

**MISCELLANEOUS NATIONAL PARK AND
MONUMENT MEASURES**

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

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 281	S. 921
S. 386	H.R. 1000
H.R. 146	S. 1097
S. 513	H.R. 1668
H.R. 182	

JULY 17, 2001



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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

76-918 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2002

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico, *Chairman*

DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii	FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota	PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
BOB GRAHAM, Florida	DON NICKLES, Oklahoma
RON WYDEN, Oregon	LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota	BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming
EVAN BAYH, Indiana	RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama
DIANNE FEINSTEIN, California	CONRAD BURNS, Montana
CHARLES E. SCHUMER, New York	JON KYL, Arizona
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington	CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
THOMAS R. CARPER, Delaware	GORDON SMITH, Oregon

ROBERT M. SIMON, *Staff Director*

SAM E. FOWLER, *Chief Counsel*

BRIAN P. MALNAK, *Republican Staff Director*

JAMES P. BEIRNE, *Republican Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii, *Chairman*

BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota	CRAIG THOMAS, Wyoming
BOB GRAHAM, Florida	BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana	CONRAD BURNS, Montana
EVAN BAYH, Indiana	GORDON SMITH, Oregon
CHARLES E. SCHUMER, New York	CHUCK HAGEL, Nebraska
THOMAS R. CARPER, Delaware	PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico

JEFF BINGAMAN and FRANK H. MURKOWSKI are Ex Officio Members of the Subcommittee

DAVID BROOKS, *Senior Counsel*

JEFF MOW, *Bevinetto Fellow*

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Akaka, Hon. Daniel K., U.S. Senator from Hawaii	1
DeWine, Hon. Mike, U.S. Senator from Ohio	11
Dodd, Hon. Christopher, U.S. Senator from Connecticut	4
Frohling, Nathan M., Tidelands Program Director, Connecticut Chapter, The Nature Conservancy	46
Gallegher, Patricia E., Executive Director, National Capital Planning Commission, on:	
S. 281	23
H.R. 1668	39
Hagel, Hon. Chuck, U.S. Senator from Nebraska	3
Hoffman, Deborah, Director, Passaic County Department of Economic Development	50
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator from Massachusetts	15
Parsons, John G., Associate Regional Director, Lands, Resources and Planning, National Capital Region, National Park Service, on:	
S. 281	20
H.R. 1668	37
S. 513 and H.R. 182	41
S. 386 and H.R. 146	43
S. 921, H.R. 1000, and S. 1097	54
Pascrell, Hon. Bill, Jr., U.S. Representative from New Jersey	7
Roemer, Hon. Tim, U.S. Representative from Indiana	12
Scruggs, Jan Craig, President of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund	25
Thomas, Hon. Craig, U.S. Senator from Wyoming	2
Torricelli, Hon. Robert G., U.S. Senator from New Jersey	18

MISCELLANEOUS NATIONAL PARK AND MONUMENT MEASURES

TUESDAY, JULY 17, 2001

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:35 p.m. in room SD-366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Daniel K. Akaka presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA, U.S. SENATOR FROM HAWAII

Senator AKAKA. The Subcommittee on National Parks will come to order. The purpose of this afternoon's hearing is to receive testimony on several park and memorial bills that are pending before the National Parks Subcommittee. The bills that we will consider today include S. 281, to authorize the design and construction of a temporary education center in the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; H.R. 1668 to authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former president John Adams and his legacy; S. 386 and H.R. 146 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in the city of Paterson, New Jersey as a unit of the National Park System and for other purposes; S. 513 and H.R. 182 amended the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Eightmile River in the State of Connecticut to study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers system; S. 921 and H.R. 1000 to adjust the boundary of the William Howard Taft National Historical Site in the State of Ohio to authorize an exchange of land in connection with the historic site and for other purposes; and S. 1097 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue right-of-way permits for natural gas pipelines within the boundaries of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

This is my first hearing as chairman of this subcommittee. Before we begin today I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Senator Thomas, for all his work on behalf of the national parks issue, as previous chairman of this subcommittee. We have had a tradition on this committee of dealing with national parks issues in a bi-partisan manner and I look forward to continuing to work closely with Senator Thomas and other members of the committee on these issues.

We have several members of Congress scheduled to testify this afternoon along with Mr. John Parsons from the National Park Service and our other invited witnesses. I would like to welcome everyone to the committee. To ensure that we have enough time to hear from everyone, I would ask all witnesses to please limit your remarks to no more than 5 minutes. Your entire written statement will be included in the official hearing record.

Now I would like to call on my colleague, Senator Thomas, for your statement.

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

Senator THOMAS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Aloha. We say that in Wyoming all the time, of course.

[Laughter.]

Senator THOMAS. I want to thank you for this hearing. Let me congratulate you on your chairmanship. As you suggested, we have worked together and will continue to do that. I look forward to it. As you mentioned, our agenda today considers boundary adjustments, rights-of-way, special resource studies—most of them are studies, which we agreed to sometime ago. Prior to making changes in the parks, there would be studies and we are pleased with that. Also, there is the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, and legislation that would authorize the Adams family memorial.

But while H.R. 1668, authorizes the design, placement and construction of the Adams Memorial, it does not specifically address the siting of the proposed memorial within the area in and around the Mall. The legislation would make the memorial eligible for consideration within Area 1. At the present time there are seven other memorials already in line for placement within the boundaries of Area 1. In addition to World War II and the Air Force Memorial, authorization exists for memorials for the black Revolutionary war patriots, Martin Luther King, George Mason, Thomas Payne and the National Peace Garden.

And of course, the discussion has always concerned the number of monuments that should be within Area 1. We addressed that during the 105th Congress. As a result of the work accomplished by the National Capital Planning Commission, we amended the legislation in this committee and passed it in the Senate unanimously during the 106th Congress, which would essentially codify the Commemorative Zone Policy offered to us by the Planning Commission. That legislation expanded the boundaries of Area 1 and established the area along the Mall known as the "Reserve"—an area where no additional monuments would be placed.

We need to address that policy, of course, and as we go forward with all of the important things that are out there. The Mall is a historic, monumental, open space which is a substantially complete work in public urban design. As I have already mentioned, there are seven unbuilt memorials and monuments which have already been authorized by the Congress, which will be constructed within the confines of Area 1.

Depending on what the subcommittee may choose to do with the two bills, we have a perfect opportunity to revisit what we have accomplished in the 106th Congress. So, in any event, Mr. Chairman,

I look forward to the witnesses and hope that we can come to some agreement on these bills that will be appropriate.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Thomas.
Senator Hagel.

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHUCK HAGEL, U.S. SENATOR
FROM NEBRASKA**

Senator HAGEL. Thank you. I have a statement that I would ask be included in the record.

Senator AKAKA. Without objection it will be included in the record.

[The prepared statement of Senator Hagel follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CHUCK HAGEL, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEBRASKA

Mr. Chairman, two decades ago, when I was serving as Deputy Administrator of the Veterans Administration, this subcommittee exhibited wisdom and foresight in approving legislation to create the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The Memorial was envisioned as a place to provide healing, honor, and recognition to the men and women who served and sacrificed in Vietnam. The Memorial has transcended its role as a national symbol of recognition and, today, stands as a living history lesson.

Today, this subcommittee will once again discuss the purpose and role of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. On behalf of my three fellow Vietnam Combat veterans in the Senate, I have introduced S. 281, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Education Act, to authorize the construction of a temporary, enhanced kiosk on the site of the current inadequate kiosk. Supporters of the Education Center include respected advocates for America's Veterans, National Veterans Organizations, prominent Vietnam Veterans such as Secretary of State Colin Powell, General Barry McCaffrey, Vice President Al Gore, and 55 Senate Co-Sponsors. Together, we envision this enhanced kiosk as an extension of the memorial's mission to help educate America's future generations who will one day lead our generation.

Congressmen Watts and Murtha have introduced the identical legislation in the House of Representatives, where the legislation enjoys support of 138 Co-Sponsors.

I suspect that most members of this committee can list a family they know who lost a loved one in Vietnam. However, a student who visits the Memorial today had not even been born during the Vietnam War. The Education Center is a relevant tool that will help them learn the context of the war and the history of the most visited memorial in Washington, D.C.

When I began crafting this legislation, I contacted the National Park Service and the National Capital Planning Commission to confer with them about the Center. Both groups supported the intent, but had concerns regarding maintaining the integrity of the Memorial as well as the Mall. I therefore carefully wrote this legislation to address these concerns. Included in the legislation are a limit on the size of the structure, a review of the need for the structure after 10 years, a provision explicitly requiring approval of the design through the Commemorative Works Act, and a provision ensuring that no funding will be taken from the Memorial Fund's Memorial maintenance accounts.

The Vietnam War was one of the defining events in modern American history. It is important that students learn more than just the dates and facts of the war. They need to have a greater understanding of the sacrifices that were asked of young Americans from another generation.

The Education Center—featuring historic photographs and interactive displays—will focus on teaching young people more about the Memorial and military service in Vietnam. When students leave the Education Center, they will have learned not only that the war officially ended in 1975, but that someone just like them may have served or lost a loved one in the war. They will have experienced the emotions evoked when a veteran visits the Wall for the first time and touches the name of a fallen comrade. And, hopefully, they will walk away with an appreciation for all who have served and who do serve in America's Armed Forces.

The Center will be an important educational resource that will add immensely to the visitor's experience at the Wall.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Senator HAGEL. It is nice to be part of your team, Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you. It is great to be with you too, Chuck. We have several of our colleagues scheduled to testify today. I know that everyone has multiple commitments this afternoon, so please feel free to leave after you have finished testifying. To ensure that we have time to hear from your constituents, please try to keep your statements brief. We include your entire remarks in the hearing record.

This is the order the Senators and Congressmen arrived and I would like to call you in that order. We certainly are fortunate and glad and happy to have all of you here. And may I call on Senator Dodd for your statement?

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER DODD, U.S. SENATOR
FROM CONNECTICUT**

Senator DODD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, very, very much. My chairman is sitting right to my left and I am tempted to defer to my chairman here. Chairman of the Rules Committee that covers our budget is on my right and I would like to defer to him.

[Laughter.]

Senator DODD. He's been here a longtime and now you know why. Mr. Chairman, thank you very, very much. And I noted that we can submit our comments here for the record, so I will try to abbreviate them so as to not delay you or the other members of the Senate or the House who are here. But I am here today to appear before you—as you already noted, Mr. Chairman—to make an appeal to the members of this committee about the designation of the Eightmile River as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers study.

Senator Lieberman, my colleague, sponsors this bill. It has been introduced on the House side by Representative Simmons, whose district this wonderful waterway exists and the legislation has been endorsed by the entire Connecticut delegation—all members.

I am also pleased, Mr. Chairman, to recognize in the audience Sue Merrow, who was the first select person of the town of East Haddam, Connecticut. And Nathan Frohling, who is head of the Tidelands Program and the manager of the Connecticut Chapter of the Nature Conservancy will be prepared to offer some detailed explanations for you or staff that would like to go in greater specificity about this river.

The communities involved here—of East Haddam and Salem and Lyme, Connecticut—are some of the oldest communities in America, Mr. Chairman. In fact, the designation of the Eightmile River does not describe the length of the river. It describes the place where the Eightmile River comes out on the Connecticut River. And dating back, we believe in pre-Revolutionary War days in old maps, the British were mapping rivers. You went eight miles up the Connecticut River and that is where this small river which runs through some of the most beautiful area in Eastern Connecticut actually comes out. So, the Eightmile River was a way of identifying where this river was located.

Anyway, these people will be offering some testimony later on, Mr. Chairman, that goes into the designation of the specific reasons.

For more than 30 years, Mr. Chairman, the Wild and Scenic River Program has been a very successful public/private partner-

ship to preserve certain, select rivers in the free flowing States. Designation as a Wild and Scenic River would ensure that the river and surrounding watersheds are protected from development projects under the locally controlled conservation management plan, which works to preserve our rivers—natural and significant resources.

I am confident that the Eightmile River significance and community support. More than 5 years ago, three Connecticut towns—I mentioned Salem, East Haddam and Lyme, Connecticut—joined with the education and environmental groups to form the Eightmile River watershed committee and signed a conservation compact to preserve this wonderful body of water. Property-owners along the river support this designation in order to preserve the natural resource that flows by and near their property. And finally the entire delegation, as I mentioned, has also endorsed this. So you have the support of property owners, the delegations of the State to all work together on this.

The State of Connecticut, in fact, has recognized the Eightmile River as a river of importance. “85% of its watershed is forested with 180 species of fish, birds, plants and reptiles live there. It is truly one of the most diverse and thriving ecosystems in the lower Connecticut River Valley.” The area of Connecticut is certainly quite different and my colleague to my left certainly has wonderful knowledge of New England certainly to underscore this point.

Connecticut is smaller, Mr. Chairman, than San Diego County, California, smaller than Yellowstone National Park. We reside in one of the most densely populated areas of America. Yet in the midst of this tremendous population density, there has been a wonderful effort to preserve these jewels of environmental ecosystems and great historical significance. And this lower Connecticut River Valley is just one of those areas and the Eightmile River plays a very important role historically, but also environmentally in this area. In addition to the water, the river itself is home to the Goodspeed Opera House, Gillette Castle Park, historic homes, farms, 19th century mills. Just along this river, Mr. Chairman—if you ever have the chance to go up, we would love to show you just the number of small graveyards that date back to the founding of the country; in the midst of the forest and there you will in encounter these remarkable very pastoral scenes and sights within feet of the Eightmile River.

So, this is a body of water that is enjoyed—that has been enjoyed—by really thousands of people for many, many years. And we would like to see it preserved for years and years and years to come. In the midst of ever growing density of population and development, to be able to carve out these areas to leave as a legacy for future generations is something we all care deeply about in Connecticut. So I am honored to be sitting here this morning—this afternoon—on behalf of the entire delegation. This bill has passed the House and included in the House, legislation House bills, so we would like to have a complementary piece of legislation adopted here in the Senate. It is a river of national significance and this study will be that one further step along the way to helping us achieving the goal that is desired by all of us in the Constitution State. And I thank you for listening.

[The prepared statement of Senator Dodd follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER DODD, U.S. SENATOR
FROM CONNECTICUT

Chairman Akaka, ranking member Thomas and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of S. 513 and H.R. 182, the Eightmile River Wild and Scenic Rivers Study Act. I am pleased that Senator Lieberman co-sponsored this important legislation and Representative Simmons of Connecticut introduced similar legislation in the House of Representatives. The House gave its support to the Eightmile study in early May.

I would like to welcome Sue Merrow, the First Selectman of East Haddam, Connecticut and Nathan Frohling, the Tidelands Program Manager at the Connecticut chapter of the Nature Conservancy. They have worked tirelessly to preserve the Eightmile River and bring together a diverse constituency in support of Wild and Scenic designation. They will be offering testimony later and will be better able to answer any technical questions the subcommittee may have. I also look forward to hearing from the National Park Service. I recognize that there is some concern about the growing maintenance backlog, but it is imperative that we do not put off a study of the Eightmile River.

For more than 30 years, the Wild and Scenic River program has been a successful public-private partnership to preserve certain select rivers in a free-flowing state. Designation as a Wild and Scenic River would ensure that the river and surrounding watershed are protected from development projects under the locally controlled Conservation Management Plan, which works to preserve a river's natural and significant resources.

I am confident of the Eightmile River's significance and community support. More than five years ago, the three Connecticut towns of Salem, East Haddam and Lyme joined with educational and environmental groups to form the Eightmile River Watershed Committee and signed a Conservation Compact to preserve the river. Property owners along the river support designation in order to preserve the natural resource that flows by and near their property. Finally, the entire Connecticut delegation has endorsed designation of the Eightmile River in order to retain the integrity of this river. You know as well as I do how uncommon it is to have such overwhelming support and enthusiasm among diverse constituencies.

The State of Connecticut has recognized the Eightmile River as a "River of Importance". Eighty-five percent of its Watershed is forested and more than 180 species of birds, fish, plants and reptiles live there. It is truly one of the most diverse and thriving ecosystems in the lower Connecticut River Valley.

This area of Connecticut is quite different from other parts of the country. Just a short drive from the metropolitan areas of New Haven and Hartford, Connecticut and a little more than an hour from New York City, the neighboring towns of East Haddam, Lyme and Salem offer its residents cultural, recreational and environmental treasures. It is home to the renowned Goodspeed Opera House, Gillette Castle, state parks, historic homes, farms, and nineteenth-century mills. Recreational opportunities abound, whether it be hiking, biking, swimming or fishing.

Mr. Chairman, Connecticut is a small state—less than 5,000 square miles—and is densely populated. Our citizens are committed to balancing conservation and growth. That is why this designation is so important. While the state and local groups have done exceptional work so far, this designation would bring in federal technical assistance and foster coordination among the many concerned groups.

The Eightmile River is a nationally significant resource. I urge my colleagues to report this bill from committee at the earliest convenience.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Dodd. May I ask Senators Thomas or Hagel if you have any questions?

Senator THOMAS. I do not.

Senator AKAKA. Otherwise may I permit them to leave when they are done?

Senator THOMAS. We would be delighted.

Senator DODD. Well Aloha to you, Senator.

[Laughter.]

Senator THOMAS. May I say I do appreciate that you described your State and of course it is different than ours. We have a lot

of space. But you certainly do need to conduct a few studies to protect these areas.

Senator DODD. I appreciate that.

Senator AKAKA. We are quite envious of Connecticut's nuclear power. All of America should have more nuclear power. We appreciate Connecticut's leadership, Senator.

Senator DODD. Well, the truth in advertising, I suppose I should tell you that I used to live in East Haddam, Connecticut, one of the towns mentioned here. And I lived, and Sumera was right behind me—my mayor. I lived in the old schoolhouse in town. It was an old schoolhouse from 1853 to about 1948—the two-room schoolhouse. The successor schoolhouse, right down the road, where Nathan Hale taught, that schoolhouse is still there. This is the schoolhouse that preceded it and right within almost up the river from me is the oldest nuclear powerplant in America—the Connecticut Yankee Power Plant—which is now been retired and they are in the process of moving it along.

So, we have tried to manage it through the years—intelligent energy development as well as conservation. We are wrestling with the issue now of what to do with the town of Haddam, Connecticut on the other side of the Connecticut River, that lost a tremendous amount of its tax base as a result of this powerplant closing down; wrestling with how to use that property well to make sure that there is not going to be any contamination and spills or problems associated with waste materials. There are some delicate questions about lower Connecticut River Valley.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

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

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Dodd.

The next person is Representative Pascrell.

**STATEMENT OF HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.,
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW JERSEY**

Representative PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the entire subcommittee for the opportunity to testify here today. My legislation H.R. 146 and I join the good Senator from our State, Senator Torricelli. This calls for a study of the Great Falls National Historic District in my hometown of Paterson, New Jersey, to determine the feasibility of adding it to the National Park System. Legislation passed unanimously on the same day that the Congressman Simmons had his legislation and we worked very closely in a bi-partisan way and now it is before the Senate.

Alexander Hamilton, who has been revisited so many times in the last several years, has become a hero in our time. Alexander Hamilton recognized the incredible beauty and potential of the Great Falls when he founded Paterson, New Jersey in 1792. It was America's first planned industrial city and I believe it is our duty to ensure its preservation for generations to come.

Tours pour into the district every year to see the seventy-seven foot Great Falls of the Passaic River which is 3 minutes from City Hall, Paterson, New Jersey—the third largest city, probably the most densely populated city in the State of New Jersey. The Falls and the surrounding neighborhood really represent the genesis of the American economic miracle. In increasing the presence of the

National Park Service, will give the area the attention and resources it rightful deserves.

From the first revolver—Sam Colt's, fireworks, the first locomotive in the Rodgers Works, the first airplane engines and of course silk—Paterson for a long time was the silk city of the entire Nation and the world, for that matter. These buildings represent the various stages of the Industrial Revolution. Waves of immigrants came here from Europe, just as waves since then from all over the world. This is where people worked in the mills.

And Alexander Hamilton had this idea long before those mills were constructed. He saw the Falls as a tremendous potential, not only for the city that was in the bend of the river where Paterson was constructed, but he saw this as a great opportunity for manufacturing. He established the society for Useful Manufacturers which is basically pro forma for many other organizations, business organizations that have since followed.

The employment opportunities of Paterson, New Jersey are historic. Between 1850 and the turn of the century, the population of Paterson increased from 11,000 to 105,000. Paterson is representative of the waves of immigrants that made this country so great; really reflected in a lot of John Updike's work, in his poem about little small cities of 160,000 people right now. Chronically the patterns and cultures of the immigrants that came to Paterson from the 18th century to the 20th century would provide us a microcosm of the affects of immigrants in the shaping of the United States. On teaching modern-day Americans about the history of industry, the mills of the Great Falls also set the backdrop for the history of the labor movement in this country. The fact the only labor museum in the entire Nation is 5 minutes away.

The bill before us is the first legislative step taken on behalf of the Great Falls towards joining with the National Park Service. I see here a synergistic partnership with the National Park Service; a city reaching out—and for an area reaching out—not only for economic development, not only to preserve—not wanting to preserve our history beyond purple ropes, but to use that history for the future of the 21st and 22nd century for the new immigrants that have arrived.

I have long thought that the Passaic River and the Great Falls are not only a critical part of our history, they are the key to our future, and we must do all we can in united fashion to protect these valuable assets. I was mayor of Paterson and I came before this committee in this very room, Mr. Chairman, in 1992—how time passes quickly—to convince the Congress that this area was worth protecting. I was proud to work with our former Senator, Senator Frank Lautenberg and now our present Senator, Senator Bob Torricelli, to secure Federal funds to revitalize this historic district.

Our work paid off then. I hope it pays off now. When we initiated the Urban Street Initiative where we restored and rebuilt Stoney Road Bridge over the upper raceway as well as many hiking paths that pass through the district. This helps strengthen a relationship between the National Park Service and the city of Paterson that is ongoing today. The city of Paterson has an even longer history of working with the Federal Government to preserve its historic

lands. In 1976, I—a Democrat—introduced a Republican President Ford, a President who recognized not only symbolically but also in reality what the Falls was all about. We became part of a national historical landmark.

So, the Park Service has long been aware of our need to protect and save this area. Today you will hear from Deborah Hoffman, executive director of the Passaic Country Development Corporation. The county, of course, is the larger entity. She will share with you many examples of the economic rejuvenation being experienced by the county, and how the presence of the National Park Service will make that growth even more expansive.

Mr. Chairman and members, I want to close out with the design guidelines itself from 1999 presented to us by the National Park Service. “The district bears eloquent testimony to astounding feats of engineering, construction, ingenious manufacturers into the courage and creativity and drudgery of untold lives spent within those mills. It is also about the human propensity to harness the forces of nature to put water and gravity and stone to work. The district the sense of having been one large factory driven by one powerful engine; an image completely consistent with Hamilton’s vision of a centralized manufactory.”

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, this area has the significance. This area is suitable. This area is feasible, which are the criteria—the very criteria—of course, the National Park Service. And I thank you for listening and I am honored to be here in your presence.

[The prepared statement of Representative Pascrell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR., U.S. REPRESENTATIVE
FROM NEW JERSEY

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the entire subcommittee, for allowing me the opportunity to testify here today. My legislation—H.R. 146—calls for a study of the Great Falls National Historic District in my hometown of Paterson, New Jersey to determine the feasibility of adding it to the National Park System.

There is no dispute that the Great Falls Historic District possesses a historic significance that makes it an area to be preserved and treasured. The history here is rich. Alexander Hamilton realized the incredible beauty and potential of the Great Falls when he founded Paterson in 1792 as America’s first planned industrial city and it is our duty to ensure its preservation for generations to come.

Already, tourists are pouring in every year to see the 77-foot Great Falls of the Passaic River and to partake in our preserved history. For the past 12 years, an average of 20,000 yearly visitors have attended the Paterson Museum in the Historic District. And the Great Falls Visitors Center reports almost 5,000 visitors to the center in the last year.

The Falls and the surrounding neighborhood really represent the genesis of the American economic miracle, and increasing the presence of the National Park Service here will give the area the attention and resources it rightly deserves.

As a key to our manufacturing roots, the mills that sit today at the Great Falls constructed paper, cotton. They manufactured the first revolver at Samuel Colt’s Works, the first locomotives at the Rodgers Works, as well as airplane engines, and, of course, silk. Paterson is known around the world as the Silk City. These buildings represent the various stages of the industrial revolution in the United States. They stand as monuments to progress, and could provide living museums for present day Americans to learn about this important part of our history.

As a result of the employment opportunities that abounded in Paterson because of the mills, the city’s population grew and diversified rapidly. Between 1850 and the turn of the century, the population of Paterson increased from 11,000 to 105,000—growing by an average of 50 percent per decade.

As a result, Paterson is representative of the waves of immigration in the United States, as Irish and English immigrants were replaced later by Italians, and then subsequently Spanish-speaking populations who still reside there today.

Chronicling the patterns and cultures of the immigrants that came to Paterson from the 18th through the 20th centuries would provide us with a microcosm of the effect of immigrants in the shaping of the United States.

This convergence between the burgeoning industrial workplace and the fledgling immigrant communities resulted in conflicts that led to the modern day labor movement.

The historic labor unrest in Paterson focused on anti-child labor legislation, safety in the workplace, minimum wage, and reasonable working hours. Some of the most important figures in early 20th Century American labor history were involved in the Great Silk Strike of 1913.

While teaching modern day Americans about the history of industry, the mills at Great Falls also set the backdrop for the history of the labor movement. Today they can teach both histories—so tightly intertwined—together.

Not only is the Great Falls Historic District historically significant, but the City of Paterson stands ready to work in conjunction with the National Park Service to develop its potential. My goal is to create a synergistic partnership between the City of Paterson and the National Park Service. I am confident that Paterson is up to the task.

This bill is the first legislative step I have taken on behalf of Great Falls toward joining the National Park Service. But it is not the first time I have worked with the City of Paterson to enhance and develop this valuable and important area. I have long thought that the Passaic River and the Great Falls are not only a critical part of our past history. They are the key to our future, and we must do all we can in a united fashion to protect these most valuable assets.

As Mayor of Paterson, I went to Washington in 1993 to testify before the House Subcommittee on Parks and Public Lands to help convince Congress that this area was worth protecting.

I was proud to work closely with our former U.S. Senator Frank Lautenberg to secure federal funds to revitalize the Great Falls Historic District. Our work paid off, and the following year I stood with Senator Lautenberg on the steps of the Paterson Museum and accepted \$4.1 million in federal dollars secured under the Urban History Initiative to restore and rebuild the Stoney Road Bridge over the Upper Raceway as well as hiking trails.

This helped strengthen a relationship between the National Park Service and the City of Paterson that is ongoing today. But the City of Paterson has an even longer history of working with the federal government to preserve its historic lands.

The Great Falls district has been on the National Register of Historic Places since 1970 and has been a National Historic Landmark since 1976. Since 1988, the Interior Department has listed the district as a Priority One threatened National Historic Landmark. So the Park Service has long been aware of our need to protect and save this area.

You will hear later from Deborah Hoffman, the Executive Director of the Passaic Economic Development Corporation, who will share with you many examples of the economic rejuvenation being experienced in the county and how the presence of the National Park Service would make that growth even more expansive.

These Falls really represent our city, its people and all its potential. This place can be a real destination that will create jobs, grow businesses and bring people in from all over. We cannot put a velvet rope around the district—we must make it a living, breathing attraction that will celebrate our past, present and future.

In conclusion, I will steal the words of the National Park Service in the Design Guidelines they created for the Great Falls Historic District in 1999:

The district bears eloquent testimony to astounding feats of engineering and construction, to ingenious manufacturers, and to the courage, creativity, and drudgery of untold lives spent within the mills. It is also about the human propensity to harness the forces of nature, to put water and gravity and stone to work. The district retains the sense of having been one large factory driven by one powerful engine, an image completely consistent with Hamilton's vision of a centralized national manufactory.

Thank you again for this opportunity.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for your statements. If there are no questions the next witness is Representative Roemer. But I know Senator Kennedy and Congressman Roemer are both testifying on the Adams Memorial Bill and if Representative Roemer would be willing to defer, we can hear from Senator DeWine first.

Representative ROEMER. I have plenty of time. That would be fine.

Senator AKAKA. May I then call on Senator DeWine.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE DeWINE, U.S. SENATOR
FROM OHIO**

Senator DEWINE. I will be brief Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, Senator Thomas, Senator Hagel let me begin by thanking you for inviting me to testify in regard to S. 921 the William Howard Taft Boundary Adjustment Act. We thank John Parsons, who you are going to hear from in a moment, who is from the National Park Service, for his testimony today. Let me also thank my colleague from Ohio, Congressman Rob Portman, for introducing the companion measure in the House, H.R. 1000. This has already passed the House of Representatives.

I strongly support the preservation of Presidential historic sites. I believe we must do all we can to protect these landmarks and see to it they are properly maintained. That is why last year I introduced the Presidential Sites Improvement Act and plan to reintroduce it later this year. That bill will provide grant money for the protection and improvement of presidential sites.

But that is not what we are here about today. What we are here about today is the William Howard Taft Boundary Adjustment Act which will complement our earlier effort on helping the National Park Service improve and protect the overall Taft site in Cincinnati, Ohio. William Howard Taft was our Nation's 27th President and the only President to also serve as Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. He was born in Cincinnati in the year 1857. The William Howard Taft National Historical Site consists of his birthplace and his boyhood home. And I have had the privilege, of course, with all of my children, of visiting this wonderful site.

While President Taft and his siblings were growing up in the house, his family was an integral part of the social, the intellectual and, yes, the political fabric of Cincinnati. The Taft house was obviously the site of many important gatherings. This bill would help the Park Service better address the needs of the Taft home historic grounds. The site is the only memorial to the former President and our bill would authorize the expansion of the site. This would also authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow the National Park Service to swap one section of equal-valued land for another.

Mr. Parson will speak in greater detail about the Park Service plans that will not only improve the overall site, but also—I would add—would help the community as well. Ultimately I believe this legislation will help make a lasting commitment to future generations by preserving the memories and the contributions of President William Howard Taft. I thank the Chair and I thank the committee.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for your statement. Are there any questions?

Senator THOMAS. At home, a section is 640 acres. Is that what you are talking about?

Senator DEWINE. As far as—

Senator THOMAS. You said you were going to exchange one section for another.

Senator DEWINE. I apologize Senator. They were talking about one area. I should have used the word "area."

Senator THOMAS. That is three-quarters of an acre, right?

Senator DEWINE. Yes. I apologize. I will be more precise next time.

Senator AKAKA. Let me call on the next witness, Representative Roemer.

**STATEMENT OF HON. TIM ROEMER,
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM INDIANA**

Representative ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, with all due seriousness, we are Senate side and Senator Kennedy is the lead sponsor on this side of this bill, and I am going to defer to him to start the testimony.

Senator KENNEDY. That's all right. You can go ahead.

Representative ROEMER. First of all, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for the opportunity to be before you. Thanks to your staff for the expedited consideration of this. Thank you too, of course, Mr. Thomas—my colleague from the House days. It is nice to see him again. And Mr. Hagel, I hope this is interesting, for the last time we saw each other we were both in line to watch a Disney movie with our families.

John Adams is fascinating and anybody who has made it through—as I just did—McCullough's 651-page book on John Adams. And I now I am supposed to explain why this Nation should remember this great and honorable man's achievements in 5 minutes. It is quite a task. Let me try to do it.

First of all, we have done it in a very bi-partisan way—in the House where Chairman Hansen and Chairman Heffley on the Republican side reported this on a subcommittee, full committee and it passed on voice vote in the House of Representatives. Eleanor Holmes North, the District representative who represents the Mall and is very, very protective of the Mall, said not only is she fully supportive of this legislation to commemorate John and Abigail Adams and the Adams family—particularly John Quincy Adams—but this bill is the model for the way to go about a putting a monument somewhere in D.C. So, we have her strong support, as well.

Thomas Jefferson, who gets so much credit and so much press, said this about John Adams' role in the Declaration of Independence. "His power of thought and expression moved us from our seats." John Adams was the voice, the passion, the articulation, the eloquence of convincing the American people to take the huge risk for independence; something never done before with success to break away with Great Britain; something that he led the efforts, headed the commissions, and the Continental Congress to argue passionately for our independence when one-third of the country was Tory, one-third of the country was True Blue, and one-third was undecided.

While George Washington was indeed our first President, was indeed the first to hold the office of the Presidency and represent the executive branch, some might argue that John Adams was our first President in terms of the legislative branch and seeing that Declaration of Independence through.

He also was instrumental in advising members of Congress for the separation of powers. In writing, as Senator Kennedy who has been thumbing through a book the Library of Congress has shared with us, the defense of the Constitution of the Government of the United States of America written in 1787 articulating in this book that ours was a Nation of laws, not of men. And that we needed a separation of power, independence—Adams crucial role—separation of powers—the appointment of John Marshall to indeed argue that we had a Nation of laws and not of men. Maybe the greatest Chief Justice in the history of the United States and an Adams appointment. And then, of course, arguing for peace and be our diplomat for the Treaty of Paris in 1783.

He probably made his best choice in life in marrying Abigail Adams who was his equal, his partner, his equal in eloquence in letters and in raising probably the most dazzling and brilliant public service family in the history of our country when you look at John Adams and his son John Quincy Adams, the sixth President. You look at his son Charles Francis Adams who Lincoln appointed to keep Great Britain out of the Civil War in the 1860 through 1865 period. And then his son, Henry Adams who was maybe one of the most gifted historians in the history of the country.

One generation of brilliance, of dedication to public service, of writing skills after another and somehow we have forgotten this family. We have neglected this family in putting up our Nation's monuments and memorials in this great town. Not far from here in our Nation's Capital is John Trumbull's picture of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. And front and center, determined and confident, right in the very middle of that portrait is John Adams standing there ready to articulate in the most eloquent, fiery and passionate terms why we needed to break away from Great Britain, why we needed our independence and how we could form the different institutions of a great republic, of a democracy for our Nation, for our history.

I guess little did he know that a Nation was not just born there but to born and unborn millions of people throughout decades and centuries later this country and the things that Adams articulated still stand. The ideals and for the passions and for the liberties and freedoms that other people all over the world look to and are trying to establish their form of government.

I hope the Senate will act as expeditiously as the House did in passing this tribute to John and Abigail Adams and John Quincy Adams and to this great legacy of the Adams' family contributors to the very many strengths of our system have been so eloquently put forward by the Adams' family. I have enjoyed working with Senator Kennedy on this bill and greatly respect his contributions both to this legislation but also over his many years as a U.S. Senator and his family's contributions as well.

I have a long statement, Mr. Chairman, that I will enter into the record at this point but I hope that we can pass this legislation in a truly bi-partisan way and do justice to this wonderfully unique and talented family.

[The prepared statement of Representative Roemer follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. TIM ROEMER, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM INDIANA

We are here today because the question has been asked: why is there no fitting memorial to John Adams and his family's tremendous legacy in American politics?

Pulitzer Prize winning author, David McCullough, has made the case that John Adams's contributions as a colossus of independence; as an equal partner with Washington and Jefferson as a creator of our country; as the first Vice President and second President; as a skilled diplomat negotiating peace with England and later with France; as an author of one of the most important diaries, and perhaps the most important letters with Thomas Jefferson, are too great not to be immortalized among his colleagues.

As a public servant, my fascination with Adams extends through three generations of his descendants. As a family, the Adamses were the guardians of our republic, from its creation through adolescence. Their courage and prophetic wisdom kept us out of war, built the foundation of American foreign policy, transcended party politics, and displayed independence in critical times. It is time to embrace their contributions with a proper memorial in our capital city.

One of the few people truly comparable to John Adams both in passion and intellect was his wife, Abigail. Those who knew them personally called their union perfect. Abigail's letters to her husband reveal not only her wit and intelligence, but also a profound belief in the equality of women that was more than 100 years before its time.

As a member of Congress, I am particularly intrigued by John Quincy Adams, the quintessential public servant, and son of John Adams. John Quincy Adams began his career as a diplomat, skillfully serving America's national interests in Russia, the Netherlands, Portugal, Prussia, and Great Britain. Under President Madison he negotiated the Treaty of Ghent, and as Secretary of State during the Monroe Administration, he helped create the most important and decisive foreign policy statement of its time, The Monroe Doctrine.

John Quincy Adams's Presidency was ambitious. Like his father, he believed that the government should invest in education and science for the betterment of its citizens. He proposed a national university and observatory. He pursued his agenda with tenacity and initiative, and like his father, enjoyed negligible political support. Like his father, he served only one term as President.

A true public servant, John Quincy Adams returned to public life after a brief hiatus to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives from his hometown of Quincy, Massachusetts. In his nine terms, he spoke of no issue more often—or with more vigor—than slavery. Like his parents, John Quincy Adams was a stolid abolitionist, known to his colleagues as “old man eloquent.” He died at the “post of duty” as a dedicated public servant, suffering a stroke on the floor of the House. He passed away two days later in the U.S. Capitol.

John Quincy Adams's son, Charles Francis Adams, spent his formative years in Washington, learning through the examples of his distinguished predecessors. As he entered into politics, Charles Francis Adams became increasingly disenchanted with the insincerity and outright corruption of his generation of leaders in Washington. He soon bolted the Whigs in favor of the Free Soil Party, which organized around the principles of a profound opposition to slavery. He received the Party's Vice Presidential nomination in 1848, and eventually held his father's old seat in the U.S. Congress. In 1860, President Lincoln tapped Charles Francis Adams—now a member of the new Republican Party, and widely known for his sharp intellect and persuasive powers—to act as Ambassador to England in order to prevent British military support for the Confederacy. His logic, reserve and directness achieved functional neutrality from Britain, which helped to preserve the integrity of our Union.

Charles Francis Adams's son, Henry Adams, shared his father's frustration with politics and corruption in Washington. His observations steered him towards journalism, where he described the shortcomings of modern politics without falling prey to them. A “liberal Republican,” Henry Adams wrote pointed, brilliant essays exposing political fraud and dishonesty. He shared the idealism and independence of his heritage, never putting politics above his convictions. Henry Adams was also an accomplished academic, teaching Medieval History at Harvard, and the first American to employ the “seminar” method of instruction. Henry Adams is best known for his acclaimed autobiography, *The Education of Henry Adams*. Some have called it the greatest autobiography in American history.

The Adamses occupy a position in American history unequalled by any other family. They helped create our nation as champions of freedom; they helped defend and guide it during its vulnerable, early days; and they helped preserve it through the most divisive battle in American history. They devoted their lives to our Republic,

and it is time to recognize and celebrate their genius, sacrifices, and significance, here in our Nation's Capital.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for your statement it will be included in the record.

Senator Kennedy.

**STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS**

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I join Congressman Roemer in thanking you and thanking the committee for the consideration of this legislation. And let me thank this committee here. There are many committees that we know in this institution. We all know about the Finance Committee dealing with Medicare and Social Security; and the Appropriations Committee; and the Defense, Armed Service and Missile Defense and all the others. But in just these past few days, I have once again seen the magic of this committee in my own State—the Essex County Heritage Corridor which was approved. I was up over the period of the weekend. I visited Salem, Massachusetts where they had the Commissioning of the Friendship and saw the thousands and thousands of students that are out there involved in both the Heritage Corridor and the Friendship, Salem, Massachusetts, one of the national parks by President Roosevelt prior to the Second World War.

And then I had the opportunity by boat to go back through the islands right off the coast where the only city in the world that has thirty-two islands, now they will be preserved; some for appropriate development, some for recreation, some for environmental preservation. That would be gone over time if that committee had not taken action on it. And then again just a week ago now in New Bedford, which has been designated a park, and what a difference that has made to this committee. The Blackstone Valley—I could go on, but the work that is done by this committee and its impact in terms of the quality of life of the people in our State has just been enormous and we are incredibly thankful to you, Mr. Chairman and the other members of this committee—Democrats and Republicans.

It has made an enormous difference and now we are here in terms of the historic preservations here in Washington. Let me say first of all to pay tribute to Congressman Roemer. He has really been the driving force on this long before Dave McCullough finished his book. I think probably he was working on it when Dave McCullough started on his book. And I welcome the opportunity to work with the Congressman, but he has really been the spark and the force behind all of this legislation. But it is enormously needed.

And let me just review very quickly. The Adams' family donated their home in an extraordinary act of generosity. So, here we have the local participation by the community itself wanting to help the preservation. And we have seen in recent times the preservation of their home, picked up in part by the State but helpful assistance by the Federal Government. This has been really an extraordinary act on their part of generosity.

In terms their coming this issue, let me just reiterate quickly three things that John Adams did, which I found impressive, which Tim has referenced. First of all, he, more than anyone else, was re-

sponsible for Thomas Jefferson writing the Declaration of Independence. Two, he was the one that selected George Washington to be the Commander of the troops. And this was the first act of national reconciliation. Here you have a Southern general commanding primarily Northern forces at that time. It had incredible symbolism in terms of national unity at the beginning of the American Revolution. And thirdly, the appointment of John Marshall. He more than anyone, historians will tell you, the independence of the judiciary committee was really John Adams.

I think beyond as President Kennedy wrote in his profiles of courage: "John Adams at the height of the American Revolution defended the British soldiers that fired on American partisans." Read this book. See the emotion that was taking place at that time. The whole city could have burned down and he was willing to take this on. An extraordinary act, in spite of the fact of his absolute dedication to the independence movement. Extraordinary act of personal heroism.

Abigail Adams, who is the principal writer about the colonial America, the Revolutionary War, and the early life of this country. There is nobody besides being probably the first woman suffragette as well as an abolitionist. Her writings are just the rarest, most penetrating, interesting collection of documents. And she—as Tim has pointed out—is an extraordinary figure. And then John Quincy Adams as a Senator from Massachusetts resigned rather than supporting the War of 1812. Eventually, he went back and rebuilt his political career but an extraordinary act of courage.

So we have really the founding of just these extraordinary and these—as Tim has mentioned—this family continued for many years. This will be his place, his place should be recognized in the nation's capital that has recognized Washington, that has recognized Jefferson, that has recognized Madison but has left out John Adams. And we think that history, American history and its values—all the things that we care about in terms of the earliest life of this country, he has made such a contribution for and as the great philosophers say it isn't only a country that produces great individuals but a great country says something about the men and women it honors.

We are asking this committee and this Senate to honor and by honoring, state what real values that we as Americans feel in terms of their contribution to the development and the continuing values of the country. I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Kennedy follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. SENATOR
FROM MASSACHUSETTS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to express my support for legislation authorizing a memorial for John, Abigail, and John Quincy Adams in Washington, D.C. Senator Kerry and I strongly support this proposal, and all 10 Massachusetts Congressmen sponsored this bill in the House of Representatives.

In Massachusetts, their importance is well-known, and we've taken significant steps over the years to preserve the Adams legacy. This preservation was possible in large part through the generosity of the Adams family, who gave the Adams' homes to the American people in 1946.

Through his role in the nation's founding and his service as the first Vice-President and the second President, John Adams left an extraordinary and indelible mark on the country. But for too long, in the country as a whole, he has often been the Forgotten Founding Father.

Historian David McCullough's current best-selling biography of Adams is now readdressing that balance, and giving the whole nation an impressive lesson in Adams' importance to our history.

John Adams' greatest action may well have been his indispensable role in July 1776, persuading the colonies to declare their freedom. Jefferson, himself, called Adams the "colossus of independence." We might not have had a country without him.

John Adams also had a profound role in shaping the Constitution, and the early development of our federal system of government. He laid the basis for the nation's independent judiciary by naming John Marshall to the Supreme Court. Adams was especially proud of the appointment of that great Chief Justice. As he later said, "My gift of John Marshall to the people of the United States was the proudest act of my life."

Adams's wife, Abigail, and son, John Quincy, also should be part of this memorial. Abigail Adams was her husband's most trusted adviser and a strong supporter of women's rights and the abolitionist movement. Her letters recorded the daily events of colonial life, the tumultuous years of the American Revolutionary War, and the early years of the nation.

John Adams' son, John Quincy, became President too, but he was renowned for his political courage long before that. In fact, President Kennedy chose him as a Profile in Courage for his actions as a Federalist Senator in supporting Jefferson's trade embargo and supporting Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase.

For all these reasons and many more, John Adams, Abigail Adams, and John Quincy Adams eminently deserve a memorial in the nation's capital. Their extraordinary leadership and dedication to the cause of independence and the development of the United States helped make the nation what it is today. It is fitting that their place in history be honored here in Washington, D.C.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for you statement.

Senator THOMAS.

Senator THOMAS. Just one clarification. This is done under the Commemorative Works Act which precludes the Federal Government paying for it, and yet it is my understanding that there has been money appropriated for it. Now, I don't quite understand that.

Representative ROEMER. Now certainly, Senator, the House side the legislation that we did pass by voice vote said that it was not only appropriate for us to honor this very distinguished family, but as I mentioned before we did it in a very bi-partisan way with a voice vote. In our legislation, on the House side, in addition to saying we needed to incorporate a foundation to raise money for this. It says in the legislation that there were not Federal funds.

I can't speak to what the intentions of the Senate are. I am over here testifying. But the history of it are articulated there. This morning we passed a bill that authorized \$10 million to Senator Coverdell for him being commemorated as the new person—his name would be inscribed on the building for the Peace Corps with \$10 million there. So, I think this legislation, these efforts are done in different ways, by different people and I am sure we see many different models of this through the years.

Senator THOMAS. Your bill and the House bill did not anticipate government funding.

Representative ROEMER. Our bill on the House, I did not request those funds. That is correct.

Senator KENNEDY. Can I just add, Senator, that the \$1 million was fairly in terms of trying to get to the program sort of started and run through the various procedures. As I understand it, historically each of the other monuments have had similar kinds of initial kinds of funding at this stage, and the support for it. And as Congressman Roemer indicated, he did not anticipate that there would be the funds. I think this legislation only has the funding

for the start up and I think that we would at other times consult with this committee should we change direction.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you.

Senator AKAKA. Again, thank you very much.

Senator TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman can I ask Senator Kennedy and Congressman Roemer to remain for one moment. Were you planning on calling on me next? I have not actually been part of the legislation but wanted to say a word about it. I have actually thought about this for years and want to commend them for bringing this forward. It is actually extraordinary in the life of this country that there has never been a memorial to John Adams.

It is really a mistake of history. In a Nation that has remembered and revered Thomas Jefferson, these two men had different visions of the future of America. And the Nation is largely a reflection of John Adams, not Thomas Jefferson. As Senator Kennedy noted, Thomas Jefferson only wrote the Declaration of Independence because John Adams asked him to do it. John Adams is the architect of the American Constitution. Thomas Jefferson played very little role. History may see them as twin giants, in fact they did not play a role of the same scale.

I think this is tremendous legislation and my only hope would be that given to really do something befitting John Adams this simply cannot be another monument in Washington. This isn't another circle with a statue or a place to sit in the park. This has to be a monument as big as the man. This man genuinely, you could say a few figures in American history that the Nation would be fundamentally different if the man had not lived. I can think of few people you could say that about other than maybe Lincoln. You would say it about John Adams. I am very glad they brought this forward and hope the committee will take it seriously. I certainly want to be a part of it. This should have been done a hundred years ago. But that is not why I am here.

Representative ROEMER. Senator, if I could just respond in ten seconds. Certainly Congress is, I have had a discussion with Mr. Thomas on this, we don't determine where the monument will be nor what it will look like. The Commemorative Works Act of 1986 does. Mr. Parson who is in the room with us today will help us determine that. But with those nice words we would certainly like to put you on the Commission.

[Laughter].

Senator KENNEDY. Thank you very much.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much. Senator, please proceed.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI,
U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY**

Senator TORRICELLI. Thank you for allowing me to make those comments, Senator Thomas, Senator Hagel. I joined Congressman Pascrell today in support of H.R. 146, the Paterson Great Falls Historic Preservation bill. I have sponsored a similar bill in the Senate. I know, Mr. Chairman, it is not traditional to think of great urban centers as Paterson as a site for a unit of the National Park Service. But National Parks are more than just open space or areas of environmental importance. The National Park Service is meant to preserve our Nation's history. The Great Falls itself is

a seventy-seven foot tall natural landmark, second largest waterfall by volume East of the Mississippi. But it is the Great Falls position as the birthplace of our Nation's first industrialized city that brings us here today.

In the years after helping our country win its freedom from Great Britain, Alexander Hamilton—a third great figure in American independence—sought to establish U.S. economic independence by developing American commerce and manufacturing. Unlike Thomas Jefferson, who I have already attacked here today once, who had a vision of an agrarian based economy, Hamilton believed that economic independence would come from industry. He believed that industry could be powered by water and after designed a water power system in 1791, He set out to find a suitable location. He crossed the Hudson River in New Jersey, stopped at Great Falls and a year later founded what has become the city of Paterson.

He built a laboratory and founded a Society for Useful Manufacturing. He formed this new community as a public/private partnership using the mighty Falls to power industry. While the new Falls provided the power, new immigrants provided the thriving work force. Together they helped Paterson become America's first industrialized city. It was, as Congressman Pascrell testified, a textile city from silk to cotton which fueled the growth of Paterson, making Paterson once known as the silk city of the world. The textile mills are still present throughout the city. Paterson is home to the largest example of early manufacturing plants in America. Remnants of the Water Power facility of the 18th, 19th and 20th century fueled Paterson industrialization and they can still be seen.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has already recognized the place of Paterson and the Great Falls in the rich history of the nation. The Great Falls have been on the National Register of Historic Places since 1970. In 1976, President Ford designated the area a national landmark. Today the National Park Service is authorized to provide technical assistance to the protection and restoration of the area. Our legislation seeks to begin the process to take the next step, which is to make the Great Falls a unit of the park system.

Establishment as a unit of the Park Service is important for several reasons. Primarily, it will bring new resources to former Park Service personnel and funding, which provides staff, tours, enhances the visitor's center to help ensure the survival of the historic facilities. But also because our Nation's urban-industrial history is currently under-represented by the National Park Service. There is currently only one urban-industrial site in the Northeast—Lowell, Massachusetts—the second industrial city in America—and I am glad I am presenting this after Senator Kennedy has left the room.

These sites are necessary to tell the story of the growth of our Nation and the transformation of its economy from agrarian to industrial. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee I hope will consider this designation. There are many things we should remember about our county. How it became an industrialized society, where American industry had its birth, how this enormous economy was conceived by Alexander Hamilton, created, built, transformed to be part of the history that is never lost.

If we do not act it can be lost. A quarter of the Nation's population lives within a 4-hour-drive of Paterson, New Jersey. Every school child in America should have the opportunity to stand where Alexander Hamilton stood, see what was built, how American industry began, how the world largest economy was given birth. That is what we are asking. This designation gives us tour guides, potentially a Visitor's Center where indeed we can commemorate a \$10 trillion economy was given birth with a single idea, a water wheel, a falls, and a plant. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for your statement. Any questions?

Senator THOMAS. No, thank you.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for testifying before the committee. I would like to make a slight change to the hearing format this afternoon. Normally the administration witnesses are given courtesy of testifying first. Given the interest in Senator Hagel's bill to authorize the education center at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, I think it might be useful to hear from all of the witnesses testifying on that issue in the same panel. Mr. Parsons has agreed to stay for the entire hearing to accommodate our format change. I would like to thank him for his cooperation.

At this time I would like to ask all three witnesses testifying on S. 281 to take a seat at the witness table: Mr. John Parsons, Associate Regional Director for the National Capitol Region of the National Park Service testifying on behalf of the administration. Ms. Patricia Gallagher, the executive director of the National Capital Planning Commission; and Mr. Jan Scruggs, president of the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial Fund.

Before we begin with this panel let me encourage you to please summarize your statements and keep your remarks to no more than 5 minutes. We have your written testimony and that will be included in its entirety in the hearing record. So, let me call on Mr. Parsons to proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON S. 281

Mr. PARSONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and I will summarize my remarks as you suggested. The Department strongly supports the efforts to educate the public about the Vietnam War and about the men and women who bravely served our country in that war. But we have nine concerns with S. 281 as introduced, and I would like share those with you.

First, we believe that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is a work of civic art that is now complete. It is a memorial that generates an emotional response of the highest order; a design that has been heralded throughout the world. It has had numerous additions over time, as you may know: the statue of the three servicemen, the Vietnam Women's Memorial, the In Memory plaque that we are working on right now. And we believe that if we intrude on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial with anything else, especially of this scale, we will be diminishing the impact of the existing work.

Second, as proposed—I have an exhibit over here that I would like to show you—as proposed at the moment, as we understand

it, the structure would be seven times the size of the existing kiosk at the Memorial. We have depicted on this exhibit—and I think you have it before you in a smaller size—what this would look like at the site of the existing kiosk.

Third, we believe that memorials are meant to be provocative not educational. We have dealt with this at the Joint Task Force of the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Memorial Commission, and the Commission of Fine Arts and have offered to articulate in a master plan for memorials, which is soon to be released, the thought of what memorials actually are. And we have come to the conclusion that educational facilities of the type suggested here are not appropriate in the context of landscape memorials, especially.

Fourth, I would point out, the National Capital Memorial Commission at a public hearing on April 26, after receiving testimony, unanimously concluded that we should oppose this measure.

Fifth, at various times similar proposals have been made for other memorials. The FDR Memorial, the World War II Memorial, the Martin Luther King, Jr. that we are working on now, as well as the Korean War Veterans Memorial—all of these have had proposals for the kind of educational facility proposed here for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and through the process designated under the Commemorative Works Act, we have discouraged such facilities.

Sixth, we are concerned, of course, that if this education center is authorized that you will be setting a precedent. People will return to you for more educational centers where we have previously discouraged them under the provisions of the Commemorative Works Act.

Seventh, we believe that the National Military Museum, which is proposed in the Defense Department authorization for fiscal year 2000, is the solution here—to combine in one facility a museum that will deal in depth with all wars of all times that this country has engaged in. It would allow an opportunity for the story of the Vietnam War to be told in that context, in a more thorough manner.

Ironically, the structure proposed by S. 281 is going to be too small, in our judgment, even though we believe it is too large. And what we mean by that is that we feel that because of the size of the visitation to the memorial, which is now four million annually, there simply would have to be a facility much larger than this to be effective. And we also feel it would have to be of a larger size in order to cover the subject matter at hand.

Ninth, we are totally committed to education about this memorial. We have worked with Mr. Scruggs of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund for years in their effort to reach out to schools all over the country with educational programs and advanced materials they have provided. We have developed a CD-ROM and a book which describes all of the collections and the memorabilia that are left at the wall. We also feel that the three rangers that we have there, combined with the volunteers that assist us, provide the kind of information that is sought by this measure; that is to use the traditional method of park rangers serving the visitors on a one-to-one basis to provide the kind of information that enlightens

them about the war as well as the Memorial itself. We have introduced wayside exhibits at the Memorial, which could thematically supplement information in the manner that is being suggested. So through that combination of materials on site, we believe that would be a better solution.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. I would be glad to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Parsons on S. 281 follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES, AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON S. 281

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 281, which would authorize the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund to construct an education center at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the Mall.

The Department strongly supports efforts to educate the public about the Vietnam War and about the men and women who bravely served our country in that war. However, we do have concerns with S. 281, as introduced. The structure that would be authorized by this legislation would detract from the visitors' experience to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial, and would set an unwelcome precedent for other memorials on the National Mall. Instead, we believe that other more suitable alternatives to the proposed education center should be explored. We look forward to working with the Committee on fulfilling the goal of the legislation of providing educational information about the Vietnam War, but doing so in ways that would not detract from the Vietnam Veterans Memorial or visually impact the monumental core in our Nation's Capital.

S. 281 would authorize the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc. to construct an education center for the purpose of educating people about the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. It would replace the small National Park Service information kiosk (168 square feet) currently at the site. The new structure would be a maximum of 1,200 square feet in size. The legislation specifies that the center would be erected for 10 years and reevaluated by Congress at the end of that period. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc. would be responsible for paying for the cost of designing and constructing the center.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial generates a memorable emotional response from virtually all who visit it. Although not part of the original design, several elements have been added to the memorial, including the flagpole and the *Three Servicemen* statue. A separate *Memorial to Women who Served in Vietnam* was constructed in 1993, and the *In Memory Plaque*, to those veterans who died after the war as a direct result of their military service in Vietnam, was authorized last year. The Department believes that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is complete and should not be subject to further additions. While we support the effort to provide the public with an opportunity to learn more about history of the Vietnam War, we believe that we risk diminishing the original work by adding adjunct structures to this site.

The education center authorized by S. 281 would not simply be another design element added to the memorial. The proposed structure would be more than seven times the size of the existing information kiosk and would visually intrude on and detract from the memorial as the focal point of the visitor's experience. In addition, this proposal would violate concepts contained in the Master Plan for Memorials and Museums in the Nation's Capital, which is being developed by a joint task force of commissions, under the leadership of the National Capital Planning Commission. That plan precludes such facilities within Area I and has gone through a public review and comment period, where endorsement was urged. On April 26, 2001, the National Capital Memorial Commission recommended opposing the bill by a unanimous vote at its public meeting.

Similar facilities have been disapproved or precluded at the Franklin Delano Roosevelt, World War II, and Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorials by the National Park Service, the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts because they would intrude on those works of landscape architecture. Each of these memorials represents a historical figure or time period important to our Nation. However, a determination was made that opportunities to educate the public further about these historical people and events could be accomplished in ways that would not detract from the memorials.

Groups who support similar facilities at these and other memorials may be watching our action on S. 281 with great interest. If an education center were to be authorized for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, similar proposals for the other war memorials would likely follow. Proponents of the education center express concern about visitors' lack of fundamental understanding of the Vietnam War, but the same could be said to be true for visitors to the Nation's Capital' memorials for the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, the Korean War, and the nearby District of Columbia World War I Memorial and the soon-to-be-constructed World War II Memorial.

One alternative to placing facilities at these memorials is to provide education about all of the wars that are part of our Nation's history in one museum. In fact, Congress has already begun the process of developing the kind of facility we believe would be appropriate for telling the story of our Vietnam veterans and the Vietnam War by establishing a Commission on the National Military Museum as part of the Department of Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2000 (P.L. 106-65). The commission established by that law is charged with developing preliminary proposals for a national military museum in the National Capital Area. If the commission recommends establishing such a facility on Navy Annex property in Arlington, Virginia, the law further provides that the Secretary of Defense may make 10 acres of that property available for that purpose. Wherever the museum is located, it presumably would be easily accessible to those who visit the Vietnam Veterans Memorial as well as other war memorials on the Mall. Once the military museum is established, we envision coordinating with the Defense Department to ensure that visitors to the military memorials in the Nation's Capital that are managed by the National Park Service are encouraged to visit the museum to learn more about the history of the wars.

Exploring other projects or sites also would allow us to find a location that is large enough to tell a more complete story of the Vietnam War. S. 281 proposes a 1,200-square-foot structure which may actually be too small for the purpose it is intended to serve. It is questionable whether it is possible to treat the Vietnam War with the range and depth that could be considered minimally appropriate in a structure of this size. It would be too small for the high volume of visitation at the memorial, which is approximately four million annually.

The Department is firmly committed to educating the public about the Vietnam War and its impact on the history of our Nation. We have been involved in several types of educational programs. For nearly ten years, the Smithsonian has displayed an exhibit of the offerings left at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and collected by National Park Service rangers. Other exhibits of offerings collected by the National Park Service have traveled to schools, universities, museums and veterans centers all over the world. In addition, the National Park Service has published a book and CD-ROM on the history of the memorial and the Vietnam War and runs a website designed to educate children about museum collections, including those associated with the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The National Park Service has been involved in a number of news programs and television specials on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial and the history of the Vietnam War.

The goal of S. 281 of educating the public about the Vietnam War is an admirable one, and one which the Department has and will continue to fully support. We strongly believe that this important goal can be accomplished in a different manner than prescribed by this legislation. We look forward to working with the Committee in exploring projects or sites that give us the best opportunity to tell the story of the Vietnam War and the men and women who served our Nation.

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

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for your statement. May I call upon Ms. Gallagher?

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA E. GALLAGHER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION, ON S. 281

Ms. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, thank you. members of the committee, my name is Patricia Gallagher and I am executive director of the National Capital Planning Commission. The Commission is responsible for preserving historic urban design and has made Washington one of the most admired capital cities in the world. I am honored to have this opportunity to express the Commission's

views regarding the proposed Education Center of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the Mall.

The Commission supports the establishment of an education program to inform the millions of visitors to Washington, including thousands of school aged children eager to learn about the complex history of the Vietnam conflict and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. However, the Commission is concerned that locating an Education Center in the open space between the Lincoln and the Vietnam Veterans Memorial could detract from the visitors' experience at these memorials.

It would also set the precedent for establishing additional Education Centers at other memorials across the Mall. In order to preserve the historic open space of the National Mall, this Commission along with the Commission on Fine Arts and the National Capital Memorials Commission in January of 2000 adopted a Commemorative Zone Policy that establishes a Reserve in the central cross axis of the Mall and states that in this Reserve we will approve no new memorials. In establishing this policy, the Commission noted that "the Reserve was a unique national space, which embodies our democratic ideals, achievements and which must be preserved as an indispensable, national significant, cultural resource."

The Senate last year demonstrated its support of this policy passing legislation to protect the Reserve as a matter of law. Although not proposing a new memorial, S. 281 would authorize the construction of an additional element to an existing memorial within the Reserve and by this act would undermine the intent of the Reserve policy.

The size of the structure, as stated by Mr. Parsons, will be seven times the size of the National Park Service's Ranger Station located at the Memorial. We believe again, as Mr. Parsons said, that this site—that this center—is too large for the Mall-sensitive landscape, but at the same time too small to tell the conflict story of the Vietnam War to its millions of visitors.

Since 1991, the Commission has been consistent in expressing its objections to additions to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which we believe succeeds in evoking a powerful, emotional response precisely because of its simplicity. Moreover, the Commission is concerned about the precedent that would be set if the Center is permitted at this location. Congress may soon find itself under increasing pressure to permit similar Education Centers at other memorials throughout the monumental core.

The Commission suggests that there are other ways to provide visitors to this and other memorials with an Education Center that would not diminish the historical landscape of the monumental core, and we would be happy to work with the committee to insist in finding suitable alternatives that are within close proximity to the Memorial.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today and would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you for your statement.

Mr. Scruggs.

**STATEMENT OF JAN CRAIG SCRUGGS, PRESIDENT OF THE
VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL FUND**

Mr. SCRUGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am very honored to be here today to represent the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund. I actually last testified for the subcommittee 2 decades ago, 20 years ago, on what was then the controversial idea of placing the National Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Constitution Garden. But with your help, the legislation was passed and most of us here would agree that the Vietnam Memorial has been a great success.

I have returned today to merely request permission to expand the currently existing kiosk on the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. The new Education Center will transform the Vietnam Veterans Memorial into a more profound learning experience for America's youth with a self-guided tour and photographs of those who are on the wall, and these will engage them. They will be memorable displays of historic events, which have taken place at the most visited memorial in Washington. Young people will gain an understanding of the Memorial that is now older than they are, Mr. Chairman.

Further, the Education Center will help them gain a better appreciation for the visits to other memorials in Washington; all of which honor service to our great Nation, a service which has kept our country free. The visitors will have the opportunity to read written remembrances and reactions to the wall that will ultimately serve as a very important, historic archive with contemporary American culture. Computer terminals will also be on hand allowing for searches for names on the wall based on States and cities.

Last year, the subcommittee approved legislation authorizing the "In Memory Plaque" on the site of the Memorial, honoring veterans who died as a result of service in Vietnam. We are actually making very good progress with that plaque. We will design, announce a design, in the relatively near future, probably September. The kiosk will also allow other groups in the future who will be demanding separate plaques because this indeed will be a magnificent architectural achievement when we are complete with it; an opportunity to be honored in the actual kiosk through rotating exhibits or perhaps even a Wall of Honor. These rotating exhibits can actually highlight the groups, the sacrifices of groups such as the Dog Handlers and others who feel the need to be memorialized.

So it is far better to honor these groups in this kiosk than to continue making further permanent alterations to the Memorial area. The arguments against the Center, which have been entered into the record by the two previous witnesses, interestingly have already been addressed. Exhibit A of your testimony which includes a letter sent to John Parsons on the 16th of July actually addresses all of these issues. Appropriate documentation has been provided. Exhibit A is attached to my testimony.

Actually the Secretary of the Interior had two concerns which I considered relatively minor. I am happy to address them at this time. She is concerned that the Center will interfere with the lines of sight to the Lincoln Memorial. But with proper landscaping and design and such interference will be minimal. The major interference with the sight lines to the Lincoln Memorial is actually the

large oak tree. The site lines in question are truly a major concern to the Interior Department that these trees could be removed. That is a step that I would certainly never support. The minimal interference that the center would introduce—and I don't think that interference is the right word—for this will indeed enhance the Memorial and the experience for visitors.

This would be a very small price to pay for the benefits to America's youth. We will work with the Secretary of the Interior to develop the proper landscaping, the appropriate siting for this very low roof structure. Ironically a number of structures near the Lincoln Memorial, including a trailer selling sodas to tourists, are major eyesores that interfere considerably with the lines of site to the Lincoln Memorial.

In your possession, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is exhibit B which actually shows the trailer's approximately—I walked it off—approximately 4000 square feet in the site line of the Lincoln Memorial sits this extraordinary trailer. And on exhibit B there are other structures as well as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which we understand can really never be removed. They have been there for 10 years. These are First Amendment demonstrators protected by the First Amendment.

The point is that when we discuss precedent here, there is plenty of precedent for bad architecture basically on the grounds of the Lincoln Memorial. We are providing, Mr. Chairman, good architecture as we reach out to teach about the Wall and to teach America's history to America's youth. The proposed site for the Center has a clearing surrounded by trees. The design of the Center itself greatly improves upon the existing kiosk as is evidenced by the unique shape of the Center, which will adapt with the site harmoniously. Further the site can be removed after a period of ten years should visitorship or interest in the wall diminish.

It would be a truly momentous decision here today if this bill were to irrevocably and unalterably alter the nation's Mall. We are not doing that. This legislation does not do that. None of us, Senator Hagel and others involved, would do that.

Twenty years ago, I testified in a slightly different format, but the Secretary has voiced her concern that the size of the center is too big. 1,200 square feet is hardly a big structure. It is appropriate to allow for computers, the others uses, the Ranger station, some exhibits on the wall such as photographs of those whose names are engraved, as opposed to the current kiosk which really does nothing to help educate the public.

One of America's most prominent and respected journalists, Don Oberdorfer of the Tet, says of the idea, "The idea of a new Education Center is an excellent one. Get it up and running as soon as possible." A local high school teacher, Jim Percocco, says it will not only serve as a valuable resource to journalists and historians, but as a tool to teach young people about the Vietnam war. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, with nearly 2 million members, joined with many other veterans groups in the exhibits to experience, help young people experience the Center. I have entered into the record letters of endorsement from many different veterans groups. I won't mention them all right now, but it includes the Medal of Honor Society, the Disabled American Veterans and others.

But this includes other respected advocates for American's veterans, as well, and prominent, thoughtful Americans whose opinions should be given due respect: Stanley Karnow, winner of the Pulitzer Prize; General Barry McCaffrey, the former drug czar under President Clinton; Lieutenant General Trolls Dyke, Alaska Governor; Tony Knowles, Lieutenant Governor of California; Governor Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania; former Vice President Al Gore and many others including the recently retired spokesman for the National Park Service.

Senator AKAKA. Mr. Scruggs, can you please summarize? We have a vote in progress.

Mr. SCRUGGS. Okay. To summarize, we have for you some educational materials. My concluding summary would be that I just hope that no one forgets the profound importance of today's hearing. We really must reach out to America's youth and engage them from a place where they can be visually and emotionally engaged; not miles away at a museum but here at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. This will go a long way towards that goal; that goal that veterans groups, educators, journalists and the American public strongly supports. Thank you very much.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much. We have a 15-minute vote in progress. We will take 15 minutes and we will be back. We will be in recess.

[Recess.]

Senator AKAKA. The committee will come to order. I thank our witnesses for their statements and the committee will be ready with questions. We will do rounds of questions with 5 minutes for each member and I will begin.

Mr. Parsons, the bill directs the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to construct the Education Center. The bill is silent on who would manage it. If the legislation is enacted what is your understanding on who would administer or manage the Center?

Mr. PARSONS. It is my understanding that the National Park Service would manage it. Of course, we would do that in cooperation with the fund and the use of volunteers as well as Park Service rangers.

Senator AKAKA. Just in case there is a difference, Mr. Scruggs, do you agree?

Mr. SCRUGGS. Yes, yes Mr. Chairman. We have been working in partnership for over 2 decades.

Senator AKAKA. The bill describes the Education Center as a temporary facility, but is unclear what would happen at the end of the 10-year period. If Congress takes no further action at the end of that period, what would happen to that Center, Mr. Parsons?

Mr. PARSONS. It would appear that the decision that is called for in the bill, the decision is that of the Congress. If the Congress did not act, I assume we would continue to operate it.

Senator AKAKA. These questions are for both Mr. Parsons and Ms. Gallagher. The bill requires that the design and placement of this Center be subject to the Commemorative Works Act. What is your understanding of what that language means with respect to each of your organizations?

Mr. PARSONS. Well, what that provides for is three approvals—the Secretary of the Interior, the Commission of Fine Arts and the

National Capital Planning Commission. It is not the best out of three. It is all three. So each one has a veto over the other. In other words, if one disapproves it, it won't be built.

Senator AKAKA. Ms. Gallagher.

Ms. GALLAGHER. I concur with Mr. Parsons.

Senator AKAKA. Is it possible to build a Center in a different part of the Vietnam Memorial grounds? Would the Park Service or the NCPD have a different view if it was built by the east end of the Memorial instead of replacing the kiosk near the Lincoln Memorial? Are there any other locations in the vicinity of the Vietnam Memorial that might work?

Mr. PARSONS. Programmatically, we don't think so. Aesthetically it could happen. I think it would have to be underground, but I think there are locations toward the east end where it could work.

Ms. GALLAGHER. I would simply restate the position of the National Capital Planning Commission since 1991. They have expressed no additions to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. However, we do believe that there are other opportunities for permanent exhibits at places such as the National Museum of American History. Mr. Parsons did mention the proposal for the National Military Museum. So, we believe there are other venues that could serve this purpose very, very well, but would not be perceived as additions to the Memorial that would be visible on the Mall site; other nearby locations, which would accommodate the appropriate size to handle the information that is necessary to truly tell the story.

Senator AKAKA. I have a question for the panel. We have heard from the National Park Service that this bill will set a precedent because proponents of other memorials may seek to have their own Education Center. Mr. Scruggs, on the other hand, has stated that other memorials already have similar facilities, including the Lincoln, Jefferson and FDR memorials and that there is a compelling need to provide an Education Center at the Vietnam Memorial. I was hoping you could elaborate on whether there was convincing rationale that this Center should be allowed or whether it is likely to be a precedent for other memorials. Let me start with Mr. Parsons.

Mr. PARSONS. Well there are a number of points there. Let me respond in this fashion. The Lincoln and the Jefferson Memorials are clearly architecture and have within them a modest space to provide an information facility in them. The FDR Memorial contains a small bookstore in combination with restroom facilities. It does not have an Education Center as I would call it. Also proposed is a below-grade facility at the Washington Monument for our public who are awaiting the opportunity to go up the Washington Monument.

But the landscape solution memorials—the World War II Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and this one—indeed are landscape solutions, which never contemplated architectural components. And therefore any such addition is incongruous as we see it.

Senator AKAKA. Ms. Gallagher.

Ms. GALLAGHER. As I stated in my testimony, I think this would set a precedent and requests time and time again that are especially problematic with these landscape solutions. Mr. Parsons

mentioned the Korean War Veterans Memorial. There is also the Ulysses Grant Civil War Memorial, the Martin Luther King Memorial that is now on the drawing board. All these future memorials and some existing may come back and ask for these similar Education Centers.

I think as our Mall becomes more and more crowded with more memorials we have to be creative and think very carefully about how we address the very important educational components that these memorials call for.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you. Mr. Scruggs.

Mr. SCRUGGS. I am happy to respond to this as well. I would like to point out the very specific nature and quality of the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. It is truly at the end of the Wall as the photographs and exhibits show it is heavily treed with large oak trees and would provide excellent cover for this which is consistent with the landscape solution. Other monuments—suppose someone were to say, oh, we need an Education Center building outside of the let's say the Washington Monument. Well, clearly it wouldn't fit there. We have basically a corner in which this memorial can be fit and it really will be a great memorial.

It was also pointed out that the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorial have a visitor center, but of course the FDR Memorial only has a bookstore. Well there is a large bookstore but inside the bookstore look what we have. Unlike the testimony you heard, and I submit this to the Senators for the record, the photographs and written material about the life of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and even a replica of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's wheelchair. The other memorials have Education Centers. We need the Education Center for America's youth. It really is a simple as that. And I realize the concern. They are legitimate but I think your job is much bigger than that.

Senator AKAKA. I have a question for the panel. The National Park Service—well, let me ask my friend Senator Thomas if he has any questions.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you. Ms. Gallagher, is there a vision for the finality of the Mall?

Ms. GALLAGHER. We do have the Memorials and Museums Master Plan, which was released for public review in December of last year. That plan is being finalized. That plan establishes a Reserve policy and identifies other zones adjacent to the Reserve throughout the rest of the District of Columbia that have remarkable, wonderful sites for future memorials.

We think the memorials should be distributed throughout the city in very special, permanent locations that could build upon the urban design qualities and the special character of Washington, DC while also honoring the important events and individuals in our history. So, we believe the Memorials and Museums Master Plan is a very responsible answer to the dilemma that we face in commemoration.

Senator THOMAS. How does the plan handle the six or seven pending memorials that are, I guess, supposed to be on the Mall?

Ms. GALLAGHER. I know that Area 1, which is just adjacent to the Reserve, has eighteen sites—permanent sites for memorials. Of course to develop any memorial within that site would require an

act of Congress. So, these are reserved for very special events and individuals in our history. And with the wisdom of Congress evaluating and weighing the commemorations that are being requested—

Senator THOMAS. They are not on the Mall?

Ms. GALLAGHER. No they are not. The Planning and Review Commission has set up firm policy for the Reserve that no new memorials should be placed within the Reserve. But it goes a step further than that and identifies other very special, wonderful sites for future memorials.

Senator THOMAS. Mr. Parsons, what is the status of the National Military Museum in Arlington?

Mr. PARSONS. It was given to the Secretary of Defense to establish a commission. He has not done that yet. It is an eleven-member panel, and as I understand it, it requires Presidential Appointees and appointees by the congressional leadership.

Senator THOMAS. What is the purpose of that museum?

Mr. PARSONS. It is to commemorate all wars and it has been given a site of ten acres in Arlington directly behind the Pentagon. But the commission is not restricted to that site. They can select a site somewhere else in Washington. But the intent of the bill was to allow ten acres of what is called the Navy Annex to be used for that purpose in the future.

Senator THOMAS. What are those kiosks that are currently adjacent to the Korean and the Vietnam Memorial?

Mr. PARSONS. We call them kiosks. They have a sloped roof and we have used them since the 1960's at all of our major memorials in the Mall area for public information.

Senator THOMAS. What is the future and authority for—I don't know what you call them—the structures that are on the steps of the Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial.

Mr. PARSONS. We certainly hope they will disappear in time—as you may recall we had about twenty of those up until 1995 when we implemented our new regulations. But the four that are there now are holding on. It has been suggested by some that legislation be passed to allow us to remove those. But at the current time they are there under a First Amendment permit. They apply for permits every twenty-one days. That is our regulation.

Senator THOMAS. The First Amendment doesn't give you a structure necessarily. It gives you the opportunity to be there and share your views.

Mr. PARSONS. Yes it does. And what has evolved over time are these structures. I am not proud of them. I am very uncomfortable with your line of questioning Senator. I am embarrassed to talk about them.

Senator THOMAS. Well, you know, Jan, this whole thing is tough to talk about because nobody is at all resistant to the idea of celebrating the Vietnam Veterans. But there is another issue. What is your view of the Mall? Do you think there is limitation? Do you think there comes a time when it is probably appropriate for no more structures to be added?

Mr. SCRUGGS. I think we have addressed that, indeed in this legislation, through making this a temporary structure. The overall vision for the Mall, I truly would defer to the very able civil servants

who are testifying to my left to put together the Master Memorial Plan for the Mall and respecting the unlimited number of ideas for memorials and the limited number of sites.

Senator THOMAS. You don't really believe that you build something and remove it in 10 years, do you?

Mr. SCRUGGS. I believe it may not happen in 10 years, but I do not believe that it will be there in 20 or 25 years. There will come a time, much like the World War I memorial on the Mall, that very few people know it exists. But you go past it and it is pathetic. There are actually trees growing out of the top of it and shrubbery. No one goes to visit it. Nobody is interested in it anymore. Eventually visitorship will diminish.

Senator THOMAS. My time has expired. Let me just say that the twelve hundred foot thing doesn't seem very sufficient. Have you figured out a way to make that tell the story? The Park Service has all kinds of ways of conveying information. Is twelve hundred-foot sufficient? That is not very large.

Mr. SCRUGGS. Senator, we have spoken to a number of consultants that will be part of the design process. This will not tell the entire convoluted story of the Vietnam War, which will indeed require a national military museum. This will tell the story of the memorial. It will engage young people with photographs and moving exhibits that the whole point is that when they are at the memorial unlike a museum miles and miles away. They are intellectually and emotionally engaged. The Wall that heals, which is what the Memorial is known as, will become, with your help, the Wall that educates.

Senator THOMAS. You believe that the Wall that heals is the purpose. Thank you.

Senator AKAKA. Senator Hagel.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Chairman, thank you. Thank you to our witnesses today. We are grateful for your expertise. We appreciate your insights because we deal with something here that is very important to our country. I begin my questions with a remembrance and Mr. Scruggs mentioned this early on in his testimony that it was really 20 years ago—and I suspect you remember this, Mr. Parsons—when Mr. Scruggs couldn't get many people to pay attention to him. I was the incoming Deputy Administrator of the Veterans Administration at the time and had a very, very modest role to play in giving some assistance to Jan Scruggs.

And I recall the same arguments 20 years ago that I am hearing today. We shouldn't have any kind of memorial to Vietnam on the Mall. Good reasons, good points, relevant to the responsibilities of the Commission and the Park Service. And I recall what Scruggs and others had to go through to break down not just the bureaucracy but the attitudes about the issue.

Now I doubt if there are many people in this country including most in the Park Service who were opposed—pretty strongly opposed—to the monument being built on the Mall 20 years ago that are now saying that it is not adding a great deal. I surely understand and appreciate the responsibilities that the two of you have about preserving the dignity of the Mall, this space, and the relevance of the openness, the views. All very appropriate. But I also go back to what Mr. Scruggs and his band of merry men and

women envisioned 22 years ago. It seems that monuments should be relevant to our times. They should be there for a reason. And if we didn't factor that in, then we would have open spaces everywhere in Washington because we wouldn't want to break any of our views. We could go all the way to the river and maybe we should cut some trees down.

There is a place for that of course. There is a reason we build monuments. And they are to obviously represent not one person. They are to represent the essence of who we are as a society and a people. So the argument that I hear about—well it is a visionary thing, we are setting a precedent; all very real and relevant, but I don't think any of those are good enough to turn a project down for those reasons alone.

With that said, I would like to see if I can come back to some of the issues here that seem to be most contentious. Would this detract from the beauty that is there? And I am a little confused. I have been hearing a reference to adding a new memorial here. But what we are talking about here is, I don't believe, a memorial. We are talking an Education Center that connects the relevancy of one of the most defining times in the history of this country. Now that to me is pretty important. It has nothing to do with whether I served there or not. I would feel the same way. But I feel a little stronger about it. But this defined the Nation in many ways. The history will write about the definition of this and why for years and years to come.

That in itself seems to me to generate enough defense of the ideas here that Mr. Scruggs and others are putting forward of trying to connect with happened from 1964 to 1975 that divided a nation, to the education of our young people. And I think that is pretty important. I think there is relevancy to the emotion and the connection of having that nearby that memorial. At it has been stated here the other memorials have education-type centers as well. I am not yet convinced that what they are talking about here detracts from any of the beauty or any of the site lines and I would like to see if we could go into that in a little more detail with each of you.

I don't at all question the responsibilities, Ms. Gallagher, that you have or Mr. Parsons. They are important responsibilities and they should not be minimized. Although I did note in the *New York Times* yesterday that Mr. Parsons you referred to my idea as an atrocity. Obviously you were misquoted. But nonetheless—and that happens to me all the time—Mr. Parsons let's begin with you. Focus on the visual impairment and beauty and we take from the beauty and we really detract from the goodness that you all have brought about working together in a warm, friendly spirit, I know, for the last 20 years.

Mr. PARSONS. I see you have given this a great deal of thought. I agree with most everything you have said. We cannot afford to have a generation of Americans coming forward to this memorial which is, in my judgment, the most powerful in the world. It is not going to be forgotten. It is not going to be an element in the landscape that no one goes to in the next 20, 25 years. It is a powerful message about war.

There is just no doubt about it and I think our area of disagreement is relatively simple. We feel that the message that is being

sought to be given here should be done with what we call wayside exhibits, which are panels—I am sure you have seen them in other national parks throughout the country—as opposed to architecture, and to augment that with rangers who can provide personal attention to those who need it. And it boils down to that simple an issue, I believe. The point of the atrocity, whether I used those words or not, is the location and the image that we are portraying over here on the easel stand. That is why my response to the chairman was that there will be some opportunity to do this underground elsewhere, although we would still object to it from the programmatic standpoint.

I do want to take an opportunity to clarify something for the record because others have said what you have said here today—that I personally and others in the National Park Service, opposed this memorial on the Mall in 1979. I will take just a minute to explain the concept. We had just finished in 1976 the Constitution Gardens, which this memorial now sits in. And one of the largest open spaces in Constitution Gardens was this field where it has been built. And the purpose of the Constitution Gardens originally—which has not been recognized—was that it would be a place of festival; a place where music festivals, art festivals, the Smithsonian Festivals for Folk Life were to be undertaken; a strolling English garden as opposed to the formal French Mall.

And it was in that context that we were opposing the location in Constitution Gardens. It was not opposition to the memorial on the Mall, as has been said today, but it was specific opposition to building it in this fresh Constitution Gardens. And of course what has happened is with the location of that memorial and now the one of the Black Patriots, it is becoming more of a memorial garden, which is okay. But that is the reason that we were opposing it so vigorously in 1979. I hope that is responsive.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

Ms. GALLAGHER. I would just like to clarify some of the points that you made earlier today and I believe Mr. Parsons, as well. We are not looking at this as the Vietnam Memorial versus the openness of the Mall. There is a larger issue that we would be arguing and concerned about regardless of what is proposed for the Vietnam Memorial. So, we are concerned about what is happening on the Mall and its development.

But we also want to protect the integrity, the power, the impact of this memorial. This is a very effective memorial as it is developed right now, and there have been numerous proposals over the years to add to it, which we believe detracts from its effectiveness. On the other hand, we absolutely recognize the need to keep this story alive, to educate all the people, the children, everyone who comes to this memorial. We feel that that is going to require more than 1200 square feet at this location.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Scruggs.

Mr. SCRUGGS. All I can do is respond to doing what is right. As I look at the Mall, as I look at the vista of the Lincoln Memorial, I see the four thousand foot refreshment stand. I see these hideous structures obscuring the view of the Washington Monument.

Senator HAGEL. Would you pull the mike a little closer?

Mr. SCRUGGS. And as I look at the Mall, I respond to the rather hideous refreshment stand which is in place next to the Lincoln Memorial, the rather hideous tents which have been in place for a period exceeding 10 years and for which there is absolutely no end in sight, nor is there an end envisioned. I look upon the architectural excellence that we provide and have provided and will provide for the Education Center and for the enormous opportunity for us to touch America's youth in the context for understanding not only the Vietnam Veterans Memorial but the other memorials as well in a manner consistent with the Lincoln, the Jefferson, the FDR Memorials.

Senator HAGEL. Let me ask, Ms. Gallagher and Mr. Parsons, is it then the size or the permanency of the structure? Why for example is the kiosk okay and an enhanced Education Center not okay? Or am I missing the point here?

Mr. PARSONS. The kiosk is purely an informational facility. You cannot enter it. It staffed by one or two people. You walk up to the window, you get information. That is the tradition of the kiosk in the National Park Service. This on the other hand is a place where groups would enter, see exhibitry, use computers and that kind of thing. So, it is a much different facility as we see it.

Senator HAGEL. So, based on that we should turn this down? Isn't it a different facility? It doesn't comply with the tradition of the Park Service? Regardless of how much good it might do or how much it might in fact enhance the area?

Mr. PARSONS. Well that and the other reasons we brought forward today, yes.

Senator HAGEL. Ms. Gallagher.

Ms. GALLAGHER. I agree. I think there are other alternatives that should be pursued, as opposed to the proposal that we have before us that can meet the objectives of educating the public about this significant event.

Senator HAGEL. You mean like somewhere else?

Ms. GALLAGHER. Somewhere else. Somewhere very near by. Now, as I stated, there is the Museum of American History. I believe the military museum that has been discussed—this is a new project. We need to engage this group and start looking at this very carefully. This is another alternative—a site yet to be determined.

Senator HAGEL. When you say "engage this group", what are you talking about?

Ms. GALLAGHER. Well this new commission has yet to be established and I think we need to reach out to the leadership, the Defense Department and the leadership in this city and government to see where they were going and understand the potential of this museum. It seems it was a very good idea and its purpose is very well founded. And maybe here is where the story can be told in a larger way.

Senator HAGEL. You don't see much in the way of a strong argument as to the emotion connected to being there at that powerful, powerful memorial and learning at the same time and being a part of that experience. You don't think there is any disconnect if you took that education and learning and took that off-campus or somewhere else? You don't think you would lose anything in the translation? Or it wouldn't be as powerful?

Ms. GALLAGHER. I think it is very powerful right now. I am not convinced that going to someplace nearby and learning more about this event at a location that is not right there—I am not convinced that that detracts from the learning experience.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Scruggs, would you care to respond to any of this discussion?

Mr. Scruggs. It seems readily obvious that when a person is intellectually and emotionally engaged in a subject—for example, when the person goes to the Jefferson Memorial—that is the time, that is the place when he or she will go to the Education Center there which has a very fantastic small center and get the information. The emotions involved in visiting the Vietnam Veterans Memorial are very different. Unfortunately they are becoming less and less relevant for America's youth. That is why we have to engage them and why we have to engage them there and not twelve miles away. And that is the purpose for this legislation.

Senator HAGEL. Let me ask a question based on your last response, Mr. Parsons. When I asked the question regarding the difficulty the Park Service has in comprehending this fitting into your responsibilities here. As you said, there were other reasons. One of the reasons—as I have heard from both of you—is the precedent setting factor, which is certainly a factor. Everything we do in this town is precedent setting. This hearing is precedent setting. So, I have never really paid much attention to that because tomorrow is another day. There will be another group of wild-eyed Senators who actually think this might be a good idea, who will come in with another screwy idea like the one Jan Scruggs did 21 years ago; a very bizarre idea we had buy-in to that.

So, we know that that will come tomorrow. It will come next year. And you are right, for every great man or woman there is, we will have a group of people. But listening to both of you today convinces me that we have in place a rather significant process to ensure that nothing gets through the net. If that wasn't the case, then we wouldn't be here today, would we? You wouldn't have a job, Ms. Gallagher, in the area you are in now if we didn't have commissions and planning commissions and the Congress and laws and acts that we must follow.

So, it is not a matter—at least it seems to me and this is where I would welcome your comment—that we can just arbitrarily come up with these wild ideas and they get built. It is a pretty long, difficult road you go through getting this done. I am somewhat convinced that this is not only torturous but it is appropriate and that it is sufficient. You can't just come up with these ideas and get them done.

So, the precedent setting argument of who knows who will be next and come in with another idea and want to build the statue, I fail to really find much power in that argument. Now, I would appreciate you both giving me your response to that because not only do we not see that the same way but see if you can convince me that this would put the entire Mall of beautiful monuments in danger because of the precedent we would set.

Ms. GALLAGHER. I would like to just state that one of our missions with the National Capital Planning Commission is to protect what we have built. The Vietnam Memorial was a precedent set-

ting event. It is a remarkable monument. We want to protect what we have created there, protect that experience, protect that expression. In addition, it is our job to protect the Mall as we contemplate future works of commemoration. That is our job, to protect the legacy of what we have created in this city. So, I am very proud to do my job. And I don't want to withhold creativity or break precedent, but when you are changing landscape that is very important to the entire country. I take that very seriously.

Senator HAGEL. Would you agree that the landscape design of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial was unprecedented?

Ms. GALLAGHER. It certainly was. And it was very, very successful.

Senator HAGEL. So does that then lead you to the conclusion that unprecedented things occasionally might work.

Ms. GALLAGHER. What I am trying to state is what we have there is very special and the Commission that I worked for over the past decade has repeatedly reviewed this very seriously, carefully. They have look at other suggestions to make additions to this memorial and they feel very strongly that it should not be altered; that what is there is precious and important. They also agree and I agree with them that the education, the story of Vietnam is a very special one and we just disagree on how that story should be told and where it should be told.

Senator HAGEL. Do you think your evaluation of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is something more precious than Jan Scruggs evaluation?

Ms. GALLAGHER. It is just very different. We represent different interests.

Senator HAGEL. Thank you.

Mr. Parsons.

Mr. PARSONS. On the issue of precedence, I guess the significance of what we are doing today is that the Congress is entering into the design process. In 1986, Congress determined that they didn't want to be involved in the location and the design of memorials and they delegated that down as we described earlier today. So, the example that I am going to give you of what has happened as a result of that is probably most spectacularly described in the World War II Memorial incident. Initially, that was proposed to have a 100,000-square-foot visitor center compared to 1,200 here. The Commemorative Works Act process—that is, the approval process of the Commission of Fine Arts, the Planning Commission and ourselves—disapproved that. That doesn't mean there still isn't a desire to tell the story of World War II on the site and that is what I am trying to emphasize.

I should also point out the FDR Memorial. There was a proposal for a 50,000-square-foot visitor center with memorabilia from FDR's time, with film footage of him in a theater, and that was disapproved by this process. So, here now is the Congress coming in on a very specific design issue in a memorial and saying we feel this way about it. So, from a precedent standpoint, I see others who didn't get what they wanted from the Commemorative Works Act process coming back to the Congress saying let's allow the Congress to come in and intrude into the design process, and that is the major difference in precedent.

Senator HAGEL. I can understand it. And I am not going to belabor this. The chairman probably wants to move on. But I would just respond by saying I didn't fail to note your comment on the World War II example to tell the story on the site, on this site. Now, I would be perfectly willing to have you design an education center on this site, as you have suggested, World War II on this site. I suspect that won't happen. Mr. Scruggs would you like to finish this off? And then I will turn it back to the chairman.

Mr. SCRUGGS. I just want to really begin by thanking the entire committee. I know it is going to be a busy day for each and every one of you. And as you begin your deliberations on this matter, I can only discuss the words of Mr. Rob Portman, a sixth grade student, Mr. Chairman, from the Sharonville Elementary School. And he says: "I wanted to say that I think you should support the Vietnam Veterans Education Center. I think this because it will help other children, including me, to learn more about the Vietnam War and let the world know that those who served are not forgotten."

Mr. Chairman, I ask that in your deliberations that you consider the words of this sixth grader and many prominent Americans which have thought long and hard about this long over due Education Center. It should have been built 20 years ago. Thank you.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you.

Senator HAGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me just again thank our witnesses. I appreciate very much all three witnesses being here and sharing their thoughts. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you. Well, Mr. Scruggs, thank you for being here this afternoon. And we will go on now to the next bill. Thank you very much.

The next bill we will hear testimony on is H.R. 1668, which would authorize the construction of the Adams Memorial. I believe both Mr. Parsons and Ms. Gallagher have statements on this bill. Mr. Parsons, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON H.R. 1668

Mr. PARSONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I will summarize my remarks, certainly given the hour of the day. This measure would authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams, along with his wife Abigail Adams and his son former President John Quincy Adams.

The Department supports the enactment of H.R. 1668 as amended and passed by the House of Representatives on June 25. This position is consistent with the recommendation of the National Capital Memorial Commission, which endorsed the proposed legislation by unanimous vote on April 26.

H.R. 1668 authorizes the establishment of the Adams Memorial in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act. The Act established a process under which, following authorization of the subject matter by Congress, the Secretary of the Interior submits a plan for the site and design of the memorial for approval by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine

Arts. The bill also provides that no Federal funds shall be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work.

We would note that one of the three Library of Congress buildings here is named after John Quincy Adams, but otherwise there is no major public work in the District of Columbia that recognizes or memorializes John Adams or John Quincy Adams and their legacy.

We agree with the sponsors of this bill that the father and son Presidents and their family's legacy of public service deserve a memorial in the Nation's Capital. The Adams Memorial Foundation has not yet proposed a site for the memorial, nor have there been any decisions made by the National Capital Memorial Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts or the National Capital Planning Commission other than endorsement of this measure.

However, because the three Commissions have established policies against siting any more memorials in the Reserve area that represents the Mall to the east and west, and the White House to the Jefferson Memorial in the north and south, this memorial would not be located there, in our estimation. Instead the recommended site would more likely be one of the hundred sites that have been identified by the Master Plan Ms. Gallagher described earlier.

That concludes my statement and I would be glad to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of John Parsons on H.R. 1668 follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES, AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON H.R. 1668

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on H.R. 1668, which would authorize the Adams Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor former President John Adams, along with his wife Abigail Adams and his son, former President John Quincy Adams, and the family's legacy of public service.

The Department supports enactment of H.R. 1668 as amended and passed by the House of Representatives on June 25, 2001. This position is consistent with the recommendation of the National Capital Memorial Commission, which endorsed the proposed legislation by a unanimous vote on April 26, 2001.

H.R. 1668 authorizes the establishment of the Adams memorial in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act of 1986. The Act established a process under which, following authorization of the subject matter by Congress, the Secretary of the Interior submits a plan for the site and design of the memorial for approval by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts.

The bill also provides that no Federal funds shall be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work. The Adams Memorial Foundation would be responsible for not only the cost of construction of the memorial, but also for establishing a fund in the Treasury equal to ten percent of the cost of construction for catastrophic maintenance and preservation, as provided for in Section 8(b) of the Commemorative Works Act.

A memorial to John Adams, Abigail Adams, and John Quincy Adams in the Nation's Capital would be quite appropriate. As one of the findings in H.R. 1668 states, "Few families have contributed as profoundly to the United States as the family that gave the Nation its second president, John Adams; its sixth president, John Quincy Adams; first ladies Abigail Smith Adams and Louisa Catherine Johnson Adams; and succeeding generations of statesmen, diplomats, advocates, and authors." One of the three Library of Congress buildings is named after John Quincy Adams but, otherwise, there is no major public work in the District of Columbia that recognizes or memorializes John Adams or John Quincy Adams. We agree with the sponsors of this bill that these father-and-son presidents and their family's legacy of public service deserve a memorial in Washington.

As noted above, this legislation simply authorizes the process for developing an Adams memorial to move forward. The Adams Memorial Foundation has not yet proposed a design or site for the memorial, nor have there been any decisions made by the National Capital Memorial Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, or the National Capital Planning Commission other than endorsement of H.R. 1668 by the National Capital Memorial Commission. However, because the three commissions have established policies against siting any more memorials in the "reserve," the area that represents the Mall east to west and the White House to the Jefferson Memorial north to south, the memorial would not be located there. Instead, the recommended site would likely be one of the 100 sites that have been identified in a master plan for memorials and museums in the District of Columbia and its environs by the three commissions as sites that are appropriate for new memorials.

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

Senator AKAKA. Thank you for your statement. Ms. Gallagher.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA E. GALLAGHER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION, ON H.R. 1668

Ms. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to state that our Commission recognizes the legacy and the remarkable contributions of the Adams family that were so beautifully recalled earlier this afternoon by Congressman Roemer and Senator Kennedy and Senator Torricelli.

The Commission is particularly pleased to support this proposal because it is one of the first memorials whose location and development will be guided by our Memorials and Museum Master Plan. The Master Plan establishes a reserve as I spoke of earlier and also Area 1 immediately adjacent to the Reserve which is a sensitive zone designated for memorials of preeminent, historical national significance. Area 2 reflects the rest of the city.

As Mr. Parson stated, this Master Plan identified one hundred sites for new memorials and museums. It provides guidelines on how these facilities should be developed. This Plan will serve as a tool for reaching public consensus on the locations in the capital that are appropriate public spaces which offer memorial-sponsor suitable locations for their projects. And importantly this Plan will ensure that future generations of Americans have sufficient supply of desirable sites for their own commemorative and cultural needs.

We believe that with the help of this Master Plan, the Adams Memorial Foundation will be able to identify several highly desirable sites for its project and we look forward to working with the Foundation to identify the most appropriate location of beauty and significance for this memorial, and to approve a design for this remarkable family.

We believe that the Memorials and Museum Master Plan offers will guide the creation of a new landscape of commemoration in the Capital and that this memorial will permit us to demonstrate that we can pay tribute to our national history in a way that makes us all proud.

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

[The prepared statement of Ms. Gallagher on H.R. 1668 follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PATRICIA E. GALLAGHER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION, ON H.R. 1668

Mr. Chairman, thank you for this opportunity to speak on behalf of the National Capital Planning Commission regarding the proposal to construct a memorial honoring former President John Adams; his wife, Abigail; and his son and former President, John Quincy Adams. The Commission recognizes the enduring legacy and remarkable contributions the Adams family made to the social and political life of our nation. Commemorating John Adams and his family's life and work in our Nation's Capital is a fitting and appropriate tribute.

The Commission is particularly pleased to support this proposal because this is among the first memorials whose location and development will be guided by the new Memorials and Museums Master Plan. The Commission developed the master plan in cooperation with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Memorial Commission and released it in draft form several months ago. The plan is the result of a two-year collaborative effort to preserve the historic open space of Washington's Monumental Core while identifying sites for new cultural and commemorative facilities.

A key feature of the master plan is a Commemorative Zone Policy that establishes a Reserve in the central cross-axis of the Mall in which the three commissions have agreed to approve no new memorial sites. The area immediately adjacent—Area I—is a sensitive area designated for memorials of preeminent and historic national significance. Finally, the Commemorative Zone Policy delineates an Area II that encompasses the rest of the city and where the review agencies will encourage development of future commemorative works: The plan integrates key natural features—rivers, ridges, overlooks—with the avenues, parks and squares created by Pierre L'Enfant and subsequent planning. Although it builds on these earlier plans, it also introduces new elements that strengthen Washington's symbolic and commemorative character.

The master plan identifies approximately 100 sites for new museums and memorials and provides general guidelines for how these facilities should be developed. The plan seeks to reach public consensus on locations in the National Capital that are appropriate for these important public spaces and offers memorial sponsors suitable locations for their projects. The plan is also intended to ensure that future generations of Americans have a sufficient supply of desirable sites for their own commemorative and cultural needs. For your information, we have provided maps of the Commemorative Zone Policy and the proposed master plan sites.

In preparing the master plan, we have consulted with a team of nationally recognized planning and design professionals and with the District of Columbia government and local and community and professional groups. Released in draft form for public comment this past December, the plan has enjoyed broad public acceptance. Benjamin Forgey, the Architecture Critic of the Washington Post has called the plan "a brilliant piece of work." The Washington Chapter of the American Institute of Architects has applauded the plan, and the Virginia Chapter of the American Planning Association has recognized it with its highest award. We are now incorporating the comments we received from the public and expect to release the final version in September.

The Commission believes that with the help of the master plan, the Adams Memorial Foundation will be able to identify several highly desirable possible locations for its project. We look forward to working with the Adams Memorial Foundation to identify a location of beauty and significance and to approve a design that is worthy of this remarkable family. We believe that the Memorials and Museums Master Plan offers a new landscape of commemoration in the Nation's Capital and that this memorial will permit us to demonstrate that we can pay tribute to our national history in a way that makes us all proud.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement and I will be happy to answer any questions.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for your statement. I see that the Department supports it and the National Capital Memorial Commission endorses it. So, my question to Mr. Parsons—I have a respect for former Presidents John Adams and John Quincy Adams for their valuable contributions to our Nation as we heard from colleagues earlier. The question is does authorizing this memorial suggest that we will now build memorials to all former

presidents? Or is it possible to distinguish John Adams and John Quincy Adams from other former presidents?

Mr. PARSONS. We have, so far, commemorated eleven presidents in this city out of forty-three so it is done with careful deliberation for sure. They are not, of course, all of the scale of Jefferson, Washington and Lincoln. Many of them are modest. We are now working on one the Congress authorized for President Eisenhower. There is a commission established to work on that. So, I don't see a proliferation or a precedent-setting situation as the previous bill brought us to debate. I have heard of no other proposals in the last 5 years to commemorate other presidents.

Senator AKAKA. Mr. Parsons, I don't have any further questions about H.R. 1668; if you will remain at the table we will call our next panel. Thank you very much, Ms. Gallagher.

Mr. Nathan Frohling of the Tidelands Program of the Nature Conservancy, and Ms. Deborah Hoffman, Director of Economic Development in Passaic County, New Jersey. Mr. Frohling is here to testify on S. 513 and H.R. 182, authorizing the study of the Eightmile River in Connecticut as a Wild and Scenic River. And Ms. Hoffman is testifying on S. 386 and H.R. 146 authorizing a park study of the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey. Please proceed with your testimony, Mr. Parsons, on both bills.

STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON S. 513 AND H.R. 182

Mr. PARSONS. Let me start with the Eightmile River in the State of Connecticut, which is S. 513, and its companion measure, H.R. 182, that was passed by the House. These bills would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating segments of the Eightmile River for study and potential addition to the Wild and Scenic Rivers system. Although the Department supports the enactment of both pieces of legislation, we will not request funding for this study in the next fiscal year so as to the focus our available time and resources on completing previously authorized studies. As you may know, there are forty-one studies that have been authorized by Congress that are now pending, and we only expect to complete a few of those a year. Hence our hesitancy to proceed or to give people the impression that we are going to proceed at this time.

By supporting this legislation authorizing a study, it does not necessarily mean the Department will support designation of these segments as additions to the Wild and Scenic Rivers system. The administration is determined to eliminate the deferred-maintenance backlog in National Parks and the cost of new parks or other commitments such as grants for Wild and Scenic Rivers could divert funds from taking care of current responsibilities.

As you heard earlier from Senator Dodd, the Eightmile River is located in the Lower Connecticut River watershed in south central Connecticut. Fifteen miles of the Eightmile River and its east branch through the communities of Lyme, East Haddam and Salem are included on the National Park Service's Nationwide Rivers In-

ventory of potential Wild and Scenic Rivers for their outstanding scenery, and for their geological fish and wildlife values.

There is strong local support for protecting the river system as evidenced by the community's formation of an inter-municipal watershed committee and the signing of an innovative Eightmile River Watershed Conservation Compact. The Eightmile River Watershed Committee has built a substantial foundation for development of river management strategies that rely on State and local conservation measures to protect the river and its resources. And that concludes my testimony on that bill. Would you like me to proceed, or would you like to deal with that one first?

[The prepared statement of John Parsons on S. 513 and H.R. 182 follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES, AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON S. 513 AND H.R. 182

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 513 and H.R. 182 as passed by the House. These bills would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating segments of the Eightmile River for study and potential addition to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Although the Department supports enactment of both pieces of legislation, we will not request funding for this study in this or the next fiscal year, so as to focus available time and resources on completing previously authorized studies. As of now, there are 41 authorized studies that are pending, and we only expect to complete a few of those this year. We caution that our support of this legislation authorizing a study does not necessarily mean that the Department will support designation of these segments as additions to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The Administration is determined to eliminate the deferred maintenance backlog in national parks, but the cost of new parks or other commitments, such as grants for Wild and Scenic Rivers, could divert funds from taking care of current responsibilities. Furthermore, in order to better plan for the future of our National Parks, we believe that any such studies should carefully examine the full life cycle operation and maintenance costs that would result from each alternative considered.

The Eightmile River is located in the lower Connecticut River watershed in south central Connecticut. Fifteen miles of the Eightmile River and its East Branch through the communities of Lyme, East Haddam, and Salem, Connecticut are included on the National Park Service's Nationwide Rivers Inventory of potential Wild and Scenic River segments. Both segments are included on the inventory for outstanding scenic, geologic, fish and wildlife values. Over eighty percent of the Connecticut River watershed is still forested, including large tracts of unfragmented hardwood forests that are home to a diverse assemblage of plants and animals including bobcats, great horned owls, red foxes, and the cerulean warbler.

Over the course of the past two years, the National Park Service has responded to interest and inquiries from local advocates and town officials regarding a potential Wild and Scenic River study for the Eightmile River. There appears to be strong local support for protecting the river system, as evidenced by the communities' formation of an intermunicipal watershed committee and the signing of an innovative "Eightmile River Watershed Conservation Compact." This compact, signed by the communities of East Haddam, Lyme and Salem, acknowledges their commitment to protect and enhance water resources, wildlife habitats, and rural landscapes in the watershed.

A study of a river to determine if it meets the criteria for designation of a wild and scenic river is the necessary first step to designating a river or a portion of a river as a unit of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The Department recognizes that any study of the Eightmile River should be evaluated in concert with all interested stakeholders at the local level. A study of the river from the confluence with the Connecticut to the headwaters of the mainstem and East Branch has strong local support.

The Eightmile River Watershed Committee has built a substantial foundation for the development of river management strategies that rely on state and local conservation measures to protect the river and its resources. Any National Park Service assistance would be contingent on the availability of funding and National Park

Service priorities. The Department will work closely with local communities before any action is taken by the National Park Service on the two segments of the river.

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

Senator AKAKA. Why don't you proceed to the other bill.

STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON S. 386 AND H.R. 146

Mr. PARSONS. Next I will provide the comments on S. 386 and H.R. 146 which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey as a unit of the National Park System. The Department of the Interior has concerns about conducting this study. We believe that existing congressional legislation already offers the Historic District ample authorization for historic preservation projects that encourage compatible economic development in Paterson. We are concerned that such a study would serve to divert the city of Paterson and the National Park Service from the very real opportunities already authorized by Congress in 1992 and 1996, opportunities that have not yet been fully implemented or realized.

In addition, the Department will not necessarily request funding for the study as I have just reported in the Eightmile River testimony, and I will not repeat that.

In the fiscal year 1992 Appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior, Congress appropriated funds for the New Jersey Urban History Initiative to provide funding for historic preservation projects that encourage economic development throughout the State. The city of Paterson was authorized to receive \$4.147 million in this Urban History Initiative. Over the years, the National Park Service has worked closely with the city to use the money to protect historic resources while fostering compatible economic development. This initiative has shown results such as funding projects for research, community grants, and restoration of historic resources. For example, the Urban History Initiative funds were used for an oral history project and ethnographic study conducted by the Library of Congress.

In the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996, 4 years later, Congress authorized \$3.3 million in matching grants and assistance to develop and implement a preservation plan for the District and to permit the development of a market analysis with recommendations of the economic development potential. The city of Paterson is committed to raising the matching funds required in this authorization. Such matching funds will be important because recent legislation indicates that Congress expects significant Federal matches for new units of the National Park System containing large numbers of historic buildings such as New Bedford and Boston Harbor. Without this demonstrated local support for the operation and protection of the new park units, it is probably not feasible to recommend their addition to the system.

Our concern is that given the limited resources, a special resource study, which is suggested by this bill, could divert our atten-

tion from the existing opportunities in the act I just mentioned. A special resource study can take years to complete, especially when considering other congressionally authorized studies that are competing for limited money available in this program. If recommendations of the study were negative and no congressional action forthcoming, years would have passed with no preservation or development action. The breadth of activities already allowed from the 1996 Act is much greater than those normally authorized for a National Park unit. It is our sincere wish that the currently authorized preservation initiative for Paterson be allowed to proceed rather than being delayed by this study.

That concludes my testimony. I will be glad to answer questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of John Parsons on S. 386 and H.R. 146 follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES, AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON S. 386 AND H.R. 146

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 386 and H.R. 146, bills to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park System.

The Department of the Interior has concerns about conducting this study. We believe existing congressional legislation already offers the Historic District ample authorization for historic preservation projects that encourage compatible economic development in Paterson. We are concerned that such a study would serve to divert the City of Paterson and the National Park Service from the very real opportunities authorized by Congress in 1992 and 1996, opportunities that have yet to be fully realized. In addition, the Department will not necessarily request funding for the study in this or the next fiscal year, so as to focus available time and resources on completing previously authorized studies. As of now, there are 41 authorized studies that are pending, and we only expect to complete a few of those this year. If this study is authorized, this does not necessarily mean that the Department will support designation of this site as a new unit. The Administration is determined to eliminate the deferred maintenance backlog in national parks, but the costs of establishing and operating a new national park could divert funds from taking care of current responsibilities. Furthermore, in order to better plan for the future of our National Parks, we believe that any such studies should carefully examine the full life cycle operation and maintenance costs that would result from each alternative considered.

Paterson, New Jersey has a rich history as the Nation's first planned industrial city as well as containing some of the country's oldest textile mills. In 1792, Alexander Hamilton formed an investment group called the Society of Useful Manufacturers whose funds would be used to develop a planned industrial city in the United States that was later to become Paterson. Hamilton believed that the United States needed to reduce its dependence on foreign goods and should instead develop its own industries. The industries developed in Paterson were powered by the 77-foot high Great Falls of the Passaic, and a system of water raceways that harnessed the power of the falls. The district originally included dozens of mill buildings and other manufacturing structures associated with the textile industry and later, the firearms, silk, and railroad locomotive manufacturing industries. In the latter half of the 1800's, silk production became the dominant industry and formed the basis of Paterson's most prosperous period, earning it the nickname "Silk City." Paterson was also the site of historic labor unrest that focused on anti-child labor legislation, safety in the workplace, a minimum wage, and reasonable working hours.

Industrial decline in Paterson followed the general pattern for northern textile cities, with a major decrease in business during the middle third of the 20th Century. Today, the historic district reflects many phases of decline and renewal: some buildings are deteriorated and vacant, while others continue in industrial use or have been adaptively reused for housing and offices.

Because of its significant role in the economic and industrial development of the United States, the 89-acre Great Falls of the Passaic/Society of Useful Manufacturers Historic District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1970 and designated a National Historic Landmark (NHL) in 1976. Since 1988 the District has been listed as a Priority One threatened National Historic Landmark in the Department of the Interior's annual report to Congress on NHLs. This threatened status is primarily based on the condition of the 7-acre site that formerly housed the Allied Textile Printers. This site, immediately below the Great Falls, has been devastated by a dozen fires over the last 15 years. The site was acquired by the City of Paterson through foreclosure in 1994 and a developer is currently under contract to redevelop the site.

In the Fiscal Year 1992 Appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior, Congress appropriated funds for the New Jersey Urban History Initiative to provide funding for historic preservation projects that encourage economic development. The City of Paterson was authorized to receive \$4.147 million in Urban History Initiative Funds to be administered by the NPS under a cooperative agreement with the City. Over the years, the National Park Service (NPS) has worked closely with the City to use the money to protect historic resources while fostering compatible economic development. This initiative has shown results such as funding projects for research, community grants, and restoration of historic resources. For example, Urban History Initiative Funds were used for an oral history project and ethnographic study conducted by the Library of Congress' American Folklife Center. Funds were also used for the stabilization of the ruins of the Colt Gun Mill as part of a match for a New Jersey Historic Trust grant to the City of Paterson.

The second major congressional initiative to support historic preservation opportunities in Paterson is section 510 of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-333; 110 Stat. 4158). The Great Falls Historic District was authorized for \$3.3 million in matching grants and assistance to develop and implement a preservation and interpretive plan for the District, and permit the development of a market analysis with recommendations of the economic development potential of the District. Yet, none of these funds authorized in 1996 have been appropriated.

Although the City has committed to the raising of the matching funds required under the authorization, we do not believe that this has yet occurred. Such matching funds will be important because recent legislation indicates that Congress expects significant non-federal matches for new units of the national park system containing large numbers of historic buildings such as the New Bedford National Historical Park and Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area. Without this demonstrated local financial support for the operation and protection of new park units, it is probably not feasible to recommend their addition to the System.

The 1996 legislation provides Paterson with the opportunity both to demonstrate its capacity for partnership, and to develop and implement a preservation program as indicators of its commitment and capacity.

Our concern is that given limited resources, a special resource study (SRS) could divert attention from the existing opportunities authorized in the 1996 Act. The SRS could easily take years to complete, especially when considering other congressionally authorized studies that are competing for limited money available in this program. If the recommendations of the study were negative and no congressional action forthcoming, years would have passed with no preservation or development action.

The National Park Service believes in the important historic and natural resources in the City of Paterson, and we believe in the capacity of the City to identify matching funding. There are signs this is beginning to happen. The breadth of activities allowed under the 1996 Act is much greater than those normally authorized for a national park unit. It is our sincere wish that the currently authorized preservation initiative for Paterson be allowed to proceed rather than being delayed by a study.

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

Senator AKAKA. Thank you for your testimony. Mr. Nathan Frohling on S. 513 and H.R. 182.

**STATEMENT OF NATHAN M. FROHLING, TIDELANDS PROGRAM
DIRECTOR, CONNECTICUT CHAPTER, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY**

Mr. FROHLING. Good afternoon. It is a delight and pleasure to be here and thank you for the opportunity to comment on this legislation. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Nature Conservancy in support S. 513 and H.R. 182.

The Nature Conservancy is an international, non-profit organization dedicated to preserving the plants, animals and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on earth. We have more than 1 million members and have protected more than 12 million acres in the United States and Canada. We work very closely with local communities and in partnership with both public and private landowners.

The Tidelands Program, which I direct in Connecticut, seeks to protect the key ecological areas within a 560 square mile region of the Lower Connecticut River. This region known as the Tidelands has received considerable acclaim over the last 10 years. Senator Dodd alluded to early today it being named one of forty last great places in the Western Hemisphere and included under the International Ramsar Convention among other recognitions.

The Eightmile River is one of the most outstanding natural features of the Tidelands region and is a top priority for the Nature Conservancy. I refer you to the map on my right, which shows you the State of Connecticut. The yellow portions represent the Lower Connecticut River watershed. The darker yellow represents what we consider to be the Tidelands Region, this 560 square mile region. And the bright yellow is the Eightmile River watershed to give you a geographic context.

It is rare to find entire ecosystems intact throughout the range, especially on the east coast. But the 40,000 acre Eightmile River watershed is one example; one last remaining example of an intact freshwater ecosystem. 85% of this watershed is forested and it contains the largest unfragmented forested region in coastal Connecticut. 9,700 acres, almost 25% of this watershed, are permanently protected already. You see a map of the watershed here and the orange color represents the large blocks of unfragmented forest. The blue and yellow represent some of the most sensitive water resource components of this watershed. Many of the white areas are also important, but these colors that you see—the orange, yellow and blue—represent the most important natural resources of this watershed. As you can see the vast majority of the watershed stands out as being recognized as important.

The Eightmile River is free flowing and the water quality of its extensive wetlands and water courses is excellent throughout. From native brook trout to blueback herring, the river system is a haven for fish in terms of diversity and abundance. It contains globally rare species and the internationally recognized fresh water tidal marsh of Hambert Cove, which is the very lower left portion of the map.

There are other smaller things that we do not often see, such as submerged aquatic vegetation and fresh water mussels. The Eightmile River is also within the State's elite for aquatic orga-

nisms such as mayflies, beetles and snails. And while many of us might not get excited about that on a day to day basis, all of these features testify further to the fact that this is a remarkable ecosystem particularly again in coastal, highly developed Connecticut and the Eastern Seaboard.

This, along with the scenic beauty and recreational abundance in the Eightmile, make this highly regarded resource by the communities that live in the area and one of those things that people value highly is the fishing that they enjoy along the river's bank. It is listed as, Mr. Parsons mentioned, in the Nationwide Rivers Inventory. We think there is little doubt about the Eightmile River system qualifying as far as the outstanding remarkable values that are key for a Wild and Scenic designation.

The greatest threat to these values is the incremental, unplanned growth. And while growth is inevitable the question is whether it will be managed to sustain the national outstanding values that are here. Six years ago the Eightmile River Watershed project was formed by local citizens and officials at the University of Connecticut to work toward conservation of this special resource and to initiate the new model for balancing conservation and growth within a watershed. Now having generated considerable information and community interest, we look to support a community process of self-determination in conserving this special place.

A Wild and Scenic River study is the best vehicle to achieving this goal and that is because the process associated with it provides the incentive, the structure, the expertise and resources needed for these communities to come together and collectively identify the issues and goals they have for this resource, and to set forth the means for achieving those goals. The study is being sought as much to facilitate this community self-determination as to achieve the designation.

A Wild and Scenic River designation would also offer special, important protection not otherwise available locally or through the State of Connecticut. Widespread support exists for a study as letters and newspaper editorials attest. Riverfront landowners as well as conservation and economic development interests have taken time to express that support. The communities are ready to do their part. A small, Federal contribution through this study can leverage a very large, local effort and the value associated with sustaining a natural treasure. The study would leverage the kind of volunteer community-based initiative that has been hailed for sustaining the fabric of our communities. And I might add that it would not require Federal land acquisition. It would not require Federal land management and it would not become a Federal park.

The time is critical. Not only is the resource being lost everyday but the communities determination and readiness to move ahead is tied to the momentum that has been built over the last 6 years and which now rests in our hopes for this study. The people of these communities are looking for your support.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify in support S. 513.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Frohling follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF NATHAN M. FROHLING, TIDELANDS PROGRAM DIRECTOR,
CONNECTICUT CHAPTER, THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to present The Nature Conservancy's testimony in support of S. 513 and H.R. 182, legislation to authorize a Wild and Scenic River Study for the Eightmile River in Connecticut.

The Nature Conservancy is an international, non-profit organization dedicated to the conservation of biological diversity. Our mission is to preserve the plants, animals and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on Earth by protecting the lands and waters they need to survive. The Conservancy has more than 1,000,000 individual members and 1,900 corporate associates. We currently have programs in all 50 states and in 27 foreign countries. To date we have protected more than 12 million acres in the 50 states and Canada, and have helped local partner organizations preserve 60 million acres overseas. The Conservancy owns and manages 1,342 preserves throughout the United States—the largest private system of nature sanctuaries in the world. Sound science and strong partnerships with public and private landowners to achieve tangible and lasting results characterize our conservation programs.

As director of the Tidelands Program, I lead The Nature Conservancy's efforts to conserve the Eightmile River system. The Tidelands Region, which includes the Eightmile River and its 39,900-acre watershed, is a top priority for The Nature Conservancy in Connecticut. The Tidelands contains extensive yet globally rare tidal marsh communities, globally rare and endangered species, and a regional landscape that is largely intact. The Nature Conservancy recognized this area in 1993 as one of the "40 Last Great Places in the Western Hemisphere." The Tidelands were designated in 1994 as containing *Wetlands of International Importance* under the Ramsar Convention and this area is recognized as one of the most outstanding areas within the boundaries of the Silvio O. Conte National Wildlife Refuge.

I also serve as Co-Chair of the Eightmile River Watershed Committee, a group of local officials and citizens charged with implementing the "Eightmile River Watershed Project." The goal of this project is to enable the three communities, Lyme, East Haddam and Salem, to balance conservation and growth in order to maintain the integrity of the watershed. Passage of legislation to authorize a Wild and Scenic River Study on the Eightmile River will significantly enhance community-based efforts to conserve the unique resources of this globally significant region.

THE EIGHTMILE RIVER

The Eightmile name is based on the distance between the location of its mouth at the Connecticut River and the mouth of Connecticut River at Long Island Sound. Extensive wetlands and watercourses combine to form the 10 mile long East Branch, the 10 mile long West Branch, and the 5 mile main stem of the river. There are other major tributaries such as Beaver Brook, Harris Brook, and Falls Brook. The water quality throughout the river system is excellent. There are no known pollution sources. An old, minor source of potential pollution is the only reason the state has not classified the river at the highest drinking water classification. There has been no evidence of pollution.

The Eightmile River system is one of the most significant aquatic resources within the Lower Connecticut River watershed and contains a number of outstanding and remarkable ecological, historical, cultural and recreational resource values. Within Southern New England, and particularly coastal Connecticut, it is uncommon to find entire ecosystems intact throughout their range, particularly at the scale of the 39,900-acre Eightmile River Watershed. From species to natural communities to its extensive wetland and watercourse system to its unfragmented forest, the Eightmile is an outstanding national treasure.

Eighty-five percent of the Eightmile River Watershed is forested. Most notably this forest habitat is largely intact; it is the largest unfragmented forest region in coastal Connecticut. In total, about 65% or 26,000 acres of the watershed is completely unfragmented and the remaining 35% are only sparsely developed. The watershed benefits from a high level of protection. The State of Connecticut, The Nature Conservancy, each of the towns, the local land trusts and others have conserved 9,700 acres or 24% of the watershed. The intact forest of the Eightmile River Watershed provides increasingly rare interior nesting bird habitat.

The Eightmile River is virtually free flowing throughout its extent. The only dams of any significance have both had fish ladders installed. The River contains the various forms of aquatic habitat types such as pools and riffles, rocky whitewater sections, sandy and gravelly bottoms, waterfalls, and wide, slow sections. The riparian zones are largely intact throughout the river system. The river is considered by the

Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection to be an exemplary occurrence of one of Connecticut's most imperiled natural communities—free flowing rivers and streams.

The River system is a haven for fish, both resident and migratory. There is a great diversity and abundance of fish species that use the river throughout their various life stages. It is one of Connecticut's best trout streams. The River contains native brook trout, brown trout and rainbow trout, plus minnows, suckers and small-mouthed bass. Anadromous species include alewife herring, blueback herring, sea lamprey, striped bass, and sea-run brown trout. Efforts are underway to restore Atlantic salmon and American shad.

Two globally rare plant species are known to exist in the Eightmile River system, Parker's pipewort and Eaton's beggar tick. The American bald eagle is also frequently found here. There are many more state rare species and habitats suitable for supporting such species. Hamburg Cove at the mouth of the river is an internationally recognized fresh water tidal marsh community.

Along with these species and communities there are other key indicators of a healthy aquatic system. Extensive, native beds of submerged aquatic vegetation exist. Fresh water mussels are present and exotic mussels are not. One in ten American mussel species has gone extinct over the last century, and almost three-fourths of the remaining species are globally rare. The Eightmile River contains both the brook floater and eastern pearlshell mussel; both are protected by the Connecticut Endangered Species Act. The Eightmile River is in the State's elite for other small aquatic organisms such as mayflies, damselflies, dragonflies, beetles, snails, etc. Among several categories of insect life, the Eightmile exceeds all other sites according to state aquatic biologist Guy Hoffman.

The Eightmile River and the watershed are highly prized by the three towns through which it flows—Lyme, East Haddam and Salem. The watershed is approximately one third to one half of the land area in each of these towns. It is a rural landscape with great scenic beauty and offers an abundance of recreational opportunities. It is one of the best rivers in Connecticut for fishing and it supports boating from canoeing and kayaking to power and sail in the river's downstream sections. Hiking, sightseeing, hunting, and nature observation are among popular activities within the watershed at a number of State Forest areas, Devil's Hopyard State Park, and three large preserves owned by The Nature Conservancy that are all open to the public.

Much of the watershed's existing development is historic and well integrated into the landscape. The river and watershed's high quality defines the character of these three towns. It is at the heart of the quality of life enjoyed by area residents. Economic interests also recognize this because economic vitality here, primarily tourism, is largely based on that quality.

The greatest threat to the special attributes of the Eightmile River and its watershed is incremental, unplanned growth. It results in landscape and habitat fragmentation, the loss of water quality, the loss of important species and natural communities, the intrusion of undesirable nuisance species, and obscures other qualities of this region. Change and growth is inevitable; for example, East Haddam is one of the fastest growing towns in the state. This issue is whether growth will be managed to protect and sustain the unique resource at the heart of this region. There are other potential threats such as the diversion of ground water for water supply in distant towns or golf course irrigation that could leave the hydrology of the system seriously altered, especially during normally low-flow periods.

THE EIGHTMILE RIVER WATERSHED PROJECT AND THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY

About six years ago, the Eightmile River Watershed Committee was formed to pursue the Eightmile River Watershed Project. The group was comprised of local officials and citizens, with the University of Connecticut Cooperative Extension System (UConn) and The Nature Conservancy providing staff support and resource expertise. The EPA Region One and Silvio O. Conte National Wildlife Refuge provided funding. The project goal: balance conservation and growth in the watershed in ways that ensure the long-term social, economic, and environmental health of its communities.

The focus of the project thus far has been the development of educational resources to support good land use planning and thoughtful stewardship by local landowners. One of the first achievements was the signing by town leaders in December of 1997 of the "Conservation Compact." This was an agreement between the three towns that committed each town to work together to protect shared natural and cultural heritage.

Since that time, the thrust of activity has been in the use of computer-based geographic information system (GIS) technology to generate state-of-the-art maps and resource information about the watershed. Collectively these materials helped make it vividly clear just how unique and precious the Eightmile River Watershed is to those who live here. The results were shown to various audiences in the community through slide shows and presentations. They generated considerable interest and support for further action.

The Nature Conservancy has worked closely with the Eightmile River Watershed Committee, each of the three towns, community groups and individuals. During this past year, we have collectively looked at how best to take the information gathered and community interest generated to accomplish tangible on-the-ground results for protecting the river and watershed. Together we have recognized that going back to the communities to directly involve them in decision-making about the future of the river and watershed was the best course of action and that a Wild and Scenic River Study is the best vehicle for doing so. There are several reasons a Wild and Scenic River Study is the best way to protect the Eightmile River.

- The Eightmile River has the necessary outstandingly remarkable values to be eligible for designation.
- A Wild and Scenic River Study, and the process associated with it, provides the structure, expertise, funding and facilitation needed for the communities as a whole to come together and collectively identify the issues and goals they have for the resource, and to set forth the means for meeting those goals. This is the heart of the matter; the conservation needed is most likely to come through community-based self-determination. Despite strong interest, it is not likely that such a community process will happen without the incentive of the Wild and Scenic River designation process. As important as designation itself may become, the pursuit of a Wild and Scenic River study now is being sought as much for the opportunity it provides to support community-based action and self-determination as it is to achieve the designation itself.
- A Wild and Scenic River designation, if achieved, would offer important protections not otherwise available locally or through the State of Connecticut. Federally funded or permitted water resource related projects that would have a direct and adverse impact on the river would not be allowed under designation. There are several threats to the Eightmile where this may be important including, for example, adverse water diversions.
- The Study would provide a greater level of scientific information than we have currently, which might be especially useful for future decision-making.
- A Wild and Scenic River study represents the potential to bring in needed funds to support the community-based process that has been identified.
- The Wild and Scenic River designation process would be built on local control. The ability to maintain local control over land use decisions is key.
- The process would further facilitate coordination among the three towns.

There has been wide spread support at the community level for a Wild and Scenic River Study and for potential Wild and Scenic River designation. A concern for the future for the Eightmile River, a love of the Eightmile River Watershed area, and community pride have combined with a recognition that the Wild and Scenic River process offers an excellent tool to address these collective interests. Over 40 letters from all levels of local government, community groups and individuals, including riverfronting property owners, have been submitted requesting the Study. Leading newspapers have carried editorials endorsing the Wild and Scenic River effort. These are summarized in the attached exhibits.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify in support of S. 513 and H.R. 182. I urge the committee's favorable consideration of this important legislation. I would be happy to answer any questions from members of the committee.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much.
Ms. Hoffman.

**STATEMENT OF DEBORAH HOFFMAN, DIRECTOR, PASSAIC
COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

Ms. HOFFMAN. Thank you Mr. Chairman and the members of this subcommittee for affording me the opportunity to testify here today. It is an honor to be before this committee and to be able to offer my views on the Great Falls Historic District Study Act.

As Senator Torricelli and Congressman Pascrell have eloquently stated, the Great Falls Historic District is a resource with a significant history worthy of being part of our National Park System. It reflects the determination of Alexander Hamilton, Paterson's founder and the first Secretary of the Treasury, to develop a strong manufacturing base in the United States.

The structures within the District represent one of the finest collections of nineteenth and early twentieth century mill architecture in the country. With its unique, largely intact, three-level water raceway system constructed to power the mills, the district remains a cohesive historic presence.

As the head of economic development for Passaic County, I know first-hand the economic rejuvenation, which is powering us into the 21st century. Today the Great Falls is home to a unique blend of manufacturing, office, retail, residential, health services and educational/cultural uses. Reinvestment in the area has been significant, showing an enthusiasm for the area's rich heritage and current prominence in our community.

For example, in 1997, a company known as Longstreet Development came to the Great Falls seeking to create an 80,000 square foot retail, commercial and residential complex known as Hamilton Square. This was one of the first major redevelopment projects in the district since the 1960s. The more than 50,000 square foot Rodgers Mill Building, once the location of automotive manufacturing, was converted to house the Paterson Museum and office suites, and the 30,000 square foot Franklin Mill was converted into office space.

In addition the Historic District continues to draw interest in reinvestment from both public and private sectors. For example, the Parking Authority of the city of Paterson will be constructing a five-hundred car parking deck with 10,000 square feet of parking space within the next 2 years. This will take place directly across from the Paterson Museum, which provides a venue for historical exhibits and art work for our local resident artist community.

Not long ago, I was approached by Sol Wagner, president of Oklahoma Sound Enterprises. Mr. Wagner's company manufactures lecterns and podiums, employs 50, and desperately required additional space. Although they could have settled on any number of properties in North Jersey, they were drawn to the Historic Great Falls District due to its manufacturing history, readily available labor force and proximity to the Route 80 Interstate. Regardless of the physical and financial constraints of the property, Sol Wagner is determined to be a part of the fabric of the Great Falls Historic District.

But perhaps the best demonstration of private sector interest in the district can be typified by Mr. Jim Fabris who wants to bring a baking plant for Dunkin Donuts to a 17,000 square foot historic building in the heart of the district. Abandoned for over a decade, the structure would house not only a manufacturing plant of baked goods for distribution to ten Dunkin Donut retail stores, but will offer tours to the public. Mr. Fabris is only at the beginning of his potential development, but he is a powerful example of the type of serious entrepreneur that seeks out the Great Falls Historic District and its historic glamour.

The not-for-profit sector has also been very active in the district. For example, the North Jersey Community Coordinated Child Care Agency recently developed a facility on Oliver Street for its corporate offices and the operation of several day care centers.

There is much to be excited about and much that can be fostered by the presence of the National Park Service. As you consider this legislation, I can assure the committee that there is a vibrant committed partnership in place to support a National Park designation. We have strong local support from the city of Paterson and the county of Passaic. As someone on the front lines everyday, I believe this is a pivotal time for the Great Falls Historic District. We must collectively decide if we will embrace the history of the site and build upon it, or miss this wonderful opportunity to protect and enhance a true national treasure.

I urge the committee to support this legislation and thank you again for this opportunity.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Hoffman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DEBORAH HOFFMAN, DIRECTOR, PASSAIC COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Thank you Mr. Chairman and the members of this subcommittee for affording me the opportunity to testify here today. It is an honor to be before this committee and to be able to offer my views on this important legislation.

As Congressman Pascrell has eloquently stated, The Great Falls Historic District is a resource with a storied history worthy of being part of our National Park System. It reflects the determination of Alexander Hamilton, Paterson's founder and our first Secretary of the Treasury, to develop a strong manufacturing base in the United States. At Hamilton's urging, the "Society for the Establishment of Useful Manufactures," (SUM), was established in the early 1790's. This was the most ambitious industrial undertaking in America at the time, making the City of Paterson the "New National Manufactory."

The structures within the District represent one of the finest collections of nineteenth and early twentieth century mill architecture in the country. With its unique, largely intact, three-level water raceway system constructed to power the mills, the district remains as a cohesive historic presence. Quite simply, it was America in all that made it great at the dawn of the 20th century.

As the head of Economic Development for Passaic County, I know first-hand the economic rejuvenation that today is powering us into the 21st century. The Great Falls is home to a unique blend of manufacturing, office, retail, residential, health services and educational/cultural uses. Reinvestment in the area has been significant, showing an enthusiasm for the area's rich heritage and current prominence in our community.

For example, in 1997, a company known as Longstreet Development came to the Great Falls looking to create an 80,000 square foot retail, commercial and residential complex, known as Hamilton Square. This was one of the first major redevelopment projects in the district since the 1960's. It involved the conversion of the 50,000 square foot 2 Market Street mill building—once the location of locomotive construction—to house the Paterson Museum and office suites; and the conversion of the 30,000 square foot Franklin Mill into new office space. The structure also provides St. Joseph's Hospital and Medical Center with a premier location for their outpatient clinics, serving patients throughout a 15-mile radius.

Today, the Great Falls Historic District continues to draw interest and re-investment from both the public and private sectors. For example, the Parking Authority of the City of Paterson will be constructing a 500+ car parking deck with 10,000 square feet of retail space within the next two years. This will take place directly across from the Paterson Museum, which provides a venue for historical exhibits and artwork created from our local resident artist community.

Not long ago, I was approached by Sol Wagner, President of Oklahoma Sound Enterprises. Mr. Wagner's company manufactures lecterns and podiums, employs 50, and desperately required additional space. Although they could have settled on any number of properties in North Jersey, they were drawn to the Great Falls Historic District due to its manufacturing history, readily available labor force and proximity to the Route 80 Interstate. Regardless of the physical and financial constraints of

the property, including environmental contamination, the sudden filing of chapter 11 bankruptcy by the property's owner, and the potential collapse of the roof due to the failure of 5 roof trusses, Oklahoma Sound is forging ahead. Sol Wagner is determined to be a part of the fabric of the Great Falls Historic District.

But perhaps the best demonstration of private sector interest in the district can be typified by Mr. Jim Fabris, who wants to bring Dunkin Donuts to a 17,000 square foot historic building in the heart of the district. Abandoned for over a decade, this structure would house not only a manufacturing plant for distribution to 10 Dunkin Donut establishments, but will offer tours to the public. Mr. Fabris is determined to work with local officials to make his dream a reality, despite the necessary costly renovations that will be needed to convert the facility to a modern "food" building. Mr. Fabris is only at the beginning of his potential development, but he is a powerful example of the type of serious entrepreneur that seeks out the Great Falls Historic District and its historic glamour.

The not-for-profit sector has also been very active in the district. The North Jersey Community Coordinated Child Care Agency (4C's) is developing a manufacturing facility on Oliver Street for its corporate offices and the operation of several day care centers. There is much to be excited about, and much that can be fostered by the presence of the National Park Service.

As you consider this legislation, I can assure the committee that there is a vibrant, committed partnership in place to support a National Park designation. We have strong local support from the City of Paterson and the County of Passaic.

As someone on the front lines everyday, I believe this is a pivotal time for the Great Falls Historic District. We must collectively decide if we will embrace the history of the site and build upon it, or miss this wonderful opportunity to protect and enhance a true national treasure.

I urge the committee to support this legislation and thank you again for this opportunity.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much. I have questions for John Parsons. Mr. Parsons, your testimony indicates that the Department wants to carefully examine the full lifecycle of operational and maintenance costs for each option considered.

I am not aware of any significant maintenance cost for Wild and Scenic River segments, especially rivers in the East such as Eightmile River where there is not likely to be any Federal land acquisition or little Federal management other than approval of the local government's river management plan. Are there other significant costs associated with the designation of an area as a Wild and Scenic River?

Mr. PARSONS. No, Mr. Chairman, there are not. It is a grant program as you have illustrated, but the idea of examining a new designation's cost is something we are going to try to insert into each of the special resource studies in the future; not necessarily a cost to the Federal Government, but a cost in general of managing a river of this kind.

Senator AKAKA. I have a question for you and Ms. Hoffman concerning the Great Falls Historic District National Park Service study. I understand the purpose of a study is to answer questions about the suitability and feasibility of designating an area as part of a National Park System. At this point does anyone have any comments about how a park such as the Great Falls Historic District might operate? Would there likely be a cooperative agreement with local authorities involved in joint funding of the park? Or would there be a major Federal presence including land and building acquisition by the Park Service? Either you or Ms. Hoffman.

Ms. HOFFMAN. Thank you very much for the question. I cannot speak on behalf of the city of Paterson, but I am confident in their dedication to this area and to the commitment to this area. The county of Passaic considers it really a gem and I am sure would

consider funding for the area. In addition, I have spoken to many of the businesses operating in the area and there is a potential to develop a special improvement district, which is a State legislation and a local legislation, that would actually develop matching funding to operate certain types of services in the area. And so I think you would see a local initiative and capability of that. I don't know whether or not that would generate multi-millions of dollars but it would certainly show a commitment on the part of the local economy and local businesses.

Senator AKAKA. Mr. Parsons.

Mr. PARSONS. The purpose of this special resource study is exactly as you have outlined. At least three alternatives would be evaluated. One would be doing nothing, which would continue the Congress' 1992 and 1996 legislation and may be supplemented with others. The second would be an affiliated area, an area that is managed in joint cooperation in some fashion with the city of Paterson or a foundation or others. And the third would be the more traditional unit of the National Park System. Another aspect of this special resource study, of course, is to examine thematically elsewhere in the Park System as to whether this would be duplicative of another unit of the Park System.

Senator AKAKA. Well, I don't have any questions for Mr. Frohling. And I want to thank all of you for your testimony. Finally, Mr. Parsons, you are the only witness on two matters, both of which I believe are non-controversial. The first is S. 921 and its House-passed companion, H.R. 1000 to adjust the boundary of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site in Ohio. The final is S. 1097 to authorize the Park Service to issue rights-of-way permits for the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Mr. Parsons please proceed with your testimony on both bills.

STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON S. 921, H.R. 1000, and S. 1097

Mr. PARSONS. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time I am going to be very brief. S. 921 as outlined to you by Senator DeWine earlier this afternoon is a very creative solution to a problem that both we and the SABIS school have in that community. It would authorize a land exchange with them to accommodate their growth as well as provide us with a parking lot on their existing property. It would also authorize the National Park Service to acquire two other pieces of property and we would urge the committee to pass favorably on that measure.

Regarding S. 1097, which affects the Great Smoky Mountains, as you may be aware the National Park Service is precluded from issuing rights-of-way permits to oil and gas pipelines. This is not true of electric facilities or water transmission, but it is true of petroleum products. So, in a situation that we have like this with a linear parkway we are often in the way. Whether it is the George Washington Memorial Parkway here in Washington or the Baltimore Washington Parkway, when you are managing a linear park and people have to cross it with utilities of this kind, our only rem-

edy is to come to Congress to seek specific legislation and that is what this would do.

There is an existing pipeline and we would like to grant right-of-way authority for that, and for a new pipeline that is needed by the city of Gatlinburg. This would allow the park to issue a right-of-way permit for both, and we would urge you to report favorably on this bill as well. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of John Parsons on S. 921, H.R. 1000, and S. 1097 follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN G. PARSONS, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL DIRECTOR, LANDS, RESOURCES, AND PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, ON S. 921, H.R. 1000, AND S. 1097

S. 921 AND H.R. 1000

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to present the position of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 1000, and S. 921, bills to adjust the boundary and authorize an exchange of certain lands at William Howard Taft National Historic Site located in Cincinnati, Ohio. The Department of the Interior supports these bills.

With one minor exception of a technical nature, H.R. 1000 and S. 921 are identical bills. H.R. 1000 was the subject of a hearing before the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation, and Public Lands, on April 26, 2001. At the hearing the witness for the Department of the Interior, NPS Associate Director Katherine H. Stevenson, recommended several amendments to the bill that would enable it to better address the needs of the William Howard Taft National Historic Site. One of these amendments would allow the Park Service to purchase one of the properties involved in the bill with appropriated funds, the other two proposed amendments were primarily technical in nature. The House Resources Committee adopted these amendments and reported the bill out of committee on May 16, 2001. The bill was passed by the House on June 6, 2001. With one technical exception which would be corrected by the amendment proposed at the conclusion of this testimony, S. 921 is identical to the House-passed version of H.R. 1000, and was introduced in the Senate on May 21, 2001.

The William Howard Taft National Historic Site, situated in a designated Historic District of the Mount Auburn section of Cincinnati, Ohio, is the only memorial to William Howard Taft, the nation's 27th President and 10th Chief Justice of the United States. William Howard Taft lived at the property that became the historic site from his birth in 1857 until his marriage to Helen "Nellie" Herron, in 1886. The Taft family sold the property in 1889.

This unit of the National Park System was established by Public Law 91-132 on December 2, 1969. The site was established specifically to "preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of William Howard Taft." Prior to the establishment of the historic site the William Howard Taft Memorial Association began efforts to acquire and restore the Taft family home. In 1963 the association leased part of the house and began to restore it. In 1968 the association bought the property. In 1969 the home and its 1/2 acre of land was transferred to the United States Government. In 1972 an additional 1/3 acre of adjacent land was cleared of an existing apartment building and also donated to the Government by the William Howard Taft Memorial Association.

H.R. 1000 and S. 921 would redraw the boundary of the Taft historic site to include two parcels of land that are presently contiguous to the site. The inclusion of these tracts within the site would benefit park visitors by giving them easier access to the site, and by enabling the Park Service to better tell the story associated with the site. In addition, these bills would benefit the local community of Mount Auburn, as it would authorize the National Park Service to transfer a tract of land to a leading private educator of Cincinnati, the SABIS International School of Cincinnati (SABIS). This tract would enable SABIS, which operates a school across the street from the site, to better carry out its educational mission.

The Taft Historic Site is bordered by Southern Avenue on the north, Auburn Avenue on the west, Young Street on the east, and Bodman Avenue on the south. The primary attractions for visitors are the Taft Home, and the Taft Education Center, which are both accessed from Auburn Avenue. However, to reach the Home or the Education Center, visitors must park along either heavily trafficked Auburn Avenue, or at the NPS parking lot, which is at the other end of the block, at the corner

of Young Street and Southern Avenue. This lot is situated between two tracts owned by SABIS, and across the street from other land owned by SABIS. Thus, the lot is far more convenient for faculty, and parents of students attending the SABIS school, than it is for Taft site visitors.

H.R. 1000 and S. 921 would enable the National Park Service to transfer this land to SABIS, which would enhance SABIS's ability to serve the community. In exchange, SABIS would transfer to the National Park Service a tract of land that it owns along Southern Avenue. The National Park Service would then develop part of this land into a parking lot, which would enable visitors to park one-half block closer to the Taft Home and Education Center than the present lot allows. The National Park Service would allow another part of this land to revert to the same character it possessed during the Taft years of 1857 to 1899—green space. The National Park Service would also develop a handicapped accessible walking trail connecting to the site on part of this land to give visitors a better feel for how this land influenced the life of William Howard Taft. The bills also provide that if a real estate appraisal shows the NPS tract to be of a different value than the SABIS tract, additional funds or land may be used to equalize the transaction.

These bills would also bring within the park's boundary another tract, approximately three-fourths of an acre that is located at the intersection of Southern and Auburn Avenues. This property presently contains a residential building with 40 apartments. For the past 18 years the National Park Service has rented administrative office space in this building. The parking lot for this building, which includes a Park Service easement, was brought within the boundary of the park by a 1981 boundary modification. Over the last 15 years, this tract has come up for sale on two occasions. Both times the NPS wanted to acquire the property, but was unable to submit an offer because the property was not within the park boundary. This property has been identified in the master plan for the park as land that would further the mission of the park.

While the National Park Service does not have a definitive plan for the use of this property at present, the tract could be used for a variety of purposes that would further the park mission. In determining the best use for this tract we would examine several alternatives, including using it to improve access to the site because of its location as a corner lot, and its potential for parking spaces; using it to aid us in telling the William Howard Taft story, as at least part of it could be restored to a condition similar to that which existed during the Taft years; and using at least part of it for administrative space, which would help the park carry out its business.

H.R. 1000 and S. 921 would give the National Park Service the authority to buy this property when it goes on the market in the future. Any potential modifications to the property would be accomplished only after consultation and collaboration with all identified stakeholders.

While the two tracts of land that would be brought into the historic site by H.R. 1000 and S. 921 were not part of the original Taft estate, their acquisition would be consistent with the historic site's enabling legislation, which provides that the purpose of the site is to "preserve in public ownership historically significant properties associated with the life of William Howard Taft." These tracts are portions of land that was contiguous to the Taft property during the time William Howard Taft resided at the site, and are therefore historically significant properties associated with the life of William Howard Taft. In addition, these properties take on even greater significance in light of the fact that a large piece of the original Taft estate that fronts Bodman Avenue will in all likelihood never be available to the Park Service. Hamilton County constructed several buildings on this site in 1995, which it uses for a juvenile detention center.

Thus, the acquisition of the tracts involved in H.R. 1000 and S. 921 may represent the last chance the Park Service has to deal with encroaching urban development that impedes its ability to carry out its mission at the historic site. Their acquisition is also consistent with the park's 1981 Master Plan, which provides for the preservation of "those elements from the historic period", and states that the park shall "provide the appropriate opportunities for visitor use" and "coordinate area planning and management activities with those of neighboring communities to attain mutual objectives".

The costs to the treasury associated with the two land transactions involved in H.R. 1000 and S. 921 are expected to be minimal. The annual operating costs that the Park Service would incur in taking over the SABIS parking lot would be offset by the costs the Park Service would forgo as a result of conveying the parking lot at Young Street and Southern Avenue to SABIS. The Park Service would incur nominal costs in developing a parking lot and walking trail along this property of approximately \$65,000. Additionally, the government would not incur any signifi-

cant cost in carrying out this land exchange, as the both properties are substantially equal in value.

The property at Southern and Auburn Avenues has been assessed at \$505,000. The level of operational costs associated with this site is unclear at this time because we do not have a definitive plan for the use of this property.

As noted above, S. 921 differs from the House-passed version of H.R. 1000 in one technical respect. To correct this oversight, the word "Historic" should be inserted prior to "Site" on page 2, line 6, of the bill.

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

S. 1097

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1097, which would provide legal authority to permit existing and future natural gas pipelines within a portion of Great Smoky Mountains National Park near Gatlinburg, Tennessee.

The Department supports S. 1097. This legislation would help address the air pollution problem at Great Smoky Mountains National Park by facilitating the use of natural gas as a relatively clean source of energy in an area where air quality is poor.

S. 1097 would provide authority for the continuing operation and maintenance of an existing gas main that runs through Great Smoky Mountains National Park that has been in place since the 1960's. And, it would allow the Secretary of the Interior to authorize construction of new gas lines, where otherwise appropriate, across several linear park lands managed by Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The areas where the new pipelines would be allowed are: the Foothills Parkway, which extends parallel to the north boundary of the park for 70 miles; the Foothills Parkway Spur, a four-mile-long park road (also U.S. 441) which connects the gateway communities of Pigeon Forge and Gatlinburg; and the Gatlinburg Bypass which links the Spur to the main body of the park. All three areas are linear lands that are managed as scenic transportation corridors. S. 1097 would not allow construction of natural gas lines across the main body of the park.

The need for this legislation came to the attention of the National Park Service last year, when Great Smoky Mountains National Park received a request from Sevier County Utility District in Tennessee for permission to install a new natural gas pipeline across the park-owned Gatlinburg-Pigeon Forge Spur right-of-way (U.S. 441) in order to provide gas service to a new development in the city of Gatlinburg. Under 16 U.S.C. 79, the Secretary of the Interior may permit rights-of-way through units of the National Park System for electrical, phone, water, sewer and some other utility services, but that general authority explicitly does not authorize installation of natural gas or petroleum product-bearing lines.

Between the 1990 Census and the 2000 Census the population of Sevier County, Tennessee, which includes Gatlinburg and Pigeon Forge, grew by 39 percent, making it the state's third fastest-growing county. Within the county some of the most rapid growth is occurring between the Foothills Parkway and the main body of the park in areas not currently served by natural gas, other than the single six-inch line along the Spur to Gatlinburg.

The single greatest natural resource problem in Great Smoky Mountains National Park is declining air quality. Its vistas are reduced by sulfate and particulate emissions. Ozone levels in the park's higher elevations reaches levels that pose a hazard to human health under Environmental Protection Agency standards. High elevation streams and soils are becoming increasingly acidified by airborne acid deposition which is threatening plants, wildlife and aquatic systems. A large proportion of this pollution is produced by coal-generated electrical power plants. Significant progress is being made to reduce emissions from power generation, and that progress could be aided if the thousands of new homes and businesses that are springing up in surrounding communities turn to the use of natural gas for their heating needs. The authority provided by S. 1097 would enable greater usage of natural gas.

The need for an authorization for existing natural gas pipelines stems from the developments that led to current National Park Service management of the Foothills Parkway Spur. The Foothills Parkway Spur was built by the Federal government in the 1950's on land acquired by the State of Tennessee and donated to the Federal government. In 1963, an agreement was signed between the National Park Service and the State of Tennessee that called for the Spur to be transferred back to the State after the Federal government built the Gatlinburg Bypass on other lands donated by the State. Subsequent to the 1963 agreement, the National Park Service allowed construction of a six-inch natural gas main down the Spur which still provides the only gas service to Gatlinburg.

At that time, the National Park Service's only concern was to ensure that the line's installation was acceptable to the State of Tennessee as the land's future owner.

Although the Gatlinburg Bypass was completed in 1968, the State has declined, for a variety of reasons, to accept the Spur back into State ownership, leaving the National Park Service with a pipeline it has no current authority to permit. This legislation will allow for the continued operation and maintenance of this line.

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

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much. As I understand this issue is non-controversial. Mr. Parsons, it is clear that rights-of-way for gas pipelines would only be authorized along existing rights-of-way and would not be otherwise allowed to cross through the park.

Mr. PARSONS. Right. This is limited to the Foothills Parkway and not across Great Smoky Mountains National Park.

Senator AKAKA. Before we conclude this hearing this afternoon, I would like to announce that the hearing record will remain open for one week, if anyone wants to submit additional comments on any of these bills. And I would like to take the time to thank all the witnesses for their testimony this afternoon. And I would especially like to thank Mr. Parsons for staying here the entire afternoon.

Mr. PARSONS. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a good idea to have rather than the administration witness just run through their testimony as to get the panels together. And it is much more productive I think.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much. The hearing is adjourned. [Whereupon, at 5:25 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

[Subsequent to the hearing, the following was received for the record:]

NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2001.

Hon. DANIEL AKAKA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation,
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Re: S. 281, proposed education center at Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the National Mall

DEAR SENATOR AKAKA: The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) is the only national nonprofit organization dedicated solely to protecting national parks for future generations. On behalf of our more than 450,000 members nationwide, I am writing in opposition to S. 281, a bill to construct an education center near the Vietnam Veterans Memorial on the National Mall.

In 1986, Congress passed and President Ronald Reagan signed into law the Commemorative Works Act to regulate the placement of commemorative works on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs. Congress took this action in direct response to the proliferation of memorials, monuments, and other structures that would encroach on the open spaces and national significance of the National Mall, a National Historic Landmark.

Building on the intent of the Commemorative Works Act, in 2000 the federal National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) proposed establishment of a Reserve on the Mall's central cross-axes in which no new memorial sites would be approved. The Reserve would encompass the Mall's central cross-axis formed by the U.S. Capitol, Lincoln Memorial, White House, Washington Monument, and Jefferson Memorial. NCPC designed a draft Master Plan to encourage the location of future memorials, museums, and monuments at other prominent locations throughout the Nation's Capital. NPCA strongly supports establishment of the proposed Reserve.

We agree that as the years pass it is important to teach future generations about the Vietnam War and other conflicts. However, we encourage the Subcommittee to consider reasonable alternatives to S. 281. In addition to locating the proposed edu-

cation center somewhere off the Mall, other possibilities include designating a site to provide substantive interpretation for all of the memorials and monuments currently on the National Mall. As the draft Master Plan demonstrates, there are a number of readily available nearby sites.

The emotional and aesthetic power of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial derives in part from the simplicity of its design and the natural serenity of its immediate environment. The proposed museum/education center would disrupt that serenity. Four times the size of the existing kiosk located nearby, the proposed structure would cause a major alteration of historic views of the Lincoln Memorial.

The National Mall is America's "Town Square," a place where all can gather and learn about our common heritage. We are concerned that its historic open space and vistas will be compromised, and the impact of existing memorials and monuments diminished if they have to compete with numerous other sites. Without a change in policy, the Mall's traditional Monumental Core may have to accommodate at least 50 new memorials and numerous new museums by 2050. In seeking to continue to add to this area, we risk greatly diminishing it.

It is therefore critical that Congress support establishment of the Reserve, and that the Commemorative Works Act be amended to encourage meaningful, early public involvement in site selection and memorial design processes. Such involvement is necessary to avoid the intense controversies provoked by other recently proposed memorials.

We urge the Subcommittee to support the "Reserve Area" as proposed by the NCPC and amend S. 281 to seek other sites that can serve to educate future generations about the Vietnam War.

Sincerely,

KEVIN COLLINS,
Acting Director, Government Affairs.

○