved a resolution supporting the designation as outlined in S. 159. I also support this designation.

For over four years, the City of Yerington has been working with Nevada Copper to craft a development plan for the Pumpkin Hollow Mine that will ensure the City of Yerington will economically benefit from the development of the mine creating a sustainable future for our City. The Pumpkin Hollow Copper mine that sits on private lands near the City of Yerington. With or without this legislation, Nevada Copper will develop and produce millions of tons of valuable minerals. The question really is whether the Yerington will benefit from this new mining project.

Nevada Copper proposes to start full project development—an investment of approximately \$1 billion—starting in 2013. In March, the company secured \$200 million to initiate the development of the underground mine and mineral processing facilities at Pumpkin Hollow. The company would like to invest another \$800 million to build out the much larger integrated open pit and underground mining operation. However, that level of financing will only happen subject to passage of S. 159.

The integrated mine operation facilitated by this legislation will create over 800 direct mine operations jobs and up to 500 construction jobs. Using the current published jobs multipliers a total of over 2,000-3,000 direct and indirect jobs would be created by the mine.

The timely passage of this legislation cannot be over-stated. We are operating on a tight timeline. With the financing they have received, Nevada Copper is initiating

detailed siting, engineering and design of project infrastructure. This legislation will allow Yerington to work with the Nevada Copper to locate infrastructure for water, sewer, and power for both mine development and the other uses contemplated by the City. Both the City and Lyon County will be able to share in property, sales, utility and net proceeds of mines taxes from mine operations. If this legislation is not successful, the mine will proceed, but as in the past, Yerington will simply have to deal with the impacts with no real benefits to the City other than some jobs for citizens.

As importantly, with this contiguous block of land, the City and Nevada Copper can begin to plan for the future, long after mining is complete. The development agreement between the City and Nevada Copper will ensure that the Company leaves behind resources and assets that will provide sustainable economic growth for the City. S. 159 solidifies the critical partnership that will provide economic enhancement for decades-and at no cost to the American taxpayer.

Some of the lands will also be utilized for economic development as commercial and light industrial needs increase to support the operations of the mine. Also, the City is proposing a portion of the lands be utilized for renewable energy development such as solar energy. Lastly, some of the lands will be utilized by Nevada Copper to maximize the mining operations on their patented lands.

As you can see, the sale of these lands to the City of Yerington will have a dramatic, positive impact by increasing jobs, the investment in Nevada, and increased tax revenues for the City, Lyon County and the State of Nevada. It will also generate jobs and economic activity in over 20 states nationwide for equipment, materials and supplies.

Mr. Chairman, the City of Yerington is not asking Congress to give the City some public lands in the hope of attracting economic development. We are asking to pay fair market value to acquire a very small percentage of federal lands that have little or no use to the public in order to enhance and increase development that is already occurring at the Pumpkin Hollow site. I cannot express enough the importance of this project to the future of our City and I urge the Committee to support S. 159.

STATEMENT OF DERB. S. CARTER, JR., DIRECTOR OF THE NORTH CAROLINA OFFICES
OF THE SOUTHERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER, ON H.R. 819

This testimony is submitted on behalf of Audubon North Carolina and Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC). In addition, SELC has represented Defenders of Wildlife in litigation prompting the rulemaking process, in the rulemaking process itself, and in intervening in litigation on the side of the National Park Service to defend the Final Rule that would be abolished by HR 819. SELC also represents National Parks Conservation Association in defending the Final Rule.

We strongly oppose HR 819. We support the National Park Service's Final Rule to manage off-road vehicle use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore in North Carolina. The bill would abolish the Final Rule which was adopted by the National Park Service after extensive public review and comment. The bill would eliminate sensible safeguards to preserve Cape Hatteras National Seashore for current visitors and future generations to explore and enjoy. In the one year of management under the Final Rule, visitation to the Seashore increased, tourism set record highs, and wildlife on the Seashore continued to rebound.

Passage of HR 819 would ignore and undermine:

Extensive public involvement in adoption of the Final Rule:

The public process informing the National Park Service's management plan included numerous public meetings, a negotiated rulemaking process that included opportunity for public comment at each meeting, and two public comments periods, during which 21,258 written comments were received on the draft Final Rule and its supporting environmental impact statement. The vast majority of commenters wrote in favor of stronger wildlife protections and more stringent off-road vehicle (ORV) restrictions than even those contained in the Final Rule. The National Park Service weighed all the comments and public input and struck a careful and fair balance among competing uses of the Seashore, which is embodied in the Final Rule. The Final Rule should be given a chance to succeed.

Detailed economic and environmental review

The Park Service's extensive review culminated in lengthy economic reports and cost-benefit analyses, an environmental impact statement that examined six alternatives to the Final Rule, and a detailed biological opinion issued by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, all of which supported the Final Rule as it was written. The

management measures in the Final Rule are based on a robust scientific record supported by leading experts.

Balanced access for pedestrians and ORV users provided by the Final Rule

The Final Rule provides a balanced approach to Seashore visitation, designating 41 miles (28 year-round and 13 seasonal) as ORV routes of the Seashore's 67 miles of beaches. Only 26 miles of beaches are designated as year-round vehicle-free areas for pedestrians, families, and wildlife, to promote pedestrian access and reduce user conflicts between motorized and non-motorized visitors. While limiting off-road vehicular traffic in these areas, the new plan will also provide new parking facilities and access ramps to facilitate visitor access to beaches.

The Final Rule and management plan only closes beaches when necessary to protect nesting waterbirds and sea turtles from disturbance. Today, one hundred percent of the Seashore beaches are open to pedestrians and 61 percent of the beaches are open to ORV and pedestrian use. The remaining 39 percent of the beaches are reserved for pedestrian use only. During the breeding season for waterbirds (late April through July) only those areas where birds are attempting to nest are closed when prescribed disturbance buffers require closure. Once nesting is completed, these areas are opened.

Most other national seashores either have regulations in place to manage and restrict ORV use or do not allow ORV use at all; only one national seashore continues to allow beach driving without a regulation in place. Four national seashores have long prohibited ORVs entirely, while four others have regulations restricting ORV use. All of those, except Padre Island, allow driving on a much smaller percentage of their beaches than does the Cape Hatteras Final Rule. Thus, the number of miles Cape Hatteras's beach set aside for ORV use in the Final Rule is significantly more extensive than most other national seashores.

The overwhelming weight of scientific authority

In contrast to the utter dearth of science to support HR 819, an extraordinary amount of scientific evidence shows that the Final Rule's beach driving restrictions are warranted and are the minimum necessary to preserve the natural resources of the Seashore for future generations. The rulemaking record includes hundreds of peer-reviewed articles, the peer-reviewed protocols developed by the government's own scientists at the U.S. Geological Survey, and the support of scientists at the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission. Arguments for ORV use on the entire Seashore are not only contradicted by substantial scientific studies at the Seashore and other locations, they are not supported by any scientific evidence in the record.

Five years of thriving tourism:

In the four years under reasonable wildlife protections and ORV restrictions similar to those implemented in the Final Rule¹ and one year under the Final Rule, tourism has thrived, park visitation has held steady and increased in some years, and tourism revenues grew. Notably, in the last two years, new records have been set for visitor occupancy and tourism revenue in Dare County, North Carolina, where much of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore land is located.

With the exception of 2011, when Hurricane Irene cut off access to Hatteras Island for nearly two months, visitation to Cape Hatteras National Seashore has remained steady or increased for the past nine years, from a low of 2,125,005 (in 2006) and a high of 2,302,040 in 2012. In the first year of management under the Final Rule, Seashore visitation was the highest since 2003.

¹These wildlife protections were established in a consent decree was entered by the U.S. district Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina in the federal lawsuit entitled *Defenders of Wildlife et al. v. National Park Service et al.* (E.D.N.C. case no. 2:07-CV-45). It imposed protections and beach driving restrictions beginning in 2008 that are very similar to those in the Final Rule.

Year	Cape Hatteras National Seashore visitation
2012	2,302,040
2011	1,960,711 *
2010	2,193,292
2009	2,282,543
2008	2,146,392
2007	2,237,378
2006	2,125,005
2005	2,260,628

*Hurricane Irene cut access for nearly two months

(See "Annual Park Visitation" Report for CAHA at <http://www.nature.nps.gov/stats/park.cfm>)

Dare County, NC, where the majority of the Seashore is located, reports that visitor occupancy tax receipts for each year under the court ordered ORV restrictions (2008 to 2012) exceeded receipts in 2007 and prior years, with 2008, 2010, 2011, and 2012 setting successive records for all-time high receipts. Tourism revenue for Hyde County, NC (the Ocracoke Island portion of Cape Hatteras National Seashore) has held steady or increased since 2005, to a record high \$31.69 million in 2011. The chart below shows tourism revenue data for Hyde and Dare Counties, both before the court ordered ORV restrictions went into effect in 2008 and afterwards:

Year	Dare County tourism expenditures (millions of dollars)	Dare County percent change from prior year	Hyde County tourism expenditures (millions of dollars)	Hyde County percent change from prior year
2011	\$877.18	+ 5.14	\$31.69	- 2.6%
2010	\$834.29	+ 8.8%	\$30.90	- 11.6%
2009	\$766.56	(-1.4%)	\$27.70	(- 1.5%)
2008	\$777.41	+ 1.9%	\$28.11	+ 3.0%
2007	\$762.65	+ 8.6%	\$27.29	(- 4.1%)
2006	\$702.25	+ 8.7%	\$28.46	+ 3.5%
2005	\$646.08	- 4.8%	\$27.49	+ 7.6%

(See North Carolina Department of Commerce reports on tourism revenue at: www.nccommerce.com/tourism/research/economic-impact/)

The majority of the national seashore is on Hatteras Island in Dare County. Dare County reports that occupancy revenue from hotels, rental homes, campgrounds, etc. on Hatteras Island was seven percent higher in 2012 (the first year under the Final Rule) than in 2007 (the year that the Interim Management Strategy, to which HR 819 would return the Seashore, was in effect). This was true despite the fact that access to Hatteras Island was cut off after Hurricane Sandy for nearly two months in late 2012. Occupancy receipts have been steadily rising in recent years under reasonable wildlife protections and ORV restrictions similar to those implemented in the Final Rule. The Dare County Visitor's Bureau reports that Hatteras Island visitors spent a record-setting \$27.8 million on lodging during the month of July 2010 (surpassing July 2009 by 18.5 percent). July 2011 occupancy receipts on Hatteras Island then set a new high of \$29.6 million. Then July 2012 set yet another new all-time occupancy high on Hatteras Island at \$30,577,703. July has the maximum restriction on ORV use due to seasonal safety ORV closures in front of villages, breeding bird closures, and night driving restrictions for nesting sea turtles. The occupancy receipts for June and September 2012, the first year under the Final Rule, also exceeded the levels for the prior years posted on Dare County's Visitor's Bureau

website, and may also represent all-time records. (See <http://www.outerbanks.org/outerbanks-statistics/> (graphs for "Occupancy by District").

Although only 4-5 percent of Seashore visitors have an interest in driving on the beaches, these visitors have this opportunity at all times under the Final Rule. Since the Final Rule went into effect on February 15, 2012 (through March 4, 2013), the National Park Service has issued 32,893 permits to operate an ORV on Seashore beaches (9,086 annual and 23,807 weekly permits). Permits require an applicant to view a short educational video on safe driving on the beaches. In the first year under the permit system instituted by the Final Rule, speeding violations on the beaches decreased by 88 percent from 200 in the prior year to 23.

Recovery of protected species under reasonable ORV restrictions:

The various federally endangered, federally threatened, and state-protected species of shorebirds, water birds, and sea turtles that live and/or breed on Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches have rebounded in the five years under court ordered ORV restrictions and the Final

Rule.—These species are sensitive to human disturbance during the nesting season. All species had declined—and some had even disappeared from the Seashore—under the prior plan that HR 819 seeks to reinstate. Under the court ordered ORV restrictions and Final Rule, records have been set for the number of sea turtle nests, piping plover breeding pairs, piping plover fledged chicks, American oystercatcher fledged chicks, least tern nests, and gull-billed tern nests.

Sea turtle nests on Seashore beaches have nearly tripled from 82 in 2007 to a record 222 in 2012. The number of breeding pairs of threatened piping plovers increased from 6 pairs in 2007 to 15 in 2012. The number of nests of beach nesting colonial waterbirds including terns and black skimmers has quadrupled, from 314 nests in 2007 to 1314 nests in 2012. By all measures, the ORV use restrictions during the nesting season from May to July have been an unqualified success in restoring wildlife to the Seashore.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Sea turtle nests	82	112	104	153	147	222
Piping plover pairs	6	11	9	12	15	15
Piping plover fledged chicks	4	7	6	15	10	11
American oystercatcher pairs	21	21	21	20	20	21
American oystercatcher fledged chicks	10	15	10	26	24	15
Colonial waterbird nests	314	255	691	414	1289	1314

(See *National Park Service, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Annual Reports 2012*)

The requirements of numerous federal laws:

Executive Order 11644 and 36 C.F.R. § 4.10 require all public land managers to adopt special regulations to authorize ORV use and requires that those plans not harm wildlife or degrade wildlife habitat.

The Park Service Organic Act declares that national parks and seashores must be managed "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historical objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 16 U.S.C. § 1. If a conflict exists between recreational uses and natural resource protection, natural resource protection predominates.

The enabling legislation for Cape Hatteras National Seashore declares that it shall be "permanently preserved as a primitive wilderness" and that "no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible [] with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna of the physiographic conditions now prevailing in the area." 16 U.S.C. § 459a-2.

The Endangered Species Act requires that all federal agencies provide for the recovery of endangered species. 16 U.S.C. § 7(a)(1). HR 4094, in contrast, prescribes that any management plan for the Seashore only provide minimum protection to endangered species, but not recovery.

The National Environmental Policy Act requires preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) for federal actions that significantly affect the environment.

The Final Rule is supported by an EIS, but the Interim Strategy mandated by HR 4094 is not.

Conclusion

In marked contrast to the National Park Service's Final Rule, HR 819 would return Cape Hatteras National Seashore to the failed protocols of the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy that were proven to be devastating to birds, sea turtles, other natural resources, and the public's enjoyment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches prior to the introduction of the consent decree. Even the Interim Strategy itself states that it was not developed as a long-term solution for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, but rather expressly and repeatedly states that it was intended only to be implemented temporarily until the Final Rule was in place. The Biological Opinion for the Interim Strategy reiterates that it will negatively impact the natural resources of the Seashore in the long-term.

In contrast to the Final Rule, the Interim Strategy that HR 819 seeks to reinstate:

1. Was not supported by the same degree of public participation and contradicts the wishes of the vast majority of people who commented on the Final Rule;
2. Is not supported by any data or evidence that it will have a greater positive impact (or avoid a negative impact) on tourism than the Final Rule;
3. Is not supported by an environmental impact statement or extensive economic studies, as the Final Rule is;
4. Will reserve an extraordinary percentage of the miles of Seashore beaches for a small minority of park users, to the exclusion of the majority of park users who prefer to enjoy the Seashore without the danger, visual blight, noise, and odor of trucks monopolizing the beach;
5. Is not supported by the great weight of scientific literature, as the Final Rule is;
6. Was responsible, in part, for the decline in population of the many protected species at the Seashore by 2007; and
7. Will violate and undermine the requirements of the federal laws listed above.

In sum, the National Park Service's Final Rule is a balanced plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore while providing areas for wildlife, and the vast majority of visitors who come to walk and not drive on the Seashore's beaches.

Please oppose HR 819, and instead support the National Park Service's balanced and common sense management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

CREC,
Hartford, CT, April 25, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
U.S. Representative, Washington, DC.

RE: S. 615/ HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act

DEAR SENATOR BLUMENTHAL, SENATOR MURPHY, AND CONGRESSMAN LARSON:

I am writing to offer CREC's support for the passage of S. 615/ HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act, and our sincere endorsement for the designation of the Coltsville Historic District as a National Park. The people of Hartford and Connecticut deserve to have this historic site preserved. Establishing Coltsville National Historical Park in the State of Connecticut is an important step towards revitalizing our capital city. It will aid in the continued growth and redevelopment of the area, will bring new jobs and revenues to our city, and will provide generations of children and families access to this important historic landmark.

CREC currently operates three magnet schools in the Coltsville Historic District: the CREC Greater Hartford Academy of the Arts High School, serving students in grades 7-12; the CREC Two Rivers Magnet High School, serving students in grades 9-12; and the CREC Greater Hartford Academy of the Arts Middle School, serving students in grades 6-8. We have further plans to develop additional portions of the Coltsville site, including the complete renovation of one of the buildings in the north part of the complex.

CREC is committed to the success and stability of the Coltsville Historic District. We recognize the great economic and educational potential that the site has for our state, and CREC is grateful to be part of the ongoing renovation and revitalization of the District. We offer our full support for the Coltsville Historic District receiving National Park designation, and we look forward to our continued partnership in this endeavor.

Thank you for your unwavering dedication to our state.

Sincerely,

BRUCE E. DOUGLAS, PH.D.,
Executive Director.

CT TRUST,
Hamden, CT, April 6, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
U.S. Representative, Washington, DC.

RE: S. 615/ HR 1259 a bill to establish the Coltsville National Historical Park Act

DEAR SENATOR BLUMENTHAL, SENATOR MURPHY AND REPRESENTATIVE LARSON:

On behalf of the Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation, I am writing to urge your support of the National Park land package that includes establishing Coltsville as a National Historic Park: S. 615/HR. 1259 a bill to establish the Coltsville National Historical Park Act.

For the Connecticut Trust, Coltsville National Park will be the culmination of almost two decades of advocacy to see the buildings restored and the complex recognized and offered as a public resource. The extraordinary national importance of the Coltsville story of precision manufacturing, innovative approaches to mechanization and the many contributions Elizabeth Colt, as a widow, made to ensure the development of a culturally vibrant capital will be part of the national consciousness, where it finally deserves to be.

There is no better time for a National Park to be established at Coltsville. The old industrial complex, with its various armories and outbuildings, is hopping with activity. One by one, the buildings have been and are being renovated. Tenants range from residents to students to manufacturing workers and restaurateurs. The Coltsville complex is emerging as the best there can be in reimagining our old industrial complexes and making them work for the 21st century. A National Park in this vibrant mix will bring visitors who will not only be immersed in the history of Coltsville but will also experience firsthand the return to life that an old industrial complex can undergo. Coltsville is a happening place that will become a centerpiece for Hartford and Connecticut once designated a National Park.

The Connecticut Trust stands ready now and in the future to assist the National Park Service, the State of Connecticut, the City of Hartford and other local partners in making Coltsville a successful National Park in Hartford. The Trust is a partner of the National Trust for Historic Preservation which has a strong interest in this project.

Thank you for taking the leadership to ensure the designation of Coltsville as a National Historic Park.

Sincerely,

HELEN HIGGINS,
Executive Director.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2013.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Chairman, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

The Department strongly opposes S. 486. As stated in testimony given before the Subcommittee on National Parks on April 23, 2013 (enclosed), the bill would reinstate the 2007 Interim Protected Species Management Strategy governing off-road vehicle (ORV) use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, replacing the final ORV Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement and special regulation.

The final plan and regulation, the product of an intensive five-year long planning process that included a high level of public participation, not only provides diverse visitor experience opportunities, manages ORV use in a manner appropriate to a unit of the National Park System, and provides a science-based approach to the conservation of protected wildlife species, but also adapts to changing conditions over the life-span of the plan.

The Department supports allowing appropriate public use and access at the Seashore to the greatest extent possible, while also ensuring protection for the Seashore's wildlife and providing a variety of visitor use experiences, minimizing conflicts among various users, and promoting the safety of all visitors. We strongly believe that the final ORV Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement and special regulation are accomplishing these objectives far better than the defunct Interim Strategy.

We urge the committee to oppose S. 486.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. JARVIS,
Director.

COALITION TO STRENGTHEN THE SHELDON/CHARTER OAK NEIGHBORHOOD
(CSS/CON),
Hartford, CT, April 12, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
U.S. Representative, Washington, DC.

RE: S. 615/ HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act

DEAR SENATORS BLUMENTHAL AND MURPHY AND CONGRESSMAN LARSON:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Sheldon/Charter Oak NRZ, I wish to reiterate our very strongest support for Coltsville National Historic Park. Our neighborhood, in which Coltsville is located, has always supported this plan and has been an active member of the Coltsville Ad Hoc Committee since the idea was conceived.

While the name Sam Colt is synonymous with Hartford and the firearms industry, the story of Coltsville is much bigger and more interesting than simply the manufacturing of guns. Sam Colt built a model factory, which employed the most advanced manufacturing technology and precision engineering of the day. Coltsville is nationally important in American industrialization and a leader in the interchangeability of parts and mechanization of virtually all aspects of manufacturing. The Colts created more than a factory. They designed a planned urban industrial district, including housing, recreational facilities, meeting halls, and churches. Much of this fabric remains today within the Coltsville area under consideration.

The significance of Coltsville is so much bigger than the sum of its physical parts. It's the story of a widow (Elizabeth) running a multi-national company; a springboard for entrepreneurs who honed their skills at Colt and went on to create typewriters, automobiles, sewing machines, bicycles, aircraft parts, and more; and it's the story of epic philanthropy as evidenced by massive art collections, memorials, and parkland donated to the public realm.

I urge you, and all your fellow Senators and Congressmen, to support S. 615/HR 1259. Our organization hopes to welcome the world to Coltsville through the experience of a National Park, so that they too might learn of the good that came from here, not just the production of guns.

Sincerely,

LYNN H. FERRARI,
President.

STATEMENT OF MAUREEN FINNERTY, CHAIR, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, COALITION OF
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE RETIREES

ON S. 371

Mr. Chairman and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees on S. 371, a bill to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, to dedicate

the park to John H. Chafee, and for other purposes. We are submitting this to be incorporated for the record with other testimony of your Hearing of April 23, 2013.

This is important legislation. We strongly support the enactment of S. 371. It would create a Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park based on its real significance to the nation, and sustained by mutually supportive partnerships.

It is the “wholeness” of the Blackstone Valley that makes it significant. It is the reason S. 371 is structured as it is. Few places exist where such a concentration of integrated historic, cultural and natural resources has survived and can be made accessible by interpretation, preservation and management strategies. This resource tells the story of a watershed that depicts every phase of industrial development and environmental interaction from colonial times to the present era of revitalization. Much can be learned here about what makes a landscape environmentally and economically sustainable. In one small area of approximately 700,000 acres between Worcester, Massachusetts and Providence, Rhode Island—a river basin of only about 45 miles long and 22 miles wide—you can still see on the landscape evocative layers of nearly every phase of American development in the Northeast.

The streams and tributaries of the Blackstone River descend 450 feet from the hills in and above Worcester, Massachusetts to the Narragansett Bay, or 10 feet a mile—a faster descent than the Colorado River through Grand Canyon National Park. Through the work of people and the power of this geography, the river and its tributaries became the first place in the United States to experience the widespread use of waterpower for industry; the Valley became the center of industrial innovation for the nation, the Silicone Valley of its time.

The first layer you can see along these waterways is evidence of Native American settlements, early transportation routes, and vocabulary of resource features highlighting the significance of the waterways. These waterways are fed by what The New Yorker magazine called “large and spectacular wetlands.”¹ Surrounding the wetlands you can see important concentrations of colonial rural landscape development including hilltop villages with village commons, and crossroad villages and colonial transportation systems. The industrial and waterpower period followed, with riverside industrial villages and cities, including large parts of the 2nd and 3rd largest cities of New England, and then continued layers to our time. You can see the affect of landscape on culture, and culture on landscape at every stage. You even can perceive a sense of the way forward toward the future, or at least the choices and the opportunities for the future.

The rolling farmlands lined with classic New England stone walls remind you that the dawn of industry led to the revitalization of farming—just one of many unexpected interrelationships this park will be able to illustrate and interpret. With the concentration of distinctive resources across an entire landscape, this park could be understood as a natural resource. With the unique survival here of representatives elements of entire 18th and 19th century production systems, this Valley can be seen as a machine—a watershed harnessed as one integrated machine. For many national historical parks with one or two primary resources a compact park and legislative framework may work best. For the Blackstone Valley, a combination of parkland administration and partnership collaboration is needed, as provided by S 371.

This reshaping of the river basin, its physical and social response, the creation of sustainable wealth and community, its economic and environmental decline and more recently its pathway to restoration is the major significance of the Blackstone River Valley. The story it tells of America is both compelling and potentially redeeming.

This Valley has high integrity, is compact, and capable of supporting the very best of interpretation and public programming in a living, working cultural landscape.

It is certainly much more, and much more interesting to visitors, than the probably-misnamed “Birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution.” Describing these resources as exclusively industrial or of a narrow period of industrial history truly misses and seriously understates what makes the Blackstone River Valley significant on a national scale.

Rather than a park boundary to include the whole watershed—the complete resource—as we and others originally proposed, this bill is a brilliant solution to the key issue of landscape and boundary. Brilliant, in the sense of a more modest, efficient and cost effective framework while still centered on the “wholeness” of the

¹ “. . . the Blackstone Valley (was) the first area in North America to be industrialized. The . . . Massachusetts part, which is bordered by large and spectacular wetlands, stayed mostly undeveloped, but in Rhode Island mill villages dotted the hillsides . . . Every town on the river was supported by a mill, and every waterfall on the river had a mill next to it . . . “The New Yorker magazine, “Encountering The Countryside,” August 28, 1989, pp. 37–63.

Blackstone River Valley. S. 371 accomplishes this by relying on the local jurisdictions and private sector involvement, and especially on partnering with the surrounding National Heritage Corridor, to enable a much smaller park.

As called for by the Special Resource Study (SRS) the park would be anchored in the essential 5 representative historic districts and, as its spine and network, the Blackstone River with its tributaries and canal. S. 371 would enable the state of Rhode Island to donate the Blackstone River State Park within in the Ashton historic mill village, as needed in the opinion of the NPS to be the robust anchor of NPS administration and the link to other park partnership districts.

We recommend that the Committee's report specifically state that the public overwhelmingly identified the river and tributaries as essential park resources because they are essential to the story of waterpower, they are the spine holding the Valley together, and they offer an important way to view and enjoy the park. They also represent the natural environment that always has been seen by the local public as the first purpose of the preservation efforts in the Valley, even as far back as the 1980's in the first survey conducted by National Park Service for the first management plan.

Therefore, we strongly urge the Committee to include in the park all the key resource areas identified in the Special Resource Study, as are found in S. 371 as written.

We will say more at the conclusion about the goals of our Coalition, but at this point let me say simply that a primary responsibility of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees is to provide insight on how legislation and policy and practice REALLY affect things in the Field, where as everyone knows, the rubber meets the road. We appreciate how difficult it can be to get beyond theory and 'what ifs' to what really can work.

To that end, our judgment is that the National Park Service is to be congratulated for the distinction and insight of the Blackstone River Valley Special Resource Study, the basis of this legislation. The Valley is as important and as complex a landscape as may be found, and the National Park Service responded with many elegant and essential resource preservation solutions in this SRS. In addition to the interests of multiple federal agencies, this park plan engaged two sovereign states and over 20 New England towns and cities and 40 historic villages. The SRS team did the work, worked with the public and really listened, and to be noted, they also read and assessed all the voluminous evaluations and analysis, the plans and their results that you find in the SRS Bibliography. It is a remarkable demonstration of strength that the team understood and articulated the special needs of this resource.

The SRS calls for NPS expenditures on the same order of magnitude as the last 20 years. As the Conservation Study Institute report demonstrates, if the existing energy and imagination and partnerships in the Valley from the NPS' past experience are incorporated into this new national park, the costs will be very modest. We believe that the higher vision established by S. 371 will attract motivated partners, and that unequivocally enabling collaboration will attract significant investments by the private sector, by State and local government, and by other federal agencies.

The National Park Service has demonstrated over the past 20 years that it and its partners have developed the right balance among the private sector, the local governments and the federal government. None of the communities or businesses has raised concerns over any loss of authority. No community has ever asked to be deleted from the heritage area. In fact, other communities keep asking to join. During the public review of the SRS, the overwhelming community response was in support of the park, with nearly all those who spoke at the public meetings calling for including the river and its tributaries in the park. This comes from placing the public at the center of decision making, of getting the balance of incentives right, but above all by the power of the Meaning of the resource and power of an exciting park story people identify with. This legislation builds from those positive relationships.

The Coalition of National Park Service Retirees strongly supports the provision to dedicate the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park to the late Senator John H Chafee. Senator, Chairman, Governor, Secretary of the Navy and Marine John H. Chafee will be as inspiring to park visitors as he is to us. He worked extremely well with all the other Massachusetts and Rhode Island Members of Congress in support of the Blackstone Valley. His successful efforts to revitalize the nation's air and water may be seen as a microcosm for the same in the Blackstone Valley. He knew that a healthy nation and a healthy economy require a healthy environment, as is also reflected in history of the Valley and the purpose of the National Heritage Corridor, now named for Senator John H Chafee.

Thank you for considering this testimony of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees.

The more than 800 members of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees are all former employees of the National Park Service (NPS) with more than 26,000 years of stewardship of America's most precious natural and cultural resources. In their personal lives, CNPSR members maintain their professional outlook. Just as the national parks are supported by the broad spectrum of the American people, the CNPSR members reflect the broad spectrum of political affiliations. CNPSR members now offer their professional experience and integrity as they speak out for national park solutions that uphold law and policy. Our members also support the mission of the National Park Service through public education.

LOS AMIGOS DE VALLES CALDERA,
Santa Fe, NM, April 23, 2013.

David Brooks,
Counsel, Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Energy and Natural Resources Committee Office, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

Re: SB285

DEAR MR. BROOKS:

As this bill comes up in front of the National Parks Subcommittee, we would like to reiterate some of our previous concerns (letter to Senators Bingaman and Udall, February 24, 2010, June 27, 2010 Testimony re SB3452, and letter to Sen. Bingaman May 10, 2011), as well as mention some new ones.

We are Los Amigos de Valles Caldera, a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization incorporated in New Mexico on September 30, 2006 by former members of the Board of Trustees of the Valles Caldera National Preserve and others. The Valles Caldera National Preserve, formerly the privately owned "Baca Ranch," is an 89,000-acre property located in the Jemez Mountains in northern New Mexico purchased by the federal government in 2000 under the Valles Caldera Preservation Act and placed under the management of the Valles Caldera Trust.

Los Amigos' mission is to support the Valles Caldera National Preserve for present and future generations through outreach, education, restoration, and collaboration.

Los Amigos currently has over 200 members. Los Amigos is supported by government grants, grants from private foundations, and individual contributions. These individual contributions have ranged from \$25 to \$1,000 and have come from a wide variety of people across the country. We have brought in over \$1 million in restoration funding.

Los Amigos was created to support the Preserve, and we plan to continue with that mission, no matter who is managing the Preserve. However, we have a number of concerns about the proposed legislation to transfer the Preserve from the Trust to the Park Service:

One.—The fourth and final criterion used by the Park Service in determining whether they should manage an important natural resource when it is already being managed by another federal agency was noticeably left unanswered in the NPS report regarding the Valles Caldera. According to National Park Service Management Policies 2006: "To receive a favorable recommendation from the Service, a proposed addition to the national park system must (1) possess nationally significant natural or cultural resources, (2) be a suitable addition to the system, (3) be a feasible addition to the system, and (4) require direct NPS management instead of protection by other public agencies or the private sector. These criteria are designed to ensure that the national park system includes only the most outstanding examples of the nation's natural and cultural resources. These criteria also recognize that there are other management alternatives for preserving the nation's outstanding resources. . . . There are many excellent examples of the successful management of important natural and cultural resources by other public agencies, private conservation organizations, and individuals. The National Park Service applauds these accomplishments and actively encourages the expansion of conservation activities by state, local, and private entities and by other federal agencies. Unless direct NPS management of a studied area is identified as the clearly superior alternative, the Service will recommend that one or more of these other entities assume a lead management role, and that the area not receive national park system status." According to the letter transmitting the NPS report regarding the Preserve, "The scope of this report is limited to the first three criteria, and the need for NPS management is not addressed." So we wonder, how and in what way could they do a better job than the Trust? With all due respect, this crucial question needs to be directly faced and

addressed. As articulated by the Park Service, this last criterion is not a political decision, but rather a matter of history, financial resources, and staffing of the Service itself.

Two.—The answer to the fourth criterion would have to take into account the Park Service's current budget problems. Under the Sequester, the NPS is taking a \$63 million cut, which they say will mean 900 positions will go unfilled. Even before this cut, the NPS budget has been cut several times since the original of this bill was introduced. It is common knowledge that the NPS is unable to meet its backlog of maintenance at its current units. This has been cited in articles in the press as well as in GAO reports. The Park Service indicated in their testimony in 2011 regarding the earlier iteration of this bill that \$32 million would be needed immediately after the Preserve went to the Park Service, for infrastructure. Then another \$4 million would be needed annually for administration. It is unclear how this could be accomplished under the cuts from the Sequester. The Los Alamos Monitor reported that there will be furloughs at Bandelier National Monument, and that they may be cutting off some access to the backcountry because of the Sequester.

The Trust is currently not having this problem. As they showed in the 2012 State of the Preserve, they have increased visitation (110,000 in 2012), revenue, and restoration. They are now "in the black" in the livestock program. They are obtaining 30 percent of their total operating costs through fees and donations. They will not be furloughing any employees under the Sequester, and they will not be eliminating programs.

Three.—Since the introduction of the original bill in 2010, the Preserve and its neighbors have been the victims of a large and devastating fire, the Las Conchas Fire of 2011. A third of the Preserve was burned, and although some of that was beneficial, a lot of it was not and still continues to have impacts on streams and wetlands. Therefore, everyone agrees that the most critical work to be accomplished on the Preserve in the foreseeable future is the restoration of the forest ecosystem to a manageable condition and the restoration of the wetlands damaged in part by the Las Conchas Fire.

The Southwest Jemez Mountains Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) Project has been funded by the Department of Agriculture. That project is designed to improve the resilience of ecosystems on the Preserve and on the Santa Fe National Forest to recover from wildfires and other natural disturbances and sustain healthy forests and watersheds by thinning and prescribed burning to restore more natural fire regimes.

If the Preserve goes to the Park Service, in the Department of the Interior, that money will be lost, along with our best opportunity to help prevent any further fires in the Preserve. This is a major concern to Los Amigos, the Trust, and the neighbors of the Preserve. If forest restoration is not significantly accomplished in the near future, the Preserve will be at great risk for a further catastrophic fire. We in New Mexico are beginning another dangerous fire season. The moisture at the Preserve is at only 65 percent of normal for this time of year. This is frightening, given the forecast for continued lack of significant precipitation in the area.

We hope that the Subcommittee will consider these points. We feel that this may not be the best time for a change in management. The Trust seems to be making significant progress toward the goals set for it in the Valles Caldera Preservation Act. We hope that Congress will give them the time to meet all of those goals and to show the potential benefits from a new kind of public land management.

We appreciate the Committee's ongoing willingness to consider our concerns. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

DOUG FRASER,
Chair, Board of Directors.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF GOVERNOR,
Hartford, CT, April 19, 2013.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
U.S. Representative, Washington, DC.

Re:S. 615/HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY, SENATOR BLUMENTHALAND, REPRESENTATIVE LARSON:

For more than a decade, the State of Connecticut has strongly supported and invested significantly in the re-development, remediation and renovation of Coltsville, the most significant and visible site in our rich precision manufacturing history. As the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on National Parks considers S.615/HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act, I pledge the State of Connecticut's continued financial support to the Coltsville renovation and re-development, and specifically to Colt's East Armory in the near term.

With three Coltsville buildings fully renovated and nearly fully occupied, there is tremendous potential for Coltsville as a National Historic Park. This designation and support from the National Park Service would propel the Coltsville redevelopment forward, and a National Park would have a beneficial effect on our state, and the city of Hartford, both in terms of job creation and urban revitalization.

Furthermore, a National Historical Park at the 17-acre Colt complex will bring to life the precision manufacturing and innovative approaches to mechanization cultivated and inspired by Sam Colt. It will complement prestigious historic landmarks in Hartford, such as the Mark Twain House and the Wadsworth Athenaeum, and expand Connecticut's tourism industry, one of the top five job producers in our state. It's a vision that everyone can agree on, including former U.S. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar, who visited the Colt campus in September of 2011. After touring the complex, he endorsed the idea of Colt becoming a national park because of its role in the Industrial Revolution.

Connecticut has been and continues to be tremendously supportive of the renovation and redevelopment of Coltsville, providing significant funding and technical assistance toward the preservation of the historic complex. To date, the state has invested \$7,705,000 in the Colt Gateway Project. The Department of Economic and Community Development (DECO) administered \$5,605,000 of the funding in the form of a \$4,500,000 grant for the construction and renovation of utility infrastructure, including the power plant. To date, \$3,480,000 was used to complete the infrastructure projects and the balance of \$1,020,000 was used to install windows in the South and East Armory buildings as well as facade and roof replacement for the East Armory building.

In addition, DECO committed \$405,000 for abatement and demolition of structures on state-owned property adjacent to the historic Sawtooth building in order to provide additional parking to serve the complex. DECO also committed \$700,000 from the Statewide Revolving Loan Fund for remediation of petroleum and hazardous contamination in the courtyard area of the former Colt factory complex. Of the \$7,705,000, the Connecticut Development Authority (CDA) administered a \$2,100,000 loan to complete the interior build-out of the South Armory.

The state has made other significant investments in and around Coltsville. The Capital Regional Education Council was relocated to buildings on the north and south parts of the campus, and DECO provided a \$500,000 grant to Colt's developer for leasehold improvements so that Foley Carrier Services, LLC, a transportation logistics company, could move its headquarters into the South Armory. The move brings 110 jobs to Hartford immediately, with plans to add up to 70 new jobs within three years.

All this funding demonstrates the significant support Connecticut has had for a fully renovated Coltsville and additional investments are being considered as the next phase of redevelopment commences. Specifically, another \$5 million has been allocated for DECO to administer as future projects progress.

A fully renovated Coltsville that includes a National Historic Park will be an economic catalyst for Hartford. It is a vision that I am strongly committed to realizing. I have instructed my administration to actively work with Coltsville developer Larry Dooley and Hartford to craft a financing plan to renovate and re-develop the East Armory that will turn Coltsville into a revitalized residential, commercial and historic destination linked to downtown Hartford.

Thank you for your steadfast leadership and advocacy to secure the designation of Coltsville as a National Historic Park.

Sincerely,

DANNEL P. MALLOY,
Governor.

HARTFORD PRESERVATION ALLIANCE,
Hartford, CT, April 19, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
U.S. Representative, Washington, DC.

Re: S. 615/HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act

DEAR SENATOR BLUMENTHAL, SENATOR MURPHY AND REPRESENTATIVE LARSON:

The Hartford Preservation Alliance, Inc. is pleased to support S. 615/HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act. Coltsville, a National Historic Landmark, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is an integral component of Hartford's historic landscape. HPA believes Coltsville to be a prime candidate for National Park status for the incredible innovative contributions the site has made to U.S. and International history.

HPA considers Coltsville one of the most recognized sites in the Capital City and support for creation of a Coltsville National Historic Park certainly aligns with the mission of HPA which is to advocate for the preservation and revitalization of Hartford, Connecticut.

Sincerely,

TOMAS J. NENORTAS,
Associate Director.

WILLIAM HOSLEY,
Enfield, CT, April 19, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
United States Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY,
United States Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
United States Representative, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONNECTICUT CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS:

I am writing to support for S. 615/HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act.

Since 1986, I have been engrossed in scholarship, public programming and historic preservation efforts aimed at saving and inspiring future generations with the stories associated with Coltsville, one of industrial age America's most fascinating and in tact historic sites. I have witnessed a rising tide of public acclimation for the Coltsville initiative that cuts across a diverse spectrum of concerns, from the usual preservationists, museum and tourism officials, to neighborhood residents, school teachers and a growing community whose pride of place embraces Hartford's role as an incubator of the industrial age or, as we sometimes phrase it, the Silicon Valley of the 19th Century.

I am impressed with the sophistication and enthusiasm of the case that's been made for its significance by National Park Service personnel. With more than 30 Coltera buildings still intact, the built environment in Coltsville is remarkable in its beauty, integrity and survival. Like most industrial buildings, Colt's East Armory, with its famous blue onion dome, has experienced changes over the years. I am astonished not by what it has been lost but by how much of what was there, remains and by its integrity.

What has not been widely reported is the even more remarkable survival and preservation in the public domain of family and company archives and collections (Wadsworth Atheneum, Museum of Connecticut History, Connecticut Historical Society, Armsmear, Church of the Good Shepherd, Colt Memorial House) that could never be replaced and has a market value in excess of \$200 million! Because Mrs. Colt had a long history of civic philanthropy, she went to extraordinary lengths to preserve evidence that is usually lost. As important as the Colt story is in American industrial history, it is equally important and more unique in the evidence it also preserves of the corresponding industrial civilization that is every bit as important to the American industrial age story.

The integrity of this dual asset—industrial buildings, products and processes and visual and material evidence of industrial age cultural resources, values and initiatives—gives Hartford and anything that might happen in conjunction with this site,

a huge leg up on other places where either the stories are not as compelling, the personalities not as colorful, or the buildings AND collections not as in tact. Our friends at NPS have argued that Hartford/Springfield have the potential to THE PLACE in all the nation, where Americans visit to learn about the epic achievement of our first high tech industrial age.

This is one of the most important historic preservation initiatives ever undertaken in Connecticut. At present Connecticut has one small National Park site in Weir Farm. Our neighbor immediately to the north has 18 National Park sites. It is long past time that this get done and given the subject matter—this ought to be an opportunity to cross the aisle and get support from potential friends like Sen. Richard Shelby, who I am sure understands the value of this as well as we do. Indeed, if an offer was made to name some aspect of a visitor center after him in conjunction with his impending retirement—I suspect it would be a slam dunk!

Please do whatever it takes to get this done for Connecticut.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM HOSLEY,
Principal, Terra Firma Northeast.

STATEMENT OF WARREN JUDGE, CHAIRMAN, DARE COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

On Tuesday, April 23, 2013, Peggy O'Dell, Deputy Director for Operations for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, testified before the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

During her Subcommittee appearance, in response to questions from Senator Martin Heinrich, Ms. O'Dell presented misleading and contradictory information that warrants correction and clarification. Following is a transcript of her misleading remarks—

Senator Heinrich—Were the closures that Senator Manchin asked about, were they complete closures to the public including pedestrians and including fishing, or is it only a closure to off-road vehicle use or motorized access?

Peggy O'Dell—The entire 67 miles remains open to pedestrians, and 43 miles remain open to ORV use.

Senator Heinrich—OK, and how much of that is open to fishing?

Peggy O'Dell—People can fish anywhere.

Senator Heinrich—Anywhere?

Peggy O'Dell—Uh-Huh

Senator Heinrich—OK, so even the areas that are closed to vehicular access are open to fishing?

Peggy O'Dell—Yes sir.

Senator Heinrich—Great, thank you very much.

Ms. O'Dell stated that “people can fish anywhere” including areas that are closed to vehicular access. This ignores the reality of the Final ORV Management Plan that is now in place at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Under this plan, areas designated for ORV access are routinely closed when breeding and nesting behavior is observed, which precludes fishing and other recreational activities. Although Ms. O'Dell insisted that 43 miles remain open to ORV access and implied that this access is guaranteed. She failed to disclose that considerable ORV areas are immediately closed, without warning, whenever breeding or nesting behavior is observed, which can change on a day-to-day basis, severely disrupt the visitor experience, and adversely impact the local tourism economy.

This important distinction is noted in the National Park Service Publication on ORV Use, which Ms. O'Dell failed to disclose to the Subcommittee.

9. Does the ORV permit guarantee that all ORV routes will be open for me to use? No. There are several reasons that parts of ORV routes may be closed to ORV use:

- There are seasonal closures along certain routes from Apr. 1-Oct. 31. These are shown on the ORV route map;
- Routes may be temporarily closed if the carrying capacity is reached;
- Routes may be temporarily closed if there is a specific need for resource protection; and
- Routes may be temporarily closed for safety reasons.

Following is a link to the cited portion:<http://www.nps.gov/caha/planyourvisit/upload/02-10-12-FAQ-Site-Bulletin-for-CAHA-ORV-regulation.pdf>

Ms. O'Dell did not accurately inform the Subcommittee about the challenges Americans face gaining ocean access for fishing and other activities. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area encompasses a vast geographical area that was uniquely designed with a system of ramps to provide direct vehicle access to the ocean. This system formed a recreational highway that provided access to the ocean. In the case of the popular, world-class fishing destination known as Cape Point, access to this vital area is not feasible without ORV access.

At the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, the purpose for driving on the beach is to gain access to recreational areas. This activity is done in a regulated and responsible manner as promoted by the County of Dare and grassroots organizations. Motorized access is not intended to be a joyride or high-speed excursion. It is a practical transportation necessity that is needed to reach the intended recreational destination.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE DINI, MAYOR, CITY OF YERINGTON, NEVADA

ON S. 159

Chairman Manchin, Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to offer testimony in favor of S. 159, the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act introduced by Senator Heller, Cosponsored by Senator Reid, and supported by the entire Nevada Congressional Delegation.

I am proud to serve as the Mayor of Yerington, Nevada. I am joined today by Lyon County Manager Jeff Page on behalf of the Lyon County Commission, to jointly express the support of the 3,156 citizens of Yerington and 52,000 citizens of Lyon County and to urge the Committee to pass this bill. This land sale represents the economic future of our City and County.

I also express the support of Nevada Governor Sandoval, and a multitude of local and regional support.

The City of Yerington is located in Northern Nevada in the Mason Valley and we have a long proud history of mining and agriculture. However, our current economy is in bad shape. Our unemployment in Lyon County has averaged over 15 percent during the past year and our citizens are suffering greatly. Over the past 10 years, we have been fortunate to receive over \$20 million in Federal funding that has been critical to maintaining our public infrastructure; however, this is not how our citizens want to survive as a community. We seek jobs and the ability to work hard to raise our families in a growing and vibrant community. We need long-term stable jobs for our citizens and an industry that will provide sustainable economic growth for decades.

S. 159 mandates the fair market sale of approximately 10,400 acres of federal lands—just 1 percent of 975,000 acres of federal lands in Lyon County—to the City of Yerington for economic development, a recreation events center and open space purposes.

The lands that will be conveyed have no current important uses. There is no threatened or endangered species habitat, no water resources, and no significant cultural resources. This is barren land that has few redeeming natural qualities.

The purchase of these lands will allow the City of Yerington to annex the Pumpkin Hollow Mine site, sell water and sewer services to the mine operation, benefit from taxes paid by the mine, allows the City to grow economically and benefit from greatly needed recreation, cultural and economic development lands.

The legislation also designates land for the Wovoka Wilderness, which is located in the South Pine Grove Hills. The land was identified as part of a local consultation process. In addition to wilderness, the legislation protects the County against a potential listing of the sage grouse on the Endangered Species List, protects existing grazing interests, maintains public access on existing roads, and provides continued access to recreation and hunting. On December 3, 2012, the Lyon Board of County Commissioners unanimously approved a resolution supporting the designation as outlined in S. 159. I also support this designation.

For over four years, the City of Yerington has been working with Nevada Copper to craft a development plan for the Pumpkin Hollow Mine that will ensure the City of Yerington will economically benefit from the development of the mine creating a sustainable future for our City. The Pumpkin Hollow Copper mine that sits on private lands near the City of Yerington. With or without this legislation, Nevada Cop-

per will develop and produce millions of tons of valuable minerals. The question really is whether the Yerington will benefit from this new mining project.

Nevada Copper proposes to start full project development—an investment of approximately \$1 billion—starting in 2013. In March, the company secured \$200 million to initiate the development of the underground mine and mineral processing facilities at Pumpkin Hollow. The company would like to invest another \$800 million to build out the much larger integrated open pit and underground mining operation. However, that level of financing will only happen subject to passage of S. 159.

The integrated mine operation facilitated by this legislation will create over 800 direct mine operations jobs and up to 500 construction jobs. Using the current published jobs multipliers a total of over 2,000-3,000 direct and indirect jobs would be created by the mine.

The timely passage of this legislation cannot be over-stated. We are operating on a tight timeline. With the financing they have received, Nevada Copper is initiating detailed siting, engineering and design of project infrastructure. This legislation will allow Yerington to work with the Nevada Copper to locate infrastructure for water, sewer, and power for both mine development and the other uses contemplated by the City. Both the City and Lyon County will be able to share in property, sales, utility and net proceeds of mines taxes from mine operations. If this legislation is not successful, the mine will proceed, but as in the past, Yerington will simply have to deal with the impacts with no real benefits to the City other than some jobs for citizens.

As importantly, with this contiguous block of land, the City and Nevada Copper can begin to plan for the future, long after mining is complete. The development agreement between the City and Nevada Copper will ensure that the Company leaves behind resources and assets that will provide sustainable economic growth for the City. S. 159 solidifies the critical partnership that will provide economic enhancement for decades-and at no cost to the American taxpayer.

Some of the lands will also be utilized for economic development as commercial and light industrial needs increase to support the operations of the mine. Also, the City is proposing a portion of the lands be utilized for renewable energy development such as solar energy. Lastly, some of the lands will be utilized by Nevada Copper to maximize the mining operations on their patented lands.

As you can see, the sale of these lands to the City of Yerington will have a dramatic, positive impact by increasing jobs, the investment in Nevada, and increased tax revenues for the City, Lyon County and the State of Nevada. It will also generate jobs and economic activity in over 20 states nationwide for equipment, materials and supplies.

Mr. Chairman, the City of Yerington is not asking Congress to give the City some public lands in the hope of attracting economic development. We are asking to pay fair market value to acquire a very small percentage of federal lands that have little or no use to the public in order to enhance and increase development that is already occurring at the Pumpkin Hollow site. I cannot express enough the importance of this project to the future of our City and I urge the Committee to support S. 159.

METRO HARTTFORD ALLIANCE,
Hartford, CT, April 16, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
U.S. Congress, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS BLUMENTHAL AND MURPHY AND CONGRESSMAN LARSON:

The Alliance serves as the Region's economic development leader and the City's Chamber of Commerce, and our investors include businesses of all sizes, health care providers and institutions of higher education, and 32 municipalities. Our mission is to ensure that the Region competes aggressively and successfully for jobs, capital and talent so that it thrives as one of the country's premier places for all people to live, work, play and raise a family.

On behalf of the Alliance investors, I write to reiterate our strong continued support for the designation of the Coltsville Historic District (the "District") as a National Park. We specifically urge your continued efforts on behalf of the passage of S.615/HR 1259, the Coltsville National Historical Park Act (the "Act").

As you know, the District is home to one of the nation's first precision manufacturing facilities, and the significant contributions to technological innovation and

manufacturing advancements by Elizabeth and Samuel Colt and generations of Colt employees are well documented. The Colt legacy of industrial innovation and technological development literally changed the landscape of American business, labor relations and the entire fabric of a major United States city. Accordingly, the District would be an outstanding addition to the existing roster of remarkable National Parks as it both defines an important part of the American experience and illustrates a class of industry that is underrepresented currently in our nation's park portfolio.

It is clear that the timing for this designation is also of critical importance to our local economy. According to McKinsey and Company, the leisure and hospitality sector could add between 2.1 and 3.3 million jobs in this decade. By increasing awareness of Hartford's significant natural and cultural attractions, we have the potential to expand foreign and domestic visitation, a key job growth at a time when job growth is our primary focus.

The Act carries with it the enhanced benefit of stimulating a stagnant economy by improving upon a national treasure, a treasure that led the Industrial Revolution and changed the borders of our nation. Again, we enthusiastically endorse the request that the District be designated a National Park and thank you for your ongoing efforts to see that the Act is passed.

Sincerely,

R. NELSON GRIEBEL,
President & CEO.

RIVERFRONT RECAPTURE,
Hartford, CT, April 18, 2013.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
U.S. Representative, Washington, DC.

RE: S. 615/HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing on behalf of Riverfront Recapture in support of the Coltsville Ad Hoc Committee's submission of Coltsville to the National Park Service for consideration as a National Historical Park.

Riverfront Recapture, Inc. is a private, non-profit 501(c)3 that was founded in 1981 by a group of corporate and community leaders for the purpose of restoring access to the Connecticut River. We have raised over \$60 million for the capital projects in both Hartford and East Hartford that are generating significant benefits to the community. Public access to the river is once again possible for local residents and tourists, and the riverfront has become a catalyst for economic development on land adjacent to the parks on both banks of the river.

Our Riverfront Master Plan, which was adopted by the City of Hartford and Town of East Hartford in 1982, envisioned a revitalized Coltsville that was home to both small businesses and local residents and reunited with the Connecticut River. This reconnection to the river was deemed important because Sam and Elizabeth Colt located their factory at that site so they could receive raw materials and ship their finished products by water. That historic connection was later blocked by the construction of a flood control dike and the interstate highway between Coltsville and the river. The restoration of this connection to the river will help us complete a three-mile loop system of riverwalks connecting Hartford and East Hartford.

Riverfront Recapture has long supported the owners and developers' various efforts to restore Coltsville with the goal of returning the historic structure to local prominence. The designation of Coltsville as a National Historic Landmark was an important step towards the ultimate goal of Coltsville becoming a National Historical Park.

To support the Coltsville Ad Hoc Committee's efforts, Riverfront Recapture will continue the development of our riverfront park system including the construction of a new park entrance adjacent to the East Armory. The new entrance will include a public plaza, a walkway and an operating gate in the dike that will restore the on-grade pedestrian connection to the river that was lost when the dike was constructed in the 1940's, followed by the highway's construction in the 1950's. The walkway will include a history wall, more than 200' in length, that will retell Hartford's development along the Connecticut River from the early 1700's through the

2011 century, with a significant portion dedicated to the Coltsville story as it relates to the river. In addition, we plan to mimic architectural details of the East Armory in the structures and plaza hardscape which will help tie Coltsville to the riverfront.

For the reasons stated above, we urge the National Park Service to look favorably upon the committee's submission of Coltsville as a National Historical Park. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH R. MARFUGGI,
President & CEO.

STATEMENT FOR THE MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ACT,
ON S. 507

The Manhattan Project is one of the most significant events in American history. Today it is impossible to imagine that in September 1942, in a valley in East Tennessee, 3,000 farmers and their families were told to leave their homes to make way for a "secret city" that would bring 100,000 men and women together to help end World War II and forever change the course of human history. The story of the Manhattan Project is not only about World War II, it is about the people who lived and worked at these sites, the scientific achievements they made, and the impact of their work on our nation's history. I have long supported establishing a national historic park to protect the Manhattan Project sites because of the project's important role in our history, but also because of its importance to the history and people of Tennessee. Oak Ridge, which was not listed on a map until 1949, became the home for 100,000 scientists, engineers, machinists, operators and construction workers. Very few of the scientists knew what they were working on, and even fewer knew anything about uranium.

Many have asked how a valley in East Tennessee became the first Manhattan Project site. As Ray Smith, Y-12's Historian, would tell it, President Roosevelt needed to convince Congress to spend a large amount of money without knowing what it was going to be used for. President Roosevelt asked Senator Douglas McKellar, a Democrat from Tennessee, if this could be done. Senator McKellar is said to have replied, "Yes, Mr. President, I can do that for you . . . now just where in Tennessee are you going to put that thang?"

This is one of thousands of stories that tell a small part of a full story that communicates the importance of this event in American history. As Americans we have a special obligation to preserve and protect our heritage, and the Manhattan Project National Historical Park will ensure that all Americans learn about the significance of the Manhattan Project and how it continues to shape our history.

In 2004, I joined Senator Bingaman as a cosponsor of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park Study Act, which directed the Department of Interior to conduct a study of the Manhattan Project sites to determine the feasibility of including the sites in the National Park System.

In 2011, following public meetings, extensive assessments of potential park boundaries and assessments of the integrity of the historical resources, the Department of the Interior found that the park was feasible, that it met the suitability requirements for establishing a new national park and that the park should be established.

As part of the park's establishment the study recommended the creation of a Manhattan Project National Historical Park with units at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington. According to Secretary Salazar, Secretary of the Interior, "the Manhattan Project ushered in the atomic age, changed the role of the United States in the world community, and set the stage for the Cold War."

Support for the Manhattan Project National Historical Park Act is bipartisan, bicameral, and has the strong support of the Energy Communities Alliance and the National Parks Conservation Association. I thank the Committee for holding this hearing today and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as it moves forward. Thank you.

WADSWORTH ATHENEUM,
Hartford, CT, April 17, 2013.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER MURPHY
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOHN LARSON,
U.S. Representative, Washington, DC.

Re: S. 615/HR 1259 the Coltsville National Historical Park Act

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY, SENATOR BLUMENTHAL, AND REPRESENTATIVE LARSON:

On behalf of the Wadsworth Atheneum Museum of Art, I write to reiterate our strong support of the Coltsville Historic National Park Act. The Wadsworth Atheneum recognizes Coltsville as an important site that documents momentous innovations in America's technological, industrial, and cultural development.

In 1905, Elizabeth Hart Jarvis Colt, wife of Samuel Colt, bequeathed to the Wadsworth Atheneum an extraordinary collection of artifacts from her husband's firearms factories and their home, Armsmear. The Wadsworth's Collection possesses rare and elaborately designed patent pistols that pay homage to the genius of Samuel Colt and the skilled craftspeople in his factories. In addition, this expansive collection preserves the memory of Mrs. Colt's art patronage to contemporary artists such as Thomas Cole and Frederic Church, as well as her civic leadership in Hartford and the U.S Sanitary Commission during the Civil War.

The establishment of a National Park museum at the Coltsville East Armory would be enormously beneficial to the contextual validation and interpretation of our museum's collections and those in the possession of our sister institutions, the Connecticut State Library, the Hartford History Museum, and the Connecticut Historical Society. It opens extensive opportunities for collaborative programming and a communal site for the continual display of materials documenting the Colts' public service. The Wadsworth Atheneum looks forward to partnering with the Coltsville administrators in the development of exhibitions, school programs, and community projects that illustrate the Colt story.

We applaud your legislative efforts as they bring the Coltsville project closer to being fully realized and accessible to students, tourists, and scholars alike.

○