

Y 4 . P 96/10 : 93-H 13

1045

93Y4  
P96/10  
93-H13

# NATIONAL VISITOR CENTER AND THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

GOVERNMENT  
Storage  
12 1973

MENTS  
12 1973

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

OF THE

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

### H.R. 5857

A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL VISITOR CENTER  
FACILITIES ACT OF 1968, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

AND

### S. 1759

A BILL AUTHORIZING FURTHER APPROPRIATIONS TO THE  
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR SERVICES NECESSARY  
TO THE NONPERFORMING ARTS FUNCTIONS OF THE  
JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

MAY 16, 1973

SERIAL NO. 93-H13

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1973

Barcode with number A11600 753242

THE  
KANSAS ST

RY  
ERSITY

SI H-80:01/009. AY

NATIONAL VISITOR CENTER AND THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

DOC  
JUL

LIBRARY  
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia, *Chairman*

- |                                  |                                 |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine          | HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr., Tennessee |
| JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico    | JAMES L. BUCKLEY, New York      |
| MIKE GRAVEL, Alaska              | ROBERT T. STAFFORD, Vermont     |
| LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas             | WILLIAM L. SCOTT, Virginia      |
| QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota | JAMES A. McCLURE, Idaho         |
| DICK CLARK, Iowa                 | PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico    |
| JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., Delaware   |                                 |

M. BARRY MEYER, *Chief Counsel and Chief Clerk*

BAILEY GUARD, *Minority Clerk*; RICHARD A. HELLMAN, *Minority Counsel*

LEON G. BILLINGS, *Senior Staff Member*

PHILIP T. CUMMINGS and DON ALEXANDER, *Assistant Counsels*

*Professional and research staff:* HAROLD H. BRAYMAN, PAUL CHIMES, FRANCES T. CLARK, KATHERINE Y. CUDLIPP, KATHLEEN R. E. FORCUM, ANN GARRABRANT, RICHARD D. GRUNDY, WESLEY F. HAYDEN, RICHARD E. HEROD, RONALD L. KATZ, CLARK NORTON, RAY PADDOCK, JUDY PARENTE, JOHN PURINTON, A. DAVID SANDOVAL, JACQUELINE E. SCHAFER, E. STEVEN SWAIN, SALLY WALKER, AND JOHN W. YAGO, Jr.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

DICK CLARK, *Chairman*

- |                      |                  |
|----------------------|------------------|
| MIKE GRAVEL          | WILLIAM L. SCOTT |
| JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr. | JAMES A. McCLURE |

(II)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON: 1971

# CONTENTS

---

## LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Dickenson, Russell E., director, National Capital Parks.....	5
Hanslin, Lars, Office of the Solicitor, Department of the Interior.....	5
Harris, Chet, National Park Service manager of the Visitor Center.....	5
Hulett, Stanley W., associate director, National Park Service.....	10
Lindsay, Douglas, site manager, John F. Kennedy Center.....	10
Wheeler, Douglas P., deputy assistant Secretary of the Interior.....	5

# CONTENTS

## LIST OF WITNESSES

1	James Earl Ray, Director, National Capital Park and Planning Commission
2	Robert J. Taylor, Director, National Capital Park and Planning Commission
3	Robert J. Taylor, Director, National Capital Park and Planning Commission
4	Robert J. Taylor, Director, National Capital Park and Planning Commission
5	Robert J. Taylor, Director, National Capital Park and Planning Commission
6	Robert J. Taylor, Director, National Capital Park and Planning Commission
7	Robert J. Taylor, Director, National Capital Park and Planning Commission



93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 5857

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 20, 1973

Mr. GRAY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

---

## A BILL

To amend the National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1968, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1968 (82  
4       Stat. 43), is amended by inserting after subsection (b) in  
5       section 102 the following new subsection:

6       “(c) In addition to the alterations and construction  
7       by the company pursuant to subsection (a) of this section,  
8       the Secretary is authorized to undertake, directly or by  
9       negotiated contract with the company, its successors, agents,  
10      and assigns, such alterations and construction, with regard  
11      to the Union Station Building and the adjacent parking

1 facility, as he deems necessary to supplement the activities  
 2 of the company in providing adequate facilities for visitors  
 3 under the agreements and leases referred to in subsection (a).  
 4 The Secretary may exercise the authority under this subsec-  
 5 tion without regard to whether or not title to the Union  
 6 Station Building or the airspace adjacent thereto is in the  
 7 United States: *Provided*, That he shall have entered into  
 8 an agreement for a lease (but such lease need not have  
 9 commenced) with the company incorporating the provisions  
 10 of paragraph (5) of subsection (a) prior to the exercise of  
 11 the authority under this subsection: *And provided further*,  
 12 That not to exceed \$8,680,000 of the funds authorized to  
 13 be appropriated in section 109 shall be available to the Secre-  
 14 tary to carry out the provisions of this subsection."

II

93<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>st</sup> SESSION

# S. 1759

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 9, 1973

MR. BAKER introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

---

## A BILL

Authorizing further appropriations to the Secretary of the Interior for services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3 That the second sentence of subsection (e) of section 6 of  
4 the John F. Kennedy Center Act (72 Stat. 1698), as  
5 amended, is amended to read as follows: "There are hereby  
6 authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be neces-  
7 sary for carrying out this subsection."

### II

Senator CLARK. With us is Mr. Douglas P. Wheeler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, accompanied by several colleagues.

Would you please introduce them, Mr. Wheeler, and then proceed with your briefing on these two proposals?

STATEMENT OF DOUGLAS P. WHEELER, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS, ACCOMPANIED BY RUSSELL E. DICKENSON, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS; CHET HARRIS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MANAGER OF THE VISITOR CENTER PROJECT; AND LARS HANSLIN, OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am Douglas P. Wheeler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks. I have with me Mr. Russell Dickenson, Director of National Capital Parks; Mr. Chet Harris of the National Park Service; and Mr. Lars Hanslin, with the Office of Solicitor.

On behalf of the Department of the Interior, I want to express our appreciation for your courtesy in considering this legislation at this time. As you know, the Department submitted the draft bill to the Congress on March 7, with the recommendation that it be enacted.

The purpose of his legislation is to authorize the appropriation of \$8,680,000 for construction necessary to complete the alteration and renovation of Union Station as a National Visitor Center. Together with the work soon to be commenced by the railroads pursuant to the existing National Visitor Facilities Act of 1968, this amount will assure completion of the alteration in time for use by the 34 million people who will be visiting the Nation's Capital in 1976. As President Nixon said in his message to the Congress on February 14, 1972, "Such a facility, desirable for all years, becomes indispensable as we look to the bicentennial."

Under the basic act which was approved in 1968, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into leases with the owner of Union Station and to operate it and adjacent parking facilities as a National Visitor Center. However, the owner was unable to obtain the necessary financing which was then estimated at \$5 million for alterations to Union Station and \$11 million for construction of an "air-rights" parking facility. No funds were authorized in the 1968 act for alteration or construction by the Federal Government.

Now the current owners have obtained commitments for financing. Under an amended agreement between the owners and this Department dated March 1, 1972, the owners have agreed to undertake the alteration of Union Station and construction of a parking facility at a cost to them of not to exceed \$16 million, of which not more than \$5 million will be expended on alteration of the Union Station building. In turn, this Department agreed to enter into a lease of the facilities at an annual cost to the Federal Government of not to exceed \$3.5 million. We understand that the owners are this week concluding the negotiations with their financial sources, and actual construction work will begin shortly thereafter.

While the owners will be able to accomplish a portion of the alteration to Union Station with the \$5 million they have agreed to provide, this amount will not be adequate to complete the job in today's dollars. We have estimated that an additional \$8,680,000 will be necessary to complete the alterations needed for public use of the building by 1976.

The enactment of H.R. 5857 is recommended, therefore, to authorize direct expenditures by the Federal Government for those elements of the alteration project that the railroads will be unable to accomplish.

These elements include \$2,048,200 for demolition and replacement of the east concourse wall, general repairs, cleaning, and replacing the roof; \$866,900 for exterior and mezzanine ramps; \$1,829,400 for half of the welcome areas and theatres; and \$1,598,000 for mechanical and electrical components, plumbing, heating, and air conditioning. We also need to replace all doors, complete the restrooms in the lounge area, and provide a granite facia for half of the north wall of the concourse.

In order that the facilities will be fully completed by 1976, it is proposed that \$7.1 million will be obligated for construction under this legislation for fiscal year 1974, and the President's budget for fiscal 1974 requests the appropriation of this amount. An additional \$1,580,000 is proposed for exhibits and furnishing, and this too is requested in the President's fiscal 1974 budget. Of course the alterations and construction by the Secretary will be fully phased in with the work being undertaken by the owners. The bill specifically authorizes the Secretary to negotiate contracts for the work with the owners or their agents, for continuity in administration.

Mr. Chairman, with the enactment of H.R. 5857, the visitor to the Nation's Capital in 1976 will have an opportunity to truly enjoy and appreciate the center of his Government on its 200th birthday. We urge your committee to act favorably on this legislation.

I would like to supplement my statement by addressing an amendment proposed by the administration and adopted by the House Committee on Public Works when it reported this bill just a week ago.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the amendment submitted in our letter of March 7, we recommend another amendment to the National Visitor Center Facilities Act of 1968. As you know, section 104 of the 1968 act directed the Secretary of the Interior to study a transportation system for visitors along the Mall, the Capitol Grounds, and to and from the National Visitor Center. We recommend that such a system be authorized.

The report of the National Visitor Center Study Commission in 1967 stated, "The interpretive shuttle system is imperative to the success of the visitor orientation program." Our report pursuant to section 104 of the 1968 act also recommended a total Visitor Center package including parking, welcome, orientation, and information and a narrated shuttle tour from the Visitor Center around the Capitol and the major tourist destinations in the monumental core of the Nation's Capital.

The National Park Service now provides, through a concessioner, interpretive shuttle tours along the Mall. Recent visitor transportation studies commissioned by the National Capital Planning Commission, the District of Columbia Land Agency, and the Department of Transportation all point out the need for improved and adequate service for the tourist. We believe it is essential for the enjoyment of the Visitor Center that the existing shuttle system be expanded to tie in with the Center when it is completed.

The Department will submit draft legislation to the Senate within the next few days which would implement our recommendation for an expanded interpretive shuttle service. As I indicated, this amendment has already been introduced in the House as H.R. 7435, and it was adopted by the House Public Works Committee on May 8.

Thank you, sir.

Senator CLARK. Thank you.

We have a few questions. Did you or anyone on your staff have anything further?

Mr. WHEELER. No; we would be happy to answer your questions at this time.

Senator CLARK. John,\* if you have questions on any of these, feel free to speak up.

The 1968 act says the annual cost of the leasing shall not exceed \$3.5 million. Is that what the Government has now agreed to pay?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. The actual figure is somewhat less than \$3.5 million. It is \$3.38 million, pursuant to the amended agreement signed last summer.

Senator CLARK. Now, this is for a period of 20 years?

Mr. WHEELER. 25 years.

Senator CLARK. What will the total cost be at the end of that time?

Mr. WHEELER. The total cost would be that lease payment times 25. It is approximately \$80 million.

Senator CLARK. What alternatives to this lease proposal have you considered? Have you considered any and if so, what would those be?

Mr. WHEELER. Prior to the enactment of the 1968 legislation, a number of alternatives were explored, including outright acquisition from the railroads of this particular property and the construction of a visitor facility at another location. Because of the availability of this property and willingness of the railroads to cooperate with us, this lease arrangement seemed the most desirable approach.

Our leases and the law both provide that the Government has the option of acquiring this property outright at any time during the 25-year period and that at the end of the 25-year lease period, this property would become solely owned by the Federal Government for the payment of \$1.

Senator CLARK. In effect you are buying it then?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct, on the installment plan.

Senator CLARK. So you don't feel it would be cheaper to buy it outright at the outset?

Mr. WHEELER. No; not considering the improvements that have to be made over the period of 25 years. We would be saving the interest on the money borrowed to acquire the property.

Senator CLARK. So you feel it is much more economically sound to do it in this way?

Mr. WHEELER. It was costed out several times since 1968 and always with the conclusion that this is the best, most feasible alternative.

Senator CLARK. Again, you have considered the possibility of building a new building?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, indeed we did.

Senator CLARK. So it is quite likely that you will own the building at the end of the 25 years?

Mr. WHEELER. At the end of 25 years. The lease provides that is a certainty. We have an option of acquiring the property at an earlier date.

Senator CLARK. Do you anticipate any additional funding later on?

Mr. WHEELER. No, we do not. I should clarify or expand on that statement by saying that the money we have asked for in this legisla-

\*John Purinton, professional staff member, Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds.

tion would allow us to complete less than the entire project as contemplated in 1968. The major deletion is a second-phase garage which would provide roughly another 2,200 or 2,300 parking spaces. Because of inflation, because of the difficulties that the railroads involved have had, both as a corporate matter and in obtaining financing, we felt that our objective at this point should be to obtain in time for the bicentennial a viable project.

The money we ask for here would accomplish that objective. We do not presently contemplate the expenditure which this involves. That is not to say that some years hence we would not want to complete the project, but we are not prepared to spend an additional \$17 million for parking at this time.

Senator CLARK. How many parking spaces would be provided under your proposal?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Harris can provide the specific figure.

Mr. HARRIS. At the moment, 2,015.

Senator CLARK. Who will operate that garage?

Mr. HARRIS. It is anticipated that the Department of Interior and Park Service will have the concessionaire operating the facility for the Government.

Senator CLARK. And anyone can park there?

Mr. WHEELER. The intent is not that anyone can park there, not that this is a supplementary parking facility for employees here on the Hill or residents of this vicinity.

Senator CLARK. That is what I wondered.

Mr. WHEELER. But that it be made available for visitors to the city who take advantage of the Visitors Center facility and that it be a gateway to the city in a sense that they would then leave their cars and travel on public transportation, thus relieving congestion elsewhere in the city.

This is going to be very difficult, quite frankly, to enforce and to make practicable, but we are certainly going to try it because the parking facilities are intended for that use and not for general use.

Senator CLARK. Have all of the necessary environmental impact statements been filed at this point?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. The project was initiated prior to NEPA, but we have an environmental study subsequent to that time.

Senator CLARK. If the additional \$8.9 million being requested were not immediately appropriated, what would happen to the project? Would Interior go ahead with it?

Mr. WHEELER. We will go ahead. In fact, we have commenced construction. But the end result would be a project not completed in time for the bicentennial and a project which would not be viable in terms of meeting visitors needs.

Some of the things that we feel we must have were original components of the plan and because of inflation cannot now be accomplished within the \$16 million ceiling set by the 1968 legislation.

Senator CLARK. So if we are going to complete it for the bicentennial, this is the only alternative?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir; and this is why we felt very strongly about making sure that the amount is requested as part of the President's 1974 budget. Of course, in order to spend that money, we need authorization from the Congress.

Senator CLARK. How will the proposed alterations and construction

undertaken by Interior for which this additional funding is requested be coordinated with the work which the owners of Union Station are going to do?

Mr. WHEELER. The bill makes provision for that coordination, but Mr. Harris can provide the details. He, I might add, is our site representative at Union Station.

Mr. HARRIS. The railroads have currently under contract a contractor's agent, the George Hyman Co., to be responsible for coordinating all of the construction activities, including the elements they are building for us as well as the construction which must be done on the railroads' behalf, a new terminal facility for them. We would hope that with this authorization, Interior would be able to continue with the Hyman Co. as the contractor is agent on the job, so the work could be tied together and well coordinated.

Senator CLARK. And will separate contracts be negotiated by the Secretary?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, I am sure the Secretary would make contractual arrangements with either the railroad people to have them continue with Hyman or with the Hyman Co.

Mr. WHEELER. In any event, the result would be a coordinated approach. We have no intention of getting in the general contracting business ourselves with this facility. That effort already has been undertaken by the railroads.

Senator CLARK. Who is responsible for coordination of the design, construction and inspection? Who would be ultimately responsible for them?

Mr. HARRIS. I think that the National Park Service is responsible now, sir. In other words, although the railroad owners are seeing to the construction, they must construct what we want. In the interest of the Government we then tell them what we would like and they build as much of it as the money will permit.

Mr. WHEELER. The ultimate sanction is our authority not to accept the project, if not completed in accordance with our specifications.

Senator CLARK. When would it be completed?

Mr. HARRIS. We anticipate the project being completed by August 1975 and operational.

Mr. WHEELER. This has been a long time in the making, as I am sure you and the members of your staff are aware, again due primarily to the railroads' difficulty in obtaining adequate financing.

We started very late but not too late, we believe, and I think both the contractor and the railroad believe, to complete this project in plenty of time for the bicentennial.

Senator CLARK. What are the exhibits and furnishings included in the budget breakdown for \$1,580,000 a part of the proposal?

Mr. WHEELER. These are Interior amenities, I suppose you would call them, albeit essential to providing the visitor with an orientation to what he will see in Washington. They are not a part of the physical structure itself, but what the Park Service would call interpretive facilities to impart information about Washington.

Senator CLARK. So when a visitor comes there, he would observe these exhibits before he makes his selection of things to see or he would be oriented to make some intelligent judgment on what it is he wants to see.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Senator CLARK. That sounds reasonable and very worthwhile. Does Interior Department have plans for any other construction or development in connection with the Visitors' Center?

Mr. WHEELER. No, not at this time.

Senator CLARK. What about private developers, hotel chains, and so forth, do they have any such plans that you know of?

Mr. WHEELER. We have been contacted by at least one such individual, who indicates, and it is far from firm, that he would be interested in following the development of this area on adjacent property. I expect it to be an incentive to such development if, as we expect, large numbers of people will be coming through this facility and looking for accommodations.

Senator CLARK. But the Government would not have any obligation in connection with that?

Mr. WHEELER. None whatever.

Senator CLARK. How do you visualize this new visitors center affecting Washington? Could you speak in general terms?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, I think it will do at least two things that we feel are much needed. One, provide for the first time a single point of contact to the extent possible, of course, for the visitor who is arriving, not just the casual visitor, but the increased numbers of people we expect will be here to observe the bicentennial, and to provide at one place what is now provided at the different locations around the Mall and at other attractions.

It would enable the visitor to plan his visit and make better use of his time while here, rather than to approach it on a hit-or-miss basis. I think that is a benefit to the city.

The second benefit would be an accompanying reduction in the amount of vehicular traffic on the city streets by first providing a parking facility at the visitors center, and second, if the amendment we have proposed today is adopted, by enabling us to make use of the very successful tourmobile service to points throughout the city. This would be an extension of the existing tourmobile service.

Senator CLARK. Speaking of it from a national point of view then, it simply makes it available to anybody in the Nation on that same basis?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Senator CLARK. An amendment to the Kennedy Center Act is pending before the subcommittee. Do you have a statement on this proposal?

Mr. WHEELER. If you are prepared to move on, I would like to turn the Kennedy Center over to Stan Hulett, who has a prepared statement.

**STATEMENT OF STANLEY W. HULETT, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE; ACCOMPANIED BY: DOUGLAS LINDSAY, SITE MANAGER, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER**

Mr. HULETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am Stanley W. Hulett, Associate Director of the National Park Service. I appreciate this opportunity to present the Department's views on this proposed legislation which was submitted to the Congress on February 22 of this year. The bill has since been introduced as S. 1759.

The proposed bill would amend section 10 of the Public Buildings Amendments of 1972 approved June 16, 1972. Under those amendments, the Secretary is directed, acting through the National Park Service, to provide maintenance, security, information, interpretation, janitorial, and all other services necessary to the nonperforming arts functions of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The 1972 legislation authorized sums as may be necessary to carry out these functions, but only for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

The proposed bill would amend the appropriation authorization to delete the language limiting the authorization to fiscal year 1973, thus permitting the National Park Service to continue to receive appropriations after June 30, 1973, for carrying out nonperforming arts functions as the Center.

This Department looks forward to providing the maintenance security, and other services and to developing a public interpretive program similar in quality to the services and programs for other memorials in the Washington, D.C. area, such as the Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial, and Jefferson Memorial.

The Center is currently estimated to be valued at more than \$70 million and visitation to the Center surpassed 2.5 million visits in fiscal year 1972, with 15,000 to 20,000 visitors per day during peak periods. This visitation does not include that solely connected with the performing arts functions of the Center.

We estimate that to provide quality maintenance security, and interpretation befitting this memorial to a former President would require a total of \$2,400,000 in the first year following enactment of the proposed bill. This amount would be required for the nonperforming arts functions alone. An additional \$585,000 will be incurred for the expenses for utilities and other services associated with performing arts functions. We would be reimbursed for these expenses by the Board of Trustees of the Center. During the fifth year following enactment and thereafter, annual costs to this Department under section 6 of the act are expected to reach \$2,600,000.

This cost estimate is based on our assumption that it is the National Park Service's responsibility to handle day-to-day, routine, operational maintenance occasioned by normal wear and tear. If the National Park Service is to be further charged by the Congress with the responsibility for carrying out the memorial functions at the Kennedy Center, we intend to carry out these functions to a standard of excellence and we will fully coordinate and cooperate with the Kennedy Center Board of Trustees and staff.

To maintain and interpret the nonperforming arts functions of the Center at the proper standard for the public will require 82 permanent employees and 15 man-years of seasonal personnel. The permanent personnel include 12 guards and 13 U.S. Park Police officers as well as building engineers, carpenters, plasterers, painters, gardeners, plumbers, and electricians. The total annual cost for personnel services and benefits is estimated to be \$990,000. Other costs attributable to nonperforming arts functions include uniform allowances—\$4,000, utilities—\$550,000, a janitorial contract—\$507,000, and other miscellaneous supporting services—\$349,000.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to answer any questions you may have at this time. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I have with me Mr. Russell Dickenson, Director of National Capital Parks, and Mr. Doug Lindsay, site manager at Kennedy Center. We would be happy to answer any questions you may have at this time.

Senator CLARK. Thank you. Could you explain and define the responsibilities delegated to the Park Service by the building amendments of 1972 with reference to the Kennedy Center. Do you have complete housekeeping functions and responsibility?

Mr. HULETT. Yes, sir; that is correct. It is strictly those activities associated with a nonperforming arts to which we are speaking today and for which we are seeking authorization for appropriation.

As I mentioned in my statement, those costs that are directly attributable to the performing arts functions are done on a reimbursable basis and we receive those funds from the Kennedy Center Board of Trustees.

Senator CLARK. What would happen if we don't pass this legislation?

Mr. HULETT. Mr. Chairman, on July 1 it would be necessary for the National Park Service to remove itself bodily from the premises because we have no existing authority of any kind which would allow us to continue our services.

Senator CLARK. That is a pretty strong argument. If it were to be approved, would additional appropriations be required to take care of any unforeseen major problems, such as air conditioning breakdown or some kind of natural disaster like a flood or tornado?

Mr. HULETT. Mr. Chairman, it has been the position of the National Park Service as enunciated in our cooperative agreement with the Board of Trustees of the Center, that our activities in the maintenance realm are limited strictly to these normal wear and tear and normal day-to-day activities and that the Center Board of Trustees would be responsible for any major calamities that might befall the Center.

Senator CLARK. What is the estimated life expectancy of the building of the Center?

Mr. HULETT. I might ask Doug Lindsay, since he had been over there for a year, if he has any feelings in that regard?

Mr. LINDSAY. I don't know if they have an estimate on that.

Senator CLARK. You haven't seen anything like that?

In case of any defects that might occur in 20 or 40 or 50 years, I assume you would not feel any responsibility. Only for housekeeping functions. Not major repairs.

Mr. HULETT. That is correct. Under the act that established the Center, the responsibility for these activities would fall to the Center Board of Trustees which, as I am sure you are aware, was established under the Smithsonian.

Senator CLARK. Do you have any specific problems in fulfilling the responsibilities delegated to you in the 1972 amendment?

Mr. HULETT. We have encountered some difficulties in the early stage, yes, sir. However, we feel now that we are getting a great deal more cooperation from the Center Board and management and there are still some rough spots that we are attempting to work out, but we are going to be negotiating an amended agreement with them very shortly and we hope we can iron out some of these difficulties at that time.

SENATOR CLARK. In fulfilling those responsibilities has it been more difficult or more expensive than you had anticipated or has it worked as you planned?

MR. HULETT. It is pretty much as we planned. The figure we are requesting in this year's budget, which was included in the budget submitted by the President to the Congress in January, included \$2.4 million as I stated earlier. That was our estimate last year as to what we expected and, other than the normal increments that we would expect from salary increases and additional cost of materials, it has been pretty much within our estimates.

SENATOR CLARK. So you would not have any recommendations for changing or amending that?

MR. HULETT. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the bill is sent up with a strictly open-ended authorization. Our feeling in this regard is that it would be very difficult to set a dollar figure simply because there may be things that are unforeseen. We do not operate under an operation and maintenance ceiling in any other part of the National Park System. We operate under a total overall ceiling for those activities, but not as a specific unit-by-unit basis, and we would hope that the committee would concur with the recommendation of the Administration in this regard that we be allowed to carry on these activities as necessary rather than with a specific dollar limitation.

SENATOR CLARK. Could you explain again why an open-ended authorization would be more essential to this particular job than any other in the Government?

MR. HULETT. As I stated, Mr. Chairman, we don't have a dollar ceiling on any other unit per se within the National Park System. We feel also that there may be unforeseen circumstances which we do not envision at this point. That might require something over the \$2.4 million in any given fiscal year.

Should that occasion arise and should we have a legislative ceiling on the amount that we were authorized to seek appropriations for, we would then be in a position, before we could proceed, if we had expended that authorization, of having to come back before the Congress and going through first, the authorizing process to get the ceiling raised, and second, following that with an appropriation request.

SENATOR CLARK. Obviously that is true. I guess my question is why should this particular project, more than any other in the Government, justify an open ended authorization? You would have that same type problem under any limitation that was imposed by authorization or appropriation.

MR. HULETT. Certainly. The point is simply that it is very difficult to set a dollar ceiling and to say that in 3 years following the enactment of this legislation that we would only need \$2.4 million and, as I say, we don't have this type of a limitation on any other single unit of the National Park System but rather we have an overall ceiling for all of our maintenance activities for 298 areas which we administer.

SENATOR CLARK. The Congress has been willing to give you that kind of an open-ended authorization for individual project operation?

MR. HULETT. That is correct, Mr. Chairman. We have this in all of the legislation authorizing individual units of the system. We do have a ceiling placed upon us for land acquisition and development

costs but not for the normal operation and maintenance on a day-to-day basis.

Senator CLARK. Did you ask for maintenance responsibility at the Kennedy Center or not? They were assigned to you, I assume.

Mr. HULETT. That is correct, sir. When the Federal Government began to look around for someone who had the capabilities, we happened to be the ones who were available and in the area and doing the same type of job elsewhere.

Senator CLARK. Does any part of this housekeeping activity actually overlap with the performing arts functions of the Center, lighting or air conditioning, janitorial services, or whatever?

Mr. HULETT. Yes, sir; they do, and these are reimbursable expenditures that I mentioned earlier, which we estimate in fiscal year 1974 to be approximately \$585,000. If I might add, sir, we would hope that the committee would find it within their wishes to move expeditiously on this matter since we have been advised by both Senator Bible, who is the chairman of our Appropriations Subcommittee, and by Mrs. Hansen, who is the counterpart chairwoman in the House, that if authorization is not provided by the time their bills are reported to the floors in the respective bodies, that the amounts we have requested will not be included.

Therefore, we would find ourselves in a rather difficult position even under a continuing resolution as of July 1 in continuing our activities, and I think it might create a bit of a hiatus if we had to move out and then back in or something of that nature.

Mr. WHEELER. This would be true, if I might add, with the Visitors Center bill as well. A continuing resolution there would have no impact, as these are new authorizations.

Senator CLARK. So you would find it necessary to have congressional approval at some point prior to June 30.

Mr. HULETT. We would hope, Mr. Chairman, perhaps to even have it prior to the reporting of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee which we anticipate to be sometime in mid June at this point.

I might add for your information, Mr. Chairman, that the House committee has reported both of these bills to the floor and it is anticipated at this point on the information from that House Public Works Committee that these matters will be taken up on the floor of the House next week.

We will be happy to provide the language that appeared in both bills, both the Visitors Center and the Kennedy Center for the committee's information.

Mr. PURINTON. We have it but it is a separate amendment.

Mr. HULETT. We will provide it for you.

Senator CLARK. Do you have any questions, John?

Mr. PURINTON. There was a gentleman who wondered if the National Visitors Center would be just another means of helping Penn Central.

Mr. WHEELER. Definitely not. We have seen this as an opportunity to provide a much needed service and quite frankly wished that the railroads had been more expeditious in their treatment of this matter. They are not making any money on the project itself. In fact, we have been criticized subsequent to signing our agreement with them

that perhaps they should be making more over the term of this agreement.

Every judgment that has been made concerning our current agreement with the railroads indicates that the Government and the taxpayer have gotten an excellent arrangement. As I indicated earlier, in exploring the alternatives we determined that this is the most economic arrangement that could be obtained under the circumstances.

Let me add to that the financing that was finally secured after lengthy negotiations has been approved by the trustees in bankruptcy.

Mr. PURINTON. At what rate did they finally get financing?

Mr. HANSLIN. They finally got it at 7.5. Our original agreement provided 7-percent financing and they were unable to obtain that because of their own difficulties and that is why we amended our agreement to allow them to go to 7 percent.

Mr. FRESHMAN. I wonder if in fact Penn Central got in worse trouble than it is, which is difficult to imagine, and were forced to divest themselves of some of the properties they hold in Manhattan as well as Union Station, how would that affect the leasing arrangement you have worked out over a 25-year period with them?

Mr. WHEELER. Their rights are assignable under the lease with our approval to whomever might acquire those properties and likewise would be an obligation upon whomever might assume those properties.

Second, we would have the option at any time during the life of the lease to acquire the property outright. In effect, the right of first refusal should they decide that they would not want to continue.

Mr. FRESHMAN. And leasing would be transferable?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct; subject to our approval.

Senator CLARK. John, any other questions?

Mr. PURINTON. What was the name of the bank?

Mr. HANSLIN. The construction loans are by Chemical Bank and the permanent loan is by Immigrant Saving Bank in New York.

Senator CLARK. Any other members of the staff that are representing Senators here who have questions. John, no other questions? If not, I don't have any further questions. We don't have a quorum here so we can't act on this legislation but we will bring it before the committee at the earliest possible time.

Mr. WHEELER. Thank you, sir. We have appreciated the opportunity to appear.

Mr. HULETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 10:45 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

