

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

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

S. 635

S. 1418

S. 715

H.R. 2330

S. 742

H.R. 2430

S. 1270

JULY 22, 2009



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

53-002 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2009

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

JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico, *Chairman*

BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota	LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
RON WYDEN, Oregon	RICHARD BURR, North Carolina
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	JOHN MCCAIN, Arizona
BLANCHE L. LINCOLN, Arkansas	ROBERT F. BENNETT, Utah
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont	JIM BUNNING, Kentucky
EVAN BAYH, Indiana	JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
MARK UDALL, Colorado	
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire	

ROBERT M. SIMON, *Staff Director*
SAM E. FOWLER, *Chief Counsel*
McKIE CAMPBELL, *Republican Staff Director*
KAREN K. BILLUPS, *Republican Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

MARK UDALL, Colorado *Chairman*

BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota	RICHARD BURR, North Carolina
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas
BLANCHE L. LINCOLN, Arkansas	JOHN MCCAIN, Arizona
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont	JIM BUNNING, Kentucky
EVAN BAYH, Indiana	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan	

JEFF BINGAMAN and LISA MURKOWSKI are Ex Officio Members of the Subcommittee

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Burr, Hon. Richard, U.S. Senator From North Carolina	3
Cantwell, Hon. Maria, U.S. Senator From Washington	3
Holtrop, Joel, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	13
Lindquist, Kirk L., Member, Michigan Lighthouse Project and Past President, Michigan Lighthouse Fund, Okemos, MI	30
Udall, Hon. Mark, U.S. Senator From Colorado	1
Walter, Greg, Jefferson State Financial Group, Cave Junction, OR	26
Wenk, Dan, Acting Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior	6
Wyden, Hon. Ron, U.S. Senator From Oregon	5

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to additional questions	41
---	----

APPENDIX II

Additional material submitted for the record	45
--	----

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

WEDNESDAY, JULY 22, 2009

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, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Mark Udall presiding.

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

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

Following up on last week's hearing, the Subcommittee on National Parks meets this afternoon to consider several bills. Although I understand a couple of the bills may require additional discussion and review, I believe most are noncontroversial.

The bills on today's agenda include: S. 635, which designates a segment of the Illabot Creek—I will let Senator Cantwell clarify my pronunciation—in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and scenic River System; S. 715, to establish a pilot program to provide for the preservation and rehabilitation of historic lighthouses; S. 742, to expand the boundary of the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site in the State of Georgia and to redesignate the site as a National Historical Park; S. 1270, to modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument; S. 1418 and H.R. 2330, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of establishing Camp Hale in Colorado as a unit of the National Park System; and H.R. 2430, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park and other National Park Service sites in Washington State.

I would like to take a minute to discuss the Camp Hale study bill, which I have sponsored, along with Senator Bennett. We also have the House-passed bill before us, which Congressman Lamborn has championed. Camp Hale, which is located in the mountains of central Colorado was a facility that trained a number of soldiers for combat in high alpine and mountainous conditions. Principally it was a training venue for the Army's 10th Mountain Division and other elements of the United States Armed Forces. The geography of the area was vital for winter and high altitude training with steep mountains surrounding a level valley suitable for housing and other facilities.

Between 1956 and 1965, the camp was also used by the Central Intelligence Agency as a secret center for training Tibetan refugees in guerilla warfare to resist the Chinese occupation of their mountainous country.

In July 1965, Camp Hale was deactivated and control of the lands was returned to the Forest Service in 1966.

Today the camp is part of the White River and San Isabel National Forest.

It is an important part of our Nation's proud national defense legacy and it deserves to be recognized and protected. The area's historical significance has already been recognized as Camp Hale was included in the National Register of Historic Places in 1992. But I think it is appropriate to conduct a study to assess whether the area should be incorporated into the National Park system. The people, understandably, who trained at Camp Hale are proud of their accomplishments and I am certainly proud to join Representative Lamborn and Senator Bennett in recognizing the historical significance of their work through this legislation.

Although the bill calls for the study to be conducted by the National Park Service, it is important to note that the lands are currently managed by the Forest Service. When we asked the agencies to comment on these bills, we inadvertently forgot to ask the Forest Service for its official comments on the bill. To remedy that, I will be sending a letter asking for the agency's official comments for the hearing record. Of course, the Forest Service witness is free to make any comments today on the bill if he desires.

With that, I would like to recognize the ranking member, Senator Burr, from the great State of North Carolina.

[The prepared statement of Senator Murray follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. PATTY MURRAY, U.S. SENATOR FROM WASHINGTON,
ON S. 635

Chairman Udall and Ranking Member Burr, I would like to thank you for holding today's hearing on S. 635, legislation which would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate 14.3 miles of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

This legislation is the result of a collaborative process, and is supported by a wide range of community stakeholders including local elected officials, environmentalists, fishermen, and agriculture organizations.

Illabot Creek flows from an elevation of almost 7,500 feet in the Glacier Peak Wilderness Area in the Cascade mountains into the upper Skagit River.

Salmon are a way of life in Washington state and their protection is critical to our heritage, our culture, and our economy. The creek's free-flowing waters provide critical spawning habitat for the wild Chinook salmon, steelhead and bull trout, all federally listed as threatened, as well as pink, coho, sockeye and chum salmon. The mature and old growth forest along the creek also provides valuable habitat for many wildlife species including bald eagles.

I want to thank Congressman Rick Larsen, who led this effort by introducing legislation in the House. I would also like to thank Senator Maria Cantwell, who is a co-sponsor of the bill introduced here in the Senate. I look forward to working with the Committee and my colleagues to protect this crucial habitat for salmon, bull trout, eagles and other species while preserving recreational opportunities, such as hunting and fishing, for future generations.

Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, thank you again for holding this hearing on S. 635, and for the opportunity to provide this testimony.

**STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD BURR, U.S. SENATOR FROM
NORTH CAROLINA**

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not exactly sure why you stared at me on the CIA piece. Maybe you know what I do every afternoon.

Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for convening this hearing before the National Parks Subcommittee. It has only been a week since our last National Parks Subcommittee hearing, but we have another full agenda today. The first set of bills covered in this hearing reflects the broad objectives of the National Park Service and, more importantly, this subcommittee.

One bill, in particular, caught my attention, S. 715, the lighthouse preservation grants bill. The bill would seek to provide maintenance funding to non-Federal entities who volunteer to acquire lighthouses from the Federal Government. I am fairly familiar with this program. While I strongly support the preservation of lighthouses, the bill concerns me since it would appear to go against the intent of the underlying law, the Lighthouse Preservation Act. In fact, in the Lighthouse Preservation Act, there was a reversion clause. The reversion clause basically reverted ownership back to the Coast Guard if the nonprofit entities or communities chose not to maintain the maintenance of them.

There is nobody that has supported any more than I have especially nonprofit entities who choose to take on the responsibility of the historic nature of preserving lighthouses. Though, when we passed that preservation act, it did not extend also our ongoing commitment to maintain, to underwrite the maintenance of those lighthouses.

So I can only speak for myself, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to hearing more about this, but I have a major problem with the belief that we can give this to an entity and then turn around and be asked to fund the maintenance of a non-Federal asset. So I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today, and to hearing their testimony.

Senator UDALL. I thank the ranking member for his comments.

Let me turn to Senator Cantwell. Hopefully, she will correct my pronunciation of Illabot Creek.

Senator CANTWELL. Illabot. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator UDALL. Thank you.

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

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank you and the ranking member both for holding this important hearing today on legislation that we are considering, and I would like to talk about two of those pieces of legislation, a bill to designate Illabot Creek in Skagit County as a Wild and Scenic River and a bill to clarify the Park Service's authority to stock fish in certain high mountain lakes in the North Cascades National Park.

First, I would like to talk about why designating part of Illabot Creek in Skagit County as a Wild and Scenic River is so important to Washington State. Senator Murray and I introduced this legislation to designate 14.3 miles of a segment of Illabot Creek as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers system. If enacted, this will

ensure protection of its important fish and wildlife habitat while also maintaining the recreation opportunities such as fishing and hunting.

The Skagit River watershed supports one of the largest wintering bald eagle concentrations in the lower 48 States, and because of this abundance of salmon and high quality habitat, Illabot Creek is the center of bald eagle foraging activity in this area.

The legislation being proposed is a result of a collaborative vetting process that involved local stakeholders and community members, including public land agencies and local county governments and private forest landowners. The 14.3-mile proposed designation has gained significant support through these efforts of outreach.

The proposed designation runs from the headwaters to the county-owned right-of-way to a bridge at Rockport Cascade Road. While we considered including the final 2 miles to the confluence of the Skagit River, this was excluded after a vetting process because of concerns from local officials. So the designation of the upper 14.3 as Wild and Scenic, in addition to conservation easements already in place on private lands in the lower 2 miles, will ensure that the free-flowing waters of the significant fish and wildlife habitat are maintained for generations to come.

The second bill the committee is considering would clarify that the Park Service authority to allow the Park Service the authority for fishing stock in the North Cascades National Park. The North Cascades contains over 245 mountain lakes, of which 91 have been historically stocked with fish. In some cases, the stocking of fish in these lakes dates back to the 1800s. For decades, volunteers, working with the State of Washington, have stocked trout in a number of lakes in this area and under carefully constructed management plans written by the Park Service biologists.

In addition, congressional consideration of the creation of the North Cascades National Park indicated that fish stocking would continue. The legislation creating the park even identified fishing as an important recreational use.

When questions were raised about environmental impacts of fish stocking, the Park Service prepared an EIS on the fisheries in the mountain lakes, and this included a 12-year scientific research project conducted by Oregon State University. The preferred alternative selected in the Park Service final record of decision is to allow continued fish stocking in 42 lakes where the agency has concluded there would be no adverse impact on native ecosystems. In its report, the Park Service also requested explicit authority to allow fish stocking to continue within the park.

So I have heard from many of my constituents in and around the North Cascades National Park, and they want the fish stocking to continue. Many tourists visit the park for its scenic beauty as well as its fishing opportunities, making the fish stocking an important component of our North Cascades National Park system throughout the State of Washington to our economy.

I have also heard from constituents who are concerned about the potential impacts of continued fish stocking. So I am looking forward to hearing from the Park Service on how allowing fish stocking would work and allow for no adverse impacts on our native ecosystem.

So I thank the chairman for having both of these bills on the docket. I look forward to hearing the testimony of the Department of the Interior and others on these issues.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Cantwell.

We have been joined by Senator Wyden. Senator Wyden, would you like to make an opening statement?

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

Senator WYDEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for holding this hearing.

I am very pleased that today we are going to be looking at S. 1270, legislation that I have introduced to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. We very much thank you for holding the hearing.

Particularly, we want to welcome and thank Greg Walter for making the trek back here from Cave Junction. In addition to running his own business, Mr. Walter is a member of the Illinois Valley Community Development Organization, and he is doing a lot of good work to advance the community's quality of life.

The legislation that I have introduced would expand the monument boundary by 4,070 acres to include the entire Cave Creek watershed, management of which would be transferred from the United States Forest Service to the National Park Service. Expanding the boundary would allow for better protection of the stunning majesty of both the underground caves and the above-ground treasures found at the monument.

Because the current 480-acre boundary is insufficient to adequately protect the cave system and its water quality, the Park Service has formally proposed a boundary modification numerous times, first in 1939, then again in 1949, and most recently in 2000.

The Oregon Caves National Monument makes an extraordinary contribution to southern Oregon's economy and to the national heritage. The monument receives over 80,000 visitors annually and is the second smallest unit of the National Park System. A larger monument boundary would help us showcase more fully the recreational opportunities on these lands within the proposed monument boundary and provide visitors more chances to enjoy them. I feel very strongly that recreation is a special economic engine for Oregon, and I certainly want to see the opportunities that would come about through a larger monument boundary for additional recreational opportunities.

Now, my legislation would additionally designate at least 9.6 miles of rivers and tributaries as Wild and Scenic or recreational, including the first subterranean Wild and Scenic River, the River Styx.

This bill would also provide authorization for the voluntary retirement of existing grazing allotments. The current grazing permittee, Phil Krauss and his family, had the Big Grayback grazing allotment, which is over 19,000 acres since 1937. Mr. Krauss now favors lease retirement and private compensation for his allotment. My bill would allow a local solution to go forward to protect the monument resources.

Only a couple of other points, Mr. Chairman and colleagues. We have got to particularly get the Forest Service on track to make sure that this special treasure has the protection that is needed. Again and again, we have seen a failure to cooperate with respect to steps that are needed to protect the monument's resources.

Today the Forest Service asks for yet more time to figure out a way to work cooperatively with the Federal partners. They say that no coordinated study or formal dialog has occurred between the Departments to discuss expansion. Yet, this proposal has been discussed for years, and a hearing was held on similar legislation a year ago and the Forest Service asked for time to discuss this with the Park Service then. But the testimony that we are getting today indicates that Forest Service has not even utilized the last year to fully tap the opportunities for interagency cooperation.

So we have got to, in this committee, stay at this, Mr. Chairman. I look forward to working with you. I note my friend from North Carolina who gave me that glowing, glowing introduction this morning when I came to the Veteran Affairs Committee. But we are going to work on this in a bipartisan way.

I will close simply by saying thank you to the great volunteers and supporters in the local business and conservation community in southern Oregon, to Phil Krauss for his commitment to Oregon's natural resources, to Craig Ackerman, the former superintendent of the Oregon Caves National Monument, and all of my colleagues in the Oregon congressional delegation, Senator Merkley, who was a cosponsor of the bill, of course, my partner here in the Senate, and colleagues in the other body, Representatives DeFazio, Schrader, Blumenauer, and Wu, who have introduced the companion legislation.

So, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, thank you very much. This is an important day for our State and to have Greg Walter having made that long trip across the country is an indication of how strongly my constituents feel about S. 1270 that would let us finally expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Wyden.

If the two administration witnesses would come forward and join us at the table, we will move right to your testimony. We have been joined by Daniel Wenk, who is the Acting Director of the National Park Service, and Joel Holtrop, who is the Deputy Chief of the National Forest System. Thank you both for being here.

Mr. Wenk, why do we not start with you? Same time, same place. Great to have you back on the Hill. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DAN WENK, ACTING DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. WENK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for this opportunity to appear before this subcommittee to present the Department of the Interior's views on the five bills on today's agenda. I would like to submit our full statements for the record and summarize the administration's positions on these bills.

S. 715 would establish a 3-year pilot program to provide financial assistance to nonprofit organizations, States, or local government

entities for the preservation and rehabilitation of historic lighthouses.

The Department was not able to determine a position on this legislation in time for this hearing. We will provide our position in a letter to the committee in the very near future.

S. 742 would expand the boundary of Jimmy Carter National Historic Site in Georgia and redesignate the unit as a National Historical Park.

The Department supports enactment of S. 742. This legislation would authorize the addition of several properties to the Jimmy Carter Historic Site that would help broaden public understanding of the life and work of President Carter and enhance the visitor experience in Plains, Georgia.

The redesignation of this site as a National Historical Park is appropriate for a unit of the National Park System that has multiple, noncontiguous sites as this unit has.

S. 1270 would adjust the boundary of Oregon Caves National Monument to include the addition of approximately 4,070 acres as a national preserve to the existing monument. The lands that would be added are currently managed by the United States Forest Service as part of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest.

The Department supports the intent of this bill as consistent with the general management plan for the park, but recommends deferring action on the bill to give us the opportunity to continue exploring ways to maintain interagency coordination. The Department of the Interior and Department of Agriculture look forward to reporting back to the committee on these discussions within 6 months.

S. 1418 and H.R. 2330 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing Camp Hale in Colorado as a unit of the National Park System.

Camp Hale was established to provide winter and mountain warfare training during World War II. It is currently managed by the United States Forest Service as part of the White River National Forest and used for public recreation.

The Department supports this legislation with amendments to include the United States Forest Service in the study and to remove the section dealing with water rights, which is, we believe, unnecessary.

H.R. 2430 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

The preferred alternative in the park's 2008 fishery management plan would allow stocking of non-reproducing fish at low densities to continue in up to 42 lakes, subject to additional monitoring. However, this action requires legislation.

The Department does not oppose this bill, but we would like to work with the committee on amendments to the bill. The National Park Service is interested in ensuring that the legislation is guided by science and an understanding of the impact that such policies would have on park resources.

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

[The prepared statements of Mr. Wenk follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENTS OF DAN WENK, ACTING DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

S. 715

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 715, a bill to create a pilot program to provide for the preservation and rehabilitation of historic lighthouses.

The Department was not able to determine a position on this legislation in time for this hearing. We will provide our position in a letter to the committee in the near future.

S. 715, titled the National Lighthouse Stewardship Act of 2009, would amend the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 470w et seq.) to create a three-year pilot program to provide financial assistance to non-profit organizations, States, or local government entities, for the preservation and rehabilitation of historic light stations, a significant component of our nation's maritime history. The proposed bill would bolster the effort to preserve these historic maritime structures already underway through the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000 (NHLPA). In addition, the bill would also provide financial resources and technical advice to the stewards of historic light stations.

Lighthouses are historic aids to nautical navigation and many are found in remote locations and all have an exposure to the extremes of weather. Such exposure promotes the deterioration of the historic fabric of the light station. And, the fact that these light stations have not been manned by the U. S. Coast Guard in decades has accelerated their rates of deterioration.

Under the NHLPA, the value associated with historic light stations is recognized by allowing them to be transferred at no cost to Federal agencies, state and local governments, nonprofit corporations, educational agencies, or community development organizations. The National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000 provides a mechanism for the disposal of historic light stations. Entities that receive light stations must make them available for education, park, recreation, cultural, or historic preservation purposes and provide public access. The program is a successful partnership among the U. S. Coast Guard, the General Services Administration, and the National Park Service. Forty-four historic light stations have been transferred through NHLPA to governmental agencies or community organizations that have agreed to take on the daunting task of preserving and maintaining these historic structures for the public good. These groups have stepped forth to preserve these icons of American history, which is no small commitment of both volunteer hours and private financial resources.

Mr. Chairman, we look forward to communicating with you about this bill after we have the opportunity for further consideration of its implications.

S. 742

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 742, a bill to expand the boundary of the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site, to redesignate the unit as a National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The Department supports enactment of S. 742. This legislation would authorize the addition of properties to the Jimmy Carter historic site that would help broaden public understanding of the life and work of President Carter and enhance the visitor experience in Plains, Georgia.

Legislation authorizing the establishment of the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site and Preservation District was enacted in 1987 to preserve the key sites and structures associated with President Jimmy Carter during his life, provide for the interpretation of the life and presidency of Jimmy Carter, and present the history of a small rural southern town. The historic site consists of President Carter's boyhood home in the community of Archery, Plains High School, the Plains depot, and the Carter compound, where President and Mrs. Carter reside. The site also includes 100 feet of scenic easements along both sides of Old Plains Highway west of Plains. The preservation district consists of the Plains Historic District, Bond Street, and 650 acres of agricultural lands within which the Secretary is authorized

to acquire easements to protect the scenic values of the community around the historic site.

President and Mrs. Carter both grew up in and around Plains. Except for time spent in college, the Navy, the Georgia governor's mansion, and the White House, the Carters have made their home in Plains, where they continue to be very engaged in community affairs. In large part because of the historic site and preservation district, the town of Plains and its environs, a community of about 700 people, looks much the same today as it did during the earlier years of the Carters' lives. We believe the boundary changes proposed in S. 742 are consistent with President and Mrs. Carter's vision for Plains as both a modest hometown of a U.S. president and a community that has preserved the history of life in a small, southern agricultural community in the early to middle years of the 20th century.

S. 742 would include several new areas to the boundary of the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site. Of critical importance to the National Park Service would be the addition of properties in the vicinity of the Carter residence that, if acquired, would serve an immediate park need. One of these properties would be appropriate for relocation of the park's maintenance and curatorial facilities. The maintenance division for the park is currently housed in a dilapidated structure built by high school students in the 1950's on the grounds of the former Plains High School. Adjacent to the structure is an unsightly maintenance yard, where trucks, tractors, lawn mowers and other equipment is stored and refuse is temporarily held. The curatorial storage facility is located next to the maintenance building. It was meant to be temporary and is inadequate for processing and storing important historical records and artifacts. Neither the maintenance yard nor the temporary curatorial facility fit with the historic character and qualities of the former school, which is now the park's visitor center, or with the center of Plains generally.

The bill would also add to the park boundary several other properties, including:

- The Billy Carter Service Station Museum at 104 West Church Street, the site of the iconic gas station operated by President Carter's brother during the Carter presidency. The museum is currently owned and operated by the Plains Better Hometown Group, a non-profit organization that assists community development.
- The property at 147 Old Plains Highway, known locally as the "Haunted House." This house is recognized as the oldest home in Sumter County and was the residence of President Carter and his family after he left the Navy.
- The Georgia Welcome Center on State Route 280/27, a state-owned facility that was built to accommodate visitors to Plains; and
- Two corridors of land no wider than 50 feet each between the Georgia Welcome Center and the President Carter boyhood home, which could be used for multi-use trails. The trails, running along each side of the Southwest Georgia Railroad lines that stretch along the same corridor, would connect a new campground proposed for the current Georgia Welcome Center property, the city of Plains and the boyhood farm.

The National Park Service anticipates that there would be no acquisition costs for the Georgia Welcome Center, the Haunted House, or the Service Station museum. We do not yet have cost estimates for the acquisition of the other properties, or for the maintenance and operation of any of these properties, but plan to estimate these costs in the near future. All funds for such activities would be subject to National Park Service priorities and the availability of appropriations.

S. 742 would also change the designation of the historic site to the Jimmy Carter National Historical Park. This proposed designation is appropriate for a unit of the National Park System that has multiple, non-contiguous sites, as does the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site. With the addition of the properties authorized for acquisition under this bill, the designation of "national historical park" would be even more apt than it is today.

Finally, the bill includes references for a map that would depict the revised boundary of the park. We will provide this boundary map to the committee in the near future.

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

S. 1270

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1270, a bill to modify the boundary of Oregon Caves National Monument, and for other purposes. The Department supports the intent of S. 1270 as consistent with the General Management

Plan (GMP) for the park, but recommends deferring action on the bill to give us the opportunity to continue exploring ways to maintain interagency coordination. DOI and USDA look forward to reporting on these discussions within 6 months. S. 1270 would adjust the boundary of Oregon Caves National Monument to include the addition of approximately 4,070 acres to enhance the protection of resources associated with the monument and to increase quality recreation opportunities. The lands that would be added are currently managed by the U.S. Forest Service as part of the Rogue-Siskiyou National Forest. S. 1270 would designate approximately 7.6 miles of these waterways as wild, scenic, or recreational under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, including the first subterranean designated waterway in the country, the River Styx, which flows through the caves as a “recreational” river. S. 1270 provides authority for the Secretary to protect the water quality—in the caves and for public consumption—and to administer the lands in accordance with current laws and regulations. The Secretary is also directed to carry out ecological forest restoration activities that would establish a fire regime, manage revegetation projects, and reduce the risk of losing key ecosystem components. The land that this bill would transfer is categorized by the U.S. Forest Service as condition class 3—high risk of fire. Most of it is also designated as Late Successional Reserve under the Northwest Forest Plan. We understand that the Forest Service is currently working on a multi-year effort to reduce fuels under a comprehensive forest plan which is intended to help restore the appropriate role of fire in the entire ecosystem, which in turn would benefit monument resources that are at risk from fire and fire suppression damage. The bill also requires the Secretary to accept any grazing lease or permit that is donated by a lessee or permittee and further requires that no new leases or permits be granted.

In 1907, the Secretary of the Interior withdrew approximately 2,560 acres for the purposes of establishing a national monument. The 1909 presidential proclamation establishing Oregon Caves National Monument included only 480 acres. The monument was managed by the U.S. Forest Service until its administration was transferred to the National Park Service in 1933. The remaining withdrawal outside of the monument is administered by the USFS as part of the Rogue-Siskiyou National Forest. S. 1270 restores these lands to the original monument boundary. The explorer Joaquin Miller extolled “The Wondrous marble halls of Oregon!” when speaking about the newly proclaimed Oregon Caves National Monument in 1909. Oregon Caves is one of the few marble caves in the country that is accessible to the public. This park, tucked up in the winding roads of southern Oregon, is known for its remoteness, the cave majesty and unusual biota. The stream flowing from the cave entrance is a tributary to a watershed that empties into the Pacific Ocean. There are no human-made obstructions that would prevent salmon migration, which makes this the only cave in the National Park Service with an unobstructed link to the ocean. The caves are nationally significant and a favorite visit for school kids and travelers alike. They remain alive and healthy because of the watershed above them. The park recognized this when developing the 1998 GMP and accompanying Environmental Impact Statement. The plan recommended the inclusion of the watershed into the park to provide for better cave protection and to protect the surface and subsurface hydrology and the public water supply.

If S. 1270 were enacted, there would be no acquisition costs associated with the boundary expansion and we estimate National Park Service’s management, administrative, interpretive, resource protection, and maintenance costs to be approximately \$300,000 to \$750,000 annually. The Department has four major issues with the bill at this time:

1. Section 6 of the bill designates the River Styx as a recreational river. The recreational status does not afford any additional protection to the water or cave resources and may encumber the current management of the cave resources.
2. Section 7 of the bill requires the Secretary to ensure that forest attributes remain intact and functioning within a “historical range”. However, because of environmental uncertainties, it may be more prudent to use “normal range of ecosystem variability” rather than “historical range”.
3. Section 8 of the bill requires that if a grazing permittee or lessee chooses to voluntarily donate a grazing permit or lease within either the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment (managed by the U.S. Forest Service) or the Billy Mountain Grazing Allotment (managed by the BLM) the Secretary shall accept the donation, terminate those permits or leases and that those allotments shall be permanently retired. It is our understanding that the same individual runs livestock on both the Big Grayback and Billy Mountain Allotments. We note that the Billy Mountain Grazing Allotment is approximately 15 miles from the

boundary of the proposed monument expansion. We would like the opportunity to work with the Committee and sponsor to further explore these grazing provisions.

4. Section 9 of the bill discusses hunting, fishing and trapping. We support the Administrative Exceptions under subsection (b) since it provides flexibility in managing the resources within the preserve. With respect to Section 9, we would like to terminate hunting within the preserve after five years with the acreage being converted to national monument status. We base this request on the information collected during the public participation process for the General Management Plan. Of the 892 comments received on the plan, only 8, less than one percent, expressed concern about the loss of hunting should the added acres be designated as part of the national monument.

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

S. 1418 AND H.R. 2330

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. 1418 and H.R. 2330, the Camp Hale Study Act. The U.S. Forest Service (White River National Forest) currently manages Camp Hale as a part of the National Forest System.

The Department supports both S. 1418 and H.R. 2330, with an amendment to section two to include the US Forest Service in a joint study with the National Park Service for the future management of Camp Hale and to delete section three. However, we feel that priority should be given to the 47 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic River System that have not yet been transmitted to Congress.

S. 1418 and H.R. 2330 are almost identical and both bills would authorize the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary), to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating Camp Hale as a unit in the National Park System. The study would also determine the methods and means for protection and interpretation of the Camp Hale site by the National Park Service, other federal, State, or local government entities, or private or nonprofit organizations. Not later than three years after funds are made available, the Secretary is directed to submit the results and recommendations of the study to Congress. The bill includes language to assure the study would not impact valid existing water rights in place upon the date of enactment. S. 1418 also specifies that the study would not impact the ability to construct and operate infrastructure necessary to develop and use those water rights. We estimate that this study will cost approximately \$300,000.

Located in and managed by the White River National Forest, in west-central Colorado, Camp Hale was established in 1942 to provide winter and mountain warfare training during World War II, because of the natural setting of a large, flat valley bottom, surrounded by steep hillsides suitable for training in skiing, rock climbing and cold weather survival skills. The size of Camp Hale varied between 5,000 and 247,243 acres when it was an active military installation.

Managed by the US Forest Service (White River National Forest), The Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site, is now used year-round by the public as a recreation area and is included on the National Register of Historic Places.

Since the time Camp Hale was used for military training, there have been numerous discoveries of unexploded ordnance (UXO) there. As recently as 2003, during efforts to contain a wildfire, UXO used during the training of U.S. troops in World War II was found on the site.

Efforts to remediate public risk from any remaining UXO at Camp Hale continue. The funding for any response actions at Camp Hale will depend on how the UXO sites there rank nationally. Depending on that rank, and available federal dollars, the remedial investigations for some or all Camp Hale munitions may not occur for several years. The Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment has discussed evaluating the hazard liabilities and remediating the site with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers prior to a transfer.

The story of Camp Hale and the men and women who trained there reflects the adaptability our nation showed during the last World War. Many of those who trained there went on to develop alpine skiing as a recreational activity, significantly influencing the economy of Colorado and many other western States. Studying and determining how best to preserve and protect Camp Hale and to commemo-

rate the sacrifice and heroism so many Americans exhibited as a result of their training is laudable.

We suggest that both bills be amended in section two to include the US Forest Service in the study to determine the future of Camp Hale and to remove section three, which includes language concerning water rights. The study recommended in both bills would examine the suitability and feasibility of designating Camp Hale as a unit in the National Park System, including evaluating all current uses and rights associated with the land. Since the bill only authorizes a study of the site, there is no possibility of the study having any affect on any water rights. As such, we believe the water rights language in both bills is unnecessary and redundant and we recommend the section be deleted.

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

H.R. 2430

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to provide the Department of the Interior's views on H.R. 2430, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area (hereafter referred to as "North Cascades Complex").

The Department does not oppose H.R. 2430; however we would like to work with the committee on amendments to the bill.

The National Park Service collectively manages North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area as North Cascades National Park Service Complex. All of the 245 mountain lakes in the North Cascades Complex area were naturally fishless. Fish stocking in this area began in the late 1800's. During this period, approximately 91 lakes were stocked at one time or another and 154 lakes were never stocked. This fish stocking provided the opportunity to fish in these mountain lakes. The issue of continued fish stocking arose in 1968 when the proposal to create the park was introduced. Although the enabling legislation does reference the requirement for a Washington state fishing license, it is silent regarding fish stocking. Stocking continued after the park was established. However, concerns over the ecological impacts of fish stocking in naturally fish-free waters continued. Then soon after the park complex was created, the National Park Service policy regarding fish stocking was revised to provide that fish stocking in naturally fish-free waters should not occur. Fish stocking was phased out in many national parks across the country to restore natural conditions and to preserve native species. In 1988, Congress designated ninety three percent of the North Cascades as the Stephen Mather Wilderness and 90 of the 91 lakes that had historically been stocked are within the Wilderness area. At the time the Wilderness was designated, Congress did not address the issue of stocking the lakes.

The 2006 Management Policies of the National Park Service (NPS) allow for the management of fish populations when necessary to restore resources to their natural state or reestablish a native species that has been extirpated. Stocking of other plants or animals is also allowed under certain circumstances. Specifically, the policies provide that *"In some special situations, the Secretary may stock native or exotic animals for recreational harvesting purposes, but only when such stocking will not unacceptably impact park natural resources or processes and when:*

- *the stocking is of fish into constructed large reservoirs or other significantly altered large water bodies and the purpose is to provide for recreational fishing;*
- or*
- *the intent for stocking is a treaty right or expressed in statute, applicable law, or a House or Senate report accompanying a statute.*

The Service will not stock waters that are naturally barren of harvested aquatic species."

The NPS appreciates the collaborative partnership with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) at North Cascades Complex and throughout the State of Washington. Despite this strong working relationship, a number of challenges have historically arisen when trying to reconcile the missions and policies of the WDFW and NPS on this stocking program. However, multiple attempts have been made to negotiate a mutually acceptable outcome on this issue. For example, in 1987, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife and Parks, negotiated an agreement allowing fish stocking to continue in certain lakes while simultaneously conducting research into the ecological impacts of stocking. In 1991, the National Park Service entered into a Consent Decree to resolve litigation challenging the fish stocking program wherein NPS agreed to conduct research into the

ecological impacts of fish stocking at North Cascades and then to conduct a NEPA review of the fish stocking of naturally fish-free lakes.

A decade of research, conducted in the North Cascades Complex through Oregon State University and the USGS Biological Resources Division, documented in the North Cascades lakes where fish had been stocked in low numbers and could not reproduce, no statistically significant ecological effects to native aquatic species were detected. However, in self-sustaining populations, non-native trout can have significant effects on native aquatic organisms such as amphibians and zooplankton.

In 2002, the NPS in collaboration with WDFW began development of a comprehensive Mountain Lakes Fishery Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (Plan/EIS). The purpose of the planning effort was to apply the results of the research and resolve the longstanding conflict over fish stocking in the mountain lakes.

On November 26, 2008, the NPS issued a Record of Decision for the final Plan/EIS and selected the preferred alternative that would stop stocking and remove fish from lakes where significant impacts were occurring (49 lakes) but allow stocking of non-reproducing fish at low densities to continue in up to 42 lakes, subject to additional monitoring. In this manner, the EIS found that the stocking would not unacceptably impact park natural resources or processes in some lakes. However, the Record of Decision (ROD) also notes that fish stocking in the Stephen T. Mather Wilderness does not meet the minimum requirements analysis conducted under section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act. In addition, the ROD recognizes that to be consistent with NPS policy, the NPS would need the legal authority to implement the preferred alternative. The ROD further provides and that if the legal authority was not provided to the NPS by July 1, 2009, the NPS, consistent with NPS policy, would discontinue the stocking program in its entirety and work to restore the natural ecology of all the mountain lakes. In the majority of lakes this would be accomplished through the combination of not stocking and continued fishing. Over time, natural mortality would remove the remainder. In lakes where naturally reproducing populations were found, the NPS would work to remove these fish. Realistically at least ten lakes are so large that no known removal techniques will work and fish populations will remain for the foreseeable future.

The NPS is interested in ensuring that any legislation regarding fish stocking is guided by science and an understanding of the impact that such policy decisions would have on park resources. We recommend, for example, that any stocked fish be both native to the local watershed and be functionally sterile. And we request that the Secretary continue a program of monitoring the impacts of fish stocking in order to determine if further adjustments are needed to protect aquatic resources. We would welcome an opportunity to work with the Committee and the sponsors of this legislation on the language of these proposed amendments.

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

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Wenk.

Mr. Holtrop.

STATEMENT OF JOEL HOLTROP, DEPUTY CHIEF, NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM, FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOLTROP. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to testify on S. 1270, the Oregon Caves National Monument Boundary Adjustment Act, and S. 635, to designate a segment of Illabot Creek as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Thank you. I will also comment on S. 1418 to direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study to determine suitability and feasibility of establishing Camp Hale as a unit of the National Park System.

S. 1270 would modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument to include approximately 4,070 acres of land currently managed by the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest.

The USDA believes that interagency coordination and cooperation with joint public involvement to ensure that public concerns

and desires are addressed is the most effective way of managing the Oregon Caves National Monument and surrounding National Forest System land.

USDA looks forward to working together with the Department of the Interior over the next 6 months to develop interagency direction. Regardless of the outcome, our common goal is to best manage the monument and the surrounding national forest for the benefit of the public.

The land managers of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest have three priorities for this area. One is maintaining and protecting cave resources, hydrologic resources, watersheds, and view sheds. A second is improving forest health by addressing hazardous fuels, and a third is managing for multiple uses while minimizing any potential impact.

With regard to Wild and Scenic River provisions of the bill, the proposed legislation provides for the addition of six river segments to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, four of which are in the proposed expansion area or in the current Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest.

The Forest Service studied these four rivers and found that they did not meet criteria for eligibility and we would recommend that the four rivers that the Forest Service studied be re-evaluated for their eligibility to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 635, Illabot Creek, meets the criteria to be included in the Wild and Scenic Rivers because of the exceptional spawning for Chinook, coho, chum, and pink salmon, native steelhead. Both Puget Sound Chinook, steelhead, and bull trout, which are also in the Illabot Creek are listed under the Endangered Species Act.

In addition, Illabot Creek provides habitat for wintering bald eagles, and the eagles using the Illabot roost are a part of one of the largest concentrations of wintering bald eagles in the continental United States.

We strongly support the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we do recommend the subcommittee consider designating all of Illabot Creek from its headwaters to its confluence with the Skagit River, 16.3 miles, as recommended in the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest Plan. This includes the lower 2 miles classified as a recreational river, of which approximately 1.4 miles is in the Skagit Wild and Scenic River corridor.

Finally, we are preparing written testimony for the subcommittee on the Camp Hale Study Act and look forward to working with the National Park Service to complete an integrated joint agency study of the historic attributes of Camp Hale located on the White River National Forest. We have a long history of working cooperatively with the National Park Service for the preservation and interpretation of significant lands and sites.

This concludes my prepared statement, and I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Holtrop follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOEL HOLTROP, DEPUTY CHIEF, NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM,
FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Thank you for inviting me to testify on S. 1270, the Oregon Caves National Monument Boundary Adjustment Act of 2009, and S. 635, to Amend the Wild and Scenic

Rivers Act to Designate A Segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S.1270

S.1270 would modify the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument to include approximately 4,070 acres of land currently managed by the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest. The resulting Monument would be designated as the Oregon Caves National Monument and Preserve. The bill would also designate six segments of rivers as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and it would provide for possible termination of grazing use on a Forest Service-managed grazing allotment, a portion of which is located within the proposed boundary of the Preserve. USDA believes that interagency coordination and cooperation, with joint public involvement, is the most effective way of managing the Oregon Caves National Monument and surrounding forest service land. USDA and DOI look forward to reporting on the progress of our interagency coordination efforts within 6 months.

I would like to take this opportunity to discuss the current status of cooperative management of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest and the Oregon Caves National Monument and provide a few comments to the bill.

We believe interagency cooperation would carry out the purpose of the bill to enhance the protection of the resources associated with the Monument and increase public recreation opportunities through a joint public involvement and review process, to ensure that public concerns and desires are addressed.

Boundary Adjustment and Management

Section 4 of the bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer management of the National Forest System Lands to the Secretary of the Interior, and to adjust the boundary of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest accordingly. The 1998 Oregon Caves National Monument General Management Plan by the Department of the Interior (DOI), developed through the public National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, recommended a similar boundary expansion. However, no coordinated study or formal dialogue between the Departments (beyond that provided under NEPA during development of the 1998 plan) has taken place on the issue of expansion.

The U.S. Forest Service is committed to cooperative management across our respective jurisdictions.

The land managers of the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest have three priorities:

- Maintaining and protecting cave resources, hydrologic resources, watersheds, and view sheds. Critical landscapes, including cave resources and watersheds, are managed by interagency collaboration. These resources, and the need to manage them in a cooperative manner, extend well beyond the proposed Monument boundary.
- Improving forest health by addressing hazardous fuels. Most of the proposed expansion area is designated in the Land and Resource Management Plan as "Late-Successional Reserve" (LSR) as defined under the Northwest Forest Plan. These areas are intended to serve as habitat for late-successional and old-growth related species. A majority of the LSR landscape within this watershed, and the larger surrounding landscape managed by the Forest Service, is in fire condition class 3—high risk of damaging wildfire. Currently the Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest is removing hazardous fuels using timber contacts to reduce fuels, both around the immediate vicinity of the Monument and across watersheds. The Forest plans to treat approximately 1550 acres to reduce hazardous fuels within the proposed expansion area. ARRA funds are helping increase the implementation rate of treatment in this area. Of the 1,550 acres, approximately 100 acres of hazardous fuels will be removed by timber contract with volume estimated at 560 thousand board feet and an appraised value of approximately \$168,000. The remaining acreage will be treated using other methods. These treatments are designed to restore the fire to this ecosystem and will help ensure that the forest attributes intended for the LSR, including bigger, older, more fire resistant trees, remain intact. To that end, we fully endorse the intent of section 7 of the proposed legislation to have forest restoration activities continue on the proposed expansion area. The hazardous fuel challenge in this region and the danger of catastrophic fire cross all jurisdictions and is one we all must work together to address.
- Managing for multiple uses while minimizing any potential impacts from harvest, grazing, mining, and road construction. On National Forest lands surrounding the Monument, timber harvesting, grazing and special forest product

harvesting (i.e. bear grass, firewood, mushrooms, etc.) are allowed only if they meet resource objectives, as described above. Road management is limited to maintenance and reconstruction activities; no new roads are planned. Moreover, interagency collaboration provides additional oversight of these multiple-use activities.

Relinquishment and Retirement of Grazing Permits

Section 8 of the legislation would require the Secretary of the Interior to permit livestock grazing at a level not greater than the level at which grazing exists on the date of enactment. The legislation also would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to accept any donation of a grazing permit by the permit holder for grazing on the Forest Service managed Big Grayback grazing allotment and if such a donation is received, ensure an end to grazing on the entire allotment. Under this legislation, only a small portion of the Big Grayback allotment would become part of the proposed Preserve, but the legislation would end grazing on a large area of land outside the Preserve. We look forward to working with the Committee to address grazing management issues.

Recreational opportunities

Current recreation on the portion of the National Forest proposed to be transferred includes horseback riding, hunting and fishing, gathering, camping, backpacking, and hiking. We support the requirement in section 9 that fishing, hunting and trapping be permitted in the proposed National Preserve with some limitations.

Wild and Scenic Rivers

Section 6 of the proposed legislation provides for the addition of six river segments to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). The Siskiyou National Forest analyzed all tributaries to the Illinois River on National Forest System lands for eligibility for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System as part of a 1989 settlement agreement to an appeal of the Land and Resource Management Plan. None of the four rivers included partly or entirely in the current Monument expansion proposal were found to meet the criteria for eligibility at that time. The segments within the proposed expansion area should be re-evaluated for their eligibility to be included in or added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 635

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

This bill would amend sec. 3(a) of the Act to designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. It adds 14.3 miles in two segments: 4.3 miles from the headwaters to the Glacier Peak Wilderness boundary classified as wild, and 10 miles from the Glacier Peak Wilderness boundary to 1000 feet south of the Rockport-Cascade road classified as recreational.

We strongly support the legislation.

The segment to be designated by S. 635 is a tributary of the Skagit River, which was added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System in 1978. It is located on the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, approximately 100 miles northeast of Seattle, Washington and flows from the glaciers of the North Cascades into the upper Skagit River, the largest tributary to Puget Sound.

Illabot Creek provides exceptional spawning and rearing habitat for summer and fall Chinook, coho, chum and pink salmon; native steelhead; and, one of the largest populations of bull trout in the Skagit River watershed. Puget Sound Chinook, steelhead and bull trout are listed under the Endangered Species Act. Illabot Creek also supports the highest density of chum and pink salmon in the Skagit River watershed and provides habitat for wintering bald eagles. Eagles using the Illabot roost are a part of one of the largest concentration of wintering bald eagles in the continental United States.

Mr. Chairman, we recommend the Subcommittee consider designating all of Illabot Creek, from its headwaters to its confluence with the Skagit River (16.3 miles) as recommended in the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest Plan (June 1990). This includes the lower 2 miles, classified as a recreational river, of which approximately 1.4 miles is in the Skagit Wild and Scenic River Corridor. With the designation of Illabot Creek as proposed in S. 635, only 0.6 mile is not included in

either Illabot Creek Wild and Scenic River or the existing Skagit Wild and Scenic River corridor. The lower 2 miles includes some of the most important fish spawning habitat and an important foraging and roosting area for wintering bald eagles. Much of this area is in the Skagit River Bald Eagle Natural Area and dedicated to resource protection.

This concludes my prepared statement and I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Holtrop.

What I would like to do is turn to Camp Hale and ask a couple questions in regards to Camp Hale, and then we will work through the Senators who have joined us. I know they all have specific interests in these specific bills.

I think, Mr. Holtrop, did you have anything else to add about Camp Hale, or did you fit your remarks into your previous statement?

Mr. HOLTROP. I finished my remarks in my oral statement. If there are some questions that I can add to, I will be happy to do so. We are preparing written testimony as you requested.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for that.

Let me turn to Mr. Wenk. You have indicated that the Park Service supports amending the Camp Hale bill to provide for a joint study with the Forest Service. Are you proposing that the Forest Service should help determine whether Camp Hale is appropriate for a park designation or rather whether the study should explore other Forest Service management options?

Mr. WENK. I believe we are supportive of working with the Forest Service to determine based on the National Park Service criteria whether or not Camp Hale meets the requirements of significance, suitability, and feasibility, which would look at management options. We believe that this is best done in cooperation with the Forest Service and would prepare that study to come back to the committee and the Senate for consideration.

Senator UDALL. So what I hear you saying is you would like to keep a number of options alive for the time being and pursue those conversations, make your best analysis, and then come back to the committee.

Mr. WENK. Yes. I know working with the Forest Service we can provide the answers to our questions about meeting the criteria of significance, suitability, and feasibility.

Senator UDALL. To respond to Senator Burr's question about why I looked at him when I mentioned the Central Intelligence Agency, I did look at him in part because he serves on the Intelligence Committee, but I thought he also would be, as many are when they hear the story, very intrigued by the training that occurred there for Tibetan refugees who did return and in some cases engaged in actions in Tibet to deter and challenge the Chinese invasion of Tibet. The history is fascinating and one that will be well served if we do, in fact, set aside Camp Hale. I wanted to make that comment.

Senator Burr brought up concerns about the historic lighthouse grant program. You mentioned you will get comments from the administration. Do you have a date in mind when those comments would be forthcoming?

Mr. WENK. We were working very hard yesterday to resolve the issues, I think, that Senator Burr addressed in terms of the base

legislation and the apparent potential conflicts with the proposed legislation. I would suggest within—I will throw out—2 weeks we should be able to easily get that back up to you.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for that clarification.

Let me turn to the ranking member, Senator Burr.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Both administration witnesses, welcome. We have had an opportunity to be together before.

Let me go very quickly because I am going to have to run out for a few minutes, if I could, Mr. Wenk, to the issue of the lighthouses. It is my understanding there are 608 lighthouses listed by the Maritime Heritage Program within the United States. Do you have any idea how many lighthouses would be eligible for the lighthouse preservation grants?

Mr. WENK. Actually, I do not believe that is clear in the legislation, whether it is just those lighthouses that have been conveyed under the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act or if other lighthouses would also be included. That is a clarification, I think, that we would need to make.

Senator BURR. My understanding is that there are some that are included and there are many that are not. There would be a great inconsistency in us offering preservation or maintenance dollars to some and not all. Would you agree?

Mr. WENK. I think you are hitting on the exact conflicts that we are trying to resolve in coming up with our position on the bill.

Senator BURR. Are you fairly confident, as I am, that the reversion clause was there for a reason, that the Federal Government at the time believed that preserving those lighthouses were important if there was local interest committed to do it? It was defined a number of different ways: community, nonprofit. I cannot remember all the different categories, but it sort of left it open for many different participants but with the understanding that transfer of title was the transfer of responsibility for all aspects of it. Is that the way the Park Service understood it?

Mr. WENK. My understanding is exactly that about the transfer of title—that the entity that it was transferred to did take on the responsibility for the preservation and maintenance and to provide access to the facility. Correct. I am not as familiar with the reversion clause that you are referring to, however.

Senator BURR. But, in fact, this new grant program would be inconsistent with what I think the original intent was of the legislation.

Mr. WENK. Senator, that is the exact reason we were having trouble coming up with a position—because we were trying to reconcile our concerns about the base legislation with this proposed legislation.

Senator BURR. I look forward, when you can get back with us on the position. I thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Burr.

Senator Cantwell.

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to ask Mr. Wenk about the fish stocking issue, if I could. Obviously, after 12 years of studying, research found that

native or functionally sterile fish at a low population density in certain carefully selected lakes would not lead to impairment of the Park Service resources. So if resources would not be impaired by limiting fish stocking in certain high lake mountains, does that mean there are no ecological impacts of stocking fish in these lakes?

Mr. WENK. No. I think we believe that it does not rise to the level of impairment, but there are impacts certainly of introducing a non-native species. They were fishless lakes. So by introducing fish within these lakes, there is an effect on the system itself that the fish has been introduced to. But we do not believe that in the lakes that we said could be stocked, that it rises to the level of impairment.

Senator CANTWELL. The record of decision had its preferred alternative known as Alternative B. Does the Park Service headquarters support implementation of Alternative B as described in the recent record of decision?

Mr. WENK. We support it with the recognition that we would need the legislation in order to implement it.

Senator CANTWELL. Why did the Park Service change the policy here, the management approach in the 1980s?

Mr. WENK. I think it was a determination that, in terms of natural areas, we were trying to maintain and preserve natural areas in their natural state to the greatest extent possible.

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you.

Mr. Holtrop, about Illabot Creek and its ecosystem. Can you talk about that and how it relates to the Skagit River and how it relates to the health of Puget Sound, which is obviously a big issue in the State?

Mr. HOLTROP. Yes, I would be happy to.

First of all, the Skagit River, to which Illabot Creek is tributary, is one of the most important, if not the most important, fish spawning rivers in the entire Puget Sound area. Illabot Creek is to the Skagit River as the Skagit River is to Puget Sound. The spawning grounds throughout that system are significantly important for the entire Skagit River fish spawning opportunities and significant in their own right.

Senator CANTWELL. How do you currently manage Forest Service land around there and how will the Wild and Scenic designation affect that?

Mr. HOLTROP. The upper 4.3 miles of the designation is in designated wilderness, and that is the segment of the river that would be designated wild. That portion of the river that would be designated recreation flows through the areas of the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forests which are managed in areas where we are managing for old growth ecosystem characteristics or very little development use, and it is the designation of a recreation river, and it is very consistent with the way that land is already being managed.

Senator CANTWELL. So the feasibility study listed some of the benefits to habitat and other species that exist there by doing this. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLTROP. That is correct. The eligibility study, first of all, found that it was free-flowing and had outstandingly remarkable

values, and then the suitability study found that it was suitable to be designated both because of the interest of the Washington State Fisheries Department to continue to work in the stream system, strong local public support for the designation, as well as the outstandingly remarkable values for both fisheries and wildlife.

Senator CANTWELL. How does a designation like this add value to the community and to those opportunities?

Mr. HOLTROP. I think it adds value in many ways. It recognizes the significance of the stream for those values, the fisheries and wildlife values. I think there is pride that comes with that in the local area. Illabot Creek would be just the fourth Wild and Scenic River designated in the State of Washington, if it were to be designated Wild and Scenic, which also indicates the significance of the area.

Senator CANTWELL. A special value that is recognized by many people.

Mr. HOLTROP. Yes.

Senator CANTWELL. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Cantwell.

Senator Wyden.

Senator WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Holtrop, I am just trying to figure out what is behind your opposition to my legislation. I think you understand that I am not at all satisfied with the agency's position here.

The reason that I am pushing hard for this legislation, to protect this treasure and what amounts to 4,000 acres and you all running the forest there—that is 1.8 million acres. You got a lot to do there—is that why the agency has not responded to what the Park Service has brought to your attention in the past? They brought to you examples of clear-cutting, clear-cutting right up to the monument boundary. That was the case in the late 1980s. There has been concern about grazing in the sensitive botanical areas. The Park Service keeps bringing you these concerns, and for one reason or another, you are not responsive to them. Yet, you keep asking for more time to somehow do something to work this out.

Now, I have had my legislation out there for a year, and you talk about how you are doing various things to work this out with the Park Service. But I do not see it. So what has been accomplished specifically in the last year? What has been accomplished with you all and the Park Service to get this worked out in the last year? Why was it not done in the last year? That would have been great and I could have moved on and do other things and my constituents would have been plenty happy.

Mr. HOLTROP. I think there has been a great deal of dialog that has occurred in the last year.

Senator WYDEN. That is not the question. Why has it not been worked out? Why has it not been accomplished in the year that I have introduced this legislation, that you all and the Park Service have not figured out a way to address these concerns?

Mr. HOLTROP. Again, I think we have been addressing those concerns. We have not worked it all the way to conclusion for the mutual satisfaction of both of the agencies. But as my testimony indicates, at the end of the day, it is going to be very important to both

organizations to recognize whether there is a 480-acre national monument or a 4,000-acre national monument. It is, as you stated, going to be in the midst of an over million-acre national forest. Both the national monument and the national forest will be significant environmental, economic, and social drivers in that community and all the communities of interest in that area, and we want to make sure that there has been a joint effort with joint public involvement to allow us to look at what are some of the issues, what are some of the approaches that we can take to be responsive to that.

I would also like to add that, for example, with the grazing use, when the National Park Service took over the national monument back in the 1930s from the management of the national forest, the grazing permit at that time had 200 head of cattle. We made adjustments in the grazing use to 70 head over the past several years, and we are in the process right now of reducing that again to 56 head of cattle on an allotment that is 26,000 acres in size, of which 1,000 acres is in the proposed expansion of the national monument.

I think we have been responsive and continue to be responsive and look forward to continuing to work with the Park Service to resolve the issues to meet the objectives of this legislation.

Senator WYDEN. Why do you not give me the written records that would describe what has been accomplished in the last year? Because I will tell you, all I see is foot-dragging, and it is not acceptable to me. I am going to push this legislation because my constituents feel very strongly about it. As far as I can tell, there has not been much accomplished in the last year since you have seen that my constituents care a great deal about it and that I care a great deal about it. We are just going to stay with this until it gets addressed.

I would certainly like to see my legislation become irrelevant. I would love to be able to see an agreement that would have some teeth in it for cooperative management, but I just do not see any evidence that that is going to take place under what is being talked about. The fact of the matter is that the Park Service has asked for an expanded monument boundary going back to the 1930s. Do you not think the communities I represent have waited long enough, Mr. Holtrop? Do you want to make them wait another century? I mean, they have been waiting since the 1930s on this. You come and tell me about dialog.

Mr. HOLTROP. There have been requests in the 1930s and 1940s and the end of the last century, as you indicated. There was also a request in 1985 by the Park Service for the Forest Service to take over the management of the management of the monument. There was an analysis done by the National Speleological Society in the earlier part of this decade considering whether the Forest Service should take over. I do not suggest that at all.

But I would just point that out to point out the fact that when there have been several studies and several analyses, my 30-plus years of experience in public land management is people do not want to do that because they enjoy doing the analysis. They do it because they find that there really are issues that are difficult to

work out. I think we need to work out some issues. I think we can do that in a joint manner.

Senator WYDEN. You and I just disagree on the nature of the problem. The reason it is not getting done is because there is no leadership. That is why it is not happening. They want to get it done. But to get problems solved, you have got to have people step up, and unfortunately, that has not taken place.

Mr. Chairman, I have just a couple of other questions. Would it be all right if I asked those at this point?

Mr. Wenk, I am trying to figure out what the Park Service's position actually is at this point. You all have been in favor of what I have been talking about for some time, and there has been long-standing Park Service support for this. There was a recent article at home in the paper indicating that you all were for it. Now it seems that you all have changed your position or at least it looks to me like you all have changed your position. So I am reading what the newspapers say which is that you all support it, and then there is past information from you all indicating you supported it. Now you seem to have changed your position, and I want to see if that is the case and, if so, why?

Mr. WENK. Senator, we definitely support the intent of the legislation. We have agreed, if you will, to try to work with the Forest Service to see if we can work through the issues that we have, but our general management plan in 1999 or 1998 actually is the official position, if you will, of the National Park Service.

Senator WYDEN. So you say today you support the intent of the legislation, but you do not support the legislation.

Mr. WENK. Senator, what we are saying is that we have agreed with the Forest Service to work diligently to see what we can work out in the short term.

Senator WYDEN. So you would like to have this worked out what? In 60 days?

Mr. WENK. I think the number we have talked about is trying within 6 months to work it out.

Senator WYDEN. So you want another 6 months on top of the fact that I introduced the legislation a year ago, on top of the fact you all were supportive of it in the past. Now you want 6 months. What is going to be accomplished in this 6 months that has not been accomplished in the last year?

Mr. WENK. I cannot answer that question, Senator.

Senator WYDEN. Then why would I support your position? This is what is so baffling about it. You just said you need 6 more months. I want to be responsive to your interests, and I said what are you going to accomplish in the next 6 months that you have not accomplished in the last year, and you do not have an answer to it.

I mean, I am not going to belabor this. Gentlemen, I hope you will put your heads together because it is my intent to work with the chairman and the ranking minority member to move this legislation as quickly as possible. This is darned near a textbook case for lack of cooperation between the Forest Service and the Park Service on something my constituents feel very strongly about, and I am going to do everything I can as a member of this committee to get this worked out.

Thank you for your time.

I thank Senator Burr for the extra time to be able to pose the questions on something that folks at home feel very strongly about. I thank you.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Wyden.

I have one last question before I check with Senator Burr to see if he has any other questions, and then we will bring up the next panel.

Mr. Wenk, the final question I have concerns H.R. 2430, the North Cascades fish stocking bill that Senator Cantwell discussed with you. As presently written, the bill would direct the Park Service to authorize the stocking of fish in the identified parks. If the bill were amended to make that authority discretionary instead of mandatory, would the Park Service still be able to continue with the fish stocking program, or do you need an explicit override of park management laws?

Mr. WENK. With discretionary authority—we would still be able to stock the lakes, sir.

Senator UDALL. I was curious. I was visiting with the staff about Rocky Mountain National Park and whether the questions that are being asked here would also apply to Rocky Mountain National Park. I have fished in some of the high lakes there. I do not know if they have been stocked. I imagine some of them have been. I just draw that to your attention and my intention perhaps for a future conversation.

Mr. WENK. Thank you, Senator. It has been the policy of the National Park Service to not stock fish in lakes for—and I cannot give you the exact date—for quite a period of time to try to return the natural systems. This case at North Cascades is an exception.

Senator UDALL. It is an exception. I appreciate that clarification. I do know that well-meaning anglers and back country enthusiasts have, through the decades, carried fish, more appropriately fingerlings, to some of these high lakes. I know of certain cases too where those pilots who own airplanes have been convinced to make fly overs and stock lakes in that same way. I finally appreciate the way in which the Park Service has kept faith with the National Environmental Policy Act and with the Organic Act of the Park Service. So these conversations will, obviously, continue and we will grapple with the right outcomes and the right approaches. So thank you.

Mr. WENK. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. Senator Burr, do you have any—thank you, again, for joining us. Next week perhaps, same place, same time?

With that, let me call the second panel forward. We look forward to the second panel's testimony.

As the second panel takes its seats, let me do a little bit of housekeeping. Senators Levin and Stabenow have statements on their lighthouse bill to be included in the record. Without objection, we will order that to happen.

[The prepared statements of Senators Levin and Stabenow follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CARL LEVIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN,
ON S. 715

Chairman Udall and members of the subcommittee, thank you for holding this hearing on S. 715, the National Lighthouse Stewardship Act. This legislation creates a three year competitive grant program at the Department of the Interior that will help to pay for the preservation and rehabilitation of historic lighthouses across the country. The grants will help nonprofit organizations, which serve as caretakers for these historic landmarks, to help them preserve and rehabilitate the historic lighthouses and keep them accessible to the public.

This legislation complements a bill that was enacted in October 2000, the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act, which I joined Sen. Frank Murkowski (R-AK) in offering. With the Coast Guard getting out of the lighthouse business, the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act helped facilitate the process of transferring historic lighthouses from the government to nonprofit historical organizations that would take over the responsibility for their care. It established an expedited process through the Government Services Agency to help ease lighthouse transfers by helping to cut through the bureaucratic red tape. As a result of the law, 51 lighthouses to date—13 in Michigan—have been transferred to custodians who will preserve them and keep them accessible to the public.

Many of these lighthouse structures are in need of significant repair and rehabilitation, which is now the responsibility of their nonprofit custodians. Unfortunately, after obtaining custody of the lighthouses, many of the nonprofit organizations have struggled to raise the funds to adequately restore and maintain the lighthouses. To address this problem our legislation establishes a pilot program that would enable state and nonprofit groups to apply for competitive grants to help with restoration and maintenance efforts. This pilot program would authorize the secretary to distribute \$20 million a year for three years.

Funding for lighthouse restoration is important to Michigan and to the nation's historic preservation efforts. There are approximately 740 lighthouses in 31 coastal states. Michigan alone has over 120 lighthouses, more than any other state. They draw thousands of visitors to Michigan and other states each year and create jobs throughout our states. Michigan's and the nation's lighthouses are national treasures that beautify our shorelines. These historic lighthouses are part of our nation's rich maritime heritage. The grants are needed to help nonprofit organizations, which serve as caretakers for the historic landmarks, to maintain the beauty of the lighthouses and keep them accessible to the public.

My office worked closely with lighthouse preservation groups in drafting this legislation. The Michigan Lighthouse Fund in my home state was invaluable in providing information on the needs of our nation's lighthouses. The funding that would be provided by this bill is desperately needed by these groups that work tirelessly to preserve our nation's maritime heritage.

This funding would help ensure our lighthouses remain cultural beacons for generations to come. America's lighthouses are national treasures that we cannot let deteriorate to the point beyond repair. I hope the subcommittee will support the National Lighthouse Stewardship Act.

I ask that the following letters from lighthouse organizations in support of this legislation be included with my testimony in the hearing record.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for holding this hearing and for considering this important piece of legislation that I have co-authored with Senator Levin. I would also like to thank Senators Burris, Collins, Durbin, Schumer, and Snowe for co-sponsoring this legislation, and emphasizing the importance of this bi-partisan effort to restore our nation's lighthouses.

I also would like to extend a very warm welcome to Dr. Kirk Lindquist. Dr. Lindquist has been a strong advocate for lighthouse restoration for years, and I greatly appreciate him sharing his expertise with us in this area. It is a pleasure having him here on behalf of the Michigan Lighthouse Project.

Michigan's lighthouses are an important part of our history, and the history of the Great Lakes. For decades these unique structures have helped to guide marine vessels of all sizes to our shores, and help the flow of goods and services to the Great Lakes and other coastal regions. Lighthouses also serve as tourist destinations for thousands of visitors each year, and generate much needed revenue for their surrounding communities. Perhaps no other region in the United States is as closely tied to their lighthouses as the Great Lakes community.

The Great Lakes make up 20 percent of the world's fresh water supply, and thirty-three million people rely on the Great Lakes for their drinking water, including 10 million for Lake Michigan alone. The Great Lakes' coastlines also are home to wetlands, dunes and endangered species and plants. Lake Michigan alone contains over 417 coastal wetlands, the most of any Great Lake.

The Great Lakes are not just an important natural resource, but they are a critical part of Michigan's economy and quality of life. Millions of people use the Great Lakes each year to enjoy our beaches, fishing and boating. Often during vacations, residents and visitors make time to visit one of Michigan's 130 lighthouses located on our nearly 3,288 miles of coastline. However, Michigan will not be the only state that will benefit from this legislation, this bill will help restore lighthouses all along the thousands of miles of coastline on the east and west coasts of the United States.

Unfortunately, the lack of available funding has caused many of our lighthouses to deteriorate. In 2006, I authored the Michigan Lighthouse and Maritime Heritage Act, a bill that Senator Levin joined me in introducing to help preserve the history of this precious natural resource. The legislation required the National Park Service to study and make recommendations as to the best way to promote and protect Michigan's lighthouses and maritime resources. I mention this legislation because the bill that we are considering today would build upon past preservation efforts with new funding.

I am proud to co-sponsor The National Lighthouse Stewardship Act. As has been noted, this legislation would create a three year competitive grant program. This program would be administered by the Department of the Interior, and would provide grants to stewards of historic lighthouses to help preserve and rehabilitate the areas they are caring for.

Given the funding constraints that have hampered past restoration efforts, the funding from this program is critical. Each lighthouse is unique, with a history that must be shared and preserved. Lighthouse restorations can sometimes be a financial burden to the local government or nonprofit group making the repairs. By allowing these groups to apply for additional assistance through a competitive grant program, we can minimize their financial burden, and maintain the quality and integrity of the restorations. These restorations will not only preserve our lighthouses, but they will also create jobs and promote tourism at a time when our economy, especially in Michigan, is struggling.

I look forward to working together to preserve our nation's lighthouses for future generations through the National Lighthouse Stewardship Act. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

Senator UDALL. Senator Stabenow asks that I convey her regrets that she could not testify in person today on her lighthouse bill. She is on the Agriculture Committee holding a hearing on the climate change. So I know, Dr. Lindquist, you are a constituent of the two Senators I just mentioned, and she wanted you to know that she sends her best wishes. I am certain the two of you have worked together in crafting the legislation that we will hear about.

We have been joined by Greg Walter, who is from Cave Junction, Oregon, a constituent of Senator Wyden. Senator Wyden, did you want to say anything about Mr. Walter?

Senator WYDEN. I just am so glad he came. He is involved in just about every good cause in his community, and we are so appreciative of his involvement and particularly this cause. I think for you it has almost been a crusade to expand the boundary, and I really appreciate your coming back. I know it is a long, physically tiring trip. I welcome you and the other witness.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator UDALL. Mr. Walter, with that nice introduction, why do we not turn to you for your testimony? We grant you, give or take, 5 minutes. If you could keep your remarks in that timeframe, then we will look forward to asking you some questions. Dr. Lindquist, you will follow with your testimony when Mr. Walter is finished. Mr. Walter?

**STATEMENT OF GREG WALTER, JEFFERSON STATE
FINANCIAL GROUP, CAVE JUNCTION, OR**

Mr. WALTER. I would like to start by thanking everyone for hearing my testimony today. Hello, all. My name is Greg Walter and I am an independent health insurance agent and co-owner of Jefferson State Financial Group in Cave Junction, Oregon. We service the community with health insurance, and we commend Mr. Wyden's efforts for the health insurance stuff. We will talk.

I am here to speak today on the positive benefits that an expanded Oregon Caves National Monument will bring to our community in the Illinois Valley of southwest Oregon.

The Oregon Caves National Monument was established in 1909 by President Taft to acknowledge and protect the marble halls of Oregon, as author Joaquin Miller described the caves in 1907. While 2,560 acres were originally withdrawn for the monument, President Taft designated a small 480-acre rectangular boundary in 1909. At that time, it was assumed that protecting the immediate area above the cave was sufficient to protect the caves.

Scientific studies over the century, however, have made it clear that below-ground caves interact with the environment above ground. It is obvious that protecting the cave creek watershed and also the lake creek watershed is key to protecting this unique cave system. Indeed, impacts on the surface environment influence the sensitive underground processes of the caves and the River Styx, which would become one of the first underground Wild and Scenic Rivers under the proposed legislation.

The current boundary simply cannot protect this cave system. While more information has been made available in recent years, the Park Service acknowledged the need for an expanded Oregon Caves National Monument as far back as 1939 and 1949 and again in their 2000 general management plan. It is long past due to fully protect this national treasure.

In order to protect cave ecology, surface and subsurface hydrology, forest ecology, view sheds, and public water supply at the national monument and also for rural economic development of Josephine County, the Oregon Caves expansion should, one, include a surface drinking water supply for the over 80,000 visitors annually—that is primarily for the Chateau—two, to protect additional surface and subsurface natural resources for current and future generations of Americans; and three, provide local rural economic development opportunities and expanded recreation at the monument.

The historic and majestic Chateau at the Oregon Caves is part of a concession operated by our Illinois Valley Community Development Organization and seasonally employs about 30 people from the local community. Operated as a local nonprofit organization, all profits are put back into the community in the form of community grants.

I also want to add that the local community development organization that operates the Chateau sees this as an economy of scale, meaning that unless we draw up a way to retain our visiting public longer, that their concession will fold or go out of business. There are only 23 rooms in the Chateau. There are about 50 seated at the dining room. They are running about 50 percent capacity. So

the expansion proposal would help in this. We would be able to better retain our visiting public that is already there. Maximizing concessions at the Oregon Caves is important to our community.

According to the National Park Service, 73 percent of visitors would stay longer at the Oregon Caves if there were more to do than a 90-minute cave tour currently offered. One of the most botanically rich and scenic forests in America surrounds the Oregon Caves and offers visitors breathtaking views, abundant wild flowers, wildlife viewing, and memorable hikes. The Oregon Caves is an appealing asset that increases the quality of life for residents and brings visitors that contribute to our local economy.

Protecting the caves via an expansion and through the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act would safeguard water supplies, sensitive ecology, and local business.

Included in my written testimony are 25 letters* from local businesses that support this legislation that I gathered in just a few days. This is from a broad base or community support. I can, obviously, get more.

So I just want to thank everybody for your time and hearing me on this.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Walter follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GREG AND MARY WALTER, JEFFERSON STATE FINANCIAL GROUP, CAVE JUNCTION, OR

My name is Greg Walter. I am an independent health insurance agent and co-owner of Jefferson State Financial Group, LLC located in the Illinois Valley. Our business serves the Southern Oregon area by helping our clients find the best health coverage for the lowest cost. I am a member of the Illinois Valley Community Development Organization Revolving Loan Fund Board where we award small business U.S. Department of Agriculture low interest loans. Additionally, I study regional history, work with our local historical societies and have a private map collection that pertains to what has occurred on public lands post European settlement with an emphasis towards the history of the U.S. Forest Service and forest policy.

I am here to speak today on the positive benefits that an expanded Oregon Caves National Monument (OCNM) will bring to our community of Cave Junction in the Illinois Valley of Southwest Oregon. I want to approach this from both a business and social perspective and hopefully bring to light where our community currently stands economically and where we hope to see ourselves in ten years.

First a little background on whom we are as a community.

The Illinois Valley is in the southern part of Josephine County with approximately 10,000 residents. Cave Junction is the second largest city in the county with a population of about 1,700 people located in the Illinois Valley 27 miles southwest of Grants Pass on Hwy 199 and is 12 miles north of the California border. Cave Junction got its start in tourism as the gateway to the Oregon Caves providing tourists with services. After World War II logging became the economic focus but "by the late 50's the logging boom had played itself out"¹. At one time there were 56 saw mills in the county but now only 1 remains. The top employers in the Illinois Valley are Josephine County School District, the Forest Service, two small grocery stores and the lumber mill. The other employers are made up of tourism businesses, small service companies, four wineries and one sausage manufacturing company.

According to a 2007 census for the county, logging and mining made up 2.75% of the overall employment picture and manufacturing made up 22%. The large employers in the county are 30 miles away in Grants Pass: Fire Mountain Gems and Master Brand Cabinets, to name a few.

The Illinois Valley is a remote rural area in Josephine County. Low wages, a lack of economic opportunity, high unemployment and rural poverty characterize this area. We have basically condemned the community pool, we have no public library and our local Boys and Girls Club struggles annually to keep its doors open operating out of the local elementary school with no facility of its own. The County re-

* See Appendix II.

¹ Piraino Realty Brochure c1972, page 15.

ceives federal funding through the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act.

A diversified, sustainable local economy is our best hope for a stable, healthy future. Josephine County's success is dependent on nurturing a diversified economy that includes developing a sustainable, restoration-based forest industry that can rely on a non-controversial supply, and it includes protecting the natural treasures of our region. There are appropriate places for logging and appropriate places for permanent protection. Safeguarding the Oregon Caves is good for nature and for business.

The Chateau at the Oregon Caves is a concession operated by our Illinois Valley Community Development Organization and seasonally employs about thirty people from the local community. Being operated as a local non-profit organization all profits are put back into the community in the form of Community Grants.

The Chateau has twenty three rooms and can seat about fifty people in their dining room on any given night. Their operating season begins in mid May and traditionally goes through September. The Illinois Valley Community Development Organization buys local food products and markets local artwork. This is an economy of scale, and because the scale is relatively small it cannot continue its operation and concessions unless we see some growth in visitation and duration of stay.

As the name implies, Cave Junction is a gateway community to the Oregon Caves. Visitors travel on Hwy 199 (The Redwood Highway) usually going to the Redwoods from Crater Lake National Park or vice-versa. The economic opportunity that Highway 199 offers to our small rural community through travel spending is considerable. There are about 300,000 tourist vehicles traveling through this corridor annually, each carrying an average group size of three people who spend an average of \$135 per day on lodging, food, gas, and other items. The total spending potential of this tourist corridor is about \$40 million dollars annually. The Illinois valley has not taken advantage of this economic engine in our backyard. According to a fall 2006 report released by the Outdoor Industry Foundation, outdoor recreation contributes \$730 billion annually to the U.S. economy, and supports nearly 6.5 million jobs across the country. We should do a better job at protecting and marketing this area.

According to the National Park Service statistics, approximately 73% of visitors would stay longer if there was more to do than the 90-minute cave tour. One of the most botanically diverse national forests in America surrounds the Oregon Caves and offers visitors breath-taking views, abundant wildflowers, wildlife viewing and memorable hikes. Unfortunately, the surrounding landscape is not marketed by the Forest Service in a way that maximizes the public enjoyment or economic potential of this unique area.

Currently, the exceptionally scenic trail system from the Bigelow Lakes trailhead (that is part of the proposed expansion area) has been cleared, but the Forest Service has not provided clear signage on the trails within the proposed monument expansion. More pointedly, there is a confusing network of roads to get to the undesignated trailhead, most of which are unmarked and the signs vandalized or removed. If the expansion bill passes the subsequent Park Service improvements could lead to the development of a more family-oriented, user-friendly place that visitors could hike to and they would stay longer.

Across the United States, there is growing recognition of the link between attractive public lands such as national parks, and the well-being of the communities that provide access to them. These "gateway communities" generally provide food, lodging, and other services for visitors. But the parks are more than simple magnets for visitors. Many gateway communities have thriving, diverse economies that are not primarily dependent upon tourism and recreation. Yet the natural appeal of these areas is at the heart of their economic success.

The Oregon Caves is an appealing asset that increases the quality of life for residents and brings visitors that contribute to our local economy. Cave Junction, the Illinois Valley in general and Grants Pass all stand to benefit from increased protections and visibility of this special place. In addition to the economic benefits of protecting this recreational magnet, protecting the caves via an expansion and through the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act would safeguard water supplies, sensitive ecology and wildlife habitat.

The Oregon Caves National Monument was established in 1909 by President Taft to acknowledge and protect the "Marble Halls of Oregon," as author Joaquin Miller described the caves in 1907. While 2,560 acres were originally withdrawn for the Monument, President Taft only designated a small 480-acre rectangular boundary in 1909. At that time, it was assumed that protecting the immediate area above the cave was sufficient to protect the subterranean ecology. However, scientific studies and new technology over the past century have made it clear that the complexities

of cave ecology most definitely include an interaction with the terrestrial and aquatic environment above ground. It has become obvious that the protection of the Cave Creek watershed is instrumental in protecting this unique subterranean system. Indeed, impacts on the surface environment influence the sensitive hydrological processes of the caves. The current boundary size simply cannot protect this cave system. While more information has been made available about the complex interaction of surface and subsurface ecology in recent years, the Park Service acknowledged the need for an expanded Oregon Caves National Monument and made such proposals in 1939, 1949 and again in 2000. It is long past due to fully protect this national treasure.

Expanding the Oregon Caves will benefit our gateway community in the following ways:

1. Fully protecting the complex ecology of this cave system by protecting the interconnected terrestrial and aquatic environments above ground.

2. It will bring an increase in the number of visitors, but more importantly they will have incentive to stay longer and visit a spectacular example of a very accessible backcountry glacial cirque, high mountain lakes and expansive views of northwest California and southwest Oregon, including the Siskiyou Crest, Red Buttes, Mt Shasta, Marble Mountains and Siskiyou Wilderness areas. This is all seen from the high point of Mt Elijah in the expansion area (the peak is named in memory of Elijah Davidson, who discovered the Oregon Caves in 1874). The Park Service has statistical evidence that the longer visitors stay in an area, the infusion into that local economy multiplies exponentially. OCNM surveys of visitors indicate that 73% of visitors would stay longer if there were more trails with features.

3. Expansion will also bring the resources and expertise of the National Park Service as far as maintaining access, trails, signage and campgrounds. Most importantly it brings Park Service branding. When visitors see the National Park Service arrowhead and national monument sign, they know they have arrived at their destination. It means they have arrived at a visitor friendly and family safe place. A bigger place with more things to do can attract more visitors and longer stays.

4. The historic Oregon Caves Chateau could be showcased as one of the great lodges of the northwest along with Mt. Rainier's Paradise Lodge, Mt Hood's Timberline Lodge, the Crater Lake Lodge, and the Benbow Inn in California. The Chateau may benefit from the expansion because the rooms could be occupied more consistently and local campgrounds will see greater use. While staying longer they will enjoy fine dining as well as have access to purchase local artwork at the Chateau gift shop. The season could also be extended an additional two months with increased visitation.

5. The Chateau is currently undergoing various stages of restoration from funding provided both by private donations and pending federal funding, which has resulted in an increased interest.

6. There is a component to this expansion that will allow for the retirement of a cattle grazing allotment and the removal of cattle from the Bigelow Lakes and Lake Creek drainage, which will provide the Chateau with cleaner water. For years, the Park Service has expressed concern about the contamination of the Monument's drinking supply due to cattle grazing. The allotment retirement would protect water quality, as well as sensitive and unique meadows that provide exceptional hiking opportunities around the Caves.

7. Above the Caves in the High Siskiyou Mountains are the Bigelow Lakes. Formed in a glacial cirque the lakes are surrounded by meadows and primeval forests. Ancient species of Brewer's Spruce and rare flowering plants inhabit the area as relics from the ice age. Due to its unique characteristics the area has been given special botanical area designation. However, the Forest Service has done little to manage for and protect this valuable resource. The Park Service has a proven track record for managing natural areas. For example, a rare botanical specimen, the California globe mallow, which grows in the area, requires periodic burning to germinate its seeds. The Park Service would be able to meet the plants needs with prescribed burning. Currently, the Forest Service emphasizes cattle grazing which is harmful to the plant and is contributing to the need to list the plant under the Endangered Species Act. Most people visit natural areas where they are sure to see rare botany or wildlife, not grazed meadows and cow patties.

8. Another important point is that the original Monument boundaries did not take into consideration the extent of the cave network underground, which extends outside of the current boundaries. Expanding the Monument boundaries

will provide protection for the entire cave network, including the terrestrial and aquatic environment above the caves, which are essential to cave ecology.

9. The expansion would open the door for Park Service nature tours in the upper Lake Creek watershed and evening presentations at Caves Campground that would better inform the American public about public lands, cave ecology, the role of fire in western forests, climate change, and the need to protect native plant diversity.

10. Lastly, the local art and tourism business and organizations are working together to produce brochures and information on the wealth of local attractions and products uniquely available to this community. The Illinois Valley has a large population of artists and entrepreneurs that are currently struggling due to lack of exposure. The Monument would be the initial destination to draw the tourist here but once they discover venues of interest, statistically they will come back again and again as well as tell friends about what they have found here.

In review, the Oregon Caves National Monument is currently an important draw to the area, but it is not comparable with other primary park and recreation destinations in the region. With all of its scenery and grandeur, Oregon has so few National Park units and we deserve more. This could be addressed by expanding and protecting the Monument's resources, providing greater access to the visiting public and improving a diversified business climate by increasing opportunities to make the Caves and Chateau as successful and regionally important as they can be. This will bring the valley community great pride and positive economic growth from the ability to showcase this backcountry crown jewel and historic Chateau that will benefit all Americans for generations to come.

I thank you all for your time.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Walter.

Mr. Lindquist, you are from the Michigan Lighthouse Project, and you hail from—how do you say your hometown?

Mr. LINDQUIST. Okemos, sir.

Senator UDALL. Okemos, Michigan. Thank you for joining us.

Mr. LINDQUIST. Thank you very much.

Senator UDALL. You have 5 minutes to share your perspective with us.

STATEMENT OF KIRK L. LINDQUIST, MEMBER, MICHIGAN LIGHTHOUSE PROJECT AND PAST PRESIDENT, MICHIGAN LIGHTHOUSE FUND, OKEMOS, MI

Dr. LINDQUIST. Mr. Chairman, Senator Burr, members of the subcommittee, my name is Kirk Lindquist, member of the Michigan Lighthouse Project. This is the interagency work group established to facilitate the orderly transfer of federally owned lighthouse properties. I am also past President of the Michigan Lighthouse Fund, the statewide nonprofit organization dedicated to securing financial resources for Michigan lighthouse stewardship organizations.

I am very pleased to be here to present comments and discuss the merits of the National Lighthouse Stewardship Act of 2009 and urge the committee to report out favorably S. 715.

This bill would authorize grants to all 31 coastal States to protect and preserve our Nation's historic lighthouses. Stewardship grants would be awarded in a manner consistent with existing Federal law and State historic preservation regulations.

It would also support rehabilitation efforts for lighthouses managed within the National Seashore and Lakeshore systems, as well as other Federal agencies, provided there is involvement of the nonprofit stewards.

The Federal Government has provided funding for lighthouse operations and maintenance since the beginning of the lighthouse program in 1787. This is no longer the case. Many properties have been excessed over the last 35 years and transferred or sold. Once these properties were removed from the Federal hands, no Federal funding has been available for maintenance or major repair.

The pace of transfers has picked up considerably after 1995. Technological developments in geo-positioning and other navigational aids during the 1990s prompted the United States Coast Guard to get out of the lighthouse business. Since that time, many lighthouse properties maintained by the Coast Guard have been transferred or sold to governments, nonprofit organizations, and private interests.

In 2002, the National Historic Preservation Act, the NHLPA, became law. This was cosponsored by Senator Frank Murkowski and Senator Carl Levin. This legislation established a process to facilitate these transfers and gave priority to State/local governments and nonprofit lighthouse stewardship organizations. The NHLPA program is administered through the combined efforts of the National Park Service in cooperation with the United States Coast Guard and General Services Administration and has been a notable success.

The financial need of our Nation's lighthouses has been difficult to estimate. Deferred maintenance has created major problems for their new owners. Normal maintenance costs for each of these 150-year-old structures can easily exceed \$80,000 per year. Rehabilitation estimates are much more, as much as \$1,500,000 per lighthouse. It is easy to predict the fate of these properties that cannot be maintained by volunteer or private landlords. They will be abandoned. The need exists even though the Coast Guard is no longer in the lighthouse business.

Just as there are 31 coastal States with lighthouses, there are at least 31 different approaches to their maintenance and rehabilitation. 10 States have specialty license plates featuring lighthouses, but only one has a sustained grant program for lighthouse preservation. This bill encourages the Department of the Interior to work through existing grant programs where practicable, especially in partnership with State historic preservation offices. This is why a pilot program is suggested. Through experience gained during this 3-year period, a preferred process will evolve and applied in a longer-term grant program.

The purpose of the excess program is to save Federal money, and these properties have been expeditiously transferred to local governments and nonprofit stewards. However, many of these groups have budgets supported by less than \$20,000 in annual revenue. The purpose of S. 715 is to provide for the difference between what they can afford and the amount needed to preserve and rehabilitate their structures.

We suggest only that the Federal Government should do the right thing. We are not asking that the traditional funding source be restored; only that the commitment to maintain these properties be respected.

Lighthouse and other maritime interests strongly support S. 715. I request that letters of support be included in the hearing record,

along with my written testimony. S. 715 would be an important tool for preservation and protection and as an instrument of economic growth for our Nation's coastal communities. It is my hope that the committee will support its enactment.

This concludes my prepared remarks. Thank you very much for the invitation to testify about issues addressed by this bill. I would be happy to respond to any questions you might have. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Lindquist follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KIRK L. LINDQUIST, MEMBER, MICHIGAN LIGHTHOUSE PROJECT AND PAST PRESIDENT, MICHIGAN LIGHTHOUSE FUND, ON S. 715

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, my name is Kirk Lindquist, member of the Michigan Lighthouse Project: the interagency work group established to facilitate the orderly transfer of federally owned lighthouse properties to government agencies, local governments and non-profit organizations. I also have served as President of the Michigan Lighthouse Fund: the statewide nonprofit organization dedicated to securing financial resources for Michigan lighthouse stewardship organizations. I am pleased to be here to present comments and discuss the merits of the National Lighthouse Stewardship Act of 2009, and urge the committee to report out favorably S. 715.

This bill would authorize grants to all 31 coastal states to protect and preserve our nation's historic lighthouses. Stewardship grants would be awarded in a manner consistent with existing federal law and state historic preservation regulations.

- Provide grants to states, local governmental units, and nonprofit stewardship organizations for lighthouse rehabilitation and preservation
- Support rehabilitation efforts for lighthouses managed with in the National Seashore and Lakeshore systems, as well as other federal agencies
- Authorize \$20,000,000 per year during the 3-year pilot program for lighthouse preservation

FEDERAL FUNDING FOR LIGHTHOUSE OPERATIONS

The Federal Government has provided funding for lighthouse operations and maintenance since the beginning of the lighthouse program in 1797. This is no longer the case. Many properties have been exsessed over the last 35 years and transferred or sold. Once these properties were removed from federal hands, no funding has been available for maintenance or major repair. The pace of transfers picked up considerably after 1995. Technological developments in geo-positioning and other navigation aids during the 1990's, prompted the USCG to get out of the lighthouse business. Since that time, many lighthouse properties maintained by the Coast Guard have been transferred or sold to governments, non-profit organizations, and private interests.

In 1995, the U.S. Government accelerated the pace of transfers of light station properties from federal ownership. In 2002, the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act (NHLPA; co-sponsored by Senator Frank Murkowski and Senator Carl Levin) became law. This legislation established a process to facilitate these transfers, and gave priority to state/local governments and nonprofit lighthouse stewardship organizations. The NHLPA program is administered through the combined efforts of the National Park Service, in cooperation with the U.S. Coast Guard and the General Services Administration, and has been a notable success.

The revenue stream from the Tonnage Duty continues to support the U.S. Coast Guard, through the Department of Homeland Security, but little federal money has been spent on lighthouse repair. Deferred maintenance has created major problems for their new owners. Normal maintenance costs for each of these 150 year old structures can easily exceed \$80,000 per year. Rehabilitation estimates are much more: as much as \$1,500,000 per lighthouse. It is easy to predict the fate of properties that can not be maintained by volunteer or private landlords: they will be abandoned. Nationally, a conservative estimated need for lighthouse rehabilitation and protection is more than \$110,000,000. The need exists, even though the Coast Guard is no longer in the lighthouse business.

PROPOSED NATIONAL LIGHTHOUSE STEWARDSHIP ACT OF 2009

Just as there are 31 coastal states with lighthouses, there are at least 31 different approaches to their maintenance and rehabilitation. Ten states have specialty li-

cense plates featuring lighthouses, but only one has a sustained grant program for lighthouse preservation. This bill encourages the Department of Interior to work through existing grant programs, where practicable, especially in partnership with State Historic Preservation Offices. This is why a pilot program is suggested. Through experience gained during this 3-year period, a preferred process will evolve, and applied in a longer term grant program.

The purpose of the excess program is to save money, and these properties have been expeditiously transferred to local governments and non-profit stewards. However, many of these groups have budgets supported by less than \$20,000 in annual revenue. The purpose of S.715 is to provide funding for the difference between what they can afford and the amount needed to preserve and rehabilitate their structures.

We suggest only that the Federal Government should do the right thing. We are not asking that the traditional funding source be restored; only that the commitment to maintain these properties be respected.

Lighthouse and other maritime interests strongly support S.715. I request that letters of support be included in the hearing record along with my written testimony. S.715 would be an important tool for preservation and protection, and as an instrument of economic growth for our Nation's coastal communities. I hope the committee will support its enactment.

This concludes my prepared remarks.

Thank you very much for the invitation to testify about issues addressed by this bill. I would be happy to respond to any questions you or the subcommittee might have.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Dr. Lindquist.

Let me turn to Mr. Walter for a question. Thanks again for your testimony. Your passion for the area clearly comes through. I enjoyed reading about the history of the Oregon Caves, the proximity to Crater Lake, and other great areas in Oregon. I had a chance to live in Portland and work in eastern Oregon in the Elkhorn Mountains and the Wallowa Mountains and am familiar with some of the beautiful natural areas in Oregon.

Your testimony clearly highlighted the many reasons that you believe the Park Service had managed this addition as a part of the national monument. Given the testimony you heard—and I am sure you are familiar with it—recommending additional time for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service to explore ways to increase their coordination, how do you view this approach to managing the Oregon Caves resources? Do you think a partnership between the two could adequately protect the monument, or do you bring a different perspective?

Mr. WALTER. I think that it would be nice to see the Forest Service and the Park Service work together. The expanded monument is going to be surrounded by Forest Service land regardless. So they are going to have to work collaboratively.

Senator UDALL. Regardless of whether that land transfer occurs, one way or the other, they are going to have a common boundary. Are they not?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

The only thing that I could think of to say is that as far as the cattle grazing, somebody has to explain to cows where the boundaries are.

But also the other thing about that too is that right now I know that they have funding for an additional—not to mention what they have already done—400 acres to do some restoration forestry up there, and it is really good work. Everybody applauds it, and I would like to see it written into the language of the bill that the Forest Service could continue to do that good work, as far as that goes. I do not know about beyond that.

As far as the collaborative efforts between—or whatever issues that they have, as a local business person, obviously, we would like to see them work together. But we also want to see the area managed for the visiting public, and that is one thing that I think the Forest Service has not done a really, really good job with. Some of that is just local vandals tearing down the signs, but the signs do not come back up again. So what happens is that we do not get people going back into these areas that we have up there. So we have the resources and we have the trails even, but we just do not have proper signage and proper parking to allow for the visiting public to safely access in a family friendly manner.

Senator UDALL. Is one of the key concerns that you have and those who are advocating for the expansion that the grazing that is occurring, as legitimate as grazing is, is not as compatible with the monument as you think is necessary?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, insofar as the—there are several issues that are going on there. It could be the water supply since the lake creek drainage—this is where they get their water from as far as the Chateau. So it is something that we want to see. We would like to see the hydrology of the drainage cared for in a better manner.

Senator UDALL. I read the summaries of the Park Service and the Forest Service and, of course, advocates in your community for these new steps forward. It is common-sensical, but it was helpful to see it written, and I know Senator Burr has in his State incredible below-ground natural wonders and resources. But what happens on the surface of the earth then can affect cave ecology and cave life and cave dynamics. I think that is what you are speaking to here as well, that although you would like to think maybe that the two environments are segregated or separated, actually they are linked. Again, I do not want to put words in your mouth, but I think that is the concern that you are expressing, is to manage those surface activities in ways that are compatible with the cave ecosystem and the cave environment as well so that they are maintained for the enjoyment of the visitors and therefore your local economy is strong.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, sir.

Senator UDALL. Thank you again for your testimony.

Let me turn to Senator Burr for questions or comments he might have.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand we are going to have a couple of stacked votes here in the next 20 or so minutes. So just to let the chair know that.

Mr. Lindquist, I am sorry to sort of put you in the cross hairs with my opening statement, and I truly hope you do not take it personally. I was involved significantly in the original creation of this program. I value the Michigan lighthouses, value the North Carolina lighthouses. I have a real problem anytime we look back at things that we did and forget the reasons that we did them.

So let me, if I could, do you believe that it was understood by non-Federal entities who acquired lighthouses that there was not a Federal responsibility that extended to fund the maintenance and existence of those lighthouses?

Mr. LINDQUIST. I can respond to that in my capacity as working on the Michigan Lighthouse Project. As the interagency team, in-

cluding Federal agencies and State and local governments, I have worked with these applicants, although there is the National Park Service process as articulated in NHLPA.

Each time a property is exsessed or a notice of excess is issued, applicants have an opportunity to visit that site and make an assessment. They receive copies of the condition reports as they have been prepared and are available. It is our opinion, as the decision is made and whether or not a particular applicant is appropriate or not, that their eyes are open, that they fully understand that this is a transfer. There is a transfer of responsibility, as well as a transfer of right. The assumption on everybody's part is that an applicant, in fact, will follow through and carry out the same custodial role as implemented and carried out by a Federal agency.

Senator BURR. he reversion clause is clear in the application.

Mr. LINDQUIST. Certainly it is. Not to comment on the intent because I certainly was not involved in any of the discussions leading up to NHLPA, but the reversion clauses clearly not only provide for what happens when the wheels fall off the cart. It provides likewise for a subsequent notice of availability and the property will be, once again, subject to the process where an applicant organization would come forward and seek responsibility. So in a sense it is not so much a closed loop, but it is a feedback loop, if you will, very similar to that, and the intent that is to dispose of and follow the intent of the excess is to make sure that the properties are in the hands of a capable organization.

Senator BURR. There was a tremendous lack of confidence as to whether the Federal Government would do anything other than stand by and watch these historic landmarks disintegrate and deteriorate.

Mr. LINDQUIST. That is true, and actually we have watched that happen during this process. We have a number of properties that have not transferred. We have one in particular in Michigan, just to use a Michigan example, in St. Joseph, where we have a property which is unbelievably beautiful. It is whitewashed. It has red roofs. It sits on a pier head. Tourist councils in the area, as well as the West Michigan Tourist Council, feature it in all their literature. The one thing to keep in mind, however, is that as you are taking a look at that pier head, the keeper's quarters has no second floor. It has fallen through. That is still under Federal ownership and responsibility.

It would be presumptuous to say that the new transferee, if you will, be it the city, would be able to do anything more than the Federal Government has in terms of safeguarding or protecting these structures from their own resources. This is clearly a plight that our lighthouses, especially the ones that are well over 100 years old, are facing.

Senator BURR. Let me, if I could, recap what the bill does. It creates a 3-year pilot program.

Mr. LINDQUIST. That is right.

Senator BURR. It authorizes \$20 million a year for each of those 3 years. You identified in your testimony that a conservative number is \$110 million to rehab these lighthouses in total. So we are asking in the 3-year pilot program to fund over 50 percent of the identified rehab that is needed for the lighthouses, funded through

a tonnage tax that currently all the funding of the tonnage tax goes to the operations of the United States Coast Guard.

Mr. LINDQUIST. One difference in interpretation I believe. This does not utilize the tonnage tax to pay for this program. The tonnage tax revenue is referenced as a ceiling or a maximum in terms of the total amount of available for this grant program.

Senator BURR. OK. So the authors offered no offset from the standpoint of—

Mr. LINDQUIST. No. As authorization bill, it does not have the offset. That is true.

Senator BURR. How much is currently being funded from the Michigan legislature for Michigan lighthouses?

Mr. LINDQUIST. The only money going out for Michigan lighthouses is from the license plate, and we have approximately \$200,000 per year generated through those people who are purchasing a Michigan lighthouse license plate. That translates into for approximately 18 of our 120—18 grantees in any particular year, usually a grant on the order of \$15,000 to \$35,000 depending on the nature of the application. A person or a group that receives money does not receive money the following year.

Senator BURR. I understand the tremendous tourism benefit that these lighthouses provide in addition to the pride of a community at preservation of a historic structure. But rationalize for me why it is in the United States taxpayers' interest if the State of Michigan or the State of North Carolina or any other State that is home to these historic properties do not see the value to their own tourism to put their own money in it over and above what has become, I think, a novel thing in many States, and that is designer license plates that law enforcement is now having a very difficult time distinguishing whose license plate it is from the standpoint of State. We will probably see a great curtailing of the number of these personalized license plates for that one reason. But share with me why this is in the taxpayers' interest of the country.

Mr. LINDQUIST. First of all, from the local perspective, to the extent that we are talking about local money, local investment, and local support for an organization that is attempting to maintain and keep a property open to the public, there is absolutely no question about the intent and desire of those communities to do so. This is not just a recent development, but it is certainly one that is commonly reported these days.

Because of the plight that all of our States have been encountering since 2001, the amount of money that is available locally through revenue sharing from State governments has been progressively and systematically nearly being reduced to the point where now there is no State role in the financing of local projects. This is a Michigan example but I believe that it is common in most State governments these days. If they had the money, absolutely.

I think that you would probably—but these lighthouses are located in rural areas. Many of them are located in areas where you have a county government with all the pluses and minuses of trying to run a county government. These are people who have second and third jobs in addition to perhaps serving on their county councils. These county governments will do whatever they can to give

moral support, but their total budgets can very easily be a shadow of what the lighthouse requirements—

Senator BURR. So if for some reason I said to you, geez, we could do this but let us incorporate it in the pot of money that is already going to that county. We will let the county decide, are you going to build the road, are you going to do the sidewalk, are you going to have a partnership with a nonprofit organization. Let us just say we put all the moneys together that we send to localities. Where do you think lighthouses are going to be in their choice?

Mr. LINDQUIST. I think for some of the larger communities where lighthouses are located and it is not only a focal point but is the identity for that community, the preservation and protection of that lighthouse, especially for those people involved in tourism, will be a high priority.

The question is whether or not it ranks equally to other priorities of that government, specifically security of its citizens, provision of protection from fires and whatever else untoward might happen within the community. We would always envision—and I think this is the case perhaps regardless of what jurisdictional level we are looking at—that the care and the safety of its citizens will be cared for primarily and principally before the other interests.

Senator BURR. I think you and I totally agree with that, and the likelihood is that as they prioritize the needs in that local community, lighthouses are going to be on that second half of that list. There are going to be those things up top that every community is struggling with right now.

I might say I have a piece of property in Michigan in Mason County. Governor Engler was nice enough, before he left office, to make those of us who did not live there permanently pay one and a half times the property tax so that we could educate Michigan kids. So I do not go into this with a great deal of warm and fuzzies relative to the way Michigan treats outsiders, but I also know that I have gotten numerous times letters from Mason County talking about the incredible unemployment, the incredible needs in the community. Oddly enough, I have never seen a community reach out to property owners for volunteer donations to help county government fill the needs, whether that is food, whether it is clothes of the residents. But it has happened. So I understand just how desperate it is up there.

Let me just suggest to you I think it is good that we try to preserve this piece of history. I am not sure that the Federal Government is the appropriate person to come to the aid of these projects, and that is with full recognition of just how tough it is from a standpoint of you as an entity of a volunteer organization who tries to raise money statewide or nationally or the community's desire that that piece be filled out.

But I think we are at a point where there is a prioritization at a local level, there is a prioritization at a State level, and contrary to what the American people believe, we are out of money here. We have got to take it from somewhere. I think we would have the same prioritization problem as we went through having many things that rank above this that do fill the need of safety, all the things that a local community would go through.

So I will continue to watch the progress of this. I cannot make you any promises relative to any support I can bring to it. I would encourage you to look for other avenues or to encourage Senator Stabenow or Senator Levin to find other funding mechanisms that might be appropriate, but clearly, it would only be where you found a program that there was not a need for and you replaced it with something historic.

Let me ask this. Do you have any idea of how much money currently is in the grant stream for lighthouse preservation?

Mr. LINDQUIST. I do not believe that there is an existing grant program through the Federal Government for lighthouse preservation and protection. There are grant programs existing, Save American Treasures, for example, and other programs congressionally controlled or legislatively controlled where funding through the grant program has been made available for lighthouse preservation and protection. But to my knowledge, there is no dedicated grant program for lighthouses.

Now, potentially within the historic preservation program, there are grants through the historic preservation offices. There are Federal funds there. To the extent that they have any State appropriation which is also dedicated for the same purpose, then there may be a grant program through which a lighthouse organization might apply.

Senator BURR. Let me make you this promise today. I have already asked my committee staff to review all Federal grant programs and to make me a list of all the appropriate grant programs that lighthouses would be eligible to go in and compete. When I get that list, I will share it with you—

Mr. LINDQUIST. Thank you.

Senator BURR [continuing]. Encourage you and others, including my State of North Carolina—you know, there is a big difference.

My good friend here may be thinking, well, the Federal Government put a lot of money into Hatteras when it was moved. That is owned by the National Park Service. It is still part of the Park Service. That is not one that was gifted, was titled over to a non-profit, to a community. It is an integral part of our tourism business on the Outer Banks. We have got others that are part of the National Park Service. We have got others that are not and were titled over and organizations did go through the rehab and preservation, and they are tremendous tourism tools. So I recognize the value of it.

Let me work with you to identify some other areas that potentially might have an interest in funding some of this preservation and I hope that they bring some added options to you. I thank you.

Mr. LINDQUIST. Thank you very much.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator Burr, for this very informative and illuminating discussion.

Thank you both for taking the time to come to Washington, DC, on behalf of the causes and projects that you hold dear.

As the hearing closes, I would like to make note that some members of the committee may submit additional questions in writing, and if so, we may ask you to submit answers for the record. To that end, we will keep the hearing record open for 2 weeks to receive any additional comments.

With that, the subcommittee is adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 3:49 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 DAN WENK FROM SENATOR WYDEN

Question 1. Following up on the Administration's request to try to find a cooperative management approach, can you point to any successful examples where the Forest Service and Park Service have successfully co-managed a Park unit and its surrounding natural resources, such as the Cave and its watershed?

Question 2. Isn't it the case that even if a cooperative agreement, such as a Memorandum of Understanding, was entered into by the agencies it could be easily terminated or modified and therefore provides no permanent protection for this natural treasure?

Question 3. How is your testimony, which appears to be a shift from the 1998 General Management Plan—which recommends expansion—consistent with the Centennial Challenge, which seeks to expand and enhance National Parks, and the Park's own 2007 Centennial Strategy document which lays out a goal of providing further education on the plan to expand the boundary?

Question 4. Mr. Wenk, my understanding is that every National Park has a fire management plan and officer assigned to it and that last year's fires in California demonstrated that National Park Service lands have responded well in slowing down advancing fires because they have been well managed to withstand these fires, including undertaking necessary forest health projects, such as hazardous fuels removal. Can you elaborate on the experience the National Park Service have in managing lands for fire resiliency?

Question 5. What fire and forest restoration activities have been undertaken by the Park Service in the Oregon Caves National Monument?

Question 6. Can you tell me of any reason why you believe the National Park Service would be unable to undertake the forest health projects needed in the area proposed for expansion?

Question 7. My legislation includes language providing for forest management activities in the land proposed for inclusion in the Monument. Do you believe this language is sufficient or is further legislative language required to ensure that forest health treatments occur?

Question 8. Can you provide me a copy of all the correspondence between the National Park Service and the Forest Service regarding the potential contamination of the Caves' drinking water supply from grazing?

QUESTIONS FOR DAN WENK FROM SENATOR BURR

S. 715 LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION GRANTS

Question 1a. The original intent of the National Lighthouse Preservation Act was to provide for the transfer of historic lighthouses no longer needed by the Federal Government to Non-Federal entities under the condition that they would assume management and preservation responsibilities for the lighthouses. Does this new grant program contradict the original intent of the bill by forcing the Federal Government to pay for maintenance of these lighthouses?

Question 1b. A reversion clause exists within the National Lighthouse Preservation Act, which states that if the non-Federal entities are no longer able to maintain their acquired lighthouses, then control and management of the lighthouses would revert to the Federal Government. Do you believe it was the intent of the original law to provide for Federal Government funding to the non-Federal entities? If so, why was the reversion clause placed in the Act?

Question 1c. How will funding for this program affect other programs funded through the National Historic Preservation Act?

S. 1270 OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT

Question 2a. I have a February 26, 1998 letter from then Siskiyou National Forest Supervisor Michael Lunn to then Oregon Caves Superintendent Craig Ackerman related to the Cave's Draft General Management Plan and EIS that is the most disparaging letter I have seen between two agencies. It accused the Oregon Caves management team of misrepresentation of facts, far reaching speculative statements, repeated statements that are not supported by science, and a general failure to recognize either the Forest's land management plan for the area, or the Pacific Northwest Forest plan's management scheme for the area.

i. Given the Park Service's inability to faithfully describe the land management that was planned for this area by the Forest Service, as well as its apparent willingness to cook the science in its document; why is the Park Service a more trustworthy land management agency to oversee management of this area?

Question 2b. I also have an article from a 2003 National Cave and Karst Management Symposium where Mr. William Halliday, founder of the Cascade Grotto Speleological Society, and Mr. Jay Swoford, founder of Friends of Oregon Caves, both long-time caving experts called the transfer of the Oregon Cave National Monument to the Park Service an "irresponsible political action."

i. Can you tell us why two wrongs will make a right in this instance?
 ii. If in the eyes of some, the Park Service has never invested the time and money deserved by the Cave, why should we be enlarging the area of the Cave the Park Service would oversee now?
 iii. If this Committee were to add an provision that required the Park Service to transfer a like amount of current National Park Service land, in Oregon, to the United States Forest Service would you still support this legislation?

Question 2c. How many acres of Condition Class II or III forestland currently managed by the Forest Service are included in the areas being proposed for expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument?

Question 2d. If these lands are left untreated what risk does this pose to the National Forest, the neighboring Oregon Caves Monument and the only road access into the Monument via State Highway 46?

Question 2e. Are these lands at a high risk of catastrophic wildfire?

Question 2f. What is the Forest Service doing to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire to the forests surrounding the Oregon Caves Monument and how long will it take to accomplish this effort?

Question 2g. Is there anything keeping the agency from completing these projects over the next several years?

Question 2h. Is the Park Service committed to complete this work and then maintain these fuel breaks if these lands are turned over to the Oregon Caves Monument?

Question 2i. Has the Forest Service prepared any NEPA documents for forest management and hazardous fuels projects to address the fire hazard in the area through forest thinning and fuels breaks? If so, how many acres have been approved for treatment? At what cost were these NEPA documents prepared?

Question 2j. Do you have a detailed set of forest management and thinning projects planned within the proposed monument expansion area and when are these projects scheduled to be implemented? Are any of these projects scheduled to be implemented in Fiscal Year 2010 and Fiscal Year 2011? If so, please provide detailed information on those specific planned projects.

Question 2k. If this expansion legislation were enacted as written this year what will happen to these planned projects? What will happen to the NEPA analysis and documentation already prepared?

QUESTIONS FOR JOEL HOLTROP FROM SENATOR WYDEN

Question 1. Following up on the Administration's request to try to find a cooperative management approach, can you point to any successful examples where the Forest Service and Park Service have successfully co-managed a Park unit and its surrounding natural resources, such as the Cave and its watershed?

Question 2. Isn't it the case that even if a cooperative agreement, such as a Memorandum of Understanding, was entered into by the agencies it could be easily terminated or modified and therefore provides no permanent protection for this natural treasure?

Question 3. The Forest Service was provided an opportunity to comment and did in fact provide comments to the 1998 General Management Plan—the Forest Service submitted correspondence with comments and the National Park Service undertook changes to be responsive to those comments. Why doesn't that constitute adequate interagency consultation regarding the expansion?

Question 4. Can you provide the comments the Forest Service submitted to the National Park Service for the 1998 General Management Plan?

Question 5. Can you provide the comments the Forest Service has submitted to the National Park Service regarding transfer of land to the National Park Service?

Question 6. What specifically do you intend to produce and commit to in the next six months to ensure adequate protection of the Caves resources?

Question 7. Can you detail and provide evidence of any special measures the US Forest Service has undertaken to further protect the natural resources and water supply of the Oregon Caves National Monument?

Question 8. Can you follow up with me and provide me a copy of all the correspondence between the National Park Service and the Forest Service regarding the potential contamination of the Caves' drinking water supply from grazing?

Question 9. Can you provide notices of violations issued on the Big Grayback Allotment?

Question 10. Can you provide the Resource Management Plan direction on grazing in Research Natural Areas and Botanical Areas in the Big Grayback Allotment?

Question 11. Your testimony mentions the Forest Service's planned fuels management and forest restoration activities. I certainly support performing those important projects. Can you tell us what the priority of those thinning projects in the Rogue River Siskiyou National Forest is, what percentage of those projects has been completed and whether all funding has been secured to complete those projects?

Question 12. My bill specifically includes language providing for forest management and the recent fires have illustrated the Park Service's capabilities in managing for fire. Can you tell me why the Agency believes the National Park Service would be unable to complete those projects if the land was transferred to their management?

Question 13. Do you believe additional legislative language is required to ensure that such treatments can occur, either under the Forest Service or the National Park Service?

QUESTION FOR JOEL HOLTROP FROM SENATOR BURR

S. 1270 OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT

Question 1a. How many acres of Condition Class II or III forestland currently managed by the Forest Service are included in the areas being proposed for expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument?

Question 1b. If these lands are left untreated what risk does this pose to the National Forest, the neighboring Oregon Caves Monument and the only road access into the Monument via State Highway 46?

Question 1c. Are these lands at a high risk of catastrophic wildfire?

Question 1d. What is the Forest Service doing to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire to the forests surrounding the Oregon Caves Monument and how long will it take to accomplish this effort?

Question 1e. Is there anything keeping the agency from completing these projects over the next several years?

Question 1f. Is the Park Service committed to complete this work and then maintain these fuel breaks if these lands are turned over to the Oregon Caves Monument?

Question 1g. Has the Forest Service prepared any NEPA documents for forest management and hazardous fuels projects to address the fire hazard in the area through forest thinning and fuels breaks? If so, how many acres have been approved for treatment? At what cost were these NEPA documents prepared?

Question 1h. Do you have a detailed set of forest management and thinning projects planned within the proposed monument expansion area and when are these projects scheduled to be implemented? Are any of these projects scheduled to be implemented in Fiscal Year 2010 and Fiscal Year 2011? If so, please provide detailed information on those specific planned projects.

Question 1i. If this expansion legislation were enacted as written this year what will happen to these planned projects? What will happen to the NEPA analysis and documentation already prepared?

Question 1j. If this Committee were to add an provision that required the Park Service to transfer a like amount of current National Park Service land, in Oregon, to the United States Forest Service would you support this legislation?

APPENDIX II

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

STATEMENT OF JACK H. SWIFT, VICE-CHAIRMAN AND SPOKESMAN, SOUTHERN
OREGON RESOURCE ALLIANCE

Southern Oregon Resource Alliance is a non-profit association of individuals, organizations, and businesses dedicated to the conservation and sustained utilization of natural resources in the southern Oregon area. SORA has been active and influential in the determination of government policies in these regards for several decades. In that regard SORA is representative of a wide array of interests in the area, both public and private.

In terms of conservation policy SORA finds itself in exact accord with the policy reasons advanced by Teddy Roosevelt when he advocated the national forest system. Our natural resources should not be squandered and eradicated. The wealth of the nation depends upon their sustained utilization. The profits derived from their responsible utilization should accrue to the public as well as private enterprise. In that regard, we see the National Forest system as the better manager of these assets.

The Oregon Caves are not a major tourist attraction. There has been no serious or studied business model or plan proposed that supports a contention that the expansion of the monument will change this reality. The Oregon Caves cannot compete with the scope and grandeur of the Carlsbad Caverns. They are at best a side trip located between the glory of the redwoods of northern California, the Smith River drainage to the south, and the draw of Crater Lake to the north. The trip between these two genuine attractions transits the Illinois Valley, from which Oregon Caves N.M. is accessed. The Illinois Valley is a semi-arid geography in which trees take twice as long to grow and mature as in areas to the south and north. The valley itself is a rather bleak perspective. It is not a Yellowstone of the West. Simply acquiring more of its surrounding hills for National Park management will do nothing to enhance its appeal.

The economic management of the lands in the proposed expansion under national forest policies is more than beneficial to the economy of southern Oregon whose timber industry has been devastated by the Northwest Forest Management Plan in combination with the current economy. Revenues from the public lands are crucial to the support of local schools. The expansion proposed will be a loss to those interests with no mitigation.

The fire management of these lands under national forest policies is infinitely preferred to those of the national park system. We have the egregious example of the Yellowstone fire. Locally, we have the recent experience of the Biscuit fire which began in a wilderness area precluding effective rapid response. It should be kept in mind that under the Northwest Forest Management Plan and traditional Congressional funding for the national forest, effective fuel management has not existed for almost two decades. We are discussing an area which historically has been visited by low intensity fuel eradication fires every ten—twelve years. There have been no such fires for decades and manual eradication has been non-existent. Again this is a semi-arid geography and the intermixed and adjacent BLM lands in the area are all rated extreme hazard for a catastrophic stand replacement event. We doubt sincerely that the national park service appreciates the hazard, has the resources to undertake the management required or even operates under the philosophical inclination to do so.

In sum, we see the expansion as a bad idea and wish our opposition to be a matter of record. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH VAILE, KLAMATH-SISKIYOU WILDANDS CENTER, ASHLAND OR; SEAN SMITH, NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, SEATTLE, WA; BARBARA ULLIAN, FRIENDS OF THE KALMIOPSIS, GRANTS PASS, OR; SHANE JIMERFIELD, SISKIYOU PROJECT, GRANTS PASS, OR, ON S. 1270

On behalf of the undersigned organizations we appreciate the opportunity to offer written testimony before the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources Committee concerning S. 1270 the Oregon Caves Boundary Adjustment Act of 2008 would offer tremendous ecological and economic benefit through the retirement of the Big Grayback and Billy Mountain grazing permits and adjusting the boundaries of the Oregon Caves National Monument (OCNM) to (1) include the surface drinking water supply for the 80,000 visitors annually; (2) protection additional surface and subsurface natural resources for current and future generations of Americans; and (3) provide local rural economic development opportunities. Legislation also proposes to add 7.6 miles of the Cave Creek watershed to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

BACKGROUND ON THE OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT

The OCNM is a 480-acre national monument located in the botanically rich Siskiyou Mountains. The monument is important to the economy and identity of the local area; the nearest town is named Cave Junction after the Oregon Caves. OCNM receives about 80,000 visitors annually, but it is one of the smallest natural area units (in area) of the National Park System. Oregon Caves is the only cave system in the nation with its particular geologic history. It is one of the few marble caves in the nation available for public tours and is longest tour cave west of the Continental Divide. The cave tour route, with its twists, turns, climbs, descents, narrowness and length is one of the most adventurous cave tour routes in North America.

A perennial stream, the "River Styx," (an underground portion of Cave Creek) flows through part of the cave system. The cave ecosystem provides habitat for numerous plants and animals, including some state sensitive species such as Townsend's big-eared bats and several caveadapted species of arthropods found only on the national monument. While the 1909 proclamation that established the national monument focused on unique subsurface resources, the significance of the land surface above the cave must not be overlooked. Surface processes, especially through the exchange of air, water and food, closely influence many of the geological and biological processes within the cave.

Recent discoveries indicate that this network of caverns possesses a significant collection of Pleistocene aged fossils, including jaguar and grizzly bear. Grizzly bones that were found in the cave in 1995 were estimated to be at least 50,000 years old—the oldest known from either North or South America. The monument preserves an excellent example of the Siskiyou Mountain's primeval forest: an area with one of the highest percentages of endemic plants in the country.

THE NEED TO ADJUST THE BOUNDARIES

When the OCNM was established in 1909, the small rectangular boundary was thought to be adequate to protect the cave. Through the years, scientific research and technology has provided new information about cave ecology, how it is influenced by its surface environment and related hydrological processes. The current 480-acre boundary is insufficient to adequately protect this cave system and its unique contributions to local economies and our national heritage. The National Park Service proposed expansion numerous times, first in 1939, again in 1949 and most recently in 1999. Most of the boundary adjustments proposed in S. 3148 are part of the 1998 General Management Plan for the monument when the National Park Service deemed the greater Lake Creek watershed suitable for inclusion in the OCNM.

We provide the following excerpts from 1999 U.S. DOI National Park Service General Management Plan, so that the committee can be assured that the most comprehensive study of this issue to date incontrovertibly concluded that expansion was in the best interest of the Caves and the nearby communities:

The transfer of the 3,410 acres of adjacent federal land within the Siskiyou National Forest to the Monument are included in the proposed action because they are integral to the future management, protection and public use of the Oregon Caves National Monument...

...the present size and rectangular configuration of the Monument at 484 acres is inadequate to provide for the long-term protection and public use of the Monument, and does not provide a logical topographical related boundary that makes sense from a land management perspective. The cur-

rent Monument boundary does not ensure the long term protection of cave resources, nor does it ensure protection of the Lake Creek and upper Cave Creek watersheds, the potable water supply that serves both visitors and Monument and concession employees, and the scenic foreground and middle ground views as seen from various points within the Monument, or the protection of forest ecology above and adjacent to the cave.

The proposed boundary change would address all these current deficiencies by providing a watershed based boundary.... The proposed boundary adjustments to OCNM would help fulfill the purposes for which the OCNM was established by President Taft. His July 18, 1909 proclamation setting aside the caves notes its, "...unusual scientific interest and importance." The proclamation also states that, "...the public interest will be promoted by reserving these caves with as much land as may be necessary for the proper protection thereof, as a National Monument."

The boundary change would enable the Monument managers to better meet their legal responsibilities for protection of Monument resources, including providing for the important protection of Monument's national and visual resources and protection to the upper Lake Creek watershed which is the source of the Monument's public water supply....

In order to protect cave ecology, surface and subsurface hydrology, forest ecology, foreground and middle ground viewsheds, and the public water supply used by employees and visitors to Oregon Caves National Monument, a boundary modification will be recommended. Including the 484 acres already within the Monument, the modified boundary will encompass approximately 4,375 acres, or an addition of 3,410 acres....

Through this change, greater protection under NPS administration will be afforded to the upper Lake Creek watershed. Since the public water supply for the Monument is located in the upper Lake Creek watershed, grazing will be eliminated as a permitted use. Human use of the watershed area will be limited to those uses that will be compatible with the protection of a public watershed....

Greater protection will also be afforded to upper Cave Creek watershed as well, which is the principal water source of the River Styx and subsurface hydrological flows into the marble cave....

Finally, since the boundary change is primarily topographically based, it will also provide greater protection for the foreground and most middle ground views form the Monument's developed area and adjacent trails.

-Pages 5-8 of the 1999 General Management Plan.

INCREASING VISITATION AND ADVANCING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The boundary adjustments proposed in S 1270 are needed for several reasons. A larger monument would increase the monument's visibility and attractions. This could lengthen visit time of the OCNM leading to economic development in local communities. The average visit to OCNM is only 2.5 hours, and the most common question is, "What can we do after the cave tour?" Economic models indicate that if the 2.5-hour average visit were extended to a one-day visit, local businesses would significantly benefit from added tourist dollars. (Personal communication with Craig Ackermann, Superintendent, OCNM, February 20, 2007.) The OCNM is surrounded by excellent outdoor opportunities including hiking, horseback riding, and bird-watching. Adjacent recreation opportunities should be protected within the OCNM boundaries, and marketed along with cave tours. In addition nearby Forest Service campgrounds would be incorporated into the monument.

The four trails within the current OCNM range from 0.7-3.3 miles. A number of longer trails around the monument offer visitors stunning views. Most of the trails weave in and out of the present OCNM boundary, and some connect with larger hiking trail systems including the Boundary and Pacific Crest Trails, giving hikers access to the Red Buttes Wilderness, Bigelow Lakes, Mt. Elijah (named for Elijah Davidson, the first Euro-American to see the Oregon Caves), and other popular areas.

Located in the Siskiyou Mountains of southern Josephine County, OCNM offers great potential for one of the state's most struggling economic communities by nurturing a budding tourism and recreation economy. According to a 1994 Illinois Valley Tourism Assessment developed for the Oregon Economic Development Department, Oregon Caves is a "centerpiece attraction" for the tourism industry in the Illinois Valley area.

Highway 199, stretching the length of the Illinois Valley, is a popular travel route between Redwood National Park and Crater Lake National Park, as well as a corridor for visitors who travel from the cultural center of Ashland to visit the Pacific

Coast, as well as the OCNM. Surveys conducted in southwest Oregon and northern California describe visitors to this region to be primarily families taking a short vacation from the metropolitan areas of Portland, Seattle, Sacramento, San Francisco, and southern California (Smokejumper Base Interpretive Plan, undated).

Highway 199 has an annual traffic load of about one million vehicles. In 1992, the state estimated that 289,000 vehicles, about one third of the vehicles traveling Highway 199, represented tourist traffic. Surveys conducted at OCNM indicate that average daily spending per tourist group is \$90. These numbers indicate that more than \$26 million in tourism dollars pass through the Highway 199 corridor annually (Letter to Oregon Tourism Commission from OCNM Chief of Interpretation Roger Brandt, 18 April 2004). Compared to neighboring northern California counties, where tourism dollars per tourist group range from \$95-\$154 (Sheffield, Emilyn, 1998, Northern California Scenic Byway Network Newsletter, Chico, California), Josephine County clearly has room for economic development in this sector.

A 1995 survey of visitors at the OCNM found that the top reasons for travel were viewing scenery, doing something with the family, and to learn more about nature. (Rolloff, David, Rebecca Johnson, and Bo Shelby, 1995). Similar studies have found that people come to Oregon to indulge in their interest in outdoor recreation, nature experiences and historic sites (Brandt, 2004).

During the recent Senate hearing on this bill, government officials with the U.S. Forest Service and National Park Service stated they'd like more time to work out a joint management agreement for the potential expansion area. The impression was left that Forest Service management produces the same benefits as Park Service management and all that is needed to produce these benefits is better coordination between the two agencies. However, along with ecological benefits, expanding Oregon Caves National Monument will generate significant economic benefits, but only if the expanded area is placed under the care of the Park Service. In NPCA's recently released report entitled U.S. National Park System: An Economic Asset at Risk, some parks, including Acadia and Point Reyes, generate economic benefits that exceed the government investment in their annual budgets by as much as 14 times. The average return for all parks is for every one dollar invested in parks, four dollars are returned to the local economy.

In addition, the intrinsic values of national parks also attract small businesses and new residents to their region, resulting in economic growth in areas near parks that is an average of 1 percent per year greater than statewide rates over the past three decades.

In addition, National Parks and Monuments are weathering the economic downturn very well. In Utah for example, park visitation is up 14 percent from the same time last year. In the Pacific Northwest, year to date park visitation is up nearly 90,000. Expanding the area under Park Service management would likely raise the area's profile and increase visitation even more, thereby producing expanded economic benefit for surrounding gateway communities such as Cave Junction and surrounding Josephine County.

FUELS REDUCTION AND FOREST MANAGEMENT

It has been implied that fuels reduction or other forest thinning operations would not occur in the adjusted OCNM boundaries (see the Statement of Joel Holtrop, Deputy Chief, National Forest System of the U.S. Forest Service). The truth is that the National Park Service has a very active fire management and fuels reduction program on units where fire management is an issue. In fact, there is evidence that the National Park Service is more equipped and better funded to carry out fuels reduction projects in a timely and efficient manner due to larger budgets.

Broadly, we agree with the Forest Service that fire and fuels issues are extremely important on the 1.8 million acres Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest. However, the OCNM boundary adjustments area (4,070 acres), only constitute 0.23% of the forest area, an immaterial portion of the landscape to affect fire behavior. We do agree that the Forest Service and Park Service should continue collaborating on fire and fuels reduction projects in this area and we support section 5(b) of the S. 1270 regarding forest restoration as long as it is consistent with the National Park Organic Act.

Mr. Haltrop's characterization of the efforts of the Forest Service in the OCNM area are overstated. Through a collaborative effort with support from the very organizations providing this testimony, the U.S. Forest Service produced the East Illinois Young Managed Stands project. This project looked at a 70,000-acre project area and identified approximately 4,000 acres for treatment. Only 100 acres were identified in the OCNM expansion area. No other specific treatments have been identified to date. It is obvious that the Forest Service has more thinning and fuels

reduction work than it could possibly accomplish on this 1.8 million acre National Forest. Transferring this small amount of land will not significantly affect the outcomes of a fire and fuels reduction program. Moreover, we are convinced that the Park Service could perform the necessary management activities to restore the forests to more natural fire and fuel conditions as is laid out in the 1999 Oregon Caves GMP.

GRAZING AND EQUITABLE COMPENSATION

The undersigned also supportive of the provision the bill to provide for the donation of a Forest Service grazing permit and a Bureau of Land Management grazing lease. The Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest's Big Grayback Grazing Allotment (17,703 acres) overlaps about half of the 4,070-acre OCNM expansion area. National Park Service regulations would prohibit continued livestock grazing in the expanded national monument. Currently livestock that use the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment tend to concentrate in the Bigelow Lakes area, a designated botanical special interest area.

Continuing to grazing livestock on the remainder of the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment is problematic for several reasons. First, as noted, livestock concentrate in the Bigelow Lakes area. Second, there are two other designated botanical areas (Miller Lake, 588 acres; Grayback Mountain, 591 acres) and the Oliver Matthews Research Natural Area, where livestock grazing occurs, contrary to the purpose of the protective designation. In addition, there are 3,553 acres of Riparian Reserves, where livestock need to be limited. Parts of the allotment are also in the Sucker Creek Key Watershed for salmonid recovery. Finally, much of the allotment is in the Kangaroo Inventoried Roadless Area.

Additionally, surface water sources used for the OCNM potable water supply are located on national forest land. Water is piped to park facilities where it is treated. Actions affected drainage in the national forest—upslope from the monument—have the potential to impact the monument. Activities such as mining, logging, grazing and stock use, have the potential to contaminate the OCNM water resources (OCNM General Management Plan, 1999, 8).

The 4,758-acre Bureau of Land Management Billy Mountain Grazing Lease is on the on the Ashland Resource Area of the Medford District BLM, approximately 3/4 of a mile south of the town of Applegate in Jackson County, Oregon. The grazing allotment is leased by the same rancher that leases the Forest Service's Big Grayback Grazing Allotment. The allotment is next door to the rancher's base property. He uses the BLM allotment in the spring and the Forest Service allotment in the summer.

The Billy Mountain Grazing Allotment includes the Enchanted forest, a grove of oak, pine and maple, and a popular hiking trail. The allotment is interspersed with private land and, while it is Open Range, there have been several complaints over the years by landowners dismayed by cows on their property. Billy Mountain also includes habitat for the federally protected Gentner's fritillary (*Fritillaria gentnerii*), a member of the Lily family. This rare plant is found in the Applegate Valley in and near allotment. Its growing season includes the period when livestock may be using the allotment.

Expansion of the national monument makes continued grazing of the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment very problematic, which therefore makes continued grazing of the Billy Mountain Grazing Allotment also problematic.

Conservation interests (specifically Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Center) and rancher on the allotment have an understanding in which the rancher will received compensation from KS Wild in return his donation of his federal grazing permit and lease to the federal government, as provided in the legislation.

In the spring of 2008, the Forest Service issued a decision to continue grazing on the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment for 10 years. While not reducing the amount of livestock grazing for the allotment, the decision requires investments in fences and changes in management to prevent overgrazing of Botanical Areas and to evenly distribute livestock. To comply with its own forest management plan, the Forest Service requires a 1/4-mile fence must be built in the Bigelow Lakes area.

Fencing Bigelow Lakes is controversial from the standpoint of both conservation and ranching interests because not enough of the botanical area will be fenced, fences are expensive, often fail and do not last. Fencing is a bad solution because of the high initial cost (\$7,030/mile according to the Forest Service), as well as the high ongoing maintenance costs. Fences in forests and deep snow require endless maintenance; they don't always work and are always an impediment to wildlife. The agency places additional requirements on the permittee to keep livestock out of certain areas.

COSTS OF GRAZING

Both the ecological and fiscal costs of various alternatives to continue livestock grazing on the Big Grayback allotment are such that the best and least costly option is to simply buyout the grazing permit and not spend tax dollars endlessly to build and maintain fences.

The annual income to the federal treasury from the Forest Service grazing permit and the BLM grazing lease is \$118.13. The cost of preparing the Environmental Assessment to update the Big Grayback Grazing Allotment is at least \$100,000. On average, the Forest Service and BLM lose \$12.26/AUM and \$7.64/AUM respectively, (GAO, 2005. Livestock Grazing: Federal Expenditures and Receipts Vary, Depending Upon Agency and Purpose of Fee Collection) or an average of \$8,174.80 annually. Based on the simple analysis above, the taxpayer would save an estimated \$8,056.68 annually, by not grazing livestock in the two allotments.

CONCLUSION

In sum, adjusting the boundaries of the OCNM is in the best interest of the Oregon Caves resources, the local communities where this is a “centerpiece attraction” and businesses in the region that are dependant on a thriving tourism economy.

PUGET SOUND PARTNERSHIP,
Olympia, WA, July 22, 2009.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
173 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you for your leadership in sponsoring S.635, which would designate a segment of Illabot Creek in Skagit County as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. S.635 is an important element to accomplishing Washington State's goal to restore and protect the Puget Sound by 2020.

The Puget Sound Partnership was established by the Washington State Legislature to unify, coordinate and prioritize all of the work currently being done in Puget Sound. Working collaboratively with regional scientists, policy experts, businesses, environmental organizations, tribes, all levels of government and citizens all around the Sound, we created the Action Agenda—a roadmap for the Sound's restoration and protection.

The designation of the Pratt River and expansion of the Alpine Lakes Wilderness is a high priority in the Action Agenda (A.2.2 on page 38). As you know, the protection of intact habitat is one of the most important, cost effective and sustainable tools for protecting ecosystem structures, processes, and functions. Wild and Scenic designation protects intact and high quality aquatic and riparian habitat, and we appreciate your leadership to include Illabot Creek in Skagit County.

Thank you again for your leadership in sponsoring S.635. We look forward to working with you and your staff to advance this important bill, as well as the companion proposal by Representative Larsen, H.R. 1593.

Sincerely,

DAVID D. DICKS,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN RIVERS,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2008.

Hon. MARK UDALL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BURR,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on National Parks, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UDALL AND RANKING MEMBER BURR: On behalf of American Rivers' 65,000 members and supporters across the nation, thank you for holding a hearing on legislation that will designate outstanding rivers in Oregon and Washington as National Wild and Scenic Rivers. American Rivers strongly supports S. 635, to designate Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and S. 1270, the Oregon Caves National Monument Boundary Adjustment Act of 2009.

ILLABOT CREEK

Wild and Scenic River designation of Illabot Creek in Skagit County, Washington is a well-deserving addition to the Skagit Wild and Scenic River system, designated in 1978. Illabot Creek has outstanding fish and wildlife values that would be protected and enhanced by Wild and Scenic River designation. Illabot Creek provides crucial habitat for threatened wild Chinook salmon, steelhead and bull trout as well as for pink, coho, and chum salmon, and is one of the two most productive bull trout streams in the entire Skagit River system. Due to the strong salmon presence, Illabot Creek attracts a large number of bald eagles, which roost at night in the stands of mature and old-growth forest along the creek. The Skagit River Bald Eagle Natural Area is regionally famous for the magnificence of its bald eagle population.

Significant investment has been made at the local level to protect this special area, including ongoing salmon recovery efforts in the Skagit basin. S. 635 will complement these investments and will ensure permanent protection for Illabot Creek's free-flowing character, water quality and outstanding fish and wildlife values. Additionally, protecting headwater streams like Illabot Creek is a critical component of Puget Sound health and recovery and can also bring economic benefits to the surrounding region by supporting recreation and tourism and protecting the region's quality of life.

OREGON CAVES NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Oregon Caves National Monument (Monument), located in the botanically rich Siskiyou Mountains, hosts a spectacular cave system with a rich geologic history and a river system which provides clean drinking water for the Monument, and is nationally significant for its hydrological, ecological and geological features. Designation of Cave Creek and its tributaries, Lake Creek, No Name Creek, Panther Creek, Upper Cave Creek, and the River Styx, as National Wild and Scenic Rivers would protect these outstanding values.

The cave resources of the Monument are directly affected by water entering the cave. The River Styx is a unique segment of Cave Creek that flows underground through the cave system and significantly shapes the subterranean geologic formations and biological processes within the caves. Surface water percolates through the soil, acquiring carbon dioxide from sources such as decaying plant materials. This interaction forms a weak carbonic acid that dissolves calcium carbonate from the bedrock as it percolates downward. When the solution reaches the cave, the calcium carbonate is deposited, thus creating the formations inside the cave. Changes in the chemical and biological composition of the water can permit changes in the processes affecting the cave. Protecting the River Styx as the first underground Wild and Scenic River, is therefore fundamental to protecting and maintaining these subterranean processes.

Cave Creek and its tributaries are part of the larger Wild and Scenic Illinois River watershed, which itself is a tributary of the Wild and Scenic Rogue River watershed. The cold waters and many miles of spawning and rearing habitat for salmon and steelhead are critical not only for the survival of these fish, but for the economic livelihoods of the multi-million dollar sport and commercial fishing industries that rely on healthy native fish runs in the region. A recent economic study by ECONorthwest found that salmon and steelhead in the larger Rogue River watershed in southern Oregon provide more than .5 billion in economic benefits each year to West Coast residents. In addition, Lake Creek is the main drinking water source for the Monument, and Wild and Scenic designation would preserve this clean drinking water source into the future.

Thank you again for holding a hearing on S. 635 and S. 1270. American Rivers looks forward to working with you and your staff to see these important pieces of legislation enacted into law this Congress.

Sincerely,

DAVID MORYC,
Senior Director, River Protection.

HAMPTON'S ROCK SHOP,
Kerby, OR, July 18, 2009.

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and the Subcommittee on National Parks;

We are small Southwest Oregon business owners living here in the Illinois Valley. We would very much like to submit, to you, our approval of S. 1270 (and it's 'twin

H.R. 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation, improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau and protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

It would prove a perfect match and a generous gift to U.S. citizens for this to happen while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial.

Thank you,

GABRIELLE & FREDRICK HAMPTON.

STATEMENT OF JAMES A. MINERVINI, DC, CHIROPRACTIC WELLNESS CENTER, LLC,
CAVE JUNCTION, OR

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and the Subcommittee on National Parks;

We are small Southwest Oregon business owners living here in the Illinois Valley. We would very much like to submit, to you, our approval of S. 1270 (and it's 'twin H.R. 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation, improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau and protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

It would prove a perfect match and a generous gift to U.S. citizens for this to happen while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JOHN L. GARDINER, PhD, PE OREGON, SURI FUTURES, INC.,
CAVE JUNCTION, OR

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and Senate Subcommittee on National Parks;

As a small business owner in Cave Junction and the Illinois Valley here in Southern Oregon, I want to submit my approval of S. 1270. I support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument.

This expansion will increase the tourism economy, bring more visitation dollars coming into SW Oregon, and it protects the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau. All with plenty of support from the local community!

Additionally, it would be a significant gift to the American people to pass this legislation while we're celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial.

This kind of thinking represents the innovation needed to jump-start the New Economy, and is just exactly what is needed now to bring sustainable jobs to our region. We need standing trees conserving carbon in the soil for the long term. Expanding the Oregon Caves National Monument takes us all in the right direction.

Thank you for supporting S. 1270.

STATEMENT OF KERRY WHITEHEAD, OWNER, RENEWABLE ENERGY SYSTEMS

Greetings!

As a small business owner in Cave Junction and the Illinois Valley, directly involved in resource conservation and environmental stewardship and sustainability, I want to submit my approval of S. 1270 (and its twin HR 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation to the National Monument and it help to improve the watershed feeding the Illinois valley. This will create a win-win situation to both our economy and our environment.

The timing of this legislation could not come at a more poignant time as we are celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Chateau located within the boundaries of the National Monument, as well as the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Oregon Caves National Monument and also Oregon's Sesquicentennial. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DR. DAVE PERRY, SELMA, OR

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and the Subcommittee on National Parks;

I am a retired professor of forest ecology living here in the Illinois Valley. I would very much like to submit, to you, my approval of S. 1270 (and it's 'twin H.R. 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation, improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau and protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

It would prove a perfect match and a generous gift to U.S. citizens for this to happen while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JUSINT, LISA, JADE, & TAO ROHDE, ROGUE NATURAL LIVING, CAVE JUNCTION, OR

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and the Subcommittee on National Parks;

As a small business owner in Cave Junction and the Illinois Valley here in Southern Oregon, I want to submit my approval of S. 1270 (and it's twin HR 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion shall increase visitation and improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau.

Additionally, it will be a nice touch and a generous gift to the American people to do this while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial.

Our family moved to this area for the quality of life and natural beauty. We have come to love the area near the caves for it's great hiking trails and natural wonders. We believe that expanding the monument will help bring visitors here and improve our local tourism economy.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT WARD, PRESIDENT, CEO, HOME VALLEY BANK, GRANTS PASS, OR

As a community bank in Josephine County, Home Valley Bank believes in supporting our community and supporting the positive changes and growth within the Illinois Valley. With the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument upon us we would like to express our strong support for the legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument.

With the passing of the legislation we will see many positive changes with the expansion. We hope to see the Monument grow from 480 acres to over 4,000 acres which will significantly increase recreation opportunities, improve the drinking water at the Chateau and most importantly protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

STATEMENT OF SANDI MARTIN, MARTIN'S DESIGN & PRINT STUDIO, GRANTS PASS, OR

We are small Southwest Oregon business owners living here in the Rogue Valley. We would very much like to submit, to you, our approval of S. 1270 (and it's 'twin H.R. 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation, improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau and protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

It would prove a perfect match and a generous gift to U.S. citizens for this to happen while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JOAN M. PERRY, HAIR ART THOU

We are small Southwest Oregon business owners living here in the Rogue Valley. We would very much like to submit, to you, our approval of S. 1270 (and it's 'twin H.R. 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation, improve the drinking

water at the Oregon Caves Chateau and protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

It would prove a perfect match and a generous gift to U.S. citizens for this to happen while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CYNTHIA M. DEAS, BONANZA CONSULTING, BONANZA, OR

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources Senate Subcommittee on National Parks;

As a small business owner in Cave Junction and the Illinois Valley here in Southern Oregon, I want to submit my approval of S. 1270 (and it's twin HR 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion shall increase visitation and improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau.

Additionally, it will be a nice touch and a generous gift to the American people to do this while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial.

Our family moved to this area for the quality of life and natural beauty. We have come to love the area near the caves for its great hiking trails and natural wonders. We believe that expanding the monument will help bring visitors here and improve our local tourism economy.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE PERALA GARDINER, PH.D., WATERCYCLE, INC., CAVE JUNCTION, OR, ON S. 1270

Our company WaterCycle Inc works in the field of watershed science and restoration. We are based here in the Illinois Valley, Josephine County Oregon, and our company works around the Western US.

As a small business owner in Cave Junction, we want to submit our endorsement of S. 1270. We support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument.

The watershed protected by this expansion is vital to our region, as a source of clean water and a priceless Wild Salmon Habitat Refuge for this part of the great Rogue River Basin.

This expansion will improve the local tourism economy, and will protect the drinking water at the Oregon Caves complex and the Chateau resort. This legislation will be an important gift to the American people, to honor our country's commitment to protect America's increasingly fragile environmental heritage.

Now is the time to do this while Oregon is celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and the State of Oregon's Sesquicentennial.

Please lend your support to SB 1270. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF LANE COSNER, SISKIYOUART.COM, CAVE JUNCTION, OR

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and the Subcommittee on National Parks;

We are small Southwest Oregon business owners living here in the Illinois Valley. We would very much like to submit, to you, our approval of S. 1270 (and it's 'twin H.R. 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation, improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau and protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

It would prove a perfect match and a generous gift to U.S. citizens for this to happen while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF GLORIA & BOB ZILLER, R.H. ZILLER & CO., INC., O'BRIEN, OR

We are small Southwest Oregon business owners living here in the Illinois Valley. We would very much like to submit, to you, our approval of S. 1270 (and it's 'twin H.R. 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation, improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau and protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

It would prove a perfect match and a generous gift to U.S. citizens for this to happen while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DEBBIE LUKAS, SISKIYOU MOUNTAIN HERBS, CAVE JUNCTION, OR

I am writing as a small business owner in the Illinois Valley (Southern Oregon) who supports the expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument. Please promote S. 1270 to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. The transfer of land from the US Forest Service and BLM to the US Park Service would be of benefit to the American public. Many of us hike and camp in the area, and this transfer will aid the continued enjoyment of the amazing Oregon Caves by local people as well as tourists for years to come! In addition, this transfer is necessary to protect Lake Creek, the source of drinking water for the Monument, which is plagued by cattle that wander from the other side of the mountain (BLM land).

In the past I have worked at the Caves, and have urged this expansion for years. Now is the time! This is the 100-year Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. It is an amazing place, worth the long travel to visit! Please do what you can to support this important bill and protect our national treasures.

STATEMENT OF CAROL RONAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ILLINOIS VALLEY FAMILY COALITION, CAVE JUNCTION, OR

The Illinois Valley Family Coalition is a non-profit organization helping needy families in Cave Junction and other areas in the Illinois Valley of Southern Oregon. As Executive Director of the Coalition, I approve and support of S. 1270 to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion shall increase visitation to our community and could have a profoundly positive impact on the needy families and general economic conditions in our area.

Given that this is the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial, this would be a momentous occasion for our community and state. This would also be a perpetual gift for the citizens of the USA now and for generations to come.

I hope you will approve this very worthy legislation.

STATEMENT OF DENNIS H. STRAYER, RETIRED FEDERAL AGENCY VISITOR CENTER MANAGER (1980-2009)

Subject: Letter of Support for the Proposed Expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument, Cave Junction, Oregon

To: Whom it May Concern: As the retired Visitor Center Manager of the Illinois River Valley Center, Cave Junction, Oregon, I would like to add my personal support for the proposed expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument from its existing 480 acres to the proposed 4,000 acres.

During my 26 ½ years as a Federal Agency Visitor Center Manager, Interpretive Ranger and Naturalist/Historian, I have had the distinct pleasure of personally guiding grade and middle school students on day hikes throughout Southern Oregon from 1996 to 2006.

The landscape that surrounds the Oregon Caves National Monument contain a diverse range of wildlife and plant species that have traditionally been part of this great natural landscape for thousands of years.

It is my understanding that the current Grazing Allotment Holder, of the grazing allotment that is located at the northeast corner of the watershed that serves as the sole water source for the Oregon Caves National Monument, is willing to return their allotment to the Federal Government provided that they are given some financial settlement. Having this change supported by Congress is essential to both the safety of visitors and staff at the Oregon Caves National Monument.

The expansion efforts would also provide the current small Oregon Caves National Monument with a larger land area that has been managed by the USDA Forest Service—Rogue River-Siskiyou National Forest since 1907. This would simply be a land exchange from the USDA Forest Service to the USDI National Park Service and would provide a significant long term benefit not only to the National Monument but to the entire Illinois Valley by providing an expanded opportunity to hike and enjoy lands under the expanded Oregon Caves National Monument.

I urge each member of Congress (U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate) to support the proposed Expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument. It would be a legacy that would be enjoyed by both local citizens and visitors alike for years to come.

STATEMENT OF RACHEL GOODMAN, L.M.T., CAVE JUNCTION, OR

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and the Subcommittee on National Parks: As a small business owner in Cave Junction and the Illinois Valley here in Southern Oregon, I want to submit my approval of S. 1270 (and its twin HR 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion shall increase visitation and improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau.

Additionally, it will be a nice touch and a generous gift to the American people to do this while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL YANASE, YANASE JEWELERS, KERBY, OR

To the Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and the Subcommittee on National Parks: We are small Southwest Oregon business owners living here in the Illinois Valley. We would very much like to submit, to you, our approval of S. 1270 (and it's 'twin H.R. 2889) and support this legislation to expand the boundary of the Oregon Caves National Monument. This expansion will increase visitation, improve the drinking water at the Oregon Caves Chateau and protect the many resources associated with the Monument.

It would prove a perfect match and a generous gift to U.S. citizens for this to happen while we are celebrating the 75th Anniversary of the Chateau, the 100th Anniversary of the Oregon Caves National Monument and Oregon's Sesquicentennial.

STATEMENT OF KATHERINE MECHLING, M.D., CLEAR CREEK FAMILY PRACTICE, SELMA, OR

Re: Expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument

To: Senate Committee of Energy and Natural Resources and Subcommittee of National Parks

Dear Committee members: I strongly support the expansion of the Oregon Caves National Monument for many reasons. This is an area of incredible beauty and unique biological diversity. I have personally hiked and studied the bird, plant and moss populations of the Caves National Monument and surrounding areas, and I have never seen anything so rich. It is also clear that there are many discoveries right here to be made. All of the most important pharmaceuticals have come from discovering new organisms. Some pivotal climate change research is happening at the Caves.

I am the only physician in Selma, Oregon, and I have been the medical advisor for the paramedics at the Caves National Monument for several years. It is a place where anyone can go, no matter their health, and almost always find a place alone in the forest, where they can hear the sounds our ears are supposed to hear and smell the scents we are supposed to smell, and feel connected to the life on Earth.

Please vote to expand the Oregon Caves National Monument.