

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCES STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE, CONCERNING S. 1897, A BILL TO REVISE THE BOUNDARIES OF GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK TO INCLUDE THE GETTYSBURG TRAIN STATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.**

**June 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1897, a bill to add the historic Lincoln Train Station in the Borough of Gettysburg and 45 acres at the base of Big Round Top to Gettysburg National Military Park in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Department supports enactment of this legislation with a technical amendment.

Gettysburg National Military Park protects major portions of the site of the largest battle waged during this nation's Civil War. Fought in the first three days of July 1863, the Battle of Gettysburg resulted in a victory for Union forces and successfully ended the second invasion of the North by Confederate forces commanded by General Robert E. Lee. Historians have referred to the battle as a major turning point in the war - the "High Water Mark of the Confederacy." It was also the Civil War's bloodiest single battle, resulting in over 51,000 soldiers killed, wounded, captured or missing.

The Soldiers' National Cemetery within the park was dedicated on November 19, 1863, when President Abraham Lincoln delivered his immortal Gettysburg Address. The cemetery contains more than 7,000 interments including over 3,500 from the Civil War. The park currently includes nearly 6,000 acres, with 26 miles of park roads and over 1,400 monuments, markers, and memorials.

Gettysburg's Lincoln Train Station was built in 1858 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The station served as a hospital during the Battle of Gettysburg, and the wounded and the dead were transported from Gettysburg through this station in the aftermath of battle. President Abraham Lincoln arrived at this station when he visited to give the Gettysburg Address.

Gettysburg National Military Park's 1999 General Management Plan called for expanding cooperative relationships and partnerships with the Borough of Gettysburg and other sites "to ensure that resources closely linked to the park, the battle, and the non-combatant civilian involvement in the battle and its aftermath are appropriately protected and used." In particular, the plan stated that the National Park Service would initiate "cooperation agreements with willing owners, and seek the assistance of the Borough of Gettysburg and other appropriate entities to preserve, operate and manage the Wills House and Lincoln Train Station."

The Borough of Gettysburg Interpretive Plan called for the Lincoln Train Station to be used as a downtown information and orientation center for visitors – where all park visitors would arrive after coming downtown – to receive information and orientation to downtown historic

attractions, including the David Wills House. This is the house where Lincoln stayed the night before delivering the Gettysburg Address. The Interpretive Plan also called for rehabilitation of the Wills House, which was added to the park's boundary through Public Law 106-290 in October 2000, and is now a historic house museum in the borough and an official site within Gettysburg National Military Park. Through a Memorandum of Understanding, the David Wills House is operated by the Gettysburg Foundation in conjunction with the National Park Service.

The Lincoln Train Station is next to the downtown terminus of Freedom Transit, Gettysburg's shuttle system, which started operations in July 2009 with a grant from the Federal Transit Administration in the Department of Transportation.

In 2006, the Borough of Gettysburg completed rehabilitation of the Lincoln Train Station with funds from a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania grant. Due to a lack of funds, however, the borough has been unable to operate a visitor information and orientation center there. Through formal vote of the Borough Council, the Borough of Gettysburg has asked the National Park Service to take over the ownership and operations of the train station. The anticipated acquisition cost for the completely rehabilitated train station is approximately \$772,000, subject to an appraisal by the federal government. It is expected that funding to acquire this land would not come from federal appropriations but would be provided by non-governmental entities.

The park has a preliminary commitment from the Gettysburg Convention and Visitor Bureau (CVB) to provide all staffing requirements for operations of an information and orientation center in the train station, thereby alleviating the park of staff costs. Anticipated operating costs for the train station that will be the responsibility of the NPS are limited to utility costs, with the rest being paid by the Gettysburg CVB. In the event that the Gettysburg CVB is unable to provide staffing and funding for operations, the NPS would seek another park partner to cover these costs and requirements.

This legislation would also add 45 acres near Big Round Top along Plum Run in Cumberland Township, Pennsylvania, to the boundary of the park. The 45-acre tract of land is adjacent to the Gettysburg National Military Park and is within the Battlefield Historic District. The land is at the southern base of Big Round Top at the southern end of the Gettysburg battlefield. There were cavalry skirmishers in this area during the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1863, but the real significance is environmental. The tract has critical wetlands and wildlife habitat related to Plum Run. Wayne and Susan Hill donated it to the Gettysburg Foundation in April 2009. The Gettysburg Foundation plans to donate fee title interest in the parcel to the National Park Service once it is within the park boundary. It abuts land already owned by the National Park Service.

The maps referenced on page two of the legislation have been updated and are being submitted for the record. Our technical amendment is to update the map reference to reflect a date of "January 2010" for both maps.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony. I would be pleased to answer any questions you or members of the committee may have regarding the Department's position on S.1897.

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCE STERWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 2158, A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE FOX-WISCONSIN HERITAGE PARKWAY AS A NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.**

**June 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 2158, a bill to establish the Fox-Wisconsin Heritage Parkway National Heritage Area, and for other purposes.

The Department recommends that the committee defer action on S. 2158. The National Park Service (NPS) has made a preliminary finding that the feasibility study, conducted by the Fox-Wisconsin Heritage Parkway, does not demonstrate that the proposed area meets the Service's national heritage area study interim criteria. The NPS anticipates completing its final review of the study within one month.

In addition, the Department recommends deferring action on S. 2158 until program legislation is enacted that establishes criteria to evaluate potentially qualified national heritage areas and a process for the designation and administration of these areas. There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

S. 2158 would establish the Fox-Wisconsin Heritage Parkway National Heritage Area (NHA), with the Fox-Wisconsin Heritage Parkway, a non-profit organization, as the local coordinating entity. The legislation includes standard language for national heritage area designation bills regarding the proposed area's administration, management plan, and funding. The proposed Fox-Wisconsin Heritage Parkway NHA runs through parts of 15 counties throughout Wisconsin and marks the path of Father Jacques Marquette's and Louis Joliet's exploration from the Great Lakes, through Wisconsin, to the Mississippi River, in 1673. Their voyage eventually led to the establishment of European settlements in the Mississippi River corridor. The proposed Fox-Wisconsin Heritage Parkway NHA includes approximately 1,400 square miles of land in central and southeastern Wisconsin, including Brown, Calumet, Columbia, Crawford, Dane, Fond du Lac, Grant, Green Lake, Iowa, Marquette, Outagamie, Richland, Sauk, Waushara, and Winnebago counties.

Prior to beginning any effort to designate an area as a national heritage area, the National Park Service recommends that interested community members or organizations undertake a feasibility study to assess several factors, including: whether the landscape has an assemblage of natural, cultural, historic and scenic resources that, when linked together, tell a nationally important

story; whether an organization exists with the financial and organizational capacity to coordinate heritage area activities; and, whether the level of support for designation exists within the region.

The Fox-Wisconsin Heritage Parkway organization prepared a feasibility study in 2010. It did a great deal of research and planning, and conducted extensive civic engagement activities across the area which involved numerous organizations, agencies, businesses, and individuals in discussions about the potential heritage area. Although the National Park Service considers a strong level of community support and a solid organizational framework to be important ingredients for a successful heritage area, the primary consideration for the NPS is whether a proposed area contains an assemblage of natural, cultural, historic and scenic resources that, when linked together, tell a nationally important story. The preliminary finding of the NPS is that the proposed area does not meet this criteria.

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

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE, CONCERNING S. 2229, TO AUTHORIZE THE ISSUANCE OF RIGHT-OF-WAY PERMITS FOR NATURAL GAS PIPELINES IN GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.**

**June 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2229, a bill to authorize the issuance of right-of-way permits for natural gas pipelines in Glacier National Park, and for other purposes.

The Department supports S. 2229 with amendments. The Department testified in support of H.R. 4606, an identical bill, before the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands on June 8, 2012. S. 2229 would provide authority for the National Park Service to grant a right-of-way permit for any natural gas pipeline that is located within Glacier National Park as of March 1, 2012, subject to certain conditions.

Currently, there is only one natural gas pipeline that runs through Glacier National Park. It was built in 1962 with the permission of the park superintendent, who may not have known that there was no authority to issue a permit for a gas pipeline. The pipeline passes within the park boundary for approximately 3.5 miles in the right-of-way for U.S. Highway 2. The line is near the southwestern boundary of the park, and in close proximity both to the Middle Fork of the Flathead River, which is designated as a Wild and Scenic River, and the Great Bear Wilderness, managed by the U.S. Forest Service as part of the Flathead National Forest. The pipeline provides natural gas to Kalispell, Montana, and the Flathead Valley, as well as to some park facilities. In 1990, a renewal of the permit was requested. The superintendent at the time recognized that he did not have the proper authority to permit this pipeline. NorthWestern Energy, which owns and operates this pipeline, recently sought a legislative solution to provide the necessary authority.

In 2008, the Flathead National Forest received a request from NorthWestern Energy to place another gas line alongside the existing pipeline (a practice known as twinning). That new line would also pass through Glacier National Park. NorthWestern Energy recently advised the National Park Service that it does not plan to take action on this proposal. However, if this proposal is revived at some point in the future, we would be concerned about potential impacts to park resources including the viewshed along US Highway 2, the Wild and Scenic River Corridor, recommended wilderness, and vegetation. We are, therefore, supportive of limiting permitting authority to the existing natural gas pipeline, as provided for in the legislation.

We recommend amending the legislation in two ways. First, S. 2229 would allow the permitting of a 100-foot right-of-way (50 feet on either side of centerline of the pipeline) through the park. We recommend allowing the width of the proposed right-of-way to be determined cooperatively

by the National Park Service and NorthWestern Energy, and described in a permit issued subsequent to the legislation, rather than codified in the legislation itself. This approach would be consistent with legislation passed in 2002 for existing and new natural gas transmission lines in Great Smoky Mountains National Park and in 2005 natural gas pipeline legislation for Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. And second, we recommend amending the bill to provide consistency with laws (including regulations) and policies applicable to rights-of-way for natural gas pipelines within units of the National Park System by deleting the reference to 16 U.S.C. 5, because that law addresses utility rights-of-way for other types of utilities than natural gas pipelines. We would be happy to provide the Committee with suggested language for these amendments.

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

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCES STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 2267, A BILL TO REAUTHORIZE THE HUDSON RIVER VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.**

**June 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2267, a bill to reauthorize the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area (NHA).

The Department recognizes the important work of the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area to preserve heritage resources in Hudson River Valley between Yonkers and Troy, New York. We recommend that S. 2267 be amended to authorize an extension for heritage area program funding until we have completed an Evaluation and Report on the accomplishments of the area and the future role of the National Park Service; and until heritage area program legislation is enacted that standardizes timeframes and funding for designated national heritage areas. Consistent with congressional directives in the FY 2009 and FY 2010 Interior Appropriations Acts, the Administration proposed in the FY 2013 Budget focusing most national heritage area grants on recently authorized areas and reducing and/or phasing out funds to well-established recipients to encourage self-sufficiency. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that Congress enact national heritage 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. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

S. 2267, as introduced, would extend the authorization of federal funding for Hudson River Valley for an additional 10 years.

The Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area was established in 1996 by Public Law 104-333. The heritage area includes 250 communities in ten counties bordering the Hudson River for 154 miles of tidal estuary. This includes three million acres of the Hudson Highlands, the Catskill Mountains, rolling farmland and compact villages, as well as small cities and hamlets. The region extends from the confluence of the Mohawk and Hudson Rivers, south to the northern border of New York City.

The mission of this national heritage area is to recognize, preserve and promote the natural and cultural resources of the Hudson River Valley. This is accomplished through a voluntary

partnership with communities and citizens, and local, state and federal agencies emphasizing public access, economic development, regional planning and interpretive programs.

Public Law 104-333 designated the Hudson River Valley Greenway Communities Council and the Greenway Heritage Conservancy, Inc. as the local coordinating entities for the NHA. The heritage area management entities facilitate public private partnerships for the preservation of heritage resources and work closely with National Park Service (NPS) staff at Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites. The heritage area's work focuses on regional initiatives for heritage programming, interpretation, and education, preservation and resource stewardship, heritage development and infrastructure, and planning and design.

During its 15 years of existence, the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area has a significant record of achievement. It has taken the lead on initiatives such as *Heritage Weekend* which gives visitors the opportunity to discover – or rediscover—many historic, architectural and natural treasures in the state. The heritage area staff has worked tirelessly to connect sites and schools together to create place-based curriculum that can be replicated and used by others through a website that provides academic resources regarding the heritage and culture of the Hudson River Valley. The staff has facilitated the creation of region-wide “shows” focusing on the NHA's nature and culture sub-themes, printed map and guides, and advanced a graphic identity at partner sites. They continue to help communities and trail groups establish a system of trails that link cultural and historic sites, parks, open spaces, and community centers as well as providing public access to the Hudson River.

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 heritage area instead of reauthorizing the heritage area. While the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area faces a sunset for its Federal funding, its National Heritage Area designation will not sunset.

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

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE, CONCERNING S. 2272, TO DESIGNATE A MOUNTAIN IN THE STATE OF ALASKA AS MOUNT DENALI.**

**JUNE 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 2272, a bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount Denali.

The National Park Service appreciates the long history and public interest for both the name Mount McKinley and the traditional Athabascan name, Denali. The Department respects the choice made by this legislation, and does not object to S. 2272.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE, CONCERNING S. 2273, TO DESIGNATE THE TALKEETNA RANGER STATION IN TALKEETNA, ALASKA AS THE WALTER HARPER TALKEETNA RANGER STATION.**

**JUNE 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to testify on S. 2273, which would designate the Talkeetna Ranger Station in Talkeetna, Alaska, as the Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station.

As the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 1913 summit climb of Walter Harper approaches, the National Park Service has no objection to S. 2273, which would name the Denali National Park and Preserve's South District Ranger Station in Talkeetna, Alaska, as the Walter Harper Talkeetna Ranger Station.

Mr. Harper grew up in Alaska, a child of Arthur Harper, a Scottish trader and prospector, and Jennie Harper, an Athabascan Indian from the Koyukuk region. As a young man, he served as an interpreter and guide for the far-flung ministry of Hudson Stuck, an Episcopal archdeacon.

He joined Stuck on an arduous trip in 1913 to reach the summit of North America's highest peak. For nearly three months, the group moved slowly south from Fairbanks and into the high mountains of the Alaska Range. On June 7, 1913, Walter Harper, 21, became the first man to set foot on the summit of Denali, the Athabascan name for the peak, meaning the High One. The archdeacon's journal described their approach: "With keen excitement we pushed on. Walter, who had been in the lead all day, was the first to scramble up; a Native Alaskan, he is the first human being to set foot upon the top of Alaska's greatest mountain, and he had well earned the honor."

Since 1913, thousands of climbers have aimed for the summit. Unlike Mr. Harper, today the vast majority begin their expeditions with an airplane ride out of Talkeetna on the south side of the Alaska Range. The National Park Service ranger station there serves as an orientation center for climbers and other visitors to the Denali region. The community is proud of its varied history as a railroad town, a jumping off point for miners, and in the past several decades as the take-off point for climbing expeditions.

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

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 2286, TO AMEND THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN SEGMENTS OF THE FARMINGTON RIVER AND SALMON BROOK IN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT AS COMPONENTS OF THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.**

**June 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee today to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2286, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of the Farmington River and Salmon Brook in the State of Connecticut as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

The Department has preliminarily concluded through the National Park Service's draft study of the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook that the segments proposed for designation under this bill are eligible for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. However, we recommend that the committee defer action on S. 2286 until the study is completed, which is consistent with the Department's general policy on legislation designating additions to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System when a study of the subject is pending.

S. 2286 would designate 35.3 miles of the Farmington River and the entire 26.4 miles of its major tributary, Salmon Brook, as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior. The segments would be managed in accordance with the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Management Plan (June 2011) with the Secretary coordinating administration and management with a locally based management committee, as specified in the plan. The bill would authorize the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Connecticut, the adjoining communities, and appropriate local planning and environmental organizations. S. 2286 would also make an adjustment to the upper Farmington Wild and Scenic River, which was designated in 1994, by adding 1.1 miles to the lower end of that 14-mile designation.

S. 2286 would complete the wild and scenic river designation of the Farmington River in Connecticut by designating all of the mainstem Farmington River segments found to meet the criteria of eligibility and suitability. At the same time, S. 2286 would provide for the continued operation of one existing hydroelectric facility – Rainbow Dam in Windsor – and allow for potential hydroelectric development of existing dams in the Collinsville stretch of the river, which is currently the subject of an active Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensing proceeding sponsored by the Town of Canton.

P.L. 109-370, the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Study Act of 2005, authorized the study of the segments proposed for designation in S. 2286. The National Park Service conducted the study in close cooperation with the adjoining communities, the State of Connecticut, the Farmington River Watershed Association, the Stanley Black & Decker Corporation (owner of Rainbow Dam) and other interested local parties. 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 any recommendation 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.

Technical assistance provided as a part of the study made possible the development of the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook Management Plan (June 2011). This plan is based primarily around local partner actions designed to guide the management of the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook with or without a National Wild and Scenic River designation.

While the study has not been finalized, it has preliminarily concluded that the proposed segments of the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook are eligible and suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System because of their free-flowing nature and outstandingly remarkable geology, water quality, biological diversity, cultural landscape, recreation values and local authority to protect and enhance these values. These findings substantiate the widely held view of the Farmington River as Connecticut's premier free-flowing river resource for a diversity of natural and cultural values, including one of New England's most significant whitewater boating runs, regionally unique freshwater mussel populations, and outstanding examples of archaeological and historical sites and districts spanning Native American, colonial and early manufacturing periods. Salmon Brook is, in its own right, highly significant for outstanding water quality, significant cold water fishery, and Atlantic salmon restoration potential.

If S. 2286 is enacted, the Lower Farmington River and Salmon Brook would be administered as a partnership wild and scenic river, similar to several other designations in the Northeast, including the upper Farmington River and the Eightmile River in Connecticut. This approach emphasizes local and state management solutions, and has proven effective as a means of protecting outstandingly remarkable natural, cultural and recreational resource values without the need for direct federal management or land acquisition.

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

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCES STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES REGARDING S. 2316, A BILL TO DESIGNATE THE SALT POND VISITOR CENTER AT CAPE COD NATIONAL SEASHORE AS THE “THOMAS P. O’NEILL, JR. SALT POND VISITOR CENTER”, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

**JUNE 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2316, a bill to designate the Salt Pond Visitor Center at Cape Cod National Seashore as the “Thomas P. O’Neill, Jr. Salt Pond Visitor Center”, and for other purposes.

The Department supports enactment of S. 2316.

S. 2316 would recognize the contributions that former Speaker Thomas (Tip) P. O’Neill, Jr. made toward the protection of the Cape Cod National Seashore by naming the Salt Pond Visitor Center after him. In 1958, Representative Tip O’Neill became one of the first members to support protection of lands on Cape Cod as a national seashore through introduction of legislation in the 85th Congress. This important legislation proposed establishing a 40-mile long national park so every American had the ability to enjoy the marshes, ponds, and wildlife, and pristine sandy beach of Cape Cod.

Representative O’Neill continued these efforts by cosponsoring bills in the 86<sup>th</sup> and 87<sup>th</sup> Congress, testifying at hearings, and advocating for support of the legislation that led to Public Law 87-126, which established Cape Cod National Seashore when it was signed into law by

President John F. Kennedy on August 7, 1961. Tip O'Neill publicly acknowledged that the legislation to establish the national seashore was a group effort and praised the commitment and the contributions of Rep. Edward Boland, Rep. James Burke, Rep. Hastings Keith and President Kennedy.

The national seashore was formally established in 1966 and Representative O'Neill attended the May 30, 1966 dedication of the Salt Pond Visitor Center. Tip O'Neill, Jr. and his family maintained a home in Harwich Port, on Cape Cod and he was a frequent visitor to the national seashore during his tenure in Congress and during his retirement years.

While the *National Park Service Management Policies 2006* state that the National Park Service will discourage and curtail the use and proliferation of commemorative works, there are two exceptions. One is when Congress specifically authorizes an exception and the other is when there is a compelling justification for the recognition, there is a strong association between the park and the person being commemorated, and at least five years have elapsed since the death of the person.

Tip O'Neill's more than fifty-year commitment to public service, including 34 years as a Member of Congress has made him an honored and esteemed friend to the mission of the National Park Service in preserving and protecting our nation's natural, historic, and cultural resources. We believe this legislation is an appropriate way to recognize Thomas P. O'Neill's role in protecting the national parks of Massachusetts and his relationship to Cape Cod National Seashore.

Mr. Chairman this concludes my statement and I will be happy to answer any questions that members of the committee may have.

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 2372, TO AUTHORIZE PEDESTRIAN AND MOTORIZED VEHICULAR ACCESS IN CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

**June 27, 2012**

---

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. 2372, a bill entitled "to authorize pedestrian and motorized vehicular access in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, and for other purposes."

The Department strongly opposes S. 2372. This bill would reinstate the 2007 Interim Protected Species Management Strategy (Interim Strategy) governing off-road vehicle (ORV) use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore (Seashore). In response to a lawsuit challenging its adequacy, the Interim Strategy was modified by a court-approved Consent Decree on April 30, 2008. The Seashore was managed under the Consent Decree through 2011. Meanwhile, the final ORV Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and special regulation went into effect on February 15, 2012.

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

The final ORV management plan for the first time provides long-term guidance for the management of ORV use and the protection of affected wildlife species at the Seashore. The plan is designed to not only provide diverse visitor experience opportunities, manage ORV use in a manner appropriate to a unit of the National Park System, and provide a science-based approach to the conservation of protected wildlife species, but also to adapt to changing conditions over the life-span of the plan. It includes a five-year periodic review process that will enable the NPS to systematically evaluate the plan's effectiveness and make any necessary changes.

The Seashore's dynamic coastal processes create important habitats, including breeding sites for many species of beach-nesting birds, among them the federally listed threatened piping plover, the state-listed threatened gull-billed tern, and a number of species of concern including the common tern, least tern, black skimmer, and the American oystercatcher. All of these species experienced declines in breeding population at Cape Hatteras over the 10-20 years prior to the implementation of the Consent Decree in 2008. For example, in 1989 the Seashore had 15 breeding pairs of piping plovers; and by 2001-2005, that number had dropped to only 2-3 pairs

attempting to nest each year. The numbers of colonial waterbird nests within the Seashore also plummeted from 1,204 nests in 1999 to 320 nests in 2007.

Under the National Park Service Organic Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Seashore's enabling act, and National Park Service (NPS) regulations and policies, the NPS has an affirmative responsibility to conserve and protect all of these species, as well as the other resources and values of the Seashore. Executive Order 11644 (1972), amended by Executive Order 11989 (1977), requires the NPS to issue regulations to designate specific trails and areas for ORV use based upon resource protection, visitor safety, and minimization of conflicts among uses of agency lands. The regulation that the NPS subsequently promulgated (36 C.F.R. § 4.10) requires the NPS to designate any routes or areas for ORV use by special regulation and in compliance with Executive Order 11644.

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

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

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

Although breeding success depends on a number of factors, with the measures in place under the Consent Decree, there has been a striking improvement in the condition of protected beach-nesting wildlife species. The Seashore has experienced a record number of piping plover pairs and fledged chicks, American oystercatcher fledged chicks, least tern nests, and improved

nesting results for other species of colonial waterbirds. The number of sea turtle nests also significantly increased, from an annual average of 77.3 between 2000-2007 to an average of 129 between 2008-2011. These improvements occurred even though many miles of beach remained open, unaffected by species protection measures, and Seashore visitation numbers remained stable.

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

Because the number of nesting birds has increased significantly since 2007, if the Interim Strategy were to be reinstated, it could be counterproductive to visitor access. Many popular destinations, such as Cape Point and the inlet spits, would still experience resource protection closures, particularly when highly mobile piping plover and American oystercatcher chicks are present. Several of the beach-nesting bird species at the Seashore may renest several times during the same season if eggs or very young chicks are lost. Under the Consent Decree, with its science-based buffers, there has been a noticeable reduction in the number of renesting attempts for piping plovers and American oystercatchers, which means the duration of closures is typically shorter. No matter which management approach is in effect, the birds will continue to attempt to nest at these sites, even if resource protection is inadequate, because that is where the most suitable habitat is located. The Interim Strategy would allow a higher level of human disturbance in proximity to nests and chicks at these key sites, which increases the chances that nests and young chicks will be lost, which in turn increases the likelihood that birds will renest one or more time at those sites. This could extend the length of time that any particular site would be closed due to breeding activity, even if the apparent size of the closure is smaller than that under the ORV plan or Consent Decree.

In addition to reinstating the Interim Strategy, S. 2372 provides authority for additional restrictions only for species listed as “endangered” under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and only for the shortest possible time and on the smallest possible portions of the Seashore. This would conflict with numerous other laws and mandates including the National Park Service Organic Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Seashore’s enabling act, the aforementioned Executive Orders, and NPS regulations implementing these laws, which provide for the protection of other migratory bird species and other park resources.

S. 2372 also provides that the protection of endangered species at Cape Hatteras shall not be greater than the restrictions in effect for that species at any other national seashore. Species protection measures cannot reasonably be compared from seashore to seashore without considering the specific circumstances at each site and the context provided by the number and variety of protected species involved, the levels of ORV use, and the underlying restrictions provided by the respective ORV management plans and special regulations. Even though Cape Hatteras has a wider variety of beach nesting wildlife species than Cape Cod or Assateague, for

example, its plan actually allows for a much higher level of ORV use on larger portions of the Seashore. It would be neither reasonable nor biologically sound for Cape Hatteras to use less protective measures if they were designed for a location where the level of ORV use is much lower to begin with. Nor does it appear that such an arbitrary approach could possibly comply with the “peer-reviewed science” requirement imposed elsewhere in the bill. The Cape Hatteras plan was specifically designed to be effective for the circumstances at Cape Hatteras.

The bill would require, to the maximum extent possible, that pedestrian and vehicle access corridors be provided around closures implemented to protect wildlife nesting areas. This concept was thoroughly considered during the preparation of the plan and EIS. The plan already allows for such access corridors when not in conflict with species protection measures. But because of the Seashore’s typically narrow beaches, and the concentrations of nests at the best available habitat near the inlets and Cape Point, nesting areas are often close to the shoreline, and access corridors cannot always be allowed without defeating the fundamental purpose of such closures, which is to protect beach-nesting wildlife. Several species of shorebirds that nest at the Seashore have highly mobile chicks, which can move considerable distances from nests to foraging sites. Inadequate resource closures in the past have resulted in documented cases of human-caused loss or abandonment of nests and chick fatalities. Corridors that cut through a resource closure area would essentially undermine the function of the closure and render it compromised or even useless.

Finally, the final ORV management plan/EIS and special regulation, are the products of an intensive five-year long planning process that included a high level of public participation through both the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and negotiated rulemaking, including four rounds of public comment opportunities. The NPS received more than 15,000 individual comments on the draft plan/EIS and more than 21,000 individual comments on the proposed special regulation. In completing the final ORV management plan/EIS and special regulation, the NPS considered all comments, weighed competing interests and ensured compliance with all applicable laws.

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

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE, CONCERNING S. 2324, TO AMEND THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ACT TO DESIGNATE A SEGMENT OF THE NECHES RIVER IN THE STATE OF TEXAS FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVER SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.**

**June 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2324, a bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Neches River in the State of Texas for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic River System, and for other purposes.

The Department supports S. 2324, with amendments. The river segment proposed for study exhibits the types of qualities and resource values that could make it a worthy and important candidate for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. However, we believe priority should be given to the 36 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.

This bill would designate a 225-mile segment of the main stem of the Neches River from the dam forming Lake Palestine in Anderson and Cherokee Counties, Texas, to the flood pool elevation of the B.A. Steinhagen Reservoir in Jasper and Tyler Counties, Texas, to be studied for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. This portion of the Neches River retains much of its wild character, and is mostly in a free-flowing state. The upper Neches River corridor contains exceptional wildlife habitat and its location in the heart of the Central Flyway makes it a crucial migratory pathway for ducks, geese, and songbirds. While portions of the river's bottomland hardwood forests have produced timber for decades, they are among the least disturbed in Texas. This section of the Neches River also provides vital habitat for fish and other aquatic animals and supports high-quality boating, fishing and a variety of outdoor recreational activities. Wild and Scenic River designation could support all these attributes.

While the segment of the river that is proposed for study flows through the Neches River National Wildlife Refuge, the Angelina and Davey Crockett National Forests, and State-managed lands, much of this segment of the river runs through private lands. If this portion of the Neches River were designated as a Wild and Scenic River, a comprehensive management plan would be needed and would be developed as part of the study. 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 any recommendation 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.

We believe there is strong local support for protecting the river system and for studying the river for potential inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Based on this local support and the presence of significant natural, cultural and recreational resources, the National Park Service believes that a Wild and Scenic River study conducted in close partnership with local communities and established partners is consistent with the purposes of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

We recommend amending the legislation by removing the provisions under Section 2 related to private property and recreation. It is premature to place restrictions on the ability of the National Park Service to administer the river before we have completed a study determining whether the river can meet the requirements for designation and before we have identified the types of preservation or management strategies that are necessary and appropriate to protect the river's resources. We would be happy to provide the Committee with suggested language for these amendments.

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

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE, CONCERNING S. 3078, A BILL TO DIRECT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO INSTALL IN THE AREA OF THE WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA A SUITABLE PLAQUE OR AN INSCRIPTION WITH THE WORDS THAT PRESIDENT FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT PRAYED WITH THE UNITED STATES ON JUNE 6, 1944, THE MORNING OF D-DAY.**

**June 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 3078, a bill which directs the Secretary of the Interior to install in the area of the World War II Memorial in the District of Columbia a suitable plaque or an inscription with the words that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt prayed with the United States on June 6, 1944, the morning of D-Day.

The Department appreciates the importance of faith in the lives of Americans across this country, the leadership of President Roosevelt, and the courage and sacrifices of Americans during World War II and today. The World War II Memorial recognizes a period of unprecedented national unity during the defining moment of the twentieth century, and is devoted to the service, commitment, and shared sacrifice of Americans.

The Department appreciates the efforts by the sponsor, Senator Rob Portman, to work with the National Park Service (NPS) on this legislation. S. 3078 proposes adding a commemorative work in the area of the existing World War II Memorial. We support the continued application of the Commemorative Works Act (CWA). Section 2 of this bill states that the Secretary of the Interior shall design, procure, prepare and install the plaque or inscription, thus allowing the NPS to determine the placement and design of the plaque. However, Section 3 of the bill requires a different method of designing and locating the memorial through the CWA. The CWA process incorporates important design reviews and public consultation. We support retaining the CWA as the vehicle for siting and designing this plaque.

The World War II Memorial was authorized on May 23, 1993, by Public Law 103-32. In 1994, Congress approved its placement in the area containing the National Mall in Public Law 103-422. Its location at the site of the Rainbow Pool was approved in 1995 by the NPS on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts (CFA), and the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC). In July 1997, the CFA and the NCPC reaffirmed prior approvals of the Rainbow Pool site in recognition of the significance of World War II as the single-most defining event of the 20th Century for Americans and the world. Even so, there were challenges to the establishment of this memorial. The design we see today was painstakingly arrived upon after years of public deliberations and spirited public debate.

The National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission (NCMAC) reviewed a proposal similar to the one before the Committee today at its meeting on September 14, 2011, and determined that no additional elements should be inserted into this carefully designed Memorial. The American Battle Monuments Commission (ABMC), charged by the Congress in Public Law 103-32 to design and build the World War II Memorial, is represented on the NCMAC, and thus concurred with that determination.

If directed by Congress pursuant to this legislation, the NPS will work to find an appropriate location for the plaque in accordance with the CWA process, as directed in Section 3 of this legislation.

That concludes our prepared testimony on S. 3078, and we would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

**STATEMENT OF HERBERT FROST, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP AND SCIENCE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES REGARDING S. 3300, A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE MANHATTAN PROJECT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK IN OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE, LOS ALAMOS, NEW MEXICO, AND HANFORD, WASHINGTON, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

**JUNE 27, 2012**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 3300, a bill to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Los Alamos, New Mexico, and Hanford, Washington, and for other purposes.

The Administration supports S. 3300. The development of the atomic bomb through the Manhattan Project was one of the most transformative events in our nation's history: it ushered in the atomic age, changed the role of the United States in the world community, and set the stage for the Cold War. This legislation would enable the National Park Service to work in partnership with Department of Energy to ensure the preservation of key resources associated with the Manhattan Project and to increase public awareness and understanding of this consequential effort.

S. 3300 would require the establishment of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park as a unit of the National Park System within one year of enactment, during which time the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy would enter into an agreement on the respective roles of the two departments. The unit would consist of one or more named resources located in Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, or Hanford. The National Historical Park would be established by the Secretary of the Interior by publication of a Federal Register notice within 30 days after the agreement is made between the two secretaries.

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

S. 3300 is based on the recommendations developed through the special resource study for the Manhattan Project Sites that was authorized by Congress in 2004 and transmitted to Congress in July 2011. The study, which was conducted by the National Park Service in consultation with the Department of Energy, determined that resources at Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Hanford, met the National Park Service's criteria of national significance, suitability, feasibility, and the

need for Federal management for designation as a unit of the National Park System. S. 3300 assigns the respective roles and responsibilities of the National Park Service and the Department of Energy as envisioned in the study: the National Park Service would use its expertise in the areas of interpretation and education to increase public awareness and understanding of the story, while the Department of Energy would maintain full responsibility for operations, maintenance, and preservation of historic Manhattan Project properties already under its jurisdiction, along with full responsibility for any environmental and safety hazards related to the properties.

Because the Department of Energy would maintain and operate the primary facilities associated with the Manhattan Project National Historical Park, the study estimated that the National Park Service's annual operation and maintenance costs for the three sites together would range from \$2.45 million to \$4 million. It also estimated that completing the General Management Plan for the park would cost an estimated \$750,000. Costs of acquiring lands or interests in land, or developing facilities, would be estimated during the development of the General Management Plan. The Department of Energy has not yet assessed fully the operational difficulties in terms of security and public health and safety, applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, and the potential new cost of national park designation at the sensitive national security and cleanup sites.

The Department anticipates that the initial agreement between the two departments likely would be fairly limited in scope, given the bill's one-year timeframe for executing an agreement that would enable the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Manhattan Project National Historical Park. We appreciate the language specifically providing for amendments to the agreement and a broad range of authorities for the Secretary of the Interior, as these provisions would give the National Park Service the flexibility to shape the park over time and to maximize the promotion of education and interpretation related to the park's purpose.

The flexibility is particularly important because managing a park with such complex resources, in partnership with another Federal agency, at three sites across the country, will likely bring unanticipated challenges. Fortunately, we have already begun a partnership with the Department of Energy regarding the Manhattan Project resources through our coordinated work on the study. If this legislation is enacted, we look forward to building a stronger partnership that will enable us to meet the challenges ahead.

While we support S. 3300, there are some areas where we would like to recommend amendments, and we are continuing to review the bill for any technical issues. We would be happy to work with the committee to develop the appropriate language and will provide our recommendations in the near future.

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