

**SPENDING, PRIORITIES AND MIS-
SIONS OF THE NATIONAL PARK
SERVICE AND THE PRESIDENT'S
FY 2012 BUDGET PROPOSAL**

OVERSIGHT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS
AND PUBLIC LANDS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Thursday, March 10, 2011

Serial No. 112-9

Printed for the use of the Committee on Natural Resources



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.fdsys.gov>

or

Committee address: <http://naturalresources.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

65-120 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2011

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

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

DOC HASTINGS, WA, *Chairman*
EDWARD J. MARKEY, MA, *Ranking Democrat Member*

Don Young, AK	Dale E. Kildee, MI
John J. Duncan, Jr., TN	Peter A. DeFazio, OR
Louie Gohmert, TX	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega, AS
Rob Bishop, UT	Frank Pallone, Jr., NJ
Doug Lamborn, CO	Grace F. Napolitano, CA
Robert J. Wittman, VA	Rush D. Holt, NJ
Paul C. Broun, GA	Raúl M. Grijalva, AZ
John Fleming, LA	Madeleine Z. Bordallo, GU
Mike Coffman, CO	Jim Costa, CA
Tom McClintock, CA	Dan Boren, OK
Glenn Thompson, PA	Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, CNMI
Jeff Denham, CA	Martin Heinrich, NM
Dan Benishek, MI	Ben Ray Lujan, NM
David Rivera, FL	John P. Sarbanes, MD
Jeff Duncan, SC	Betty Sutton, OH
Scott R. Tipton, CO	Niki Tsongas, MA
Paul A. Gosar, AZ	Pedro R. Pierluisi, PR
Raúl R. Labrador, ID	John Garamendi, CA
Kristi L. Noem, SD	Colleen W. Hanabusa, HI
Steve Southerland II, FL	Vacancy
Bill Flores, TX	
Andy Harris, MD	
Jeffrey M. Landry, LA	
Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, TN	
Jon Runyan, NJ	
Bill Johnson, OH	

Todd Young, *Chief of Staff*
Lisa Pittman, *Chief Counsel*
Jeffrey Duncan, *Democrat Staff Director*
Rick Healy, *Democrat Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS

ROB BISHOP, UT, *Chairman*
RAÚL M. GRIJALVA, AZ, *Ranking Democrat Member*

Don Young, AK	Dale E. Kildee, MI
John J. Duncan, Jr., TN	Peter A. DeFazio, OR
Doug Lamborn, CO	Rush D. Holt, NJ
Paul C. Broun, GA	Martin Heinrich, NM
Mike Coffman, CO	John P. Sarbanes, MD
Tom McClintock, CA	Betty Sutton, OH
David Rivera, FL	Niki Tsongas, MA
Scott R. Tipton, CO	John Garamendi, CA
Raúl R. Labrador, ID	Edward J. Markey, MA, <i>ex officio</i>
Kristi L. Noem, SD	
Bill Johnson, OH	
Doc Hastings, WA, <i>ex officio</i>	

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held on Thursday, March 10, 2011	1
Statement of Members:	
Bishop, Hon. Rob, a Representative in Congress from the State of Utah ...	1
Prepared statement of	2
Grijalva, Hon. Raúl M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Arizona	2
Prepared statement of	3
Statement of Witnesses:	
Jarvis, Hon. Jonathan B., Director, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior	3
Prepared statement of	5

**OVERSIGHT HEARING ON “EXAMINING THE
SPENDING, PRIORITIES AND MISSIONS OF
THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE AND THE
PRESIDENT’S FY 2012 BUDGET PROPOSAL.”**

**Thursday, March 10, 2011
U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands
Committee on Natural Resources
Washington, D.C.**

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:03 a.m. in Room 1324, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Rob Bishop [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Bishop, Hastings, Young, Duncan, Lamborn, Broun, Coffman, McClintock, Rivera, Tipton, Labrador, Noem, Johnson, Markey, Kildee, DeFazio, Holt, Grijalva, Heinrich, Sarbanes, Sutton, Tsongas, and Garamendi.

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ROB BISHOP, A
REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF UTAH**

Mr. BISHOP. The Subcommittee will come to order. The Chair notes the presence of a quorum, apparently three times over.

The Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands is meeting today to hear testimony on the spending, priorities, and the missions of the National Park Service and the President’s Fiscal Year 2012 budget proposal.

Under Committee Rule 4[f], opening statements are limited to the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee so that we can hear from our witness more quickly. However, I ask unanimous consent to include any other Members’ opening statement in the hearing record, if submitted to the clerk by the close of business today. And hearing no objections, it is so ordered.

I will state that as our policy for questioning, we will do what the full committee does, and simply go by the seniority of those present when I bang the gavel down. And with me, you have probably an extra four or five minutes to get here before I actually bang the gavel down.

We will do the same thing on the Minority side, unless Mr. Grijalva has a change in that. He will be in control of his members.

I also, as we begin, ask unanimous consent—you are in control.

Mr. GRIJALVA. You are asking too much.

Mr. BISHOP. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Holt, the gentleman from New Jersey, join us on the dais and participate in today’s hearing. Hearing no objection. Welcome; thank you for being with us today.

If I could, just in my opening statement, Director Jarvis, I want to thank you for appearing before us here this morning to present your agency’s budget request. The core mission of the Park Service

is to protect the great natural and historic components of our National Park System for the enjoyment and use of current and future generations of Americans.

In fact, to fulfill the purpose of a park, people have to see it. And if we don't do that, then there is no purpose for having national parks.

But as we all know, this is a challenging time for the Federal budget, just as it is for family budgets of millions of Americans. And despite competing demands for limited resources, I know that the American people want us to ensure that our parks will be kept open, will be maintained, and will be passed on to our children in good shape. So protecting the core mission of the Park Service means that in a time of fiscal constraint, we have to make choices. That means we must distinguish between wants and needs, and cannot allow either mission creep or a quest for expansive new programs to come at the expense of the irreplaceable and existing national treasures.

So I look forward to hearing your budget request, your thoughts on how we can ensure a bright future for the Park System while staying within a tight budget.

Before I turn to the Ranking Member for his opening statement, I also want to express my thanks to the dedicated people who work for the Park Service on the ground, in the areas where their service is desperately used and needed, and appreciated.

With that, I will close, and turn the time to the Ranking Member for his opening statement.

[The prepared statement of Chairman Bishop follows:]

**Statement of The Honorable Rob Bishop, Chairman,
Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands**

Director Jarvis, I want to thank you for appearing before this committee to present your agency's budget request.

As I see it, the core mission of the Park Service is to protect the great natural and historic components of our National Park System for the enjoyment and use of current and future generations of Americans. But as we all know, this is a challenging time for the federal budget just as it is for the family budgets of millions of Americans.

Despite competing demands for limited resources, I know that the American people want us to ensure that our treasured parks will be kept open, will be maintained and will be passed on to our children in good shape. Protecting the core mission of the Park Service means that at a time of fiscal constraint, we must make choices. It means we must distinguish between wants and needs. We cannot allow "mission creep" or a quest for expansive new programs come at the expense of our irreplaceable, existing national treasures.

I look forward to hearing your budget requests and your thoughts on how we can ensure a bright future for the Park System while staying within a tight budget. Before I turn to the Ranking member for his opening statement, I want express my thanks to the dedicated people who work for the Park Service for their service.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE RAÚL GRIJALVA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I am going to put my statement in for the record so we can expedite the hearing, other than to thank Director Jarvis for being here.

And these are difficult times for the Federal budget, but the American people overwhelmingly support their parks. And every Member of Congress will make the declaration that he or she

supports the Park. And I know the Director appreciates those declarations. But at the same time, this is a time when we should be also building the system. This is a time when we need to deal with the backlog of maintenance.

And in doing so, I think even in hard times, during our World Wars, the Depression, National Park units were added to the Park System. So in difficult times, I think the American people still appreciate and want that lasting legacy to be protected for them. And with that, let me yield back.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Grijalva follows:]

**Statement of The Honorable Raúl Grijalva, Ranking Member,
Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands**

It is a pleasure to welcome Director Jarvis to the subcommittee. We appreciate your time and effort to join us today and your service to the country as NPS Director.

Every Member of Congress says he or she supports National Parks. I am sure these declarations of support are appreciated by the Director and I know they are appreciated by the American people, who support the NPS and its work, overwhelmingly.

But to truly support National Parks we must support *building* a National Park System for the future. Truly supporting National Parks means leaving future generations a system that is even stronger, more popular and healthier than the world-class system we inherited.

Mischaracterizing the dedicated men and women who wear the NPS uniform as out-of-touch or uncaring is not the way to support national parks. NPS employees care deeply about visitors and about the local communities in which they live and work. The truth is that NPS units generate millions in revenue and create thousands of jobs for local economies.

Claiming that the National Park Service wants to “grab” federal land or violate private property rights is not the way to support National Parks. The NPS does not own all of the critical parcels needed to protect and preserve our national parks, particularly in the face of global climate change. The National Park System does not yet represent all aspects of the American story and it does not yet attract visitation from all segments of the American public. Federal land acquisition, from willing sellers *only*, is not only an appropriate tool to address these needs, it is critical to the future of the system.

And using the maintenance backlog or the economic downturn as reasons to oppose expansion of the National Park System is not the way to support National Parks. Eight units were added to the system during World War I; dozens of units were added during the Great Depression, and seven units were added during World War II. If the generations before us had the wisdom to invest in national parks during some of the most challenging periods in American history, surely we can find a way to continue building the system during our time as its stewards.

Supporting National Parks means supporting more funding for parks and park operations; it means supporting targeted federal land acquisition to provide the system the resources it needs, it means supporting more park professionals to manage our parks and it means working diligently with non-federal partners to stop actions that might harm national park resources.

I look forward to hearing from Director Jarvis regarding the importance of his mission and how Members of Congress can truly be supportive of that mission. I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. With that, we will now hear from our witness, the Director of the National Park Service, Jonathan B. Jarvis from the Department of the Interior. Mr. Jarvis.

**STATEMENT OF JONATHAN B. JARVIS, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL
PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. I greatly appreciate this opportunity to appear before

you today on the Fiscal Year 2012 President's budget request for the National Park Service.

If I may, I would like to summarize my testimony, and submit my entire statement for the record.

We appreciate the Subcommittee's support for the work we do as stewards of our nation's most cherished natural and cultural resources. We look forward to continuing to work with you as the National Park Service prepares for our second century of stewardship, beginning in 2016.

As any resource manager can tell you, wise stewardship sometimes involves making very difficult choices. The National Park Service's 2012 budget request reflects a careful and serious response to the need to reduce Federal spending by supporting our highest priorities, while proposing significant reductions to a number of worthy programs.

In addition to the program reductions, the budget request also includes substantial management savings and efficiencies. The National Park Service is also making significant progress in reducing our unobligated balances.

The aim of these efforts, Mr. Chairman, is a more targeted and focused use of funds, limited to those strategic areas we have determined to be the highest priorities of the National Park Service.

By focusing available resources on the areas of greatest need, the National Park Service can maintain its existing responsibilities while supporting important new initiatives.

The Fiscal Year 2012 budget proposes total discretionary spending of \$2.9 billion. This is a net increase of \$137.8 million above the Fiscal Year 2010 appropriation. The budget request includes an increase of \$39.5 million at more than 100 parks. Those are very important operational increases at over 100 units.

This amount is intended to address operations at new parks and other new responsibilities, improve mission-critical operations, engage youth in employment and educational opportunities, and protect historical assets in parks specifically commemorating the Civil War Sesquicentennial.

Our operations budget is key to helping us continue to protect critical and natural resources we are entrusted with, and to serve park visitors, who number 285 million each year.

Supporting America's Great Outdoors Initiative, which includes fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund Programs at \$900 million, the NPS budget request includes \$160 million to acquire 98,000 acres of land within authorized boundaries of the National Park System. The proposed acquisitions were determined through a coordinated process that the Department of the Interior now uses, along with the Land Management Agencies in DOI, as well as the U.S. Forest Service.

The criteria we use emphasize opportunities to jointly conserve important landscapes, especially river and riparian areas, wildlife habitat, urban areas that provide needed recreational opportunities, and those containing important cultural and historical assets.

We also look to the ability to leverage partner funds, and the degree of involvement with other bureaus, and the urgency for project completion.

Also included in the NPS request is \$200 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund State Conservation Grant—that is the state side of LWCF—that would enable local communities to enhance outdoor recreation opportunities. A portion of these funds would be allocated through a competitive component targeted at community parks, green spaces, landscape-level conservation, and recreational waterways. These grants would address the public's concern about the lack of open space and outdoor recreation areas in certain urban and other areas that were frequently conveyed to us in the listening sessions we held for America's Great Outdoors.

In conjunction with the State Conservation Grants, the request includes an increase of \$1.1 million for the National Park Service's Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program, to better bolster technical assistance to communities.

The Fiscal Year 2012 budget also maintains funding at \$9.9 million for the Secretary's Cooperative Landscape Conservation Initiative. This initiative will bring networks of resource professionals together to promote a science-based understanding of the effects of climate change. This will produce practical applications that have broad benefits for resource managers across the landscape.

In order to fulfill the Service's stewardship responsibilities and sustain key initiatives, the increases I have described are offset by program reductions. The budget proposes no funding for Save America's Treasures, Preserve America Grants, or the Park Partnership Program.

The request also eliminates funding for statutory assistance, and proposes significant reductions in the construction accounts, as well as the National Heritage Area.

In addition, the budget calls for management savings and efficiencies totaling \$46.2 million.

I want to speak also about the Park Service effort to restrain funding. I would also like to remind you of the important economic value of our national parks.

National parks are drivers of economic growth, particularly in gateway communities. They stimulate spending and job creation. Taxpayer investments in national parks result in far more than the obvious recreational and educational dividends.

In 2009, park visitors spent \$11.9 billion, and supported 247,000 private sector jobs. Supporting the parks is not just a matter of wise stewardship; it is also an economic investment in the future.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would just like to say how much I appreciate the support we have, this committee has held for the National Park Service through many, many years, and we look forward to working with you. And that is my summary, and I am open for questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Jarvis follows:]

**Statement of Jonathan B. Jarvis, Director, National Park Service,
U.S. Department of the Interior**

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today at this oversight hearing on the spending, priorities, and the missions of the National Park Service (NPS) and the President's FY 2012 budget request. We appreciate your support for our stewardship of our nation's cherished natural and cultural resources and for the important educational and recreational opportunities we provide for the American people.

Introduction

Responding to the need to reduce Federal spending in a difficult economic climate, the FY 2012 budget request for the NPS contains strategic spending increases combined with selected program reductions and eliminations, made only after serious and careful deliberation. The FY 2012 budget proposes total discretionary appropriations of \$2.9 billion and \$394.5 million in mandatory appropriations for total budget authority of \$3.3 billion. This is a net increase of \$137.8 million above the FY 2010 discretionary appropriations and an estimated net decrease of \$13.0 million in mandatory appropriations from FY 2010.

National parks are drivers of economic growth, particularly in gateway communities. They stimulate spending and job creation. Taxpayer investments in national parks result in far more than the obvious recreational and educational dividends. In 2009, park visitors spent \$11.9 billion and supported 247,000 private-sector jobs. The President's budget will ensure that national parks continue to serve the 285 million visitors who come every year to relax in America's great outdoors and learn about the people and places that make up America's story.

The FY 2012 budget request supports continued stewardship of this Nation's most cherished resources through the Administration's America's Great Outdoors initiative—a landmark investment in engaging people, particularly youth, in America's outdoors and conserving our Nation's natural and cultural heritage. It also supports the Secretary's goals of cooperative landscape conservation and engaging America's youth in the great outdoors.

Budget Summary

The FY 2012 budget request reflects the President's commitment to our national parks with an increase of \$276.6 million over the FY 2010 enacted level, as part of the Administration's America's Great Outdoors initiative. A key component of this initiative is bolstering operational funding at park units that need it most. The budget requests an increase of \$39.5 million for park operations at new parks, and to address new responsibilities, improve mission critical operations, engage youth in employment and educational opportunities, and protect historical assets at parks commemorating the Civil War sesquicentennial.

Further supporting the America's Great Outdoors initiative, the NPS budget request plays a key role in the Administration's proposal to fully fund Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) programs at \$900 million in FY 2012. The NPS request is critical to achieving the goals inherent in the LWCF Act of 1965, which was designed to use revenues generated through the depletion of natural resources for State and Federal land acquisition and the enhancement of lands and waters for recreational and conservation purposes. The request includes \$160.0 million for Federal Land Acquisition, an increase of \$73.7 million from FY 2010, which would be used to leverage other Federal resources, along with those of non-Federal partners, to achieve shared conservation outcome goals in high-priority landscapes. The request also includes \$200.0 million for the State Conservation Grants program, of which \$117.0 million would be targeted to a new competitive matching grants program for States to create and enhance outdoor recreation opportunities.

The FY 2012 request maintains NPS funding of \$9.9 million for the Secretary's Cooperative Landscape Conservation initiative. This initiative will bring together natural resource professionals at the Federal, State, and local level through real and virtual connections to facilitate the wider sharing of information. These networks of resource professionals will be supported by science centers that translate global scientific understanding of environmental change into solutions at the landscape level. A science-based understanding of these issues and their practical applications will have broad benefits for resource managers that are wrestling with the need to find practical and cost-effective approaches to conservation in the face of economic challenges. With this funding, resource monitoring will increase at more than 150 of the most vulnerable parks in high elevation, high latitude, arid, and coastal areas, such as monitoring for melting permafrost in Alaska and changes in salt marsh salinity along the South Atlantic coast. Additionally, over 500 employees will be trained to incorporate adaptation approaches into resource management.

In order to uphold our stewardship responsibilities and sustain key initiatives, the National Park Service undertook a rigorous review of our ongoing activities and made difficult choices. The proposed budget eliminates funding for Save America's Treasures grants, Preserve America grants, and the Park Partnership Projects program. Further, the request eliminates funding for Statutory Assistance and proposes significant reductions in the NPS Construction and National Heritage Areas programs.

In addition to the program reductions the budget includes management savings and efficiencies totaling \$46.2 million, including \$18.4 million that will be realized

in 2011. The NPS will realize the remaining savings in 2012 by reducing \$24.8 million in supplies and material, and \$3.0 million in savings for travel and transportation of persons. In proposing the reductions and absorptions requested in the FY 2012 request, we have been careful to protect park operations as much as possible, and we continue to advance innovative approaches to collaboration and cost savings. The consolidation of our workforce management, acquisition, and contracting offices are prime examples of strategies that will, in future years, deliver greater services at less cost.

I would also like to mention the significant progress we have made in responsibly reducing our unobligated balances. Over the past two years, we implemented a number of policy and program changes, including reducing retention percentages at larger fee-collecting parks if their unobligated balances exceeded 35 percent of gross revenue. The result has been a more efficient targeting of funds to where it's needed most for the benefit of park visitors and protecting resources. It has also allowed individual parks more independence in project selection and expedited the approval of small fee projects. The unobligated balance for this program was reduced from \$218 million at the end of FY 2009 to \$86 million on January 1, 2011.

Operation of the National Park System

The FY 2012 budget requests \$2.3 billion for the ONPS, a programmatic increase of \$72.9 million over the 2010 enacted level, but a net increase of \$35.3 million. This includes \$39.5 million for park base increases which would benefit over 100 parks. The funds would be used to sustain and improve the condition of cultural resources; provide for new areas and responsibilities; ensure the continuation and improvement of mission critical operations; engage youth; and work collaboratively with partners. These increases are also a critical component of addressing key goals of the Administration's America's Great Outdoors initiative and connecting the public to the Nation's natural and cultural heritage and treasures. Other major increases improve capacity to perform repair and rehabilitation of park assets (\$7.5 million), consolidate workforce management and acquisition offices (\$6.8 million), increase baseline inventories of park cultural resources (\$4.5 million), enhance cyclic maintenance efforts (\$3.2 million), expand security at park icons (\$1.8 million), facilitate information sharing and resource protection of park cultural resources (\$1.5 million), and address oceans and coastal stewardship (\$1.3 million).

The FY 2012 budget proposes a net increase of \$5.7 million in support of the Secretary's Youth in the Great Outdoors initiative, which seeks to foster a life-long stewardship ethic in young people. The NPS is dedicated to engaging America's youth in developing a life-long awareness of, and commitment to, our national parks, and we have proposed this investment in 27 parks as part of park base funding to establish youth programs that provide educational experiences and employment opportunities on a continuous basis. This increase builds upon the \$13.5 million in youth employment and engagement programs that the NPS received in FY 2010 and the \$4.4 million that was provided from recreational fee revenues to youth projects that benefit the visitor experience.

Land Acquisition and State Assistance

The NPS FY 2012 budget proposes funding totaling \$360.0 million for Federal land acquisition and State Conservation grants funded through the LWCF, an increase of \$233.7 million from the FY 2010 enacted level. Of the total amount, \$160.0 million is available for land acquisition projects and administration, including \$10.0 million to provide grants to States and local communities to preserve and protect Civil War battlefield sites outside the national park system through the American Battlefield Protection Program.

Beginning in FY 2011, the Department instituted a coordinated process for prioritizing Federal land acquisition projects among the three Departmental land management bureaus and the U.S. Forest Service. The cross-bureau criteria emphasize opportunities to jointly conserve important landscapes, especially river and riparian areas, wildlife habitat, urban areas that provide needed recreational opportunities, and those containing important cultural and historical assets. Additional criteria for these projects include the ability to leverage partner funds, the degree of involvement with other Interior bureaus for the project, and the urgency for project completion. The FY 2012 land acquisition request totals over 98,800 acres of the highest priority landscapes, spanning the country from Alaska and Hawaii to Maine and Florida and the Virgin Islands. As required by law, the proposed tracts are located within authorized park boundaries.

The request also provides \$200.0 million, including administrative costs, for State Conservation Grants funded by the LWCF, a net increase of \$160.0 million from the FY 2010 enacted level. Of this total, at least \$78.0 million would be distributed

equally to States as required by law, an increase of \$40.8 million over the FY 2010 enacted level. With the remaining funds, the 2012 budget proposes developing a competitive component targeted at community parks and green spaces, landscape-scale conservation, and recreational waterways. These grants would address the public's concern about the lack of open space and outdoor recreational areas in certain urban and other areas that was frequently conveyed during listening sessions for the America's Great Outdoors initiative.

The competitive component would fund "signature projects" that create more outdoor recreational opportunities and conserve open space where access to natural areas has been inhibited or is unavailable; protect, restore, and connect open space and natural landscapes; and provide access to waterways. The projects would be expected to be larger in scale and would likely require and receive greater amounts of funding than has typically been awarded. NPS estimates that 10 to 50 grants could be funded to support acquisition of open spaces and natural areas and development of facilities for outdoor recreation across the Nation. Under the LWCF Act, a single State cannot receive more than 10 percent of total grant funds, so no State would receive more than \$17.9 million under this proposal. Each State would continue to automatically receive an apportionment that would total approximately \$1.5 million. Applications would be evaluated using standard LWCF State grant criteria, as well as new criteria, such as the project's ability to increase and improve recreational access or the use of science and mapping to identify valuable lands for wildlife conservation.

National Recreation and Preservation

The National Recreation and Preservation appropriation funds programs that support local and community efforts to preserve natural and cultural resources. For FY 2012, \$51.6 million is requested; a net decrease of \$16.9 million from the FY 2010 enacted level. The request includes an increase of \$1.1 million for the NPS Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance program to bolster technical assistance to communities that are working to increase and improve recreational opportunities. As a key component of the Administration's America's Great Outdoors initiative, this increase would help provide an important resource to local communities as they work with States to implement projects funded from the proposed \$200.0 million for the LWCF State Assistance program.

The budget also includes a request of \$2.0 million for the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Water Trails grants program. This proposal reflects the Administration's continuing commitment to ecosystem restoration, including stewardship of the Chesapeake Bay, pursuant to Executive Order 13508. The funds would provide technical and financial assistance for conserving, restoring and interpreting natural, cultural and recreational resources within the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

As noted above, the budget proposal provides \$19 million in savings by not funding Statutory Assistance earmarks or Preserve America Grants and cutting in half Heritage Partnership Program grants to encourage self-sufficiency among well-established National Heritage Areas while continuing support for newer areas. These reductions are proposed to focus NPS resources on the highest priority needs within parks.

Historic Preservation Fund

The NPS plays a vital role in preserving the Nation's cultural history through a variety of programs that address preservation needs nationwide. The FY 2012 request for the Historic Preservation Fund is \$61.0 million, a decrease of \$18.5 million from the FY 2010 enacted level. The FY 2012 budget provides an increase of \$6.5 million, of which \$3.5 million is for Grants-in-Aid to States and Territories and \$3.0 million is for Grants-in-Aid to Tribes. The total budget request for HPF in FY 2012 is \$50.0 million for Grants-in-Aid to States and Territories and \$11.0 million for Grants-in-Aid to Tribes. These key increases were provided as part of the America's Great Outdoors initiative to support increased State and Tribal National Historic Preservation Act compliance requirements and an expected 25% increase in the number of Tribal Historic Preservation Offices between 2010 and 2012. No funds are requested for the Save America's Treasures grants program in order to focus NPS resources on the highest priority needs within parks.

Construction

The \$152.1 million requested for Construction includes \$70.3 million for line-item construction projects. The line-item request, along with recreation fee revenues and park roads funding will provide substantial resources for protecting and maintaining existing park assets. Funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act and previous appropriations has enabled the NPS to make significant gains in addressing outstanding construction projects. The NPS should complete all ARRA-

funded construction projects in FY 2012. The request funds 14 projects including continuation of ecosystem restoration at Olympic and Everglades National Parks and critical new projects at Big Cypress National Preserve, the National Mall, and the Flight 93 National Memorial. The budget proposes funding for the highest priority health and safety and mission-critical projects and does not propose funding for new facilities or deferred construction of replacement facilities. It also includes funding for the Great Smoky Mountains North Shore Road settlement agreement.

Performance Integration

In formulating the FY 2012 budget request, the NPS used a variety of tools to incorporate performance results into the decision-making process. These tools include the Budget Cost Projection Module, the Business Planning Initiative, and the NPS scorecard, as well as continued program evaluations. These tools are used to develop a more consistent approach to integrating budget and performance across NPS, as well as to support further accountability for budget performance integration at all levels of the organization. Given the far-reaching responsibilities of the NPS, we must remain strategic in our thinking and decision-making.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my summary of the FY 2012 budget request for the National Park Service. We would be pleased to answer any questions you or the other members of the subcommittee may have.

Mr. BISHOP. OK. Thank you for your testimony. At this point we will start the questioning for the witness, as obviously a beautiful day like today turns our attitudes and our feelings to the great outdoors.

So we will start. As was my policy the other day, I wish to be the last one on our side to go. So I will turn for the first question to the gentleman from Alaska, Mr. Young.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Jarvis, welcome to the committee. I know you have no surprise if I am going to ask you about the Yukon Charley.

After I talked to you in my office about the incident on the river, I have received 20 separate cases of abuses of the Park Service since that case. Twenty different cases, by your personnel. And as you recall, you made a pledge to work with me to correct the behavior of the law enforcement rangers in the management of the Yukon Charley Preserve.

What have you done to correct your current management and law enforcement officers?

Mr. JARVIS. Congressman Young, we have intervened pretty aggressively in Alaska, with both the Regional Director and the Superintendent at Yukon Charley, to have a great discussion around your concerns and the concerns of the local communities in and around Yukon Charley about the level of enforcement, our authorities in that area, and recognition that we are part of the community up there. And I believe that there is sort of a new-found appreciation for a working relationship in the community.

I know that for a while there was—

Mr. YOUNG. I haven't got all day, so I wanted to ask you, but I am limited on time. It is ironic to me that we have a letter here from the City Council of Eagle asking for a replacement of those that are employed there, unanimously signed. And actually, they say that there is no way there can be a working relationship.

And what disturbs me, I have received a letter from your Regional Director—Sue Masica, her name is—and she says, "I have strong confidence in the management and employees of the Yukon-Charley Rivers, and do not intend to move anybody."

Now, that is a non-starter. There is no relationship there, sir. None. And she has got a real snotty attitude. And I have told her

that. She doesn't believe she should be working with the local people. She won't even visit up there.

Now, have you checked to see whether she has gone and had a meeting with them?

Mr. JARVIS. I believe she has intent to go there. I do not know, off the top of my head, whether she has actually gone.

Mr. YOUNG. Again, sir, you are head of this department. And to have the attitude that they are doing—they believe it is their park. It is not their park. This is the people's park.

And you know, I get very concerned. By the way, what background check do you run on the people that are hired by the Park Service?

Mr. JARVIS. We run, particularly for our law enforcement employees, we run an extensive background check.

The two individuals that were the principals in the case, one was born in Alaska. And—

Mr. YOUNG. It doesn't make any difference where he was born. Did you run a background check?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. You did. And what did you find on one of those employees that did the arresting?

Mr. JARVIS. I personally not have reviewed that background check.

Mr. YOUNG. Would you believe that you would find out, one has about 20 different charges against him? DUIs, impersonating an officer, and et cetera down the line. Did you know that?

Mr. JARVIS. I did not know that.

Mr. YOUNG. Well, I would suggest your Regional Director start looking into that. And the attitude of pulling a shotgun on Alaskan residents. In fact, what bothers me is, there was a statement by your department that says that you have jurisdiction to stop a boat on the moving water of the Yukon River. Is that correct?

Mr. JARVIS. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. Where did you get that jurisdiction?

Mr. JARVIS. We believe through the creation of the Yukon Charley National Preserve, that—

Mr. YOUNG. That is not what ANILCA says. What does ANILCA say? Section 103[c]: "No lands which before, on, or after December 5 of 1980 are conveyed to the State, to any Native corporation, or any other private party shall be subject to the regulation applicable solely to public lands within those units." That is our water.

And what gives them the authority to pull that boat over?

Mr. JARVIS. Based on our attorneys' advice to us, we do have jurisdiction on the water.

Mr. YOUNG. Now, that is a battle between the State and your department.

Mr. JARVIS. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. You are trying to establish the fact that under ANILCA—I had to fight with your secretary the other day—you don't have that authority. We will win that in court.

But I was told by your Regional Director the Coast Guard gave them the authority to do so, to check a boat. Is that correct?

Mr. JARVIS. I believe we are acting in compliance with, and in partnership with, the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. YOUNG. And the Coast Guard says no. I have talked to the Coast Guard. You don't have that authority, and we are not going to give it to you.

So you are saying they gave it to you, and you took it without asking them?

Mr. JARVIS. I was not involved in that discussion, so I don't really know—

Mr. YOUNG. Well, I would once again go back to your Regional Director. And those people that are doing this. Because you are not getting along in Alaska. And for a long time you were doing a good job. And they have the attitude right now that Alaskans don't count. It is our park.

Now, I am going to go through this again with you. Because either you do something, or I will make sure it is not funded.

Mr. BISHOP. We are going to have another round of questioning. Thank you. Other than that, everything OK? No, I am sorry.

Mr. YOUNG. Don't get me started right now. I am going to move to strike the last words.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BISHOP. I won't do that again. At the suggestion of the Ranking Member, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Director Jarvis. It is great to see you. And I would like to take this opportunity to thank you again for coming to Lowell, Massachusetts as part of our Innovative Cities Conference, in which we really wanted to highlight the very important role the creation of a national park, the impact of that park, on the revitalization of a post-industrial city. So I want to thank you for that.

It is not only the tourism you generate, but the stream of Federal dollars, the impact on further development and investment by the state and local governments, the growth of a nonprofit community, as well as the extraordinary private sector investment that came about, over time, but as a result of that initial step toward creating a national park there. So thank you very much for joining us.

Mr. JARVIS. It was a pleasure.

Ms. TSONGAS. But I wanted to ask you about the recently released America's Great Outdoors report, which highlighted the importance of urban parks and community green spaces. It also established priorities for the initiatives such as creating a new generation of accessible urban parks and community green spaces in connecting people to the parks' green spaces, rivers, and waterways in their communities. And I could not agree more with these priorities.

Since I have come to Massachusetts I have been working on these same issues, and have worked closely with one group in particular, Groundwork Lawrence, which exists in another city that I represent, Lawrence, Massachusetts, to accomplish these goals.

Groundwork Lawrence is part of the Groundwork USA Initiative, which, as you know, was launched by the National Park Service and the EPA in 1996 to transform blighted urban neighborhoods into parks and livable open spaces. And since its creation, Groundwork USA has developed into a network of extremely successful Groundwork Trusts that have a proven record of leveraging modest

amounts of public investment into major private investments. For every one dollar of public funding, Groundwork Trusts have leveraged over \$21 in private funding, the important partnership that can exist between the public and private sectors.

With these investments, the Groundwork Trusts have not only transformed their physical environments, but they have created jobs in communities with high unemployment, and helped to create places hospitable for economic development.

I was so inspired by the impact that Groundwork Lawrence has had in my district—took a small, horrible, ugly site along a modest river that goes through the city into a beautiful public space that young people have become involved in growing vegetables, flowers, and other things, becoming more connected to nature, but also really very important space for the surrounding community—that I introduced legislation last Congress, the Groundwork USA Trust Act of 2010, that would expand upon the existing 19 Groundwork Trusts, and centralize the administration of the program in the National Park Service.

So as you look at the Outdoors Initiative, what is the Park Service doing to support programs such as Groundwork USA that seek to improve our urban landscape? And how will the America's Great Outdoors Initiative take advantage of these types of organizations that are already doing such great work in our communities?

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you, and thank you for your great work in Lowell. We hold that park and that community up as the perfect example of how the National Park Service can strategically invest and leverage the partnerships with organizations, such as Groundwork and others, to really achieve a much, a very vibrant city. And we are very proud of all those partnerships.

The America's Great Outdoors report is the compilation of over 51 listening sessions around the country, and the comments of well over 100,000 individuals, including 21 listening sessions with young people. We specifically held gatherings of young people under 24, into their teens, and they were led and facilitated by young people, on my staff and on the staff of the department, to engage in what their ideas about the future.

And these kinds of organizations, like Groundwork and the Student Conservation Association and the California Conservation Corps and other organizations that engage young people in true restoration work, the development of skills and the development of an appreciation of America's great outdoors, as well as its cultural histories, as well, are at the center, in many ways, of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative.

The AGO report, in sort of broad, a broad umbrella, talks about rivers and riverways, which are integral in so many years, particularly in the East, but I think in the West to a certain degree, we have sort of looked at our rivers more as an industrial asset, rather than a true asset to the social consciousness and the recreational opportunities of communities. So there is a lot of focus on rivers.

There is a lot of focus on urban parks. Urban parks recognize their role in threshold experiences for the public and getting kids for their very first time experiencing in the outdoors. Yet we know that in some communities, kids, there are park-deficient neighborhoods—

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Jarvis, I am going to have to ask you to finish in one simple sentence. You are over time.

Mr. JARVIS. OK. So the bottom line is, the work of AGO is very much supportive of the work of Groundwork.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. I appreciate that. We will have time for other rounds later on.

Mr. JARVIS. OK.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Coffman, the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Jarvis, for your service to our country and being here today.

Director Jarvis, thank you for appearing before this committee today. Over the past few weeks this committee has held budget oversight hearings for a number of agencies housed within the Department of the Interior.

Based on your testimony today, and looking back on information this committee has already heard from, the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and also the U.S. Geological Survey, I am extremely concerned about the budgetary decision-making process, and the lack of coordination between the land management bureaus within the Department of the Interior, as well as other administration agencies and departments.

Finally, I am shocked at the ongoing lack of transparency by this Administration and the Department of the Interior.

An issue that has recently caught my attention is President Obama's Great Outdoors Initiative. It appears from the background information I have read, as well as the written and oral testimony presented to the committee over the last several weeks, this "initiative" is redirecting resources and consuming valuable dollars, when our nation is in the middle of a fiscal crisis.

For example, the USGS budget specifically proposes "an additional \$12 million for the restoration of some of the nation's most iconic ecosystems to support America's Great Outdoors."

The National Park Service budget is full of references to America's Great Outdoors Initiative. Specifically, the first line of your budget summary reads, "The Fiscal Year 2012 budget request reflects the President's commitment to our national parks with an increase of \$276.6 million over the Fiscal Year 2010 enacted levels for part of the Administration's Great Outdoors Initiative."

I could go on and on with examples in your budget that request increases or divert funds based on this initiative. Would you explain to the committee the purpose of the Administration's Great Outdoors Initiative?

I am also interested to learn more about how the initiative was developed. I have read that there were 51 listening sessions, and roughly 105,000 comments were submitted. But what else was involved in the development? Were you or any of your employees in the Park Service involved in the process? In what form was your input? Meetings, how often, written documents, et cetera.

If not, why is the Forest Service budget based on this initiative? If he says—I am sorry. Do you consider this to be a transparent process?

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you, Congressman. America's Great Outdoors Initiative began with the White House and the President working with Secretary Salazar and Secretary Vilsack in tasking us to go talk to the public, go listen to the public; hear what they have to say about this extraordinary legacy that we have in this country of America's great outdoors, the public lands legacy that has been set aside in many ways for the American public to enjoy. All of its benefits, from recreation, from economic development.

But not to go out with any preconceived notion, but to actually listen to the public. And that is exactly what we did. We traveled the country for almost the entire summer, 51 listening sessions, on ranches and in homes, in community centers across—in urban and rural parts of the country.

And all of that information was then analyzed and developed into a set of recommendations that reflect what we heard from the public.

Absolutely, I can't speak for the other Federal agencies in any detail, but I can speak for the National Park Service. We were actively involved. I have employees that work in communities across the country, in many, many rural and urban areas, and they were a participant in that they knew who should be invited. And said come one, come all, and participate in this great process.

I do believe it was quite transparent, and there was no preconceived notion about this, other than a celebration of, and a recognition that the public land estate, and particularly the national parks, are an economic contributor to this country.

Mr. COFFMAN. And what is your, how would you regard your backlog of maintenance in your park areas?

Mr. JARVIS. Backlog maintenance is a serious concern for us, sir. It is currently pegged at about \$10.8 billion. We have an old infrastructure in the National Park System, and it is going to need a lot of investment to fix.

Mr. COFFMAN. So in your budget, is there monies to procure new properties? Or to expand existing properties?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, sir, there is money for the Land and Water Conservation Fund—\$160 million—that would be focused on acquisition of inholdings, inside park boundaries.

Mr. COFFMAN. OK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Holt, for five minutes, give or take.

Mr. HOLT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Director Jarvis. I have been impressed with your dedication to protecting our national parks for future generations. And I always like to quote Teddy Roosevelt, as we do in this business, that there is nothing so American as our national parks. The fundamental idea behind the parks is that the country belongs to the people. I certainly agree.

And whether you live in New Jersey or California or Wyoming or Utah, we should never forget that Yellowstone, Yosemite, Ion, Grand Teton, to name a few, belong to all Americans.

You know, it is where Americans not only connect and commune with nature, and go to recreate and re-create, but also to learn the history and character of America. And the importance to our national sense of purpose, from preserving, presenting and inter-

preting battlefields and other sites, the American Revolution cannot be over-emphasized.

I am pleased to see in your budget increases for programs such as the Youth in the Great Outdoors, and fully funding of the State-side Land and Water Conservation Fund. And I note money toward preserving Civil War battlefield sites.

Some of the Revolutionary War sites are among the most important, and even popular, in the Park System. But many others are yet to be preserved, presented, and interpreted for all Americans.

One way to do these is through the Heritage designation, such as the Crossroads of the American Revolution in New Jersey. Another that I hope we will have soon is through legislation that, such as the Revolution and War of 1812 Battlefield Protection Act, which would have passed in the last Congress but for a parliamentary fluke. So I hope we will get that done.

Over the last several years I have worked with our colleagues here to designate 14 counties in New Jersey as a Crossroads of the American Revolution National Heritage Area, which became official in 2006. I can't over-emphasize the importance of this, not just to New Jersey, but to the whole nation. These are sites that are at great risk of being lost, and whose significance has not been, has yet to be fully interpreted for Americans today.

So with that, I hate to see a 30 percent cut in your historic preservation programs. I think this is so important, as I said, to our national sense of purpose.

And so I realize there are tough choices in front of you, but I ask you please to find a way to do these things that need to be done for the earlier sites.

Let me also, while I have the floor, just in a sentence, say that Sandy Hook needs your attention. This is a jewel in the most densely populated state in the country. Beautiful, natural scenery that is accessible to millions. And so with that, I would ask your comment on what can be done with, in the face of this proposed 30 percent cut in historic preservation.

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you for that question, Congressman. We did try, through the budget process, to identify several programs specific to historic preservation.

And as you indicated, you know, the National Park Service has turned to tell America's story, you know, from the Revolution—from settlement, Revolution, Civil War, the War of 1812, you know, right up through, you know, even our current activities, Flight 93 and the War on Terrorism. You know, World War II, Vietnam, all of those.

And to quote another great American, Gen. Tommy Franks said there is nothing more patriotic than the national parks, because we tell that story. And the Revolutionary War story is essential to it, as well.

We did request a \$1 million increase to our Battlefield Acquisition Grants Program, which is focused broadly on battlefield sites, including Revolutionary War sites. We did up some funding for our State Historic Preservation Officers to help them identify and get protection on these critical resources that are not—

Mr. BISHOP. I am sorry again, Mr. Jarvis. The red light is on. One sentence, do it.

For everyone here, you guys don't have the opportunity of seeing what the time is coming down here. But if you watch the monitor there, we have been going over on every one of those by 30 seconds to 45. I am going to try to cut you off as closely as we can. I apologize for that.

So I will cut off the next speaker, which happens to be the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Tipton, you get that.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, you might ask if it would be possible to put a clock back on the mantelpiece.

Mr. BISHOP. We were just talking about that, and I think it is a good idea. I would also say, though, there will be other rounds of questioning. And also, if you want to submit something as a question in writing, I am sure Director Jarvis, in a very timely manner, would like to respond to it.

Mr. JARVIS. Absolutely.

Mr. BISHOP. The gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thanks, Director Jarvis, for being here. We have a lot of national parks obviously in Colorado.

In my Third Congressional District of Colorado, can you give me an idea of what some of your maintenance backlogs are?

Mr. JARVIS. In those specific parks, or in general?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes, just in general.

Mr. JARVIS. The biggest challenge we have is that over 60 percent of the infrastructure of the national parks were built prior to 1970. You know, we have 68,000 assets in the National Park System, 21,000 buildings, 16,000 miles of road. And you know, they are well used by the American public, and old.

So over the last 10 years we have invested extensively in understanding that, and how we need to invest strategically, particularly in critical systems.

Mr. TIPTON. What is the estimated amount of dollars that you—

Mr. JARVIS. Ten-point-eight billion.

Mr. TIPTON.—need to—pardon me?

Mr. JARVIS. The total deferred maintenance is \$10.8 billion.

Mr. TIPTON. Ten-point-eight billion dollars. And that brings me really to my next question. I see that you have a line item for \$168 million, which is kind of a pimple on \$10 billion. But \$168 million to acquire new lands.

And I am kind of curious, in terms of your opening statement, you were talking about the prioritization process that you went through. When we have that big of a backlog in terms of deferred maintenance, why are we stripping off \$168 million in valuable resources now to acquire new lands?

Mr. JARVIS. The Administration set the priority to go for full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund at \$900 million. That is money that is generated from the revenues of Outer Continental Shelf oil leasing that comes back to the Treasury.

And in many ways it is different money than that which is used for our deferred maintenance program, which is the more operational side of the house. It is a trade-off, there is no question about that.

Mr. TIPTON. Did the Administration ask for your input on that? Because in these tough economic times, we really do need to prioritize. And expanding the scope of the Park Service—I happen to be a big supporter of our public lands, as I believe everyone on this committee is. But we have some constraints right now.

So did they seek your input? And was that your guidance to the Administration, to acquire more lands, rather than to correct some of the problems that we have under current holdings?

Mr. JARVIS. Absolutely they did seek my input, and I did make a strong case that our deferred maintenance is a concern. We need to be investing on an annual basis on bringing that deferred maintenance down, particularly in the critical systems.

Mr. TIPTON. All right. Well, I guess I didn't understand that. You did stand up and say that you were pushing for the deferred maintenance over acquiring new lands? Is that accurate?

Mr. JARVIS. I pushed for an appropriate balance between those two.

Mr. TIPTON. OK. Have you run any sort of a cost benefit analysis? Because I get a little worried in terms of duplicative government, where we have redundancies. And we have the EPA out now looking at climate change, and impacts that are going to be there. And now we are again taking very precious resources right now, in terms of many of the treasures that we have here in our country, trying to be able to protect them all across. Mine happens to be some of the oldest in the United States, with Mesa Verde National Park.

But we are stripping off some of those resources, getting a redundant program. Do you have any statistical analysis? Have you done any cost benefit analysis in terms of the use of those dollars? Or should we maybe be letting another agency do that, and we get back to repairing the roads that need repaired?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, in the case of the National Park Service in terms of the amount of money we are requesting, I don't think that is duplicative of any other program. Ours is very site-specific.

What we are working on is looking at the impacts directly on the ground, within our national parks, that are a concern to us. Such as, you know, the change in and rain on snow in the fall, which causes extreme damage to visitor facilities in some of our parks.

Mr. TIPTON. OK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time. Thanks.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, I appreciate that. The Chair will recognize for five minutes the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. Sutton.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Jarvis, for being here today. The work of the national parks is invaluable to our nation, and I thank you for your service.

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you.

Ms. SUTTON. As you may be aware, the Cuyahoga Valley National Park sits in my district. And it is the only national park in Ohio. Not only is it a critical economic asset to our district, it also brings together corporations, individuals, and philanthropic groups toward a common goal of preserving our natural assets.

I want to just, at the outset, say in terms of land acquisition, this park is a good example of why an appropriate balance of those funds is necessary.

The Cuyahoga Valley National Park is not situated in the same way as many of our bigger national parks is. The borders of the park are two large metropolitan areas and countless smaller communities, and it is a rare gem in the middle of what people think of sometimes as a very industrialized area.

But because of the proximity to several major cities, there are also some very special opportunities that exist, that would not otherwise be there without that park. Countless children from the area have been able to experience youth education programs through the park's Environmental Education Program.

And I know that you, Mr. Jarvis, have been a champion of youth education and involvement in the national parks, and I want to compliment you on raising the profile of those important programs.

Could you just discuss for a moment—as I said, I want to just highlight the significance of this park as an economic engine for our area that has literally kept many small businesses afloat during these economic times that surround the park. But also, if you could just speak to the budget for the National Park Service in terms of the youth education programs, because I think that is another area of extreme significance for our park in particular.

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you so much, and thank you for all your support at Cuyahoga. It is an exemplar for us on how a park with proximity to urban environments can really, really shine. And John Divo, and now Stan Austin there, I think are doing excellent jobs with that.

In particular with the focus on youth, I am going to have my budget person pull up exactly what we are spending on planning for youth programs. And there is a significant investment in this budget for youth employment, youth engagement across the system, through partners.

I think that the key to the future of youth engagement is definitely through these partners. Groundwork is a perfect example. The Boy Scouts, the YCC, all of those kinds of things. So I will get back to you with the total figure here, because there is a whole laundry list of a variety of things here.

But it is around \$15.3 million service-wide for youth programs this year. Some of them are going to be quite innovative. So I would love to come talk to you about those in detail.

Ms. SUTTON. Thank you, I appreciate that. And I do think it is important, when we think of the national parks, to think that this national park, as I say, in a very industrialized, at least some people consider a very industrialized area, is, I believe last year was the sixth most visited national park in the country.

So it is not what people traditionally necessarily think of when they think of the national parks, but such an important, important jump for us.

In 2008, Congress directed the National Park Service to conduct evaluations of the nine National Heritage Areas, including the Ohio and Erie Canal, which of course runs through the 13th District, and throughout Ohio, with the goal of having those evaluations completed in three years, before the 2012 deadline.

To date, it is my understanding that only three of the nine National Heritage Area evaluations have been completed. So what is the status of those evaluations, in light of the looming deadline?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, I recently met with the Alliance of Heritage Areas to discuss that specifically, because some of them are very concerned about the sunset dates. I will have to get back to you on the full status of that, be glad to provide that to your office.

As we have been doing these evaluations, we are learning, you know, there is, some of the Heritage Areas have been very, very successful, and are quite sophisticated in raising private philanthropic, as well as leveraging our investment. Some not so.

And so what we are looking to do is learn as we go along with each one of these, so that we can assist the newer Heritage Areas in being successful.

Ms. SUTTON. I look forward to working with you. I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I recognize the gentlewoman from South Dakota for five minutes.

Ms. NOEM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Director Jarvis, for being here today, and for testifying before the Subcommittee.

My home State of South Dakota is home to Mt. Rushmore National Memorial and Wind Cave National Park, and the Badlands National Park, as well. We are proud to host almost three million visitors to our state every year, from across the United States and across the world. It is an honor to be from a state that hosts what has become an international symbol of American democracy and freedom.

Many of my colleagues here today can attest to the benefit that these national parks, monuments, historic sites, and other lands in the National Park System have on our areas' economic prosperity.

It is also important to preserve these areas that are important to our nation, as well as the local communities around them. I am happy to be a part of this Subcommittee, and the opportunity to talk to you about that.

And I want to specifically discuss with you Mt. Rushmore, because it has some unique challenges in front of it. It includes around 1200 acres of forest, along which, within Black Hills National Forest, they are struggling to fight the pine beetles that are killing our trees.

Because of this and the potential fire hazard, Mt. Rushmore has had to make many changes. They have had to cancel their annual fireworks display, which is a big advantage for us in promoting our tourism, not just on the national level, but on the international level. And it has been very detrimental to our state and to our country.

What is the National Parks plan to address the pine beetle problem? I have met with the superintendent of that park specifically, and she indicates and they indicate that they have a real problem with funding and with resources.

So I would like to ask you, is there adequate funding to address the pine beetle issue on Mt. Rushmore? Because it does impact not only Mt. Rushmore, but will impact our entire Black Hills region, the community, the economics of the area, and our entire state. So what signs of progress have you seen, and what requests have you made on their behalf?

Mr. JARVIS. We have made specifically a request in the 2012 budget for control of the mountain pine beetle, in coordination with

the U.S. Forest Service, where most commonly we are adjacent to. And it really is a problem, and it has to be addressed for Mt. Rushmore, Black Canyon, Grand Teton, Rocky Mountain, and a few others where the mountain pine beetle infestation has really created a particularly problematic situation, with large fuel accumulations.

We have to be very targeted in that use of those kinds of funds, to focus on areas of greatest risk: the wildlife-urban interfaces, the places where we have investment risk, or the public's risk. This is such a broad problem across the West that we have to be very specific.

And frankly, there is not enough funding to take it all on, so we have to be very strategic in that. But we are working very closely with the U.S. Forest Service, particularly at Mt. Rushmore.

Ms. NOEM. Can you tell me where Mt. Rushmore might be on that priority list?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, it is part of our funding for the 2012 program, specifically for pest management in that area.

Ms. NOEM. OK. So in regards to that, then, the Administration has proposed over \$160 million for land acquisition. So while the current lands are struggling with issues like the pine beetle situation at Mt. Rushmore, it seems that it would be wise to make sure that our current lands are taken care of and maintenance is taken care of, before we try to acquire more.

I know you have talked about striking a balance. But in the meantime, if we are not maintaining and taking care of the lands we currently have, what is your feelings on that in regards to acquiring more that we may not have the resources to care for, as well?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, the National Park Service, the Land Acquisition Program focuses on lands that are inside park boundaries. And so actually there is an efficiency to be gained through consolidation of land holdings.

So in many ways it is an efficiency effort, to acquire these inholdings, from willing sellers, to provide—and the net effect really doesn't affect us very significantly in terms of operational increases as that.

So I do think there needs to be always an appropriate balance between some land acquisition and a focus on our core responsibilities of operations.

Ms. NOEM. OK. So it is your understanding that the land that the United States would consider acquiring would all be land that is currently within or surrounded by national—

Mr. JARVIS. That is correct.

Ms. NOEM. OK.

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, that is correct.

Ms. NOEM. Thank you for the clarification. I appreciate that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP. I would like to recognize the gentleman, the Ranking Member, at this time, for five minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Director Jarvis, the question I have been asking your colleagues from the other services. A government shutdown. How would that impact the National Park Service? And the discussions we have been having today about needs and acquisitions and budget priorities.

Mr. JARVIS. In anticipation of the potential for a budgetary shutdown for Fiscal Year 2011, we have run analyses on our national parks to look at essential personnel necessary to protect critical resources and to keep critical systems in place.

But if we were to go to a full shutdown, then the units of the National Park Service would be essentially closed to public use.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me ask another question, and it has to do, again, it is a fiscal question. It is a reimbursement question.

On the border, border protection being a critical issue, your interface with Homeland Security and that. And as the law enforcement portion of the service continues to expand, and we are dealing with places like Oregon Pipe and Big Bend and other places, you are dealing with more issues relative to security, supplanting in some cases, and supplementing in other cases, the efforts of Homeland Security and their law enforcement activities.

And there is a cost attendant to that. Because I believe you are taking that law enforcement function from visitor issues, from resource protection, into the very critical work that is being done on the border on overall security.

Homeland Security is one of those exempt departments in terms of budget cuts. Is there any reimbursement from Homeland Security for the fact that Park Service, through its law enforcement arm primarily, is supplanting in some instances, and supplementing very strongly those law enforcement efforts along the border?

Mr. JARVIS. No, sir, there is no reimbursement for the operational responsibilities that we have developed along the border.

We have increased our law enforcement numbers, over 100 rangers, law enforcement rangers, particularly in the Tucson sector where Oregon Pipe, Tohono Odom, Cabeza Prieta areas are, to provide basically additional support to the challenges along the U.S.-Mexico border.

The National Park Service Rangers bring a unique set of skills to that, that do augment the responsibilities of Homeland Security. And we have a very good working collaborative relationship down there.

Mr. GRIJALVA. And I don't know how you can extrapolate that, but if at all possible, if you could provide the committee with those costs.

Mr. JARVIS. Certainly.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I think that is something that I have asked in the past about pursuing. Because, in discussing with your staff in those parks, they have to divert from visitor services, from resource management, from resource protection, to supplementing what Homeland Security is doing on the border. And I am just curious as to cost; and if at all possible, I would appreciate that very much.

Mr. JARVIS. We would be glad to develop that analysis and provide that to your office.

Mr. GRIJALVA. And one other question. The process that is going on right now in terms of the four options being presented around Grand Canyon National Park, which would be used to determine what withdrawal of lands around the park would occur. When does that public comment period close? And how soon after that closure do we anticipate a decision on the part of the Park Service and the Secretary?

Mr. JARVIS. Let me just check in terms of the, when that—I don't remember off the top of my head in terms of the Grand Canyon uranium withdrawal.

We have a draft environmental impact statement in play right now, which was released, let us see—yes, the DEIS comments are due June 20. Is that correct? Yes, I think that is over flights. That didn't sound right.

I will have to get back to you on the exact date. But we have a DEIS that was put out in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management. We are in the process of getting public comment as we speak. And I will get back to you on the date that that is due.

Mr. GRIJALVA. OK. And just some cursory indication of what the participation has been up to this point, prior to the closing. I will yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. The Ranking Member gave a great question as far as the cost. My office would like to have those numbers, as well as his, at the same time.

I, too, have not gone first round, but Mr. Young has a medical appointment at 11. Is it all right if I allow him to go? And then Mr. Duncan, you will be the next one after that.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Jarvis, I will get back to the same subject I was talking about. Where the stated purpose of approaching boats by the Park Service on the Yukon River is to conduct boat safety checks, and to check for the State of Alaska boating registration, did the State of Alaska give you this authority, or ask you to enforce their boater registration requirements?

Mr. JARVIS. I am unsure of that. I will find out.

Mr. YOUNG. Well, the answer is no, the state did not do that. But nevertheless, you have charged Mr. Wyler for violating state boater registration laws. I mean, this is a rotten thing you are doing up there. I mean, there is no justification for that. You don't have the authority, they didn't have the authority. And yet you are charging Mr. Wyler for boat registration. That is a state law, not yours.

So again, get into the bottom of this, and check that superintendent of yours out. Because I am going to hound you until something is done up there. I just want you to know.

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, sir. I kind of expect that. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Duncan, as usual, I lied. Mr. Garamendi from California has entered here; it is his turn next. And then I promise.

The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Jarvis, it is a pleasure to see you once again.

Mr. JARVIS. Great to see you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I think the last time I saw you, you had not yet assumed this position.

Mr. JARVIS. That is correct.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We know you have your tasks, whether it is boat registration or not. Nonetheless, enforcing the laws and protecting the resources of our national parks is your task. And I suppose if somebody is inappropriately operating in a national park, you should be, and your superintendent should be paying attention to that.

I am concerned about your budget. As near as I can remember, for the last 30 or 40 years, you have never had enough money to

maintain the national parks to their best standard. You have asked for some more money on maintenance. Could you, you may have already gone through this; if you have, just say yes, I have gone through it already, and sorry you weren't here earlier, Congressman.

But if you have not, could you please just talk a little bit about the maintenance and the deferred maintenance and the like?

Mr. JARVIS. We have asked, in the 2012 request, for an increase of \$7 million in our Cyclic Maintenance Program. And we have also asked for an increase of \$35 million or so for operations at 100 parks, some of which would be applied to deferred maintenance.

There are other decreases in some of our capital accounts, such as line item, which would have an impact on, or basically give us a reduced ability to address deferred maintenance.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So how far behind will we be, 30 or 40 years behind in all of this?

Mr. JARVIS. At this rate, we could be very far behind. Our current deferred maintenance is at \$10.8 billion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So the longer we go, the more behind we get.

Mr. JARVIS. It grows at about 2 percent per year.

Mr. GARAMENDI. My recollection, when I was involved in this more deeply as Deputy Secretary, this was a very, very severe problem. Not only a problem of critical national assets being lost to decay, but also safety issues. I assume that that is still the same situation?

Mr. JARVIS. I think in the ensuing years, we have invested significantly in a better understanding and prioritizing what resources we do have on critical systems, particularly those that are concerns for safety, for water quality, those kinds of things.

So the large number of \$10.8 billion is the total. But in reality, the critical systems—life, health, safety, those kinds of things—are more in the \$3 billion category.

And so with the resources we have, which is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$350 million a year, we are investing predominantly in those critical systems. So I think we are making some headway in those areas, but on the big number, no.

Mr. GARAMENDI. OK. A final is that in the past, and I think this is continuing, on those icon parks, reaching out and finding private support to be joined with public support, how is that going?

Mr. JARVIS. For the big parks, the big iconic parks like Yosemite, Yellowstone, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Rocky Mountain and others, we have excellent philanthropic partnerships, friends, organizations that have been quite successful at raising funds for them.

On the broader scale, we have the National Park Foundation, the legislatively created philanthropic partner, which I believe is on a very good path now to increase the philanthropic and private sector support for our parks.

Mr. GARAMENDI. A final point, just a point here. I did serve on the National Parks Foundation, and I am delighted to see it has been significantly augmented and more robust.

We will have to rely upon private philanthropy more—well, we have to continue that. And urge, all of us, wherever we may be, we care about our own personal park. We ought to look at the philan-

throply and assist in that. And the National Park Foundation is a pretty good way to do it.

Thank you very much, Mr. Jarvis. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the time.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. Now to the very patient and long-suffering gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Duncan.

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I don't have any questions, but I do want to make a few comments.

First of all, 394 units, 84 million acres, 22,000 employees; that should be enough to satisfy almost anyone. But it has become clear to me over the many years that I have served in this position, that you can never satisfy government's appetite for money or land. It is just impossible. They always want more.

And yet, this is my 23rd year on this Subcommittee. And I remember hearing when the maintenance backlog was \$4 billion, and then \$6 billion, and then \$9 billion. And now today, \$10.8 billion. And I believe that over the years, the Park Service has hired far too many chiefs and not enough Indians, far too many Master's degree and PhD and experts and researchers and law enforcement people and historians and press people and so forth, when we probably should be hiring a lot more simple, but important, laboring maintenance people, if the backlog is to that extent.

But I know, too, that all the politicians love to create parks. And we have created so many state and local parks across this country, and national parks, we have so many parks now that we can't get the use out of them unless our people somehow figure out a way to go on permanent vacations.

And frankly, a few years ago, even as recently as five or 10 years ago, if I had said we were going to be facing deficits of \$223 billion in one month, as came out day before yesterday, people would have thought that was ridiculous. And yet I know, too, I know that many people still care more about what is on television. But all the people who really follow, all the millions who follow government and politics, they are not just concerned now; many of them are absolutely scared about the future of this country, and the financial condition of the Federal government.

And I know from what I have read in the past and from hearings, that many of these national park units have very few visitors. They are not all Great Smoky Mountain National Parks, or Yellowstone, or Yosemite. And many of these parks would more appropriately be state, should more appropriately be state or local parks. As bad a shape as the states are in or the local governments, none of them are in as bad a shape financially as is the Federal government, with our \$14.3 trillion national debt.

And finally, I will just say that I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Holt. But I have heard probably at least 100 or more times in this committee about Teddy Roosevelt, as if an implication is Republicans should be ashamed they were not all wanting to create new national parks.

And yet, the comparison is ridiculous. Because the Federal government was not nearly as big when Teddy Roosevelt was around. It didn't have nearly anywhere close to as many parks. It was not \$14.3 trillion in debt. The situation is totally, completely different.

And so it is just, that is a comparison that shouldn't be made at all, because it is almost meaningless.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee. The gentleman from Maryland, you came in at the appropriate time. You have five minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director Jarvis, thanks for being here. We missed you last week. As you know, we had the ribbon-cutting for the new visitor center at Fort McHenry, which is sort of the unofficial kickoff of the bicentennial celebration, which is coming up. And I will apologize to my colleagues here in advance, I will be talking about it all the time over the next couple years. Just so you are ready for this celebration. We are really looking forward to that in Maryland, having the eyes in the Nation and the world upon us as we celebrate that 200th anniversary of the War of 1812, the penning of our National Anthem, and all of the attendant historic events.

I did just want to ask you to speak briefly to sort of how the Park Service is getting ready for this, and the support that I know will be forthcoming. The attention not just to Fort McHenry, but also to the Star-Spangled Banner National Historic Trail. Which is actually going to be the, the Star-Spangled Banner Trail will actually be kind of the continuing legacy after the grand celebration of the bicentennial.

So I am interested both in terms of how the Park Service is preparing for the bicentennial, as well as its attention to the National Historic Trail.

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you, Congressman. And thank you for your very strong support up there. I am sorry I missed the grand opening. I was up there before it was opened; I plan to go back.

We have in the Fiscal Year 2012 budget a request for \$5 million for our 1812 parks, that can invest in the outreach, exhibits, public information, program, to celebrate the bicentennial of the War of 1812.

Dennis Reidenbach, who is the Regional Director for the Northeast, is leading this effort. And he has got a group around him of educators, park superintendents, and others that are developing this whole plan for the recognition celebration commemoration of the War of 1812.

Mr. SARBANES. I appreciate that. I don't know where the approval or authority came from, but I want to thank you and the Park Service for making my father an honorary park ranger last week. He has only taken the hat off twice I think in the last week, since he put it on.

I did want to, before my time ran out, I did want to pick up a little bit on the theme of my colleague in terms of the use of national parks. As you know, I think I have been a strong proponent of legislation which we call No Child Left Inside, which is an attempt to promote outdoor education and engagement by our youth in the outdoors, in a more integrated way, with instructional programming across the country.

And I would like you to speak to the fact, I assume this will be your perspective, that our national parks, potentially some that may be viewed by others as under-utilized, hold great promise for

that kind of a partnership with our youth and with students, going forward. And how is the Park Service focusing on those opportunities?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, I very much support the initiative. For the seven years prior to coming on as the director, I was the national co-chair of the Federal No Child Left Inside Task Force. I co-chaired with California State Park Director Ruth Coleman to coordinate our state and Federal efforts around No Child Left Inside.

We believe this program has enormous potential. And we see all kinds of positive benefits for children when they are exposed to the outdoors, in terms of it can be life-changing.

So in this 2012 budget, we have a number of programs that focus on this, including the Let's Move Outside Initiative of the First Lady, which was really originated with an initiative from the National Park Service.

So we have now over 50 parks actively involved in Let's Move Outside, as a part of this program. So I think there is a huge potential for the National Park Service to be a significant leader in this.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RIVERA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you so much for being here today. I am honored to represent two national parks in my district: the Big Cypress National Preserve, and the Everglades National Park. I am just a short distance from a third, the Biscayne National Park, and very close to a fourth, the Dry Tortugas National Park.

Last December, the State of Florida conveyed to the Federal government over 29,000 acres of state-owned land located adjacent to the Big Cypress Preserve, called the Additional Lands. We Floridians have a special place for Big Cypress National Preserve. We appreciate the mix of landscapes, from marshes and cypress swamps to its prairies and pinelands. We appreciate the rich wildlife, such as the colorful wading birds, the majestic Florida panther and, of course, our gators, which are deeply rooted in our appreciation of these national treasures.

Along with the Everglades, they are unique. And we share the goals of preserving these beautiful and historic areas.

However, we also believe that this must be done in a way that allows responsible, traditional access. I recently visited with the Big Cypress National Preserve Superintendent, Pedro Ramos. And I commend him for the great work he is doing. And also, for that matter, Superintendent Dan Kimball of the Everglades National Park, for their management plans. They deserve much of the credit for the work being done, to go through some difficult issues, and we are fortunate to have their leadership.

However, I am concerned regarding the proposed Wilderness and Primitive Back-Country Management Zone Designations in Big Cypress, and how these designations may hinder land management and public access.

Back-country recreation would allow for traditional uses, such as hunting, fishing, and associated vehicular access, which was speci-

fied by Congress when authorizing the addition to the existing preserve.

So I am wondering, why can't the additional lands to the Big Cypress National Preserve be designated precisely as back-country recreation, instead of wilderness? And back-country primitive, and Congress intended and Floridians were promised?

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you, Congressman. I, too, have been down to visit the folks at Big Cypress specifically on this issue, and spent time with Superintendent Ramos to discuss this.

As you well know, Big Cypress is a complicated, and often controversial, place. And I believe that they worked through an arduous public process that took almost 10 years to get to a point where there is an appropriate balance. The final EIS and record of decision designated over 130 miles ORV trails, plus additional trails; and reduced their original proposal for wilderness designation down to just about 50,000 acres, from original potential of 120,000 acres.

And by the way, we are being sued by the environmental community on that decision, that we did not make enough wilderness. We just had two lawsuits filed in the last week on this decision, that we were not, that we allowed too much OHV use.

So we think that we have struck the appropriate balance of providing great access to this extraordinary resource, while at the same time conserving some portion of it.

Mr. RIVERA. Well, I strongly urge the service to reconsider the designation as we go forward.

I also appreciate your proposed investment of nearly \$10 million to continue funding Everglades restoration and research, as well as your proposed operations increase of half a million dollars for Everglades National Park. Restoring the Everglades is important for providing drinking water for millions of Floridians, for numerous tourism and recreational opportunities, and on-the-ground jobs that put people to work now.

I recently observed firsthand one of these restoration effort projects, the building of the Tamiami Trail Bridge, to facilitate water flow. And we also learned from a recent economic study that Everglades restoration generates four dollars for every one dollar of investment.

So could you please explain how these funds would not just help the Everglades ecosystem and the wildlife within it, but how they help people and the surrounding community? And why we should make these investments.

Mr. JARVIS. The work on the Tamiami Trail is the first step toward, we hope, more of that. The Tamiami Trail will be raised so that water flows can pass through.

Our economists give us very strong data that every dollar that goes locally into that community, through the National Park Service, results in four dollars to return to that local economy, in terms of tourism, food sales, hotels, construction workers. All of that is a direct benefit to that part of the world. And we have much more detailed economic data that I would be glad to share with you on that, how that works.

Mr. RIVERA. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. The gentleman from Michigan has joined us. Mr. Kildee, you are recognized.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much. I apologize for being late; I had another hearing.

I do want to commend the Park Service for the wonderful parks we have in Michigan, and the maintenance of them. We all would like having it a little better, of course; but with the economy being what it is, I think you have—Isle Royale is just a gem. Isle Royale became part of the United States only because Benjamin Franklin, when he was in Paris, felt it was probably filled with copper, and put the boundary line up a little higher, so Isle Royale would become part of the United States rather than Canada.

And the Sleeping Bear Dunes, Phil Hart, who was my inspiration of getting into politics many years ago, Phil Hart was the father of that. And I appreciate the care with which you give those and the other responsibilities you have in the State of Michigan.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I appreciate that. Thank you, sir. Let me finish off this first round with a couple questions of my own. I have a whole lot here.

Let me follow up on an area that Mr. Tipton started with you, if I could. I realize that one of the big priorities for you has been expanding this climate change program within the National Park System.

It is somewhat seen as duplicative, since we have overlapping agencies that do the same thing with EPA: USGS, and the list goes on and on.

Can I ask how much you plan to spend in this fiscal year on climate change programs?

Mr. JARVIS. About \$10 million.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. With that, though, we have also heard from people within the Park Service that there is, in this effort, no actual work product or results that can be shown from diverting this \$10 million from infrastructure needs at the park level.

How will it be possible to judge the effectiveness of this \$10 million spent in this area? What is the work product levels for which you are seeking?

Mr. JARVIS. I can give you some specific examples, Chairman. For instance, based on some of our climate change models, we expect sea level to rise. The National Park Service manages a lot of coastline in this country, and we have critical resources along those coastlines. Let us say archaeological sites.

Mr. BISHOP. I don't want anecdotal evidence. Give me the standards you are looking for. So sea level rising?

Mr. JARVIS. No. The standard is vulnerability assessment. We want to assess the vulnerability of critical resources from let us say sea level rise. So by doing—the difference that we do in the National Park Service is, we are very place-based. We are not theoretical. We are looking right down on the ground, to say, you know, if the sea level rises, you know, one foot in the next 50 years, then what resources are at risk.

Mr. BISHOP. All right, but once again, the question that is coming from people within your department is how do we know we have actually done something. So I am asking what standard will be

used to judge that we actually have had a work product produced by this money.

Mr. JARVIS. We are developing what we call vulnerability assessments for all of our national—

Mr. BISHOP. When will you have that finalized, and can share it with this committee?

Mr. JARVIS. I don't have a timeline on completion of that, but I would be glad to get back to you on that. I just don't have that in front of me.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. We would ask for that, in a timely fashion.

I have about half my time left. Let me go to one other element that also deals with climate change, and then I will go to some other areas on the other rounds, which I have.

You have said if there is any silver lining, climate change is forcing us to think and act at the landscape scale, words I don't like to hear. "No longer can we think of parks as islands. We have to be planning mitigation corridors so species can migrate northward."

I am concerned that there is a mindset within the NPS that believes that the mission should take you outside of the boundaries of the National Park Service, as well. So I want you to tell me how you envision managing a landscape scale when you run up against impediments like simple things like private property, or state lands? Do you actually believe your management scale should go outside the natural boundaries of National Park Service property?

Mr. JARVIS. I don't believe the National Park Service's responsibilities are outside of our boundaries, but I do believe that the Federal and state responsibilities, in aggregate, need to look at the landscape scale. Everything that we hear and read about climate change says that species that normally migrate need corridors to migrate, and they need some way to move across certain landscapes.

Mr. BISHOP. So you have said, though, as far as the Park Service, you are not looking outside the actual boundaries of the Park Service.

Mr. JARVIS. Not for our—we are looking to participate in those sort of large-landscapes discussions, but not to move outside of our park boundaries, no.

Mr. BISHOP. In other agencies that have played around in the areas, like pest control, wildfire management, BLM, Forest Service, the others, they have a record that I think is equivalent to yours, but not necessarily worse than yours. Do you have a record of better management in these particular areas than any other agency, which you could name?

Mr. JARVIS. I am sorry, sir, I don't quite understand the question.

Mr. BISHOP. Are you better at managing these resources than your fellow Federal agencies are at managing these resources? Like forest health, pest control.

Mr. JARVIS. No. But I think these issues, like forest health, are an issue that does cross landscapes, as we talked about with Mt. Rushmore. We are adjacent to Forest Service. And if we are going to treat mountain pine beetle, we have to do it together.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. I have other questions, but I have nine seconds left, so I will go to the second round.

Ms. TSONGAS from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Thank you. I have a question. I know you know that I represent, as well as Lowell National Historical Park, Minuteman National Historical Park. And as you have had the discussion around sort of the balance between purchasing inholdings versus deferred maintenance, I know that is a struggle.

But just to give you an example of one of those inholdings which I have talked about, and probably will talk about ad nauseam, is Barrett's Farm. And I know that that is one of those purchases that would take place with a fully funded Land and Water Conservation Fund. So I thank you for that; it is an important piece of American history.

But Minuteman National Park is visited by more than one million people each year. It preserves for future generations the important sites, including, hopefully, Barrett's Farm, associated with the opening battle of the American Revolution, a battle that we all know led to the founding of our country.

And visitors are able to experience the sights, sounds, and spirit of the landscape on which the Revolutionary militia men first fought for our nation's independence. Preserving the soundscapes of the park is critical to achieving this goal, when you think of the quiet place that this great drama and important element of our history unfolded.

Nearby Hanscom Field Airport recently announced plans to double the private jet infrastructure at the airport. These plans represent a direct threat to the historically and environmentally significant areas adjacent to the airport from increased jet aviation and the resulting noise and air pollution. Due to the severity of this threat, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has designated the surrounding area as one of the 11 most endangered historic places in America.

In 2001, President Clinton established a Federal interagency working group, composed of representatives in the National Park Service, Department of Transportation, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to "promote the long-term protection of resources of the Minuteman National Historical Park and other historic sites in the vicinity of Hanscom Field."

Unfortunately, this effort did not make progress because, among other reasons, it was created immediately prior to a change in administrations.

This past year, a collection of historians and activists, including David McCullough, Ken Burns, Doris Kearns-Goodwin, and Douglas Brinkley, have advocated for reconvening the Federal Interagency Working Group to address threats to the park.

Understanding the ongoing concerns the expansion of the airfield poses to the park, while also appreciating the need for the role economic development plays in the health of our economy, do you think it would be helpful to seek to reconvene a group similar to the Federal Interagency Working Group established by President Clinton, that would help make progress in supporting economic development without adversely impacting the surrounding national treasures?

Mr. JARVIS. I am not familiar with that specific work group, but I do know that we have a Federal interagency work group with FAA that addresses impacts from, you know, potential development of new routes or overflights. And it may be appropriate that we address it within that, but in this case it may be more, you know, at this sort of site-specific level, it might be advantageous to do that.

But let me look into that and see whether or not the broader interagency work group with FAA that we are currently working with has looked into this specific one.

We have a very good working relationship with FAA in terms of the discussions around everything from, you know, route alignment to approach alignment to, you know, and in the cases of the parks themselves, you know, reduced-noise aircraft, all kinds of things, to help reduce those kinds of impacts.

So let me follow up with you on that.

Ms. TSONGAS. That would be great, thank you. I think the fear is that it will be a death by 1,000 cuts, that without a process that is sort of in place to deal with the need to address the expansion, the expansion efforts at Hanscom, while also protecting the natural landscape around which sound is actually very important for visitors to experience that moment in history.

So I look forward to working with you.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Holt.

Mr. HOLT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am sorry our colleague from Tennessee, my good friend Mr. Duncan, had to leave. Because I think he was too quick to take offense, or take as a challenge, my quotation from Theodore Roosevelt.

The point I was making was not that he was a Republican or a Democrat or a Bull Moose, but that there is nothing so American as our national parks. The fundamental idea behind the parks is that the country belongs to the people. It is something that, you know, I think was highlighted in the public broadcast of the parks last year. It is something we mustn't forget.

On the general question that Mr. Duncan and others had about acquiring land at tough times, I guess I would ask whether 1940 was a time that we faced financial stringencies, economic stringencies here in the United States; and that we could not possibly have afforded to preserve the Great Smoky National Park, in what is now Mr. Duncan's district. It was unaffordable. We certainly should not have done that, I suppose, now, I think, still the most-visited national park in the system.

Let me ask whether the money that you propose to spend on land acquisition, you said it will bring some efficiencies by acquiring some inholdings. Will it also be preserving things that might otherwise be lost?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLT. OK, thank you. Furthermore, let me comment on a visit that I had to the park that one day will be known as the park formerly known as Glacier National Park, where I had a great lesson in the effects of climate change.

It seems to me the money that is spent there recognizing, cataloguing, documenting the climatic changes is very valuable work. And I think you had mentioned looking at what might happen to

seashores. But I think you would agree that looking at what happens to glaciers is also important to be documented, and important work of the Park Service.

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, Congressman, Glacier National Park in many ways is the poster child for us for climate change. The disappearance of the glaciers in Glacier National Park is of a deep concern. Besides their being the namesake, they are what cool the streams through the summer, and are the lifeblood of the resident trout populations, which are important for recreational fishery and the center of the ecosystem there.

Mr. HOLT. And not only cool the streams, but actually provide a stream flow that lasts all year long—

Mr. JARVIS. That is right.

Mr. HOLT.—rather than drying up in the summer. Let me ask a completely separate question.

The Delaware River is part of the Scenic River National Scenic River System. I am wondering whether you, whether someone from the Park Service is taking part in interagency discussions of the effect on the water quality of drilling and mining activities, in particular fracking, hydraulic fracturing, in the Delaware River watershed.

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLT. You may not have primary responsibility for drilling, I understand. But are you taking part in interagency discussions of this?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes, sir. We are participating actively in the interagency work, looking at the Marcellus Shale and the fracking proposals in the Pennsylvania-Ohio regions for the development of these gas resources. Absolutely, we are participating. And with concerns for protecting water quality, in particular.

Mr. HOLT. Thank you. And if I had time, I would ask you to discuss your plans for the National Mall, America's front yard and back yard. But I do not, so I hope maybe you can supply more information to us for the record.

Mr. JARVIS. Yes.

Mr. HOLT. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I will be brief. Mr. Holt covered the climate issues; there are numerous ones, that he basically spoke to a few.

The one other thing I would like to comment on, and just say yes or no. My recollection is in recent decades, every national park originated with a piece of legislation put forward by some Member of Congress or Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. JARVIS. That is correct. With the exception that some national monuments are created under the Antiquities Act by the President.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you. So with regard to the growth of the national parks, if we are concerned about that, we might look to ourselves.

The other question that I have really deals with the issue of the role of national parks. You have an organic law that basically sets out the general purposes. But often each unit has a specific law that sets out its purpose.

Mr. JARVIS. Correct.

Mr. GARAMENDI. So with regard to comparing a national park unit to U.S. Forest Service and their role, or to the Bureau of Land Management and their role, it really doesn't compare.

For example, in Yosemite timber is not managed at all. It is natural. Whatever there is, when fires occur, they occur. With the protection of assets, keeping that in mind. And sometimes they are put out, and sometimes they are not.

So it is just completely different, and the comparison just doesn't work, Mr. Chairman. And we may question whether, in a particular unit, if the national parks, the management plan is appropriate. And there are certainly questions in most national parks about that. But to compare the national parks to other Federal assets is a comparison that is not really useful.

And there are plenty of questions that I have raised, and I am sure others have raised, about a particular unit's management. And we have numerous examples about that. We can talk about the management at the Golden Gate National Recreation Area with regard to oysters, for example. And it is appropriate for us to question those.

Mr. Jarvis, thank you for being here. Mr. Chairman, thank you for what is an extremely important and fascinating committee. I am delighted to be on it, and look forward to working with you and the other Members.

One of our great assets are our national parks, and they are a delightful addition to America's history and culture and heritage. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Kildee from Michigan, do you have another round?

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. About three years ago I had the joyful opportunity of visiting the home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, along with Eleanor Roosevelt's home.

I was deeply impressed by the dedication of the staff there. They had a really feeling for the place. But you know, Presidential libraries now, millions and millions of dollars are raised by each president, and you can raise it in various and sundry of ways.

Franklin Roosevelt basically built that himself, the library attached to his home. And there was a fire in the home at one time, which required some restoration.

But when I went through there, it must be lack of funding for that. Because here we have letters of Franklin D. Roosevelt about the Depression, World War II. I read a letter from Franklin Roosevelt written in 1934 to John Dingle's dad, who the son is still serving here in the Congress. He is the longest-serving—and this is a handwritten letter about a post office.

And yet I looked around, and the humidifiers were what you would buy at Sears for your home. The electrical system is really antiquated, and I think there could be a disaster. And I know it is not for lack of devotion, of yourself and the staff, but for lack of dollars.

But what are we planning to do to update that, at least so we don't jeopardize those valuable papers and all the other artifacts associated with Franklin D. Roosevelt?

Mr. JARVIS. The National Park Service has more items in its museum collection than the Smithsonian. And it is a concern, in terms of protection and preservation of those items. Because we have inherited places like Roosevelt's home, other places that come with extraordinary historic resources that are invaluable and irreplaceable.

And with the money we have, we do the best we can. If we can't buy the state-of-the-art, we go to Walmart and buy the latest we can afford.

We have invested over the years to consolidate collections and put them in state-of-the-art. I believe at the Eleanor Roosevelt facility, we do have a museum-quality facility that was developed a number of years ago. But in some of these other places, we do not. And part of it has been funding issues for us.

Mr. KILDEE. Since that, because I can just tell the dedication of the staff in talking to some of the people here in Washington, their concern about that. But perhaps Congress has to, even while we try to balance the budget, to realize that those papers of Franklin D. Roosevelt are just absolutely priceless, and that we should do something.

Certainly Eisenhower's library and Richard Nixon's library and Bill Clinton's library, they are going to be absolutely, probably the latest state-of-the-art for safety and preservation. And here we have something built when Franklin Roosevelt was still alive, and by the standards of that day.

Mr. JARVIS. We do have a request in for an out-year budget for the development, protection, and renovation there that would provide that kind of museum quality. But it is not in the 2012 budget.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I am sure Sears and Walmart appreciate the shout-outs, as well.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BISHOP. Ranking Member for a second round.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes. Mr. Jarvis, about half of the Land and Water Conservation Fund is going to go to the states in competitive grants. Explain the importance of that.

Mr. JARVIS. OK. The state side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund has been a program that the National Park Service has administered in direct association and cooperation with the states for, since its inception. Though it has been a small amount of money in recent years.

The approach that is proposed in the Fiscal Year 2012 budget is that 40 percent of the state side of money will still go directly to the states, based on population. That is a pro rata formula that has been traditional.

But 60 percent of that money would be developed into a competitive grant program that is focused on sort of three broad areas. But let me say in terms of getting down to the specifics of the state criteria, we are going to directly engage the states in that discussion. And we have the first meeting of that next week, for the National Recreation and Park Association, the National Association of State Park Directors, and the National Association of State Liaison Officers are all coming in with representatives, to sit down with us and help develop that criteria.

So once we do that, then we would assist the states in making necessary amendments to their Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans, their SCORPs. And the focus would be principally on access to rivers for recreation purposes along waterways. It would be on urban parks, and on pieces of land that provide really connectivity. You know, public access to public lands, investment to these portals that provide sort of this connectivity that we have been looking for, that really allow the public to get to these public lands and use them for recreation.

So that is kind of the focus area. But we really need to work with the states over this next year to develop that criteria.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes, and I appreciate the criteria. Because that 60 percent does allow an opportunity for urban park development and activity, and some preservation that is particularly, in New Mexico and Arizona, where historic and cultural resource protection is important as part of the whole visitorship.

Is it realistic to say that we could simply freeze expansion of the National Park Service while we take the backlog, maintenance backlog, from \$10.78 billion to zero? I say that with about, the second part of that question is what would the impact be? We just froze all acquisition, and would we ever reach zero?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, to a certain degree it is different kinds of money, in terms of the operational deferred maintenance versus the Land and Water Conservation funding, which comes from the revenue side. But let me just say in order to drive down deferred maintenance, we would need somewhere in the neighborhood of an annual appropriation specific to deferred maintenance in the \$450 million class. And that would just be on critical systems. Over a period of about 10 years, we could drive DM down to zero. So it is not really an offset in that way.

Let me just say about history doesn't stop in this country. History continues. And the American people always turn to the National Park Service to help tell the story of this country, which is constantly evolving.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much. I appreciate your presence and look forward to continuing to work with you, Director. I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. Let me pick up where the Ranking Member was. I think he asked some very good questions in both of his rounds.

You mentioned also, not only to him but also to Mr. Tipton, that \$160 million of the fund he was talking about is for Federal land acquisition. And I was appreciative that you said that, in exchange for construction and maintenance, was something with which you argued with the Administration. And that you tried to find—you argued for a balance. I guess the question is, was the balance met, in your opinion?

Mr. JARVIS. The Administration set the priority for full funding at \$900 million.

Mr. BISHOP. Do I take that as a yes or a no?

Mr. JARVIS. I support the President's budget. We internally fought a variety of—

Mr. BISHOP. That is probably the right answer. You are safe with that one.

Mr. JARVIS. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. I do want you to talk to me, though, about some of the line items in there. I notice that you have \$66 million in a line item for construction and management; yet three different line items have \$60 million for planning and management. Can you tell me why those numbers are so equal, and why planning is almost as high as the construction on the line items?

Mr. JARVIS. I don't understand the—

Mr. BISHOP. I am sorry. It is construction and maintenance with the \$66 million, planning and management with \$60 million. I apologize. If you add the three line items together to deal with planning and management, they come to \$60 million.

Mr. JARVIS. OK. I would assume that that number, and I would have to look at the hard numbers on that, what the \$60 million is.

Mr. BISHOP. Oh, OK. Then maybe if you can answer that later in writing.

Mr. JARVIS. We would be glad to analyze that.

Mr. BISHOP. At your pleasure, thank you. Can I ask you, and once again going back to some very good questions by Mr. Grijalva, how much has the National Park Service received in the form of mitigation payments from the Department of Homeland Security?

Mr. JARVIS. The total for the department is around \$10 million. But I can't tell you off the top of my head how much is specifically to the Park Service, because it is not just for NPS.

Mr. BISHOP. Good, thank you. And maybe that goes to the second part. How are those funds counted? And how do we track their spending of those funds?

Mr. JARVIS. It is a reimbursable account. So we have to expend, devise the project, execute, and then get reimbursed by Homeland Security from the account that was identified.

Mr. BISHOP. So you tell them prior to any reimbursement what you want, and then they reimburse you for a specific?

Mr. JARVIS. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP. Could you give me, say, the last year's specifics, what they are?

Mr. JARVIS. Certainly.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, I appreciate that, as well. If I could also ask you why does the Park Service have a policy to mow Jimmy Carter's lawn and home? It does not appear to be required in legislation that gave it title. And it is different than any other living situation in which somebody granted their property after they left this earthly existence. Why are we taking care of that property right now?

Mr. JARVIS. I am going to have to get back to you on that one. That is pretty site-specific, and I don't really know the details.

Mr. BISHOP. Well, it has been in the news, first of all; and it is truly unique, obviously, in NPS. So I would like a response to that one, as well.

Mr. JARVIS. OK.

Mr. BISHOP. I notice that your budget reduces funds for National Heritage Areas. And I encourage that, as you are making a criteria for how to judge those in the future, I think that is very wise.

You also said that you encourage them to be self-sufficient. Have we ever had a heritage area that has become self-sufficient?

Mr. JARVIS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. Let me ask two more, if I may. Snowmobile access continues to be a problem at Yellowstone, or Sunkist Yellowstone if we go to the future. And I would like to know if the Park Service is open to crafting an approach that would allow private-license guides to take groups into the park, rather than only allowing commercial guided tours? This would I think allow more access, and perhaps be more affordable.

Are you open to some kind of pilot program similar to that?

Mr. JARVIS. I think the key to our success thus far in Yellowstone has been that all trips in are guided, of some way. I think the key is that whoever is guiding the group has to be approved by the Park Service, to understand that there are responsibilities for speed, protection of wildlife, all those kinds of things.

We are in the middle of an environmental impact statement, as you well know, for winter use in Yellowstone. And I would be glad to discuss that with the team of some way that—because I think guiding of snow machines is essential to that type of protection. Right now it is all commercial, but I would be glad to talk to them about that.

Mr. BISHOP. I would be interested in that. Now, Mr. Grijalva, I do have one other personal question. My time is about to expire. Do you have something else you wanted?

Mr. GRIJALVA. No.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Kildee, if you have another question, I don't want to go in front of you if you do.

Mr. KILDEE. No, I am all set. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Then let me ask this last one. I was watching the local news two nights ago, in which, without giving a shout-out to Channel 9, but it was Channel 9 news, in which they were talking about a woman who, back in—do you remember Carmageddon, back in January? Especially on the parkway; that is your responsibility. She was stuck on that parkway, with a five-year-old, she being somewhat diabetic. And in an effort to try and get out of that parkway, she went across the median, and your Park Service ticketed her for \$150.

Now, one of the reasons why I bring this up is I was on that same, I can't say damn, can I? That parkway, from roughly 4:00 until 11:30 that same night. And I recognize what had gone through there. It was a very frustrating experience, where the Park Service closed the only off ramp in both directions, and everyone sat there.

I am sorry, back in my home state, when you close a road, you try and keep people off the road, not try and keep people from leaving that particular road. Even though on the roadway going back to Washington, it was all clear at three different times, even though you didn't allow any cars to go on it. But it was nicely cleared, anyway.

Can I ask why you were ticketing that woman? Especially because, in all sincerity, I went across the median as well, to try and get out of that mess. Three different times you had emergency vehicles go past us, and they didn't clear it off to let people out. And in the morning at 7:00, when I woke up and turned on the news,

it was still closed, with over 50 cars having run out of gas and been abandoned there.

I am very much concerned about those tickets for that particular night, especially this woman. It illustrates the situation. I am going to have to tell you, I would appreciate if you would look into that situation.

Mr. JARVIS. OK.

Mr. BISHOP. Because indeed, if she has to pay \$150 for trying to get out of that mess, and others have to pay that, you will be back here again.

Mr. JARVIS. Absolutely.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Could you look into why Mr. Bishop didn't get a ticket?

Mr. JARVIS. Well, I was thinking of mailing him one, but no.

[Laughter.]

Mr. BISHOP. Fortunately, I was on official business. And the other six drivers that helped push everybody over so we could finally get off that. It was a horrible night, I recognize that. But it is not that uncommon in other areas. And even though there was a whole lot of snow that came down, there were hours and hours in which that was not open to people who were stuck there.

And I was very concerned, especially with that woman. Because, let us face it, there were no cars coming the other direction to inhibit her coming across and getting back to D.C.

Mr. JARVIS. We will look into it, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. For her sake.

Mr. JARVIS. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP. And mine. I would appreciate you doing that.

With that, unless there are any other additional questions or comments for the witnesses, I want to thank you for being with us and sitting here for this time.

Members of the Subcommittee, if they have additional questions for the witness, they will provide them to you, I hope. And the hearing record will be open for 10 days to receive those type of responses.

With that, I appreciate your attendance here. Mr. Jarvis, I appreciate you spending the time with us.

Meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:53 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

