

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES, AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES CONCERNING S. 349, A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE SUSQUEHANNA GATEWAY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

May 19, 2010

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 349, 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. 349 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. The Administration anticipates submitting such a legislative proposal to you in the near future, and we recommend that Congress enact national heritage area program legislation in 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. Program legislation was introduced in the 109th and 110th Congresses, and we look forward to continuing to work with Congress on this very important issue.

Flowing for 441 miles, the Susquehanna River is the longest river on the East Coast and the largest contributor of fresh water to 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. 349 designates the Lancaster-York Heritage Region, 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 management entity, now known as Susquehanna Heritage Corporation, has demonstrated success in coordinating among diverse partners in Lancaster and York counties. Over the past nine years, Susquehanna Heritage 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, this entity 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.

The bill, as introduced, contains provisions that have become standard for designating national heritage areas. However, if the Committee decides to act on this bill, we would request the opportunity to work with the Committee to amend the language in Section 5(a), designating the management entity, due to the management entity changing its name and to discuss some other provisions where clarifications or technical corrections may be needed.

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

Statement for the Record

**Bureau of Land Management
Department of the Interior
Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee
Subcommittee on National Parks
S. 1596, Gold Hill-Wakamatsu Preservation Act
May 19, 2010**

Thank you for the invitation to present testimony on S. 1596, the Gold Hill-Wakamatsu Preservation Act, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Gold Hill Ranch from willing sellers using non-federal contributions and appropriated funds to preserve it as a site of historical and cultural value. Preservation of cultural and historical resources is a priority for the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). We support the goals but note that BLM can make this acquisition under its existing authorities, and we would like to work with the sponsor and the Committee to clarify S. 1596.

Background

The Wakamatsu Colony is an early settlement site of great cultural significance to the Japanese-American community. It is the oldest known cultural site in North America associated with Japanese immigration. The colony was founded in 1869 by 20 immigrants from Aizu-Wakamatsu, Japan. These colonists fled Japan during the political upheaval that accompanied the Meiji Restoration. The colonists purchased land at Gold Hill in western El Dorado County, California, and established a tea and silk plantation. The colony operated for two years, after which the land – known as the Gold Hill Ranch – was acquired by its current owners, the Veerkamp family. The Veerkamps now desire to sell the property; however, they recognize its historic and cultural significance and hope to sell it to a governmental entity.

The 272-acre site includes a home from the 1860s that was occupied by the colonists, the mulberry trees they planted, and the grave of Okei Ito. Her grave is thought to be the oldest Japanese immigrant grave in North America. Adjacent to the site is the Gold Trail Elementary School, which since 1980 has maintained a sister-school relationship with Higashiyama Elementary School in Aizu Wakamatsu. The school property hosts a monument dedicated by then-Governor Ronald Reagan that established the Wakamatsu Tea and Silk Farm Colony as California Registered Historical Landmark Number 815.

Several Japanese-American civic and cultural groups and others have written to the BLM to express their support for preservation and restoration of the Wakamatsu Colony site. The Gold Hill region is an historic California gold rush landscape that is urbanizing rapidly, so preservation would prevent the loss of an important pioneering site. Members of that community, including the Japanese American Citizens League, Representative Doris Matsui and California State Assemblyman Alan Nakanishi, are working with the American River Conservancy (a local land trust) to raise the funds needed to purchase the site. Their goal is to establish an endowment that would fund future restoration, interpretive operations, and maintenance of the site. Citing the BLM's highly successful management of other nearby acquired lands, local Japanese-American community organizations and the American River Conservancy are advocating that the BLM take title to the property.

Acquisition of the Gold Hill Ranch would be consistent with the goals of the BLM's Sierra Resource Management Plan. The BLM's nearby Mother Lode Field Office already manages

several acquired properties for their historical and conservation values, including the historic Chung Wah Chinese cemetery about 15 miles to the west of the Ranch, which was donated to BLM by the Chinese-American community in 2007, and the Pine Hill Preserve, a rare plant preserve totaling 4,000 acres across dozens of parcels about 5 miles southwest of the Ranch.

S. 1596

S. 1596 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the BLM, to acquire the Gold Hill Ranch from willing sellers using non-federal contributions and appropriated funds to preserve it as a site of historical and cultural value. The BLM supports the goals of the bill, and acknowledges the efforts to date by the private sector to raise funds for the acquisition. BLM notes that it can make the acquisition under its existing authorities, subject to budget priorities and the availability of appropriations. However, this project did not rank high enough in the BLM's annual national ranking process for inclusion in the land acquisition priority lists for the 2010 and 2011 budgets. The legislation is also unclear as to the purposes for which the use of appropriated funds is authorized, and the BLM would like to work with the sponsor and the Committee to clarify this provision.

The bill does not waive a fair market value determination. Therefore an appraisal by the Department of the Interior's Office of Valuation Services would be required before acquisition. Based on the experience of the BLM and American River Conservancy with land values in this area, the \$3,290,000 limit identified in S. 1596 for the cost of acquisition appears to be

reasonable. We would note, however, that it is BLM policy to engage in fair market valuations for its acquisitions, disposals, and exchanges.

We appreciate provisions in section 4(d) that give the Secretary discretion regarding development of a visitor center and direct that private funds or State grants be used to the maximum extent practicable to leverage the cost of constructing the visitor center and conducting restoration activities. This provides an excellent opportunity for expression of community support for preservation and restoration of this site.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony in support of the goals of S. 1596, and we look forward to working with the sponsor and the Committee to clarify the legislation.

Statement for the Record
Bureau of Land Management
Department of the Interior
Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee
Subcommittee on National Parks
S. 1651, Modification of Patent for Whitefish Point Light Station (Michigan)
May 19, 2010

Thank you for the invitation to present testimony on S. 1651, legislation to modify a land patent pertaining to the Whitefish Point Light Station (Michigan). Although the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) role under the legislation is ministerial, preservation of historic lighthouses such as the Whitefish Point Light Station is a priority for the Department of the Interior. The BLM supports S. 1651.

Background

In the late 18th and 19th centuries, the United States built a series of lighthouses in and around Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, and Lake Superior to aid in navigation of the Great Lakes. The role played by these lighthouses in the westward expansion and economic growth of the United States is part of our national heritage, with ships and shipwrecks recalled in story and song. The Great Lakes lighthouses—including the Whitefish Point Light Station at issue in S. 1651—are listed on the National Register of Historic Properties.

The U.S. Coast Guard retains responsibility for aid to navigation in the Great Lakes, as it (or its predecessor, the Revenue Marine) has since 1790. In the mid-1990s, concerns reached the Congress that the Coast Guard, in carrying out its mission in the Great Lakes, was unable to

assure preservation of the historic lighthouses. Interest in preserving the Whitefish Point Light Station led the Congress, in 1996, to convey land adjacent to the Light Station to two non-profit organizations dedicated to conservation and historic preservation— an 8.27 acre parcel to the Great Lakes Shipwreck Historical Society (Historical Society) and a 2.69 acre parcel to the Michigan Audubon Society (Audubon Society) of Chippewa County—and a 33 acre parcel to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) (Public Law 104-208, Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, Fiscal Year 1997, Section 5505.)

This law contains limitations on development at the historic lighthouse, and explicitly requires compliance with the “Whitefish Point Comprehensive Plan of October 1992.” The patents BLM issued under this authority (including the most recent, number 61-2000-0007, issued March 10, 2000, to the Historical Society) contain this reference.

In 1999, the Audubon Society brought suit against the Historical Society and the FWS over plans to develop a museum at the site. The parties reached a settlement agreement under which the three groups developed the “Human Use/Natural Resource Plan for Whitefish Point, December 2002,” to supersede the Whitefish Point Comprehensive Plan of 1992.

S. 1651

S. 1651 directs the Secretary of the Interior to modify patent number 61-2000-0007 by striking reference to the Whitefish Point Comprehensive Plan of October 1992 and inserting the “Human Use/Natural Resource Plan for Whitefish Point, dated December 2002.” S. 1651 affirms the

applicability of the National Historic Preservation Act to the Whitefish Point Light Station. The BLM supports this legislation.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony in support of S. 1651.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 1750, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONDUCT A SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY OF THE GENERAL OF THE ARMY GEORGE CATLETT MARSHALL NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE AT DODONA MANOR IN LEESBURG, VIRGINIA AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

May 19, 2010

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you to provide the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1750, a bill to authorize a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the General of the Army George Catlett Marshall National Historic Site at Dodona Manor in Leesburg, Virginia and for other purposes.

The Department supports enactment of S. 1750. However, we recommend that the title of the bill be amended to refer to the "General George C. Marshall House (Dodona Manor)" rather than the "General of the Army George Catlett Marshall National Historic Site," as the former is consistent with the landmark's current listing on the National Register of Historic Places. We also believe that priority should be given to the 45 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic River System that have not yet been transmitted to the Congress.

S. 1750 authorizes a special resource study for General George C. Marshall's home, Dodona Manor. One of the options that the study would consider is making the site an affiliated area of the National Park System. The study would also consider other alternatives for preservation and protection of the home and interpretation of the life and accomplishments of George C. Marshall. The home was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1996. We estimate the cost of this study to range from \$200,000 to \$300,000, based on similar types of studies conducted in recent years.

Born in 1880 in Uniontown, Pennsylvania, George Marshall attended the Virginia Military Institute to prepare for a military career. He rose steadily through the ranks, serving with distinction in various posts in the United States, the Philippines, and China, and in Europe during World War I. In World War II, General Marshall led the Allied forces to victory in the Atlantic Theatre. Following the war, as Secretary of State, Marshall designed a humanitarian program for rebuilding war-ravaged Europe. For his ambitious European Recovery Plan, more broadly known as the Marshall Plan, Marshall was awarded the 1953 Nobel Peace Prize.

General Marshall enjoyed living at Dodona Manor for 18 years from 1941 until his death in 1959. At the time of the Civil War, the house was called Oak Hill. Marshall, who likened the sound of the white oak leaves rustling in the wind to the ancient Greek oracle of Zeus speaking

through the oak forest of Dodona Grove in Epirus, renamed the house “Dodona Manor.” While living there, he rose from being an Army officer respected for his military contributions to one of the most important and respected world figures of the 20th Century. Winston Churchill, recalling the years of World War II, said that the only individual on whom all the leaders conferred unqualified praise and admiration was General Marshall.

Many military post houses across the United States were occupied by General Marshall and his first and second wives, but never for long. Dodona Manor was his residence for the last 18 years of his life, coinciding with his years of national and international achievement. General Marshall brought his best possessions to Dodona Manor – oriental rugs purchased during duty in China, and books in large number, which he owned and read. He indulged his favorite pastime of tilling the earth and planting gardens. From there he commuted to Washington during his military service and later as Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense. Dodona Manor has survived almost entirely as he left it and no other site provides the opportunity for reflection on the years when Marshall rose to become one of the great figures of the 20th Century.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. I would be happy to answer any questions that you or other Committee members may have regarding this bill.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 1801, A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE FIRST STATE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

MAY 19, 2010

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S.1801, a bill to establish the First State National Historical Park in the State of Delaware.

The Department strongly supports the establishment of a unit of the national park system in Delaware as proposed by S. 1801, but is concerned about the addition of certain resources in the bill that were found not to meet congressionally established criteria for unit designation, and the terms of the park-specific grant authorization.

In 2008, pursuant to Public Law 109-338, the National Park Service completed a Special Resource Study of the coastal area of Delaware and identified a number of resources of national significance that were determined suitable and feasible to administer as a unit of the national park system. These included historic resources that were instrumental in early Swedish, Dutch, and English settlement in the United States, and others associated with Delaware's role as the nation's first state.

In 1638, Peter Minuet led Swedish colonists to present day Wilmington, Delaware, and established New Sweden at a point known as "the rocks" on the Christina River. The settlers constructed Fort Christina at this location and this site is now a National Historic Landmark. In 1698, Swedish settlers established Holy Trinity ("Old Swedes") Church near the fort, the oldest church building standing as originally built in the United States and also a National Historic Landmark.

In 1651, Peter Stuyvesant led Dutch settlers from New Amsterdam and constructed Fort Casimir at a place he named "New Amstel," in present day New Castle, Delaware. Conflicts between the Swedish and Dutch colonists resulted in changing occupations of the fort with the Dutch regaining control in 1655. Also in 1665, the English arrived at New Amstel and seized control of the settlement, renaming it "New Castle." William Penn landed in New Castle in 1682 and took possession of the city. In 1704, Penn established Delaware's Assembly and New Castle remained the colonial capital of Delaware until 1776. The New Castle Historic District, which contains multiple resources from the time of earliest settlement through the Federal era, is a National Historic Landmark.

Delaware's important role as the nation's first state is also exhibited in resources of national significance. Delaware's representatives to the Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention played important parts in the adoption of the Declaration of Independence and

crafting of the United States Constitution. On June 15, 1776, the Delaware Assembly, meeting in New Castle, voted to sever its ties with the English Crown three weeks prior to the Declaration signed in Philadelphia on July 4th. National Historic Landmarks associated with these early revolutionary leaders include the homes of John Dickinson (the “Penman of the Revolution”), Gunning Bedford, Jr., and George Read. The Dover Green witnessed Delaware’s vote to become the first state to ratify the nation’s new Constitution.

S. 1801 would establish the First State National Historical Park to include the resources cited above that the Special Resource Study found meet the criteria for congressional designation of a unit of the national park system. The staff of the new park would be authorized to interpret related resources outside of the boundary, within the state of Delaware. The Special Resource Study estimated annual operating costs for the park at \$450,000 to \$550,000, which would fund 5-7 FTEs, and costs associated with a general management plan at \$600,000. The bill provides for \$3 million in one-time matching grants for rehabilitation of existing structures to serve as administrative and visitor services facilities for the park and \$2.5 million in one-time matching grants for historic preservation, interpretive devices, and the design, construction, installation, and maintenance of exhibits. The latter may include matching grants for research and exhibits at the Zwaanendael Museum in Lewes, and the State Archives in Dover, Delaware. All funding would be subject to NPS priorities and the availability of appropriations. A study of additional resources related to the purpose of the park is also authorized to assess their potential eligibility for National Historic Landmark designation and options for maintaining the historic integrity of such resources.

S.1801 also proposes to include within the park boundary the historic district in Lewes, Delaware. This district is listed on the National Register of Historic Places at the local level of significance and the National Register nomination for the district indicates that today its significance is based primarily on its fine examples of Victorian architecture. The Department questions adding this historic district to the park boundary as identified in the Special Resource Study since it is not a National Historic Landmark, does not meet the required national significance criterion for unit designation, and is not consistent with the park’s purpose as outlined in Section 4(b) of S. 1801.

However, we note that Section 4(g) of S. 1801 permits interpretation of resources related to the purposes of the park located outside of its boundary. We would suggest that any extant resources in Lewes, within or outside of the historic district, relating to early Dutch, Swedish and English settlement, or Delaware’s role as the first state, would be eligible for interpretation without including this district in the park boundary. Such resources would also be candidates for further analysis as to their National Historic Landmark potential under the bill’s study provisions in Section 5.

We also note that Section 6 would authorize one-time matching grants to State and local governments, private property owners and nonprofit organizations to pay for the historic preservation of non-Federal resources within the park boundaries. While some parks now provide limited financial assistance through cooperative agreements, the limited matching grant authorization proposed in Section 6 could raise expectations that the National Park Service

would be asked to provide annual financial assistance for the operation and maintenance of these non-Federal sites within the park boundary.

We would like work with the Committee to further clarify that the grants under Section 6 are one-time grants and not reoccurring grants. We would also like to work with the committee on a technical amendment regarding the appropriate wording for the New Castle Historic District in Section 2(a)(2)(B)(ii) and inclusion of a map reference in Section 3.

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

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES, AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS CONCERNING S. 1802 AND H.R. 685, BILLS TO REQUIRE A STUDY OF THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING THE UNITED STATES CIVIL RIGHTS TRAIL SYSTEM.

May 19, 2010

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1802 and H.R. 685, legislation to require a study of the feasibility of establishing the United States Civil Rights Trail System.

The Department supports S. 1802 as introduced, and H.R. 685 as passed by the House, which are substantially identical. However, we feel that priority should be given to the 45 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic River System that have not yet been transmitted to Congress.

S. 1802 and H.R. 685 authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study in order to evaluate a range of alternatives for protecting and interpreting the sites associated with the movement to secure racial equality for African-Americans in the United States in the 1950s and 1960s, including alternatives for potential additions to the National Trails System. We estimate that the cost of this study will range from \$500,000 to \$750,000, given the large number of sites across multiple states which must be included in the study.

The struggle for civil rights has been a hallmark in the development of the United States from its earliest fight for independence from Great Britain during the 1770s and 1780s through the passage of the landmark 1964 Civil Rights Act guaranteeing all Americans the right to vote and prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The movement leading up to the passage of the Act was filled with violent confrontations that challenged the very foundation of our country, yet it also represented the highest aspirations of its citizens.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the most comprehensive civil rights legislation in the history of the United States and its provisions serve as major themes of the civil rights story both before and after the Act's passage. The Department recognizes that events, places, and individuals important in the civil rights story should be celebrated and commemorated in a way that helps the public understand and appreciate the significance of the era. Many civil rights-related sites have been identified and are currently recognized within the National Park System, the National Trails System, and as National Historic Landmarks, such as those commemorating the life of Martin Luther King, Jr. and well-known events such as the desegregation of Little Rock Central High School and the 1965 Selma-to-Montgomery Voting Rights March.

In 1999, Congress authorized the Secretary to conduct a theme study related to civil rights sites on a multi-state level. The National Park Service, in partnership with the Organization of American Historians, prepared the civil rights framework study to assist the National Park

Service in identifying and prioritizing those areas of history significant in illustrating the civil rights story. The study, *Civil Rights In America: A Framework for Identifying Significant Sites*, was transmitted to Congress on June 2, 2009.

The study identified broad themes within the civil rights story, as well as the events, persons, and places that represent those themes, and assessed the degree to which related sites are represented and recognized. These themes include equal education, public accommodation, voting, housing, equal employment, criminal injustice, immigrant rights, and American Indian civil rights. The study did not assess the feasibility or suitability of inclusion of particular sites into the National Trails System, the National Park System, or as National Historic Landmarks. S. 1802 and H.R. 685 would allow the National Park Service to assess sites specifically associated with the struggle for African-American racial equality from 1954-1968, which touches on most, but not all, of these broad themes.

The study also recommended that the National Park Service complete four National Historic Landmark theme studies to recognize, promote, and protect civil rights-related sites and their relationship to the civil rights story's chronology, historic themes, and how various minorities are represented. National Historic Landmark theme studies are an effective way of assessing whether or not places are nationally significant in American history. They provide a historic context within which to evaluate properties, and identify places that should be studied for national designation.

S. 1802 and H.R. 685 both provide for the proposed study to build upon this and other existing studies and reports. If enacted, this legislation can serve as a keystone piece in the ongoing work of understanding the issues, preserving the place, and telling the stories of the struggle to ensure civil rights for all Americans.

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

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES, AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 2953 AND H.R. 3388, BILLS TO MODIFY THE BOUNDARY OF PETERSBURG NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

MAY 19, 2010

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2953 and H.R. 3388, bills that would modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The Department supports S. 2953 and H.R. 3388. The Department previously testified in support of H.R. 3388, on November 5, 2009, before the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands.

S. 2953 and H.R. 3388 are identical bills that would authorize two modifications to the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia. First, the bills would expand the currently authorized boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield by an additional 7,238 acres. The boundary expansion proposal results from an analysis of “core battlefields” and a subsequent boundary adjustment study conducted as part of Petersburg National Battlefield’s General Management Plan completed in 2005. Second, the bill authorizes a transfer of administrative jurisdiction between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army for a 1.7 acre parcel of land to accommodate a security perimeter fence at Fort Lee Military Reservation.

The City of Petersburg lies in the corridor of intensive growth from Washington, D.C., to south of Richmond, Virginia. The region surrounding Petersburg National Battlefield has been and is currently experiencing significant development pressures impacting areas immediately adjacent to the park and unprotected battlefield sites. This development not only threatens park resources and public enjoyment, but also the core portions of the battlefields.

The park commemorates the Petersburg Campaign, the longest sustained combative military front on American soil, in both time and distance. When Congress created the park in 1926, only a fraction of the battlefield acreage associated with the 26 major battles of the Petersburg Campaign was included in the original boundary. These additional battlefields proposed to be added to the park will allow the public to better understand the size, complexity, and duration of the 9½ month Petersburg Campaign and siege while offering protection to existing park resources.

In January 2002, in response to significant development pressures in the region surrounding the park and as part of its General Management Plan process, Petersburg National Battlefield undertook a detailed assessment of battlefields in the Petersburg Campaign cited in the Civil War

Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC) report of 1993 entitled “Report on the Nation’s Civil War Battlefields.” The CWSAC report identified 100,000 acres of the Petersburg battlefields as “core battlefields” encompassing all of the critical phases defined for a battle. Of the 100,000 acres cited, 23,000 acres were determined to retain historic integrity.

During its more detailed analyses of the 23,000 acres, the park concentrated on those portions of the battlefields that were south of the Appomattox River and directly associated with the siege or defense of Petersburg, and that were identified as Class A (decisive) and Class B (major) by the CWSAC. Additionally, the park used historical maps and documentation to further refine the acreage to that constituting the portion of the battlefield on which both armies were engaged directly and that had a bearing on the outcome for each battle. Park staff further analyzed the integrity of these areas and their potential for public access and interpretation. The analyses disclosed that 7,238 acres met the criteria for integrity and interpretability.

The estimated time period for acquisition of the 7,238 acres of these nationally significant lands is 15-20 years. Virtually all of the land subject to the boundary adjustment represents a mixture of private and non-profit organization-owned parcels. Agricultural and conservation easements will be the preferred method of acquisition for most parcels, particularly for those owned by non-profit organizations. Easements enable protection of these battlefields from inappropriate development while retaining private ownership and compatible use of the land. Where easements are not possible, and there is interest by the landowners, a range of acquisition methods, such as donation, and fee simple acquisition from willing sellers based on available funding, will be utilized for battlefield preservation.

If all the lands were acquired by the National Park Service through fee simple means, the total estimated cost would be \$29.7 million. However, if the boundary expansion is enacted, the park will be pursuing partnership efforts through easements and donations that will likely significantly lower acquisition costs. The estimated costs for capital expenses (trails, wayside exhibits, rehabilitation of existing visitor contact station, etc.) and expansion-related costs (surveys, hazardous materials studies, etc.) are an additional \$1.74 million. Development of visitor services and interpretation at these new battlefield locations would be minimal and include small parking areas, wayside exhibits, and trail and other enhancements to the sites. The annual increase in operations and management is estimated to be approximately \$484,000. All numbers are in 2008 dollars. All funds are subject to NPS priorities and the availability of appropriations.

Public response to the General Management Plan and the proposed boundary expansion have been uniformly favorable among local governments, organizations, and individuals. The Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution supporting future legislation to expand the boundary of the park as outlined in the General Management Plan. Many civic organizations in the Petersburg region have also indicated support for the proposal.

The second main provision of the bill would authorize a transfer of administrative jurisdiction between the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior for a 1.7 acre parcel of land. Following September 11, 2001, the Army was required to erect a perimeter fence around Fort Lee Military Reservation, located adjacent to Petersburg National Battlefield. The fence intruded slightly into the boundary of the park. The land exchange would transfer to the Army

the 1.7 acre of land where the perimeter fence is located, in return for a 1.7 acre of the military reservation to be added to the park. The Secretary of the Army is supportive of this provision. There is no cost associated with this authorization.

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

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 2976, A BILL TO DESIGNATE THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE WILDERNESS AT SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

May 19, 2010

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 2976, a bill to designate the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Wilderness at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in the State of Michigan.

The Department strongly supports enactment of S. 2976. However, we recommend that the wilderness be designated as the "Sleeping Bear Wilderness," rather than "Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Wilderness," as the former is consistent with the style of the majority of wilderness areas in units of the national park system. This legislation would designate 32,557 acres, or 46 percent, of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan's Lower Peninsula as federally protected wilderness. It defines the boundary of the wilderness area as the line of demarcation - the general line formed by the lakeward extent of the first contiguous vegetation that is upland from the high water mark of Lake Michigan. Management of the wilderness area would be in accordance with the 1964 Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

P.L. 91-479 established Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore on October 21, 1970, in order "...that certain outstanding natural features including forests, beaches, dune formations, and ancient (glacial) phenomena...be preserved in their natural setting and protected from developments and uses which would destroy the scenic beauty and natural character of the area...for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreation, and enjoyment of the public." This bill clearly supports the intent of that law.

The park extends nearly 30 miles along the eastern shore of Lake Michigan, the most visited of our Great Lakes, and the only one entirely within the United States. It also includes two large Lake Michigan islands with an additional 35 miles of shoreline. The National Lakeshore protects and preserves superlative scenic and recreational resources including towering perched sand dunes that rise as high as 450 feet above Lake Michigan; miles of beautiful sugar sand beaches; sparkling inland lakes and clear streams; important wetlands; and an upland beech-maple Northern Hardwood Forest. This landscape is home to black bear, deer, bobcat, trumpeter swans, raptors, and many species of songbirds. Federally threatened and endangered species include the Piping Plover, Pitcher's Thistle, and Michigan Monkeyflower as well as several state-listed species. The high, perched dunes afford spectacular views across Lake Michigan and over other glacially formed landscapes. The contrast between the open, sunny environment of the dunes and the adjacent lush beech-maple forests is striking.

The park includes many historic features as well. Long before the area became a National Lakeshore, Native Americans, lumbermen, merchant sailors, and farmers visited or settled here. Today, a lighthouse and three U.S. Life-Saving Service Stations, coastal villages, and picturesque farmsteads reflect the National Lakeshore's rich maritime, agricultural, and recreational history and are open for public enjoyment. The region surrounding the National Lakeshore is a popular vacation and summer home destination. In recent times, the area has undergone considerable growth as homes and support services are built for expanding full-time and summer populations.

The park receives nearly 1.2 million visitors each year who enjoy the beaches, hiking, camping, backpacking, hunting, fishing, bird watching, paddling the lakes and streams, cross-country skiing, snowshoeing, ferry trips to the islands, touring historic areas, the spectacular views from the Pierce Stocking Scenic Drive, and the rite of passage of the famous Dune Climb. The park maintains over 100 miles of backcountry trails, two campgrounds accessible by vehicles, six backcountry campgrounds, and dispersed camping on North Manitou Island. The National Park Service estimates that the presence of the National Lakeshore brings nearly \$30 million of economic benefit to the local community each year.* Native American use of the area extends some 3,000 years into the past and is represented today primarily by the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians. Nothing in S. 2976 would modify, alter, or affect any treaty rights.

The park encompasses a total of 71,291 acres; about 58,571 acres of land and 12,720 acres of water. Over 30,000 acres of the proposed 32,557-acre wilderness area have been managed as wilderness since 1981, when a wilderness proposal produced under the park's first comprehensive General Management Plan (GMP) was published. Since that time, the five areas of the park proposed as wilderness have provided outstanding recreational opportunities for hikers, backpackers, anglers, paddlers, and hunters with hunting being allowed in accordance with State regulations. A network of hiking trails and numerous camping opportunities will continue to be maintained in this portion of the park, even with the wilderness designation. The additional acres in the current proposal arise from the inclusion of the Sleeping Bear Plateau, an area unsuitable for anything but foot travel that continues to offer outstanding opportunities for solitude. Since formal wilderness designation would not change the way in which visitor use is currently managed in the area proposed as wilderness, there is no reason to believe it would have any detrimental impact on visitation or the local economy, and formal designation may actually have a beneficial impact.

The proposed wilderness area does not include any existing county roads or areas managed primarily for historic resources. This is to ensure the continued availability of the county roads for visitors accessing remote trailheads, beaches, and the backcountry, and to promote visitor access to historic areas. Although the National Lakeshore boundary extends one-quarter mile out into Lake Michigan, none of the waters of Lake Michigan are proposed as wilderness. S. 2976 would authorize the use of boat motors on the surface water of Lake Michigan adjacent to the wilderness and beaching of those boats below the line of demarcation, subject to applicable laws. This is to ensure continued access by boaters to the shoreline beach adjacent to the wilderness area. These have been areas of significant public concern.

* Stynes, Daniel J. "National Park Visitor Spending and Payroll Impacts: 2008." National Park Service, 2009.

Designation of the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore Wilderness Area will not limit public access or change the way the area is currently being managed for public use and enjoyment. Permanent wilderness designation in Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore will ensure protection of significant ecological resources and wilderness values along with solitude, quiet, and unconfined recreation for this and future generations in the areas proposed as wilderness within the National Lakeshore.

Between 2006 and 2009, the NPS developed an updated GMP for the park. Because of public concern over the 1981 wilderness proposal, and its inclusion of county roads and historic sites, a formal Wilderness Study was conducted as part of this comprehensive planning effort. Approximately 36,000 acres within the Lakeshore were identified as being potentially eligible for wilderness designation in five areas of the park. After extensive public involvement, review, and comment, including overwhelming public support for wilderness designation, the preferred alternative in the final GMP/Wilderness Study was approved by the Midwest Regional Director on January 6, 2009. The area of proposed wilderness was mapped at 32,557 acres, with a portion in all five eligible areas, and is the same as the proposed wilderness designation in S. 2976. The final GMP/Wilderness Study does not propose wilderness in several eligible areas, including those areas fragmented by the road corridors near the Otter Creek area of the Lakeshore; the land within the Port Oneida Rural Historic District; the lands in the historic “Cottage Row” on North Manitou Island; the area in the South Manitou Island historic farm loop; an area near the historic Bufka Farm identified for a bicycle trail; and the congested area at the top of the Dune Climb.

Passage of S. 2976 would support the overarching vision in the new GMP for Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, which is to value the lakeshore primarily for preservation of its natural resources, and for the opportunities it provides for visitor enjoyment of natural, cultural, and recreational resources in a scenic outdoor setting. The bill has very strong, broad-based public support. The overwhelming majority of local officials, the conservation community, and the Michigan delegation are united in their support for this bill as a winning resolution to an issue that has been debated since the park’s establishment in 1970. Parties that had been bitterly polarized over earlier proposals have reached consensus that this bill strikes an appropriate balance between preserving access and guaranteeing outstanding primitive recreational opportunities.

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

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES, AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING S. 3159 AND H.R. 4395, BILLS TO REVISE THE BOUNDARIES OF GETTYSBURG NATIONAL MILITARY PARK TO INCLUDE THE GETTYSBURG TRAIN STATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

MAY 19, 2010

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 3159 and H.R. 4395, bills that would add the historic Lincoln Train Station in the Borough of Gettysburg and 45 acres at the base of Big Round Top to Gettysburg National Military Park in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The Department supports enactment of this legislation. The Department previously testified in support of H.R. 4395 on January 21, 2010, before the House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands.

Gettysburg National Military Park protects major portions of the site of the largest battle waged during this nation's Civil War. Fought in the first three days of July 1863, the Battle of Gettysburg resulted in a victory for Union forces and successfully ended the second invasion of the North by Confederate forces commanded by General Robert E. Lee. Historians have referred to the battle as a major turning point in the war - the "High Water Mark of the Confederacy". It was also the Civil War's bloodiest single battle, resulting in over 51,000 soldiers killed, wounded, captured or missing.

The Soldiers' National Cemetery within the park was dedicated on November 19, 1863, when President Abraham Lincoln delivered his immortal Gettysburg Address. The cemetery contains more than 7,000 interments including over 3,500 from the Civil War. The park currently includes nearly 6,000 acres, with 26 miles of park roads and over 1,400 monuments, markers, and memorials.

Gettysburg's Lincoln Train Station was built in 1858 and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The station served as a hospital during the Battle of Gettysburg, and the wounded and the dead were transported from Gettysburg through this station in the aftermath of battle. President Abraham Lincoln arrived at this station when he visited to give the Gettysburg Address.

Gettysburg National Military Park's 1999 General Management Plan called for expanding cooperative relationships and partnerships with the Borough of Gettysburg and other sites "to ensure that resources closely linked to the park, the battle, and the non-combatant civilian involvement in the battle and its aftermath are appropriately protected and used." In particular, the plan stated that the National Park Service would initiate "cooperation agreements with willing owners, and seek the assistance of the Borough of Gettysburg and other appropriate entities to preserve, operate and manage the Wills House and Lincoln Train Station."

The Borough of Gettysburg Interpretive Plan called for the Lincoln Train Station to be used as a downtown information and orientation center for visitors – where all park visitors would arrive after coming downtown – to receive information and orientation to downtown historic attractions, including the David Wills House. This is the house where Lincoln stayed the night before delivering the Gettysburg Address. The Interpretive Plan also called for rehabilitation of the Wills House, which was added to the park’s boundary through Public Law 106-290 in October 2000, and is now a historic house museum in the borough and an official site within Gettysburg National Military Park. Through a Memorandum of Understanding, the David Wills House is operated by Main Street Gettysburg at no cost to the National Park Service.

The Lincoln Train Station is next to the downtown terminus of Freedom Transit, Gettysburg’s shuttle system, which started operations in July 2009 with a grant from the Federal Transit Administration in the Department of Transportation.

In 2006, the Borough of Gettysburg completed rehabilitation of the Lincoln Train Station with funds from a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania grant. Due to a lack of funds, however, the borough has been unable to operate a visitor information and orientation center there. Through formal vote of the Borough Council, the Borough of Gettysburg has asked the National Park Service to take over the ownership and operations of the train station. The anticipated acquisition cost for the completely rehabilitated train station is approximately \$772,000, subject to an appraisal by the federal government. Funding to acquire this land would be subject to the availability of appropriations and NPS priorities.

The park has a preliminary commitment from the Gettysburg Convention and Visitor Bureau (CVB) to provide all staffing requirements for operations of an information and orientation center in the train station, thereby alleviating the park of staff costs. Anticipated operating costs for the train station that will be the responsibility of the NPS are limited to utility costs, the rest will be paid by the Gettysburg CVB. In the event that the Gettysburg CVB is unable to provide staffing and funding for operations, the NPS would seek another park partner to cover these costs and requirements.

S. 3159 and H.R. 4395 would also add 45 acres near Big Round Top along Plum Run in Cumberland Township, Pennsylvania to the boundary of the park. The 45-acre tract of land is adjacent to the Gettysburg National Military Park and is within the Battlefield Historic District. The land is at the southern base of Big Round Top at the southern end of the Gettysburg battlefield. There were cavalry skirmishers in this area during the Battle of Gettysburg, July 1863, but the real significance is environmental. The tract has critical wetlands and wildlife habitat related to Plum Run. Wayne and Susan Hill donated it to the Gettysburg Foundation in April 2009. The Gettysburg Foundation plans to donate “fee title interest” in the parcel to the National Park Service once it is within the park boundary. It abuts land already owned by the National Park Service.

When H.R. 4395 was marked up by the House Committee on Natural Resources, the bill was amended to combine two map references into one map that shows both parcels. If S. 3159 moves forward we recommend that the bill be amended to reflect this newer map.

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

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN E. WHITESELL, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES, AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES CONCERNING S. 3168, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ACQUIRE CERTAIN NON-FEDERAL LAND IN THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA FOR INCLUSION IN THE FORT NECESSITY NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD.

May 19, 2010

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 3168, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain non-Federal land in Pennsylvania for inclusion in the Fort Necessity National Battlefield.

The Department supports the enactment of this legislation with amendments. Acquisition of the property, however, would be dependent on the results of an appraisal of its value, future availability of funding, and National Park Service acquisition priorities.

S. 3168 authorizes the acquisition of approximately 157 acres in Farmington, Pennsylvania. Upon acquisition, it further authorizes a boundary adjustment for Fort Necessity National Battlefield. The property contains traces of the historic Braddock Road and other resources.

Fort Necessity National Battlefield was the site of the first battle of the French and Indian War in July 1754. The war's outcome determined that the British, rather than the French, would control the Forks of the Ohio and, therefore, development of the colonies. Leading troops as a then-young lieutenant colonel in the Virginia Regiment, this battle was future General George Washington's first and only surrender.

The existing authorized boundary of Fort Necessity National Battlefield contains traces of the Braddock Road, built in 1755 as part of British Major General Edward Braddock's unsuccessful and bloody campaign to take Fort Duquesne at the Forks of the Ohio, a campaign during which Washington served as a volunteer aide to General Braddock. Washington had originally blazed this road in his 1754 expedition.

The property that is the subject of S. 3168 contains both historical and landscape resources relating to the purpose of Fort Necessity National Battlefield. If acquired, approximately 500 feet of the historic Braddock Road trace would be added to the park and would adjoin the existing portion of the trace within the current boundary.

An archeological site, dating approximately from the period of the 1770s to 1810s, is located on the subject property. Taverns were constructed along the Braddock Road following the American Revolution, but prior to the construction of the National Road. The property contains archeological remains of a former tavern structure and associated outbuildings and landscape. The property is contiguous to the park's current southeastern boundary and is becoming

increasingly important as development pressures impact areas immediately adjacent to the park. The owner of the property is a willing seller.

We would like to like to work with the Committee to develop amendments that would provide a more precise identification of the land that would be authorized for acquisition and to make some minor technical changes.

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