AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 113–493

CURRENT 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

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 1189	**S. 2221**
S. 1389	**S. 2264**
S. 1520	**S. 2293**
S. 1641	**S. 2318**
S. 1718	**S. 2346**
S. 1750	**S. 2356**
S. 1785	**S. 2392**
S. 1794	**S. 2576**
S. 1866	**S. 2602**
S. 2031	**H.R. 412**
S. 2104	**H.R. 1501**
S. 2111	**H.R. 2197**

JULY 23, 2014

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

91–555 PDF WASHINGTON : 2014

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

MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana, *Chair*

RON WYDEN, Oregon
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan
MARK UDALL, Colorado
AL FRANKEN, Minnesota
JOE MANCHIN, III, West Virginia
BRIAN SCHATZ, Hawaii
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin

LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
MIKE LEE, Utah
DEAN HELLER, Nevada
JEFF FLAKE, Arizona
TIM SCOTT, South Carolina
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
JOHN HOEVEN, North Dakota

ELIZABETH LEOTY CRADDOCK, *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*

RON WYDEN, Oregon
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan
BRIAN SCHATZ, Hawaii
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
TAMMY BALDWIN, Wisconsin

ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
MIKE LEE, Utah
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
JOHN HOEVEN, North Dakota

MARY L. LANDRIEU and LISA MURKOWSKI are Ex Officio Members of the Subcommittee

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Baldwin, Hon. Tammy, U.S. Senator From Wisconsin	9
Goldfuss, Christina, Deputy Director, Congressional and External Affairs, Department of the Interior, Accompanied by Carl Rountree, Assistant Director, National Landscape Conservation System	12
Portman, Hon. Rob, U.S. Senator From Ohio	8
Smith, Greg, Acting Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest Systems, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	38
Udall, Hon. Mark, U.S. Senator From New Mexico	1
Walsh, Hon. John, U.S. Senator From Montana	10

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to additional questions	51

APPENDIX II

Additional material submitted for the record	53

CURRENT NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

WEDNESDAY, JULY 23, 2014

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:34 p.m. in room SD–366, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Mark Udall presiding.

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

Senator UDALL. The Subcommittee on National Parks will come to order. Good afternoon to all of you.

This afternoon, the Subcommittee on National Parks is holding a hearing to consider 23 bills covering a wide range of issues relating to the Federal land administered by the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service, including national park and monument designations and boundary adjustments, several national heritage area designations and reauthorizations, wild and scenic river designations, national trail designations, and other related issues.

Although the agenda is lengthy, most of the bills appear to be non-controversial, so I am hopeful we can move through the bills fairly quickly.

The purpose of this afternoon's hearing is to consider the administration's views on these bills and allow committee members an opportunity to ask any questions they may have.

We will also include any written statements that have been sent to the subcommittee in the official hearing record.

Because of the large number of bills on today's agenda, I will not read through the list, but at this time, I will include the complete list of bills in the hearing record, without objection.

I would like to take a few minutes to mention two bills of particular interest to me. The first is S. 1794, a bill I introduced and is co-sponsored by Senator Bennet, to designate 22,000 acres of public lands as the Browns Canyon National Monument in Chaffee County, Colorado. This would include designation of 10,500 acres of wilderness.

Browns Canyon is an unique natural resource. Hundreds of thousands of visitors come to Browns Canyon year after year to raft or kayak the canyon's exciting whitewater rapids or fish the gold medal trout waters of the Arkansas River.

But there is a lot more to this landscape than just the river. The rugged and remote lands to the east feature quiet canyons and rock

formations, outstanding habitat for Bighorn sheep and elk, and sweeping views of the Collegiate Peaks in Arkansas Valley.

Browns Canyon is also a vital economic resource. The landscape supports thousands of jobs from river outfitters and ranchers to the main street businesses of Salida and Bueno Vista, to the State economy far beyond Chaffee County.

Outdoor recreation, including hunting and fishing, is a core part of my State's economy. It supports 125,000 direct jobs, over $13 billion in consumer spending, and nearly $1 billion in State and local tax revenue.

That is why I can say with confidence when we work hand in hand with communities to preserve public lands, we are supporting jobs, our economy, and Colorado's special way of life.

I have spent 18 months developing this bill side by side with Chaffee County residents and other stakeholders. I held public meetings, received thousands of written comments, and my staff and I conducted over 50 meetings. The resulting bill is emblematic of how public land bills should be done, from the bottom up and based on what the community wants.

Let me share a couple of the specific elements in the bill. No. 1, it protects existing legal uses as they are now, allowing fishing, hunting, boating, livestock grazing, commercial outfitting, water supplies, mountain biking and motorized use to continue uninterrupted.

Second, it maintains the ongoing cooperative management of the area by the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife.

Third, it makes permanent a ban on mining for the bed and banks of the river, protecting water supplies, boaters and anglers.

I will submit additional testimony into the written record for this hearing, including my intention that local ranchers have flexibility to run livestock in the national monument and transfer their grazing allotments to future generations.

However, in short, my bill preserves this special place just as it is now, for us and future generations.

The bill has a wide base of support, including over 200 local businesses and sportsmen that welcome the area's gold medal trout waters and big game hunting opportunities.

Both the Town of Buena Vista and city of Salida passed resolutions of support, and two of the 3 Chaffee County Commissioners, both Republicans, support the legislation with its carefully crafted conditions. The Denver Post, Pueblo Chieftain, and local Chaffee County Times have all come out in favor of my bill.

Browns Canyon National Monument is an idea whose time has come, and I speak from experience. Over the Independence Day weekend, I rafted Browns Canyon with a group of Colorado veterans. Like the many other times I have visited, hiked and rafted Browns Canyon, I was awestruck by this special place, and I am not alone in my passion for Browns Canyon or my efforts to protect it.

There have been many attempts over the years to protect Browns Canyon, including a more expansive 2006 bill led by Republicans and co-sponsored by the entire Colorado Congressional Delegation, that would have designated the entire area as Wilderness. Now, I

look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this common sense bill and protect Browns Canyon.

I would also like to comment briefly on S. 2104, Senator Flake's bill, which I co-sponsored, to provide for reimbursement to those States which donated funds to keep certain national parks open during the government shutdown last year.

When the Federal Government shut down, the State of Colorado used their own funds to ensure continued operation of the Rocky Mountain National Park. Colorado, like other States, did this because they knew shutting the park would have crippling economic effects on the towns and small businesses near the park.

How Colorado is unique is that 3 weeks before the shutdown, the towns near Rocky Mountain National Park were hit with record flooding, which was already costing the community millions of dollars in damages and lost tourism revenue.

After the shutdown, the State determined Estes Park and other cities would be devastated by the one-two punch of a shutdown on the heels of a flood that was sure to depress tourism, so the State stepped up to limit the damage associated with what was in my opinion an extremely poor decision to shut down the Federal Government.

Regardless of how co-sponsors of this bill may view the utility of last year's shutdown, we all agree that our States should be repaid in full for the costs incurred to keep parks open for our constituents and visitors to our States.

The subcommittee is also considering a related bill sponsored by Senator Flake, S. 1750. This bill would provide standing authority for States to pay to keep specified Federal areas open during any future government shutdown and then get reimbursed when Federal funds are appropriated.

Now, in my view, there is a major policy difference between these two bills. S. 2104 would reimburse those States which stepped in to provide funding to keep certain national parks open to the public during the 2013 shutdown.

Each State had negotiated an agreement with the National Park Service to provide State funds for specified amounts to keep certain parks open during the lapse of appropriations. Once the Federal Government reopened, the Park Service was made whole with Federal funds as well, and I believe it is fair and appropriate to reimburse the States for the funding they provided.

It seems to me that the answer to solving this problem in the future is to avoid shutting down the government in the first place. In contrast, S. 1750 appears to contemplate additional government shutdowns. I do not believe this is a sound policy and I share the administration's concerns with this proposal.

So, with that, at this time I would like to recognize the subcommittee's ranking member, my friend and probably the best kayaker in the Congress, Senator Portman, for an opening statement, and after that, turn to other members of the subcommittee for their statements.

Senator Walsh, we are glad you have joined us and we look forward to your statement at the appropriate time.

Senator Portman.

[The prepared statements of Senators Stabenow, Cantwell, Kaine, King, Levin, and Udall follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. DEBBIE STABENOW, U.S. SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN

I would like to thank Chair Landrieu for including the MotorCities National Heritage Area Extension Act for consideration in today's hearing.

Automobiles are part of the Michigan way of life. In 1998, I was proud to co-sponsor the bill that established the MotorCities National Heritage Area in Michigan. True to its purpose, the Heritage Area has helped to preserve and promote Michigan's automotive and labor heritage. I am pleased to co-sponsor with Senator Levin the bill before us today, S. 2221, to extend the authority of the MotorCities National Heritage Area through 2030.

Michigan has a diverse economy, but we are known around the world for our leadership in the automotive industry. Henry Ford, Billy Durant, Ransom Olds, and the Dodge brothers were among the pioneers responsible for vast improvements in the quality of transportation and production techniques and who helped to build the middle class. That history, and all of the innovation that continues to this day, deserves recognition and preservation.

The MotorCities National Heritage Area, with funding and technical assistance from the National Park Service, has partnered with a broad set of over 30 organizations to preserve that heritage, attract visitors, and inspire the next generation of automobile enthusiasts and innovators.

For example, it has established over 120 historical markers and 25 exhibits on topics such as Detroit's role as the Arsenal of Democracy during World War II, the African American experience in the auto industry, and the effect of the automobile on technology development. It has helped restore the birthplace of the Model T and other buildings of historical importance, while creating new tourist attractions.

Automotive heritage tourism events attract almost 6 million visitors to the region each year. Overall, the National Parks Conservation Association estimates that the 49 National Historical Areas nationwide generated $12.9 billion in economic activity while supporting 148,000 jobs.

Nine of those 49 heritage areas have already had their authority extended. Only the Motorcities National Heritage Area is set to expire this year, so it is important that we pass this bill soon so the public can continue to enjoy the benefits of the MotorCities National Heritage Area.

Thank you, Chair Landrieu.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MARIA CANTWELL, U.S. SENATOR FROM WASHINGTON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this important hearing.

I am pleased that we are moving forward today on legislation to establish two National Heritage Areas in Washington state—the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area and the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area.

These two bills are about preserving scenic, historic landscapes in the Pacific Northwest while promoting outdoor recreation and spurring economic growth in the area.

Washington's National Park entities are a lifeline to local communities.

A recent National Park Service economic impact study indicates that National Heritage Areas contribute almost $13 billion annually to the national economy and support 150 thousand jobs. On average, each individual Heritage Area generates almost $300 million in economic activity and supports about 3,000 jobs—primarily through tourism and visitor spending.

Outdoor recreation in Washington state provides my constituents and visitors from around the country and the world a unique natural experience.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas but none are located in the Pacific Northwest.

The 3,000 miles of coastline that my bill designates as the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area will promote maritime-related tourism, economic development, and share maritime history as told through Washington state's museums, historic ships, fishing culture, and other activities.

The Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area recognizes 1.5 million acres of land along Interstate 90 as a scenic byway and historic transportation corridor. Starting in the early 1800s this area started being used for logging, mining, and farming. Due to these activities, a transportation corridor developed bringing loggers, trappers, miners, prospectors, and their family across the Snoqualmie Pass to build their lives on the Puget Sound and in Seattle.

Each of these areas helps tell the story of the development of the western United States. And it is important to protect these areas so that future generations can enjoy and learn from them.

Not only do they tell a story, protect environmental resources, and spur economic growth, study after study shows us that visiting National Park entities can aid psychological and spiritual well-being.

I have heard from numerous constituents about how important these two areas are to them.

That is why I, along with my colleague Senator Murray, proposed legislation to designate these locales as National Heritage Areas.

Designating the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area and the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area will help preserve these places for generations to come. I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. TIM KAINE, U.S. SENATOR FROM VIRGINIA

Madame Chair, thank you for considering S. 1718, to authorize acquisition of lands to expand Petersburg National Battlefield. I have introduced this bill with my Virginia colleague Senator Mark Warner, and our Virginia colleagues Congressmen Bobby Scott and Randy Forbes introduced the House counterpart. I also want to recognize my friend and predecessor Senator Jim Webb for his original sponsorship of this legislation.

Virginia is a state where history can be found everywhere you look. In preserving historic battlefields in Virginia and elsewhere, the National Park Service (NPS) seeks not just to show visitors a field but to immerse them in an experience. Nowhere is this philosophy more fitting than in Petersburg, Virginia. Rather than one battle on one field, the 1864 Siege of Petersburg went on for 292 days involving multiple changes of fortune for the Union and Confederacy over 108 separate battles and engagements. The Union's eventual victory at Petersburg paved the way for the surrender a week later of Robert E. Lee to Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House, just upriver from Petersburg and an NPS historical site as well. The Petersburg campaign was also significant for the key contributions of members of the U.S. Colored Troops. Some 15,000 of the 187,000 African Americans who served in uniform for the Union served at Petersburg, and 15 of the 16 Medals of Honor awarded to the U.S. Colored Troops during the Civil War were awarded for service in the Petersburg and Richmond campaigns.

Depicting the scope of this epic struggle has long been a priority of NPS, as many sites important to understanding the siege are unmarked and in danger of being lost to development. This bill would authorize NPS to add 7,238 acres over 12 parcels of land to Petersburg National Battlefield, making it the largest Civil War historic battlefield in the nation. This legislation strictly specifies that land acquisition will be either from private donations or from willing sellers at fair market value. The bill also addresses a priority of the Army in executing two land transfers between Petersburg National Battlefield and the adjacent Fort Lee.

Though it would be worth preserving these hallowed lands for their historic significance alone, Virginia prides itself as a state that is good for business, and Civil War tourism is a thriving source of economic activity. According to a study by the Virginia Tourism Corporation, Civil War tourists stay twice as long and spend double the money of typical tourists. Of out-of-town visitors interviewed at 20 battlefields, two-thirds were visiting the area specifically to see the battlefield, and three-quarters said they would visit other Civil War sites while in the area. According to the latest NPS data, more than 591,000 people visited Petersburg Battlefield, spending more than $11 million and supporting some 150 local non-NPS jobs. The benefits of historic tourism to local communities and small businesses is also why I and my colleague from Mississippi, Senator Thad Cochran, introduced legislation (S. 916) earlier this year to reauthorize the American Battlefield Protection Program.

On the historic battlefields of the Civil War, American troops demonstrated the meaning of freedom, particularly the thousands fighting for their own. Passage of this legislation will ensure that the historic deeds done in and around Petersburg are fully commemorated for posterity.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ANGUS KING, U.S. SENATOR FROM MAINE, ON S. 1520 AND H.R. 2197

Mr. Chairman—I would like to offer testimony in support of S. 1520 and H.R. 2197 to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River in Maine and its associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. I am eager to see the results of a study and whether or not a Wild and Scenic designation would be appropriate for the York River.

The York River consists of 109 miles of streams and rivers banked by various habitats that support rare and endangered species. Based on the findings from a reconnaissance survey conducted by the Northeast Regional Office of the National Park Service in 2013, it is very likely that segments of the York River exhibit the free-flowing character and noteworthy natural, cultural and recreational resource values likely to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The survey also found that the strong presence of community and interest group support for a Study, along with a demonstrated track record of natural and cultural resource protection, provide a strong indication that a Wild and Scenic Rivers Study would be appropriate and productive. Among these community stakeholders are the elected officials of the towns of York, Kittery, Eliot, and South Berwick (the four towns through which the river flows); the Greater York Region Chamber of Commerce; York Land Trust; York Water District; York Shellfish Conservation Commission; York Country Club; Great Works Regional Land Trust; Eliot Historical Society; Kittery Land Trust; Maine Coast Heritage Trust; Gundlow Company; and numerous other businesses and conservation and historical groups.

However, a study is a critical step in determining what challenges a Wild and Scenic designation may pose to infrastructure upgrades, development, existing commercial and recreational activities and on activities concerning energy production and transmission infrastructure, and on the authority of state and local governments to manage those activities, and other impacts not listed here but listed in the bill. Determining these impacts is an important step forward in considering a Wild and Scenic designation.

Thank you for your time and efforts in chairing this hearing. I hope that my colleagues can join me in support of this study and will give this bill every consideration. I look forward to the results of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Study that would be provided by passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CARL LEVIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN, ON S. 2221 AND S. 2293

ON S. 2221

Thank you, Chairman Udall and Ranking Member Portman for holding this hearing on the MotorCities National Heritage Area Extension Act. I also want to thank Senator Stabenow for co-sponsoring the measure and as a member of this subcommittee for championing the bill through the committee process.

The MotorCities National Heritage Area, also referred as the Automobile National Heritage Area, was established on November 6, 1998 through legislation Congressman Dingell and I introduced with bipartisan co-sponsorship. This heritage area spans across 16 Michigan counties and includes nearly 1,200 auto-related resources, celebrating the rich automotive and labor history of our country. Michigan is a magnet for car enthusiasts and history buffs around the globe and MotorCities helps them learn about our history and celebrate it with us. When visitors come to Detroit to see where Henry Ford first built the Model T or to Lansing to learn about the rise of Oldsmobile, the existence of the Motor Cities National Heritage Area enhances their visit.

By connecting hundreds of auto-related organizations and raising awareness about these sites through its education and publications, the visibility and impact of the resources are multiplied. The investment of MotorCities through its grants and other assistance leverages additional funding; every dollar in federal grants is matched on average by more than five dollars. Federal support has been critical to ensuring that historic resources are preserved and restored, telling the story of an industrial sector that is an integral part of our nation's history.

On October 1, 2014, this assistance will no longer be available unless Congress extends the authority for MotorCities to receive federal funding, which is what my legislation would accomplish. Specifically, this bill would provide an additional 16

years of authority for MotorCities to be eligible to receive federal funding. If this bill or a similar measure is not enacted, the MotorCities heritage area federal funding authority would be sunset. We cannot allow that to happen.

MotorCities' work in assisting the sites in the area, as well as coordinating and promoting auto-related events, has resulted in vital economic development that has benefitted the region. Over a million people visit the MotorCities NHA each year, resulting in an economic impact to the region of over $150 million.

We cannot afford to let an organization that preserves one of America's greatest stories and boosts economic development to falter by eliminating the federal support that is so helpful to its work. Thank you for holding this hearing, and I hope you will quickly advance this legislation to the full Senate.

ON S. 2293

Thank you, Chairman Udall and Ranking Member Portman for holding this hearing on the National Scenic Trails Parity Act (S. 2293). I was pleased to join Senator Baldwin in sponsoring this legislation that involves three trails, the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails (NSTs).

The National Scenic Trails Parity Act would correct an inconsistency in the Park System's treatment of its NSTs by designating all of the NSTs as units of the National Park System (NPS). Currently, three of the six NSTs are treated by the Park Service as units of the NPS, while the remaining three are not. It was never the intent of Congress to treat a subset of the NSTs differently from others in the national trails system. All of the NSTs should be treated in the same way, including in designing and printing NPS trail brochures, accessing funding by non-profit associations, and promoting the trails through NPS promotional materials. This legislation would correct the long-standing disparate treatment of these trails, and would allow these trails to be on an equal footing with the Appalachian, Natchez Trace, and Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trails.

I have been particularly focused on the North Country NST, which is the longest off-road hiking trail in the country, traversing seven states and covering 4,600 miles. The longest segment of the trail is in Michigan, with 1,150 miles of trail. Hundreds of miles of the trail have been constructed and maintained by volunteers. In 2013, over one thousand volunteers provided over 77,000 hours of their time, which is equal to $1.7 million in work. We owe it to these volunteers to ensure the North Country NST is treated as an equal to other NSTs and provide it with the recognition it deserves.

This legislation is a common-sense bill that simply corrects a discrepancy in the Park Service's administration of its trails. There is no cost to this legislation and this committee and the full Senate should approve it without delay. Again my special thanks to Senator Baldwin for leading this effort and thanks for holding this hearing. I look forward to the enactment of this important legislation.

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

As Chairman of the National Parks subcommittee, I submit this written testimony to further clarify key provisions related to livestock grazing in my bill to designate the Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness, S.1794. As stated at the hearing, my intention is that local ranchers maintain flexibility to run livestock in the National Monument and transfer their grazing allotments to future generations.

To meet that intention, I included ranching as a purpose of the monument and stated that all existing laws continue to apply after the monument is designated, which includes transferability. The bill also states that "there shall be no curtailment of grazing in the National Monument or Wilderness simply because of a designation under this Act," and refers to the standards set by appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101-405) and H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617), herein referred to as "appendix A."

Appendix A is a common-sense document, and it is my intention that it be implemented in a way that maximizes flexibility and adaptability to changing technology. For example, Appendix A clearly allows the maintenance of existing facilities such as fencing. However, if ranchers choose to implement new technology that reduces the visual effect of fencing but meets the same purpose—such as "invisible" or "virtual" fencing—it is my intention that these improvements proceed under Appendix A.

Colorado's farms and ranches are a critical part of my state's economy and identity and produce food and fiber for the world. In particular, cattle ranching plays

a critical role in the economy, culture, and heritage of the Arkansas River Valley. Therefore, it is my intention that the Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness support that industry and educate visitors about its role.

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

Senator PORTMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, from the Senate's best mountain climber, that is quite a compliment.

This is an important hearing because we get to look at a bunch of different pieces of legislation, some have been talked about already today, and I know Senator Walsh is going to talk about others.

There are 24 bills, I think, before us. My sense is they are mostly non-controversial, maybe all are. I look forward to getting started on that. I do not have any bills before the subcommittee.

I will thank the chairman and the chair of the full committee, Senator Landrieu, for their work on the World War II Memorial Prayer Act, which was just signed into law by the President about two and a half weeks ago. I think this is going to really enhance the World War II Memorial.

It allows the D-Day Prayer that Franklin Roosevelt spoke on that momentous day to be part of the World War II Memorial, something I have worked on for a while, and it is a beautiful prayer for those of you who do not know it.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues and the subcommittee staff, David Brooks and Kaleb Froehlich, for helping us to get to that point.

I want to talk about the parks for a second. We have a neat opportunity coming up because as you know, the Centennial is upon us, and in 2 years, the parks celebrate a 100 year birthday. Unfortunately, some of the parks look that old and have a lot of deferred maintenance needs, and although we have done a good job in some areas to try to combat that, in others, we have not addressed it.

We have some work to do, and I think we should use this 100 year anniversary to formulate a bipartisan approach that holds the parks up and talks about the grandeur of our parks, but also in the process of commemorating the Centennial, helps to prepare them for the next century.

Again, we have plenty of challenges, with tight budgets and with a lot of deferred maintenance. A great opportunity, I think, to use this. I know Senator Udall is interested in that, and we look forward to working with him and others on that.

If we look back, since 1916, there has been a lot of changes and a lot of growth, huge growth with the parks. We have been able to restore in some cases some beautiful areas, and in other areas, protect them.

I was just this past weekend at Cuyahoga Valley National Park, which is our biggest park in Ohio. Most years, one of the top ten parks in the country in terms of visitation. You probably have not been there yet.

Senator UDALL. I have not.

Senator PORTMAN. Have to get you there. You cannot mountain climb there but you can kayak there.

It is a great example of a suburban, urban, rural park. It does a lot of interpretive work. Jane and I were there visiting with the new superintendent, who is very impressive, and also with the head of the Friends Group, which is called the Conservative for Cuyahoga Valley National Park, and also with one of the chief interpreters, and we got to see their new canal interpretive center, and they have done a great job with that.

It is just an example of a park that is really serving the needs of a population area in northeast Ohio that does not have necessarily access to some of the big parks out west but has the ability to go to Cuyahoga Valley, and people use it.

So, that is what we have to be sure we are encouraging for the next 100 years so we continue to have these tremendous assets and these gems.

I think again this is a good opportunity today to get through some important bills, but also I hope we will hear from some folks about how to encourage something big on the Centennial and being able to connect even more people to our national parks.

It is good to have Senator Walsh with us today, and I will turn it back to the chairman to introduce the witnesses.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Portman. Senator Baldwin, did you have an opening statement or comments you would like to share?

STATEMENT OF HON. TAMMY BALDWIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

Senator BALDWIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening us, and Ranking Member Portman.

I listened with great interest to each of your opening statements, and it is so clear how important these local and national resources and jewels are.

I remember several times, although many years ago, rafting through Browns Canyon. It is a big favorite of mine. But listening to how much each of you enjoy the outdoors, I wanted to highlight two bills that are on the agenda today.

The first relating to the Apostle Islands area in Lake Superior, where I would invite Senator Portman to come kayaking, it is some of the best kayaking around, and also some of our long distance trails, where I would invite both of you, but certainly you, Senator Udall, to come hiking.

I am delighted to have the chance to hear later from our witnesses on two bills that are very important to my home State of Wisconsin.

The first is S. 2031, which would add an historic lighthouse located in Ashland, Wisconsin, into the nearby Apostle Islands National Scenic Lakeshore. The Coast Guard currently manages the lighthouse, and a few years ago, they went through a public process to find a new caretaker for the structure. None emerged other than the National Park Service.

Local park staff at the Apostle Islands already manage 8 lighthouses in the Lakeshore, and together with the Ashland light, they are a national treasure, and a treasure in our northern communities of Ashland and Bayfield.

This bill would allow this local icon to be preserved, and the bill is supported by my colleagues in the Senate and by bipartisan members of the Wisconsin Delegation in the House of Representatives. I am really pleased that we are able to address this local priority in the committee today.

The second bill that I would like to highlight is S. 2293, the National Scenic Trails Parity Act, which addresses a long-standing disparity in treatment among the 6 national scenic trails managed by the Park Service. Of these 6 trails, 3 were declared units through an administrative process, and 3 operate with many of the features but not the full array of benefits of the unit trails.

This bill would resolve the issue, and the Ice Age Trail, North Country, and New England National Scenic Trails would receive parity with the other full trail units. This would allow them to compete for resources and be included on interpretive materials distributed by the Park Service staff, and be eligible for foundation funding sources.

Senators from the North Country and New England National Scenic Trails have joined me as original co-sponsors of this bill, which would ensure that these spectacular trails can fully serve the public in the agencies' second century.

I thank you again, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Baldwin. Senator Walsh, it is an honor to have you here. We will be eager to hear your testimony. Senator Portman and I are trying to place this wonderful photograph here, and I am assuming you will tell us where that is and probably draw us to your great State of Montana to experience it directly.

Senator WALSH.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN WALSH, U.S. SENATOR FROM MONTANA

Senator WALSH. Thank you, Chairman Udall, for holding this important hearing on the East Rosebud Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

The East Rosebud Creek begins high up in the Absaroka-Beartooth Mountain Wilderness, and flows to the Yellowstone River. It is one of the most spectacular places in Montana, and that is what the picture represents there today.

This bill will designate two sections of the creek totaling approximately 20 miles under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968. The Act has a special place in Montana history, having been drafted and championed by the famous Craighead brothers, biologists, who researched grizzly bears and other species.

Private developers proposed tapping the East Rosebud Creek 3 separate times for power. Three times the proposals have been shelved.

Earlier this year, I met with constituents about the wild and scenic" designation. They came to Washington to explain why they are so passionate about keeping East Rosebud the way it is today.

I followed up with a large public meeting in Billings, Montana, and I was overwhelmed by the broad support of the designation in the community, and so I introduced this bill, but I cannot say that I am surprised by the support. Protecting the free flowing nature of the creek means that the creek will continue to attract people

from around the world to enjoy its Class 5 whitewater kayaking, and I stress Class 5 whitewater kayaking.

[Laughter.]

Senator WALSH. If they are not kayaking, they will be out fishing for wild brown trout.

Protecting the East Rosebud means we will keep drawing backpackers to the famous Beaten Path Trail that crosses the Beartooth plateau, all the way to Cooke City. It means keeping a free flowing creek for the rock and ice climbers who flock to the many walls of the East Rosebud.

All those visitors stay in local hotels, eat in local restaurants, and shop in local small businesses—in Billings, Roscoe, Columbus, and Red Lodge. The bottom line is that this bill is good for the local economy.

I can also tell you that 100 percent of the proposed land for designation is already Federal land. This bill does not impact private land around East Rosebud at all. I also confirmed with the U.S. Geological Survey that there is no potential for oil and gas development under the land in question. In fact, many of the Montanans who enjoy the East Rosebud have good jobs in the oil, gas and mining industries elsewhere in the State of Montana.

So, this bill will change very little in how the Federal land under the designation is administered. What it would do and what Montanans want is to protect the free flowing and pristine nature of the creek against future diversions and dams.

Recreational uses like hunting, kayaking, and fishing would not be impacted, nor would agricultural uses, such as grazing, which occurs today, with no harm to the outstanding remarkable values of the creek.

No Montana rivers have been added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System since 1976, almost 40 years. East Rosebud Creek is the place to start. It will be good for jobs, good for Montana's outdoor heritage, and it is widely supported by the community.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing me to make these comments.

Senator UDALL. Senator Walsh, thank you for those comments and thank you for sharing this marvelous place and this important opportunity we have to protect and preserve this area.

I do not know if Senator Baldwin or Senator Portman have any questions for Senator Walsh.

I would add that rock climbers are out there but ice climbers are certifiable.

[Laughter.]

Senator UDALL. Senator Portman and I were looking with great interest at the kayaker in this wonderful photograph, and that is some serious boating that individual is undertaking. We want to make sure that opportunity——

Senator WALSH. We would be happy to get Senator Portman out there to kayak.

Senator UDALL. He would be happy, I know, to visit Montana, and we are also going to invite him to Colorado, to Browns Canyon, although he may have already tried Browns Canyon because he has kayaked many a river.

Thank you again. You are welcome to stay, but I know you have a busy day. We will excuse you if that is what you need to do. So, thank you for being here.

Senator WALSH. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. As Senator Walsh departs, I think I would like to call our witnesses to the table, and we will look forward to their testimony.

Welcome, the two of you. We have been joined by Ms. Christina Goldfuss. She is the Deputy Director, Congressional and External Affairs, of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. I understand it is her first time appearing before the committee. We welcome you.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. We have also been joined by Mr. Gregory Smith, who is the Director of Lands, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

Ms. Goldfuss, why do we not start with you? The floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE GOLDFUSS, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, CONGRESSIONAL AND EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ACCOMPANIED BY CARL ROUNTREE, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LANDSCAPE CONVSERVATION SYSTEM

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Thank you. Thank you for having me today, Mr. Chairman, and for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on 22 bills on today's agenda.

I am accompanied today by Carl Rountree, who is the Assistant Director for the National Landscape Conservation System, and will be happy to answer questions on S. 1794, the Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness Act, which is also on the agenda.

I would like to submit our full statements on each of these bills for the record and summarize the department's views. It is a long list.

Senator UDALL. Without objection.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I will run through it as quickly as possible. To start, the department supports the following 12 bills: H.R. 412, which would authorize a study of the Nashua River and two tributaries for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 1389 and H.R. 1501, which would authorize a special resource study of the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument, New York City.

S. 1520 and H.R. 2197, which would authorize a study of the York River for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 1718, which would modify the boundary of the Petersburg National Battlefield. S. 1785, which would modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park, and establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System.

S. 1866, which would extend the authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia. S. 2031, which would adjust the boundary of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore to include the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light.

S. 2264, which would designate two World War I memorials, including one at Pershing Park in the District of Columbia, and S. 2356, which would adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve.

The reasons for our support for these bills are explained in our full statements. For several of the bills we are requesting amendments, and we would be happy to work with the committee on those.

Regarding S. 2576 and S. 2602, which would establish the Maritime Washington and Mountains to Sound National Heritage Areas in the State of Washington, and Title I of S. 1641, which would designate the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, the department supports the objectives of these bills.

However, the department recommends that Congress pass National Heritage Area program legislation before designating any additional new Heritage Areas.

The department would support, if amended, S. 1189, which would adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium.

Regarding S. 2111, S. 2221, and Title 2 of S. 1641, which would extend the authority for funding for 4 National Heritage Areas, the department recommends amending these bills to authorize an extension for Heritage Area program funding until such time that the National Park Service has completed an evaluation and report on the accomplishments of the areas, and the future role of the National Park Service, and until National Heritage Area program legislation is enacted.

The department takes the same position for S. 2318, which would extend the authority for the commission of the Erie Canalway Heritage Corridor.

The department does not object to S. 2293, which would clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System.

Regarding S. 2104, which would refund the States funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate units of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown, because the department does not currently have the authority to make these payments, Congress would have to pass this legislation in order to provide the department with this authority.

The department recommends that the committee defer action on S. 2346, which would amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails and designate the American Discovery Trail, until such time as private sector partners are able to demonstrate the capacity to support such an endeavor and level of public backing necessary to ensure its continued success.

Finally, the department strongly opposes S. 1750, which would authorize the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to enter into agreements with States to provide for continued operations during times when they are unable to maintain a normal level of operations due to a lapse in appropriations.

We disagree with the idea of enacting any laws to try to lessen the impact of a future government shutdown for a few select governmental activities rather than protecting all such activities by avoiding a lapse in appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, Senators, this concludes my statement. Mr. Rountree and I would be pleased to answer any questions that you might have.

[The prepared statements of Ms. Goldfuss follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENTS OF CHRISTINA GOLDFUSS, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, CONGRESSIONAL AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

ON H.R. 412

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 412, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Nashua River and its tributaries in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes. This bill passed the House on June 23, 2014.

The Department supports enactment of this legislation with amendments. The river segments and tributary areas proposed for study 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 24 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.

H.R. 412 directs the Secretary of the Interior to study a 19-mile segment of the mainstem of the Nashua River, except for a 4.8-mile segment that is currently the subject of a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensing proceeding for an existing hydroelectric facility (Pepperell Hydro Company, P-12721). It is the Department's understanding that this excepted segment would appropriately allow the FERC to complete the ongoing licensing proceeding without the delay that a Wild and Scenic River Study would otherwise impose. As specified in the bill, the study would include unnamed tributaries of the Nashua River along the segment designated for study, in addition to the two named tributaries, the Squannacook and Nissitissit Rivers. The bill requires the study to be completed and transmitted to Congress within three years after funding is made available for it. We estimate the cost of the study to be approximately $300,000, based on similar studies recently conducted by the National Park Service (NPS).

The Nashua River, once severely polluted, played an important role in the nation's river conservation history by inspiring support for both the state and federal Clean Water Acts. The transformation of the Nashua from a neglected and polluted waterway to one which now boasts the Oxbow National Wildlife Refuge, regionally significant paddling and fishing opportunities, a remarkable protected greenway system, and other important natural and cultural values, is a remarkable success story. The Squannacook and Nissitissit Rivers are two of eastern Massachusetts' most significant remaining cold-water trout fisheries.

The Northeast Regional Office of the NPS recently completed a reconnaissance survey of the Nashua River at the request of Representative Niki Tsongas, the sponsor of H.R. 412. The survey provided a preliminary evaluation of the approximately 27.5 miles of river that would be studied under H.R. 412 as a step toward a full Wild and Scenic River Study. The findings of the survey indicate that segments of the Nashua River exhibit the characteristics and resource values likely to meet eligibility criteria for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. In addition, over the course of the past four years, the NPS has responded to interest and inquiries from local advocates and town officials regarding a potential Wild and Scenic Rivers study for the Nashua River, and there appears to be strong local support for protecting the river system.

If enacted, the National Park Service intends to undertake the study in close cooperation with the affected communities, the relevant agencies of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and interest groups such as the Nashua River Watershed Association through a partnership-based study approach. 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.

Although the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires the development of a comprehensive river management plan within three years of the date of designation, it has become the practice of the National Park Service to prepare this plan as part of a study of potential wild and scenic rivers when much of the river runs through private lands. This allows the National Park Service to consult widely with local landowners, federal and state land management agencies, local governments, river authorities, and other groups that have interests related to the river prior to determining if the river is suitable for designation. Early preparation of the plan also assures input from these entities as well as users of the river on the management strategies that would be needed to protect the river's resources.

As passed by the House, H.R. 412 includes certain requirements for the study which we recommend deleting. These requirements include determining the effect of the designation on existing commercial and recreational activities and on activities concerning energy production and transmission infrastructure, and on the authority of state and local governments to manage those activities. They also include requiring the identification of any authorities that would compel or permit the Secretary of the Interior to include or participate in local land use decisions or place restriction on non-federal lands, or that could be used to condemn property. And, they include requiring the identification of all private property located in the study area. The purpose of conducting a study is to determine whether a river meets the established criteria for eligibility for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. We believe that the existing criteria used for making that determination result in a sufficient amount of information and analysis of the effects of a Wild and Scenic River designation. The additional requirements included in these bills could potentially increase the cost of the study and the time required to complete it.

This concludes my prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to answer any questions you or other committee members may have regarding this bill.

ON S. 1189

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1189, a bill to adjust the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, and for other purposes.

The Department would support S. 1189 if amended as described later in this statement. The inclusion of Hinchliffe Stadium within the park boundary would facilitate the National Park Service's role in preserving and interpreting a nationally significant cultural resource associated with the history of African-American achievement and racial integration.

S. 1189 would amend the enabling legislation for Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park to include Hinchliffe Stadium, one of the few remaining stadiums in the country to have hosted Negro League baseball, within the park boundary. The stadium is located on approximately 6 acres of land adjacent to the existing park boundary. The park currently encompasses a large portion of the Great Falls Historic District, which is composed of resources associated with Paterson's industrial history. By including the stadium within the park boundary, this iconic property would be brought under the provisions of the park's enabling act that authorize the National Park Service to enter into cooperative agreements to identify, interpret, restore, and provide technical assistance for preservation of the property. As introduced, the bill would also authorize the National Park Service to accept the donation of the property.

Hinchliffe Stadium, an historic 10,000-seat Art Deco structure, was built as a public works project between 1931 and 1932 and served as a venue for professional and amateur baseball, automobile and motorcycle racing, entertainment and school athletic competitions. The stadium has been owned and operated by the Paterson Public School District since 1963. The School Board closed the stadium in 1996. In March 2013, four years after Congress authorized the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park, Hinchliffe Stadium was designated a National Historic Landmark.

The stadium's national significance is tied to its history as a Negro League Baseball venue be-tween 1932 and 1944, serving as the home field for the New York Black Yankees, the New York Cubans, the Newark Eagles and others. Hinchliffe games featured hometown favorite and future Hall of Famer Larry Doby, who in 1947 would become the first African-American ball player to integrate the American League. As cited in the National Historic Landmark study, Hinchliffe also derives its significance from its integral role in the social history of the city. Many of Paterson's silk and other mill workers formed teams and played in the stadium,

making it an important part of the fabric of community life in industrial Paterson during the Great Depression and in decades beyond.

To raise public awareness of Hinchliffe's threatened status, the National Trust for Historic Preservation named the stadium to its 2010 list of America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places and included it on their inaugural list of America's National Treasures. The National Trust has since been directly involved in seeking to preserve the stadium, and in establishing a Steering Committee comprised of the National Trust, the City of Paterson, the Paterson Board of Education, the Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium and the National Park Service. Through the efforts of the Steering Committee, approximately $1.2 million in funding has been secured to undertake a partial restoration of the stadium, work that recently commenced. The restoration and stabilization project will identify the actions necessary to preserve and fully restore the stadium for future use.

At a special meeting of the Paterson Board of Education in May 2013, the Board voted unanimously to support legislation that would include the stadium within the boundary of the park, with the proviso that the school district not relinquish control of the stadium, require National Park Service acquisition of the property, or permit the National Park Service to acquire or manage the stadium without the express support of the school district.

The Paterson Board of Education and the National Park Service are in agreement about the desirability of maintaining ownership of the stadium by the Paterson Public School District. We believe that the role of the National Park Service with respect to the stadium should be limited to providing interpretation, education, and technical preservation assistance. For that reason, the Department would support S. 1189 only if the bill is amended to prohibit the National Park Service from acquiring ownership of the stadium. We would be pleased to provide the committee with recommended language.

We also recommend that the legislation be amended to reference an updated map, which would require striking "March 2013" and inserting "April 2014" on line 14 of page 2 of the bill. And, we note that the word "containing" needs to be inserted between the words "land" and "Hinchliffe" on line 9 of page 2.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

ON S. 1389 AND H.R. 1501

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to provide the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1389 and H.R. 1501, as passed by the House, bills to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument in Fort Greene Park, in the New York City borough of Brooklyn, as a unit of the National Park System.

The Department supports enactment of this legislation with amendments. However, we believe that priority should be given to the 24 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 the Congress.

S. 1389 and H.R. 1501 authorize a special resource study of the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument. This study would determine whether this site meets the National Park Service's criteria for inclusion in the National Park System of national significance, suitability, and feasibility, and need for National Park Service management. The study would also consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the resources. We estimate the cost of the study to range from $100,000 to $200,000, based on similar types of studies conducted in recent years.

The Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument commemorates the sacrifice of over 11,000 patriots who died while incarcerated in British prison ships anchored off Brooklyn during the American Revolution. The monument was constructed in 1908 and is located in Fort Greene Park. Designed by the architect Stanford White and set in a landscape designed by the landscape architects Calvert Vaux and Frederick Law Olmsted, it is 149 feet tall and constructed of granite. Prominent sculptural elements were executed by Adolph Alexander Weinman. The monument's base includes a crypt containing some the remains of the prisoners recovered from the Brooklyn waterfront in the nineteenth century. Also, Fort Greene Park was the location of American fortifications during the Battle of Long Island, and has been classified as a "Class A Battlefield Commemorative Property" in the National Park Service Report to Congress on the Historic Preservation of Revolutionary War and War of 1812 Sites in the United States, dated September 2007.

Construction of the monument was funded jointly by the federal government and the City of New York; it is currently owned by the New York City Department of

Parks and Recreation. Both the monument and Fort Greene Park are contributing resources to the Fort Greene Historic District that is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

For both S. 1389 and H.R. 1501, we recommend an amendment to change the reporting requirement for the study from one year after enactment of the bill to three years after funding is made available, consistent with the requirements for special resource studies in the National Park System General Authorities Act. Further, since the name of the act has been enacted into law, we recommend section 1(b)(2) of S. 1389 be amended to reflect this.

We also recommend that the committee act on S. 1389, rather than H.R. 1501. If the committee acts on H.R. 1501, we recommend an amendment deleting certain requirements for the study. Specifically, we urge deleting section 1(b)(3)(d), which would require an analysis of the effect of designation as a unit of the National Park System on existing commercial and recreational activities, and on activities concerning energy production and transmission infrastructure, and on the authority of state and local governments to manage those activities. We also urge deleting section 1(b)(3)(e), which would require an identification of any authorities that would compel or permit the Secretary of the Interior to influence or participate in local land use decisions or place restrictions on non-federal lands. The purpose of conducting a special resource study is to determine whether a resource meets the criteria for inclusion in the National Park System and, if it does not, to provide information on alternative means to protect the resource. We believe that the special resource study requirements under existing law result in a sufficient amount of information and analysis of the effects of including a resource in the National Park System. These additional requirements could potentially increase the cost of the study and the time required to complete it.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes our prepared statement. I would be happy to respond to any questions about this matter.

ON S. 1520 AND H.R. 2197

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1520 and H.R. 2197, bills to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the York River and associated tributaries for study for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The Department supports enactment of this legislation with amendments. However, we feel that priority should be given to the 24 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. 1520 and H.R. 2197, which are substantially identical, would authorize the National Park Service to study 11.25 miles of the York River and its tributaries in York County, Maine, for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The York River watershed drains 33 square miles located almost entirely in the communities of Eliot, Kittery, and York, and flows into the Gulf of Maine through York Harbor. We estimate the cost of the study to be approximately $300,000, based on similar studies recently conducted by the National Park Service (NPS).

The York is a small, highly scenic, and very historic watershed. Navigable portions of the York and its tributaries offer excellent recreation for small powerboats, canoes, and kayaks. The ecological resources of the York and its importance to the Gulf of Maine have been recognized through the close association with the nearby Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve. York Harbor and the York River were essential to the early commercial activity of the region and many important historic sites from the 18th and 19th Centuries have been documented and preserved.

The Northeast Regional Office of the NPS recently completed a reconnaissance survey of the York River at the request of Representative Chellie Pingree, the sponsor of H.R. 2197. The survey provided a preliminary evaluation of the approximately 11 miles of river that would be studied under S. 1520 and H.R. 2197 as a step toward a full Wild and Scenic River Study. The findings of the survey indicate that segments of the York River exhibit the characteristics and resource values likely to meet eligibility criteria for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. In addition, over the course of the past four years, the NPS has responded to interest and inquiries from local advocates and town officials regarding a potential Wild and Scenic Rivers study for the York River, and there appears to be strong local support for protecting the river system.

If enacted, the NPS intends to undertake the study in close cooperation with the affected communities, interested organizations, and relevant agencies of the State of Maine through a partnership-based study approach. 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.

Although the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act requires the development of a comprehensive river management plan within three years of the date of designation, it has become the practice of the NPS to prepare this plan as part of a study of potential wild and scenic rivers when much of the river runs through private lands. This allows the NPS to consult widely with local landowners, federal and state land management agencies, local governments, river authorities, and other groups that have interests related to the river prior to determining if the river is suitable for designation. Early preparation of the plan also assures input from these entities as well as users of the river on the management strategies that would be needed to protect the river's resources.

Both H.R. 2197 and S. 1520 include certain requirements for the study which we recommend deleting. These requirements include determining the effect of the designation on existing commercial and recreational activities and on activities concerning energy production and transmission infrastructure, and on the authority of state and local governments to manage those activities. They also include requiring the identification of any authorities that would compel or permit the Secretary of the Interior to include or participate in local land use decisions or place restriction on non-federal lands, or that could be used to condemn property. And, they include requiring the identification of all private property located in the study area. The purpose of conducting a study is to determine whether a river meets the established criteria for eligibility for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. We believe that the existing criteria used for making that determination result in a sufficient amount of information and analysis of the effects of a Wild and Scenic River designation. The additional requirements included in these bills could potentially increase the cost of the study and the time required to complete it.

This concludes my prepared remarks, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to answer any questions you or other committee members may have regarding this bill.

ON S. 1641

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1641, a bill to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area, and for other purposes.

The Department supports the objectives of Title I of S. 1641, which would designate the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area. This 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.

Regarding Title II, which provides for the extension of funding authority for the National Coal Heritage Area and the Wheeling National Heritage Area, the Department recognizes the important work that has been done by the organizations involved with both national heritage areas. However, we recommend that Title II be amended to authorize an extension for both heritage areas' program funding until such time as the National Park Service (NPS) has completed an evaluation and report on the accomplishments of the area and the future role of the NPS; and until national heritage area (NHA) program legislation is enacted that standardizes timeframes and funding for designated national heritage areas.

The NPS is initiating phase-in of a funding formula for NHAs, which is a merit-based system for allocating heritage area funding that considers a variety of factors based upon criteria related to program goals, accountability, and organizational sustainability. When fully implemented, the performance-based funding formula plan will reward NHA entities that bring in additional non-Federal investment and that have developed a sustainability plan. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when national heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that Congress enact national heritage area program legislation during this Congress.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides their designation and administration as a national system. National heritage area program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluation of proposed national heritage areas, guiding planning and management, clarifying roles and responsibilities, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

Title I of S. 1641 would establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area encompassing 16 counties in northeastern West Virginia and two counties in western Maryland, a region that has a rich history of human activity shaped by the geography of the forested central Appalachian Mountains. The proposed local coordinating entity would be the Appalachian Forest Heritage Area, Inc., a non-profit organization that currently coordinates forest-related heritage tourism activities in this region. The provisions in this bill are similar to provisions in most of the other NHA designation bills that have been enacted in recent years, including a total authorization of $10 million and a sunset date for the authorization of funding 15 years after the date of enactment.

The Appalachian Forest Heritage Area, Inc. prepared a feasibility study for designation of the area as a national heritage area several years ago. The National Park Service reviewed the study and found that it met the NPS interim criteria contained in National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines. The Appalachian Forest Heritage Area, Inc. was informed of this finding in a letter dated August 16, 2007.

The area encompassed by the proposed NHA is a significant part of the central Appalachian highlands that has a long history of timber harvesting, forest management, and the production of forest products. It is an area that provided resources for industrial expansion in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, but where large portions of the forests have regrown. Areas within the proposed NHA include the Monongahela National Forest, portions of the George Washington National Forest, the Canaan Valley National Wildlife Refuge, and the Seneca Rocks-Spruce Knob National Recreation Area, along with a large number of state forests and parks and areas protected by nonprofit conservation organizations. The extensive hardwood forests and undeveloped rural character of the area provide scenic vistas, opportunities for nature observation, and outdoor recreation opportunities.

There are also numerous historic and cultural sites within the area, such as historic sites from the logging era and Civilian Conservation Corps structures. It is an area well-suited to demonstrate the connection between forest and forest products, and the folklife, music, dance, crafts, and traditions of central Appalachia. Designation as a NHA would help the region realize the full potential of the cultural, natural, historic, and recreational resources of the region.

Title II of S. 1641 would extend the authorization of funding for the National Coal Heritage Area until September 30, 2017. The National Coal Heritage Area was established in 1996 by Public Law 104-333. Its funding authorization, which expired in 2012 under that law, has been extended through appropriations acts through September 30, 2015. In total, the NHA has received approximately $3.6 million, and every federal dollar has been matched at least once with non-federal funds or in-kind services.

The National Coal Heritage Area spans 13 counties in the Appalachian Mountains of West Virginia and includes significant resources such as coal mines, camps, company stores, train depots, memorials, parks, National Register Districts, and trails. Its mission is to preserve, protect, and interpret historic, cultural, and natural resources associated with West Virginia's coal mining heritage to stimulate tourism and economic development, enhancing the quality of life for residents. The NPS is currently concluding an evaluation of this NHA, as required under Public Law 110-229.

Title II would also extend the authorization of funding for the Wheeling National Heritage Area until September 30, 2017. The Wheeling National Heritage Area was established in 2000 by Public Law 106-291. Its funding authorization will expire under that law on September 30, 2015. In total, the NHA has received approximately $9.7 million of the total $10 million authorized to be appropriated, and every federal dollar has been matched in accordance with its enabling act.

The Wheeling National Heritage Area encompasses significant historic and cultural resources in and around City of Wheeling, West Virginia, including many that are National Historic Landmarks or listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Wheeling played an important role in the development and establishment of a multitude of industries in the United States that facilitated the Nation's expansion. The NHA helps preserve the city's Victorian architecture, waterfront park, historic city markets, and renovated industrial buildings.

We recommend a technical amendment to the Title II heading and to the section subheadings to make it clear that the bill would extend the authorization for federal funding for the two national heritage areas, instead of reauthorizing the national heritage areas. While both National Coal and Wheeling face sunset dates for their federal funding, their national heritage area designations will not sunset.

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

ON S. 1718

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1718, a bill to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes.

The Department supports S. 1718.

S. 1718 would authorize two modifications to the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield. First, the bill would expand the currently authorized boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield by an additional 7,238 acres. The boundary expansion proposal results from an analysis of "core battlefields" and a subsequent boundary adjustment study conducted as part of Petersburg National Battlefield's General Management Plan completed in 2005. Second, the bill would effect a land exchange between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army involving approximately one acre under the each Department's administrative jurisdiction.

The City of Petersburg lies in the corridor of intensive growth from Washington, D.C., to south of Richmond, Virginia. The region surrounding Petersburg National Battlefield has been and is currently experiencing significant development pressures impacting areas immediately adjacent to the park and unprotected battlefield sites. This development not only threatens park resources and public enjoyment, but also the core portions of the battlefields. The park commemorates the Petersburg Campaign, the longest sustained combative military front on American soil, in both time and distance. When Congress created the park in 1926, only a fraction of the battlefield acreage associated with the 26 major battles of the Petersburg Campaign was included in the original boundary. The additional battlefields proposed to be added to the park by S. 1718 will allow the public to better understand the size, complexity, and duration of the 9° month Petersburg Campaign and siege while offering protection to existing park resources.

In January 2002, in response to significant development pressures in the region surrounding the park and as part of its General Management Plan process, Petersburg National Battlefield undertook a detailed assessment of battlefields in the Petersburg Campaign cited in the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC) report of 1993 entitled "Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields." The CWSAC report identified 100,000 acres of the Petersburg battlefields as "core battlefields" encompassing all of the critical phases defined for a battle. Of the 100,000 acres cited, 23,000 acres were determined to retain historic integrity.

During its more detailed analyses of the 23,000 acres, the park concentrated on those portions of the battlefields that were south of the Appomattox River and directly associated with the siege or defense of Petersburg, and that were identified as Class A (decisive) and Class B (major) by the CWSAC. Additionally, the park used historical maps and documentation to further refine the acreage to that constituting the portion of the battlefield on which both armies were engaged directly and that had a bearing on the outcome for each battle. Park staff further analyzed the integrity of these areas and their potential for public access and interpretation. The analyses found that 7,238 acres met the criteria for integrity and interpretability.

The estimated time period for acquisition of the 7,238 acres of these nationally significant lands is 15-20 years. Virtually all of the land subject to the boundary adjustment represents a mixture of private and non-profit, organization-owned parcels. Agricultural and conservation easements will be the preferred method of acquisition for most parcels. Easements enable protection of these battlefields from inappropriate development while retaining private ownership and compatible use of the land. Where easements are not possible, and there is interest by the landowners, other acquisition methods, such as donation and fee simple acquisition from willing sellers based on available funding, will be utilized for battlefield preservation.

Under a 2008 estimate, the total estimated cost of purchasing in fee simple all of the 7,238 acres would be $29.7 million. Protection of land through easements and donations, which is anticipated for a large portion of the lands, would likely significantly lower acquisition costs. The estimated cost for capital expenses (trails, wayside exhibits, rehabilitation of existing visitor contact station, etc.) and expansion-related costs (surveys, hazardous materials studies, etc.) is $1.9 million. Develop-

ment of visitor services and interpretation at these new battlefield locations would be minimal and include small parking areas, wayside exhibits, and trail and other enhancements to the sites. The annual increase in park operation and maintenance is estimated to be $531,000. Development and operational maintenance numbers are in 2014 dollars. All funds would be subject to NPS priorities and the availability of appropriations.

Public response to the General Management Plan and the proposed boundary expansion have been uniformly favorable among local governments, organizations, and individuals. The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution supporting future legislation to expand the boundary of the park as outlined in the General Management Plan. Many civic organizations in the Petersburg region have also indicated support for the proposal.

The bill would also effect a transfer of administrative jurisdiction between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior involving two small parcels of land. Following the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Army was required to erect a perimeter fence around Fort Lee Military Reservation, located adjacent to Petersburg National Battlefield. The fence intruded slightly into the boundary of the park. Effective upon enactment of this bill, the Army would receive administrative jurisdiction over the 1.170 acres of park land where the perimeter fence is located and the National Park Service would receive 1.171 acres of land at Fort Lee. The Secretary of the Army is supportive of this provision. There is no cost associated with this exchange.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer any questions that you or other members of the subcommittee may have regarding this bill.

ON S. 1750

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide the views of the Department on S. 1750, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States and political subdivisions of States providing for the continued operation, in whole or in part, of public land, units of the National Park System, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and units of the National Forest System in the State during any period in which the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, is unable to maintain normal level of operations at the units due to a lapse in appropriations, and for other purposes.

The Department strongly opposes S. 1750. We have a great deal of sympathy for the businesses and communities that experienced a disruption of activity and loss of revenue during last fall's government shutdown and that stand to lose more if there is another funding lapse in the future. However, we disagree generally with the idea of enacting laws to try to lessen the impact of a future government shutdown for a few select governmental activities rather than protecting all such activities by avoiding a lapse in appropriations. We also believe that this legislation specifically, with its mandate to enter into agreements to reopen public lands at the request of a state, would be very difficult to execute. Furthermore, we are concerned that agreements to have states provide funding for activities that are inherently Federal in nature, even for a short period of time, would undermine the longstanding framework established by Congress for the management of Federal lands under the stewardship of the Department.

S. 1750 would require the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with States or their political subdivisions, upon their request, to accept funds to open National Park units, National Wildlife Refuges, Bureau of Land Management lands, and National Forests. The authority would be in effect only during a period when the Secretary is unable to operate and manage the units at normal levels. The bill would also provide for reimbursement for the amounts provided to the Secretaries to reopen the sites when appropriations are enacted providing retroactive funding, or when the State or political subdivision establishes that entrance fees were collected for the period covered by the agreement. If those requirements are not met, the Secretary would have discretionary authority to provide to reimbursement to the states, subject to the availability of appropriations.

The desire to avoid the kind of disappointment to the public and disruption of economic activity that results from a lapse in Federal appropriations is understandable. When the partial government shutdown occurred from October 1 through October 16, 2013, a lot of attention was focused on effects of closures of national parks, national wildlife refuges, public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and national forests—all places that are highly valued by the public for their rec-

reational offerings and that serve as economic engines for the communities in which they are located.

It was because of the critical importance of these sites that the Secretary of the Interior agreed to reopen several of them using donated funds during the partial shutdown. As the shutdown entered its second week, the National Park Service entered into donation agreements with six states to accept the donation of funds necessary to allow the National Park Service to temporarily reopen 13 national park units. In these cases, the states were concerned enough about the loss of economic activity associated with certain national parks to use their own funds to alleviate the impact of park closures.

These agreements did help a select number of businesses and communities. However, they should not be held up as a model of how the Federal government should do business. The national parks that were opened during the shutdown were fortunate to be located in states that had the resources and political will to fund them. The National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which all seek to treat the land units under their stewardship equitably, have grave concerns about enshrining in law a process that favors units located in states willing to donate funds to operate them over those located in other states.

Furthermore, the agreements were designed to be temporary, emergency measures for some individual situations, and would not necessarily work for operating all Federal lands. Even for those sites where agreements might work, the potential difficulty of executing agreements on the scale envisioned by S. 1570-every agreement that every state or political subdivision requests-at a time when most of the agencies' staff would be furloughed, cannot be overstated. During last October's partial shutdown, it was an enormous burden on the National Park Service and the Department, with their skeletal staffs, to execute just six agreements to reopen 13 park units. If a large number of states requested such agreements for a large number of sites in a future shutdown, the agencies likely would not have the capacity to respond to all of the requests.

The 2013 Federal government shutdown had terrible impacts for American citizens, businesses, communities, states, and the economy as a whole. These impacts are summarized in the report released by the Office of Management and Budget entitled "Impacts and Costs of the October 2013 Federal Government Shutdown" (November 2013). The report makes clear that the economic effects and disruption to lives and activities from the shutdown were felt far and wide. Enacting a law to try to avoid the impact of a future shutdown on specified activities is not a responsible alternative to simply making the political commitment to avoid a shutdown in the future by providing appropriations for all the vital functions the Federal government performs.

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

ON S. 1785

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1785, a bill to modify the boundary of Shiloh National Military Park in the States of Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield in the state of Tennessee as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Department supports S. 1785.

S. 1785 would add three sites related to the Siege and Battle of Corinth to the boundary of Shiloh National Military Park. In 1991, the "Siege and Battle of Corinth Sites" was designated a National Historic Landmark. The Corinth Battlefield Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-271) authorized the creation of the Corinth Unit, as part of Shiloh National Military Park, to "interpret the Siege and Battle of Corinth and other Civil War actions in the area in and around the city of Corinth, Mississippi." The legislation defined a large partnership role with state, local, and private park partners in the planning, development and interpretation of the unit. The law also authorized a special resource study to identify and determine any other areas that would be appropriate for inclusion in the unit.

The "Corinth Special Resource Study and Boundary Adjustment Environmental Assessment," completed in 2004, identified 18 sites that have a high degree of integrity and significant resources that would provide opportunities for public enjoyment, and recommended that these be included in the boundary of the Corinth Unit of Shiloh National Military Park. In 2007, Congress amended the Corinth Battlefield Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 110-161, Section 127) to expand the boundary of the Corinth Unit of Shiloh National Military Park to include 12 of those sites.

S. 1785 would further modify the boundary of Shiloh National Military Park to include three of the six remaining sites identified in the 2004 special resource study. These three sites—the battlefields of Fallen Timbers, Russell House, and Davis Bridge—would contribute significantly to telling the remarkable story of the Union Army's Mississippi Valley Campaign during the Civil War, especially the Battle of Shiloh, Tennessee and the Siege of Corinth, Mississippi. The Mississippi Valley 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 first battlefield that S. 1785 would include in Shiloh's authorized boundary is Fallen Timbers. On April 8, 1862, after two days of fierce fighting at Shiloh, Major General Ulysses S. Grant dispatched Brigadier General William T. Sherman on a reconnaissance to investigate Confederate intentions. Sherman encountered a large Confederate field hospital protected by a force of Southern cavalry under Lieutenant Colonel Nathan Bedford Forrest in an area called Fallen Timbers. Sherman advanced against the Confederate force and captured the field hospital with its surgeons and about 250 wounded Southern soldiers and about 50 wounded Union soldiers that had been previously captured by the Confederates. After this engagement, the Confederates retreated to Corinth and Sherman returned to Shiloh Church. Thus, the final shots of the Battle of Shiloh were fired at Fallen Timbers. A cautious and methodical Union advance would now mark the beginning of the advance upon, and siege of Corinth.

The Fallen Timbers Battlefield site consists of 468 acres of agricultural and forested land, a small portion of which is developed. The Civil War Trust has acquired approximately 270 acres of this land with the intention of donating it to the federal government. The remaining 198 acres that would be included in the boundary are in private ownership.

The second battlefield that S. 1785 would include in Shiloh's authorized boundary is the Russell House. On May 17, 1862, during the advance upon Corinth, Union forces led by Major General Sherman, fought a Confederate brigade and compelled the southern force to abandon its strong outpost at the Russell House situated on the Tennessee-Mississippi state line. Because the position possessed a great natural strength, Sherman's men lost no time fortifying it and driving the enemy further south toward Corinth.

The pastoral setting of the Russell House Battlefield retains a high degree of integrity, contains the extant remains of field fortifications, and has high potential for archeological survey and research. The approximately 666-acre tract that would be included in the boundary is in private ownership.

The third battlefield that S. 1785 would include in Shiloh's authorized boundary is Davis Bridge. On October 5, 1862, Union troops attacked a retreating Confederate force at Davis Bridge on the Hatchie River. The Federals drove the Confederates back across the river, seized the bridge, and charged into a thicket east of the river. Confederates defending the heights overlooking the crossing to the east inflicted heavy casualties on the Federals and checked their further advance, thereby permitting the defeated Confederate force to retreat south into Mississippi. The engagement at Davis Bridge was the last Confederate offensive in Mississippi.

In 1998, a 598-acre portion of the Davis Bridge Battlefield was listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The bridge across the Hatchie River has long since washed away and the banks of the river have undergone erosion, but the 1,090 acres proposed to be included in the park boundary retain a high degree of integrity with much of the acreage remaining in agricultural cultivation or woodlands. The State of Tennessee owns approximately 845 of these acres. An approximately five-acre plot, which is a contributing property to the Siege and Battle of Corinth National Historic Landmark, has been donated to the National Park Service by the Davis Bridge Memorial Foundation.

If this legislation is enacted, we anticipate that we would acquire the majority of land by donation and that we would not develop visitor services or facilities at the three sites for the foreseeable future. Therefore, land acquisition and development costs would be minimal. Our current estimate for administrative costs associated with land donation at the three sites is $60,000 to cover title searches, environmental site assessments, and closing actions.

S. 1785 would also establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield in the State of Tennessee as an affiliated area of the National Park System. The bill designates the city of Parkers Crossroads and the Tennessee Historical Commission as the management entity for the affiliated area and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide technical assistance and enter into cooperative agreements with the management entity for the purpose of providing financial assistance for the marketing, marking, interpretation, and preservation of the affiliated area. As an affiliated area, Parker's Crossroads Battlefield would continue under non-federal ownership

and management, but the owner would be required to administer the site consistent with laws applicable to units of the National Park System.

Affiliated areas comprise a variety of locations in the United States that preserve significant properties outside of the National Park System. Some of these have been designated by Acts of Congress and others have been designated administratively. All draw on technical assistance or financial aid from the National Park Service.

The Parker's Crossroads Battlefield is listed in the National Register of Historic Places and is significant for its role in the military history of the Civil War and its archeological potential to yield information concerning the battle. The Parker's Crossroads Battlefield was the final engagement of Confederate now-Brigadier General Nathan Bedford Forrest's West Tennessee raid of December, 1862 which resulted in the disruption of Major General Ulysses S. Grant's supply lines as his army advanced towards Vicksburg. Forrest's raid and the simultaneous destruction of Grant's supply depot at Holly Spring, Mississippi, caused Grant to end his overland campaign against Vicksburg.

Since the battle, the area has remained largely in agricultural fields and forests consistent with its appearance in 1862, and the site retains a high degree of integrity. It is likely that the site contains physical remnants of the battle which can provide information concerning troop movements and areas where primary fighting occurred. The site is known to contain the remains of soldiers who were killed during the fighting and other burials may have also occurred there.

We recommend amending both of the map references in S. 1785 to allow for more current maps to be substituted. We would be happy to provide the committee with recommended language and updated maps. We may also suggest some technical amendments.

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

ON S. 1866

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. 1866, a bill to provide for an extension of the legislative authority of the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in honor of former President John Adams and his legacy.

The Department supports S. 1866 with two amendments.

This bill would extend to December 2, 2020, the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor President John Adams and his legacy.

The authority to establish the John Adams memorial was originally enacted on November 5, 2001. The Adams Memorial Foundation (Foundation) requested that the subject of the commemoration be determined to be of preeminent and lasting significance to the nation so that the proposed memorial might be placed in Area I, a request that was considered favorably by the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission (NCMAC) in 2002 and recommended to Congress. Public Law 107-315, enacted on December 2, 2002, granted the Foundation the additional authority to seek a site within Area I for the memorial.

Authorizations under the Commemorative Works Act (CWA) have a seven-year sunset period, which extends from the date Area I authority is granted by Congress, to allow time to obtain a building permit and begin construction of a memorial. The Foundation was unable to select a site, design the memorial, receive the requisite approvals, or raise sufficient funds for the construction of the memorial by the expiration of its authority on December 2, 2009, seven years after the enactment of the Area I authority. Public Law 111-88 extended the Foundation's authority until September 30, 2010, and Public Law 111-169 further extended it until December 2, 2013.

With the additional seven years of legislative authority provided by S. 1866, the Foundation should be in a viable position to achieve site and design approvals as well as to raise the minimum 75 percent of the funds sufficient to build the memorial. Should the Foundation meet these thresholds, the Secretary of the Interior may exercise her authority under the CWA to grant an additional three-year administrative extension to allow the Foundation to finalize construction documents and raise the balance of necessary funding. The Department recognizes that the Foundation has worked diligently through the process of securing a site location within Area I, including appearing before the NCMAC on numerous occasions. The Area I approval by Congress in 2002 would continue to be valid under this proposed extension of authority. The Department is cognizant of the complexities involved in se-

lecting a location for this memorial, and looks forward to continuing to work with the Foundation as it moves forward through this process.

P.L. 107-62 establishes an account for the deposit of excess funds with the Secretary of the Treasury. The Department recommends one amendment that would establish the account with the National Park Foundation consistent with Section 8906(b)(3) of the CWA, and similar to authorizing laws for other memorials. The Department also recommends the bill be amended to clarify the disposition of excess funds should the authority to establish the memorial lapse. We would be glad to work with the Subcommittee on these two amendments.

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

ON S. 2031

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2031, a bill to amend the act to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the state of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, to adjust the boundary of that National Lakeshore to include the lighthouse known as Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, and for other purposes.

The Department supports the enactment of S. 2031 with the amendments discussed below.

S. 2031 would adjust the boundary of the Apostle Island National Lakeshore (Lakeshore) to include the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, thereby transferring ownership of the historic 1915 lighthouse to the National Park Service (NPS) from the U.S. Coast Guard in accordance with previously enacted legislation which mandates that any Federal property located within the boundaries of the Lakeshore be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior without further administrative action. S. 2031 ensures that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers can maintain the breakwater, and, in accordance with the terms of the previously enacted legislation, the U.S. Coast Guard can continue to maintain a Federal aid to navigation in the lighthouse. All three agencies would be required to cooperate in their operations so that each of their agency missions is served.

Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, located on the south shore of Lake Superior, is responsible for the care of what renowned lighthouse historian F. Ross Holland, Jr., has described as "the largest and finest single collection of lighthouses in the country." The park manages six historic light stations, and a total of eight standing light towers—more than in any other unit in the National Park System. All of the lighthouses currently located within the boundary of the Lakeshore, as well as the Ashland Harbor Breakwater Light, are listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The Lakeshore has developed into one of the premier locations in the National Park System for historic preservation and education centered on lighthouses, including interpretive programs highlighting the stories of light keepers and the expansion of the United Sates in the late 19th century through maritime commerce. In 2006, Apostle Islands rehabilitated the 1863 Raspberry Island Lighthouse, which is a very popular visitor attraction. This year, the Lakeshore is concluding a major historic preservation project that will rehabilitate the 1856 Old Michigan Island Light, the oldest in the park, and significantly improve conditions at four other light stations.

All of the lighthouses currently managed by Apostle Islands National Lakeshore were transferred from the U.S. Coast Guard to the National Park Service as part of a Congressionally authorized boundary adjustment and land transfer in 1986 that mandated that any Federal property located within the boundaries of the Lakeshore be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. At the time of the 1986 transfer, the future of the Ashland Light was not in question.

In May 2012, the Coast Guard announced its intent to dispose of the Ashland Light under the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act (NHLPA). The NHLPA, enacted in 2000 as an amendment to the National Historic Preservation Act, provides a public process for the disposal of Federally owned historic light stations by allowing them to be transferred at no cost to Federal agencies, State and local governments, nonprofit corporations, educational agencies, and community development organizations. The first step is the determination of the property as "excess to service requirements" by the U.S. Coast Guard and its identification as a historic structure. This determination is reported to the General Services Administration and notice is given that applications may be made for the structure. If an application is accepted, the lighthouse is simply transferred to the applicant subject

to compliance with requirements to maintain the light and make it available to the public.

No public or private entity, aside from the NPS, expressed interest in obtaining and maintaining the Ashland Light through the NHLPA process. However, as the Ashland Light is not within the existing park boundary, a boundary adjustment is needed to clarify that the property will be administered as part of the park.

The Ashland Light sits in Lake Superior's Chequamegon Bay, less than two miles offshore of the small city of Ashland, Wisconsin. The tower is visible from most of the city's waterfront, and the light shines brightly at night. Images of the Ashland Light are everywhere in the city; they adorn the logos of the local newspaper, the Chamber of Commerce, and many local businesses. Few residents, however, have actually visited the Ashland Light or understand the vital role it played in one of the busiest ports on Lake Superior a century ago.

The Ashland Light is currently in fair condition, but its long-term survival as part of the nation's maritime heritage is not assured. The NPS and the local community are optimistic that the condition could be improved and appropriate visitor educational opportunities could be provided in the future if the Ashland Light were managed as part of Apostle Island National Lakeshore. With the addition of the Ashland Light, the NPS would manage all of the nationally significant historic lights in the region, further enhancing the park's role in historic lighthouse preservation and education.

The Department would recommend two amendments.

The Department recommends deleting the portion of the amendment made in Section 2 that provides buffer zone language. The park boundary adjustment in S. 2031 includes only the lighthouse itself, not any of the waters of the Bay. The NPS has no authority to manage or permit activities outside of park boundaries. Fishing, boating, snowmobiling, and all other existing uses of the Bay's waters are not affected by this bill. The buffer zone language is unnecessary.

The Department also recommends that the portion of Section 2 of the bill directing the Federal agencies to cooperate in their operations be amended to clarify Congressional intent. The bill does not otherwise alter the statutory standards or other mandates of the three agencies, nor does it affect the ongoing need for them to work cooperatively to carry out those mandates in the area, as they currently do with respect to other lighthouses within the boundary. We would be glad to work with the Subcommittee to amend the existing language to ensure that the bill does not affect the missions of these agencies.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I am prepared to answer any questions from members of the Committee.

ON S. 2104

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to provide the Department of the Interior's views on S. 2104, a bill to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown.

S. 2104 requires the Director of the National Park Service to reimburse each State that provided funds to open and temporarily operate a unit (or units) of the National Park System in October 2013, when there was a lapse in appropriations for most Federal government activities. The bill specifies that the reimbursement shall be carried out using funds appropriated for the National Park Service after enactment of this legislation. We estimate that the cost of reimbursing the States would be approximately $2 million.

From October 1 through October 16, 2013, the National Park Service, along with other bureaus and offices of the Department of the Interior, implemented a shutdown of our activities due to a lapse in appropriations. Under the closure determination and notice issued by the Director of the National Park Service, and consistent with applicable law, the National Park Service closed and secured all 401 national parks across the country, suspended all activities, and furloughed more than 20,000 National Park Service employees.

In response to the economic impacts that the park closures were having on many communities and local businesses, as the shutdown entered a second week, Secretary Jewell announced that the Department would consider agreements with Governors who indicated an interest and ability to fully fund National Park Service personnel to reopen specified national parks in their States. Six States—Arizona, Colorado, New York, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Utah—signed donation agreements with the Department to open a total of 13 park units that are all significant contributors to tourism in the States where they are located. State donations under these

agreements totaled approximately $3.6 million. Once these agreements were signed and the funds were transferred, the National Park Service reopened the national parks in accordance with the specific agreements.

Under the terms of the agreements, the States donated to the National Park Service lump sum payments in advance to cover the cost of operating the parks for a specific number of days. Further, these agreements stipulated that funds donated and used to re-open the parks could not be returned to the States. The employees who returned to work in these parks during the shutdown were paid for these days out of the funds donated by the States. When Congress passed a continuing resolution providing appropriations for the first three and a half months of FY 2014 on October 16, 2013, the National Park Service was able to resume operations on October 17, 2013, and stop charging employee time against the funds that had been donated by the States.

Once the shutdown ended, the National Park Service immediately began the process of reimbursing the six States for the portion of donated funding that was not expended to operate the parks, which totaled approximately $1.6 million. However, the National Park Service does not have the authority to reimburse States for the portion of funding that was expended (approximately $2 million); an act of Congress is needed for that. S. 2104 would provide that authority. We would like to point out that, as written, the source of funds for repayment will be derived from future appropriations, not from funds received by the parks in FY14.

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

ON S. 2111

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2111, a bill to reauthorize the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area (NHA).

The Department recognizes the important work of the Board and Staff of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Corporation to preserve Yuma, Arizona, a natural crossing area on the Colorado River, and a landmark in America's westward expansion. We recommend that S. 2111 be amended to authorize an extension for heritage area program funding until such time as the National Park Service (NPS) has completed an evaluation and report on the accomplishments of the area and the future role of the NPS; and until national heritage area program legislation is enacted that standardizes timeframes and funding for designated national heritage areas. In this case, we note that funding is currently authorized for the Yuma Crossing NHA through FY 2015.

The NPS is initiating phase-in of a funding formula for NHAs, which is a merit-based system for allocating heritage area funding that considers a variety of factors based upon criteria related to program goals, accountability, and organizational sustainability. When fully implemented, the performance-based funding formula plan will reward NHA entities that bring in additional non-Federal investment and that have developed a sustainability plan. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when national heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that Congress enact national heritage area program legislation during this Congress.

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

S. 2111 would extend the authorization for federal funding for the Yuma Crossing NHA for 15 additional years, until September 30, 2030. The Yuma Crossing NHA was established in 2000 by Public Law 106-319. Since its creation, this NHA has become the nexus of the Yuma, Arizona, community, bringing together a multitude of partners including business and Quechan Indian Tribe leaders; economic development organizations; city, county, state, and federal government representatives; and members of the agricultural community to focus on improving regional recreation, economic development, historic preservation efforts, and natural resource conservation opportunities. In total, the NHA has received $4.2 million in federal Heritage Partnership Program funding, and every federal dollar has been matched at least once with non-federal funds.

Yuma Crossing NHA is an example of how effective collaborative efforts can be in supporting local communities and economies. This NHA has made tremendous progress over the last decade revitalizing Yuma's riverfront, which was once an

overgrown thicket of non-native trees and underbrush and a corridor for illegal activities. Thanks to the work coordinated and accomplished by the NHA, working with the Bureau of Reclamation and other state and federal agencies, the Yuma Crossing NHA has reconnected the community to the Colorado River, created an extensive multi-use recreational trail system and restored more than 400 acres of wetlands. The effectiveness of Yuma Crossing NHA in creating an increased sense of community for the region, expanding regional recreational opportunities, supporting the restoration of critical wetlands habitat and important community cultural assets, and leveraging local financial and human capital support cannot be overstated.

The Yuma Crossing NHA has succeeded in leveraging its relationships and abilities to better the overall community. For instance, in 2008-2009, when faced with a severe economic recession, Arizona State Parks contemplated closing the Yuma Quartermaster Depot and the Yuma Territorial Prison, both key state historical parks within the City of Yuma. In response to this situation, the City of Yuma and the Yuma Crossing NHA agreed to lease and manage the two parks, rather than see them shuttered. The community embraced this collaborative effort and demonstrated its support by donating $70,000 during the first two months of the parks' new management. Since then, the NHA has upgraded the parks' museum exhibits, reduced operational costs, and increased visitation.

We recommend a technical amendment to the long title of the bill to make it clear that the bill would extend the authorization for federal funding for the national heritage area, instead of reauthorization of the national heritage area. While the Yuma Crossing NHA faces a sunset date for its federal funding, its national heritage area designation will not end.

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

ON S. 2221

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2221, a bill to extend the authorization for the Automobile National Heritage Area in Michigan.

The Department recognizes the important work of the MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership in preserving, interpreting and promoting the automotive and labor heritage of Michigan. We recommend that S. 2221 be amended to authorize an extension for heritage area program funding until such time as the National Park Service (NPS) has completed an evaluation and report on the accomplishments of the area and the future role of the NPS; and until national heritage area (NHA) program legislation is enacted that standardizes timeframes and funding for designated national heritage areas. Because the sunset date for the authorization of funding for the MotorCities NHA is September 30, 2014, the FY 2015 Budget proposes a one-year extension (through FY 2015).

The NPS is initiating phase-in of a funding formula for NHAs, which is a merit-based system for allocating heritage area funding that considers a variety of factors based upon criteria related to program goals, accountability, and organizational sustainability. When fully implemented, the performance-based funding formula plan will reward NHA entities that bring in additional non-Federal investment and that have developed a sustainability plan. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when national heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that Congress enact national heritage area legislation during this Congress.

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

S. 2221, as introduced, would extend the authorization of federal funding for the Automobile National Heritage Area for an additional 16 years until September 30, 2030. The Automobile NHA was designated in 1998 by Public Law 105-355 to preserve the cultural and historic landscapes associated with the automobile in Southeastern and Central Michigan. The NHA covers 10,000 square miles and includes portions of 16 counties, and 250 townships and municipalities, in southeast and central Michigan. The mission of this NHA is focused on raising awareness and understanding about the impact of the automobile on this region with an emphasis on increasing tourism, expanding education and encouraging revitalization. This is accomplished through voluntary partnerships with communities and citizens, and local, state, and federal agencies emphasizing public access, economic development,

regional planning and interpretive programs that highlight the role of auto and labor history in the region.

We also recommend a technical amendment to the bill that would allow the name of the heritage area to reflect the common parlance of MotorCities NHA, rather than Automobile NHA. Public Law 105-355 designated the Automobile National Heritage Area and the Automobile National Heritage Area Partnership as the management entity for the NHA. In subsequent years, the management entity has been renamed the MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership. An amendment to change the name of the heritage area to reflect the name of the management entity would eliminate the dual names used for the heritage area.

During its 16 years of existence, the MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership has a significant record of achievement and, with government funding assistance since its establishment, has shown significant success in working with partners and the federal government to preserve, interpret, and promote the significant resources of the local communities within the region. In total, the NHA has received over $6.3 million in federal funding, and every federal dollar has been matched at least once with non-federal funds and in-kind services.

The MotorCities National Heritage Area partnership has undertaken preservation, education and tourism initiatives to great success. It has worked with its partners to save the Ford Piquette Avenue Plant, the birthplace of the Model T automobile. Once semi-abandoned and threatened with demolition, today Henry Ford's 1906 automotive factory stands and interprets the story of the first affordable automobile for Americans. This National Historic Landmark is open for tours and events. In order to build an understanding of the interconnected stories of the MotorCities NHA, the group has begun a Wayside Exhibit program to create a comprehensive system of approximately 250 outdoor exhibits in communities throughout central and southeastern Michigan that connect the auto and labor history of the region. Done in partnership with a seven year grant from the Federal Highway Administration Department of Transportation and Michigan's Department of Transportation, the signage will commemorate the shared automotive heritage and increase public awareness of the interrelated sites within the NHA to locals and visitors alike. The Heritage Area understands that tourism is a driving economic factor within the region and has been working on a tourism collaboration effort called "Autopalozza" with their state partners at the State Travel Michigan and the Detroit Convention and Visitors Bureau. This umbrella group functions to promote the various major, special, automotive attractions that are particular to the State of Michigan. With innovative partnerships like this, the NHA reaches a much broader audience for visitors, and exposes the heritage area to a national audience.

The management entity has worked tirelessly to connect nearly 1,200 auto-related sites, attractions and events, the largest concentration of auto-related resources in the world. The heritage area management entity facilitates public private partnerships for the preservation of heritage resources and remembers the auto industry's past while celebrating its future. The auto industry centered in Michigan put the world on wheels, created the American middle class, and continues to define the way we live, work and play.

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

ON S. 2264

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2264, a bill to designate memorials to the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I, and for other purposes.

The Department supports S. 2264 with two amendments.

S. 2264 would redesignate Pershing Park in the District of Columbia as the National World War I Memorial and allow for the enhancement of the park through the construction of appropriate sculptural and other commemorative elements, including landscaping, to further honor the service of members of the United States Armed Forces in World War I. The bill also designates the Liberty Memorial of Kansas City at America's National World War I Museum in Kansas City, Missouri, as the National World War I Museum and Memorial. Finally, the bill makes amendments to the World War I Centennial Commission Act.

The Department has testified previously on other bills which sought to designate a National World War I Memorial in either the District of Columbia or at the Liberty Memorial in Kansas City, Missouri. In the 111th Congress, S. 760 and H.R. 1849 proposed designating the Liberty Memorial as the National World War I Memorial, while S. 2097 would have rededicated the District of Columbia War Memo-

rial as a National and District of Columbia World War I Memorial. In the 112th Congress, H.R. 938 proposed to designate the Liberty Memorial as the National World War I Museum and Memorial, and the District of Columbia War Memorial as the District of Columbia and National World War I Memorial. In each case, the Department testified that it was premature to establish a National World War I Memorial without studying existing sites that may already serve that role. The Department also testified that a national memorial to World War I already exists in the District of Columbia.

General John J. Pershing Park, located in the area along Pennsylvania Avenue between 14th and 15th Streets NW, was built by the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation and is now under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service. The park includes a statue of General Pershing and artwork detailing the major battles in World War I that involved U.S. troops. Quotations on the existing World War I Veterans Memorial at Pershing Park include General Pershing's tribute to the officers and men of the American Expeditionary Forces of World War I and a commemoration of those who served in the United States Navy in World War I. The Department believes that this is the appropriate site to commemorate World War I.

The National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission (NCMAC) has concluded that the existing World War I Memorial at Pershing Park serves today as a national memorial to the veterans who served in World War I. On July 23, 2013, NCMAC considered H.R. 222, which would have established a new and separate memorial to the veterans of World War I within the District of Columbia. The Commission unanimously recommended enhancing the existing World War I Memorial in Pershing Park rather than establishing a second memorial. More recently, on May 6, 2014, NCMAC considered S. 2264 and its companion bill, H.R. 4489. The intent of the bill to enhance the existing commemoration at Pershing Park was met with unanimous approval.

S. 2264 directs that there will be no infringement upon the existing District of Columbia War Memorial, and provides for compliance with the Commemorative Works Act (CWA), with two exceptions. The bill waives section 8905 with regard to site selection, as Pershing Park is an existing memorial site and the bill only calls for its re-designation. The bill, also, waives section 8908(b) of the CWA, as the Area I designation process is precluded by re-designation of Pershing Park. The Department agrees with these waivers. It further prohibits Federal funds from being used for the design, establishment, or enhancement of a memorial or commemorative work by the WWI Centennial Commission.

Because of the importance of World War I to the history of the United States and consistent with the treatment of memorials to other significant wars fought by our country, the Department believes that this bill would designate the National World War I Memorial as a new unit of the National Park Service, which would in turn be managed by the National Mall and Memorial Parks. We recommend that language be included in the text of the legislation establishing the memorial as a separate unit of the National Park System.

The Department also recommends striking "national" from the name of the title of the memorial to redesignate Pershing Park in the District of Columbia as the World War I Memorial. No other memorials to our country's wars sited in the District of Columbia have "national" in their title, including the World War II Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. H.R. 4489, as reported by the House Natural Resources Committee, includes this recommendation. We believe siting the World War I Memorial in our nation's capital will allow the memorial to stand on its own and provide appropriate recognition to honor the service and sacrifice of all those who fought in this war.

The proposed amendments are attached. In addition, the Department of Justice advises that it has constitutional concerns with S. 2264, which it intends to convey to the Committee by separate transmission.

This concludes my testimony on S. 2264, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Proposed amendment to S. 2264

On page 2, strike lines 17-19 and insert:

> "(a) REDESIGNATION.—Pershing Park in the District of Columbia is hereby redesignated as the 'World War I Memorial', a separate unit of the National Park System."

ON S. 2293

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2293, a bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System.

The Department does not object to S. 2293.

S. 2293 would amend the National Trials System Act to require the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails to be designated as units of the National Park System. The National Park Service (NPS) has carefully considered the concerns of Congressional members that certain trails are excluded from equal participation in NPS funding and programs because they are not currently counted as units of the National Park System. Although most of these concerns have been addressed through administrative actions, the National Park Service would not object if Congress determines that conferring unit status on these trails is the most expedient means of addressing any perceived inequality. The NPS recommends that the potential concerns of local communities be considered prior to undertaking any change to a particular trail's designation to ensure continued public support, which is critical to the success of our long distance trails.

The NPS administers, or co-administers, a total of 23 long-distance trails, including three that are counted as units of the National Park System. In addition to the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, which was established in 1968 and listed as a unit of the National Park System in 1972, the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail, and the Natchez Trace National Scenic Trail were listed as units in the mid-1980's through an administrative decision reflecting the extent of Federal land ownership and the NPS' administration of these trails.

Regardless of how the trails are counted, all of the long-distance trails administered by the National Park Service are, by law, part of the National Park System. Therefore, designating any trail as a unit does not change the management of that trail, or affect any existing agreements, easements, or other legal instruments in effect for the administration of the trail. However, we recognize that this difference in the manner in which certain trails are designated may have led to the perception that the trails are receiving unequal treatment.

The National Park Service has taken steps to assure that trails have equal access to NPS funding and that the public is aware of the National Scenic and Historic Trails on the NPS website and other forms of media. We also worked with the National Park Foundation, our Congressionally authorized philanthropic partner, to allow the long distance trails to be considered for grant funding.

The National Park Service recognizes and values the unique relationship and partnerships that have been developed with communities along these national trails. We will continue to work with the trail partners to improve communications and address any of the concerns that have been regarding equal participation.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

ON S. 2318

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2318, a bill to reauthorize the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Act.

The Department recognizes the important work of the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Commission (Commission) and its primary partner, the Erie Canalway Heritage Fund, Inc., in preserving, interpreting, and promoting the 524-mile system of historic canals that compose the Erie Canalway. We recommend that S. 2318 be amended to authorize an extension for the Commission until such time as the National Park Service (NPS) has completed an evaluation and report on the accomplishments of the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor (Corridor) and the future role of the NPS, and to provide for the transition of management of the Corridor from the Commission to the Erie Canalway Heritage Fund, Inc., during the evaluation period. We further recommend that National Heritage Area (NHA) program legislation be enacted that standardizes timeframes and funding for designated national heritage areas.

The NPS is initiating phase-in of a funding formula for NHAs, which is a merit-based system for allocating heritage area funding that considers a variety of factors based upon criteria related to program goals, accountability, and organizational sustainability. When fully implemented, the NPS funding formula plan will reward NHA entities that bring in additional non-federal investment and that have developed a sustainability plan. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when national heritage areas reach the end of their

authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that national heritage area program legislation be enacted during this Congress.

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

S. 2318, as introduced, would extend the authorization of the Commission for an additional 15 years, until December 21, 2030. The Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor was designated by Public Law 106-554, enacted on December 21, 2000, to preserve, interpret, promote, and provide access to the Erie Canalway's historical, natural, cultural, scenic, and recreational resources. That law established the Commission to develop and implement the Canalway Plan and foster initiatives within the Corridor, and provided for the Commission to sunset 10 years after enactment. Section 8203 of Public Law 111-11 extended the authorization for the Commission for an additional five years, until December 21, 2015.

As the designated authority for implementing the Canalway Plan, the Commission serves as the management or local coordinating entity. A more limited extension of the Commission's authorization would enable it to continue beyond December 21, 2015, as the entity able to receive federal heritage area funding while a transition to the local coordinating entity takes place. Through FY 2014, the Corridor has received approximately $8.4 million.

The Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor encompasses the most commercially enduring and historically significant system of canals in the United States. This waterway played a key role in turning New York City into a preeminent center for commerce, industry, and finance. Besides being a catalyst for growth in the Mohawk and Hudson Valleys, these canals helped open up western America for settlement and for many years transported much of the Midwest's agricultural and industrial products to domestic and international markets. The Corridor covers 4,834 square miles, includes portions of 23 counties and 234 municipalities, and is home to 2.7 million people across the state of New York. The mission of the Corridor is focused on preserving and sharing the extraordinary heritage of the Erie Canalway, promoting the Corridor as a world-class tourism experience, and fostering vibrant communities connected by the waterway. This is accomplished through close collaboration among the Commission, the Erie Canalway Heritage Fund, Inc., and voluntary partnerships with communities and citizens, and local, state, and federal agencies.

As mentioned earlier in this statement, the Department recommends that S. 2318 be amended to provide for the Erie Canalway Heritage Fund, Inc., (Fund) to be the local coordinating entity for the Corridor. The Fund is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that has been established exclusively for charitable, educational, and civic purposes. It focuses its activities on implementing the vision formed by the citizens of the Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor and is a key partner with the Commission in helping to implement the Corridor's preservation and management plan. We would be happy to work with the committee on language that would provide for the appropriate transition of management of the Corridor from the Commission to the Fund.

Amending the bill to provide for the nonprofit organization to be the local coordinating entity would be consistent with the general trend of other national heritage areas that were first authorized with commissions as the management entity. As our experience with heritage areas has grown, we have found that nonprofit organizations have certain advantages over federal commissions as local coordinating entities, including the fact that they do not sunset and they are better situated to do the fundraising needed to sustain the heritage area as it moves toward self-sufficiency. At this time, only three of the 49 authorized national heritage areas, including Erie Canalway, have federal commissions serving as their management or local coordinating entities.

Finally, we recommend a technical amendment to the title of the bill to make it clear that the bill would reauthorize the Commission rather than the entire Erie Canalway National Heritage Corridor Act, which suggests that the Corridor designation faces expiration. While the Commission faces a sunset date in 2015, the Act establishing the Corridor as a national heritage area does not sunset.

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

ON S. 2346

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before this committee to present the Department's views on S. 2346, the National Discovery Trails Act of 2014.

The National Park Service, in accordance with P.L 102-461, conducted a study on the feasibility and desirability of adding the American Discovery Trail (ADT) to the National Trails System. This study, which was transmitted to Congress in 1998, found that the ADT could be appropriate for designation as a new class of national trails, separate from National Scenic Trails or National Historic Trails. Nevertheless, we recommend that the Committee defer action on S. 2346 until such time as private-sector partners are able to demonstrate the capacity to support such an endeavor, as well as the level of public backing necessary to ensure its continued success. Further, prior to supporting any proposal to amend the National Trails System Act to include any new category of trails, the National Park Service would recommend additional discussions between the NPS, the bill's sponsor, and advocates of the National Discovery Trail concept to clarify the purpose of National Discovery Trails and determine if the need for such trails could be met through an existing category of national trail.

Finally, we would propose several amendments to address concerns with language that could hinder effective management of the trail corridor, particularly the limitations on acquisition authority.

S. 2346 amends the National Trails System Act by adding "National Discovery Trails" as a new category of trail that may be designated as part of the Act and designates the American Discovery Trail as the first National Discovery Trail. The bill further amends the National Trails System Act by establishing the following criteria for National Discovery Trails: the trail must link one or more areas within the boundaries of a metropolitan area, and should connect to other trails; the trail must be supported by a competent trail-wide volunteer-based organization and have extensive local and trail-wide support by the public, user groups, and by affected State and local governments; and, the trail must pass through more than one state and be a continuous, walkable route. Further, the bill requires the appropriate Secretary to administer the trail in cooperation with a trail-wide volunteer based organization, and to develop a comprehensive management plan for the trail.

The ADT was proposed in 1990 as a continuous mid-continent, coast-to-coast trail to link metropolitan areas to the nation's major long-distance trails, as well as to shorter local and regional trails. In October 1992, through P.L. 102-461, Congress directed the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of adding the ADT to the National Trails System. This study was completed in December of 1995, and submitted to Congress in 1998. The over 6000-mile route of the ADT, as described in this legislation and mapped in the feasibility study, extends from Cape Henlopen State Park in Delaware to Point Reyes National Seashore in California. The ADT crosses the states of Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

The feasibility study team visited many parts of the trail's route, analyzed its purposes and goals as a stand-alone project and as an integral part of the National Trails System. Five purposes were identified that apply specifically to the ADT. These purposes were primarily based on the trail proponents' ideas and visions for the trail, and are as follows: provide a continuous coast-to-coast route for non-motorized users (e.g., hikers, bicyclists, equestrians); establish a marked route connecting representative examples of America's heritage; serve as an East-to-West spine, linking many major trails and strengthening the national network of trails; enable users to experience the spectrum of American landscapes; and create opportunities for people to meet, communicate with, and appreciate others from around America and the world.

The National Park Service study team developed the following three alternatives based on its findings:

- Alternative 1 examined the ADT as a potential National Scenic Trail.
- Alternative 2 recognized the unique characteristics of this trail and suggested a new category of trails within the National Trails System.
- Alternative 3 explored taking no Federal action.

S. 2346 is based on Alternative 2, a new category of long-distance trails.

Under Alternative 2, Congress would authorize the ADT as a National Discovery Trail—the first of its kind. Congress would need to amend the National Trails System Act to include National Discovery Trails as an additional class of trails in the

National Trail System before the ADT could be authorized as a National Discovery Trail.

One of the primary reasons for proposing the establishment of National Discovery Trails would be to address a potential conflict with National Scenic Trails following roads. When the ADT was initially proposed, a guiding principle in identifying the trail's route was that it be located on public lands and rights-of-way to avoid the acquisition of private land. This meant that the proposed trail often was routed along roads. If it is authorized, long segments of the ADT will be on roads for the foreseeable future. However, the National Trails System Act specifically prohibits the use of motorized vehicles along National Scenic Trails. This new class of trails could be located along roadways, if necessary, to make the trails continuous. Unlike a National Scenic Trail, it would be acceptable—although not desirable—for a National Discovery Trail to have segments where there were no opportunities for an off-road, non-motorized, trail experience.

National Discovery Trails would have several other distinct features. Currently, there are no trails that are primarily intended to tie together existing trails and urban areas into the national network envisioned by the National Trails System Act. National Discovery Trails would be intended to link existing national, regional, and local trails into an integrated system, much like the way the interstate highway system functions. Similarly, these national trails would connect urban areas where most Americans live with rural and backcountry areas.

Notwithstanding the potential benefits of creating a new class of national trails and authorizing the ADT as the first National Discovery Trail, we have a number of outstanding questions about the new classification, and in particular, the proposed ADT.

Strong partnerships are vital to any national trail, and would be especially important in the structure envisioned by S. 2346. The Appalachian Trail was the model and impetus for the National Trails System. When that trail was established as a National Scenic Trail in 1968, it was well-supported by a vibrant nonprofit organization, the Appalachian Trail Conference, with thousands of members and decades of trail-building experience. For the National Park Service, helping protect and administer the Appalachian Trail from the beginning has been a mutual partnership, with both the conference and the service offering their skills and strengths to keep the trail viable and intact.

However, some of the trails subsequently established as part of the National Trails System have not had—and still do not have—strong partner organizations. In some cases, the Federal agency administering a trail has had to wait for such a group to get started or to assist in organizing it. Trail partnerships are essential to the well-being of the National Trails System. While S. 2346 endeavors to address this concern through a provision in the bill requiring that one of the criteria for establishing a National Discovery Trail is that there already exists at least one competent, volunteer-based organization for the proposed trail, backed up by extensive State and local public support, the NPS remains concerned that this provision may not prove sufficient to ensuring the capacity of the incoming partner organization. In the case of the ADT, the NPS is concerned that the trail does not currently meet the proposed threshold of competency and public support, and would recommend deferring action in designating it as a National Discovery Trail until such time as the ADT's private-sector partners are able to demonstrate the capacity to support such an endeavor.

Beyond specific questions about the ADT, the NPS would recommend that additional consideration be given to the purpose of introducing a new class of national trails, and the potential impact on existing national trails. As with any new designation, attention should be given to the justification, need, and demand for a new category of trails. The criteria and standards for determining if a particular trail is appropriate for designation should be very clearly defined. Further, if designated National Discovery Trails lack the capacity to ensure consistency and congruence with existing national trails, the public could be confused and the value of the National Trails System as a whole could be diminished.

Other successful models of partner-driven and community-based long distance routes, such as the East Coast Greenway—an entirely volunteer and community-supported long distance trail primarily dedicated to non-motorized routes traversing the numerous east coast states—could potentially provide similar benefits, while addressing concerns of Federal involvement and placing control of trail development with local and State entities. The NPS would welcome the opportunity to work with the bill's sponsor, and advocates of the National Discovery Trail concept, to address these issues and offer support in developing a model that meets the needs of all the parties involved.

If the Committee moves forward on this bill, we would like to work with you on amendments to provide clarity and consistency. We are particularly concerned about language in two places where we believe State and local jurisdictions, which would have the primary responsibility for protecting and managing segments of National Discovery Trails, would be severely hampered in their ability to keep the trail open to the public and to provide recreational access by limiting land acquisition or appearing to limit rights-of-way.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I will be glad to answer any questions that you or other members of the subcommittee may have.

ON S. 2356

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2356, a bill to adjust the boundary of the Mojave National Preserve.

The Department supports the enactment of S. 2356, but recommends two amendments regarding the acreage to be transferred out of the park and a qualification on the lands to be acquired by donation.

S. 2356 would adjust the boundary of Mojave National Preserve to remove approximately 525 acres on the north side of the park from the boundary of the park. This acreage would be transferred to BLM for a proposed rail alignment. XpressWest is constructing a high-speed rail line from Victorville, CA, to Las Vegas, NV. The proposed route would follow and generally parallel Interstate 15 (adjacent to the north boundary of the Preserve), except for the grade to Mountain Pass, which is too steep and the road curve too sharp to allow for the rail line to follow the Interstate. The NPS lacks authority to grant rights-of-way for railroads; the BLM, however, has such authority and can grant any necessary permits, in accordance with section 501 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, to XpressWest to complete the project. The area proposed for transfer to the BLM would accommodate the grade and curve requirements for the proposed high-speed train through the Mountain Pass.

As mitigation for the removal of land from the boundary of the park, this bill authorizes that other land would be acquired by donation. The bill authorizes approximately 4 acres of land be acquired for every acre of land removed from the preserve. The bill would authorize the transfer of 525 acres of National Park Service land to the Bureau of Land Management to accommodate the necessary railroad right-of-way, and the Preserve to receive in exchange a donation of approximately 2,100 acres of private land.

S. 2356 also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to permit cattle grazing, in accordance with applicable NPS laws and policies, on the land acquired under Section 3(a) by donation. The bill states that cattle grazing shall take place during the period beginning on the date on which the land is acquired and ending on the date that is 25 years after the date on which the land is acquired, to the same extent permitted on the day before the date of enactment of the Act.

The NPS allows agricultural grazing if it is specifically authorized in a park's enabling legislation. Section 510(a) of P.L. 103-433, the enabling legislation for Mojave National Preserve, specifies that the privilege of grazing domestic livestock on lands within the preserve shall continue to be exercised at no more than the current level, subject to applicable laws and NPS regulations. NPS Management Policies state that, "The Service will phase out the commercial grazing of livestock whenever possible and manage recreational and administrative uses of livestock to prevent those uses from unacceptably impacting park resources."

We recommend two amendments to S. 2356. Section 3(a)(2) authorizes the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of approximately 525 acres of land from the National Park Service (NPS) to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The official map, numbered 170/120,846-B, delineates the transfer of approximately 520 acres. The Department recommends that the acreage in the bill be amended to match the map.

Section 3(a)(1) authorizes the acquisition by donation of approximately 4 acres of land within or adjacent to the boundary of the preserve to be used for mitigation for every 1 acre of land removed from the preserve. The Department recommends that the donated land be qualified as land identified in the Mojave National Preserve's Land Protection Plan as suitable for fee acquisition. We will be happy to work with the committee on the appropriate language for the second amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I am prepared to answer any questions from members of the Committee.

ON S. 2576

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 2576, a bill to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area.

The Department supports the objectives of S. 2576. The Maritime Washington National Heritage 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. The Department also recommends a technical amendment to provide for an official NPS map to accompany the legislation.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, although there is no authority in law that guides their designation and administration as a national system. National heritage area program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluation of proposed national heritage areas, guiding planning and management, clarifying roles and responsibilities, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

S. 2576 would establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area to include Federal, State, local and tribal lands that allow public access and are at least partly located within one-quarter mile landward of the shoreline from Gray's Harbor to the Canadian border and extending through the City of Seattle to include Lake Union. This "Salt Water Coast" covers 3,000 linear miles of coastline.

The proposed local coordinating entity would be the Pacific Northwest Maritime Heritage Advisory Council operating under the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation.

A Feasibility Study for a Washington State National Maritime Heritage Area was completed and published by the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation in April 2010. The NPS conducted a review of the study for consistency with the interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines. The review of this document and a subsequent revised Statement of Importance and boundary justification, submitted March 5, 2012, found that it meets these criteria. The Washington Trust for Historic Preservation was informed of this finding in a letter dated June 5, 2012.

The unique geography of the Puget Sound, northern coast, and Grays Harbor region reflects a maritime history both before and after our nation's borders were set. The steep terrain of glacier-clad mountain ranges juxtaposed to saltwater shoreline with a temperate climate enabled native people build a complex culture around canoe routes and salmon cycles. By the late 18th century Spanish, English, and Russian explorers were mapping and naming places in the region in the name of science and the interest of colonial empire. After the 49th parallel was established as the nation's northern border in 1846, this new corner of the country entered a dramatic period of social, political and military development. The vast conifer forests were easily accessible for timber production and the coastal geography made possible its transport to the developing American west. The timber trade and the abundant marine resources—especially salmon—of the Strait of San Juan de Fuca, Puget Sound, and the Pacific Ocean, attracted American, European, and Pan-Asian settlers who provided the labor for thriving port economies such as Port Angeles, Port Townsend, and Port Gamble.

The proposed Maritime Washington National Heritage Area stretches from northern points of entry at Bellingham and Blaine south to the protected harbors of Aberdeen and Hoquiam. The focal point of the heritage area is the greater Puget Sound area, a system of interconnected marine waterways, harbors, bays, and inlets along the shores of the San Juan Archipelago and the many waterfront towns, cities, and ports that have grown up here over time. The naval facilities on Puget Sound have built and repaired vessels in their fleet for over a century. Today, the region still relies on these waterways to make up the largest marine highway system—its famous ferries—for day-to-day transportation.

The cultural landscape of the region tells the stories of a rich Native American civilization, development of the farthest territorial corner of the United States, of gold rushers and ship builders, and of a gateway to Alaska, Asia, and the seaports of the world. Traditional Native American sites, lumber towns, logging mills, salmon processing plants, historic ships, lighthouses, museums, and a host of other maritime-related objects, sites, and traditions relate these stories and make up the proposed Maritime Washington National Heritage Area. The designation would strengthen and encourage the partnership of organizations that have for two dec-

ades been committed to the recognition, preservation, and continued economic, recreational, and educational use of this landscape and its resources.

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

ON S. 2602

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 2602, a bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

The Department supports the objectives of S. 2602. The Mountains to Sound Greenway 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. The Department also recommends a technical amendment to provide for an official NPS map to accompany the legislation.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, although there is no authority in law that guides their designation and administration as a national system. National Heritage Area Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluation of proposed national heritage areas, guiding planning and management, clarifying roles and responsibilities, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

S. 2602 would establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area to include lands within the Yakima River basin upstream of Manastash Creek and the cities of Ellensburg, Roslyn, Cle Elum, and South Cel Elum in Kittitas County. It would also include all lands in the Snoqualmie River, Cedar River, and Lake Washington watersheds, the Puget Sound near shore watersheds within and including the cities of Seattle and Shoreline, and 22 additional cities in King County.

The proposed local coordinating entity would be the nonprofit corporation Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust (Trust).

NPS review of the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area Feasibility Study completed by the Trust in March 2012, found that the study did not meet the NPS Interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines. The NPS requested the Trust provide a revised statement of national importance; themes and a list of associated resources; a summary of traditions, customs, beliefs and folk life; and a boundary justification. The NPS received the Addendum from the Trust on May 27, 2014, which (1) explained that the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area is nationally important for its association with the expansion of our national transportation system and the creation of our modern timber industry; (2) identified three themes associated with the region's national importance and their related historic and natural resources; (3) summarized the ongoing traditions, customs, beliefs, and folklife that interprets and celebrates the region's national importance; and (4) justified the proposed boundary in relation to the strategic assemblage of resources and opportunities for conservation, recreation and education, as well as public interest in this national heritage area designation.

The proposed Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area tells a nationally important story of how the Northern Pacific and Milwaukee railroads, and later the Sunset Highway and Interstate 90, created the final section of an historic transportation corridor that wove the Northwest into the nation's fabric, opened up trade between the United States and Asia, and led to the development of the nation's modern timber industry.

Although the Puget Sound area was part of the United States by 1950, the Cascade Range isolated the region from the rest of the nation, with little access to its abundant natural resources and sheltered deep-water ports. Chartered by President Lincoln in 1864, the Northern Pacific Railroad was constructed along a Native American pathway through the nearly impassible Snoqualmie Pass to reach Seattle 20 years later. The connection of the Eastern seaboard and Great Lakes with the farthest reaches of the continental United States reinforced the newly drawn American-Canadian border. The City of Seattle grew into a booming hub for shipbuilding and the trade of foreign goods and the region's own wealth of natural resources, opening the country's first trade routes on what we now call the Pacific Rim. Rail towns sprung up along the main lines with mill and coal towns on the spurs, while piers stretched into Puget Sound, attracting immigrant workers whose descendants live in the region today.

The Milwaukee Road crossed the Cascades in the early 1900s using pioneering tunneling and electrification techniques. The high speed electric trains of the Milwaukee Road carried Japanese silk to New York, the nation's most precious rail commodity after gold and silver bullion, but the railroad made its money carrying passengers to ski, hike, and climb at Snoqualmie Pass. The conservation ethic that developed in the region from enjoyment of the region's natural beauty is strongly held today.

Washington's modern economy is descended directly from the Northern Pacific Land Grant that was used to build the railroad. In place of public financing, the railroad received the largest federal land grant in American history. The railroad was granted 40 million acres—every other square mile of land in a checkerboard pattern up to forty miles on either side of the right-of-way. This consolidated ownership, as well as steam technology brought by the railroad, created the booming timber industry that helped rebuild San Francisco after the 1906 earthquake and fueled shipbuilding in World War I. Airplanes being produced for the military on a large scale for the first time were built from the region's prized spruce trees. Demand for this aircraft led William Boeing to found a company in the region in 1916 that supplies the nation's air transportation industry today.

Plantation forestry involving sustained-yield harvest and reforestation was invented in 1937 by William Weyerhauser, who had amassed one and a half million acres of Washington timberland. He established the first seedling industry at Snoqualmie Falls and began to manage timber across multiple harvests, a radical idea at the time. This remains the industry standard across much of the country today.

The cultural heritage of the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area is alive in the ethnic diversity of the region's population, in the traditions, customs and celebrations, and in museums, festivals, historic sites, and interpretive trails that both residents and visitors enjoy today. Following modern-day political and land-management structures, the proposed heritage area boundaries are pragmatic, thus offering the best formula for long-term success as communities seek to manage, enhance, and interpret resources across this landscape.

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

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Ms. Goldfuss.

Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF GREG SMITH, ACTING ASSOCIATE DEPUTY CHIEF, NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM, FOERST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a comment on two bills. Mr. Chairman, I am Greg Smith, the acting associate deputy chief, National Forest System, and we thank you for the opportunity to be here.

Browns Canyon. The USDA supports S. 1794. We defer to the Department of the Interior regarding the provisions of the bill affecting the BLM. S. 1794 would designate approximately 22,000 areas of Federal land that are managed by two agencies, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, as the Browns Canyon National Monument.

Within the monument, 7,900 acres of public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management, and 2,500 acres managed by the National Forest System, on the Sedalia Ranger District, on the Pike and San Isabel National Forest, would be designated as the Browns Canyon Wilderness.

S. 1794 would designate approximately 12,060 acres of national monument and 2,500 acres of wilderness to be administered by the Forest Service, as depicted on the map entitled "Browns Canyon National Monument" dated November 7, 2013.

We have determined these lands designated to be compatible with the current Pike and San Isabel National Forest Plan. There-

fore, Senate bill 1794 provides existing grazing in the national monument and wilderness shall continue, and motorized and mechanical transports shall be prohibited in the portion of the national monument east of the Arkansas River, except on roads and trails open to such uses on the date of enactment of this Act.

Additionally, grazing permits or leases for national monument areas shall continue to be administered and no curtailment of grazing in the national monument or wilderness shall occur due to the designation of this Act.

Nothing in this Act affects the use of any allocation of water, water rights, or interest in lands on the date of enactment of this Act, and the Forest Service may prescribe measures to control noninvasive plants and noxious weeds within the National Forest System portions of the national monument and wilderness.

Subsection 7 stipulates that Forest Service Road 184 within the new national monument shall be maintained as a Level II road. Subsection 3 would allow the temporary closure of the roads to any and all use to protect the public safety and for maintenance and other administrative uses. Forest Service Road 184 within the proposed national monument is currently open, and in accordance with laws and regulations, will be maintained administratively to prevent resource damage, trespassing, and public safety issues.

However, the department does not support specifying the maintenance level in this legislation. In addition, we recommend several technical corrections to the bill, as detailed in our testimony, regarding the type, the date of the map on the record, and also minor technical area wording in Section 7, invasive species and noxious weeds.

Mr. Chairman, this completes my testimony on this bill.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Smith. We will now turn to questions from members of the committee. Senator Baldwin, I know you have a busy schedule.

Senator PORTMAN. He has one more bill, I think.

Senator UDALL. You have one more bill?

Mr. SMITH. One more bill.

Senator UDALL. I am sorry. I was excited to get to questions. My apologies.

[Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH. The USDA supports S. 2392. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90–542, protects the free flowing conditions, water conditions, and outstanding remarkable natural, cultural, and recreational values of some of our most precious waters.

It also provides an opportunity to build partnerships among landowners, river users, tribal nations, and all levels of government.

S. 2392 amends Section 3(a) of the Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. It adds a 13 mile segment from the source of the creek in the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness to East Rosebud Lake as a wild river, and a 7 mile segment below East Rosebud Lake to the first private land as a recreational river.

This bill is consistent with the Custer National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, which identifies the segments as eligible for designation as a wild and recreational river, respectively.

The Custer National Forest has not conducted a suitability study on East Rosebud Creek. As eligible rivers, these segments are currently managed by the Custer National Forest in a manner that is consistent with the proposed designations.

The proposed designations would prohibit future FERC, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, licenses of any new hydroelectric projects or facilities directly affecting those creeks. There are no existing FERC licenses or no pending proposals for licenses in the Rosebud Creek area.

Congressional designation of the two segments would not disrupt or alter existing management or use of areas surrounding the East Rosebud Creek, but would require additional planning and monitoring for the creek and adjacent Custer National Forest lands.

We recommend that Section (b) be deleted as the river segments' proposed designation because they are entirely bounded by National Forest System lands.

Mr. Chairman, this does conclude my statement.

[The prepared statements of Mr. Smith follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GREG SMITH, CHIEF, NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM, FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ON S. 1794

Mr. Chairman, I am Greg Smith, Acting Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest System, U.S. Forest Service. Thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) regarding S.1794, the "Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness Act of 2013."

S. 1794 would designate approximately 22,000 acres of federal land that are managed by two federal agencies, the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service as the Browns Canyon National Monument. Within the Monument, 7,960 acres of public lands managed by Bureau of Land Management and 2,500 acres of National Forest System lands on the Salida Ranger District on the Pike and San Isabel National Forests would be designated as the Browns Canyon Wilderness."

USDA testified in support of the designation of the Browns Canyon before the House Natural Resource Committee, regarding H.R. 4289, the Colorado Wilderness Act of 2009, on March 11, 2010. At that time, USDA expressed concern regarding allowing continued motorized use of Turret Road; in S. 1794 the wilderness boundary has changed and thus has remedied our concern. S. 1794 would designate approximately 12,060 acres of National Monument and 2,500 acres of Wilderness to be administered by the Forest Service, as depicted on the map titled "Browns Canyon National Monument" dated November 7, 2013. We have determined these land designations to be compatible and congruent with the management prescriptions in the current Pike and San Isabel National Forest Plan. Therefore, USDA supports S. 1794. We defer to the Department of the Interior regarding provisions in the bill affecting BLM.

S. 1794 provides that existing grazing in the National Monument and Wilderness shall continue and motorized and mechanical transport shall be prohibited in the portion of the National Monument east of the Arkansas River, except on roads and trails open to such uses on the date of enactment of this Act. Additionally, grazing permits or leases for the National Monument area shall continue to be administered and no curtailment of grazing in the National Monument or Wilderness shall occur due to the designation of this Act. Nothing in this Act affects the use or allocation of any water, water right, or interest in water on the date of enactment of this Act and the Forest Service may prescribe measures to control nonnative invasive plants and noxious weeds within the Forest Service portion of the National Monument and Wilderness.

Subsection 7(a)(2)(D)(i) stipulates that Forest Service Road 184 within the new National Monument shall be maintained as a Level II Road. Subsection (iii) would allow for temporarily closures of the road to any and all uses to protect public safety and for maintenance or other administrative uses. Forest Service Road 184 within the proposed National Monument is currently open, and in accordance with laws and regulation will be managed administratively to prevent resource damage, tres-

pass, or public safety issues. However, the Department does not support specifying the maintenance level in this legislation.

In addition, we recommend several technical corrections to the bill, the first regarding the date of the map on record at the BLM Salida, CO, office. The map is dated November 5, 2013, not November 7, 2013 as written in S. 1794. We also recommend additional technical corrections to Section 7(e), 'Invasive Species and Noxious Weeds', in order to be consistent with law, regulation and policy; the words 'nonnative' and 'plants' should be struck and the word 'species' should be inserted in place of 'plants'.

This concludes my testimony. I would be happy to answer any questions.

ON S. 2392

Mr. Chairman, I am Greg Smith, Acting Associate Deputy Chief, National Forest System, U.S. Forest Service. Thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) regarding S. 2392, the "East Rosebud Wild and Scenic Rivers Act"

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Public Law 90-542 (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287, as amended) protects the free-flowing condition, water quality, and outstandingly remarkable natural, cultural, and recreational values of some of our most precious waters. It also provides an opportunity to build partnerships among landowners, river users, tribal nations, and all levels of government.

S. 2392 amends Section 3(a) of the Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. It adds a 13-mile segment from the source of the creek in the Absaroka-Beartooth Wilderness to East Rosebud Lake as a wild river, and the 7-mile segment from below East Rosebud Lake to the first private land as a recreational river.

The Department supports S. 2392.

The bill is consistent with the Custer National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan Amendment Number 2, approved December 15, 1989, which identifies the segments as eligible for designation as wild and recreational respectively. The Custer National Forest has not conducted a suitability study for East Rosebud Creek; therefore, the Department does not have a recommendation regarding designation under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. However, as eligible rivers, these segments are currently managed by the Custer National Forest in a manner consistent with the proposed designations.

The proposed designations would prohibit future Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) licensing of any new hydroelectric facility on, or directly affecting, these creek segments. There is no existing FERC license, or pending proposals for licenses, in the East Rosebud Creek area.

Congressional designation of these two segments would not disrupt or alter existing management or use of the area surrounding East Rosebud Creek, but would require additional planning and monitoring for the creek and adjacent Custer National Forest lands.

We recommend that Section 3(b) be deleted as the river segments proposed for designation are entirely bounded by National Forest System lands.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Smith. I wanted to see—Senator Baldwin has a busy schedule—if she had any questions for the witnesses.

Senator BALDWIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do, one, hopefully brief.

Senator UDALL. Take your time.

Senator BALDWIN. Ms. Goldfuss, I am really proud that my home State has hosted two of the scenic trails that I discussed in my opening statement earlier. I love hiking, so I really had the pleasure of taking advantage of these spectacular trails.

As you heard, unfortunately, Wisconsin's Ice Age Trail and North Country Trail, as well as the New England National Scenic Trail, do not enjoy full unit status that other national scenic trails do that are administered under the National Park Service.

We actually have in this country 3 trails with full status and 3 without. So, I wonder if you could just share with us why this disparity exists.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I wish I had an easy answer for you.

Senator BALDWIN. I wish you did, too.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I assume the question would not be asked if you knew it already.

Senator BALDWIN. That is 4 years of correspondence back and forth.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Exactly. In preparation for this hearing, we have had many discussions internally looking at some of the enabling legislation and some of the administrative decisions that came about in the disparity between the two categories that we have, 3 as units, 3 as not.

All I can say is we agree that it is inconsistent, and I just hope you can continue to work with us on this, because we do have administrative authorities that we can use, and we also want to keep working through some of the questions that your office has raised.

Senator BALDWIN. I appreciate that, and certainly think that if we were to advance this legislation, we would have real clarity. So, I appreciate your answer. I have been working on this for about 4 and a half years, previously as a member of the House and now as a member of the Senate, and I look forward to continuing to work together.

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Baldwin.

Senator Portman.

Senator PORTMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess my questions are going to go to the point I made earlier about the need for us to be good stewards of the Park Service and with all the backlogs that we have, to make sure we are not continuing to expand the Park Service in ways that might look attractive short term but put us even further behind in terms of our ability to maintain the properties, and again, be good stewards.

So, as I look at this, the bills that modify or expand boundaries, S. 1189, S. 1718, S. 1785, S. 2031, S. 2356, they all seek to expand National Park units.

So, my question for you, Ms. Goldfuss, would be how much land is involved overall, and how much land is currently in private ownership. Do you know the answers?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Are you saying cumulatively for all the bills that we have presented today?

Senator PORTMAN. Cumulatively, yes. I was lumping together all these one, two, three, four, five that all expand or modify boundaries.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I apologize. I do not have the exact number for all of the bills. I could attempt to add, but it would be very rough.

Senator PORTMAN. Why not give us an example, for instance, the Mojave National Preserve, or the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Paterson Great Falls is the addition of a stadium that neighbors the park, so it is small in acreage, and actually the Park Service would not be taking over or in the amendment we are proposing, we would not be taking it over, it would be a preservation easement that would be placed over the actual stadium. The city of Paterson and the school district there would hold on to the actual ownership of the stadium.

When it comes to the battlefield in——

Senator PORTMAN. Let's just back up for a second on the stadium. I have seen a photograph of it. It would be putting an easement on to preserve it. What would that require in terms of additional personnel from the Park Service or costs for the Park Service?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. If the legislation were to be passed, we would have to look at—right now, we have staff on the ground, so incorporating that would not take additional staff immediately. We would want to look at what the interpretation needs were and how we would incorporate that into the existing unit.

So, I would not have numbers right now in terms of additional personnel, and then we would have to study what requirements we have in terms of maintaining that stadium. There have been studies that are pretty large in terms of the upkeep for that, but that would not be a burden we would take on initially.

Senator PORTMAN. How about the Mojave National Preserve?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. So, 2,100 acres would be eventually donated to the National Park Service, but at this time, those acres have not been identified for donation yet.

Senator PORTMAN. Again, and maybe there is a better example of this, Shiloh or Petersburg or Apostle Islands, as we talked about, what does that mean in terms of the Park Service, in terms of additional personnel, additional costs?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Unfortunately, it is going to be unique to each unit. If you look at the Apostle Islands——

Senator PORTMAN. Let's take the 2,100 acres at Mojave, let's say that is in fact donated.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Right.

Senator PORTMAN. Donations are great, but then the upkeep and the maintenance, the stewardship. I assume the park would have a role there.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Correct, and in that particular case, we have asked that the lands identified be tied to our land protection plan for the park, so in that case, when the lands are donated, if they are of high resource value, it is actually a benefit for us, because it is easier to manage the area when it is connected. So, whether it is private ownership in holdings' areas right next to the park—I mean I think Apostle Islands actually might be an example of what you are looking for, where we are taking on an additional lighthouse.

Senator PORTMAN. Yes.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. From our perspective, history does not stop, even though we have an enormous maintenance backlog, that is a top priority for us to address, and thank you so much for your comments on the Centennial in the beginning.

We really see the Centennial as an opportunity to prepare the parks for our next generation and our second century. We have the responsibility at the same time to address historic moments in time. That is part of our mission. We cannot disconnect them.

So, although we recognize the maintenance backlog is something we are working very hard to address and a top priority in our budgeting, we also see that opportunities to include new pieces of

history and tell the story for all Americans are very important as we continue going forward.

Senator PORTMAN. Would it be possible for you to give the subcommittee an analysis of each of these? I am sure you have it. How much it will increase the operating expenses at each unit, and also just specifically, how many more personnel would be required, so we have that for the record.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Yes, definitely, we will get you want we can.

Senator PORTMAN. You know, again, you talked about the maintenance backlog. What is the impact on the maintenance backlog? Is it going to make it even worse? I assume it does, because we are not talking about additional funding in these bills. We are talking about acquisitions.

How about hunting and fishing? When you look at some of these new proposed park units, S. 1389, S. 1785, S. 2293, for instance, areas where I assume there would be hunting and fishing currently underway. What is proposed there? Do you know?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I wish I had all the names memorized with the numbers. If you can tell me which ones you are talking about.

Senator PORTMAN. S. 1389.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. S. 1389. So, that is in New York City, the Prison Ship Martyrs' Monument Preservation Act, so it is a park actually in Brooklyn, so hunting and fishing——

Senator PORTMAN. Probably not a lot of hunting there.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Right, not a lot of hunting there.

Senator PORTMAN. Yes. Although, it looks pretty wooded.

[Laughter.]

Senator PORTMAN. OK. Let's leave Brooklyn out of this, although it does look—they probably have some wild turkeys there.

[Laughter.]

Senator PORTMAN. How about S. 1785.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. OK, Shiloh National Military Park. Let me just find out where Shiloh is.

Senator PORTMAN. Shiloh Battlefield in Tennessee.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I can get you the information on hunting in that particular battlefield area, but once again, I am not sure it is a major concern in the area. It is pretty residential.

Senator PORTMAN. What might be most helpful is if you would just give us an analysis, again, for purposes of analyzing these where you think it is an issue, and whether there is a way to deal with that.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. We would be happy to.

Senator PORTMAN. The language in S. 2104 suggests approximately $2 million was advanced from the States to the Park Service to keep different units open. What is the exact figure that will be reimbursed to the States listed in the legislation? We talked about that earlier. How much will each State be receiving?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Two million is the total, and we can get you a breakdown by State.

Senator PORTMAN. OK. That would be helpful. Do you have any sense of how many visitors were lost nationwide when those units were closed for the shutdown, which I think was about 16 days?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Yes. So, there was a loss. We did a report soon after the shutdown to look at the impacts. There was about $414

million lost nationally in gateway communities, and around 11 million visitors nationally.

Senator PORTMAN. Wow. This includes local community impacts from the gateway communities?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Excuse me?

Senator PORTMAN. That would include the local community impact?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Correct.

Senator PORTMAN. OK. Does the inclusion of 4(c)(1) in that S. 1750 language allow the States to receive a refund for all the amounts provided to the Parks Service without returning any fees that might have been charged to visitors during the shutdown? How do you deal with that? I assume there were fees still collected in some of those places—or not?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I am sorry. Could you repeat the question?

Senator PORTMAN. Were there fees collected during that period?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. In the parks that were closed?

Senator PORTMAN. Yes, when the States took them over.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I will have to get back to you on how we handled the fee collection during that period of time and how much money——

Senator PORTMAN. Can you just let us know?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Yes. I believe we did carry on in the parks that were reopened by the States, but I do not have an exact figure on that.

Senator PORTMAN. Have you netted that out in terms of the amount to be repaid?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. We will get it for you.

Senator PORTMAN. OK. That is great. Thank you very much. Mr. Smith, just quickly, on yours, you did a good job describing them on the lands, you have BLM/U.S. Forest Service involvement here.

With regard to the Colorado River—I am sorry—the Colorado Wilderness Act amendment, which would be S. 1794, I guess, just a question, why were those areas not originally included in the Colorado Wilderness Act? Do you know?

Mr. SMITH. My understanding is it was originally put in the Wilderness Act but it was larger; and I think it was taken out.

Senator PORTMAN. OK. Why will the BLM and the Forest Service and others maintain control over the purposed area instead of the land being classified as a National Park Service national monument?

I understand BLM and Forest Service are going to maintain control over some of the areas.

Mr. SMITH. I think basically we have been managing those lands together for some time, so I think that is the reason we went that way. I do not have any knowledge of why it was not proposed for transfer to the Park Service. I think it is just the way they have been managed. Most of them have been managed as the proposed designation as it is already, so I think it was just the logical flow, to just keep it within the BLM and Forest Service.

Senator PORTMAN. OK. With regard to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act designations, S. 412, S. 1520, H.R. 2197 and S. 2392, from the testimony earlier, it sounds like the designations, at least for the one in Montana, is not going to change the purposed uses of

the river or the water uses or the surrounding land. Is that true with all these?

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Senator PORTMAN. Great. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks for the answers in your follow up.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Portman, for a thorough review of many of these important bills.

I wanted to just respond to Senator Portman's important questions about Browns Canyon. As I understand it, and we will make sure it is very clear for the record, the land proposed in the wilderness—for the wilderness in my bill, there has been a wilderness study a year for more than 20 years, to determine whether it was part of the original process, and therefore, would have been designated as a wilderness study area in the first Bush administration.

Because it was identified as having wilderness qualities, it has been managed as a tier one Roadless area because of its wild and undisturbed nature.

As I mentioned, in 2005/2006, Congressman Hefley, with whom Senator Portman and I both served in the House, proposed 22,000 acres, give or take, as wilderness in this area. For a number of reasons, it did not get to the finish line but there was a lot of support that was generated at that time.

One of the reasons we did not get to the finish line was there was still local concerns, and over the next 8 years, I worked along with a lot of other stakeholders to get to a point where there is just broad support for this, as I mentioned in my earlier remarks.

So, with that, let me turn to Mr. Smith, just for comments. You let it be known you support the two bills you are testifying on, the Browns Canyon National Monument designation, and the East Rosebud Creek Wild and Scenic Rivers' site. I do not have any questions for you, although that could change over the next few minutes.

One other point, since we are talking about Browns Canyon again. Senator Portman had asked about the management of the area. There was an unique arrangement, Senator Portman, that was derived 6 or 8 years ago between the BLM, the Forest Service and our Department of Wildlife and Natural Resources in Colorado.

They share costs. They share management. Given the mixed ownership of the area, it has actually been an exemplary, I should say, partnership. We maintained that.

That was one of the conditions that locals asked us to embrace because again, it has worked very well, it has given the rafting companies and the anglers and many others certainty about whatever permitting processes are necessary, and how those lands are managed.

It is very, very uplifting when you go there and see how this corridor is managed, from the trash that is generated to the launches themselves, and the way the various users coordinate on the river corridor, whether it is anglers, whether it is the rafters or the hikers. There are equestrians that use the area as well.

It is a nice creative way in which to manage that river corridor.

So, let me turn to Ms. Goldfuss. Let me ask you first about S. 2104, which would authorize appropriations to reimburse the States which donated funds to keep certain national parks open during the government shutdown last year.

It is my understanding that the parks that received State donations ultimately received their full Federal appropriation, so they actually received double funding during the shutdown. Is that your understanding as well? It may get at sort of what Senator Portman was trying to discover, if you will. He has a keen eye. He used to head the OMB. We want to make sure his questions are answered.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Yes, that is correct. They did get their full appropriation and got the donation during the period of time of the shutdown.

Senator UDALL. My next question is to S. 1189, which would modify the boundaries of Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park in New Jersey to add the Hinchliffe Stadium to the park.

When the park was designated, the stadium was excluded from the proposed park boundary because of questions about its historical significance. The Park Service now supports adding the stadium to the park boundary.

What accounts for those change of views with respect to including the stadium in the park? Has there been a re-evaluation of the historical significance of the site?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Yes, that is correct. Since the original legislation, there has been a report and a review, and it has actually been designated as a national historical landmark, so we have identified that significance.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for that clarification. Continuing with you, several of the bills on today's agenda would extend the authorization period for specific National Heritage Areas so that they could continue to receive Federal funding.

In recent years, the committee has included language in Heritage Area bills requiring the Park Service to conduct an evaluation of the area prior to the expiration of its funding authorization, and to make recommendations about the need for future funding requirements, so Congress could in the end better evaluate how successful the Heritage Area has performed.

I want to make sure I understand the Park Service's position on these various Heritage Area funding reauthorizations. Your recommendation is that evaluations should be conducted for these areas before they are given long term funding reauthorizations; is that correct?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Correct. We are looking at the extension so that we can have the time to conduct the actual evaluation and reports that would give you that information.

Senator UDALL. Let me follow up on a related issue that you raised. Every time the Park Service has testified on a bill to establish a new National Heritage Area, the testimony recommends that action on the bill be deferred until program legislation is enacted, which would better define the designation and administration of these areas.

From what I understand, most recent Heritage Area designations have had studies which have been approved by the Park Service

prior to designation, and for the most part, the management language in every Heritage bill is essentially the same.

What would Heritage Area program authority add beyond the requirements that are currently included in all of those bills?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. We look at the program authority similar to the creation of the Park Service as a whole and the system. So, initially, we had individual parks, and then once we had a collective of individual parks, we needed a system and a framework for actually managing each of the parks.

The Heritage Areas, we have now had 30 years, 49 different Heritage Areas, and in terms of coordinating and really setting up a framework for the future on these, it is helpful to have that program legislation in place to administer them.

Senator UDALL. One final Heritage Area related question, apart from your recommendation for action on the 3 proposed Heritage Areas, Appalachian Forest in West Virginia, the Maritime and Mountains to Sound Heritage Areas in Washington State, have the appropriate studies been completed and reviewed, and are all 3 areas appropriate for designation as National Heritage Area sites?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Yes, that is true. They have all been found suitable and we worked closely with the communities on the ground to make sure they understand those needs and identified the right characteristics.

Senator UDALL. I am going to go off my formal list of questions. So, do you still feel like the Heritage Area system is administered more on an ad hoc basis than, if you will, a consistent or formulaic basis using "formulaic" in a positive way, not a critical way?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Our Heritage Area staff in the system does an amazing job to set up the framework, and we do apply the same standards as much as we can, but it is similar to any of the systems and programs that we administer. Having legislative authority and actual criteria that is in law is helpful for administering things in perpetuity.

Senator UDALL. We have a number of National Heritage Areas in Colorado which have proven their worth many times over, and we want to continue to improve the administration as well as the education and availability of those areas.

I want to work more with you all as we move forward.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. They are huge opportunities to coordinate on the ground.

Senator UDALL. Yes, and clearly, I believe, within the Park Service mission. Now, let me move to S. 1866. That would extend the legislative authority for the Adams Memorial. The memorial was initially authorized, I believe, in 2001. The Commemorative Works Act provides 7 years for the sponsoring organization to generate the required permits and raise the funding needed to build the memorial.

In the past, several memorials have had their legislative authority extended multiple times. Why? The sponsors were unable to raise enough money to begin construction. You are familiar with that.

As a result of those many extensions, the Park Service recommended a change to the law which authorized it to administra-

tively extend the authority an additional 3 years, if the sponsor met certain requirements. I think that is right.

You are now supporting extending authorization for this memorial an additional 7 years or a total of 19 years. Is this acknowledgement that the time requirements in the Commemorative Works Act are still unworkable?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I would say it depends on which memorial we are looking at and the ability of the outside groups to actually raise the funds. So, we would not say that the timeframes are unworkable. It really depends.

We have seen many that have met and been able to accomplish their goals in the timeframe that is given in the Commemorative Works Act, but for those that cannot, we need the ability to extend it, and then we also feel that the timeframes are necessary to reevaluate and make sure that it is still a viable proposal.

Senator UDALL. Your judgment is the Adams Memorial has potential, the Adams Memorial is important enough, the Adams' family has such a significant historical place in America, that we should keep this possibility alive?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Correct; yes.

Senator UDALL. Let me turn to S. 2293. It would clarify that 3 national scenic trails shall be administered as units of the National Park Service. Senator Baldwin spoke about this earlier. Why is legislation necessary for this, and to pile on ever so gently, why have you not classified the 3 trails the same as the other national scenic trails?

Ms. GOLDFUSS. I will just extend what I said to Senator Baldwin. The case is not clear here. There is administrative authority in terms of addressing this question of unit status.

Through this hearing and through our conversations with Senator Baldwin, we are going to take a closer look at this, because it is somewhat nomenclature. For the most part, we administer and apply the same set of standards and different—you know, the trails are able to get the same amount of our attention and funding.

So, for us, we do not feel like there is a disparity between the trails, but we recognize that it can seem inconsistent and we need to take a closer look.

Senator UDALL. I look forward to seeing your analysis and understanding further where we are and where we might go. It is impressive looking at the National Scenic Trails System. I did not know the extent to which there were these kinds of opportunities.

Once again, America leads the way, and it makes me really proud to see this, and I know we will work to further enhance, support and protect these trails, and I would bet add some additional ones because it seems to be something certainly Senator Portman and I spend time on, get excited about, providing greater access to the incredibly diverse nature of our landscapes in America.

Senator Portman, I am finished with my questions. Do you have any other thoughts?

Senator PORTMAN. No, I do not. Thank you. I appreciate the follow up. I know at least the staff on our side did not have all the answers, so that would be helpful as we move forward from this hearing.

Ms. GOLDFUSS. Most definitely.

Senator PORTMAN. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. If there are no further questions, I want to thank both of you for taking the time to come to the Hill, and for your thoughtful and informative testimony.

Some members of the committee may submit additional questions in writing. If so, we may ask you submit answers for the record. I know you will be happy to comply with those requests. We will keep the hearing record open for 2 weeks to receive any additional comments.

The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:33 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to Additional Questions

[Responses to the following questions were not received at the time the hearing went to press:]

QUESTIONS FOR CHRISTINA GOLDFULL FROM SENATOR MURKOWSKI

Question 1. Some of the bills in the hearing seek to expand National Park Units. How much of the land involved in these proposed expansions is currently in private ownership? How many additional acres will be added to the National Park System?

Question 2. Will expanding the boundaries under S. 1189, S. 1718, S. 1785, S. 2031, and S. 2356 require any additional personnel to work at each location? What will the total cost of expansion be in each case?

Question 3. If S. 1189, S. 1718, S. 1785, S. 2031, and S. 2356 are signed into law, how will it affect the annual operating expenses at each location?

Question 4. How will the new units under S. 1389, S. 1785, and S. 2293 add to, or affect, the maintenance backlog?

Question 5. How is the land under consideration in S. 1641, S. 2576, and S.2602 currently being utilized? Will the National Heritage Area designation change how the land is currently being used?

Question 6. Is any land under consideration in S. 1641, S. 2576, and S.2602 privately owned? If so, have any of the land owners objected to these proposals?

APPENDIX II

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

STATEMENT OF BILL IMBERGAMO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, THE FEDERAL FOREST RESOURCE COALITION

On behalf of the over 390,000 Americans who earn their living managing our National Forests and BLM forest lands, we applaud the introduction of the Public Access to Public Lands Guarantee Act of 2013. The recent unnecessary closure of the National Forests System and BLM lands created significant disruption for our members and potentially vast liability for the Federal government.

Of course, as you note, it is strongly preferable for Congress and the Administration to simply avoid any future government shutdowns. Further, it is incumbent upon Congress to take action immediately to stabilize appropriations and provide full year funding bills for our Federal land management agencies. The Forest Service and BLM have been funded since 2008 by a series of 12 short-term omnibus bills and Continuing Resolutions, which have last on average just 5 months. In fiscal year 2013, the Forest Service field units did not receive their final allocation of appropriations until half way through the fiscal year.

The Forest Service faces significant obstacles as it attempts to manage the our public forests. Most of these consist of frivolous appeals and litigation by groups who do not support forest management. These groups exploit the laws passed by Congress and interpreted by the Courts. These difficulties are compounded when the agency budget is unstable, unpredictable, and passed in short-term chunks. Congress must act to clarify the tangle of laws that enable this type of dilatory behavior.

Your legislation would be helpful in the unfortunate event that the Congress and President fail once again to find common ground, leading to another unnecessary shutdown. Many states are capable of assuming management responsibility on the National Forest System. Having such a process in place would help prevent unnecessary disruption of vital forest management activities. We look forward to working with you on this legislation.

STATEMENT OF PHYLLIS BAXTER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF APPALACHIAN FOREST HERITAGE AREA, INC., ON S. 1641

Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the Subcommittee's consideration of S. 1641 to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area. We would like to offer brief comments in support of this bill and to share with you some of the ongoing benefits of this endeavor.

Appalachian Forest Heritage Area celebrates the central Appalachian forest including its history, culture, natural history, forest management and products. Our grassroots partnership has been operating as an ad hoc heritage area initiative for over ten years within eighteen counties in the highlands of West Virginia and western Maryland. Our organization promotes rural community development through heritage tourism development and forest conservation.

We have developed diverse stakeholder support, identified assets related to forest heritage, and established an organization through a broad range of partnerships with public, non-profit, and private entities. We have completed a Feasibility Study addressing the National Heritage Area criteria identified by the National Park Service, and supported by over 165 support letters. This study has been reviewed and approved by the National Park Service as meeting those criteria. In completing this study, and through our planning, operations, and efforts to seek national designation, we have done all that we can to follow the steps and standards set forth in the proposed National Heritage Area program bill, so that if and when such a bill is passed, we will be fully compliant with its provisions and expectations.

Appalachian Forest Heritage Area has operated as a sustainable organization for more than ten years, demonstrating that we are committed to helping build the future for our unique and nationally significant forest region. We explore the relationship between the Appalachian highlands forest and the people who live within it by developing interpretive products to share multiple forest heritage themes and stories, connecting cultural heritage and natural tourism sites, and establishing a forest heritage museum and information center. We mobilize volunteers to assist cooperating public lands and private landowners with forest conservation efforts such as non-native invasive species control, tree plantings, and recreation improvements. We administer a dynamic AmeriCorps program which places members with local sites providing direct service for conservation, historic preservation, and heritage development.

We are seeking National Heritage Area designation primarily because this honor will acknowledge the nationally significant role that the Appalachian Forest has had in our nation's history, and will provide recognition of the importance of our region's forest heritage resources historically and today. National Heritage Area designation will provide us with access to technical assistance and resources that will help us reach out more effectively across the entire 18-county, two-state area, and enable us to accomplish much more to benefit our forests, our area, and our communities.

National Heritage Areas are a proven strategy to support collaborative regional efforts where stakeholders are working together to preserve their nationally significant resources while leveraging those resources for appropriate growth and community benefit. Appalachian Forest Heritage Area is working every day towards accomplishing these goals for our rural, under-developed area. We ask you to support this Bill to establish the Appalachian Forest National Heritage Area to recognize, protect, and help develop the forest heritage assets of this outstandingly beautiful, nationally significant region.

Thank you for your attention to our efforts.

STATEMENT OF LAND MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ON S. 1794

Thank you for inviting the Department of the Interior to testify on S. 1794, the Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness Act. The Department supports S. 1794 as it applies to lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and defers to the Department of Agriculture regarding lands within the National Forest System Lands.

BACKGROUND

Browns Canyon is characterized by its rugged beauty, colorful outcroppings and the abundant wildlife of the Arkansas River Valley. The west side of the proposed national monument features Browns Canyon which descends 3,000 feet to the Arkansas River. From the river, the land climbs dramatically to an elevation of 10,000 feet. A significant herd of bighorn sheep resides within Browns Canyon and it is an important winter range for deer and elk. Hunters and hikers alike take in the spectacular vistas across the Arkansas Valley to the 14,000 foot peaks of the Collegiate Range, while the gulches and canyons offer exceptional opportunities for solitude.

The Arkansas River is one of the nation's most popular whitewater rafting destinations, with more than 300,000 visitors floating it annually. Nearly half of these visitors float the nationally-renowned Browns Canyon segment. In addition to whitewater rafting, visitors enjoy fishing, hunting, hiking, backpacking, camping, horseback riding, snowshoeing and photography in the area.

For over a decade, bipartisan proposals have been proposed to protect Browns Canyon. Local elected officials, sportsmen's groups and business owners have endorsed Senator Udall's current proposal to permanently protect this dramatic landscape.

S. 1794

S. 1794 proposes to designate nearly 22,000 acres of Federal land in Chaffee County, Colorado, as the Browns Canyon National Monument. The bill further proposes to designate over 10,000 acres of the national monument as wilderness. Approximately 9,750 acres of the proposed monument and 7,960 acres of the proposed wilderness are lands currently managed by the BLM, and approximately 12,060 acres of the proposed monument and 2,500 acres of the proposed wilderness are lands currently managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Each agency would continue to manage these areas following designation.

Each of the national monuments and National Conservation Areas (NCAs) designated by Congress to be managed by the BLM is unique. However, these designations typically have critical elements in common, including: withdrawal from the public land, mining, and mineral leasing laws; limiting off-highway vehicles to roads and trails designated for their use; and language that charges the Secretary of the Interior with allowing only those uses that further the conservation purposes for which the unit is established. Furthermore, these Congressional designations should not diminish the protections that currently apply to the lands. This bill honors these principles, and we support the monument's designation as it applies to lands managed by the BLM.

The core of the proposed national monument would be designated as the Browns Canyon Wilderness. This area meets the definition of wilderness; the land and its community of life are largely untrammeled. It has retained its primeval character and has been influenced primarily by the forces of nature, with outstanding opportunities for primitive recreation or solitude.

Under the bill, most of the existing Wilderness Study Area (WSA) will be incorporated into the Browns Canyon Wilderness. Approximately 120 acres of land within the WSA will not be designated as wilderness and would be released from WSA status. These released acres along the Arkansas River will be managed as part of the monument, but release from WSA status will provide more flexibility in the area contiguous to the river.

We would like the opportunity to work with the sponsor on an updated map prior to markup of the legislation.

CONCLUSION

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of S. 1794, we look forward to its swift passage.

STATEMENT OF KATHIE YOUNGHANS, AMICAS RESTAURANT AND MICROBREWERY, SALIDA, CO

Dear Senator Udall:

We the undersigned* businesses support you in moving forward to designate a National Monument for the Browns Canyon Area along the Arkansas River in Colorado. Browns Canyon provides a unique combination of exciting whitewater, wildlife and wilderness recreation. We believe a national monument designation would preserve Browns Canyon while sustaining jobs, growing our economy and protecting Colorado's quality of life for generations to come.

The area is renowned for offering a range of year-round opportunities for exploring Colorado's outdoors. Browns Canyon is the most popular whitewater rafting destinations in the nation and folks regularly visit to go whitewater rafting, kayaking, hiking, hunting and fishing in Browns Canyon and biking and off-roading in the surrounding area. As a national monument, Browns Canyon would attract tourists statewide, nationally and internationally who will visit our Valley, spend their well-earned dollars and boost our economy all while appreciating this remarkable Colorado landscape.

A designation would attract public attention and increase tourism to the Arkansas River Valley. We support your efforts to protect Browns Canyon and ask you to move as quickly as possible to secure a much deserved national monument designation to help promote our community and tourism to the area.

STATEMENT OF APRIL PROUT-RALPH, MARKETING DIRECTOR, CHAFFEE COUNTY VISITORS BUREAU

The Chaffee County Visitors Bureau would like to extend its support for the designation of Browns Canyon as a National Monument. We will support any proposals which do not deny access to any user groups.

More than 150,000 visitors will annually float this stretch of the Arkansas River with a commercial rafting organization. In Colorado outdoor recreation generates more than $10 billion in annual revenues to our state economy and supports close to 107,000 jobs. Many businesses in Chaffee County depend on tourists and the tourism activities they come to enjoy.

---

* Other names and organizations have been retained in subcommittee files.

Permanent protection such as a National Monument creates visibility for local communities which help safeguard and highlight the amenities that attract visitors and businesses that support and thrive from increased tourism.

A 2011 study of 17 recently established National Monuments found that without exception, local communities experienced economic growth following a monument's designation. Both jobs and tourism increased in those areas where national monuments had been established.

STATEMENT OF KATIE BLACKETT, CEO, AND SCOTT BRADEN, DIRECTOR OF CONSERVATION, THE COLORADO MOUNTAIN CLUB, GOLDEN, CO

The Colorado Mountain Club (CMC) fully supports designation of a new national monument and wilderness to protect the outstanding recreational opportunities and natural resources of Browns Canyon on the Arkansas River. CMC, in particular, appreciates the leadership of Sen. Udall for starting a conversation around protecting Browns Canyon.

Founded in 1912 and celebrating our Centennial this year, CMC boasts over 7,000 members and 14 chapters across the state. CMC members engage in over 3,000 hikes, trips and activities per year, the majority in our state's iconic Rocky Mountains. We have been active in conservation issues since our founding; indeed CMC members were deeply involved in the establishment of Rocky Mountain National Park in 1916. Since that time we have advocated for protection of wild places and have defended opportunities for human-powered recreation.

One of Colorado's crown jewels, Browns Canyon offers a range of year-round recreational opportunities in a beautiful and wild setting. In addition to being the nation's most popular whitewater rafting destination, Browns also offers hiking, kayaking, hunting, fishing and photography opportunities. The whitewater tourism industry in the Arkansas valley has a total economic impact of $60 million per year. A national monument designation will only increase the name recognition and thus the tourism for the region.

The Outdoor Industry Association's recent study found that outdoor recreation is one of the bright spots of our national economy, with an annual contribution of $646 billion and creation of 6.1 million jobs. We urge our leaders to find ways to facilitate this growth in outdoor recreation, and protection of our public lands is one of the most effective ways to make sure we nurture our outdoors recreation economy. Additionally, Colorado College's State of the Rockies survey found that 78% of Coloradans believe that we can protect land and water and have a strong economy at the same time, and that 67% of Coloradans self-identify as conservationists, and that this label bridges partisan, ethnic and rural/urban lines in the state.

STATEMENT OF DAVID N. POTTS, CHAFFEE COUNTY COMMISSIONER, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, SALIDA, CO

As a sitting County Commissioner of Chaffee County, Colorado I extend my support for the creation of the Browns Canyon National Monument. For all to understand that tourism is the current economic foundation of Chaffee County, that the rafting industry has not yet recovered from the drought of 2002 and we need to recognize the international marketing advantage that the industry will benefit from by floating through the Browns Canyon National Monument.

By supporting the creation of the Browns Canyon Monument, I understand from the presentation of the proposal that no existing uses will be affected in any manor detrimental to those uses. The proposal also states that the Turret Trail (FS 184) will remain intact for its current total of nearly seven miles.

In the development of "The Management Plan" there needs to be an element of understanding for impact on Chaffee County's infrastructure, specifically County Roads 194, 301 & 300. These county roads will be the main and easiest accessible routes to the proposed monument other than the Arkansas River. The county should be a member in standing of the "Management Team" with the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service and the Colorado Parks & Wild Life and receive due consideration for any further development, maintenance and general upkeep of these county roads because of the anticipated increase of use.

This letter of support speaks only for me and not for the Chaffee County Board of Commissioners as a whole.

STATEMENT OF PETE MAYSMITH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CONSERVATION COLORADO

Dear Senator Udall,

Thank you for sponsoring the Browns Canyon National Monument with Wilderness Act and your leadership on winning permanent protection for this Colorado icon. You have created a well-rounded bill that reflects input and significant support from from a vast array of stakeholders; that is an impressive accomplishment.

Conservation Colorado applauds S. 1794 and is excited to see progress, especially its upcoming hearing before the National Parks subcommittee. Your bill would create a 22,000 acre national monument centered on the Arkansas River, and additionally designate a 10,500 acre wilderness area within the monument. Your Browns Canyon National Monument proposal would allow for rafting and fishing to continue on the clear flowing waters, and preserve the canyon for future generations.

Conservation Colorado recently commissioned a statewide poll on how constituents feel about designation of Browns Canyon National Monument. A resounding 77% said that they support designation. This support was widespread across rural and urban parts of Colorado, among men and women, including Republicans as well as Democrats. In particular, suburban women were especially supportive.

The stretch of the Arkansas River that runs through Browns Canyon is one of the most popular white-water recreation areas in the country. It brings in $55 million each year to the local economy. Last year, rafters spent nearly 50,000 more user days on Colorado rivers, including an increase of 10,000 user days on the Arkansas River alone. The Arkansas River is continually the highest grossing river in Colorado.

Recently, the non-partisan research organization Headwaters Economics analyzed the economic growth connected to the seventeen national monuments that were designated between in 1982 and 2011 in eleven Western states. The study showed that population, employment, personal income, and per capita income either remained steady or improved in the areas surrounding the national monuments. Permanent protection of Browns Canyon as a national monument creates visibility that will likely be a strong economic benefit for local communities given that the designation will safeguard and highlight the very amenities that attract people and businesses to Chaffee County. National monuments develop into long-term economic boosts for their communities and states by increasing and improving tourism, recreation, and the relocation of businesses and people.

A national monument designation will guarantee the social, environmental, and economic legacy of Browns Canyon remains unaltered for future generations to be able to continue to enjoy as we do today.

Thank you again for your efforts.

STATEMENT OF MARTIN WALSH, MASON CITY, IA

To Whom it May Concern:

I would like to submit my support for the National Scenic Trails Parity Act to bring various long distance hiking trails to the same protection as the Appalachian Trail and others.

Two of the trails being considered, the North County Trail and the Ice Age Trail service the Midwestern United States, an area severely lacking in National Parks and public land in general. As a resident of Iowa and a lifelong Midwesterner, I think it is crucial to grant these trails the protection and significance allotted by this act.

Thank You.

STATEMENT OF GARY KLATT, WHITEWATER, WI

NATIONAL PARK UNIT STATUS FOR THE ICE AGE, NORTH COUNTRY, AND NEW ENGLAND NATIONAL SCENIC TRAILS

I am heavily invested in the Ice Age Trail as a 21 year active volunteer and board member of the Ice Age Trail Alliance. We are at a good and difficult place in our development right now. Good because we have an excellent, hard-working and effective staff and a strong volunteer base. Difficult because we have put our planned 1000+ mile trail down on most of the easy places—e.g. public land and willing landowners. The remaining 400 miles we need to complete will require impressive work and money as we compete with developers and convince landowners to give or sell us access. Having Unit Status will be a huge help in our efforts to extend our trail and in getting folks to value hiking and being outdoors.

STATEMENT OF RITA FOX

Please vote in favor of giving National Park Unit Status to the Ice Age, North Country, and New England National Scenic Trails so that they would have the same status as the Appalachian, Natchez Trace, and Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trails. I would like to see the Ice Age National Scenic Trail (and two others) administered by the National Park Service, given the same status within the agency and make us eligible for the array of new funding and resource support appropriated to support the National Park System.

With the Ice Age Trail so accessable to people in the state of Wisconsin, it is important to me to see it get all the help it can to exist. I have hiked the entire 1100 miles and work on the Mobile Skill Projects and appreciate all it takes to build and maintain trail such as ours. This help would be welcomed. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF BRUCE E. MATTHEWS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NORTH COUNTRY TRAIL ASSOCIATION

The North Country Trail Association supports the passage of S. 2293, the National Scenic Trails Parity Act. There is no logic or rationale in the current—and inexplicable—disparity among National Park Service-administered trails, with three having unit status (Appalachian, Natchez Trace and Potomac Heritage) and all the advantages associated in their management thusly, and three other relegated to a lesser status (North Country, Ice Age and New England). For many years, professional staff within the National Park Service as well as the major citizen support groups have attempted to redress this clear disparity, to no avail.

The North Country Trail Association greatly appreciates the leadership of Senators Baldwin, Levin, Markey and Blumenthal with this bill, and we urge the Senate to correct this disparity and accord equal status to all the national scenic trails administered by the National Park Service.

STATEMENT OF DEAN PAYNTER, JANESVILLE, WI

This message is in support of S. 2293 which confers National Park Unit Status on the Ice Age National Scenic Trail as well as the North Country National Scenic Trail and the New England Trail. The Ice Age Trail passes through the heart of the City of Janesville and is the focal point of trail systems in our community. Enhancements to the Ice Age National Scenic Trail are beneficial to everyone in Wisconsin.

The Ice Age National Scenic Trail is comparable to other trails with unit status, like the Appalachian and Pacific Crest Trails. It is comparable in length, in regional significance, in geologic scientific study, as a tourism asset, as it shows off the beauty of the State of Wisconsin.

We very much appreciate the attention of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to this important issue.

Thank you!

STATEMENT OF MARJORIE DEJONGH

I am writing to request your support of the Ice Age Trail as part of the National Scenic Trails Parity Act.

This trail helps stimulate the local economy and protect the environment at the same time. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.

STATEMENT OF DAVID W. PHILLIPS

Dear Senator Landrieu,

I am writing to you to express my strong support for Senate Bill 2293, The National Scenic Trails Parity Act.

I am now 70 years old and have remained active and in good health in large part because of an active lifestyle. National Scenic Trails have provided me recreation, inspiration and spiritual solace since my boyhood. I still view an early backpacking trip on the Appalachian Trail in Pennsylvania as a turning point in my teen years, a time when my life's path had begun to take me in a very negative direction. Something happened on that trip that opened up other, more positive possibilities. I have now lived more than half of my life in Wisconsin and have used the North Country

Trail and the Ice Age Trail as opportunities to connect with nature, history and the better qualities of my fellow human beings.

I have worked as a volunteer on the Ice Age Trail for thirty-eight years and have a deep understanding of its uniqueness and importance. Not only does it connect some of the most outstanding features of the last ice age, it is unique in that it connects communities of people all along the way. Yes, it is like other long distance trails in that it goes through lots of wild country, but it also connects villages and towns along the way, giving people of all ages an opportunity to walk out of their towns and enjoy and be inspired by the forests, farmland, prairies and wetlands that sustain us physically and spiritually. Wisconsin is infinitely more beautiful once we leave the highway. A well maintained footpath is the best way to experience that beauty.

The Ice Age Trail is about 60% complete at this time. The work done thus far has involved a tremendous number of volunteer hours and financial assistance from individuals and businesses. The completion of the last 40% of the trail will require an all out effort by all partners. Enactment of the National Scenic Trails Parity Act will be a critical component to realize this goal.

Thank you for consideration of my letter. I will appreciate an opportunity to have it placed in the hearing record.

STATEMENT OF THE MOUNTAINS TO SOUND GREENWAY TRUST, ON S. 2602

Chairman Udall, Senator Portman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for holding today's hearing. I am Cynthia Welti, Executive Director of the Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust, and am pleased to offer these comments in support of S. 2602 to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area. The Trust would like to thank Senator Cantwell and her staff for their hard work with us and the National Park Service to develop the consensus legislation pending before the Committee. We also appreciate the support from Senator Murray for this legislation. Finally, we would also like to thank Congressman Reichert for introducing a House companion. A broad coalition of residents, businesses, government agencies, elected officials, and nonprofit organizations has come together in support of this designation effort because they are excited about the economic, cultural, and community benefits that National Heritage Area status will provide. This designation fits the Mountains to Sound Greenway for the major role this area played in the formation of our nation, and continues to serve today as a model of natural areas in balance with economic growth.

THE LANDSCAPE

The Mountains to Sound Greenway is located in Washington State and encompasses 1.5 million acres surrounding Interstate 90 from Seattle, across the crest of the Cascade Mountains, to Ellensburg in Central Washington. The Greenway contains conserved public forests and parks, private rural farms and working forests, and the fifteenth-largest metropolitan area in the nation. The Mountains to Sound Greenway is a large, lived-in, iconic landscape, spanning three watersheds, with more than 900,000 acres of public land, 1,600 miles of recreational trails, 28 cities, and more than 1.4 million residents. The Greenway provides easy access to outdoor recreation and nature for millions of people, a key to the quality of life in Washington State.

HISTORY

The Mountains to Sound Greenway is nationally important for its association with the expansion of our national transportation system and the creation of our modern timber industry. Beginning with the foot paths that Native Americans used to cross the Cascade Mountains, Snoqualmie Pass has funneled cultural exchange between east and west for thousands of years. This unique geography shaped travel routes, drove commerce and culture, and inspired bold acts of development and groundbreaking conservation.

The footpath over Snoqualmie Pass linked the Coast Salish tribes with Yakama people of the Columbia Plateau, and ultimately, through an extensive trading network, to the Great Plains. The route they established, following the lowest pass in the North Cascades, went on to shape how this region and the United States developed.

The Oregon Treaty of 1846 which set the US northern boundary west of the Rocky Mountains, included the Puget Sound area, key to the nation's future trade routes. However, the daunting natural barrier of the Cascades mountain range kept the re-

gion and its valuable assets isolated from the rest of the nation. While the mountains, forests, and waterways of the region were rich in natural resources, and offered extremely valuable deep-water harbors on the Pacific Ocean, these assets were not available because of the lack of overland connection to the established markets of the eastern United States.

In 1864, President Lincoln signed the charter for a northern transcontinental railroad, mandating that the terminus be on Puget Sound. Lacking cash to fund the massive construction effort, the United States awarded the Northern Pacific Railroad the largest land grant in American history. The government transferred forty million acres, or two percent of the contiguous United States, to the railroad as a subsidy for building the rail line.

Construction of the Northern Pacific, and later the Milwaukee Railroad, through the Snoqualmie Pass area was crucial in connecting this remote corner to the rest of the nation. This historic transportation corridor forged a singularly rugged traverse through the last frontier of the continental United States, before descending through vast stands of timber to reach the estuarine complex of Puget Sound. These east-west transcontinental rail lines, and later the Sunset Highway and Interstate 90, connected the Atlantic seaboard and the Great Plains with Seattle and Puget Sound, weaving the Pacific Northwest into the nation's fabric and placing the last link in the chain allowing full trade between the United States and Asia.

The towering rainforests are a defining feature of the Pacific Northwest, and the Northern Pacific Railroad land grant has been instrumental in shaping the timber industry as a cornerstone of the region's economy. The privatization of massive quantities of federal land in the Cascades changed timber's business model, transforming the industry from a collection of small, temporary operations to long-term resource management of tree harvesting in the Cascades. This led to sustainable harvesting practices that have been replicated across the nation.

The Northern Pacific Railroad saw the potential value of the forests alongside its tracks, and was determined to capitalize on that resource. They created a timber subsidiary that became Plum Creek Timber, the largest private landowner in the nation to this day. Some of the land was sold to other timber interests, including 900,000 acres that launched the Weyerhaeuser timber company. Both Plum Creek and Weyerhaeuser are still based in the Seattle area.

This wealth of timber that provided the resource base to complete our nation's rail system in the late 1800s went on to supply crucial construction materials to power the American war machine in World War I. Boeing was founded in the Seattle area to turn the region's spruce trees into war planes, and Douglas Fir was used to build ships for the U.S. Navy.

The railroads, and the network of logging roads that came with them, created access to the Cascade Mountains for a wide array of outdoor recreation. Citizens of the region flocked to the mountains for skiing, hiking, mountaineering, and other endeavors, and began forming a special bond with their natural surroundings that still defines the region's culture today.

By the mid-1950s, residents started to realize that it was possible for us to delve too deeply and overwhelm the natural bounty of the region. A new era of citizen-led conservation began. Local citizens united to create a sewage-treatment authority to clean up Lake Washington in the 1950's—a groundbreaking antecedent to the Clean Water Act. In the 1960's, voters enacted the largest park-bond issue in the country at that time to preserve and expand a network of parks and boulevards. In 1979, citizens of King County voted to preserve prime farmland in the county, the first time voters anywhere in the nation had voted to tax themselves to preserve farmlands. In the late 1980's, Washington State Parks acquired 300 miles of the defunct Milwaukee Railroad, leading to what is now the longest rail-trail conversion in the country.

GREENWAY COALITION

By the mid-1980s, the Seattle region was beginning to boom with new technology industries and the population was growing rapidly. Concerned citizens realized that much of this growth would sprawl out from Seattle along Interstate 90. In 1991, community leaders formed a coalition of agencies, businesses, and activists, the nonprofit Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust, to create and implement a common vision that would balance strong economic growth with retaining the region's defining characteristics: a dramatic physical landscape whose history is still very much intact, giving rise to and sustaining a unique ecological resource and a network of towns and cities inextricably tied to the land.

In its first two decades of work, this Mountains to Sound Greenway coalition has rendered remarkable accomplishments. Working with large timber corporations and

government agencies, partners have connected a major swath of public land, instituted new education programs, and involved hundreds of thousands of volunteers in trail renovation and ecological restoration.

HERITAGE STUDY

After 20 years of successful collaboration in creating the Mountains to Sound Greenway, residents realized the time had come to gain official recognition of this special place in our nation that deserves special care. The National Heritage Area program stood out as the best vehicle for this recognition, providing a flexible framework and tools for formalizing partnerships and interpreting resources—without affecting property rights or land management structures. In 2009, the Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust initiated the Heritage Study, a public involvement campaign to gain formal recognition of the landscape, and to lay a pathway for the upcoming decades. The Heritage Study was a stakeholder-driven process that included more than 150 meetings with more than 1,000 individuals.

As a part of the Heritage Study, stakeholders from around the Greenway agreed upon boundaries. The boundaries of the proposed Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area are based on the history of the transportation corridor in the vicinity of Snoqualmie Pass, marked by the intersection of the Northern Pacific and Milwaukee Railroad transcontinental rail lines, the historic Sunset Highway, and today's Interstate 90. The boundaries encompass many of the railroad spur lines that stretched north and south from these transcontinental lines in the center of the Greenway, comprising an assemblage of resources that tell the Greenway's story with focus and integrity.

The proposed boundaries are appropriate to the Greenway's nationally important themes. They are pragmatic, realistic, and follow modern-day political and land-management structures, thus offering the best formula for long-term success as Greenway communities seek to manage and interpret resources across this diverse landscape. They are based in strong public interest and hold significant opportunities to enhance the resources of this land and its nationally important story.

The Greenway Trust studied the feasibility of establishing a National Heritage Area extensively and, working closely with the National Park Service, met all the agency's program criteria.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Nearly 2,000 elected officials, agencies, businesses, and individuals have expressed their support of the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area, and are excited about the benefits of this non-regulatory approach to conservation.

Major corporations, such as supporters Microsoft, Expedia, CH2M HILL, and Recreational Equipment Inc. (REI), see the advantages of locating near an inspiring landscape with easy access to mountains, lakes, and trails. Elected officials know the long-term benefits of engaging the whole community in local planning. The legislation has support from Governor Inslee, the entire King County Council, and all Kittitas County Commissioners. A wide range of nonprofits support designation, drawn by the opportunities to protect quality of life while conserving natural and historic resources and growing tourism. Between the Kittitas County Historical Museum in Ellensburg, the Museum of History and Industry in Seattle, the Association of King County Historical Organizations, and a dozen others, the campaign has robust backing from the historical community.

This designation will help us keep the balance between urban and natural areas as people continue to move here. It will build an awareness of this unique landscape that highlights its historical contributions to the nation and draws tourism dollars to local communities. Designating the Greenway as a National Heritage Area will also empower citizens, businesses, interest groups, and government agencies to work together more efficiently toward ensuring the Greenway remains a cornerstone of this broad community for generations to come. With National Heritage Area designation, we can promote a shared vision of the Greenway that will aid in raising private funds to leverage government grants and vastly increase the productivity of our efforts.

Thank you again for this opportunity to share our region's national significance with the Subcommittee. We ask for your support and advocacy for the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area Act. Those of us in the region know that our home and landscape have played a special place in America's story, and we are ready to join Congress, the National Park Service, and the rest of the National Heritage Area network in sharing our stories with the nation. We welcome any questions you may have.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN HOTEL & LODGING ASSOCIATION

Dear Chair Landrieu and Ranking Member Murkowski,

The American Hotel & Lodging Association (AH&LA), the sole national association representing all segments of the 1.8 million-employee U.S. lodging industry, strongly supports Senator Flake's legislation, S.1750, the Public Access to Public Land Guarantee Act, and S.2104, the National Park Access Act, and we thank the National Parks Subcommittee for holding a hearing to discuss these bills.

During last year's government shutdown, many small businesses and communities across the country with economies that rely on our national parks lost hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity due to the National Park Service's decision to wait more than a week before authorizing states to reopen and operate parks using non-federal funds. These communities' principal industry, and in some instances only significant industry, is tourism and this delay had very serious consequences. Hoteliers in particular were severely impacted by the 16-day shutdown, during which our industry lost $115.2 million in economic activity.

S.1750 provides valuable safeguards against shutdown delays in the future and would prevent interruptions in normal operation before they start by allowing the Administration to enter into agreements with states to allow for the continued operation of public lands due to a lapse in appropriations. In addition, S.2104 would help repair some of the economic impact on communities by requiring the federal government to refund to the states all state funds used to operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown.

S.1750 and S.2104 ensure that no matter what happens in Washington, the communities across the country that rely on national parks as their economic drivers will not face undue hardship. The successful operation of our national parks is crucial to the economic viability and job creation capabilities of the hotels, resorts, restaurants, retail outlets, and many other small businesses relying on park visitors. Consequently, we urge the full Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to prevent future economic uncertainty by scheduling a mark-up of Senator Jeff Flake's legislation as soon as possible.

STATEMENT OF GREG BRYAN, MAYOR, TOWN OF TUSAYAN, AZ

Dear Chair Landrieu and Ranking Member Murkowski,

On behalf of the Town of Tusayan, Arizona, which sits at the southern entrance to Grand Canyon National Park, and the many businesses in our and surrounding communities, we would like to express our strong support for our Arizona Senator Flake's legislation S.1750, the Public Access to Public Land Guarantee Act, and S.2104, the National Park Access Act. We would also like to thank the National Parks Subcommittee for holding a hearing to discuss these bills.

Our community, as well as communities across America, was severely impacted when the federal government shut down last fall for 16 days. Millions of dollars were lost in our community and hundreds of millions across our country in communities that depend upon our National Parks, Monuments and Recreation areas as key, if not sole, components for our economies. Not only were our citizens and businesses significantly impacted, but visitors from around the world arrived at great expense only to be turned away. Those types of impacts and reduction in trust in America's tourism industry have long term consequences for our country and communities.

We need to have the confidence that our National Parks, Monuments and Recreation areas will not be used again as tools in political fights on Capitol Hill. We invest millions of dollars in our infrastructure as Towns and businesses, only to have it diminished by a sudden and complete closure during a critical part of our already short tourism season. Many businesses depended upon that last piece of opportunity to save funds to tide them over for the winter and have funds to start up the next year. It placed many in jeopardy of not being able to reopen the following year and forced them to lay off many staff that were facing the same hardship issues.

We encourage the Subcommittee to look favorably on these pieces of legislation that will help to rebuild confidence in our National Park and destination tourism industry by assuring that those communities and states that choose to reopen during another government shutdown will have the opportunity to do so. It took 12 days last time for the National Park Service to decide there was a way to allow States to cover the cost of reopening our national treasures and those days cost us all dearly. We ask you to support S.1750 in its effort to make this process a defined one, not subject to political manipulations in the future. We hope there will never

be another shutdown, but people, desires and motivations change and we see this as a prudent safety net for one of America's critical tourism industries and pieces.

We would also encourage you to support S.2104, which will enable the repayment for thousands of dollars that were spent in reopening our Parks for 5 days during the last shutdown. When the budget was passed, the NPS was reimbursed for all lost wages and costs, as well as retained all entrance fees that were collected during that five day period. In essence they received a windfall by being paid by States and then paid by the government for the same services. We would ask that you see the integrity and moral value in seeing that we are reimbursed through this legislation.

We very much appreciate the work this Subcommittee does and hope that you will see the relevancy and significant importance to our communities and States across America in these pieces of legislation. We would be most happy to provide any information needed and answer any questions the Subcommittee might have.

STATEMENT OF SHAWN POMAVILLE, MANAGING DIRECTOR, MOTORCITIES NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA, ON S. 2221

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership regarding S. 2221, a bill to extend the authorization of the MotorCities National Heritage Area. These views are being presented by Shawn Pomaville, Managing Director of the MotorCities National Heritage Area.

The MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership, also known as the Automobile National Heritage Area Partnership, was established in 1998 by Public Law 105-355 to interpret and protect the unique cultural and economic contributions Michigan has made to the automotive industry. The MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership preserves and tells the story of American car-making and its global significance, a story that cannot be told anywhere else. It is the story of the automobile and its role in helping to establish and expand industry in the United States. It is the story of the role of the labor movement and the social impact of the automotive industry on past, present and future generations.

The MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership tells this unique story through regional partnerships and activities that celebrate the land, people, natural resources and communities. The methods by which we tell the story include education, preservation, interpretation and resource stewardship. Often referred to as the Silicon Valley of the automotive industry, the MotorCities National Heritage Area spans over 10,000 square miles in southeast Michigan and contains over 6 million people.

During its 16 years of existence, the MotorCities National Heritage Area has had a significant record of achievement. It has worked closely with the business community; county and state governments; and multiple non-governmental organizations to build a network of partner sites dedicated to preserving and interpreting America's automotive story.

According to an Evaluation Report issued by the University of Michigan-Dearborn's Institute for Local Area Government that concluded in 2013, the MotorCities National Heritage Area has achieved the proposed accomplishments envisioned in the authorizing legislation and subsequent General Management Plan, which set forth the framework and direction for the coordinating entity. These include the following:

- MotorCities National Heritage Area has clearly helped to preserve the historical, cultural and recreational resources related to the region's auto and labor history, including preservation for future generations.
- MotorCities National Heritage Area has enhanced the region's economic vitality through heritage tourism investments.
- MotorCities National Heritage Area has increased the organizational capacity of grantees and partner organizations.

Working together, the network has developed several successful public projects which would not have otherwise been put in place. These projects prevent our history from merely sitting idle or simply crumbling away as would have been the case with the Ford Piquette Avenue Plant in Detroit. This is the site of Henry Ford's first factory built for Ford Motor Company and the birthplace of the Model T. With the assistance of the MotorCities National Heritage Area, the Piquette Plant has been transformed from a semi abandoned eyesore to a celebrated National Historic Landmark hosting thousands of tourists each year. This created an economic impact by spurring on more investment in the neighborhood. The economic benefits of herit-

age tourism projects such as this include creating new jobs and businesses, increasing tax revenues, and diversifying the local economy.

An example of an interpretation and education project whose purpose is also to build a sense of regional identity, is the public Wayside Exhibit program. This program promotes heritage tourism and educates visitors and residents alike. Approximately 230 exhibits have been installed to tell the unique, automotive-related stories of the people, places and ideas that shaped the region.

In 2012, the Northeast Regional Office of the National Park Service commissioned an economic impact study and hired an independent firm, Tripp Umbach, to measure the community and economic impact of the National Heritage Areas. As a leading expert in their field, Tripp Umbach has conducted more than 400 customized studies for major corporations, healthcare organizations, universities and non-profit organizations throughout the world. Tripp Umbach collected primary data from six National Heritage Areas, including information on operation and capital expenditures and tourism information. According to the Tripp Umbach study, the overall annual economic impact of National Heritage Areas in the United States is $12.9 billion, which is a direct result of federal funding provided annually for the Heritage Partnership Program within the National Park Service.

The economic impact is comprised of three main areas: tourism, operational expenditures and grant-making activities, with the majority of the impact (99%) generated by tourism spending. These include:

- $4.6 billion in direct impact (tourism spending, National Heritage Area operational expenditures and grant making activities);
- $8.3 billion in indirect and induced impacts (employee spending and businesses supporting the tourism industry).

The study further concluded that National Heritage Areas support more than 140,000 jobs throughout the nation, including 94,000 jobs directly and 45,000 indirectly. The Tripp Umbach report concluded that the overall impact of National Heritage Areas and their related spending and operational activities generated $1.2 billion in Federal taxes. The type of taxes paid includes payroll taxes, income taxes and corporate taxes."

MotorCities National Heritage Area likewise leverages federal funds to great advantage. Since 2009, every $1 the MotorCities National Heritage Area has awarded through its community grant challenge program has been matched by more than $5 in funding or in-kind services. This reflects a major commitment of resources on the part of partners throughout the area. It is an example of how a modest investment of tax-payer dollars can have a significant impact in regions that need it the most.

Continuing coordination and capacity building is required to protect the millions in federal and local investments made to date. According to the Evaluation from the University of Michigan-Dearborn's Institute for Local Area Government, without the Heritage Area and its affiliation with the National Park Service, it is unlikely that these partnerships and their benefits would continue, placing much of Michigan's automotive heritage at risk of disappearing.

Michigan would lose the ability to leverage the cultural and historic linkages from its rich automotive heritage that contribute to a sense of pride in the region and afford a multitude of economic impacts.

Our region tells the ongoing story of an industry and people that are integral to our national history, relevant to our present, and can provide unlimited inspiration for our future.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes the testimony of the MotorCities National Heritage Area Partnership. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ANDY INGRAHAM, PRESIDENT/CEO, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BLACK HOTEL OWNERS, OPERATORS & DEVELOPERS,

Dear Speaker Boehner, Leader Reid, Leader McConnell, and Leader Pelosi:

The successful operation of our national parks is crucial to the economic viability of the hotels, resorts, restaurants, retail outlets, and many other small businesses relying on these park visitors. We commend Senator Jeff Flake and Congressman Steve Daines for their leadership in offering legislation to ensure the impacts felt during the recent government shutdown are not repeated in the future. With Rep. Daines' Protecting States, Opening National Parks Act (H. 3286) and, today, Senator Flake's Public Access to Public Lands Guarantee Act (S. XXX), we are one step closer towards putting safeguards in place to offset the threat of another damaging government shutdown. During the recent 16-day government shutdown, the National Park Service waited more than a week before authorizing states to reopen

and operate national parks using non-federal funds. This delay resulted in the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in economic activity in communities whose principle, and in some instances only, industry is tourism. Our national parks are integral to such communities, and with their closure thousands of citizen's livelihoods are impacted.

S. XXX and H. 3286 provide valuable safeguards against such delays in the future and would prevent interruptions in normal operation before they start. In the event of a government shutdown, S. XXX would require the federal government to enter into an agreement with any state or municipality that offers non-federal funds to temporarily operate public lands, even if that reopening is only partial. Additionally, both bills would require the federal government to refund the state or municipality, if Congress retroactively appropriates funds or if the federal government collected entry fees for those lands during the shutdown.

Unfortunately, uncertainty arising from the partisan gridlock in Washington continues to prevent any guarantee of avoiding future government shutdowns. This uncertainty will only further impair the ability of lodging and many other industries to continue driving economic growth and job creation. Senator Flake's and Rep. Daines' bills assure that no matter what happens in Washington, the small businesses and communities across the country that rely on national parks will not face undue economic uncertainty and strife.

We urge the House of Representatives and the Senate to act quickly on this legislation to ensure the stability of the local economies throughout the country that rely on our national parks.

STATEMENT OF NATHAN FEY*, COLORADO STEWARDSHIP DIRECTOR, AMERICAN WHITEWATER

Dear Senator Udall and Congressman Lamborn:

As a collective voice for the thousands of Colorado's citizens and visitors that recreate on our public lands and waters, we are writing in support of efforts to permanently protect Browns Canyon of the Arkansas River in Colorado.

Outdoor Alliance Colorado (OAC) is a new coalition for human powered outdoor recreation that includes: the Colorado Mountain Club; the Colorado Mountain Bike Association; the Colorado networks of the Access Fund and American Whitewater; and Outdoor Alliance. OAC advocates for the protection and enjoyment of public lands and waters in Colorado, on behalf of those that hike, mountain bike, climb, paddle, ski and snowshoe.

Browns Canyon of the Arkansas River comprises roughly 23,000 acres of Forest Service and BLM lands in Chaffee County. The area is renowned for providing year-round opportunities to climb, paddle, mountain bike, ski and hike. By preserving this incredible landscape that surrounds the Arkansas River, we can ensure that visitors and citizens alike can continue to benefit from inspiring recreational experiences, and continue to sustain and grow our local and regional economy.

In Colorado, outdoor recreation generates over $10 billion annually in revenues to our state economy and supports 107,000 jobs. Activities like hiking, biking, climbing, camping, whitewater rafting, and kayaking, are enjoyed by nearly 4 million people each year, helping to generate $500 million in state tax revenue. People from across Colorado and the country regularly visit the region to enjoy these activities, and it is critical that Browns Canyon be protected to both ensure that the area will remain open to outdoor recreational pursuits and to preserve Colorado's outdoor legacy for future generations.

Outdoor Alliance Colorado strongly supports permanent protection of Browns Canyon, to:

- Preserve opportunities for solitude and human—-powered recreation including rafting, kayaking, climbing, biking and hiking.
- Ensure that the outdoor recreation opportunities and natural legacy of this unique area remains intact for future generations.
- Permanently assure that no new road construction would damage the area's watershed or wildlife habitat.

For over a decade, there have been bipartisan efforts to protect this unique area, and therefore we request that you finally ensure this area receives the protection it deserves. Your leadership is needed and appreciated, so that future generations can experience the beauty, clean water and air, and wildlife that we have today.

---

* Other names and organizations have been retained in subcommittee files.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTINA KING, PRIVATE BOATERS COALITION OFFICER, PIKES PEAK RIVER RUNNERS OFFICER

The purpose of this letter is to provide written support for the Brown's Canyon National Monument. I recently attended the public meeting in Nathrop, Colorado on April 13, 2013. I listened to the many comments and am impressed with the responses and the detailed work done to date. My only regret is that the size of the proposed monument was decreased to the most recent proposed size.

The Private Boaters Coalition & Pikes Peak River Runners (both based in Colorado) consists of groups of boaters who consider the Arkansas River their home river. They also travel to many western rivers and enjoy wild areas along whitewater rivers. The term "private boaters" is typically a misnomer but is a commonly used term that describes the self-outfitted public who regularly runs western rivers using their own skills and equipment. Private boaters support the protection of Brown's Canyon (through its close relationship to the Arkansas River). They recognize and support the value of protecting this area with a wilderness proposal. The Private Boaters Coalition and Pikes Peak River Runners represent at a minimum 300 private boaters probably more but we only track membership in our online community.

The Arkansas River corridor is a wonderful place to see bighorn sheep, deer, occasional beaver and the general beauty of a wild area. Protecting these qualities through wilderness & national monument legislation ensures that future boaters will also enjoy these resources as we see them today. Legislating Brown's Canyon as a wilderness area (while not turning the Arkansas into a wilderness area) will protect the adjacent corridor areas as well as protecting this wild area as well. Private boaters are a strong presence in the Brown's Canyon area and contribute to the economic well-being of Buena Vista and Salida areas. Many boaters have purchased second (future retirement) homes including land in the valley and have strong ties to this area. Please protect this area and do not let the OHV motorized group dominate the decision to not allow more motorized use in the area. There are many areas outside of this boundary where they can ride. We want this area protected for quiet use and future recreational enjoyment by the many other non-motorized stakeholders involved. We are fine with continued grazing use but have seen first-hand evidence of cattle dung and erosion caused by cattle use along the river. Please continue to work with ranchers to control cattle use along the riverbanks. We work very hard to tread lightly and appreciate others who do the same.

Please consider this letter as strong support of introducing the Brown's Canyon National Monument proposal. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS D. RUSHIN, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, YUMA CROSSING NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA, ON S.2111

Dear Mr. Chairman Udall, Ranking member Portman, and other distinguished members of the Subcommittee; I appreciate this opportunity to submit testimony on S.2111 on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, as well as its many public and private partners.

In 2000, when Senators John McCain and Jon Kyl introduced and secured enactment of legislation to designate the Yuma Crossing a National Heritage Area, Yuma, a city of 100,000 located in the southwest corner of Arizona, faced serious challenges.

- Despite its location on the Colorado River, Yuma had become disconnected from the river. A jungle of non-native vegetation, infested with hobo camps, trash dumps and meth labs, made access to the river nearly impossible and certainly dangerous.
- Yuma's downtown riverfront was severely blighted. Originally designated as a National Historic Landmark in the 1960's, the Yuma Crossing NHL was categorized by the National Park Service as in a "threatened" status.

By 2002, the Yuma community had developed a management plan, which was approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The plan focused primarily on reclaiming Yuma's riverfront from an environmental, recreational and commercial standpoint.

Since then, more than $100 million of public and private investment has transformed Yuma's riverfront with 400 acres of wetlands restoration, (considered a model in the desert Southwest); two large riverfront parks with 9 miles of waterside trails; and a revitalized downtown riverfront which has both rescued the National Historic Landmark and attracted substantial private investment along the Colorado River.

How was this accomplished? While the National Park Service funds of about $3 million over the last 12 years has been important seed money used to leverage projects, that funding alone would not have made all this possible. In fact, no single investor or funder could have made this happen. And that is the point. Success has been based on creating strong partnerships among an extremely diverse set of stakeholders.

Let me give you just three brief examples:

1) The Yuma East Wetlands: Once overrun with salt cedar and phragmities, 400 acres has now been restored with cottonwoods, willows, and mesquites. Many believed that high soil salinity and low river flows made restoration technically impossible. An even greater challenge was to bring together the Quechan Indian tribe, area farmers, and governmental agencies at all levels to agree upon and implement a restoration plan-a voluntary and cooperative plan that respected tribal concerns, conventional farming practices, and private property rights. Not only was the restoration completed, but in 2013, the local partners struck an historic deal with the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program (Bureau of Reclamation) for a 50-year program of maintenance.

2) The Heritage Area was able to bring together the City of Yuma, a private developer, and historic preservation interests to facilitate a $30 million investment in a riverfront hotel and conference center. In the course of the project, the Heritage Area integrated the telling of the Yuma Crossing story into Pivot Point Plaza along the original 1877 rail alignment of the first train to enter Arizona. The National Historic Landmark has now been rescued from its threatened status.

3) In 2010, when the deep recession and severe state budget cutbacks threatened closure of Yuma's two state historic parks, the Heritage Area stepped in to save the parks-working with the City of Yuma, the Yuma Visitors Bureau and most importantly the entire Yuma community-raising funds to renew and revitalize their museums and grounds. Today, the parks are in a strong financial position and Arizona State Parks has begun the process of negotiating a long-term agreement to ensure local management and empowering the local community.

All three of these examples provide strong evidence of the need for the National Heritage Area's important and continuing role in Yuma's progress and the need to maintain our valuable partnership with the National Park Service. To that point, I have attached statements of support for reauthorization from Yuma City Council, Yuma County Board of Supervisors, the Quechan Indian Tribe, and the Yuma County Chamber of Commerce. As NPS Director Jon Jarvis has said, "National Heritage Areas are places where small investments pay big dividends". Yuma is a prime example.

Our Heritage Area empowers local citizens and government to preserve their heritage resources, to tell their unique stories, and to revitalize their communities, and in so doing, they allow these citizens to improve the quality of their lives and their economic opportunities. I urge this Subcommittee to approve S. 2111 because the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area has proved to be both very effective at preserving nationally significant resources and at using federal funds to leverage significant non-federal investment.

Finally, I think it important to address an issue for which there has been a great deal of misinformation. Some Washington, DC-based interest groups have made allegations that the Yuma Crossing NHA has somehow threatened private property rights. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Ten years ago, the Heritage Area and the Yuma Farm Bureau came together to clear up some misunderstandings, and the partnership with the farming community is as strong as ever. In fact, a 5th generation farmer, Patty Ware, serves on our Board and served as our Chair for a number of years. She became so exasperated with these unfounded rumors that she wrote a letter to the Heritage Foundation, a copy of which I am appending to my testimony. She never received a response. It is worth reading in its entirety, as it sets the record straight. But let me quote just a few sentences from the February 22, 2011 letter:

> "Private property rights are the fundamental basis of our way of life (farming). However, so is the truth. What you keep dredging up and re-circulating is not the truth. . .Perhaps getting out of Washington DC and actually seeing what is going on would do the Heritage Foundation some good. I invite you or your staff to come to Yuma and find out the facts."

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF VICKIE SUE VIGIL, PRESIDENT, SALIDA BUSINESS ALLIANCE

The Salida Business Alliance is a group of 65 plus networking businesses We have members on Highway 50 as well as in Historic Downtown Salida. Our focus is working with all business and community groups to improve the economic environment as well as to enhance the culture and beauty of our city.

I am writing to express the support of our business group for any efforts to permanently protect the Browns Canyon area of the Arkansas River in Chaffee County, Co. This area is renowned for offering a range of year-round opportunities for experiencing Colorado's outdoors. Browns Canyon is the most popular whitewater rafting destination in the nation.

People from across the state and country regularly visit this area to hike, hunt, fish or enjoy the spectacular scenery. By preserving this incredible landscape that surrounds the river, we can ensure that visitors continue to benefit from inspiring recreational experiences, and continue to sustain and gfow our local and regional economy.

Our businesses benefits from tourist that come to this areat o visit unique places like Browns Canyon. We strongly support protecting the Browns Canyon area.

STATEMENT OF ALAN H. ROWSOME, SENIOR DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS FOR LANDS, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY

Dear Chairman Udall and Ranking Member Portman:

The Wilderness Society, on behalf of our over 500,000 members and supporters from across the country, would like to express our views on the legislation being heard tomorrow in the Subcommittee on National Parks, and respectfully request that this letter be included in the July 23, 2014 hearing record for the Subcommittee.

S. 1794—BROWNS CANYON NATIONAL MONUMENT AND WILDERNESS ACT OF 2013

The Wilderness Society strongly supports, S. 1794, which would protect 22,000 acres of public land as a national monument, including 10,500 acres designated as the Browns Canyon Wilderness. Browns Canyon is a natural wonder that is of vital importance to Colorado citizens for recreation, local economic benefits, hunting and angling, and many other uses. Browns Canyon is one of the most popular destinations in the country for whitewater rafting—bringing in more than $23 million annually to the Upper Arkansas Valley economy.

The proposed national monument will also protect one of the most spectacular landscapes in Colorado as well as important habitat for wildlife including black bear, bighorn sheep, elk, mule deer, mountain lions, eagles, falcons, imperiled bats and many other species of wildlife.

The local community began working with their lawmakers on a bipartisan basis almost a decade ago on this legislation and this has resulted in endorsements from a wide array of stakeholders including sportsmen, conservationists, outdoor recreation outfitters, and local businesses. Additionally, this input helped to create legislation which balances current uses with conservation by allowing for existing livestock grazing and other existing uses to continue. We commend Senator Udall for crafting a bill with significant input from the local community that would not only protect this vital economic driver but also preserve as wilderness a natural icon in the state of Colorado.

This legislation is extremely popular both locally and statewide, with a recent poll showing that 77% of Colorado residents support protecting Browns Canyon as a national monument. We would urge this committee to advance this vital bill which not only protects a unique natural wonder but also provides long-term economic certainty for the hugely important statewide outdoor recreation economy—of which whitewater rafting generates $140 million annually.

S. 2602—MOUNTAINS TO SOUND GREENWAY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

The Wilderness Society is pleased to offer our support for S. 2602, A bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, sponsored by Senator Maria Cantwell (D-WA), and its companion bill H.R. 1785, Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area Act, sponsored by Representative David Reichert (R-WA-8). This bi-partisan bill will establish the 1.5-million-acre Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area, stretching from the city of Seattle across the crest of the Cascades to the eastern edge of Kittitas County, in the heart of central Washington.

The Interstate-90 corridor is the main transportation artery that runs through this landscape, connecting east to west, following centuries-old travelways that have fueled the growth and development of the region. Traveling along this corridor, one realizes the great need and opportunity a National Heritage Area designation poses for this region. For decades, the Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust has worked to protect the beauty and natural character of this landscape and facilitate large-scale collaboration across land management agencies and interest groups to realize a critical common vision for this corridor-one that manages growth, drives a robust economy, and recognizes and embraces the cultural heritage of the land. Since the Trust's creation, the organization has protected more than 225,000 acres of land, organized more than 500,000 hours of volunteer time toward community-based stewardship projects, educated more than 3,000 children annually about the environment, and facilitated broad-based collaboration among multiple interests along the Greenway.

The National Heritage Area designation would not only nationally recognize the unique heritage and history of natural resource conservation along this corridor, it would also establish a cooperative management framework to facilitate collaboration among the various government agencies, interest groups, and citizens. The Trust would also be designated as the local coordinating entity-a role the Trust as informally played for decades-thereby implementation of projects and programs among the diverse partners of the Heritage Area.

Since 2009, the Trust has worked diligently to thoroughly assess the feasibility of the designation opportunity, convening more than 150 public meetings, engaging more than 1,000 citizens, and securing support of more than 2,000 elected officials, agencies, businesses, and individuals. The Wilderness Society is proud to join this long list of supporters, advocating for the Congressional designation of the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area. The Heritage Area will encompass the Alpine Lakes Wilderness, the most-visited wilderness area in the country, and one our organization has been working to expand in recent years. The National Heritage Area designation would recognize the importance of the most wild places in this landscape as well as the most rapidly urbanizing, providing the critical opportunity to continue to balance the natural integrity of the region with the myriad needs of this dynamic landscape.

For these reasons we urge your support of both S. 1794, the Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness Act and S. 2602, the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area Act.

STATEMENT OF STEVE MOYER, VICE PRESIDENT FOR GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Dear Chairman Udall and Ranking Member Portman:

Trout Unlimited respectfully requests that the July 23, 2014 Subcommittee on National Parks hearing record include this letter in support of S. 1794, the Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness Act. S. 1794 would designate Browns Canyon in Chaffee County, Colorado as a National Monument. On behalf of Trout Unlimited 153,000 members including over 10,000 in Colorado we strongly support and urge passage of S. 1794.

It has been 23 years since the first legislation was introduced in Congress to permanently protect Colorado's Browns Canyon. Browns Canyon, and the Arkansas River that runs through it, includes world-class hunting and fishing habitat. Recently the Arkansas River was awarded Gold Medal status recognizing its outstanding fishery. It is also one of the most popular whitewater rafting and kayaking destinations in the country.

Legislation to protect this area was first introduced in 1991, and since then there have been 13 separate bills to conserve this important area. Despite broad public support, none of these bills have passed Congress. In 2005, Representative Joel Hefley (R-CO) and Senator Wayne Allard (R-CO) introduced the Browns Canyon Wilderness Act to permanently protect the area. Currently, Senators Mark Udall (D-CO) and Michael Bennet (D-CO) have proposed the Browns Canyon National Monument and Wilderness Act of 2013 to conserve the 22,000 acre Browns Canyon National Monument.

Recently the threat of mining in the area has emerged, as a series of mining claims have been filed in Browns Canyon straddling the Arkansas River. These claims were filed during a lapse in what had been an administrative closure for over 20 years. The mining claims are a reminder of the need for the type of lasting protection for Browns Canyon that S. 1794 would provide.

The time is now to finish the work of protecting Browns Canyon. We strongly urge passage of S. 1794.

STATEMENT OF DAVID BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICA OUTDOORS ASSOCIATION

Dear Senator Udall:

The draft Brown's Canyon National Monument and Wilderness Act legislation of November 18, 2013 has several provisions which are important to outfitters and the continuation of their services to the public.

- The Purposes Section helps clarify the legislation's intent to "sustain traditional uses in the Brown's Canyon area, including hunting, angling, livestock grazing, commercial outfitting, and boating".
- While the banks of the Arkansas River will be part of the National Monument, the bill authorizes the Bureau of Land Management to maintain its cooperative relationship with the State of Colorado in managing river outfitters within the Arkansas Headwater National Recreation Area. The Arkansas River itself is excluded from the boundaries consistent with the river level.
- Withdrawal of the area within the boundaries of the Monument from mining and mineral extraction will help maintain the recreational and scenic values of the area.
- The Forest Service will continue to manage those lands within its boundaries, providing continuity to outfitters who are operating within the National Forests that become part of the Monument.
- The authorization of outfitting in the Wilderness should relieve the requirement to determine the "need" for outfitting for any services occurring there now. The agencies will likely be required to determine the extent to which those services are necessary to fulfill the recreational purposes of the Wilderness. However, the Arkansas River itself and its banks are excluded from the boundary of the Wilderness.

Your intent to maintain the economic values derived from recreation and outfitting are well recognized. Therefore, I feel certain that you will monitor the development of the Management plans for the Monument and Wilderness to ensure that the intent of the legislation is realized.

Thank you for your consideration of the interests of the outfitting industry in the development of this legislation.

STATEMENT OF SCOTT BOSSE, NORTHERN ROCKIES DIRECTOR, AMERICAN RIVERS, ON S. 2392

Dear Chairman Landrieu and Ranking Member Murkowski:

On behalf of American Rivers, we offer the following testimony in support of S.2392, the East Rosebud Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 2014 sponsored by Senator John Walsh (D-MT) and co-sponsored by Senator Jon Tester (D-MT). This legislation, which would protect one of Montana's most spectacular free-flowing rivers by adding it to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, enjoys popular local support and the language in the bill is clear, clean and concise. The bill had a hearing before the National Parks Subcommittee of the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee on July 23, 2014.

American Rivers protects wild rivers, restores damaged rivers, and conserves clean water for people and nature. Since 1973, American Rivers has protected and restored more than 150,000 miles of rivers through advocacy efforts, on-the-ground projects, and an annual America's Most Endangered Rivers campaign. Headquartered in Washington, DC, American Rivers has offices across the country and more than 200,000 members and supporters, including more than 700 in Montana. Many of our Montana members live along and/or recreate on East Rosebud Creek.

American Rivers has been working with local citizens to protect East Rosebud Creek since 2010, when Hydrodynamics, Inc., a Bozeman-based energy company, first proposed building a hydropower project on the creek on lands managed by the Custer National Forest. The project, which eventually was withdrawn by the proponent on May 31, 2013 in the face of strong local opposition, was the third such hydropower project proposed on East Rosebud Creek in the past two decades.

Under S.2392, two reaches of East Rosebud Creek totaling 20 river miles would be added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, forever protecting their free-flowing character, clean water, and outstanding scenic, wildlife, fishery, recreational, geologic and historic values. Both reaches flow across public lands managed by the Custer National Forest. No private lands would be included in the Wild and Scenic designation.

While Montana currently has four Wild and Scenic rivers (the three forks of the upper Flathead River and a 150-mile reach of the Upper Missouri River) totaling 368 river miles, Congress has not designated a Wild and Scenic river in the state since 1976. A recent poll commissioned by Montanans for Healthy Rivers found that nearly nine in ten Montana voters support maintaining or increasing the number of protected rivers in the state, and 75 percent support the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Support for the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act amongst Montanans cuts across all demographic categories including age, gender, geographic region, party affiliation, and ideology.

Local support for protecting East Rosebud Creek as a Wild and Scenic river runs strong among local homeowners, ranchers, and business owners, and opposition is virtually non-existent. Friends of East Rosebud, a local grassroots organization formed to protect East Rosebud Creek's free-flowing character, clean water, and special values, has collected signatures from more than 1,800 citizens from 43 states who want to see it preserved in its current condition. Earlier this year, on April 12, 2014, approximately 130 citizens from southern Montana showed up at a public meeting in Billings to express their support for a bill to designate East Rosebud as a Wild and Scenic river. Virtually no one spoke up in opposition to a Wild and Scenic designation.

CONCLUSION

Montana has 177,000 miles of streams, yet only 368 stream miles, or two tenths of one percent, have been protected through inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. As one of Montana's most spectacular free-flowing rivers that has faced repeated threats from hydropower development over the past two decades, East Rosebud Creek is an excellent candidate for Wild and Scenic designation and one that enjoys popular local support. For these reasons, we urge the Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee to vote in favor of S.2392 so it can move to the full Senate for consideration.

Thank you for considering our testimony on this important legislation.

STATEMENT OF MIKE KISSACK, ARKANSAS RIVER OUTFITTERS ASSOCIATION

Dear Senator Udall,

The Arkansas River Outfitters Association (AROA) is a professional organization comprised of and representing the majority of the commercial outfitters on the Arkansas River. Our membership consists of outfitters representing rafting, float fishing, walk and wade fishing, photography, kayak instruction, shuttle services, climbing, hiking, and many other activities within the Arkansas River Valley. As an organization we are strongly in favor of the current proposal for National Monument and Wilderness designation for Browns Canyon.

This unique landscape is not only the most rafted stretch of whitewater in the nation, but it's also extremely popular with countless other user groups. The legislation as drafted seems to allow all user groups the ability to utilize this area just as they always have. As an organization that draws visitors to this region to experience its natural beauty and recreational opportunities, having this designation gives us a tremendous advantage in our ability to market the Arkansas River Valley. Just telling guests that they will be rafting through a proposed National Monument has been a sales tool that has worked for many of us already. In an increasingly competitive marketplace unique advantages like this are essential to our viability and the viability of our surrounding communities.

Aside from the obvious benefits of protecting habitat, preserving wilderness for future generations, and guarding this beautiful landscape, the economic impact of this designation on our communities would be tremendously positive. According to the 2012 Commercial River Use in the State of Colorado Report generated by the Colorado River Outfitters Association (CROA), commercial boaters on the Arkansas River had a direct expenditure of $20,543,280 and an overall economic impact of $52,590,798. This is money that is spent on food, lodging, and with other businesses in our mountain communities. Additionally, a report generated by Headwaters Economics entitled The Value of Public Lands: Lessons for Communities & Businesses Around Browns Canyon, shows that rural areas like the Arkansas River Valley see significant increases in population, employment, personal income, and per capita income immediately following a National Monument designation within their surrounding areas.

In conclusion, AROA would like to thank you for the effort that you have put forth in drafting this legislation and strongly supports it in its current state.

STATEMENT OF TOM KLEINSCHNITZ, CHAIRMAN, COLORADO RIVER OUTFITTERS ASSOCIATION

Dear Senator Udall and Congressman Lamborn:

On behalf of the Colorado River Outfitters Association, I am writing to express our support of any efforts to permanently protect Browns Canyon of the Arkansas River.

Considered Colorado's most appreciated but unprotected landscape, Browns Canyon comprises roughly 23,000 acres of Forest Service and BLM land. The area is renowned for offering a range of year-round opportunities for exploring Colorado's outdoors. Browns Canyon is the most popular whitewater rafting destinations in the nation. The regional whitewater rafting, kayaking and all other whitewater sports industry accounts for over $23 million in direct expenditures for a total economic impact of over $60 million in the Arkansas Valley annually.

People from across the state and country regularly visit to go whitewater rafting, kayaking, hunting and fishing in Browns Canyon. For example, roughly 150,000 visitors participate annually in commercial rafting trips with our outfitters on this stretch of the Arkansas River alone, due in no small part to the area's outstanding wild scenery. Places like Browns Canyon are an important part of many Coloradoans' personal identity, and attract and retain talented individuals to the region to enjoy a high quality of life. By preserving this incredible landscape that surrounds the river, we can ensure that visitors continue to benefit from inspiring recreational experiences, and continue to sustain and grow our local and regional economy.

In Colorado, outdoor recreation activities generate over $10 billion annually in revenues to our state economy and supports 107,000 jobs. Our businesses depend on these visitors and the activities they come to enjoy. Colorado and the Arkansas River Valley is also an integral part of the national outdoor recreation, conservation and historic preservation economy, which contributes $1.06 trillion annually to the U.S. economy, and supports 9.4 million American jobs.

For over a decade, there have been bipartisan efforts to protect this unique area. Browns Canyon is a national treasure which deserves to be permanently protected to both ensure that the area will remain open to whitewater boating, fishing, hiking and other recreational pursuits to preserve Colorado's outdoor legacy for future generations. As a business association whose members and partners are dependent on this area for economic security, we strongly support designation of Browns Canyon as a National Monument or Wilderness area without further delay. Sincerely,

---

STATEMENT OF KEVIN A. AND BETSEY DELOREY, MADISON, WI, ON S. 2293

We wish to go on record as in support of S.2293—National Scenic Trails Parity Act. Will you please see that our support is entered into the appropriate record for this bill?

Thanks for your efforts.

STATEMENT OF DENNIS GIESE, BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, CHAFFEE COUNTY COLORADO, SALIDA, CO

As a current Chaffee County Commissioner, I would support the Brown's Canyon Wilderness s Area legislation with the conditions below. This area includes Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service lands with the following as the general boundaries:

North—300ATV1–2 and 185 DRC1 (ATV routes authorized by the Fourmile Travel Plan)

East—Parallel West side of the Aspen Ridge Road with offsets to allow for camping and parking

West—Original BLM Wilderness Study Area (Arkansas River)

South—South of the "Turret Trail" Road and Original BLM Wilderness Study Area

The area summarized above should coincide with the general description of the Brown's Canyon Wilderness Area that has been proposed the last several years.

This support is conditioned on the preservation of the existing access of current users and that there is no further closure of areas or designation of use to current and historical users of this area. This includes ATV access along the "Turret Trail" Road and the current grazing allotments.

This support does not speak for the Chaffee County Board of Commissioners as a whole but only for me.

STATEMENT OF CAROL DONNELLY, CHAIR, ON BEHALF OF THE FRIENDS OF THE YORK RIVER, ON S. 1520

Dear Chairman Udall and Committee Members:

As representatives of a broad-based community effort, we are writing to express our strong support for S. 1520 (and H.R. 2197), a Bill to Amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to Designate Segments of the York River and Associated Tributaries for study for Potential Inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

While Maine is blessed with many beautiful rivers that are also economically and ecologically productive, some water ways rise above others. And in southern Maine, the York River is a standout.

The York River is one of southern Maine's defining features. Its waters are clean and flow in large part unencumbered from their origins high in the watershed at York Pond, where it begins its 11-mile journey and turns from fresh to salt water before entering the Gulf of Maine at York Harbor. The watershed has a diversity of habitats and ecological communities—extensive salt marshes, a mix of forest types and countless freshwater wetlands. Wildlife abounds—28 species of fish have been documented in this small river system, and its salt marshes provide resting and nesting places for migrating and resident birds.

But it is not just natural values that make it special: the York River is a resource appreciated and used by people for hundreds of years—from Native Americans on through the periods of European settlement, when the river served as a vital transportation link and source of industry. The beautiful, preserved historic buildings, plus remnants of old granite dams and mills found today along its tributaries, testify to the rich history of the York River.

The York River is a resource appreciated and used today, from commercial fishermen to those who enjoy fishing and boating as pastimes on the river. The river attracts vacationers and seasonal as well as the year round residents, providing important economic opportunities for small businesses in the area. Area students study the ecology and history of the York River through schools and a local museum.

The National Park Service (NPS) recently released a preliminary evaluation of the suitability of the river, "Wild and Scenic River Reconnaissance Survey of the York River," that recognized the outstanding and remarkable values of the river. The report concluded that "Based on a preliminary analysis through this reconnaissance survey, the National Park Service concludes that the York River appears to be a good candidate for a Wild and Scenic River Study...In sum, all of the elements for a successful Study process appear to be in place for the York River."

For the past four years, residents of the towns of York, Eliot, and Kittery have been meeting, discussing, and exploring the concept of the National Park Service's Wild and Scenic Partnership Program and what it could mean for the York River watershed. After extensive public meetings with a variety of residents and special interest groups, we have determined that the Partnership Program may be a very good fit for the York River, whose many tributaries flow through the three towns. We would very much like to receive funding through the Park Service to conduct the comprehensive 3-year study to help make this determination.

We have broad support: The boards of selectmen in all three towns voted to support the National Park Service paid study. In addition, many civic groups and individuals—including a regional Chamber of Commerce, several local businesses, the local shellfish commission and two local historic preservation organizations—have endorsed the concept of the study. In all, thirty-one organizations and individuals have written letters of support for the York River Study Bill.

This is a wonderful opportunity for residents of York, Kittery, and Eliot to gather important information on the York River and to explore its eligibility for the Wild and Scenic Rivers Partnership Program. And just as importantly, to explore whether the Wild and Scenic Partnership is appropriate for the river and our three communities.

We urge you to pass Senate bill 1520 so we can begin on this path of discovery.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this important legislation.

STATEMENTS OF MARTHA RAYMOND, NATIONAL COORDINATOR FOR HERITAGE AREAS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The National Park Service (NPS) received the statement of national importance for the proposed Maritime Washington National Maritime Heritage Area. Thank you for preparing the statement as a supplement to the Washington State National Maritime Heritage Area Feasibility Study.

While it is not our role to offer a recommendation regarding National Heritage Area designation until the NPS is asked to provide testimony on a pending bill before Congress, we have reviewed the feasibility study, statement of importance and boundary description per the interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines. The study met criteria 2-10 and the statement met criterion 1 by explaining why the heritage area is nationally important, linking the nationally important story to an assemblage of resources, and explained the heritage area boundary in relation to the assemblage of resources. Together, these documents have addressed and met all ten interim feasibility study criteria.

We recognize that a lot of hard work went into the preparation of these documents. We wish you success as you work towards designation and building an organization and partnership that can coordinate heritage area activities. If you would like further guidance, please do not hesitate to contact Gretchen Luxenberg of the Pacific West Regional Office, at 206-220-4138, or Martha Raymond, National Coordinator for Heritage Areas, at 202-354-2222.

ADDENDUM TO THE MOUNTAINS TO SOUND GREENWAY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA FEASIBILITY STUDY

The National Park Service (NPS) received the Addendum to the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area Feasibility Study, May 27, 2014. Thank you for revising the Addendum in accordance with our guidance memo dated May 6, 2014 to include a statement of national importance, themes, associated resources, traditions, customs, beliefs and folklife, and a boundary justification.

While it is not our role to offer a recommendation regarding National Heritage Area designation until the NPS is asked to provide testimony on a bill before Congress, we have reviewed the Addendum in accordance with the interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines. Based upon our review, conducted with the National Heritage Area Coordinator for the Pacific West Region, we find that the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area Feasibility Study (March 2012) and Addendum (May 6, 2014) meet all feasibility study assessment criteria.

The May 6, 2014 Addendum specifically meets criteria 1, 2, 5, and 9 by (1) establishing that the proposed Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area is nationally important for its association with the expansion of our national transportation system and the creation of our modem timber industry; (2) identifying three themes associated with the region's national importance and a strategic assemblage of 48 national important historic resources and 12 natural resources; (3) demonstrating that there are ongoing traditions, customs, beliefs, and folklife that are a valuable part of the region's national importance; and (4) justifying the proposed boundary in relation to the strategic assemblage of resources and opportunities for conservation, recreation and education, as well as public interest in national heritage area designation.

Congratulations! We recognize the hard work that went into the reassessment of and revisions to sections of the Addendum. It has been a pleasure working with Doug Schindler, Elizabeth Lumley, and Ben Hughey on your staff, as well as meeting Board President, Bill Chapman and Executive Committee Member, Janet Ray.

We wish you success as you work towards designation and building interest in the national importance and historic resources of the proposed Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area. If you would like further information about the review process, please contact me at (202) 3542222. For technical assistance related to heritage projects or preparations of management planning, please contact Linda Stonier, Heritage Area Coordinator for the Pacific West Region, at 415-623-2322.

STATEMENT OF JOE TAYLOR, PRESIDENT/CEO, QUAD CITIES CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU, MOLINE, IL, ON S. 2346

The Quad Cities Convention and Visitors Bureau promotes tourism for Davenport/Bettendorf, Iowa and Rock Island/Moline, Illinois and supports S. 2346 to create a new category of discovery trail for the National Trails System and to designate the American Discovery Trail as the first trail of this kind.

The ADT runs coast to coast from California to Delaware and passes through the Quad Cities as it goes across Iowa and Illinois. The Quad Cities has an extensive local trails system that already connects to the ADT route and would increase tourism to the Quad Cities as the trail becomes the equivalent of the interstate highway system for bicyclists.

The Quad Cities Bicycle Club, Bi-State Regional Commission, Rock Island County, the City of Rock Island, the City of Moline, the Village of Carbon Cliff, Henry County and the Henry County Economic Development Partnership all have endorsed the ADT and its addition to the national trail system.

The bureau and its partners encourage passage of S. 2346 to advance trail development for the nation.

STATEMENT OF RALPH "TERRY" SCANGA, JR., GENERAL MANAGER, UPPER ARKANSAS WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT, SALIDA, CO

Dear Senator Udall;

As you are aware the Upper Arkansas Water Conservancy District negotiated particular language to be included in the authorizing legislation in order to provide protection of water rights in the Browns Canyon area as well as future water rights development in the Arkansas River. The purpose of this letter is to summarize those protections.

The protections include language that precludes the Federal Government from imposing a reservation for water rights within the proposed National Monument or the Wilderness areas and interferring with the exercise of existing water rights within that area. Further the Arkansas River, no matter at what level, is excluded including the waters of the river.

Also of significant note is that the included area does not encompass areas where existing water right diversions are located and therefore will not interfere with the operation and maintenance of those structures that appropriate water from the Arkansas River.

I appreciate you and your staff taking the tune and effort to respond to our concerns in the protection of the water resources of the Upper Arkansas Basin.

STATEMENT OF KEN ROSEVEAR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, YUMA COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, YUMA, AZ

Dear Senator McCain:

On behalf of the Yuma County Chamber's 850 members, I am writing to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area. Since its inception in 2000, the Heritage Area has had an enormously positive impact on the economy and landscape of Yuma. In particular, it was the driving force to reclaim and revitalize seven miles of riverfront along the Lower Colorado River. It led the effort to save Yuma's state historic parks when Arizona State Parks had scheduled their closure due to state budget cuts in 2010. It has leveraged a small federal investment of National Park Service funds into a total public and private investment on the riverfront of more than $100 million.

You will hear from some in Washington "think-tanks" (but not in Yuma) about certain as yet unspecified "threats of private property rights". I cannot speak for all Heritage Areas, but here in Yuma, the Heritage Area has not only scrupulously respected private property rights but has also encouraged and facilitated significant private investment along the riverfront.

The loss of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area would be a terrible setback for our community, just as we attempt to recover from the deep national recession. We thank you for having spearheaded the original designation, and request that you help us preserve and maintain the progress our community has made over the last 13 years.

STATEMENT OF GREGORY S. FERGUSON, CHAIRMAN, YUMA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, YUMA, AZ

Dear Senator McCain:

On behalf of Yuma County, I want to add my support for the reauthorization of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area through 2030. We are particularly appreciative of the way the Heritage Area has worked in close partnership with so many sectors of our community. It has all been based on voluntary and cooperative

efforts with business, farmers, non-profit groups and government agencies. The changes along the Colorado River can only be described as amazing.

We need the Heritage Area to continue to manage the Yuma East Wetlands and the state historic parks, so that the riverfront continues to thrive. This is a really cost effective investment of National Park Service funds, which are being leveraged at a rate of 5:1.

We will follow up with a formal resolution from the Yuma County Board of Supervisors. We very much appreciate your continuing support for the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA WARE, CHAIRWOMAN, YUMA CROSSING NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, YUMA, AZ

I am writing to express my concern about the Heritage Foundation's continuing allegations that the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area (YCNHA) is some terrible threat to private property rights. It is simply not true.

Many years ago, there was some misunderstanding within our community about this issue. i am a landowner who was included within the original boundary designation of the YCNHA. As a Farm Bureau member, I was appointed to represent the Farm Bureau at YCNHA Board meetings. The Farm Bureau and YCNHA worked closely together to resolve any outstanding issues. I attended every meeting until the boundaries were amended by Congress through H.R. 326 on October 11. 2005. No one else from these other groups doing all the complaining ever attended a single meeting. They were, however, kept informed of all meetings and actions.

Part of the resolution between the Farm Bureau and the YCNHA was to bring people like myself who are original homesteaders and farmers in this community onto the Board. I became a board member in 2005, and now serve as the Chairwoman of the Board of Directors.

My wish is that the individuals "stuck in the mud" on this particular part of YCNHA's history take time to ask people such as myself who were involved directly. Please stop "harping" on self serving half truths and look to the actual events. Please feel free to contact me at patwarefarms@yahoo.com, and I will provide any information you request to support the truth on this matter.

Ask anyone in Yuma about the Heritage Area, and you will find very strong support for the efforts to reclaim our riverfront on the Colorado River. We have built two riverfront parks, seven miles of multi-use trails, restored 400 acres of wetlands, and spurred over $30 million of private investment in the downtown riverfront. Our most recent effort was to save two state historic parks from closing and to take over their operations by raising $70,000 in community donations in a 60 day period. This has all been done on a strictly voluntary and collaborative basis.

I will not speak for all National Heritage Areas, but you have the Yuma Crossing all wrong. Perhaps getting out of Washington, DC and actually seeing what is going on would do the Heritage Foundation some good. I invite you or your staff to come to Yuma and find out the facts. Until then, I ask that the Heritage Foundation stop with the groundless allegations.

Private property rights are the fundamental basis of our way of life (farming). However, so is the truth. What you keep dredging up and re-circulating is not the truth. Please give this letter your consideration and know all the facts stated are true and documented.

I ask you to please move on from this tedious, untrue, and ongoing criticism of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, and instead focus on other subjects that are more current and warrant your concern.

○