AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 112–401

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 29
S. 1150
S. 1191
S. 1198
S. 1215
S. 1589
S. 1708
S. 2131
S. 2133
H.R. 1141
H.R. 2606

MARCH 7, 2012

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

74–296 PDF WASHINGTON : 2012

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico, *Chairman*

RON WYDEN, Oregon
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan
MARK UDALL, Colorado
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
AL FRANKEN, Minnesota
JOE MANCHIN, III, West Virginia
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware
LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
MIKE LEE, Utah
RAND PAUL, Kentucky
DANIEL COATS, Indiana
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
JOHN HOEVEN, North Dakota
DEAN HELLER, Nevada
BOB CORKER, Tennessee

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

MARK UDALL, Colorado, *Chairman*

MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
DEBBIE STABENOW, Michigan
AL FRANKEN, Minnesota
JOE MANCHIN, III, West Virginia
CHRISTOPHER A. COONS, Delaware
RAND PAUL, Kentucky
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
DANIEL COATS, Indiana
ROB PORTMAN, Ohio
DEAN HELLER, Nevada
BOB CORKER, Tennessee

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

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Harris, Annie C., Executive Director, Essex National Heritage Commission, Salem, MA	30
Kerry, Hon. John F., U.S. Senator From Massachusetts	2
Reagan, Michael J., Member of the Board of Supervisor, Solano County, CA	24
Reed, Hon. Jack, U.S. Senator From Rhode Island	4
Toothman, Stephanie, Associate Director, Cultural Resources, National Park Service, Department of the Interior	7
Udall, Hon. Mark, U.S. Senator From Colorado	1

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to additional questions 39

APPENDIX II

Additional material submitted for the record 43

NATIONAL PARKS BILLS

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 2012

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:38 p.m. in room SD–366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Mark Udall presiding.

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

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

This afternoon, the Subcommittee on National Parks is holding a hearing to consider 11 bills, most of which relate to national heritage areas or national historic parks.

The agenda today includes proposals for new national heritage areas in California and Pennsylvania, a study of a possible new heritage area in Connecticut, and extensions of authorizations for several existing heritage areas.

In addition to those bills, we are also receiving testimony today on bills to authorize a land exchange at Lowell National Historical Park in Massachusetts, to establish the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park in Rhode Island and Massachusetts, to authorize the construction of a natural gas pipeline through the Gateway National Recreation Area in New York, to extend the authorization for the Coastal Heritage Trail in New Jersey, and finally, a bill to authorize a study for a potential national park in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The National Park Service appears to be generally supportive of several of these bills, but has identified concerns with a few of the bills. We will hear from the Park Service witnesses in a few minutes who can explain their concerns in greater detail.

I look forward to working with the Park Service, and the sponsors of the bills, to see if we can find a way to address those concerns, so we can get the bills ready for committee markup.

At this time, I would like to turn to my 2 illustrious colleagues, who have joined the subcommittee today, to hear their testimony in support of their bills. I turn to Senator Kerry to begin.

Senator Kerry, you are recognized.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. KERRY, U.S. SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS

Senator KERRY. Mr. Chairman, thank you very, very much.

Thanks for allowing us to speak on behalf of these bills, and I am delighted to join my colleague, Senator Reed from Rhode Island where we share a common interest here with respect to one of them; an important interest. We have enjoyed, I have enjoyed working actually, particularly, with Senator Chafee when he was here on this, and I will speak about it in a minute.

But I believe the bills that I am addressing here today, I think, make sense. We certainly are prepared to work with the Park Service on any of the issues. Obviously, we want to work these to get them primed for markup and hopefully can move forward.

But there is no question in my mind that these bills will help Massachusetts grow its economy, but also, preserve 2 of the many remarkable historical treasures that we are blessed to have in our State. I hope the committee will look favorably on these, and be able to help us move to markup as soon as possible. I think you will see the basic common sense of them pretty quickly.

The Lowell National Historical Park Land Exchange Act of 2011 is really simple, it is very straightforward, and it makes economic sense. It would allow the Secretary of the Interior to exchange land in Lowell in the National Historical Park, which we have there, for land currently owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the city of Lowell, and the University of Massachusetts Building Authority. So this bill would simply allow that land swap to take place with a net plus in revenue to the Federal Government, I believe.

This bill is supported by the National Park Service, by the city of Lowell, and by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. So there is no battle over it at all. Everybody is on the page.

The Federal land includes a maintenance facility and parking lots that are no longer of use to the National Park Service. So the bill will open up important development opportunities in Lowell and, as I said, the Federal Government can hopefully make money from the transaction. So I think it is good government all around.

On the second issue, the issue that Senator Reed and I share an interest, is the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park Establishment Act.

Now, I was very pleased to work on this with Senator Reed, and I think we both have a common excitement about this. I want to invite you, Mr. Chairman, to come up maybe in the later spring and early summer here, get you out on the Blackstone River, and have a chance in a canoe, and get out there, and you will see the wildlife which may even impress a Coloradan, a westerner. I do not know; I hope so.

We designated this. I was here when we first worked on this. I worked on it with Senator Kennedy and Senator Chafee, and it was designated as a National Historic Corridor. Senator Reed and I believe it is time now to take the next step, and to turn this National Heritage Corridor into a National Historic Park.

Under our legislation, some of the valley, the Blackstone River Valley, which is this industrial valley, goes back to the early development of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, a slew of beautiful old

mill buildings, and waterworks, and canals, and other things along the way. It will take some of the most historic components of that, the Old Slater Mill, the Blackstone River itself, its tributaries, the Blackstone Canal will all become part of the Park.

The evidence of the success of this, really, is in Lowell where, under Senator Tsongas's early leadership, we developed one of the first urban national parks in America; a remarkable site. But this will have the benefit of enormous future land preservation and leverage critical tourism dollars for both of our States.

Senator Chafee, who was a great champion of open space and of preservation, a Marine veteran, Secretary of the Navy, throughout his long political career was one of the most passionate environmentally committed senators. He had a great love of history, a love of New England, a love of this region, and I know he would be excited about this concept of turning this river valley into this national park.

It is unique to the American experience in its development, and I think protecting it as a national historical park would be hugely in the public interest, and a wonderful way to honor his memory.

Finally, just a quick word about the Essex National Heritage Area Reauthorization Act; Senator Kennedy and I also worked together on this through the 1990s together with the citizens of the region. This is the area north of Boston, encompassing communities like Salem, and Gloucester, Rockport, and many others inland. It has a tremendous impact on conservation in the area, but we recognized the national significance of this historic area, a 500 square mile region. We established the National Historic Heritage Area, which has allowed it to develop a remarkable interconnectedness in terms of tourism and the preservation of these historical sites.

Mr. Chairman, there are now 9,968 historic structures listed on the National Register of Historic Places in this area. There are 400 historic farms. There are 86 significant museums. There are 26 important National Historic Landmarks, 9 scenic State Parks fit within that area, 2 National Park units are there now, and one National Wildlife Refuge. It is a remarkable arena.

Annie Harris, who is the Executive Director of the Essex National Heritage Commission, is going to be here to testify today. She will speak in more detail to the successes of the area, but she will also highlight one of the best parts of the program there. It is something called "The Youth Job Corps." The Corps accepts between 10 and 25 young people each summer who work at the Salem Maritime and Saugus Iron Works National Historical Sites under the supervision of the National Park Service employees.

So these kids not only get a great work experience, but they develop an important sense of history, pride, and loyalty to the hometown, and that is a wonderful thing to create, I think, in our citizens.

So thanks for giving me a chance to talk about these 3 areas. We really want to work with this committee to get this out of here. They should not be controversial and they would have a profound impact on the long-term historic and economic development of our State.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Senator, for that very compelling statement.

I do very much look forward to working together with you. I think the emphasis on jobs and our youth, there is nothing better than that combination. I look forward to getting in a kayak or a canoe.

Senator KERRY. Yes.

Senator UDALL. See, you may remember, I went to school in western Massachusetts and fell in love with that part of our great country, and I always looking forward to visiting your part of New England.

Senator KERRY. Thank you. We appreciate it. We look forward to it, and I know you love getting out there.

Senator UDALL. Senator Reed.

STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND

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

I thank you particularly for the opportunity to appear today and to speak on behalf of S. 1708, the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park Establishment Act. I was proud to introduce this bipartisan legislation, along with Senator Kerry, Senator Whitehouse, and Senator Scott Brown. I particularly want to thank Senator Kerry for his kind words in support of this legislation, but also he was instrumental along with Senators Ted Kennedy, John Chafee, Lincoln Chafee, and others in moving us where we are today. We are on the verge, we hope, of enacting this legislation and creating a national park.

Creating this new national park will preserve the industrial heritage, and natural and cultural resources of the Blackstone River Valley. It will help provide economic development opportunities for the local economy, and build upon the solid foundation that the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor has already established.

Samuel Slater built his mill in 1793 and started the American Industrial Revolution in Rhode Island along the Blackstone River. He was an early proponent of taking intellectual property and bringing it someplace else, and getting an industry going. He did, and that really was the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in the United States, and the factory system, and it all has its roots there.

But as Senator Kerry has pointed out, the Blackstone River Valley is a rich concentration of mills and villages. They illustrate this whole period of American history from the 1790s and through the mid-part of the 1800s. The Blackstone Valley is truly a national treasure, thousands of acres of beautiful, undeveloped land and waterways that have been developed and made accessible to vacationers and outdoorsmen and women.

The extensive work of the National Park Service and the tireless efforts of Federal, State, and local officials, developers, and volunteers in both Rhode Island and Massachusetts have resulted in the recovery of dozens of historic villages, river ways, rural landscapes throughout the Corridor. It is a remarkable success story.

These types of economic redevelopment and environmental restoration efforts reflect the ongoing story of the Blackstone River

and the whole valley, stretching between Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

One example is the Ashton Mill in Cumberland, Rhode Island. With the designation as a National Heritage Corridor, with the clean up of the Blackstone River that resulted, with the creation of the Blackstone River State Park in Lincoln very close to Ashton, and the construction of the Blackstone River Bikeway, this property was then restored for reuse as rental apartments.

Once again an old mill, that was on the verge of demolition, was turned into a vital and vibrant rental property that has revitalized the entire community. That is one example of what is happening along the Blackstone River.

We have made progress in environmental restoration. Senator Kerry invited you to get in a kayak and a canoe and come down the River. I do not think he would have done that 20 years ago. You can do it now. In fact, we had Interior Secretary Ken Salazar up there, and as he was walking along the Blackstone, the kayakers and the canoers were up and down the river. So it has been restored.

I have been pleased to help over the years working with both my colleague John Chafee and our Massachusetts colleagues with Lincoln Chafee and with Sheldon Whitehouse. Senator Lincoln Chafee was the one who asked the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of the Heritage Corridor. After extensive local input from stakeholders and historians, a draft study was released last July and officially transmitted to Congress this March.

The study recommended the creation of a new, national historical park whose boundaries would encompass nationally significant areas in both Rhode Island and Massachusetts including the Blackstone River and its tributaries; the Blackstone Canal; and the historic districts of Old Slater Mill in Pawtucket; the villages of Slatersville and Ashton, Rhode Island; and the villages of Whitinsville and Hopedale in Massachusetts.

The Department of Interior officially stated in its recent letter to Congress about the study that its preferred management option is the creation of a new, national historical park since it is the most effective and efficient alternative for the protection of resources and visitor use and enjoyment, and is favored by most Blackstone River Valley stakeholders and citizens, who commented on the study.

The park described in the study and the legislation that I have introduced, along with Senator Kerry, would be run collaboratively through a special partnership in which the National Park Service would manage and operate the facilities, and provide educational services in the park, in partnership with regional and local preservation groups who would lead the efforts to preserve the surrounding rural and agricultural landscape within the greater Blackstone River Valley.

The partnerships between the Federal, State, and local and private organizations have a proven track record of success within the Corridor, and I believe that the communities in Rhode Island and Massachusetts that have been engaged in this endeavor for many years will continue to successfully partner with the National Park Service going forward.

Designating these areas as a national historical park has important economic and environmental, historical and educational benefits for the region. It would provide opportunities for work, opportunities for recreation, and opportunities to boost economic development while memorializing the history of this place and its role in the American Industrial Revolution.

This is a 2 State initiative clearly indicated by the presence of Senator Kerry and myself today. Mr. Chairman, I, too am very proud as Senator Kerry that this park has been chosen to commemorate the work of John H. Chafee, a great environmentalist.

In 1962 when I was 12 years old, as the Governor of the State, he introduced the Green Acres Program, which was State resources acquiring open lands. That was 8 years before the real dawn of the environmental movement in the United States. He was a visionary then, a visionary in the Senate, and this would be a fitting tribute to his service as a Marine, as the Secretary of the Navy, as the United States Senator, as the Governor of Rhode Island, and as a great American.

So, I hope that we can move together, work with the Park Service, come quickly to a conclusion and move this forward.

I would also like to submit a letter* in support of this legislation from Senator Whitehouse.

Senator UDALL. Without objection.

Senator REED. Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you so much. I look forward to working with you, and Chairman Bingaman, and Ranking Member Murkowski, and Ranking Member Paul, and all the members of the committee.

Thank you.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, gentlemen, for the compelling testimony. I know you both helm important committees and subcommittees, but this is one of the reasons I think I have a great assignment, chairing the National Park Subcommittee is to reconnect with our heritage and our national landscapes.

I do not think it would surprise you if I told you that in my family, both my uncle Stewart and my father, Mo, venerated John Chafee, and it was a real thrill for me to meet him as a young man because of that vision and that passion. He was Teddy Roosevelt in our era, you could argue, maybe with a little more statesmanlike vocabulary. But he was—what, Senator Kerry?

Senator KERRY. Calmer demeanor.

Senator UDALL. A calmer demeanor. But he is a hero to all of us, and this would be very, very fitting and I look forward to working with you.

One final comment, Senator Kerry. I am not very competitive, but if Secretary Salazar has been up on the Blackstone, I have got to get up there as well.

Senator REED. You can fly into Providence.

Senator UDALL. Great. Thanks. Thank you again. I know how busy you are. Thanks for taking the time to appear before the subcommittee. Thank you.

---

*Letter has been printed in the Appendix.

We have—now we will be joined by Dr. Stephanie Toothman, who is the Associate Director of Cultural Resources at the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

Dr. Toothman, I understand this is your first time testifying before us, and it is wonderful to have you here with us. I look forward to your comments and again, the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF STEPHANIE TOOTHMAN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, CULTURAL RESOURCES, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to—thank you.

Senator UDALL. There we go.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. It is my first time.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee to present the Department of the Interior's views on 11 bills on today's agenda. I would like to submit our full statements on each of these bills for the record and summarize the Department's views.

Senator UDALL. Without objection.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Thank you.

The Department supports S. 1215. This legislation would provide for the exchange of land located at Lowell National Historical Park, and would continue the preservation loan fund to help finance the restoration and redevelopment of historic structures through 2036. Both provisions facilitate the Park's long term goals without requiring any additional appropriation.

The Department supports S. 1708 and H.R. 2606 with amendments.

S. 1708 would establish the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park as a new unit of the National Park system.

H.R. 2606 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow the construction and operation of natural gas pipeline facilities in the Gateway National Recreation Area, and authorizes a non-competitive lease. Detailed explanations of these amendments are contained in our full statements. We request the opportunity to work with the committee on these amendments.

The Department supports S. 1191 and H.R. 1141.

S. 1191 directs the Department to conduct a study of the resources of a prototypical New England mill town in the Naugatuck River Valley in Connecticut, and my apologies if I did not get "Naugatuck" right.

While H.R. 1141 directs the Department to conduct a study of the prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sights on Rota located in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. The Department also recommends a technical correction to H.R. 1141.

The Department supports the goals of S. 29 and S. 1150, but recommends deferring action on both of these bills.

S. 29 would establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area. A feasibility study for the area is underway by the Delta Protection Commission, and the National Park Service staff is currently reviewing the Commission's draft study for consistency with the Interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study

Guidelines. The Department believes it would be premature to recommend support for establishment of this National Heritage Area without an evaluation of its feasibility.

S. 1150 establishes the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in the State of Pennsylvania. A 2008 study determined Susquehanna meets the interim criteria for potential designation. However, there is currently no program legislation that establishes criteria to evaluate potentially qualified national heritage areas, and a process for the designation and administration of these areas.

We recommend that Congress defer action on S. 1150 until the heritage area program legislation is enacted by Congress.

The Department supports S. 1198, S. 2131, and S. 2133, 3 bills that would reauthorize Federal funding for 5 National Heritage Areas where authority for Federal heritage area program funding sunsets at the end of fiscal year 2012. The Department recommends extending their authorization until we have completed an evaluation and report on the accomplishments of these Areas, and the future role of the National Park Service, and until heritage area program legislation is enacted.

S. 1198 would reauthorize the Essex National Heritage Area in the State of Massachusetts.

S. 2131 would reauthorize the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, and the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor in the State of Pennsylvania.

S. 2133 would reauthorize America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership in the State of Iowa. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future Federal role when heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that Congress enact national heritage legislation during this Congress.

The Department has no objection to S. 1589, which would extend the authorization for the Coastal Heritage Trail in the State of New Jersey.

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

[The prepared statement of Ms. Toothman follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF STEPHANIE TOOTHMAN, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, CULTURAL RESOURCES, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ON S. 29

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 29, a bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area.

The Department recognizes the importance of the natural, historic, scenic and cultural resources within the proposed Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area, but recommends deferring action on S. 29 until a feasibility study is completed. A Feasibility Study for a Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area is underway by the Delta Protection Commission. National Park Service staff are currently reviewing the Commission's draft study for consistency with the interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines. The Department believes that it would be premature to recommend support for establishment of this national heritage area without an evaluation of its feasibility.

S. 29 would establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area within the counties of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo, in the State of California, with the Delta Protection Commission designated as the Heritage Area's management entity. The Sacramento-San Joaquin is a rare inland/

inverse Delta and the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Americas. Its vast size, unique shape, and geographic location in the heart of California has produced a heritage of habitat and community diversity, industry, innovation, and a unique infrastructure.

A rapid rise in sea level following the last ice age 10,000 years ago inundated the alluvial valley of the Sacramento River and formed the Delta landscape. From the confluence of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers emerged a system of freshwater and brackish marshes and extensive grassland, oak woodland, savannah, chaparral, and riparian habitat rich with wildlife. Native Americans built villages and trading posts, and early fur traders such as Jedediah Smith trekked into the region in search of otter, mink and beaver.

Then, gold seekers on their way from San Francisco to the gold fields in the Sierra Nevada recognized the fertility of the Delta's soils. Beginning in the 1880s, with significant contributions from Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, East Indian, Portuguese and Italian immigrants and the development of innovative equipment, one of the largest scale reclamation projects in the United States converted the vast marshes into the predominantly agricultural landscape that characterizes the Delta today.

As one of the most productive agricultural regions in the country, the Delta exports crops throughout the world and contributes billions of dollars to the California economy. The Delta irrigates over seven million acres of the State's farmland and also supplies two-thirds of California's residents their drinking water.

Still an important natural area, the Delta is a key stopover on the Pacific Flyway and an important anadromous fish corridor. Its waterways provide leisurely retreats for large, nearby urban populations in the San Francisco Bay area and Great Central Valley. Agricultural-related tourism initiatives are springing up to showcase and share the region's agricultural traditions while wildlife friendly farming practices demonstrate how Delta farmland and habitat can coexist.

A Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area could promote a wide range of partnerships among governments, organizations and individuals to increase public awareness of and appreciation for the important natural, historic, scenic and cultural resources of the area. However, the Department would withhold a final recommendation until we have had an opportunity to review the completed feasibility study.

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

S. 1150

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1150, a bill to establish the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in Pennsylvania.

The Department recognizes the appropriateness of designating the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area, but recommends deferring action on S. 1150 until program legislation is enacted that establishes criteria to evaluate potentially qualified national heritage areas and a process for the designation and administration of these areas.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas. We recommend that Congress enact this legislation during this Congress.

Flowing for 441 miles, the Susquehanna River is the longest river on the East Coast and the largest contributor of fresh water to the Chesapeake Bay. The portions of the river flowing through Lancaster and York Counties in Pennsylvania exhibit exceptional natural and recreational value and traverse landscapes of historical importance to our nation.

The region of the proposed Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area was first inhabited by Native Americans who left evidence of their occupation in a myriad of archeological sites, as well as rock art at several petroglyph sites. When Captain John Smith journeyed up the Susquehanna River in the summer of 1608, he sent emissaries to the Susquehannock town located on the east side of the river near present day Washington Boro in Lancaster County. Tribal leaders there entered a trade alliance, opening to the English a trade network extending hundreds of miles.

In 1668, William Penn set the tone for religious tolerance in Pennsylvania and brought colonists who settled the great fertile valley of the Susquehanna Gateway region, beginning its long history as an abundant agricultural center. Serving as an important transportation corridor, the river provided opportunities for commerce and invention. It was here that John Elgar constructed the first iron steamboat in America. The birthplace of Robert Fulton, the original inventor of steam powered boats, is a National Historic Landmark in Lancaster County. Here, too, Phineas Davis designed and built the first practical coal burning steam locomotive, thereby revolutionizing railroad transportation.

The region is the home ground of the "Plain People".the Amish and Mennonites. Their religious values, simple way of life, and well-tended farms speak to the deepest feelings that Americans have about ourselves and our national experience.

In this region, visitors also find evidence of our Revolutionary War past. Lancaster and York Counties served as venues for the Continental Congress when it left Philadelphia upon the British occupation of that city. In the courthouse in York, the Congress approved the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union, the nation's "first constitution," and sent it forth to the states for ratification. In the summer of 1781, Continental Army General James Wood established Camp Security, housing more than a thousand British soldiers from General John Burgoyne's army, which had surrendered at Saratoga.

The region also has an abundance of natural resources including migratory bird nesting sites, remnants of old growth forests, and areas of both ecological diversity and scenic quality. Ferncliff, known for its wildflowers, and the Susquehanna Gorge are both designated National Natural Landmarks. Recreational resources abound in the region, including the Kelly's Run and Susquehanna River Water Trails, both National Recreation Trails.

S. 1150 designates the Susquehanna Heritage Corporation, a non-profit organization, as the proposed management entity for the Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area. The area, designated as a state heritage area in 2001, recently changed its name from the Lancaster-York Heritage Region to the Susquehanna Gateway Heritage Area, to reflect the area's expanded focus, which includes the cultural and economic value of the Susquehanna River. The Susquehanna Heritage Corporation has demonstrated success in coordinating among diverse partners in Lancaster and York Counties. Over the past nine years, the Corporation has been effective in facilitating preservation, interpretative, and educational projects and in leveraging community participation and funding. The heritage area has strong support from the public and from a myriad of state, local, federal, and non-governmental partners throughout the area. In 2008, the Corporation prepared a national heritage area feasibility study that was reviewed by the National Park Service and found to meet the interim criteria for potential designation.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony. I would be pleased to answer any questions from members of the committee.

S. 1191

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before the committee to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1191, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Naugatuck River Valley National Heritage Area in Connecticut, and for other purposes.

The Department supports enactment of S. 1191. However, we feel that priority should be given to the 36 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic Rivers System that have not yet been transmitted to Congress.

In addition, the Department continues to recommend that Congress enact program legislation for national heritage area studies and designations. There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas. We recommend that Congress enact this legislation during this Congress.

The proposed study area includes a part of Connecticut following the Naugatuck River Valley between Torrington and Shelton in the counties of Litchfield and New Haven. The Naugatuck River Valley contains a collection of historic and natural resources relating to the industrial, intellectual, political, and architectural heritage

of the United States. The proposed study area includes numerous properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and three National Historic Landmarks: the Litchfield National Historic Landmark District; the Tapping Reeve House and Law School, which was the first law school in the United States; and the Oliver Wolcott House, which was the home of a signer of the Declaration of Independence. Many of the fourteen communities identified in the bill are prototypical New England mill towns that represent one of the main manufacturing centers of the nation during the 19th and 20th centuries and a crucial hub of industrial innovation. The valley's principal industries were rubber (Charles Goodyear developed the rubber vulcanization process here), brass (first developed in the valley), and clock making. The story of the immigrants who worked in these industries and contributed to the cultural mosaic of the country is equally compelling. The river flows for over forty miles through landscapes of historical importance to our nation.

The proposed study area has extensive recreational resources in place or under development, including the Naugatuck River Greenway, the Derby Greenway, and the Steele Brooke Greenway. Through the efforts of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection and the support of the local communities, considerable progress has been made to restore water quality along the length of the proposed study area. It is an area worthy of study for potential designation as a national heritage area.

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

S. 1198

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1198, a bill to reauthorize the Essex National Heritage Area.

The Department recognizes the important work of the Essex National Heritage Area to preserve heritage resources in Essex County, Massachusetts. We recommend that S. 1198 be amended to authorize an extension for heritage area program funding until we have completed an Evaluation and Report on the accomplishments of the area and the future role of the National Park Service; and until heritage area program legislation is enacted that standardizes timeframes and funding for designated national heritage areas. Consistent with congressional directives in the 2009 and 2010 Interior Appropriations Acts, the Administration proposed focusing most national heritage area grants on recently authorized areas and reducing and/or phasing out funds to well-established recipients to encourage self-sufficiency in the FY 2013 Budget. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that Congress enact national heritage legislation during this Congress.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

Essex National Heritage Area (Essex) was established in 1996 by Public Law 103-333. Essex was established to recognize, preserve, promote, and interpret the historic, cultural, and natural resources of the North Shore and lower Merrimack River valley in Essex County, Massachusetts. The early settlement history, maritime history, and the imprint of the early industrial era on the landscape, in particular, were considered to be nationally distinctive and met the criteria for Heritage Area designation. Essex preserves and interprets a rich cultural landscape that includes historic homes, small family farms, and historic industrial architecture. Additionally, Essex contains an array of scenic and natural resources such as rocky coasts and harbors, marshlands, and rivers. Essex spans 500 square miles in northeastern Massachusetts, and includes 34 cities and towns.

Essex is managed by the Essex National Heritage Commission (Commission), which facilitates public private partnerships for the preservation of heritage resources and works closely with National Park Service (NPS) staff at Salem Maritime National Historic Site and Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site, both of which are within the boundary of Essex. The Commission's work focuses on regional initiatives for heritage programming, interpretation, and education, preservation and resource stewardship, heritage development and infrastructure, and planning and design.

During its 15 years of existence, Essex has a significant record of achievement. Essex has worked closely with NPS staff at Salem Maritime and Saugus Iron Works on a variety of educational and interpretive programs to educate visitors and students about local heritage resources. One successful example is the Trails & Sails weekend, a county-wide event that involves more than 50 host organizations at more than 140 host locations in Essex County in providing interpretive tours, hikes, walks, sail trips and special events at no charge to participants. The Essex Local History In a National Context program has also successfully brought the main themes of Essex into area classrooms.

Essex has played a significant role in local communities in helping to inventory and research historic resources. Working with the Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation, Essex created a catalog of heritage landscapes that communities had identified as being valuable and worthy of protection. In all, communities identified 1,320 resources in 24 of the 34 municipalities included within the boundary of Essex. Additionally, the inventory articulated strategies for preserving these historic resources and landscapes.

Essex has also implemented a successful public information and wayfinding campaign for promoting tourism within the Heritage Area. More than 80 directional highway signs have been installed within Essex that point visitors toward regional visitor centers and historic and natural visitor destinations. These signs not only have helped visitors find tourism destinations within Essex, they have also helped create a regional identity for the heritage area. Essex also plays a significant role in leveraging federal dollars. For every Federal dollar Essex received, it leveraged approximately $5 of non-federal funds in fiscal year 2011 ($671,000 Federal vs. $3,574,139 non-federal). In total, Essex has received over $12 million in Federal funding.

S. 1198, as written, would extend the authorization of federal funding for Essex for an additional 15 years and increase the authorization of appropriations by $5 million. Currently, Essex is one of the nine heritage areas now being evaluated by the NPS pursuant to Public Law 110-229. We anticipate the Essex evaluation will be transmitted to Congress this year, and will include recommendations on what the future role of the National Park Service should be in the area.

We recommend a technical amendment to the long title of the bill to make it clear that the bill would extend the authorization for Federal funding for the heritage area instead of reauthorizing the heritage area. While the Essex National Heritage Area faces a sunset for its Federal funding, its National Heritage Area designation will not sunset.

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

S. 1215

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1215, a bill to authorize the exchange of land or interest in land between Lowell National Historical Park and the city of Lowell in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

The Department supports enactment of this legislation. S. 1215 would enable Lowell National Historical Park to acquire land by means of exchange with public entities and to continue beyond 2018 the successful use of the Preservation Loan Fund to help finance the restoration and redevelopment of historic structures. Both of these provisions would facilitate the park's long-term goals without requiring any additional appropriations.

Public Law 95-290, enacted in 1978, established Lowell National Historical Park to preserve and interpret the city's nationally significant historical and cultural sites, structures, and districts associated with the city's role in the 19th Century American industrial revolution. Along with the park, the law established the Lowell Historic Preservation Commission to complement and coordinate the efforts of the park, the Commonwealth, and local and private entities in developing and managing the historic and cultural resources and to administer the Lowell Historic Preservation District. The law established an arrangement that requires a high level of cooperation between the Federal, Commonwealth, and local governments, and the private sector. The General Management Plan (GMP) and the Lowell Preservation Plan were designed to be supportive of local government preservation and community development efforts and to encourage substantial private investment in the redevelopment of the city's vast 19th-century urban resources.

Over the past three decades, the park and the commission have played a key role in the city's revitalization. Working in cooperation with the city, Commonwealth,

and other public entities and private partners, the National Park Service has contributed to the rehabilitation of over 400 structures and the creation of extensive public programs to preserve and interpret the city's cultural resources. An estimated $1 billion in private investment has occurred within the park and preservation district since the creation of the park. To date, 88 percent of the 5.2 million square feet of vacant mill space within the park and preservation district has been renovated or is in the process of being renovated in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Because of changes in the vicinity of the park as these preservation and redevelopment efforts have occurred, the National Park Service would like to shift the use, management, or ownership of some park lands in order to facilitate their redevelopment for other uses. The park's maintenance facility and visitor center parking lot sites, which are not historic, have been identified by the University of Massachusetts-Lowell, and the City of Lowell, respectively, as critical to their master plan redevelopment programs. The university and city seek to acquire these sites from the park, have proposed to develop them in ways consistent with the mission, intent and purposes of the park, and have expressed a willingness to work with the park to help facilitate the equitable exchange and relocation of these facilities. The park's September 2010 GMP Amendment specifically recommended the Visitor Center Parking Lot exchange with the city. The University's request to exchange the park's maintenance facility came after the GMP, but is in the park's long-term interest. The National Park Service supports the exchange of both the Visitor Center Parking Lot and the park's maintenance facility.

Under current law, the park has authority to acquire property from the Commonwealth or its political subdivisions only by donation. S. 1215 would give the park the authority to acquire land by exchange from the Commonwealth, the city of Lowell, or the University of Massachusetts Building Authority. This authority would enable the park to conduct both proposed land exchanges. The legislation ensures that if the value of land to be acquired by the park is lower than the value of the land exchanged, the city or Commonwealth would be required to make a cash payment to equalize values and the park would have use of those funds for the purpose of replacing exchanged facilities and infrastructure. At this time, the National Park Service has not identified potential exchange properties.

The Preservation Loan Fund was also authorized in Public Law 95-290 and formally established in 1983. The purpose of the fund is to stimulate private investment in nationally significant historic buildings to meet the historic preservation mandate within the Lowell National Historical Park and Preservation District. The law directed the commission to loan the funds to the non-profit Lowell Development and Financial Corporation, to create a revolving loan fund to accomplish historic preservation goals. The program has funded twenty-one nationally significant historic building projects with loans totaling approximately $2.5 million. The original Federal appropriation of $750,000 leveraged non-federal project investments totaling approximately $130.3 million to date, representing over $173 in non-federal investment for each Federal dollar appropriated.

The Preservation Loan Fund was initially authorized for a 35-year period expiring in 2018. S. 1215 would extend the program for an additional 25 years. The extension of the program would enable existing funds to continue in a revolving fund for the purposes identified in the original authorization. No additional appropriations would be needed. Despite what has been accomplished in Lowell, numerous historic structures still require rehabilitation, and this program is an important catalyst for generating the private and non-federal funding needed to ensure the preservation of these structures. Extending this authorization would greatly enhance the park's efforts to assure the integrity of the park and preservation district.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I would be pleased to answer any questions you or members of the subcommittee may have regarding S. 1215.

S. 1589

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1589, a bill to extend the authorization for the Coastal Heritage Trail in the State of New Jersey.

The Department does not object to S. 1589, but notes that the National Park Service is no longer providing technical assistance since the authorization of funding expired on September 30, 2011. This bill would extend the trail's authorization to September 30, 2016.

Public Law 100-515 enacted on October 20, 1988, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to designate a vehicular tour route in coastal New Jersey and to prepare an inventory of sites along the route. An interpretive program was also mandated

to provide for public appreciation, education, understanding and enjoyment of important fish and wildlife habitats, geologic and geographical landforms, cultural resources, and migration routes in coastal New Jersey. The Secretary was authorized to provide technical assistance, prepare and distribute information, and erect signs along the route. The resulting New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route links national wildlife refuges, national parklands, National Historic Landmarks, and National Register sites with important historic communities, state parks, natural areas, and other resources to tell the story of New Jersey's role in shaping U.S. history and in providing internationally important habitats for bird and other migrations.

The trail was envisioned as a partnership among the National Park Service (NPS), the State of New Jersey, and many local government and private non-profit partners. Through interpretation of five themes (Maritime History, Coastal Habitats, Wildlife Migration, Relaxation & Inspiration, and Historic Settlements), the trail brought attention to important natural and cultural resources along coastal New Jersey. The trail had a variety of accomplishments that have continued to provide enjoyment and education to visitors even after the trail's authorization expired including a wayside exhibit program, welcome center partnerships in several communities, a successful publications and brochure program, and a highway directional signage program. All of these accomplishments were the result of partnerships with state, local and other entities and helped meet the trail's core mission of natural and cultural resource preservation along with interpretation and public education in a cost-efficient manner through technical assistance while reducing operational responsibilities. No NPS funds were used for maintenance, repair, or operation of any road or road-related structure.

Prior to the expiration of the NPS authority for assistance for the trail in 2011, the NPS completed a strategic plan for the trail. The strategic plan identified four options for the continuance of the trail's mission: 1) No further NPS management of the trail after the sunset date of September 30, 2011; 2) Limited time for NPS management, in order to transition to a new management framework; 3) A new federal role for or within the trail project area; and 4) Permanent authorization for the trail. With the exception of option 1, all identified options required legislative action.

With the expiration of the trail authorization on September 30, 2011, the NPS moved forward with implementing option 1 from the strategic plan and commenced an orderly conclusion of NPS management of the trail. The NPS closed its trail office in Newport, New Jersey, relocated staff assigned to work on the trail to other NPS offices and ended direct NPS involvement in the operation of the trail. If assistance is reauthorized, the NPS does not intend to reopen its trail office, reassign staff to work on the trail or otherwise change its current management structure. The NPS would support the trail through the work of appropriate regional staff.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony. I would be pleased to answer any questions from members of the committee.

S. 1708

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1708, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park.

The Department supports S. 1708, if amended in accordance with this testimony.

S. 1708 would establish a new unit of the National Park System, the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park (Park) within the existing, bi-state, Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor (Corridor) that extends from Worcester, Massachusetts to Providence, Rhode Island. The bill directs the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) to administer the Park in accordance with the laws applicable to the National Park System and authorizes the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with state and local governments as well as the coordinating entity for the Corridor and others, for the purpose of collaborating on programs, projects and activities that further the purposes of the Park.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary to acquire land for the Park from willing sellers with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from another federal agency, or exchange. Lands owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or the State of Rhode Island, or their political subdivisions, may only be acquired by donation or exchange. Finally, the Secretary is directed to complete a General Management Plan for the Park within three years after funds are made available. Among other things, the plan must seek to make maximum practicable use of certain named visitor facilities in the Corridor that are operated by Corridor partners, many of which were developed with significant investment of federal funds.

S. 1708 is consistent with the findings of the Special Resources Study (SRS) that the National Park Service (NPS) completed in accordance with Public Law 109-338 of 2006, which directed the NPS to conduct the SRS to "evaluate the possibility of (A) designating one or more sites or landscape features as a unit of the National Park System; and (B) coordinating and complementing actions by the [Corridor] Commission, local governments, and State and Federal agencies, in the preservation and interpretation of significant resources within the Corridor." The SRS evaluated a broad range of sites, features and resources throughout the Blackstone River Valley and concluded that the following meet the criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park System: Old Slater Mill National Historic Landmark district in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, the historic mill villages of Ashton and Slatersville in Rhode Island, and Hopedale and Whitinsville in Massachusetts; the Blackstone River and its tributaries; and the Blackstone Canal. S. 1708 proposes to include these sites and features in a new unit of the National Park System.

The SRS also evaluated various management alternatives with different scopes and levels of National Park Service involvement. The preferred alternative, from both an environmental and park management perspective, is a new unit of the National Park System that consists of the aforementioned sites and features, and that would partner with the coordinating entity for the Corridor and others to undertake the protection and interpretation of these resources. S. 1708 reflects that recommendation, as it proposes to create a National Historical Park in the Blackstone River Valley of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. The Park would be granted the necessary authorities to continue to work with the Corridor and other partners to optimize protection, management, and public enjoyment of these resources. We believe that the NPS, working in partnership with local groups within the Corridor is the most effective and cost efficient management model for a new unit of the National Park System in the Blackstone River Valley.

If established based upon the management alternative recommended in the SRS, we estimate that the cost to create the Park would be $6.1 million in one-time expenditures on research, planning, construction and/or rehabilitation, and exhibits. When the Park is fully established, operational costs are estimated to be $3.5 million annually for salaries, supplies and equipment. All funds would be subject to NPS priorities and the availability of appropriations.

We recommend several amendments to S. 1708 to clarify authorities and conform the bill to similar legislation establishing new National Park System units.

First, we recommend changing the name of the Park to Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park. While we have the greatest respect for the late Senator John H. Chafee and recall his strong support for the protection of our national parks and his efforts to preserve the resources of the Blackstone River Valley, we know of no instances of national parks being named after their congressional sponsors nor do we wish to set this precedent. Naming the Park after the late senator would divert attention from the important resources and values that Park visitors learn about at national park sites, and could cause confusion between the park and the surrounding national heritage corridor that bears the senator's name.

As an alternative, we recommend that the committee consider dedicating the Park to Senator Chafee, naming the main visitor center in his honor, or providing some interpretive exhibits or materials about his work.

Second, we recommend that parcels for Federal land acquisition be prioritized in order to establish a base for NPS ownership and management and that NPS be authorized to acquire a limited amount of land for administrative purposes outside the boundary of the Park. NPS currently has office space outside of the park boundary in Woonsocket, RI, and being able to continue to use this space for purposes of the park will save money and allow a central location that will better serve the urban communities of the park. We also recommend language that creates a matching requirement for the expenditure of Federal funds under cooperative agreements for any natural, historic or cultural resource protection project in the Park or the Corridor that is consistent with the general management plan. There is approximately $1 million in unexpended funds for the heritage corridor that remains available for these types of projects. The use of this cooperative agreement authority for any future projects would be subject to further appropriations for this purpose and Administration priorities. We will be happy to work with the committee on drafting these suggested amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2131, a bill to reauthorize the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, and the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor.

The Department recognizes the important work of the three national heritage areas to preserve historic, cultural, natural, and recreational resources in Pennsylvania. We recommend that S. 2131 be amended to authorize an extension for heritage area program funding until we have completed an Evaluation and Report on the accomplishments of the area and the future role of the National Park Service; and until program legislation is enacted that standardizes timeframes and funding for designated national heritage areas. Consistent with congressional directives in the 2009 and 2010 Interior Appropriations Acts, the Administration proposed focusing most national heritage area grants on recently authorized areas and reducing and/or phasing out funds to well-established recipients to encourage self-sufficiency in the FY 2013 Budget. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that Congress enact national heritage legislation during this Congress.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

Created by Public Law 104-333 in 1996, the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area (Rivers of Steel) is made up of eight counties in southwestern Pennsylvania known for their significant contributions to the steel industry in America. The mission of Rivers of Steel is to preserve and interpret the history of the region and share the dynamic story of the evolution of southwestern Pennsylvania from a small colonial settlement to the flourishing of the steel industry in the area.

The Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area (Lackawanna) was established by Public Law 106-278 in 2000. The Lackawanna includes four counties in northeastern Pennsylvania with historical ties to the anthracite coal industry. These counties preserve nationally distinctive resources related to Pennsylvania and America's industrial history, including the history of major labor unions and the struggle to improve working conditions of mine workers. The mission of the Lackawanna is to conserve, interpret and develop the historical, cultural, natural and recreational resources associated with the area's significant history.

The Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor (Delaware and Lehigh) was established by Public Law 100-692 in 1988, one of the earliest National Heritage Areas created by Congress. The Delaware and Lehigh follows the historic Delaware Canal and Lehigh Navigation Canal through eastern Pennsylvania. Completed in 1834, the Delaware Canal was an important early transportation route that transformed eastern Pennsylvania from an agrarian region to an industrialized society. The Delaware Canal is a designated National Historic Landmark and portions of the Lehigh Navigation Canal are on the National Register of Historic Places. The purpose of the Delaware and Lehigh is to provide an integrated management structure that will preserve and interpret the canals and their history.

The bedrock of the National Heritage Area concept has always been building partnerships for achieving goals. All three of these non-profit heritage areas, with government funding assistance since their establishment, have shown significant success in working with partners and the Federal government to preserve, interpret, and promote the significant resources in their local areas. Every Federal dollar has been matched with non-federal funds. For example in fiscal year 2011, Lackawanna's Federal appropriation was $446,112 while the amount of leveraged non-Federal dollars was $1,361,235. For the same fiscal year, Rivers of Steel received $682,000 in Federal funding and received $734,313 in leveraged dollars, while Delaware and Lehigh received $625,000 in Federal funding and received $1,566,395 in leveraged dollars, which equals an average of $2 in non-federal funds for every dollar of Federal funds. In total, Lackawanna has received nearly $6 million in Federal funding, Rivers of Steel has received approximately $12.2 million in Federal funding, and Delaware and Lehigh has received about $11.5 million in Federal funding.

S. 2131, as drafted, would extend the authorization for federal funding for these three heritage areas for an additional ten years. Currently, the Evaluation and Report required by Public Law 110-229 is being completed for Rivers of Steel and we anticipate the evaluation will be transmitted to Congress this year. There is no leg-

islation requiring an Evaluation and Report for Lackawanna. To be consistent with other national heritage areas, we recommend the bill be amended to include Evaluation and Report language similar to Sec. 462 of Public Law 110-229 for Lackawanna. The NPS and the Delaware and Lehigh completed an evaluation for the Delaware and Lehigh, however, this evaluation did not include recommendations on what the future role of the National Park Service should be in the area. The National Park Service will take another look at the evaluation and include recommendations on the future role of the National Park Service prior to transmitting it to Congress in order to be consistent with the other reports.

We recommend a technical amendment to the long title of the bill to make it clear that the bill would extend the authorization for federal funding for the heritage areas instead of reauthorizing the heritage areas. While the three heritage areas face a sunset date for their federal funding, their national heritage area designation will not sunset.

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

S. 2133

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2133, a bill to reauthorize the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership in the State of Iowa.

The Department recognizes the important work of the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership, better known as Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area, in northeast Iowa. We recommend that S. 2133 be amended to authorize an extension for heritage area program funding until we have completed an Evaluation and Report on the accomplishments of the area and the future role of the National Park Service; and until heritage area program legislation is enacted that standardizes timeframes and funding for designated national heritage areas. Consistent with congressional directives in the 2009 and 2010 Interior Appropriations Acts, the Administration proposed focusing most national heritage area grants on recently authorized areas and reducing and/or phasing out funds to well-established recipients to encourage self-sufficiency in the FY 2013 Budget. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding. We recommend that Congress enact national heritage legislation during this Congress.

There are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas. Program legislation would provide a much-needed framework for evaluating proposed national heritage areas, offering guidelines for successful planning and management, clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all parties, and standardizing timeframes and funding for designated areas.

America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership, better known as Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area, in northeast Iowa, was established in 1996 by Public Law 103-333 to interpret farm life, agribusiness and rural communities-past and present. Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area preserves and tells the story of American agriculture and its global significance through partnerships and activities that celebrate the land, people, and communities of the area. The heart of America's agricultural revolution still exists in the Silos and Smokestacks region, and the national heritage area is telling the breadth and scope of this story in a compelling, meaningful way.

The heritage of American agriculture and its influence on the global agricultural revolution were considered to be nationally distinctive and met the criteria for national heritage area designation. American agriculture is one of the primary sources of this country's wealth and world leadership and should be preserved and interpreted. Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area preserves and interprets a rich cultural landscape that includes family farms and historic industrial architecture and rural communities across a 37-county region in Northeast Iowa covering over 20,000 square miles.

The national heritage area is managed by the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership, which facilitates public private partnerships for the preservation and interpretation of heritage resources. The Commission's work focuses on regional initiatives for heritage programming, interpretation, and education, preservation and resource stewardship, heritage development and infrastructure, and planning and design.

During its 15 years of existence, the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area has a significant record of achievement. It has worked closely with the regional business community, county and state governments and multiple non-governmental

organizations to build a network of partner sites dedicated to preserving and interpreting the past, present and future of America's agricultural story. Working together, the network has developed a successful public information and way-finding program for promoting tourism that welcomes visitors along the major highway corridors surrounding the region and identifies the more than 100 partner sites in the heritage area. The new signs serve as a connecting thread for this network of sites, while letting visitors know they can discover a piece of America's agricultural story being preserved at the site.

This way-finding program has not only helped visitors find tourism destinations within the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area, but has also helped the heritage area develop a regional identity.

The bedrock of the National Heritage Area concept has always been building partnerships for achieving goals. Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area, with minimal government funding assistance since its establishment, has shown significant success in working with partners and the Federal government to preserve, interpret, and promote the significant resources of northeast Iowa. Every Federal dollar has been matched with non-federal funds. For example, in fiscal year 2010, Silos and Smokestacks received $609,000 in Federal funding while the amount of leveraged non-Federal dollars was $626,000. Since its establishment, Silos and Smokestacks has received $8,847,107 million in Federal funding.

S. 2133, as is written now, would extend the authorization for federal funding for the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area for an additional 10 years. Currently, Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area is one of the nine heritage areas being evaluated by the National Park Service pursuant to Public Law 110-229. We anticipate its evaluation will be transmitted to Congress this year.

We recommend a technical amendment to the long title of the bill to make it clear that the bill would extend the authorization for Federal funding for the heritage area instead of reauthorizing the heritage area. While the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area faces a sunset for its Federal funding, its national heritage area designation will not sunset.

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

S. 1141

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's testimony regarding H.R. 1141, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System.

The Department supports H.R. 1141 with a technical amendment. Priority should be given, however, to the 36 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic Rivers System that have not yet been transmitted to Congress.

H.R. 1141 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to complete a Special Resource Study of sites on the Island of Rota for potential inclusion in the National Park System. We estimate that this study will cost approximately $250,000 to $300,000.

Rota, where the indigenous Chamorro and Carolinian people have retained their cultural heritage in its natural environment, is the southernmost island of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). Spared the population displacement of other colonial islands and largely bypassed during World War II, Rota preserves striking examples of the three thousand-year-old Chamorro culture surrounded by the best remaining expanse of this island chain's native limestone forest. The Mochon Latte Village, the Chugai Pictograph Cave, the Taga Latte Stone Quarry, and the Alaguan Bay Ancient Village prehistoric sites include architectural features unique to the ancient Chamorro culture and represent outstanding examples of the territory's cultural resources. These sites possess a high degree of integrity in location, materials, workmanship and association.

The limestone forests of Rota are the most intact and most extensive examples of primary, native limestone forest remaining on any island in the Mariana Archipelago. The forest provides and sustains habitat for endangered bird species, a threatened species of fruit bat, and numerous species of invertebrates that are proposed for listing as threatened or endangered. Several of these species are endemic to Rota. The significance of this unique biotic community cannot be overstated.

Rota's residents and legislative delegation have demonstrated an extraordinary commitment to the protection of the island's environment, including establishment

of marine protected areas on Rota. In 2004, Senator Diego M. Songao, Chairman of the Rota Legislative Delegation of the Fourteenth Commonwealth Legislature, formally requested planning assistance from the National Park Service (NPS).

In response to this request, the NPS completed a reconnaissance survey of Rota's natural and cultural resources in September of 2005. The reconnaissance survey found that the natural and cultural resources of the island of Rota are significant to island residents, the CNMI, and the entire nation and merit protection. It also made a preliminary finding that these resources are likely to be suitable and feasible for inclusion in the park system.

At present, the people of Rota and their political leaders find themselves at a crossroads regarding the uses to which their lands are being put. Major land use changes are continuing to take place in the form of residential and agricultural lots being subdivided out of the island's public lands and transferred into private ownership.

Congressional authorization to conduct a Special Resource Study will provide a public process to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating prehistoric, historic, and limestone forest sites on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, as a unit of the National Park System. The NPS would be pleased to actively engage organizations, residents and others in discussions of how best to preserve Rota's significant cultural and natural resources.

The NPS recommends a technical correction to clarify the intent of section 2(a)(2) of the bill. We interpret this section to apply to areas identified as suitable and feasible for designation as a unit of the National Park System. It is possible, however, to read this section more broadly to imply that the National Park Service should examine alternatives for management of the entire island of Rota. We would like to work with the committee to clarify the intent of this section.

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

H.R. 2606

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 2606, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to allow the construction and operation of natural gas pipeline facilities in the Gateway National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

The Department supports H.R. 2606 with amendments described later in this statement.

H.R. 2606 addresses the need for expansion of the current gas line operated by the firm National Grid. The last expansion was over 40 years ago and the line is at capacity. This legislation would authorize the Secretary to allow for a natural gas pipeline right-of-way to pass through Gateway National Recreation Area. Further, it authorizes a non-competitive lease that will facilitate the adaptive use of two historic aircraft hangar buildings on Floyd Bennett Field to house facilities needed for operation of the pipeline. Use of the buildings would be subject to restoration of the buildings and the collection of payment for their use at fair market value.

Numerous alternative routes were considered by National Grid as part of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission compliance process. However, the most feasible route considered would be to use an underground pipeline that traverses lands within Gateway National Recreation Area. It would require a 60,000-square-foot facility to house the metering station and equipment needed to move the gas from the supply lines into smaller, lower-pressure distribution pipelines.

One option considered is to build the facility outside of the park. If built outside of the park, the National Park Service believes that the metering station and required security structures, which would be the approximate size of a football field with 20-foot high walls, would impact park resources, particularly the park viewshed.

The option of constructing a new facility within the park would also cause impacts. New construction for pipeline facilities within the park would be contrary to the National Park Service's goals of reducing infrastructure and carefully managing existing facilities. Floyd Bennett Field and its associated buildings are listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a historic district, and such new construction could additionally jeopardize this status.

The option that appears to be most feasible with least impact to the park is the one that H.R. 2606 would allow: the rehabilitation and use of two currently deteriorated historic airplane hangars on Floyd Bennett Field. If these are used to house the metering station, then neither the 20-foot-tall security structure that would be required around the facility outside of the park nor new construction within the park would be needed. Additionally, the use of these historic hangars on Floyd Ben-

nett Field would allow for operation of the pipeline without impacting the historic landscape, while also providing for long-term care of the structures and providing annual income from rent, which the Secretary would be authorized to retain for infrastructure needs, resource protection, and visitor services at the park.

As passed by the House on February 7, 2012, H.R. 2606 contains provisions to help ensure that the leasing and permitting authorized at Gateway National Recreation Area will be conducted in a way that protects park resources and that revenue derived from the leasing will be retained by the park, consistent with National Park Service law and policy. These are important changes that were made to the bill when it was reported by the House Natural Resources Committee and on the House floor. However, there are two additional amendments we would like to recommend: one to clarify that the equipment housed in the leased hangar will not be subject to both a lease and a permit, and the other to ensure that the National Park Service has the appropriate authority to make any necessary modifications to the lease before renewing it. Proposed language for both of these amendments is attached to this statement.

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

Proposed amendments to H.R. 2606, New York City Natural Gas Supply Enhancement Act, as received in the Senate

Page 2, line 18: Strike "natural gas." and insert "natural gas (but not including the metering and regulating station)".

Page 4, lines 14-16: Strike "with any changes to its terms and conditions mutually agreed upon." and insert "upon review, evaluation, and modification, if necessary, of its terms.".

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Dr. Toothman.

I do have a series of questions, but let me start with S. 29, the proposed national heritage area in California.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Yes.

Senator UDALL. As I understand your testimony, the Park Service's principle concern with the bill is that you are still reviewing the study prepared by the Delta Protection Commission, so that the designation at this time would be premature. Is that a correct analysis on my part?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. It would be premature for us to make a recommendation without having completed that review.

Senator UDALL. That review. When do you expect to have that review completed?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. We have provided initial comments to the Commission and they are working on them. We expect to have them finalized before they meet in May to make their own decision on whether they concur with the recommendations. So I would say by the end of May.

Senator UDALL. That is helpful.

Let me turn to S. 1150, the proposed Susquehanna Gateway National Heritage Area in Pennsylvania. In this case, you have recommended that we defer action on the bill until comprehensive heritage area legislation is enacted, which, I believe, has been the Agency's recommendation——

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Yes.

Senator UDALL. For all recent heritage area proposals.

Apart from that concern, does the Susquehanna proposal appear to meet the criteria for national heritage area designation?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Yes. We feel it is a very good candidate.

Senator UDALL. You feel it is a very good candidate?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Yes.

Senator UDALL. Let me move to the Essex National Heritage Area, which we heard testimony and comments from both Senator Reed and Senator Kerry, and that is S. 1198.

It extends the authorization for the Essex National Heritage Area to receive Federal funding, and I think we can include the Iowa Heritage Area, and the 3 Pennsylvania Heritage Areas in this question, since they all raise the same issue.

Your first recommendation is that the authority for these areas be extended long enough to allow the Park Service to complete an evaluation of the areas.

Do you have a timeline that you can give us for when you expect to have each of these evaluations completed for the individual heritage areas?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Yes, I do, but I also want to clarify one point.

Senator UDALL. OK.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. They remain heritage areas at the end of fiscal year 2012. What is expiring is their authority to compete for financial support from the appropriation we receive for heritage areas. So what we are asking for is an extension of their eligibility to compete for that funding

Senator UDALL. So the heritage areas themselves and their authorizations do not expire.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Right.

Senator UDALL. It is the authorization to compete for funding.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Yes, to be eligible for that Federal funding. We are in the midst of completing the evaluations, and we expect to have them done by the end of the year.

Senator UDALL. End of the year. Let me bring a follow on question, and you may have already answered this, but I want to ask it for the record.

So the larger policy issue may be if a heritage area has completed its initial authorization period, and has been successful, would additional Federal funding be appropriate, or should each area only get a one-time funding authorization? Does the Park Service have a position on the issue?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. May I just confer?

Senator UDALL. Oh, sure; of course.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. OK. We do not have an official position on that right now, but we are supporting the interim extension until we can work with the committee on that issue.

Senator UDALL. All right. So you want an interim, you would support an interim extension.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Right.

Senator UDALL. But as far as a long term policy, you would like to discuss that and come up with a clear position from the Park Service's point of view.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Yes. Excuse me. I think they could also, in terms of those discussions, be part of the discussions of a national heritage program legislation. That might be one area.

Senator UDALL. I look forward to the fruits of your labor and perhaps we will have a continuing conversation on what you recommend through the analysis you will do.

Let me turn to the Blackstone National Historical Park, and I want to ask you to clarify for the record that Senator Reed, I be-

lieve, did not speak to the Essex National Heritage Area; Senator Kerry did as it is exclusively in Massachusetts. But the 2 of them did discuss the Blackstone National Historical Park. I have one question.

As I understand it, the area is currently designated as a National Heritage Corridor, but it is different from the more recent heritage area models in that it also has a Park Service presence. Is that not correct? Would that summarize it?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Yes, that is correct. Most of the recent designations have involved a non-profit entity rather than a commission. So that is one difference.

In addition, their funding was different in that they had several streams of funding that were related to the National Park Service presence in its early creation, one of which was related to an appropriation for projects, one of which was related to, an in which there is still funding available, development. Then they also received an allocation, initially individually by law now from the competitive pool from which we now provide funding. So we would like to see that the $1 million that they still have preserved as this legislation moves forward.

Senator UDALL. Let me follow up. I said I had one question, but I actually have 2 or 3 questions that make up one question.

So this subcommittee had considered a number of proposed national historical parks this Congress that are within the same NPS region. One of the issues we have had to address is whether the Park Service will have a sufficient management role, one that is consistent with a National Park designation. Your testimony on the Blackstone bill noted that the new park is envisioned as a partnership with the Heritage Corridor and other local entities.

Do you expect the Park Service to have direct management responsibilities here, or will the other partners be primarily responsible for management of the Park?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Within the areas designated for the Park and potential acquisition by the Park Service, we would expect to have National Park Service management authority. It would be our expectation and desire that we would continue to partner on issues affecting the larger corridor within which the Park would be located.

Senator UDALL. I know we are coming at the question from some different directions, so thank you for elaborating.

Let me move to the Gateway National Recreation Area and pipeline right of way. That is H.R. 2606, which would authorize the Park Service to issue a right of way for a natural gas pipeline across the Gateway National Recreation Area in New York. I understand the Park Service needs legislative authority to allow for a natural gas pipeline to cross through a national park.

If the bill is enacted, what criteria will the Park Service use to determine whether it is appropriate for a pipeline right of way to cross national parklands?

Ms. TOOTHMAN. We would use the same criteria that we would apply to any such proposal. We would be looking at it both through the NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Office. The National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 process. I just came

from the NCSHPO meeting, so that is on my mind, but so we would do——

Senator UDALL. Better you than me.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Full compliance, and public scoping, and review.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for keeping all those acronyms separate. I serve on the Armed Services Committee, so we have a lot of acronyms over there as well.

So following on, earlier in this congress, the committee considered similar legislation, which authorized a pipeline through a portion of Denali National Park in Alaska. In that case, the legislation provided that the right of way could only be issued if following appropriate analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, quote, "The route through the Park was the one with the least adverse environmental effects for the Park," end of quote.

Should we consider including a similar provision in this bill? If you want to take that under advisement or for the record, feel free to do so.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. I think we would address that, again, through the NEPA process, preferred option and we would look at the most environmentally—one that we felt was not an adverse impact and which would be selected under the NEPA process. So I am not sure that it needs to be in your legislation, I think, would be the best response I can give you.

I have seen the 2 hangars that are proposed to house the monitoring-metering facility, and they are 2 hangars that we have not found an appropriate use for. It would be a major boost for the park to have a compatible, acceptable reuse of those facilities as part of this project. So that is one reason why we would also be looking at it through Section 106 in terms of whether this is an appropriate adaptive reuse.

Senator UDALL. That is the end of my questions. Let me thank you for taking the time to come to appear today before the subcommittee. Thank you for all you do to enhance and protect our national heritage areas, and our historical park, and our national recreation areas. We are fortunate as Americans to have such a bounty of public lands, and access, and opportunities.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. I agree with you, and I thank you for your support.

Senator UDALL. Thank you. Thank you so much, and I know you are busy, so you are welcome to stay and listen, or to leave as your schedule dictates.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. I will be glad to stay. A number of these bills are very important to us.

Senator UDALL. Thank you.

Ms. TOOTHMAN. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Dr. Toothman.

I would like the panel to come forward. We are looking forward to your testimony.

Before I introduce the witnesses, I want to include in the record, a statement from Senator Joseph Lieberman on the Naugatuck River Valley National Heritage Area Study Act. We will do that without objection.

Congressman Sablan from the Mariana Islands has submitted a letter to the committee, and we will, with unanimous consent, also see that that is included in the record.

So we have been joined by the Honorable Michael J. Reagan, Supervisor of Solano County, California and by Ms. Ann Harris, Executive Director of the Essex National Heritage Commission from Salem, Massachusetts.

Mr. Reagan, if you want to start. Generally 5 minutes is what we appropriate. We look forward to your statement.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. REAGAN, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SOLANO COUNTY, CA

Mr. REAGAN. Thank you, Chairman Udall.

It is a pleasure to come here and testify. When I used to be an Air Force Legislative Liaison, I used to skull others to come over and do this. This is the first time I have had the opportunity to do it myself.

I am Mike Reagan, a member of the Board of Supervisors, Solano County and today, we were asked by Senator Feinstein to testify in support S. 29 to establish the Sacrament-San Joaquin Delta Heritage Area. I will abridge my comments for the sake of the time, and I have submitted my entire remarks for the record.

Senator UDALL. Without objection.

Mr. REAGAN. Thank you.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is a unique and vital place both within my county and the State of California. It includes portions of the counties of Solano, Sacramento, Yolo, San Joaquin, and Contra Costa in northern California. We believe it is highly appropriate and justified that we collectively recognize what a treasure it is, and do everything we can to preserve and enhance its future.

Senator Feinstein's Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Establishment Act, S. 29, is a strong step in this direction, and for this reason, Solano County is pleased to support this important bill.

I thought I would cover a little bit about why we think this area merits the designation. California's delta, there is an amazing natural system and a major contributor to California's vitality and its evolution.

The vast size, we are talking about an area over 700,000 acres. Unique shape, it is an inverted delta, one of the only ones in the world where the major river systems come in to a delta and then it passes through a series of inland, a coastal range of mountains through a series of bays and out into the ocean. So the delta is actually pointed inland.

The geographic location has contributed to its importance in an ecological and a cultural landscape. The Delta is essentially the center of California, from which the rivers and streams flowing hundreds of miles from the north, south, east, and west all drain through the Delta and into the Carquinez Strait, and then into the San Francisco Bay.

The Bay Delta region is the largest estuary in the West Coast of the Americas, North and South. It is the second largest in the United States after the Chesapeake Bay.

This region is home to more than 3.5 million residents. It serves a $36 billion agricultural industry, mostly comprised of family farms, and supplies water through Federal and State water projects to more than 23 million Californians and another 3 million acres of agricultural land.

Historically, the Delta has a multicultural landscape with Native American Indian settlements, and a lot of history dating from California's Gold Rush. Most of the towns and cities were formed at that time.

There are a number of minority groups including Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, East Indians, Portuguese, and Italians established communities in the Delta and have made significant contributions in shaping the Delta into the vibrant agricultural landscape that it is today.

The high fertility of the Delta's soils and an abundant, high quality water supply has enabled the Delta to be an extremely productive agricultural region since reclamation. There have been, and are, a large variety of specialty crops grown in the Delta. I will just name maybe a dozen of them: peaches, plums, cherries, tomatoes, onions, peas, celery, spinach, melons, wine grapes, olives, blueberries, pears, sugar beets, seed crops, more. We have a lot of cattle and sheep also raised in the area. Crops from the Delta have been shipped throughout the Nation as well as to other parts of the world for quite some time.

In addition, the rare Mediterranean climate of the Delta supports unique plant and animal species, and provides habitat for more than 750 species of plants and wildlife, and 55 species of fish.

The State of California's legislature has long recognized the importance and significance of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, and passed the Delta Protection Act of 1992, which is a unique approach to large scale protection of valuable multi-resource landscape, and led to the establishment of the Delta Protection Commission that you spoke about earlier, who you heard the National Park Service speak about earlier.

That State Commission is governed by 15 members who have representatives from cities, counties, special districts, and different agencies of the State of California. I am a member of that Commission. I am also serving, currently, as the Vice Chair. I am not here testifying for the Commission because we have not yet had a chance to review the National Park Service's comments, which I understand are generally favorable suggestions to strengthen the application. Our staff is readying an amendment that we will adopt here within the quarter.

I do want to indicate that the entire State's level of involvement and commitment to keeping the Delta as a unique and viable region in California is very high.

It is also worth noting that just getting into my county, within the proposed national heritage area in this legislation is the 116,000 acre Suisun Marsh which is the largest contiguous brackish water marsh remaining on the West Coast of North America. We have been maintaining that for over 100 years.

The Marsh is carefully managed for habitat, and it includes considerable threatened and endangered species, and duck habitat, a number of hunting clubs, and a unique herd of introduced tule elk

reintroduced into the area. We have also included within the proposed boundaries of the National Heritage Area, the main waterway for transportation and commerce into this part of the California, the Carquinez Straits, which shares its rich history with the Delta.

Agricultural goods produced in the Delta were processed and stored in grain warehouses and mills that basically supplied the Gold Rush and California's development since.

It is home to numerous fishing fleets and canning facilities, which supported the Delta's fishing industry. Today the Strait continues to support a unique and diverse Bay Delta ecosystem by providing passage for native fish species and thousands of migratory birds traveling along the Pacific flyway, as well as ships traveling to and from international ports into the 2 inland seaports that are located in the city of Stockton and the city of West Sacramento.

A review of the description of a national heritage area reveals how clearly the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Area fits under the description and criteria necessary for this national heritage designation. It embraces a defined place where, quote, "Natural, cultural, historic, and recreational resources combine to form cohesive, nationally distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography. These areas tell nationally important stories about our nation and are representative of the national experience through both physical features that remain and the traditions that have evolved within them," end quote. The Delta of today contains all of the requisite elements and the landscape tells the story.

When asked to travel down the spine of the Delta through legacy communities such Hood, Courland, and Clarksburg, and Walnut Grove to get a sense of the meshing of culture and natural landscape, the story just unfolds before your eyes as you are going through it.

The establishment of a national heritage area in this Delta would further our efforts to protect and restore the valuable natural, esthetic, cultural, recreational, and historic attributes in the Delta including recognition that the Delta, as a place, merits national recognition.

I would also like to thank Senator Feinstein for introducing and Senator Boxer for co-sponsoring S. 29. Additionally, I would also like to extend my appreciation to the House members who introduced companions Delta NHA designation legislation including Representatives John Garamendi, George Miller, Doris Matsui, Jerry McNerney, and Mike Thompson. We in the Delta are grateful for their efforts and we look optimistically for a successful conclusion to this process after the NPS has had a chance to review the completed application and come back to this committee in the future.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Reagan follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MICHAEL J. REAGAN, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, SOLANO COUNTY, CA, ON S. 29

Good afternoon, Chairman Bingaman, and members of the committee. My name is Michael J. Reagan and I am a member of the Board of Supervisors of Solano

County, California. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify today in support of S. 29, to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Heritage area.

We have long recognized the Delta as a unique and vital place both within my County and to the State of California. It also extends over portions of the Counties of Sacramento, Yolo, San Joaquin and Contra Costa, in Northern California. It is highly appropriate and justified that we recognize what a treasure it is and do everything we can to preserve and enhance its future. Senator Feinstein's Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Establishment Act (S. 29) is a strong step in this direction, and for this reason Solano County is pleased to support this important bill.

My supervisorial district includes part of Solano County's portion of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. I have actively engaged in Delta related activities during my 8 years on the Board of Supervisors and for several years prior to that as a Senior Policy Advisor to a State Senator representing the area. I am currently the County's representative on the State's Delta Protection Commission, serving as Vice Chair. I also serve, on behalf of the County, on the Delta County Coalition (DCC). The DCC is a coalition of five counties: Sacramento, Yolo, San Joaquin, Solano and Contra Costa, cooperatively representing our collective local interests in discussions with the State and the Department of Interior officials.

The Delta, a Rare and Unique Place

The Delta is an amazing natural system and a major contributor to California's vitality and evolution over many decades. The vast size, unique shape, and geographical location of the Delta have contributed to its importance as an ecological and cultural landscape. It is a rare inland/inverse Delta, at the confluence of five rivers, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Mokelumne, Cosumnes, and Calaveras, through which waters flow from a vast watershed covering about 40% of California's land area. The impressive Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is essentially the center of California from which rivers and streams flowing hundreds of miles from the north, south, east and west . . . from the far reaches of the Cascades and Sierra Nevada to the Coast Range . . . ALL drain through the Delta and Suisun Marsh to the Carquinez Strait and into the San Francisco Bay.

The sheer size and distinctive shape of the Delta's landscape is unmatched anywhere in the world. The Delta's flat landscape includes about 1,000 miles of channels and levees protecting islands, and is the only inland delta in the United States. The Bay-Delta region is the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Americas, and the second largest in the United States after the Chesapeake Bay.

Today it is home to more than 3.5 million residents, serves a $36 billion agricultural industry comprised of family farms and supplies water to more than 23 million Californians and 3 million acres of agricultural land. The entire area is supported by more than 1000+ miles of levees protecting 60 distinct islands.

Historically, the Delta has a multi-cultural landscape with Native American Indian settlements and history from the California gold rush era. A number of minority groups including Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, East Indians, Portuguese, and Italians have established communities in the Delta and made significant contributions in shaping the Delta into the agricultural landscape that it is today.

The high fertility of the Delta's peat soils, the high water table, and an available water supply, has enabled the Delta to be an extremely productive agricultural region since reclamation. There have been and are a variety of crops grown in the Delta including peaches, plums, cherries, tomatoes, onions, peas, celery, spinach, melons, wine grapes, olives, blueberries, pears, sugar beets, seed crops and more. Crops from the Delta have been shipped throughout the nation, as well as other parts of the world for quite some time.

In addition, the rare Mediterranean climate of the Delta supports unique plant and animal species and provides habitat for more than 750 species of plants and wildlife and 55 species of fish.

State Legislative Support for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta

The State of California Legislature has long recognized the importance and significance of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and passed the Delta Protection Act of 1992 delineating a Primary and a Secondary Zone of the Delta which consist of approximately 500,000 acres and 238,000 acres, respectively. The Primary Zone is the area protected by State law from urban development, and includes waterways, levees, and farmed lands, extending over portions of five counties: Solano, Yolo, Sacramento, San Joaquin and Contra Costa. The Delta Protection Act is a unique approach to large scale protection of a valuable multi-resource landscape and lead to the establishment of the Delta Protection Commission.

The Delta Protection Commission is governed by 15 members, with representation from cities,, counties, special districts, and the state of California. While I am a member of the Delta Protection Commission, I am not here testifying on their behalf I do want to indicate the State's level of involvement and commitment to keeping the Delta a unique and viable region in California.

Specifically the 15 members of the delta Protection Commission are as follows:

Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors
Central Delta Reclamation Districts
Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
North Delta Reclamation Districts
San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors
South Delta Reclamation Districts
Solano County Board of Supervisors
Business, Transportation and Housing Agency
Yolo County Board of Supervisors
Department of Food and Agriculture
Cities of Contra Costa and Solano Counties
Natural Resources Agency
Cities of Sacramento and Yolo Counties
State Lands Commission
Cities of San Joaquin County

In the fall of 2009, the California State Legislature passed a comprehensive package reforming governance of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and related aspects of statewide water management. In Section 85301 of Senate Bill X7-1 (SBX7-1), the Legislature charged the Delta Protection Commission (DPC) with developing:

> A proposal to protect, enhance, and sustain the unique cultural, historical, recreational, agricultural, and economic values of the Delta as an evolving place . . . The Commission shall include in the proposal a plan to establish state and federal designation of the Delta as a place of special significance, which may include application for a federal designation of the Delta as a National Heritage Area.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is both a hard working landscape and a place of great environmental sensitivity. It features highly productive farmlands, unique historical communities of diverse cultural roots, urban centers, miles of serene and wandering waterways, a complex levee and flood control system, key water distribution infrastructure both large and small, a myriad of fish, bird, animal and plant species along with unique habitats, traditional drawbridges, distinctive architecture and beautiful vista. It is truly the convergence zone of California's majestic mountains, sea and valley areas; a land where you can be in an urban center one moment and 10 minutes away feel like you are reconnected to nature. It is difficult to comprehend the Delta landscape in one drive through. I have been in the region for years and continue to discover new opportunities and adventures in the Delta.

Why should the Delta be a National Heritage Area?

Why is this important to the State and the five counties covered by the proposed National Heritage Area? The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is in the heart of one of the most productive agricultural areas. The climate and soils of our area allow for growth of many crop varieties over a long growing season. The county's agricultural sector is a vital part of the county's overall economic base. Many of our communities directly serve the agricultural activities and are critical to their existence and agriculture is essential to Solano County.

It is also worth noting that within Solano County and with the proposed National Heritage area is the 116,000 acre Suisun Marsh, the largest contiguous brackish water marsh remaining on the west coast of North America. The marsh is carefully managed for habitat, and includes considerable bird and duck habitat, a number of hunting clubs, and a unique herd of introduced Tule Elk and a number of protected species.

Also included within the proposed boundary area under consideration is the Carquinez Strait. A main waterway for transportation and commerce, the Carquinez Strait shares a rich history with the Delta. Agricultural goods produced in the Delta were processed and stored in grain warehouses and mills that once flourished on the shores of the strait. It was also home to numerous fishing fleets and canning facilities which supported the Delta's fishing industry. Today the Strait continues to support a unique and diverse Bay/Delta ecosystem by providing passage for native fish species and thousands of migratory birds traveling along the Pacific Flyway.

There is a strong interconnectedness between our agricultural economy and other economic sectors. We believe the current efforts of the delta counties to support agritourism initiatives to further showcase the Delta's agricultural and wildlife friendly farming practices are demonstrating how Delta farmland and habitat can coexist.

As important as the Delta is, it is subject to many stressors, including environmental, as well as lying at the center of California's water resource challenges. There is much debate on how to restore the Delta's health into the future. These deliberations will be carried out over time and accompanied by volumes of analysis. How the communities and ecosystem of the Delta will evolve in the future will depend on a strong National and State commitment to the needed investment and reinvestment. That said, we believe the legislation you are considering (S 29) transcends that debate and represents a clear and constructive way to do something positive for the Delta, and within a reasonable time frame. We are hopeful that establishment of a National Heritage Area will provide further enlightenment and recognition of the Delta as a unique and valued place; and that studies provide a better understanding of its socio-economic complexity; and can serve as a catalyst for investing in its future.

A review of the description of a National Heritage Area reveals how clearly the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta area fits under the description and criteria necessary for a NHA designation. The designation of a National Heritage Area embraces a defined place where:

> natural, cultural, historic and recreational resources combine to form cohesive, nationally distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography. These areas tell nationally important stories about our nation and are representative of the national experience through both physical features that remain and the traditions that have evolved within them.

The Delta of today contains the requisite elements and the landscape tells the story. One only has to travel down the spine of the Delta through legacy communities such as Hood, Courtland , Clarksburg, and Walnut Grove to get a sense of the meshing of culture and natural landscape. The story unfolds before your eyes.

We fully recognize the potential benefits of a National Heritage Area designation. We acknowledge the fact that it has a local orientation and allows the various local entities to retain land use jurisdiction. Additionally, we like that it reinforces the regions identity under a unifying theme while respecting the variables that exist between various areas of the Delta. Even the ability to use the National Park Service Arrowhead symbol has a symbolic significance and value.

We recognize that funding associated with this designation would be limited. Nonetheless, we do appreciate the immense value of federal investment as we look for "seed" money and to leverage opportunities. We truly believe that if we target those dollars in a strategic way we can generate many multipliers that will benefit the region. The educational opportunities alone could provide many returns to our efforts.

The establishment of a Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area would further efforts to protect, and restore, the valuable natural, aesthetic, cultural, and historic attributes in the Delta, including recognition that the Delta as a place merits national recognition.

Status of Feasibility Study

As the committee members are aware, there has been a National Heritage Area designation feasibility study, funded in part by grants from the California Endowed Fund of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the California State Parks Foundation. In January of this year a draft feasibility study was released by the California Delta Protection Commission for a five week public review after which a revised draft was transmitted to the National Parks Service for their review. The California Delta Protection Commission has received their response and is incorporating their suggestions. We anticipate formal adoption of the revised Study by the Commission within this quarter. Upon acceptance of this feasibility study by the Delta Protection Commission, it will be submitted to our Congressional Representatives for presentation to Congress for consideration.

Furthermore as part of the continuing local efforts on behalf of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region numerous letters of support and partnership commitment were acquired from a wide variety of organizations including: historical societies, chambers of commerce, county boards of supervisors, recreation groups, historic preservation organizations, city councils, and more. There is a desire and willingness for us to work as partners in the region.

In closing, the merits of a Sacramento-San Joaquin NHA are clear. NHA designation would bring significant added value to our collective efforts. Recognition and validation of the significance of the Delta's nationally through the NHA designation will bring focus and leadership to new partnerships and collaborations that would otherwise not take place. On behalf of the Solano County Board of Supervisors I come as their representative today share that we strongly support S.29 and urge approval of this legislation.

In concluding, I would like to thank the Chairman and other members of the committee for conducting this important hearing. I also would like to thank Senator Feinstein for introducing and Senator Boxer for cosponsoring S. 29. Additionally, I would also like to extend my appreciation to the House members who introduced companion Delta NHA designation legislation, including Representatives John Garamendi, George Miller, Doris Matsui, Jerry McNerney, and Mike Thompson. We in the Delta are grateful for their efforts and we look optimistically for a successful conclusion to this process.

Thank you. Have a good afternoon.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Supervisor Reagan.

Miss Harris, I look forward to hearing your testimony.

STATEMENT OF ANNIE C. HARRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ESSEX NATIONAL HERITAGE COMMISSION, SALEM, MA

Ms. HARRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for this opportunity to testify.

Senator UDALL. I think you may need to turn on your mic.

Ms. HARRIS. Sorry. Thank you for this opportunity to testify. My name is Annie Harris, and I am the Executive Director of the Essex National Heritage Commission. I have submitted my full, written testimony today, but I think you will be happy to know, I will just be summarizing it.

Many of my remarks today also pertain to the other National Heritage Areas whose bills are before you today and looking for reauthorization. They have asked me to request that the record be kept open so they can submit their written testimony too.

Senator UDALL. Without objection, we will do so.

Ms. HARRIS. Thank you.

During these challenging economic times, every program that receives Federal funds needs to justify its worth, and must deliver substantial public benefits. I am proud to say that the national heritage areas do this. Since our designation in 1996, Essex Heritage, along with the other heritage areas, have proven that the National Heritage Area Program is one of the most effective and efficient of the external programs in the National Park System.

At Essex Heritage, we work to conserve, promote, and develop our region's nationally significant resources using these heritage assets to revitalize our communities, and strengthen our economy. We promote cultural tourism sites that support the third largest job producing industry in Massachusetts. We provide grants in conservation and preservation that create jobs in construction and tourism. We create summer jobs for urban youth and much more.

From our experience, we know that jobs and heritage development go hand in hand. Strong economies occur where there is deep community pride and dedicated stewardship.

In the last 14½ years, Essex Heritage has achieved a great deal, but there is still much more to be done. Let me cite 3 examples of our accomplishments and the work that lies ahead.

One, creating regional trails takes decades. In Essex, the idea of our regional trail network began about 45 years ago, but it took the

unique management and partnership skills of Essex Heritage to secure the rights of way and to see that some of the first miles of trails were built.

With the growing need for safe roads to schools and youth obesity on the rise, these trails are much more than just recreational routes. When this trail network is complete, there will be 58 miles of safe pedestrian and bike access connecting one-half of our region's communities. What is most important is that these trails will link many of our town centers and our schools and our libraries, not just our parks and recreation areas, but our work is not done here.

Two, our Summer Youth Job Corps with the National Park Service has been highly successful, but for every young person hired, there are 10 more looking for work. We employ the disadvantaged urban youth who live near our parks, providing them with job skills and counseling, along with their summer work. When a young person such as Daniel Mondragon says, and I quote, "This program has taught me responsibility, appreciation for the city and its history, and has opened new doors for my future," end of quote. How can we afford to let this program go?

Three, the Essex Coastal Scenic Byway is a strategy for improving the economies of the region's underserved urban communities, as well as our affluent towns. Under the leadership of Essex Heritage, the recently completed Byway Plan is setting the course for new ways in which the 13 coastal communities can collaborate for their mutual benefit. The way is forward, but we need to continue.

The work of the national heritage areas is important not only for our regions, but for the National Park Service. In my written testimony, I cite numerous National Park reports that make this case.

But the support that I think I most appreciate is the comments of Director Jon Jarvis who, on numerous occasions, has said that he is a diehard fan of the National Heritage Areas because the Heritage Areas, and I quote, "Offer an alternative model, more versatile, and inclusive, a new iteration of the classic model of parks."

In closing, national heritage areas have proven to be one of the most effective ways for the National Park Service to engage with local citizens, and the conservation of nationally significant places. This work happens without the Park Service having to bear all the costs of owning, maintaining, and managing these places.

Also, national heritage areas involve people where they live in long term, multi-partnership, large landscape, and community conservation projects. The residents and businesses do not have to vacate these landscapes because heritage areas do not require public ownership for their success.

In summary, the value of the national heritage areas lies in their ability to amplify their limited Federal funding, to leverage the public investment with private funds, to promote the principles of conservation and preservation from the grassroots up, to create jobs and revitalize communities, and to assist the National Park Service in meeting its mission.

So thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity. If you come to Blackstone, we are only about 1 hour north, come visit us.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Harris follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ANNIE C. HARRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ESSEX NATIONAL HERITAGE COMMISSION, SALEM MA

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testifytoday regarding S. 1198, a bill to reauthorize the Essex National Heritage Area. Many of my comments also pertain to two other bills before you today S. 2131 to reauthorize the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area and the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor and S. 2133 to reauthorize the America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership in the State of Iowa. I have been asked to speak on their behalf and also to request that the record be held open so that these National Heritage Areas may be allowed to submit written testimony as well.

My name is Annie Harris, and I am the Executive Director of the Essex National Heritage Commission. The Commission is the regional non-profit organization that manages the Essex National Heritage Area, a 500 square mile region located north of Boston, rich in in historic, cultural and natural resources. I also serve, in a volunteer capacity, as the Vice President of the Alliance of National Heritage Areas.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I would like to speak to you about the importance of reauthorizing the Essex National Heritage Area, and the other National Heritage Areas whose bills are before you today, in advance of our September 30, 2012 sunsets.

During these challenging economic times, every program that receives federal funding needs to justify its worth and deliver substantial benefits to the American public. The National Heritage Areas do this. Since our designation by Congress in 1996, the Essex National Heritage Area along with Rivers of Steel, Delaware & Lehigh Canal, Lackawanna Valley and America's Agricultural Heritage have proven that the National Heritage Area program is one of the most effective and efficient "external" programs in the National Park System.

In the Essex National Heritage Area, our work is to conserve, promote and develop the nationally significant stories and resources of the region. From the infamous Salem Witch Trials of 1692 to the "Perfect" storm of 1991, we have a robust network of public and private partnerships that rely on the heritage resources and stories to revitalize our communities and strengthen our economy. We promote cultural tourism sites and programs, supporting the third largest job producing industry in Massachusetts. We provide grants in conservation and resource stewardship that not only preserve the historic fabric of our region, but also create jobs in construction and tourism. Currently, it is estimated that we have created 1,488 jobs through our grants programs. For the past three summers, we have provided summer jobs for disadvantaged youth at two park sites. To date, 56 youth jobs have been created. We develop trails and bikeways for recreation and healthy living. Fourteen miles of trail were recently completed and are now providing safe recreation opportunities. We create regional events that build community pride and last year alone we assisted in attracting 1.3 million visitors to the region. We know that jobs and heritage development go hand in hand. Strong economies occur in places where there is deep community pride and dedicated stewardship.

I am here today to request the reauthorization of Essex Heritage and my fellow National Heritage Areas in Pennsylvania and Iowa. Although, I have visited my companion areas and have been very impressed with their work, I speak now only on the accomplishments of Essex Heritage and the work we have before us. I respectfully ask this committee to permit the other Areas to submit their own testimony with their accomplishments.

In the last fourteen and a half years, Essex Heritage has achieved a great deal but there is still much more to do. Let me cite some examples of our accomplishments and the work that lies ahead:

- Trail Development—Creating regional trails takes decades. In the case of the Essex Heritage Border-to-Boston Rail Trail and the adjacent Coastal Trail, the ideas for these trails began 45 years ago, but it took the unique management and partnership skills of Essex Heritage to secure the rights-of-way and see that the first miles of trail were built. With the growing need for safe roads to schools and youth obesity rising, these trail are much more than recreational routes. When the Coastal Trail and the Border to Boston Rail Trail are complete, there will be 58 miles of trails connecting half of the Area's communities, providing safe pedestrian and bike access to town centers, libraries and schools as well as parks and natural recreation areas. This goal is within reach provided the coordination and guidance provided by the Heritage Area continues.
- Youth Job Corps—Our summer youth corps with the National Park Service has been highly successful but for every young person whom we have hired, there are 10 more still looking for work. We have made a point to hire the disadvan-

taged urban youth who live near our parks, providing them with jobs skills and career counseling along with their summer work. When a young person such as Daniel Mondragon says, "This program has taught me responsibility, appreciation for the city and its history, and opened new doors for my future," how can any of us afford to let this program disappear?

- Stimulating the local economy—The Essex Coastal Scenic Byway is a strategy to highlight the historic, cultural and natural assets along the region's coastline for the benefit of improving the local economies in the Area's underserved urban communities as well as its affluent towns. Under the leadership of Essex Heritage, the recently completed plan sets a course for new ways in which the 13 coastal communities can collaborate for their mutual benefit. The promise is clear, but for success, Essex Heritage needs to continue.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as I testify for our reauthorization, you may be questioning why we deserve your attention when there are so many other needs especially within the National Park Service. Therefore, I would like to direct you to what the National Park Service, the National Park System Advisory Board and the National Parks Second Century Commission say about the National Heritage Areas and our importance to the National Park Service.

- In 2006, Douglas P. Wheeler, then Chairman of the National Park System Advisory Board, wrote: "National Heritage Areas represent a significant advance in conservation and historic preservation: large-scale, community-centered initiatives collaborating across political jurisdictions to protect nationally-important landscapes and living cultures." (Charting a Future for the National Heritage Areas; Foreword).
- In 2009 the Second Century Commission Report—Advancing the National Park Idea—states that "National Heritage Areas provide a collaborative model that fits well within a large-landscape-scale preservation and conservation framework. Recognizing them as long-term assets to the national park system, we recommend that Congress pass authorizing legislation creating a system of National Heritage Areas providing for permanent funding and directing full program support from the National Park Service to designated areas." (Advancing the National Park Idea ; page 23).
- In April 2010, President Obama launched America's Great Outdoors and in the report issued in February 2011—America's Great Outdoors: A Promise to Future Generations—ten major priorities were identified from "providing quality jobs, career paths and service opportunities" to "making the federal government a more effective conservation partner." In the goals and recommendations that follow on from these priorities, Essex Heritage has identified 30 areas of our work which directly support the AGO (Essex Heritage and its Relevancy to America's Great Outdoors, 2011). I am confident that my colleagues' work in their National Heritage Areas also supports and enhances the priorities of the AGO.
- In August 2011, the National Park Service Call to Action: Preparing for a Second Century of Stewardship and Engagement, states that the "parks" described in the report "connote not only the 394 units of the National Park System but national heritage areas . . . as well." (Call to Action; page 6)

Most recently, in January 2012, the National Park Service's Northeast Region published the Report of Impacts and Operational Strategy for Sunsetting National Heritage Areas. The report discusses the value that the National Heritage Areas provide to the National Park Service and lists five major impacts on the National Park Service if the Areas sunset (Report of Impacts; page 3)

1. NPS parks located within a heritage area will lose the opportunities and resources that enlarge understanding of the park resources and themes through the NHA.
2. NPS identity is key to attracting and keeping other partners engaged in NHAs. The NPS will lose the leverage that its contributions to NHAs, proportionately modest but essential to operational support, create.
3. NHAs act as conveners for many other partners within the region. The NPS parks and programs would have difficulty replacing this partnership facilitation.
4. NHAs will have to curtail programs and events that highlight the distinctive cultural and natural assets of the region for lack of funding once NPS leverage ends.
5. NHAs bring numerous organizations and volunteers to the NPS mission within the communities they serve. The NPS will lose these connections.

The NPS NER report further states that the "National Heritage Areas have an impressive body of accomplishment in conservation, cultural and educational preservation and programming, economic development, recreation, and heritage tourism. They have provided the NPS regions the means by which to organize diverse communities around shared history and culture." It then refers to Director Jon Jarvis conversation with the directors of the National Heritage Areas in February 2011, when he described the National Heritage Areas as "an alternate model, more versatile and inclusive, a new iteration of the classic model of parks." (Report of Impacts: page 2)

National Heritage Areas have proven to be one of the most effective ways for the National Park Service to engage and partner with local citizens of every background in the preservation and interpretation of their nationally important and significant resources—and this work happens without the National Park Service having to bear all the costs of owning, maintaining and managing these places. National Heritage Areas involve people where they live in long-term, multi-partnership, large landscape and community conservation projects without requiring that the residents and businesses vacate the area because National Heritage Areas do not require public ownership for their success. The value of the National Heritage Areas lies in their ability:

- To amplify their limited annual federal funds with matching dollars many times over;
- To leverage the public investment with private funding, volunteer time, in-kind donations, and local and state contributions;
- To promote the principles of conservation and preservation from the grassroots and in harmony with the goals of the National Park Service;
- To create jobs and revitalize communities using the Area's indigenous resources;
- To assist the National Park Service in meeting its mission by proving a bridge to local communities, underserved populations, youth and diversity.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today, and I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator UDALL. Thank you. Miss Harris, thank you for your compelling summary. You would make Jon Jarvis proud. You also helped educate the committee, and those who are here today, to listen as to the value, and the purpose, and the structure of the national heritage area approach.

Let me, if I might, I have one question for each of you. I will start with you, Miss Harris, if that is alright.

One of the fundamental policy issues that we need to resolve is whether a national heritage area should be given additional authorization, receive Federal funds after its initial authorization has expired. You have heard me talk about this with the previous testifier.

What is your best argument why an additional authorization is good public policy?

Ms. HARRIS. First of all, I think there are long term investments, and to reach the full benefit of the Federal investment, they need to be seen that way. Certainly, when we went into this project, the Greater Heritage Area, we knew there was a 15-year sunset. Actually, we did not know going in, but then we realized when the legislation was passed. But also, we expected if we did well, we would have a shot at being able to be reauthorized because these are long term projects.

In fact, Congress did pass a bill a few years ago that asked the Park Service to evaluate us, and we have been evaluated, and I think you will be very interested in the evaluations when the Park Service does submit them to you.

Also, all of our work is done in public-private partnerships, and the Park Service is an important partner with us. We are able to

take the Federal funds and leverage them, and usually the match—we are required to come up with a match—usually our match is much better than 1 to 1. That match, we also can leverage with additional funds, both public, State and local funds, and also a lot of private funds. But we need that structure of the partnership. We need all partners to be at the table.

Last, to be perfectly frank, most philanthropy, most other sources of funds, public and private funds, only go into projects, they are really project-specific, the funding from the Park Service provides a base. That is all it provides. It provides a base from which we can pay our rent and provide some staff support. From that, we are able to then apply for grants, leverage, and do projects. But it is important, what we call, seed money, to seeding all of the other public and private investment that we get, which is considerable.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for that and I think you have covered the landscape of the waterfront, whatever image you want to use.

But if you have additional thoughts on that as well, the committee would certainly welcome those. Your passion is apparent, and I very much look forward to keeping my commitment to Senator Kerry and Senator Reed, and most importantly to you, to come up and see the Blackstone.

Ms. HARRIS. Am I allowed to say a few more words?

Senator UDALL. Sure, please, yes.

Ms. HARRIS. I also serve on a subcommittee to the National Park Advisory Board, and we are looking at the future of the Park Service for the next 100 years.

Senator UDALL. Yes.

Ms. HARRIS. I must say, I think very strongly that the future for the Park Service is going to be in partnerships. I think, you know, there is a desire to have the Park Service play a much larger role in this country in terms of education, and interpretation, and conservation, and I think it can play that role.

But it is going to have to, and need to, and wants to play it in partnership because we cannot have everything owned by the Federal Government. We cannot maintain, everything cannot be within boundaries of parks. They really need these partnerships and the heritage areas are a very, very effective model. You have it in place. It is extremely important to keep it in place, and to move forward.

Also, second point, there is an excellent bill to create a national heritage area program within the Park Service. It has been introduced. It was introduced last week in the House. We all hope that it will pass this session or next.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for those additional comments. We have held hearings on the 100 year anniversary of the National Parks and the National Park system. I am sure you have studied what has been said. You have studied the reports that have been put forth that offer vision, and excitement, and passion.

Ms. HARRIS. Yes, yes.

Senator UDALL. I think, a way in which to further connect Americans to the parks, and the national heritage areas are key. So thank you for——

Ms. HARRIS. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. The work you do and for the way in which you present the potential here, and the opportunities.

Mr. Reagan, I have a question for you.

Mr. REAGAN. Sure.

Senator UDALL. It is my understanding that local management entities for most national heritage areas are typically nonprofit organizations with experiences in coordinating and promoting the heritage of the region through partnerships with landowners and local businesses.

Your proposed area is somewhat different, at least in my analysis with a Government commission managing the heritage area and with most of the commission members being elected or appointed State or county government officials; nothing against elected officials, by the way, county, or Federal, or otherwise.

In your opinion, will the Delta Protection Commission have enough time, resources, and expertise available to effectively administer the heritage area given the competing responsibilities all the commission members have?

Mr. REAGAN. It has a staff.

Senator UDALL. I'm sorry?

Mr. REAGAN. The Commission has a staff.

Senator UDALL. A staff. Please elaborate.

Mr. REAGAN. There is actually a three-headed governance entity that the State has established there: a stewardship council, a protection commission, and a conservancy. All of us have partnerships with the nonprofits, the cities, counties, and landowners. We actually have elected, selected members representing the property owners in the north, central, and south Delta who are part of our Commission.

It is a State level priority to protect and preserve this area. We see this national heritage designation as smart business for the Federal Government as a means of branding something that is, and should be, a worldwide recognized destination for tourism and recreation, as well as the appreciation of the—everybody knows about how much of America's specialty crops come out of California. This is the heart of the "Slow Food Movement" in this area here.

Just in my county alone, we have 80 crops, different agricultural commodities that generate over $1 million in farm gain. We are small compared to some of the other counties in the Delta. I mean, this is a tremendously vital, agricultural, recreational, and ecological treasure. That, I think, this designation can actually help us brand it appropriately as an international destination.

Senator UDALL. I have to note that your county looks like it is significantly sized to me, as I study this map.

Mr. REAGAN. We are 850 square miles.

Senator UDALL. You say there are counties that are much bigger.

Mr. REAGAN. Yes.

Senator UDALL. Yes. Thank you, again.

Mr. REAGAN. We are only 400,000 people. We are actually the second most urbanized county in California after San Francisco as in percentage of the population who lives in an incorporated city, which actually occupy less than 15 percent of the land area of the county.

Senator UDALL. I really enjoyed learning more about the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. You painted an intriguing picture of everything that occurs, whether it is the forces of Mother Nature, or it is those who grow the food that sustains us. I look forward to working with you.

Mr. REAGAN. Thank you.

Senator UDALL. Your 2 Senators, who are outstanding Senators, by the way, I do not have to tell you that, to move this important initiative forward. So I want to thank you both for your testimony.

Before we adjourn, I would like to include in the record a letter from Congressman Garamendi on this very topic we just discussed. We will do that without objection.

Senator UDALL. Let me now say I want to thank you again for your testimony, for taking the time to join us in Washington. Some members of the committee may submit additional questions in writing, and if so, we may ask you to submit answers for the record.

We will keep the hearing record open for 2 weeks to receive any additional comments.

Senator UDALL. Again, thank you, and the subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:38 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to Additional Questions

RESPONSES OF STEPHANIE TOOTHMAN TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR UDALL

Note on responses—The questions below relate to H.R. 2606, the New York City Natural Gas Supply Enhancement Act. The responses are based on the assumption that H.R. 2606 would be enacted in the form the bill was received in the Senate.

Permits

Question 1. What is the process for approving the initial permits?

Answer. The process for issuing and approving permits is governed by NPS policy contained in Director's Order #53: Special Park Uses. [D.O. #53 can be found at http://www.nps.gov/policy/DOrders/D053.htm]. The Regional Director signs all new right-of-way (ROW) permits.

Question 2. What is the process for renewing permits after the initial 10 year term?

Answer. The renewal process will be identical to the original approval process, except that the renewal may be approved by the park superintendent.

Question 3. Who has discretion to cancel permits after 10 years?

Answer. The permits will automatically expire after 10 years.

Question 4. What is the approximate revenue that will be generated from permits?

Answer. The permit fees will be based upon a Department of the Interior-approved appraisal identifying fair market value and upon actual costs incurred by the park to administer and monitor the permit. Work on the appraisal cannot begin until the legislation is passed.

Question 5. What Right-of-Way permits will be issued?

Answer. A ROW permit will be issued for all portions of the gas line that cross NPS lands.

Question 6. What is the process for Right-of-Way permit approval/renewal?

Answer. The process for issuing and approving permits is governed by NPS policy contained in Director's Order #53 (Special Park Uses). The Regional Director signs all new ROW permits. The park superintendent may approve renewal of ROW permits.

Lease

Question 7. Who will the lease the land- Williams or National Grid?

Answer. Williams will lease the hangar and associated land at Floyd Bennett Field.

Question 8. Will the lease transfer from one to the other at some point? If so, will the lease berenegotiated at that point?

Answer. Transfer (re-assignment) of the lease cannot take place without the expresswritten consent of the NPS. The terms and conditions of the lease will address anyanticipated transfer among parties.

Question 9. What is the length of the lease?

Answer. The length of the lease will be determined through the negotiation processbetween the NPS and the lessee. The lease will not exceed 60 years, since that is thelimit for NPS leases under NPS leasing regulations (36 CFR part 18).

Question 10. What is the approximate revenue that will be generated from lease fees?

Answer. Lease revenues are not known at this time because a Department of the Interior-approved appraisal has not been completed. Rent revenues, at a minimum, must be fair market value rent.

Question 11. Will the lease fees ever increase or be renegotiated at any point during the lease term?

Answer. Yes, this is possible. Conditions allowing for increases will be included in the lease terms.

Revenues

Question 12. Will all revenues go directly to Gateway National Park rather than to Treasury or NPS General Fund?

Answer. Revenues from the lease of the hangar will be retained by Gateway National Recreation Area, as will the cost recovery to administer and monitor the ROW permit. Revenues generated from the fair market value of the ROW will go to the Treasury.

Question 13. What specific projects does NPS plan to use the additional revenue for?

Answer. H.R. 2606 allows the revenue to be used for infrastructure needs, resource protection, and visitor services. We anticipate that the revenue will be used primarily for the restoration of key historic structures and to improve visitor services.

Question 14. Will all additional revenue be spent on capital improvements?

Answer. Not all, but we anticipate that much of it will be spent for that purpose.

Question 15. How can we ensure that revenues from the lease will not be used to offset cuts tofederal funding for Gateway?

Answer. At national park units that use NPS leasing authority, there has been no indication of reductions in federal funding as a result of NPS retention of leasing revenue.

Environmental/Park-Going Experience

Question 16. What is the environmental impact on the park-during and after construction?

Answer. During construction, impacts, if any, will be minimal and will be mitigated in accordance with Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) requirements. There are no anticipated environmental impacts once the project is completed.

Question 17. What is the impact on park visitors-during and after construction?

Answer. There will be no impact to park visitors after construction. During certain phases of construction, visitors will not be able to use a small part of Floyd Bennett Field.

Question 18. What is the impact of the pipeline trenching?

Answer. Except for a 100-foot section between Flatbush Avenue and the hangar building, the pipeline will be laterally drilled, not trenched. If there are impacts, they will be resolved through the FERC compliance process.

Question 19. An artificial reef lies off the Rockaways-will the pipeline disturb it?

Answer. No. The FERC compliance process has taken the artificial reef into consideration. The reef will not be disturbed.

Question 20. Can the monitoring station be located somewhere other than a historic hanger?

Answer. If the metering station is built outside the park, a new facility would need to be built. The size of the structure would be approximately that of a football field with 20-foot-high walls. The most likely location would be adjacent to the park, in a natural area, which would adversely affect the viewshed of the park. If the metering station is within the park, it will be located totally within the confines of the historic hangar. The public will see the restored building with no indication of the metering station located within the walls. There will be no visual intrusion on the historic scene.

Question 21. What is the impact on park visitors if the monitoring station is located in one of the historic hangers?

Answer. The impact to park visitors will be positive. The hanger is closed to visitors at the current time and will continue to be closed once it becomes a monitoring station. What will change for visitors is the visual experience they have when they visit Floyd Bennett Field. Currently, visitors see a structure in decrepit condition. After the hanger is rehabilitated, they will see an attractive historic structure.

Safety

Question 22. What are potential safety hazards?

Answer. FERC will ensure that all safety hazards are identified and addressed.

Question 23. What safety review will be conducted prior to construction?

Answer. FERC will review the security and safety measures to be incorporated into the design of the metering station and pipeline. These measures will reflect a

collaborative effort between Williams, National Grid, the New York Police Department, the U.S. Park Police, and New York City Fire Department.

Question 24. What safety standards will be in place after construction?

Answer. We are not the technical experts on this subject and will defer to FERC's expertise on safety standards.

APPENDIX II

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY, ON S. 1589

The New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail is a valuable asset to the State of New Jersey that promotes the vast cultural resources along the state's vibrant coastline and helps boost tourism and local economic development. The trail showcases the rich and diverse resources along the coast, from the beaches of the Jersey Shore to the wetlands and wildlife in the Delaware Bay to the museums and state parks in the region. Since the trail's creation in 1988, the National Park Service (NPS) has reached important milestones implementing various pieces of the trail but was unable to complete it before its authorization expired at the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2011.

In 1993, the National Park Service established an implementation plan for the trail that included five interpretative themes in eight counties across 300 miles of coastline. According to the plan, the trail would stretch through five regions from Perth Amboy to Cape May and then west to the Delaware Memorial Bridge. Along the driving trail, the plan calls for signs, five welcome centers, promotional brochures and other visibility and outreach to bring tourists to trail destinations. Destinations include the Sandy Hook Gateway National Recreation Area, Island Beach State Park, the U.S. Coast Guard Station in Atlantic City, and the Cape May National Wildlife Refuge, and many other intriguing sites.

While the plan called for the development of five themes, only three have been developed. In addition, NPS opened two welcome centers but have not opened the remaining three. The initial plan called for more than $10 million to complete the plan, but just $4.5 million was appropriated from FY 1993 to FY 2011. Lack of funding prevented NPS from completing the trail before the authorization expired at the end of FY 2011.

On September 21, 2011 I introduced S. 1589, a bill to extend the authorization for the Coastal Heritage Trail in the State of New Jersey. The bill, cosponsored by Senator Menendez, would extend the authorization for the Coastal Heritage Trail in the State of New Jersey through FY 2016 to give NPS additional time to complete implementation of the plan.

The New Jersey coastline is a treasure that is a source of pride for New Jerseyeans and serves as a popular attraction for thousands of tourists. The beaches, historical landmarks, natural habitats, and cultural sites lure many people to the shore, supporting local economic development and enriching New Jersey's heritage. That is why I am proud to sponsor S. 1589. I urge the committee to approve this legislation so the National Park Service can fulfill the mission initiated in 1988 and complete the development of the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail.

STATEMENT OF C. ALLEN SACHSE, SPECIAL ADVISOR AND FORMER PRESIDENT/EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE DELAWARE & LEHIGH NHC, INCORPORATED, ON S. 2131

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present testimony in support of S. 2131. My comments will address the reauthorization of the Delaware and Lehigh National Heritage Corridor (D&L) as established by Public Law 100-692. However, I support the reauthorization of Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area and Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, which are also included in SB 2131. In addition I also support the reauthorization of Essex National Heritage Area addressed in S. 1198, and America's Agricultural Heritage Partnership addressed in S. 2133.

Congress designated the D&L as the nation's third national heritage corridor in November 1988 to assist the state and local agencies in preserving and interpreting

the corridor's significant historic, cultural and natural resources, while fostering economic development focused on those resources. The D&L is located in eastern Pennsylvania with a population over 1.65 million. The story of the corridor is the story of America's industrial revolution expediously growing along the historic transportation system. From the anthracite coal fields of the Wyoming Valley to the port town of Bristol, the system of overland railroads and canals moved anthracite coal the early fuel for this revolution. Along the 165 mile route a diversity of industries flourished, including iron and steel, cement, transportation, textile, slate, agriculture, and zinc. This system (the spine of the D&L) was innovative in its day, and continued to operate for over 100 years. The Delaware and Lehigh Canals became the nation's longest operating towpath canal system, and the Switchback Gravity RR was the nation's first commercial successful railroad.

In 2005, the D&L engaged the services of the Conservation Study Institute (CSI), Northeast Region of the National Park Service to assess the accomplishments and future challenges of D&L partnership network. The findings are detailed in the report titled Connecting Stories, Landscapes, and People: Exploring the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor Partnership. The report was completed and published in spring of 2006.

The research found that progress had been very significant; participation and activity of partners was growing expediously each year; time and momentum are very important; almost half of the projects were corridor wide in scope; over 40 percent activities were determined to be "ongoing" activities requiring ongoing commitments; telling a 'national story' was both the greatest strength and challenge of the D&L; and building partner capacity and sustainability were continual challenges.

The D&L partnership's ability to leverage funding and other resources has been very impressive. The study substantiated that for each dollar provided through the National Park Service, the Corridor was able to directly leverage almost 12 dollars from other sources. Even today during these challenging economic times the D&L is still leveraging more than two times our NPS funding each year. Obviously, this means investments into communities, important cultural and natural resources, and jobs.

Looking to the future the CSI study team identified critical ingredients necessary for sustained success of the partnership network. Foremost among the ingredients necessary to sustain the partnership at current level was the NPS role. The team concluded, "The anchoring state and federal government connections provided by the PA Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) and the NPS are extremely important to the stability and sustainability of the D&L partnership system. These two partners have played critical and complementary roles in the Corridor partnership for a long time—the DCNR since it was formed in 1993 and the NPS since the Corridor's formative stages. They provide credibility and reinforce the importance of the Corridor initiative for partners and communities. . . . Other critical structural ingredients include secure, stable funding from diverse sources and the ability to leverage funds, resources, and ideas. It is important to note that the ability to leverage derives primarily from the funding and participation of the two anchoring state and federal partners."

The D&L had asked CSI to examine future management (sustainability) options both inclusive and exclusive of federal and/or state participation. All options recognized the importance of a continuing relationship with the anchoring partners—DCNR and the NPS. However, one option addressed the possibility of moving forward without a federally authorized management entity and dedicated federal funding. If this were to become a reality, the study team concluded, "this scenario would be a significant setback for the Corridor initiative and in all likelihood would substantially slow the progress toward achieving its broad mandate. Without federal authorization, D&L, Inc., and the partnership overall could have reduced stature, clout, and credibility with government agencies and other stakeholders. Perhaps more importantly, the loss of dedicated federal funding would leave a substantial void-both in direct terms for Corridor operations and management plan implementation, and indirectly in leveraging support from others."

Other than the D&L, there is no agency within the five counties that has a similar multifaceted mission and capacity to continue the work of the D&L at the same geographic scale and commitment to community enhancement. To demonstrate this I will provide two brief examples as to the scale and complexity of the work of the D&L.

D&L Trail—The vision of the D&L Trail (165 mile spine) emerged during the management action plan (MAP) process. The MAP did challenge the proponents to secure a public right of way within the first decade (in principle completed in 2004); then building the trail (underway and ongoing); creating volunteer support and owners compact (underway and ongoing); and when the D&L Trail is near completion

seek Congressional designation as a National Historic Trail—(this issue has yet to be pursued). Because the historic towpath canals were in commercial use longer than other towpath canals in the United States, parts of the system maintain a great deal of integrity even today. For instance, the 59+ mile Delaware Canal has been designated a National Historic Landmark, and several sections of the Lehigh Canal are recognized as National Recreational Trails.

The D&L Trail is a great recreational resource for it reconnects the population centers of eastern PA, as well as tremendous interpretive resource connecting the mines to the markets (industrial towns). The D&L Trail is also a rallying point for small town revitalization. With the completion or enhancement of each section of trail thousands of new users come from near and far. Towns along the trail are experiencing income growth for existing small businesses and even the opening of new businesses to serve the trail users.

In the past five years over 20 miles of new trail has been constructed along the spine of the D&L Trail system. Presently the D&L has received preliminary approval for an additional $6.5 million in TEA Enhancement funding for eight construction projects along with DCNR funding to support the design of these projects. The D&L does not own the trail. But instead, we assist the more than 20 local agencies who do own the trail by securing and administering grants, providing design and construction management of major construction, and developing volunteer tender and patrol services along the D&L Trail.

Tales of the Towpath is an award winning 4th grade curriculum written and produced by the D&L staff. The Tales of the Towpath text book tells of commerce and industry during 1850's along the canals through the experiences of 10 year old Finn Gorman. The D&L services to participating schools includes: a text book for each student in the class; a traveling trunk filled with period items; a teacher's manual that includes extensive information for local field trips; teachers training (required) accepted by the PA Dept. of Education for continuing education certification; a classroom visit by the author; and an interactive web site.

In just four years the program has grown tremendously. This school year there are 64 elementary schools using this social studies curriculum and over 6000 students discovering the history of the corridor through the reflections of Finn as a child working on his family's canal boat. The D&L is very proud of the fact that the school districts of Allentown and Bethlehem area offer the curriculum in all of their elementary schools. Allentown and Bethlehem are the most populated cities in the corridor and have the highest numbers of minority residents. This curriculum provides insights into the history and heritage of the communities where they live.

The D&L the staff authored the textbook, produced the teacher's curriculum guide, and gathered all the supportive materials. The Tales of the Towpath curriculum received a great deal of funding support through small grants and corporate donations, which were secured by leveraging a PA Corporate Educational Tax Credit program.

During my introduction, I referenced the purpose for designation as stated in the act was to assist the Commonwealth and local agencies with preserving the resources and sharing the story while fostering sustainable economic development. The D&L addresses sustainable development in a variety of ways. Landmark Towns, Market Towns and emerging Trail Towns are D&L assistance programs focused on the historic towns and cultural resources along the spine of the corridor. The rural landscape is a focus of our Conservation Landscape Initiate assistance. Tourism development and marketing is done in partnership with our four visitors and convention agencies.

In 2008, the D&L conducted a survey of visitors to key partner sites to help measure the economic impact of heritage tourism within the Corridor. The Money Generation Model, second edition, (MGM2) developed for the National Park Service, was the model used to gather information. The MGM2 is an econometric model designed to provide an estimate of the economic impact that visitors have on the local economy in terms of their contribution to sales, income and jobs in the area. The direct impact of sales resulting from heritage tourism was $21,874,480 which supported 570 jobs within the Corridor.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I will not repeat the words of Annie Harris, President of Essex NHA, in her testimony to this committee presented at the hearing on March 7th. However, I do want to reemphasis the value of the work being done by the National Heritage Areas throughout this nation, and their importance to the National Park System. Ms. Harris noted a number of recent reports examining the future of the NPS and how best to save and share the story of America. The National Heritage Areas were recognized as major partners and contributor to the work of the NPS and each report recommended continual support to the program.

Cost effective and results oriented, the D&L partnership offers a time tested model for telling a nationally significant story, saving the associated cultural and natural resources, and creating employment opportunities. The scale of this 'living landscape park' is huge. The continual support of the NPS enables the D&L to leverage the collective richness of many the partners that own and care for the key cultural and natural resources. Together we can preserve and share this story.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the continued support of the NPS is vital to the sustainability of the D&L partnership network. Thus, I ask you to pass S. 2131 and I thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony.

STATEMENT FOR LACKAWANNA HERITAGE VALLEY NATIONAL AND STATE HERITAGE AREA, SUBMITTED BY NATALIE GELB, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ON S. 2131

The Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area is located in Northeastern Pennsylvania. It comprises the cities of Scranton and Carbondale, as well as scores of other municipalities near the Lackawanna River. Rich in natural resources, particularly anthracite coal, the region attracted thousands of immigrants in search of work and a new life in America in the 19th and early 20th centuries. It became a major manufacturing hub for coal mining, railroading, steel production and textile mills. It also was home to America's early labor movement, the first electric trolley system in the United States, and the development of distance learning with the creation of courses by mail to help miners, to prepare for their licensing exams. The mines produced, and the railroads transported, millions of tons of anthracite coal, the energy source that fueled the nation during the Industrial Revolution.

In 2000, the Lackawanna Heritage Valley became a National Heritage Area, and the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority was designated as its management entity. This statement urges the committee to support Senate Bill 2131 to extend until September 30, 2022, the authorization of the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, the Delaware & Lehigh National Heritage Corridor, and the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area. As outlined in the March 7, 2012, testimony of Stephanie Toothman, Associate Director of Cultural Resources of the National Park Service, the three Pennsylvania national heritage areas preserve the historic, cultural, natural and recreational resources of their respective regions. Each designated geographical area has been recognized for its significant contribution to the history of the nation. By their very nature, each national heritage is different, representing an important aspect of the American story.

The theme of the Lackawanna Heritage Valley is "Land, People, Industry." Geographically designated as the watershed of the Lackawanna River, it encompasses Lackawanna, and parts of Luzerne, Susquehanna and Wayne counties. The area is known today for its authentic historic sites, stunning architecture, vibrant ethnic communities, diverse recreational activities, and beautiful mountains, lakes, and waterways. The Lackawanna River runs for forty miles, and it is in the Chesapeake watershed.

The Lackawanna Heritage Valley was the destination for thousands of immigrants who came to the region to find jobs and a better life and ended up building a new nation. To tell that story, LHV has formed an award winning partnership with WVIA-TV, its local PBS station, to create the ″Extraordinary Journey″ series. Starting with "Stories from the Mines," a history of the anthracite coal mining industry, several documentaries have been produced: "The Extraordinary Journey of the Eastern Europeans," "The Irish: Two Nations, One Heart," "Paesani: The Italians of Northeastern PA," and "St. Ubaldo," the story of a festival that is held each year in Jessup, Pennsylvania, a traditional event that was brought to Jessup, Pennsylvania, by immigrants from Gubbio, Italy, where it has occurred each year since the 13th century. In 2012, with the support of a local financial institution, WVIA created "Legacy: The Story of the Lackawanna Heritage Valley." WVIA not only airs these documentaries repeatedly, but it also offers them to PBS affiliates throughout the country and markets the DVDs for public purchase.

LHV has formed a coalition of federal, state, regional and local partners who work together to enhance the quality of life and improve the economic vitality of local communities. Its mission is to educate the public about the historic, cultural, economic and natural resources of the region. Small in size, but large in impact, the Lackawanna Heritage Valley ties the past to the present, always with a connection to the future. The Lackawanna Valley continues to reinvent itself, having survived the demise of the anthracite coal industry, the emigration of the textile industry offshore, and the transition from a manufacturing to a service economy that is focused on education, healthcare and a burgeoning bio-tech sector. The link between past modes of energy production, i.e., coal, to co-generation plants and natural gas pro-

duction in the Marcellus Shale, and from the convergence of major railroads to the confluence of interstate highways, maintains the region's relevance as times change.

The Lackawanna Heritage Valley ties all facets together in its role as convener and coordinator of the efforts of federal, state, regional and local governmental entities working with historic, cultural, educational and environmental partners and private entities to combine resources and build capacity. LHV hosts a monthly "Heritage Roundtable" of partners who meet to report on their respective activities, to share ideas, and to develop collaborative projects and programs that are strengthened by their collective efforts, expertise and enthusiasm. The partners rely on LHV not only for technical assistance and, sometimes, seed money or grant funding, but also as the catalyst for action. The Heritage Valley is recognized and valued by the hundreds of organizations with which it works each year for its role in weaving together the disparate elements and organizations that create and strengthen the fabric of the community.

Like its counterparts throughout the country, the Lackawanna Heritage Valley honors its story, stimulates the local economy and creates stronger communities. It focuses on education, enlightening the public, creating a sense of place, and engaging the community in its work to conserve and preserve the region's resources. Please allow me to outline a few examples of the many ways it meets those goals:

EDUCATION

The Heritage Passport program—LHV works with the Lackawanna County Library System to provide students enrolled in the summer reading program free entry to various historic venues and cultural attractions, including the Scranton Cultural Center, the Everhart Museum, Steamtown National Historic Site, the Electric City Trolley Museum, the Lackawanna Historical Society and the Pennsylvania Anthracite Heritage Museum. This program has allowed thousands of young people and their families the opportunity to learn about the region's industrial history and cultural traditions by visiting these important sites. For most, it is the first and only time that they have been able to afford such a visit.

Museums as Classrooms—LHV works with professionals from the regional Northeast Educational Intermediate Unit, to present courses for teachers that are conducted at local historic and cultural sites. Teachers participate on site, using primary resources to enhance their ability to teach their students about the respective venues. Participants are provided with curriculum guides, developed according to PA State Standards, for each site, including Steamtown, the Trolley Museum, Scranton Cultural Center, Lackawanna Historical Society's Catlin House, Everhart Museum and Pennsylvania Anthracite Heritage Museum. Teachers receive continuing education credits for this program.

Teacher mini-grants—Each year LHV offers ten mini-grants of $500 to teachers for programs that relate to heritage or environmental stewardship. A variety of unique activities have been completed, some of which have resulted in permanent recycling programs, new student activity groups, gardens, improved park, as well as ethnic cookbooks, family albums, and artworks reflecting the students' diverse backgrounds.

CULTURE

Heritage Explorer Train—LHV underwrites this annual journey on a train from Steamtown National Historic Site in Scranton to communities along the Lackawanna River where passengers have the opportunity to spend several hours at special events that showcase and celebrate the unique foods, traditions and businesses of the towns they visit. The Lackawanna Historical Society provides packets of information for the train ride, including children's activities and scavenger hunts that help them learn about the history of that particular city, borough or township. The Lackawanna Heritage Valley works with Steamtown National Historic Site, a component of the National Park Service, on a wide range of programs. In 2004, Steamtown and LHV received a federal partnership award for their effective working relationship and award winning projects.

Christmas in a Small Town—In December, the Lackawanna Heritage Valley sponsors a Steamtown train that brings Santa to communities along the rail line where LHV has recreated several historic railroad stations. Thousands of residents, visitors and former residents return home to enjoy this event. The "Santa Trai" has become an honored tradition, with each community competing to create the best welcome and the largest crowds.

Festivals and Celebrations—LHV supports and sponsors numerous cultural events, from Labor Day Weekend's "La Festa Italiana", a feast of Italian Food that attracts 150,000 visitors to Scranton, and the RailFest at Steamtown, to the Steamtown Marathon, the Scranton JazzFest, Pages and Places Book Fair, and the

other festivals and events that celebrate the diverse ethnic groups that settled the area. Most recently, LHV has provided support for newer immigrant groups that are introducing their own traditions, such as the Diversity Fair at Nay Aug Park, Latino multi-cultural events and exhibits featuring customs and traditions from India and Southeast Asia.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Lackawanna River Corridor Association—LHV has worked with the Lackawanna River Corridor Association for the past twenty years to restore the Lackawanna River to its current pristine state. Once a virtual industrial sewer, today the river has sections that have been designated as Class A Trophy Trout areas, attracting fisherman from near and far. In May, LRCA holds an annual RiverFest that hosts canoe and kayak races, and a day of riverside activities and educational presentations to celebrate the river. LHV has provided funding to restore the historic building, one of the oldest homes in Scranton, that houses LRCA. Ambassadors in Action, LHA's active volunteer group, engages in river and trail cleanups on an increasingly regular basis.

Conservation Alliance—LHV hosts more than seventy environmental organizations in a group organized to collaborate and coordinate activities that foster environmental stewardship. Each year, LHV coordinates the "Great NEPA Cleanup" held in April, promoting, publicizing and leading the efforts of myriad groups, including scout troops, colleges and universities, businesses and neighborhood organizations. It also sponsors annual workshops that are led by professionals in the field to share knowledge and offer valuable training regarding best practices.

Lackawanna River Heritage Trail—LHV's signature project is the development of the 70+ mile Lackawanna River Heritage Trail system from the New York State border to the City of Pittston in Luzerne County. The multi-purpose trail provides a wide range of recreational and wellness benefits, as well as alternative transportation opportunities along the Lackawanna River. It connects people to the river and communities to each other. The trail also acts as a linear interpretive park, with directional, safety and interpretive signage and other amenities that educate users about the industrial, cultural and community sites that developed along the Lackawanna River. In addition, the trail provides access to fishing, canoeing and kayaking in summer, cross country skiing in winter and, in the northern sections, opportunities for snowmobiling and horseback riding.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Connecting Nature and Commerce—The LHV trail is the spine of the Lackawanna Greenway which, when complete, will connect at either end with the Susquehanna Greenway to form a 250 mile loop that will be part of the Pennsylvania Mega Greenway network. LHV works closely with communities along the Lackawanna River to connect the trail to economic development by aligning the trail to travel through or close to the main streets of communities. LHV assists town officials and business owners to become "trail-friendly" so as to accommodate and encourage trail users to eat, shop, stay overnight and enjoy the amenities in each town.

A survey of the Lackawanna River Heritage Trail in 2009 proved that there were an estimated 128,000 annual user visits to the trail, resulting in a direct economic impact of approximately $28.3 million. This number is projected to increase as more sections of trail are constructed and opened for public use.

Ambassadors Tours—LHV works with regional Convention and Visitors Bureaus, as well as its fellow Pennsylvania State Heritage Areas and other governmental entities and media partners, to promote tourism. Hundreds of individuals have participated in these day-long "Ambassadors Tours" of the Heritage Valley, where they learn about the history of the area and its many cultural, recreational and economic opportunities. Each year, LHV hosts members of Leadership Lackawanna, a program of the Scranton Chamber of Commerce for upcoming community leaders and executives of local businesses, newcomers to the area, and long time residents, to help them to understand all the area has to offer.

Although there is no legislation that mandates an Evaluation and Report to be performed for the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area, Ms. Toothman recommends in her testimony that language similar to the of Section 462 of Public Law 110-229 be included in an amendment to S.B. 2131, that would require Lackawanna to have Evaluation and Report. Lackawanna concurs with that recommendation, and it further endorses the extension of authorization for federal funding for Lackawanna, Rivers of Steel and Delaware & Lehigh, so that the important work can continue.

The testimony before this committee of Annie Harris, Director of the Essex National Heritage Area, references several reports, as well as America's Great Out-

doors memo, that recognize the National Heritage Areas as vital to the NPS mission. Subsequent to that testimony, Jonathan Jarvis, Director of the National Park Service, issued Policy Memorandum 12-01 on March 16, 2012, to all employees "to affirm the NPS's support for the National Heritage Areas Program," and to recognize them as a vital part of the NPS mission. He stated, "National Heritage Areas are places where small investments pay huge dividends, providing demonstrable benefits in communities across the country and in partnership with our national parks. It is important for us to recognize the benefits that heritage areas have for our parks and our program, and to find ways to build on their success by integrating their work with ours and providing support to them in any way possible."

Since its designation, the Lackawanna Heritage Valley has received $6 million of federal funds from the National Heritage Areas program. Since 1992, LHV has invested more than $37 million in the region, and it has created 1,649 fulltime jobs. Although it can be difficult to measure the effects of Lackawanna Heritage Valley on the quality of life and sense of pride among residents, this ratio proves that the economic impact has been impressive.

Perhaps most apparent to the people of the region is the degree of community engagement that LHV has stimulated. Thousands of individuals use the trail, visit the sites, ride the trains, enjoy the celebrations, watch the videos and clean up the river. Hundreds of volunteers have been "Heritage Partners." Through the work of the Heritage Valley, people who live here have a greater recognition and appreciation of the importance of their legacy. Children are learning from a very young age to protect the environment, to have a sense of place, and to understand that they can plan their futures in their communities.

This is a great accomplishment for an area that has faced and overcome tremendous economic challenges over the past half century. Their work ethic and perseverance were passed on to them by their forebears. People who grew up here and moved away are returning, and those who stayed now see the place and themselves with new eyes. The Lackawanna Heritage Valley must survive if this revitalization is to continue.

STATEMENT OF MAUREEN FINNERTY, CHAIR, EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, COALITION OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE RETIREES, ON S. 1708

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to present the views of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees on a bill currently before you, S. 1708, a bill to establish the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, and for other purposes. We are submitting this for the record, to be incorporated with other testimony of your hearing of March 7, 2012.

This is important legislation. We are pleased with the committee's involvement, and know that your consideration can help the get the balance right for the significant resources of the Blackstone Valley, and for the National Park Service as a whole. The Coalition of National Park Service Retirees strongly supports the enactment of an S. 1708 that would create a Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park, based on its real significance to the nation, and sustained by mutually supportive partnerships.

On the question of the park name, please consider our letter of December 13, 2011 to Chairman Bingaman in which we address the complexity of the question in some detail. So to focus today on the structural issue crucial to the success of this park we point out only this: If a family sets out to visit Gettysburg they go to Gettysburg National Military Park. If they go to visit Yellowstone, they go to Yellowstone National Park, or if to the Lincoln Memorial they go to the Lincoln Memorial. A park named for a person as an honorific instead of the plain name of the resource itself will confuse the potential visitor.

The primary issue for this legislation is to assure that the park is fully founded on the resource of significance, anchored solidly on the resources that tell the story that matters. The concern is the park during the legislative process will be stripped of the recommended sites needed to tell the story of national significance. This park will need to include all representative sites identified by S. 1708 and by the Blackstone River Valley Special Resource Study (SRS) to retain its significance and meaning, and work effectively with related resources outside park boundaries.

We believe appropriate legislation can provide the strategy and authority needed to protect and interpret the nationally significant resource. We believe the challenge before the committee for the Blackstone River Valley is not formidable or risky, but will require the committee to craft legislation distinctively designed to meet the

need of this specific resource rather than a more compact framework that works well in most places but will not preserve the resource here.

In this testimony we will identify the nature of the resource and the reasons why the legislative framework proposed in the SRS makes sense. We will describe the national significance, as the National Park Service (NPS) testimony does not address this, but an understanding of the resource is necessary to provide the needed legislative framework. We will explain why this park will be affordable and within the order of magnitude of the existing funding over the past 20 years to the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor commission, and why 5 small units and parcels along the tributary and main stem of the Blackstone River, can be founded on a mix of partnership and ownership and still be sufficiently robust and self-sustaining to be the anchor and inspiration for cooperative visitor strategies outside the park in the larger Valley. We believe we will show that experience demonstrates no concern for federal overreaching beyond the park, and we will suggest alternatives to the land protection amendments proposed in their testimony by the NPS.

What is the essential resource and story?

It is certainly much more, and much more interesting to visitors, than the touted "the Birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution." Describing these resources as exclusively industrial or of a narrow period of industrial history truly misses what makes the Blackstone River Valley significant.

It is the "wholeness" of the Blackstone Valley that makes it significant, the concentration of resources and innovation across an entire landscape, and the 200-year long extent of the story that is the key to the need for appropriate legislation.

This is the story of a representative watershed that has witnessed every phase of industrial development and interaction with the environment from colonial times to the present efforts of environmental revitalization. This Valley has high integrity, is compact, and capable of supporting the very best of interpretation and public programming.

This landscape, particularly the north and west, contains what The New Yorker magazine called "large and spectacular wetlands." Across its 45 miles, the streams and tributaries of the Blackstone River descend 450 feet from the hills in and above Worcester, Massachusetts to the Narragansett Bay, or 10 feet a mile—a faster descent than the Colorado River through Grand Canyon National Park and the reason why to this day there is no continuous road along the banks of the Blackstone. Instead, through the muse of geography and the work of people, the river and its tributaries became the first place in the United States to experience the widespread use of waterpower for industry; it became the center of industrial innovation for the nation, and the first major area of conflict in America between the environment and industrial development. This reshaping of the river basin, and its physical and social response, the creation of sustainable wealth and community, its economic and environmental decline and more recently its pathway to restoration is the major significance of the Blackstone River Valley, and the compelling story it tells America.

In this small area between Worcester and Providence, Rhode Island, you can still see in successive layers an important concentration of colonial rural landscapes—the incubator of the essential pre-industrial skills—including hilltop and crossroads villages, still-existing rural roadways built in the 1600's atop the trails of Native Americans and farmlands still bordered by classic stone walls; layered above that the rise of tiny industrial villages and then cities, the first rural turnpikes, then the canals and railroads and highways, including large parts of the 2nd and 3rd largest cities of New England, a hugely diversified industrial base and 10,000 historic sites with continued layers right through to our time. Omnipresent in every layer are features indicating the significance of the waterways of the Blackstone River Valley.

It is an environmental story of people living on the land, how the resources sustained the people and how the people sustained the resources; the story of what happens when the people or the resources fail, and of the solutions that can bring about the recovery of both the resources and the people who live with them and depend on them.

- Historians have described the Valley as the perfect small model for interpreting and understanding every phase of industrial and community development.

But, other than creating a park boundary around an entire living valley, how can such a place receive the recognition it deserves as a national historical park? What would be feasible, effective and affordable?

S. 1708 and the SRS each have determined that, in a living landscape, the whole valley should be protected and interpreted through locally-driven partnership, but the national historical park should itself be a robust presence made up of represent-

ative parcels of national significance, each parcel carefully selected, distributed and linked as anchors throughout and for the whole Valley.

The Coalition of National Park Service Retirees generally supports this approach as practical and affordable.

- We recommend a park not unlike the design in S. 1708 or the proposed National Park Service amendments, but with key practical distinctions.
- We support a park made up of representative parcels of on the Blackstone River and its tributaries, with specific sites at Whitinsville, Hopedale, Slatersville, Ashton and Slater Mill. Removal of any one of these sites would compromise the integrity and coherence of the park. In particular we support legislative authorities for the park to be the anchor to provide technical and financial assistance to a new 501(c)(3) partner and other partners as appropriate and in accordance with a plan, to develop cooperative visitor and preservation strategies outside the NPS units.

Although small in comparative acreage, this park and park operation as designed will contain sufficient leverage to enable the NPS to cooperate successfully with others to preserve the distinctive character and tell the story of the whole of the Blackstone River Valley. We strongly urge the committee to avoid a framework of only one or two units such as the Slater Mill Historic Site or Centennial park in Slatersville alone. We believe such a park would not be feasible because by themselves these sites would not be representative of the whole, and could not serve as the sinews or backbone of the larger and more important story. The rest of the Valley must see its connection to and identity with the national historical park.

The National Park Service has broad and deep skills and partnership strategies found throughout numerous programs and parks. After years of experience we know these skills and strategies when assembled and targeted can work as a stable and predictable foundation for unit preservation and administration, when applied to populated cultural landscapes through a preservation compact with a highly supportive and engaged local community.

We believe this resource and issues involved in protecting this park as proposed by the SRS are of crucial importance to the future of the National Park Service.

As the NPS approaches its Second Century the question is, will the National Park Service be permitted to accept the strategic role needed by America to preserve and protect nationally significant places and landscapes in the century to come? To do so, the National Park Service must assemble and use in a strategic way all the wide range of skills developed in various individual NPS programs or projects and realize they are actually a time-tested tool kit. These skills and tools can be taught, are replicable and can be adapted to different circumstances based on congressional purposes and local needs.

- Like the SRS, we recommend that the boundaries for the park areas of Slater Mill, Ashton, Slatersville, Whitinsville and Hopedale follow its Historic District or National Landmark boundary.
- The tributaries and the river should be represented by parcels each identified to include multiple character-defining elements such as rural, natural, cultural, recreational or ecological features.
- Lands within the park boundaries would be authorized for donation or willing seller acquisition, or, in lieu thereof, firm assurances such as by covenant or code or park administrative agreement that the resource is protected in a manner consistent with park purposes, as certified by the Secretary of the Interior.
- For lands within park boundaries on which the United States holds an interest in the land, the Secretary may provide up to 100 percent of preservation costs.
- We have seen no legislative maps for the tributaries or rivers. If no representative parcels for tributaries and river as described above have been identified for the committee or if it is not practical to have them identified prior to enactment, we recommend a provision in the legislation authorizing the Secretary to incorporate in the park such small and representative parcels upon notification of the committees and publication in the Federal Register.

This certification of consistency by the Secretary would be similar to the Taunton Wild and Scenic River in Public Law 111-11, section 5003. This approach would be ideal for including portions of the state park at Ashton within the Ashton NPS unit, or the nationally significant private homes or factories at Slatersville where continued private use would be the highest and best means of preservation.

We caution critics of partnership who expect the NPS to hold fee ownership throughout an entire unit, that the critical thing here is to identify an entire distinctive and character-defining cultural landscape for each unit. Of necessity when the story is about development, innovation and landscape, multiple partnerships are re-

quired. The key thing now is to preserve the complete resource with the involvement of the private interests while the site integrity is high.

There will be criticism that having park parcels miles apart is not feasible, for managers or for the Visitor Experience.

In fact, the thing that makes this valley such an exemplar is that it is small and comprehensible, and extremely susceptible to a wide variety of interpretive and public programming. "Disconnected" sites usually are not the ideal for a park, but this park would use the river and its tributaries to "connect" the sites, with each other and the rest of the Valley. The historic transportation routes between sites enhance the meaning and value of each NPS park destination site. The partnership projects located between lands to be operated by the NPS—such as "the Great Road," a tremendously significant series of early 19th Century sites along an ancient trail—will contribute to the park story.

The river and its tributaries will be the main link. New England has a very "local" sense of place and of local identity, sometimes with a sense of disassociation from sites very nearby. But each local place does see itself linked to this common watershed. Through the watershed, the common links of each local microcosm will be understood by visitors and residents, and reinforced by canoe trails, greenways and bikeways through the work of the National Heritage Corridor, the two states and local communities.

The river and its tributaries enable the visitor to see beyond the narrow story of one factory or one industry. They link the other rural or natural resources, and connect the natural and cultural landscape with the icons of industry, such as mills and canal and railroad and worker housing. One understands what it took to make this world, and can see plainly what was sustainable economically and environmentally, and what was not.

- We agree that financial assistance for development outside the park should be matched by 50 percent.
- We do not agree this makes sense within the park unit.

At the very least, NPS should have the authority to provide 100 percent of the funding when the NPS holds an interest in the land; for some such preservation assistance would be an incentive to donate an easement or preserve a property in accordance with the Secretary's Standards. There needs to be a distinction between the NPS assistance in for programs for the national heritage corridor and for the park. There needs to be an incentive, in particular, for properties within the sites identified for NPS administration, or the ability for the NPS to act in a timely way if the preservation of a resource is at stake.

- An NPS General Management Plan is not the right vehicle for planning for cooperative activities, especially outside park boundaries, as proposed in the NPS testimony.
- We recommend a joint preservation and interpretive plan as both a framework and a priority setting tool, to be approved by the Secretary, based on the nationally significant themes represented at all levels inside and outside the park.

The cooperative approach to planning will produce the creativity needed. The required the approval of the Secretary before the preservation plan can be funded, the joint planning team—perhaps made up of the new non-profit, the "Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, Inc." and the NPS working together—will keep the plan affordable, targeted and strategic. Targets outside the park that are consistent with both national historical park and national heritage corridor purposes would be eligible for matching federal preservation funding. This plan may require little more than an updating of existing national heritage area plans that identify natural and cultural sites that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained because of their cultural or natural significance. This joint preservation plan could be incorporated as a part of the General Management Plan, but there is no real partnership without partnership planning.

The park resources should be seen as fully sustainable and powerful on their own, but also serving as anchors for interpretation and technical assistance and as exemplars and microcosms of the many other significant resources that need local leadership and support outside the parks but inside the Valley. Together, park and partners can tell the big story, and celebrate their resources, history and accomplishments.

- We do not agree the matches should be by "project" as proposed by the NPS, rather than by "program" as we recommend.

Some projects attract much larger matches than others. Some crucial expenditures such as advance planning and design or surveys and biological studies to le-

verage proper protection, can never by themselves be expected to be fully matched in all cases, but they are essential partnership tools to leverage huge third-party contributions. Of course donations of lands or easements or of in-kind assistance should be considered as matches. When the complete program, involving often multiple partnerships, can be considered for matching purposes as a whole, significant preservation work and participation can result. Matching the program, rather than by project, is also easier for bookkeeping purposes and project management purposes, and can enable each partner to contribute 100 percent of what it does well. The NPS might, for example, do all the archeological and other advance studies and planning plus the interpretive work, while a scenic byway connecting the site could be planned and maintained by the state or other agency.

- While we agree that, in addition to the nationally significant park sites, a specific and limited acreage should be authorized to be included in the park for administrative or visitor contact sites, we do not agree this authority should be restricted to Woonsocket, RI, as provided in the NPS amendment.

For example, Massachusetts has already obtained $5.5 million in funding for offices and a contact center just off Route 90 and Route 146. This would bracket access to the park on the two major interstate highways in New England, Route 95 at Slater Mill and Route 90 at this site, and encourage access to all sites in between in the Valley. Right now all the visitor contact centers are either in Rhode Island, or in the MA town of Uxbridge that borders Rhode Island at the bottom of the MA portion of the Valley. NPS should be permitted flexibility to work with the State of Massachusetts if it chooses to include this site of great potential at the northern end of the Valley.

- The proposed NPS amendment requiring identification of priority land acquisition in advance contradicts NPS experience and practice.

Land protection planning, and cooperative management agreements typically all happen after park establishment, for good reason. NPS negotiators may welcome the additional strength and flexibility, in the negotiations for the administration agreement for certification by the Secretary, by including the preservation plan for the non-federal parcels in the mix with the parcels for NPS acquisition to create one balanced administration plan for each park site. The robust park as proposed in this testimony would not require a statutory priority system. We would yield to the wisdom of the committee if it is seen that extra assurance of robust park units is desirable.

- While the continuation of independent funding authorities to the national heritage corridor would enhance the park, we appreciate that may contradict congressional intention for this legislation, as the alternative to reauthorization of the existing commission. However, in existing law (Public Law 99-647 (16 U.S.C. 461 note), section 9) the Secretary has ongoing projects review authority in consultation with the corridor commission. For the consultation process, we recommend in lieu of the existing federal commission, that the successor organization, the Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, Inc., be substituted for the purposes of that process.

This section 9 provision should not be lost. It has helped other federal agencies understand the significance of the Valley and led to much positive cooperation leading to huge budgetary and program efficiency from many other federal agencies with local communities and the NPS.

- As our final recommended amendment, we believe the park purposes in Section 2 of S. 1708 could be made simpler and stronger, and focused more properly on what would make the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park important to the nation. We are attaching a proposed amendment that could help accomplish this.

The industrial story should be seen of one piece with the environmental story, the story of the creation of wealth and community, the understanding that the Blackstone Valley as a whole can be seen as one system.

This understanding of history is well supported as context throughout the entire SRS, and strongly articulated by the six historians assembled by the Organization of American Historians to advise the NPS on park significance. To supplement the committee's record on this key issue, we recommend including the profound but brief narrative reports written by these six industrial historians. These short reports see this big story, state it more clearly than the SRS, and see the opportunity for a modest but strategic role for a properly located, scaled and strategic national historical park.

Equally supportive of the big picture, and the proper balance between the NPS and the partners, and why things work as well as they do in the Blackstone Valley, we also recommend that the record include a copy of the 2005 National Park Service report by its Conservation Study Institute (CSI), "Reflecting on the Past, Looking to the Future," that gives the best understanding of these issues. This report was the foundation for Public Law 109-338, "The John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 2006." We will forward a copy of this report to the committee. Readers of this report can see immediately why continuing the existing level of energy and huge leveraging in the Valley today is essential to any preservation plan, and why the small federal role in this two-state valley unlocks the rest. This will be as true for the park as it was for the national heritage corridor.

The National Park Service is also to be congratulated for the distinction and insight of the Blackstone River Valley Special Resource Study. This is as important and as difficult a landscape as may be found to devise so many elegant and essential resource preservation solutions. Beyond the interests of multiple federal agencies, it should be remembered this park plan engaged two sovereign states and over 20 New England towns and cities and 40 historic villages. At one point in the colonial history of Massachusetts, simply being from Rhode Island and on Massachusetts soil was legally punishable by death on sight. More recently, for a period of 40 years, from 1790 until 1830, the obvious canal between Worcester and Providence was blocked to prevent mutual benefit and enterprise. As recently as 1989 on a sign on the Massachusetts border where the river could be seen to continue to flow into Rhode Island was this notorious marker: "NOW LEAVING THE BLACKSTONE RIVER VALLEY." It took personal resilience, a great willingness to really listen to Americans and an uncommon belief in the value of the preservation mission of the National Park Service to produce this masterwork. Most could not think out of this box. Most would not try to achieve what now can be done here.

To conclude, we would like to address some of the needless final fears concerning this proposed park.

1. That passing this legislation will lead every national heritage area to seek NPS status.

In fact, very few of the other heritage areas would be interested or qualified to be units of the National Park System.

The Blackstone River Valley has always had the closest ties to the NPS of any heritage area. Unlike all other heritage areas, it has an ongoing ONPS allocation, and in effect would not require a new ONPS allocation to be continued as a Unit of the National Park System. On its own terms, this proposed park has been found after an extremely painstaking and objective study, to be suitable, feasible and significant and should be made into an innovative national historical park on the merits.

2. Something on this scale, with so many thousands of historic sites and so many dozens of historic villages will be a money sink.

In fact, as the CSI report demonstrates, if the existing energy and imagination and partnerships in the Valley from the NPS' past experience are incorporated into this new national park, the costs will be very modest. The SRS calls for NPS expenditures on the same order of magnitude as the last 20 years.

The National Park System Advisory Board after considering this CSI study for its own 2006 report Charting a Future for National Heritage Areas, found:

> . . . the [Blackstone River Valley] corridor has fostered restoration of dozens of historic buildings for private and public use, annual cleanup efforts, regular water-quality testing, and improved water access. The commission's work has generated thousands of volunteers and new recreation enthusiasts. Residents, businesses, and local governments are reconnecting with the Blackstone River, generating new economic vitality, valued at 22 times the National Park Service investment of $24 million over the past 18 years. The commission has inspired federal, state, and local governments; historical, recreational, and environmental organizations; businesses; and private landowners to collaborate on projects based on shared ideals and goals.

In other words, for an NPS expenditure of $24 million over 18 years, or averaging $1.3 million per year, a total of $528 million was leveraged from other sources to carry out the Blackstone River Valley mission.

This would be a great partner, and a great deal, for the national historical park.

3. Providing NPS partnership opportunities outside park boundaries will be an intrusion of federal authority over private lands and local governments.

In fact, after 20 years it is clear from the record that exactly the opposite happens. No one has cited any loss of their power or authority. No community has ever asked to be deleted from the area. In fact, other communities keep asking to join. The overwhelming community response was in support of the park, with nearly all those who spoke at the public meetings calling for including the river and its tributaries in the park.

This is because all the planning is collaborative and voluntary. The regional umbrella developed by the corridor commission and NPS empowers local people and communities to have a seat at the table to voice their priorities effectively the federal government, not the other way around. Since no one is mandated to participate, and because the partners participate because of their commitment to the quality of life in their communities, everything is voluntary. The NPS role on all these non-federal lands has been to bring the interpretive message to celebrate the resources and to provide the technical skills, plans and studies that show that preservation is compatible with economic health.

Thank you for considering this testimony of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees.

The more than 800 members of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees are all former employees of the National Park Service (NPS) with more than 24,000 years of stewardship of America's most precious natural and cultural resources. In their personal lives, CNPSR members maintain their professional outlook. Just as the national parks are supported by the broad spectrum of the American people, the CNPSR members reflect the broad spectrum of political affiliations. CNPSR members now offer their professional experience and integrity as they speak out for national park solutions that uphold law and policy. Our members also support the mission of the National Park Service through public education.

We would welcome any questions, and would be delighted to provide whatever level of detail is necessary.

ATTACHED—PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2, S. 1708.

PROVIDED FOR THE RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE

- Six Scholars Reports for the Blackstone River Valley Special Resource Study.
- "Reflecting on the Past, Looking to the Future: A Technical Assistance Report to the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Commission," the Conservation Study Institute, Woodstock, VT.

Proposed Amendment to S. 1708, section 2.

On page 1 and 2, strike all of SEC. 2 PURPOSE, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to establish the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park——

(1) to preserve, protect and interpret for the benefit and inspiration of future generations certain nationally significant natural and cultural resources in the Blackstone River Valley that exemplify the transformation and sustainability of a landscape that was the first complete river and its tributaries harnessed for industrial innovation and development in the United States, and that today reveals every phase of industrial development from colonial times to the present;

(2) to support and enhance the efforts of the citizens, organizations, and state and local governments of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and other agencies, to work cooperatively to protect, preserve and celebrate the purposes of the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor and the purposes of the Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT T. LEAVENS, GLOUCESTER, MA AND ELIZABETH M. WARE, NEWBURYPORT, MA, ON S. 1198

Mr. Chairman and Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present our views on S.1198, a bill to reauthorize the Essex National Heritage Area.

1. Heritage Commission-arm of the NPS and 501 c (3) non-profit.

The Essex National Heritage Area (ENHA) was created by Congress in a vote of the Omnibus Parks Act of 1996. The creation of the HA included a provision that

would allow for the creation of a management entity of the HA. About a year or so after the Congressional vote, and around the time that the management plan for the area was being approved by the National Park Service (NPS), the Essex National Heritage Commission (ENHC) was created. Additionally, the ENHC filed papers for non-profit, 501-c-(3) status with the Secretary of State of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

ENHC Executive Director Annie Harris notes in her testimony to the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, National Parks Subcommittee that "The Commission is a regional non-profit organization that manages the Essex National Heritage Area, a 500 square mile region located north of Boston, rich in historic, cultural and natural resources." To our knowledge, there is no such entity as a "regional non-profit organization." The ENHC is a Massachusetts non-profit entity whose Congressional charge is the oversight of a specific region.

The status of the ENHC as both a Congressionally-designated management entity of the ENHA and a quasi-arm of the National Park Service and a Massachusetts non-profit is a dangerous combination. The ENHC is given a tremendous amount of leeway as a non-profit but can ultimately use that flexibility to gather information and eventually team up with the NPS, who has the benefit of enormous and far-reaching Federal powers. The NPS and the ENHC have "cooperative agreements" so that if the ENHC desires a certain outcome, they can rely on the NPS to make it happen via its Federal powers. That manifests itself in a dangerous alliance that allows the NPS to expand its land holdings, local land use controls and federal controls through secretive "partnerships" and "cooperative agreements."

It should be noted that these "cooperative agreements" and "partnership agreements" have been requested from both the NPS and the ENHC, but have not been made available. Being a non-profit, the ENHC is not required to provide the information under a Freedom of Information Act request and the NPS has consistently refused to comply with FOIA. The only means to get copies of these agreements is to sue the NPS, which is a daunting and financially-untenable action to an average citizen.

The chameleon-like status of the ENHC is dangerous to the ENHA as well. As a non-profit, it is difficult to find out information on their inner operations and any coordinated efforts they are working on with the NPS. For example, at present there is a House Bill for funding for a study of expanding the boundaries the Salem Maritime National Historic Site, but there is no background or information provided by the NPS or the ENHC on this initiative. Why such an expansion is viewed warranted by both organizations and where their target areas are are unknown to those in the ENHA. Press releases have mentioned several sites, whose owners and/or overseers have been unaware of the NPS and ENHC's interest. Alone, the ENHC has no power to exercise eminent domain powers. In concert with or subject of "cooperative agreements" with the NPS, the ENHC has a lot of power and control. This level of power and control is disturbing and one questions whether it was intended in the Congressional legislative action of 1996.

2. Funding and "Making Their Federal Match"

According to the Congressional legislation in 1996, the ENHA is supposed to match its federal funding dollar for dollar. Since the creation of the management entity of the ENHC, it is doubtful that the ENHC has matched its NPS funding on a dollar for dollar basis. Executive Director Harris notes in her testimony that "The value of the National Heritage Areas lies in their ability to amplify their limited annual federal funds with matching dollars many times over;"

According to the statement to your committee by Stephanie Toothman, Associate Director of Cultural Resources, National Park Service concerning S.1198, "for every Federal dollar Essex received, it leveraged approximately $5 of non-federal funds in fiscal year 2011 ($671,000 Federal vs. $3,574.139 non-federal). In total, Essex has received over $12 million in Federal funding."

The statements of Ms. Harris and Ms. Toothman are troubling for many reasons. Firstly, Congress only initially authorized $10 million in Federal funding to ENHC. Who authorized the extra $2 million? Secondly, $10-12 million for a 15-year period does not seem to be "limited annual federal funds." With over three quarters of their annual allocation being used for salaries and minimal rent (per review of the Massachusetts Secretary of State tax filing) , only about $200,000 is actually being spent on initiatives and grant programming for the area, with a $25,000 grant program having been offered in one of the last three years and no grant program in each of the other two years.

Thirdly, there is a serious question as to whether Essex or any other heritage area makes its match. Senator Kennedy's office and Congressman Tierney's executive aides were both asked how the ENHC made its match. While both legislators

heavily support the ENHC, neither office could answer the question of how or if the ENHC made its match. The ENHC audits do not specify how or if the match of federal funds is made, with the auditors specifically circumventing that issue by stating language to the effect that "if this program qualifies as a match per federal requirements, then it is a match; however the auditors would not make that determination. In a discussion several years ago with Heritage Area Administrator Brenda Barrett, Ms. Barrett stated that the financials were not really reviewed by her office or by the NPS and that "the Heritage Areas could do anything they want" with little to no oversight by the NPS or her office.

The ENHC grant program papers seem to tell the story of how the ENHC makes its match. When operative, the grant program requires that the remaining funds of the project are able to be used as ENHC "match." For example, a local historical society decides it needs to replace a building roof. Say that this project has a $50,000 price tag. The local historical society raises $48,000, with ENHC providing the remaining $2,000 in one of its "partnership grants" to the project. The ENHC is then allowed to use the $48,000 as their "match," noting that the $2,000 has "leveraged" $48,000 in private funds to do the needed restoration. In actuality, the work would have been completed without the ENHC grant funds and, in many situations, the bulk of the donated funds were secured before the ENHC was approached about donating the final $2,000.

In speaking with an ENHC commissioner who was a member of the grant selection team, the grant "match" theory noted above was confirmed by him. When faced with a number of grant proposals, the ENHC selection of grants did not seem to focus on who was most needy but who had the larger projects and how the ENHC "could leverage" the most funds per year. Additional "match" of volunteer time is also included the ENHC's calculation of how much money and participation is "leveraged" in a given year. Having attended several semi-annual meetings (of course monthly annual meetings could generate a larger match) and being asked to sign a "match form," I have no idea of what monetary value my time as an attendee was given. As a non-profit, the ENHC is not obligated to tell me!

3. What is their area of jurisdiction?

When the ENHA was designated, a specific map, entitled NAR-51-80,000 and dated August 1994, was created to delineate the area. As with other elements of the Heritage Area designations, this map seems to have been either reinterpreted to expand the area or has been just outright ignored. There are several examples of this lack of clarity of regional jurisdiction. Recently noted on the ENHC's website, a story of the idea of possibility of linking the new proposal for the "Wonderland casinos" in East Boston and Revere, Massachusetts with the Essex Coastal Scenic Byway has been proposed. In the article, job creation and increased revenues to the area were highlighted. It should be noted that East Boston and Revere are not within the boundaries of the ENHA, but that does not appear to stop that relationship from being fostered. What a casino has to do with a scenic coastal byway is not clear but Ms Harris and the Commission members seem to be doing whatever is necessary to link the Commission with job creation and increased revenues to communities located north of Boston, whether they are technically within the ENHA or not. We do not believe that gambling was a part of the Cultural Heritage that Congress had in mind when it created the ENHA.

Likewise, in 2004, the NPS, who funds the ENHC, designated the ENHC as the new owners of the Baker's Island Light station reservation, a 10 acre "excessed" U.S. Coast Guard station, containing a lighthouse, two keeper's houses and other associated structures. This award was granted by the NPS to the ENHC under the National Historical Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000, and may be one of the first "partnership" acts to expand the Salem Maritime National Historic Site to include Baker's Island, which is not located within the ENHA.

This latter example of NPS/ENHC coordination is particularly troublesome in that it indicates the ability of the ENHC to act in its non-profit role (ignoring Federal mandates that most HAs are not supposed to own real estate, particularly from the entity that funds them), proves the NPS/ENHC "partnership" is without controls or mindfulness of its Federal limits of area designation and provides an excellent example of the ENHC's attempts to shape-shift the ENHA. Since its inception, the ENHC has been particularly vague as to its areas of jurisdiction, noting in some documents that the ENHA includes all of Essex County (which it does not!), includes 500 square miles (unspecified) north of Boston to whatever description of the area is most beneficial at a given moment. At this point in time the transfer of the Baker's Island light station to the ENHC has not taken place due to the fact that the U.S. Coast Guard needs to complete a $1.5M lead soil remediation project in order for the property to be transferred.

In the meantime, the ENHC and NPS have secured $250,000 in funds under the Paul Sarbanes Transportation Grant program to have a specialty boat fabricated so that the NPS can run tours to the light station, which is to be operated as a privately owned/public park. Transporting the public from a National Park Historic Site to a private park is not Paul Sarbanes Transportation in Public Parks grant eligible. That does not stop the Park Service, who by the way administers their Paul Sarbanes grants themselves through a "cooperative agreement" with the Department of Transportation. Sound familiar? It is anticipated that these tours will start in summer of 2012, despite the fact that the site has not been remediated and may be of danger to young children due to the lead levels of the soil.

4. Role in Land Use controls and Decision Making.

The ENHC has been involved in controlling land uses and interfering with property rights since its inception. In her testimony to your committee, Ms. Harris states that "In the case of the Essex Heritage Border to Boston Rail Trail and the adjacent coastal trail, the ideas for these trails began 45 years ago but it took the unique management and partnership skills of Essex Heritage to secure the rights-of-way and see that the first miles were built." Did the Congressional legislation anticipate or dictate that the ENHC could become involved in negotiating land ownership transactions? Perhaps not as a Congressionally-designated area but "as a non-profit, they can do anything they want."

To stress their interest in historic preservation, the ENHC has recently started holding historic preservation building restrictions. This authority is supposed to be reserved for entities that have experience and expertise in formulating and holding such restrictions. While several individual members may have historic preservation experience, the ENHC has no such experience or track record in the preservation of historic properties.

The Essex Coastal Scenic Byway, an 85-mile route through a number of North Shore communities, is another example of the ENHC's involvement in meddling in private property rights issues. In the Essex Coastal Scenic Byway report, prepared by Walker/Brown, consultants to the ENHC, it is recommended that communities adopt land use controls to limit development and control aesthetic issues along the byway. The ENHC represents that the route is entirely within the ENHA, despite present efforts to now have it start in East Boston and Revere.

5. Heritage Tourism, Job Creation and Role of the Essex National Heritage Commission.

Ms. Harris' testimony indicates that the ENHC created 1,488 jobs through the grant program and assisted in attracting 1.3 million visitors to the region. Both of these figures cannot be confirmed, particularly since the NPS figures (if those were the ones used) include "visits" to their website as visitors to the park itself. When website "hits" are calculated and included in the "visitation" figures, then they are interjected into a marketing model that includes those website "hits" to include expenditures of "visitors" to the ENHA. One might visit the ENHC and NPS Salem Maritime National Historic Site 500 times annually via the web, but those "visits" do not necessarily equate to area expenditures leading to a false expansion of tourist feet on the ground and fictitious analysis of visitor expenditures in the region. Actual visitors to Salem are likely counted twice if they go to the Visitor's Center and the Salem Maritime National Historic Site.

The ENHC's claim of the creation of almost 1,500 jobs due to their grant program is almost laughable, given that the ENHC has either not operated its grant program in the past five years or has operated it with such a low amount of funds, that there is no mechanism for their determination of "new" jobs that have been created. An argument can be made that for those projects that sought grant funds, the work would have been completed whether the ENHC awarded grants or not . . . hence the argument that no "new" jobs have been created.

The ENHC operates as a regional chamber of commerce for the ENHA, however that area is defined on a given day. They do not interpret or preserve historic properties nor do they oversee cultural or natural resources at any level. They disseminate information on agencies and organizations that do perform those acts. As one ENHC Commissioner stated to me, "If they disappeared tomorrow, no one would miss them. If the $1M in funds that goes to the ENHC were to be given to select Chambers of Commerce within Essex County, the Chambers could much better use the funds for greater impacts than the ENHC, who spends three quarters of their federal funding on salaries and rent." Hardly a resounding endorsement of the ENHC!

6. Lack of Heritage Area Planning.

Stephanie Toothman, in her testimony to your committee, has stated that "Consistent with congressional directives in the 2009 and 2010 Interior Appropriations Acts, the Administration proposed focusing most national heritage area grants on recently authorized areas and reducing and/or phasing out funds to well-established recipients to encourage self-sufficiency in the FY 2013 Budget. The Department would like to work with Congress to determine the future federal role when heritage areas reach the end of their authorized eligibility for heritage program funding." She further notes that "there are currently 49 designated national heritage areas, yet there is no authority in law that guides the designation and administration of these areas." We ask that your committee not support the additional funds requested in a lengthening of the sunset provision for the ENHC for the following reasons:

a. In its roles as the management entity of the ENHA and as a non-profit agency, the ENHC is responsive to no one. The NPS does not fully oversee its operations and, as a non-profit, it is protected from providing certain information to the public, who might want to understand their roles and operations in cooperation with the NPS. This element of their operations needs to be clarified and their records need to be made available to the public, as they are merely an extension of the NPS;

b. The ENHA is one of the original heritage areas, created in 1996, has received over $12M and has yet to become self supporting. It is considered one of the most "successful" heritage areas in the program. How much worse are the others?;

c. Congress, OMB and the NPS need to determine what a match of federal funds is and how that "match" is calculated. It needs to be reasonable and easy to calculate. To date we do not believe that the ENHC has met its match of Federal funds;

d. Congress did not anticipate the role of heritage commissions in formulating and administering land use controls. This issue needs to be addressed;

e. The ENHC needs to stay within the confines of its federally-designated area-map NAR-51-80,000, dated August 1994. To stray off shore and into other communities not within its district cannot be what was intended by the legislation of its designation;

f. If it is determined that heritage areas are to remain, Congress, the NPS and other related organizations need to develop a long range plan of the roles of heritage areas in federal government. At present the ENHC is a boondoggle, answering to no one, continually requesting federal dollars and not providing any service more than, as one ENHC Commissioner has stated, what a local chamber of commerce would provide.

STATEMENT OF CASWELL F. HOLLOWAY, DEPUTY MAYOR FOR OPERATIONS, CITY OF NEW YORK, ON H.R. 2606

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am Caswell Holloway, New York City's Deputy Mayor for Operations. On behalf of Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg, thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in support of H.R. 2606, the New York City Natural Gas Supply Enhancement Act. This legislation is not just about facilitating the construction and operation of a natural gas pipeline-though the jobs created by the project are certainly a good thing. This pipeline is critical to building a stable, clean-energy future for New York City, and dramatically improving the public health of New Yorkers.

As the members of the committee know, H.R. 2606 is will make possible the construction of a 3-mile, 26" diameter natural gas line that will enable National Grid to supply gas consumers in Brooklyn from an existing bulk pipeline in the Atlantic Ocean that is operated by the Williams Companies. Congressional action is needed to authorize the pipeline route to cross beneath the Gateway National Recreation Area (Gateway), which is operated by the National Park Service. I note that Mayor Bloomberg is working closely with the National Parks Service on many initiatives to improve public access to and use of Gateway and City and National Parks throughout New York City.

As with any pipeline project, the primary concern is public safety-and Williams and National Grid are taking steps to ensure that this pipeline is safe, and has a minimal impact on Gateway, as well as property along the entire route. Foremost among these measures is the planned use of horizontal directional drilling, a trenchless construction method, that will install the pipeline at a considerable depth below ground-from 30 to as much as 80 feet at certain points. And trenchless technology, which the City has used successfully on our own water and sewer projects,

will minimize the impact of the construction itself. In addition, the developers have stated that they will: (1) use piping of a gauge and strength that will greatly exceed the safety requirements established by the Department of Transportation's Pipeline and Hazardous Material Safety Administration; (2) undertake rigorous safety measures beyond those directed by federal regulators at DOT and at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), such as the use of automatic shut-off valves; and (3) voluntarily meet a number of additional safety and reliability measures sought by New York City and by the TriBorough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, including a reinforcing concrete cap over a portion of the pipeline. The TBTA is part of the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and a portion of the pipeline route crosses through a right-of-way deep beneath an MTA property.

The City led the environmental assessment for the National Grid portion of the project, and following a thorough review, the City issued a Negative Declaration for that segment in December of 2011. FERC is acting as lead agency for the environmental review of the Williams part of the line, from the ocean connection point on the Transco line to the approach of the principal bridge connecting the Rockaways to the Brooklyn mainland. As you can see from this description, getting this project done involves a major effort that includes the private sector, and the City, State, and Federal governments.

As I noted at the outset, this project is vitally important to New York City. Energy demand in New York City is increasing, and will continue to grow. Indeed, in July of last year, the City's electric utility company, Con Edison, reported that overall demand peaked at 13,189 megawatts, eclipsing the former all-time record for the utility set in 2006.

And some 90 percent of New York City's electric generation—much of it located in Brooklyn and Queens—uses natural gas as its primary fuel. Consequently, there is a very close relationship between the availability of natural gas, and our ability to ensure adequate and affordable electricity for New York City's 8.4 million residents, and the millions more who work in and visit New York City. It has never been more important to secure clean, reliable, domestic energy sources to meet this demand.

In 2007, Mayor Bloomberg issued PlaNYC, a comprehensive long-range sustainability program for the City. Among other ambitious goals, the plan seeks to achieve a 30 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, wider use of repowered electric generation facilities, and a dramatic reduction in the use of highly polluting heating fuels-particularly Number 4 and 6 grade oils. When burned, 4 and 6 oil produce carbon dioxide at a rate that greatly exceeds that of natural gas. In addition, the combustion of these fuels throws off considerably higher levels of pollutants such as sulfur and nickel, and particulate matter emissions. We estimate that the elimination of these fuels alone will save more than 200 lives, and eliminate 100 hospital visits per year. This is an amazing return on a comparatively small investment-changing the fuel supply at approximately 10,000 of the 950,000 buildings in NYC. Mayor Bloomberg recently enacted regulations that mandate phasing out the use of dirty heating fuels by 2030-but to meet that goal, we have to increase the availability of natural gas in New York City.

No new bulk gas transmission lines have been built in New York City for more than forty years, and without new supply, many parts of the City will have to continue to rely on dirty fuels for heat and electricity. Natural gas is the most efficient and cleanest-burning fossil fuel available. The National Grid/Williams pipeline will significantly increase our access to natural gas, and given the location of the Rockaways area of Queens that the gas line will serve, and the geographic position of the Gateway Recreation Area, there is no practicable alternative to traversing beneath Parks' property.

I might note that there will also be a direct benefit accruing to Gateway from this legislation. As I understand it, the proposed lease agreement to be entered into by Williams and the Park Service will involve payment of funds by the pipeline developer for preservation and restoration of historically important aircraft hangar buildings at Floyd Bennett Field.

In sum, I urge your passage of H.R. 2606 as a means of ensuring that New York City's future energy needs are met in a way that assures system reliability, reduces our carbon footprint, and protects public health. Thank you again for the opportunity.

U.S. SENATE,
State of Rhode Island, March 7, 2012.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Washington, DC.
Hon. MARK UDALL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Washington, DC.
Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Washington, DC.
Hon. RAND PAUL,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on National Parks, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN, SENATOR MURKOWSKI, SENATOR UDALL, AND SENATOR PAUL, I write to express my strong support for the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park Establishment Act (S. 1708). This legislation, championed by Senator Reed of Rhode Island and cosponsored by myself, and Senators Kerry and Brown of Massachusetts, would create a National Park designation for the birthplace of the American Industrial Revolution. S.1708 will continue efforts to preserve these historic sites and spur tourism and economic development in the region. I encourage the committee to approve this important and bipartisan bill.

The Blackstone River Valley is where the United States took its first step toward industrialization when, in 1790, Samuel Slater constructed America's first textile mill. Slater's success in Pawtucket, Rhode Island brought many others to the Blackstone River Valley to build their own factories. Soon, mill villages like Ashton and Slatersville began to spring up across the region, and a canal was constructed to transport goods along the river. Throughout the 19th century, manufacturing flouri shed in the valley. People from Ireland, Quebec, Portugal, Poland, and elsewhere, immigrated to the area to work in these mills, enriching the region with their vibrant cultures and traditions.

The importance of the Blackstone River Valley in bringing forth America's Industrial Revolution is central to our nation's history and worthy of national recognition. For this reason, in 1986, Congress designated the area a National Heritage Corridor. The Corridor designation expires in October of this year. Now is the time to implement a more permanent and active National Park Service presence in the area to partner with the strong local private entities dedicated to preserving this corner of American history.

Under S. 1708, the Old Slater Mill Historic District, the mill villages of Ashton, Hopedale, Slatersville, and Whitensville, the Blackstone River and its tributaries, and the Blackstone Canal will become part of a new National Historical Park. In addition to providing greater protection for valuable historic resources, the designation will expand tourism and recreation activities on and along the Blackstone River, and open new economic opportunities for the region. Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar, local organizations, state officials and agencies, and all Congressional representatives from the region support the creation of this National Historical Park.

The John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park Establishment Act is a critical step in continuing to preserve America's industrial heritage. I urge the committee to support to this important legislation.

Sincerely,

SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
United States Senator,

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC., March 6, 2012.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.
Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BINGAMAN AND RANKING MEMBER MURKOWSKI, Thank you for your consideration of the Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act, H.R. 1141, a bill that authorizes the Secretary of Interior to study the suitability and fea-

sibility of designating areas on the island of Rota for inclusion in the National Park System. The Subcommittee on National Parks holds a hearing on H.R. 1141 on March 7, 2012; and I ask that you support the bill for passage.

In 2004, the National Park Service sent a team to Rota, at the request of then-Northern Mariana Islands Senator Diego Songao of Rota, to assess the importance of the cultural and natural resources of the island. The study team surveyed the Mochon Latte Stone Village and other sites of the ancient Chamorro people of the Marianas. The team explored the Chugai Cave, containing over 90 pictographs of prehistoric origin. The Park Service identified the presence of rare species of plants and animals, such as the critically endangered aga, or Marianas crow, and the endangered nosa Luta, or Rota bridled white-eye, in the limestone forests that blanket parts of Rota. Having completed this field reconnaissance, in September 2005 the Park Service issued a report that concluded there are cultural and natural resources located on Rota that are of "national significance." The Park Service further recommended a study of the "suitability and feasibility" of designating these sites as a unit of the National Park System. H.R. 1141 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to conduct the recommended study.

In the 111th Congress the House of Representatives approved a bill with the language of H.R. 1141 by voice vote without objection. The Senate, however, did not have time to act. So I introduced H.R. 1141 when the 112th Congress convened. The House of Representatives has again approved the bill. Both the Parks Service and the public on Rota support the bill. The Parks Service testified to the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands in May 2011 without recommending any change in H.R. 1141. In testimony submitted to the National Parks Subcommittee the National Park Service now recommends an amendment, clarifying that the areas to be studied are those suitable and feasible for inclusion and not the entire island. I believe a plain reading of the bill leads to the more limited conclusion and suggest that report language reinforce that interpretation. Representatives of the people of Rota have also testified in favor of H.R. 1141 or offered letters supportive of having areas of their island added to the National Park System. I have attached several of these letters and their enclosures, and I ask that they be made a part of the Subcommittee's hearing record on the bill. Conducting a suitability and feasibility study is the established procedure when areas or resources of national significance have been identified. Eventually, establishment of a unit of the National Park System on Rota, should that prove appropriate, would serve the twin purposes of protecting national treasures, while at the same time freeing up other areas for development should the people of Rota so choose. For these reasons, I ask that your committee favorably report H.R. 1141.

Sincerely,

GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN,
Member of Congress.

REPRESENTATIVE TERESITA APATANG SANTON,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Saipan, MP, February 3, 2012.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Chairman, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, 304 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Rota National Park Bill, H.R. 1141

DEAR CHAIRMAN BINGAMAN, I am writing this letter to respectfully seek your consideration and support of H.R. 1141 for the conduct of a suitability and feasibility study of prehistoric, historic and primary limestone forests on the island of Rota in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

The island of Rota, amongst the islands within the Mariana Islands archipelago, which includes the island of Guam, possesses the largest prehistoric, historic and intact primary limestone forests that are in critical need of preservation. The preservation of these important areas through the establishment of a National Park will greatly assist in the protection of our native cultural heritage and also serve as critical habitat for native endangered flora and fauna for which the American people and our future generations may enjoy.

Our past and present legislative delegations and people of the island of Rota have supported and are enthusiastic about the idea of establishing a national park on the island to protect the remaining remnants of our cultural heritage and native wildlife.

With this is mind, the Rota Legislative Delegation and people of Rota appreciates your taking the time to consider this important matter and kindly ask your support

and passage of H.R. 1141 which would help us realize one of the largest National Park units in America's westernmost frontier in the northwestern pacific. Thank you.

Sincerely,

TERESITA A. SANTOS,
Vice Chairperson.

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS,
Saipan, MP, January 27, 2012.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN
Chairman, U. S. Senate, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Building Washington, DC 20510.

Hon. LISA MURKOWSKI
Ranking Member, U.S. Senate, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BINGAMAN AND RANKING MEMBER MURKOWSKI:

The purpose of this letter is to express strong support for the "Rota Cultural and Natural Resources Study Act," H.R. 1141 which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study archaeological, historical and natural resources on Rota, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, for inclusion in the National Park System.

In 2005, the Interior Department field survey found that Monchon Latte Stone Village, the Chugai Pictograph Cave, and other ancient sites on Rota have national significance and should be protected. These sites are crucial to protecting our remains of the ancient Chamorro people for all time.

I commend Representative Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan for introducing this legislation which was referred to your committee on January 24, 2012. The people of Rota are hopeful for the passage of H.R. 1141. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

PAUL A. MANGLONA,
Senate President.

MARK MICHAEL,
May 6, 2011.

Hon. SABLAN CONGRESS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABLAN Thank you for your letter in regards to legislation H.R. 1141.

I personally believe there are some very historically worthwhile things on Rota that should be protected but I was wondering if the people of Rota fully understand that when you get a national park designation that the land it occupies is basically no longer yours but belongs to the Federal government.

Two things in your letter I just have to comment on. One our CNMI Senate has failed to act on a lot of things and to me as a group they are a big disappointment. And two you mention Rota's eco-tourrsm I have heard this buzz word many times, but I haven't seen anybody practicing eco-tourism full time here. Our elected officials think that casinos are eco-tourism.

I think your introduced legislation is a great idea and hopefully you and I will see it fulfilled.

Sincerely,

MARK MICHAEL.

COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Rota, MP, March 30, 2011.

Hon. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO SABLAN,
Member of Congress, 423 Cannon House Office Building, House of Representative Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SABLAN: Thank you for providing me a copy of H.R. 1141 for which you are asking for my thoughts and comments in your letter of March 23, 2011. Indeed it is an honor that certain sites on Rota have historic significance, both modern and pre-historic, which may qualify as units of the U.S. Natural Park

Service. Should the suitability and feasibility study, as proposed by H.R. 1141 confirm this, our goal of turning Rota into an eco-tourism destination would be greatly enhanced. Therefore, I am in support of H.R. 1141 and I am ready to render oral testimony on this bill if it is scheduled for a public hearing.

On a minor note, the National Register of Historical Places website (www.nps.gov) does not list the sites indicated in section I (b)(4) of H.R. 1141. The web page lists the Japanese Hospital, the Japanese Sugar Mill, the Japanese WWII Command Post, but none of these is listed in H.R. 1141. I am not nitpicking, but I am concerned that we are confusing the public. Perhaps, the web page hasn't been updated.

In closing, our people join me in recognizing your efforts in having our issues heard in the halls of the U.S. Congress.

Sincerely,

MELCHOR A. MENDIOLA,
Mayor.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH LIEBERMAN, U.S. SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT, ON S. 1191

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to offer a statement in support of this significant legislation, the Naugatuck River Valley National Heritage Area Study Act.

As the first arsenal of American democracy, the Naugatuck Valley deserves special recognition for its contributions to our nation in times of war and peace. Fourteen towns and cities along the Naugatuck River—which flows for forty miles between Torrington and Shelton—are a part of the valley, which is notable not only for its physical beauty but for its industrial history shaped by the arrival of numerous immigrant populations during the late 1800s and early 1900s. Factories along the Naugatuck River led to the creation of prominent industries which still shape the fabric of communities today: the brass industry in Waterbury, the rubber industry in Naugatuck, and the clock industry in Thomaston, just to name a few. The region is also architecturally significant, with numerous industrial-era and art deco buildings, including 88 structures listed in the National Register of Historic Places. As industry has moved out of the valley, many of our communities are just now rediscovering the natural beauty and potential of the Naugatuck River, and I applaud the efforts underway to reconnect our communities with the River that has inherently shaped their histories.

As the committee is aware, this legislation would direct the Secretary of the Interior to complete a study to determine whether the region is worthy of being a National Heritage Area. This has the support of all the communities in the study area, the state, and the civic organizations that have actively preserved the Naugatuck Valley's unique history, and has been championed by the Greater Valley Chamber of Commerce. I am encouraged by the support of Senator Blumenthal and Representatives DeLauro, Larson, and Murphy, and I am confident that if examined, the Naugatuck River Valley will receive the federal attention it deserves.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CITY OF TORRINGTON,
Torrington, Connecticut, March 6, 2012.

Hon. JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. CONGRESSMAN JIM HIMES,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. CONGRESSWOMAN ROSA DELAURO,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. CONGRESSMAN CHRIS MURPHY,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS LIEBERMAN, BLUMENTHAL AND CONGRESSMEN MURPHY, HIMES & DELAURO,

On behalf of the City of Torrington, I am writing today to express my full support for S. 1191 the Naugatuck River Valley national Heritage Area Study Act.

From the City of Torrington to the lower valley, the communities that line the Naugatuck River share a history that is rich in industry and production. The

Naugatuck River Valley has been the birthplace of innovation from brass, to rubber, clocks, and more. This area has been the driving force in manufacturing in the State of Connecticut for generations.

The historical significance of this are should not be overlooked. From the first law school in America in Litchfield, to architectural gems such as the Warner Theatre in Torrington or the Sterling Opera House in Derby, the Naugatuck River Valley has a wide array of significant buildings that deserve to be recognized for their contribution to our communities.

If passed, Senate Bill 1191 has the potential to shed light on the many aspects of the Naugatuck River Valley that all who reside here treasure and respect. I urge the passing of this bill and look forward to being a part of this worthy endeavor.

Respectfully,

RYAN J. BINGHAM,
Mayor.

VALLEY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Shelton, Connecticut, March 5, 2012.

Hon. JOSEPH LIEBERMAN,
Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROSA DELAURO,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM HIMES,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRIS MURPHY,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

RE: S.1191; Naugatuck River Valley National Heritage Area Study Bill

It is with great excitement and anticipation that I am writing in support of Senate Bill 1191, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a study regarding the suitability and feasibility of establishing the Naugatuck River Valley National Heritage Area in Connecticut, which will be discussed before the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on Wednesday, March 7th.

As is outlined in this proposed bill, the Naugatuck River Valley is comprised of 14 communities along the Naugatuck River, which stretches for more than 40 miles from its headwaters in Torrington, CT to the confluence with the Housatonic River in Shelton, CT. This region of Connecticut has an assemblage of natural, historic and cultural resources that represent distinctive aspects of American heritage worthy of recognition, conservation and celebration as a National Heritage Area. Of particular note is the Valley's prominent role as a center of three major industries during the American Industrial Revolution: the Brass Industry centered in Waterbury, CT, which to this day is known as The Brass City, the Rubber Industry, which was spawned in neighboring Naugatuck, CT and the Clock Industry, where Seth Thomas began making the first of millions of clocks in Thomaston, CT in 1813.

In addition to the region's contribution to the Industrial Revolution, the Naugatuck River Valley has also been a major contributor to the United States war efforts, from the American Revolution and Civil War to World War II, a fact noted by Ken Burns in his 2007 PBS film, "The War" in which he characterized Waterbury as the "arsenal" of the war effort because of its high concentration of industry.

Among the region's notable citizens have been authors, diplomats, inventors and patriots, among them David Humphreys, Aide-de-Camp to General George Washington, Commodore Isaac Hull, Commander of "Old Ironsides", Ebenezer Bassett, the country's first black Ambassador and Pierre Lallement, inventor of the modern two-wheel bicycle.

Most importantly, the Naugatuck River Valley is home to a group of public-spirited citizens that have been pursuing National Heritage Area designation for a number of years, and the Greater Valley Chamber of Commerce has been proud to support their efforts. The Chamber was pleased to receive funding from The Community Foundation for Greater New Haven to conduct a preliminary study of the natural, cultural and historic resources of the Naugatuck River Valley, which we are anxious to share with the National Park Service as a foundation for their feasibility and suitability study. What we have documented about this Valley is truly astounding and worthy of preservation and celebration.

On behalf of the business community in the "All America City" Naugatuck River Valley, thank you for your support of this important bill for the Valley's past, present and future.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. PURCELL, CCE, CAE,
President.

BOROUGH OF NAUGATUCK,
Naugatuck, Connecticut, March 6, 2012.

Hon. RICHARD BLUMENTHAL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. JOSEPH I. LIEBERMAN,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROSA L. DELAURO,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. JAMES A. HIMES,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER S. MURPHY,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BLUMENTHAL, SENATOR LIEBERMAN, REPRESENTATIVE DELAURO, REPRESENTATIVE HIMES AND REPRESENTATIVE MURPHY: This letter serves to acknowledge my support for Senate Bill 1191. The purpose of this legislation is to commission a feasibility study to create the Naugatuck River Valley National Heritage Area.

As a lifelong resident of the Borough of Naugatuck, I am honored to join with the leaders of our neighboring communities from Torrington to Shelton to support this initiative. The Valley has a rich history of ingenuity and industrial productivity during times of war and peace. Throughout the industrial age and continuing to this day, Valley workers and business owners have manufactured products used throughout the world.

Together, we are bound not only by our common history, but by the scenic Naugatuck River which travels through each of our communities. Once the victim of industrial pollution, the Naugatuck once again runs clean and strong through the Valley, and the diverse ecosystem throughout the watershed has returned. Many Valley communities, including Naugatuck, recognize that the Naugatuck River not only provides recreational and environmental benefits for Valley residents, but presents opportunity for responsible economic development as well.

The most valuable resource in the Valley, however, is the people who call it home. The time-honored traditions of hard work, devotion to family, service to community and entrepreneurial creativity remain alive and well.

Designation as a national heritage area would strengthen the Naugatuck River Valley in many ways. We greatly appreciate your continued support for our region, and would be pleased to further discuss support for this important legislation at your convenience.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. MEZZO,
Mayor.

U.S. CONGRESS,
House of Representatives, March 7, 2012.

Hon. MARK UDALL,
SH-328, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Hon. RAND PAUL,
SR-208, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN UDALL AND RANKING MEMBER PAUL, As your subcommittee holds a hearing on Senator Feinstein's bill, S. 29, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Establishment Act, I would like to offer my strong support. This bill would establish a National Heritage Area in the Delta in order to protect the largest estuary on the West Coast. I introduced companion legislation in the House, H.R. 486, because of the Delta's environmental importance, its rich history and culture, as well as the economic benefits it provides to the State of California and the Nation.

The Delta is home to more than 3,500,000 residents, 2,500 family farmers, 750 species of plants and wildlife, and provides drinking water for 23 million Americans. Furthermore, it supports billions of dollars in economic activity and tens of thousands of jobs. That said the Delta is facing escalating challenges from invasive species, wastewater discharges, and stress from water exports. Establishing a National Heritage Area in the Delta would help combat these issues and preserve its vibrant community and fragile resources. This bill empowers the Delta Protection Commission to build local bottom-up partnerships for conservation efforts with greater assistance from the National Park Service.

Both of California's Senators, as well four of my colleagues from the Delta in the House of Representatives have supported this critical legislation. I ask for your support in aiding local efforts to protect this wonderful community and economic engine.

Sincerely,

JOHN GARAMENDI,
Member of Congress.

○