

Congressman Glenn 'GT' Thompson (PA-05)

Testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies – April 14, 2011

Chairman Simpson, Ranking Member Moran, thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee today. I am Congressman GT Thompson of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

Representing one of the most rural districts east of the Mississippi River presents many challenges, as well as opportunities. My Congressional district makes up about 22% of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is an area about 3,000 square miles larger than the state of New Jersey.

Natural resources, including coal, oil, natural gas, and timber harvesting, have had a long history in the fifth district and continue to be major economic engines throughout the region. In fact, the petroleum industry started in Titusville, when Colonel Edwin Drake drilled the world's first commercially successful oil well in 1859. This breakthrough, of course, was a major discovery that was a major driver of the American Industrial Revolution during the latter half of the 19th Century. This discovery not only shaped America's place in the world, but also has had a profound effect on world history.

Today, Pennsylvania has returned to our energy roots with the newly realized Marcellus Shale natural gas play. This resource has already produced enormous economic benefits in my region, which has struggled tremendously to create jobs and maintain population over the past several decades. This development is not a short term economic boon. To the contrary, the prosperity Marcellus has created will continue for generations. Upwards of 80,000 jobs have already been created in Pennsylvania as a direct result of the Marcellus and the Commonwealth has estimated an additional \$600 million in tax revenues this year alone. This increase in revenue will also of course only increase in time. Although production in the Marcellus is still in its infancy, it is already providing about 10% of the entire northeast's natural gas supplies. The surplus generated from this domestic production has led to decreased commodity pricing, while foreign petroleum prices continue to rise due to political turmoil in foreign lands. It has been estimated that Marcellus output will greatly increase in the coming decades, making this cleaner fuel source more affordable for our nation's families and industries.

While some may suggest the industry requires regulatory oversight from the Congress or the EPA, the fact remains that the Commonwealth has done a remarkable job regulating Marcellus activities through the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection. We have some of the toughest environmental laws in the country and I fully support regulation of this industry by the Pennsylvania DEP.

This Subcommittee plays an important role in my district and many areas like it around the country. Therefore, I wanted to make the Subcommittee aware of my priorities and the great needs of my district during these difficult financial times.

US Forest Service/Allegheny National Forest

Just down the road from Colonel Drake's well is the Allegheny National Forest – or the ANF for short. This forest, nurtures the finest and most valuable hardwoods in the world. The ANF is particularly known for cherry. The ANF is indeed a special forest, with a unique history intertwined with production of oil, natural gas and timber. When the forest was created in 1923, mineral estates were severed from the Forest Service's ownership of the surface. This was done with the clear intention to allow timber and oil production to continue; and allow for the Forest Service to oversee and manage sustainable timber harvesting. Consequently, 93% of the subsurface mineral rights are still owned by the private sector, which drives the local labor market and economy.

I find it frustrating to watch as the ANF struggles to perform critical functions as their budget has been continually reduced as a result of western wildfires. The FLAME fund has been crucial in providing insulation to the budgets' of our national forests, and I applaud the Subcommittee for their input into the creation of the fund and support through appropriations. I can say that the fund appears to be a success, because forests such as the Allegheny have not been experiencing the historical difficulties wildfires have caused in the past.

Perhaps the greatest challenge to the Forest Service continues to be unnecessary litigation that continually hamstring the Forest Service from carrying out its most basic duties. Without a doubt, we all have a duty to ensure the Forest Service is adequately performing and the legal avenue for the public to address any malfeasance must be intact. However, I strongly believe there are some outside the Service, as well as within, who are intentionally abusing the system based on a radical environmental ideology. These legal battles often create inefficiencies and are a drain on the Service's budget, staff and resources. How can the Forest Service – or any government agency for that matter – do its basic jobs when they are incessantly involved with frivolous lawsuits? As the Chairman of the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy and Forestry, I believe there is an imperative to address these issues and respectfully request your partnership to make necessary improvements.

Forest Service Research Stations

In addition to providing a sustainable source of timber, another pillar of the Forest Service's mission is to maintain forest health. Part of maintaining healthy forests is research and its subsequent application. Pennsylvania and many other states have suffered devastating effects

as a result of invasive species such as the Gypsy Moth and the Emerald Ash Borer. Given the devastation that has occurred in large regions of the country, it is imperative that we continue research and to establish best practices and means of combating these species in order to prevent further destruction of our forests.

The Forest Service operates two excellent research stations in Pennsylvania. One is located in the fifth district and the other is located in the south east portion of Pennsylvania, in Chester County. With some of the other increases to the Forest Service's budget – particularly the Legacy program – it makes little sense to reduce the operations of these stations because of the valuable scientific information they provide, which in turn is critical to keep our national forests healthy. Therefore, it is vital that these stations receive level funding for Fiscal Year 2012 in order to perform this basic function of the Service's mission. This is specifically important with regard to the Forest Inventory & Analysis National Program because of their efforts to stop the spread of the Emerald Ash Borer.-

Fish & Wildlife Service

The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service has been performing excellent research in order to assist with the restoration of fish populations around the country. They have made great strides in the Northeast, particularly with the Atlantic Salmon, which has been devastated in recent decades. There is a research facility in Pennsylvania that is doing incredible work with this salmon species, as well as advanced research in fish genetics and migration patterns. Given the importance of this extensive ecological work, I respectfully request level funding for the Fish & Wildlife Service, particularly for fish related research.

PILT/ Secure Rural Schools

Four of the 17 counties in Pennsylvania's Fifth District are within the boundaries of the Allegheny National Forest. The Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program is essential in this region because there is little to no tax base, which means little to no tax revenue for these forested counties. PILT is the major source of funding for services such as the police force, firefighters, and road construction. Similarly, the Secure Rural Schools program ensures that children residing in these forested counties receive adequate education. Therefore, I respectfully request full funding for both PILT and Secure Rural Schools.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee. I am hopeful as we move forward that the Subcommittee will recognize the balance between fiscal responsibility and continuing our federal commitments to our National Forests and citizens residing in forested counties. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Statement of Gregory E. Conrad, Executive Director, Interstate Mining Compact Commission re the FY 2012 Proposed Budget for the Office of Surface Mining before the House Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee

My name is Gregory E. Conrad and I am Executive Director of the Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC). I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement to the Subcommittee regarding the views of the Compact's member states on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 Budget Request for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) within the U.S. Department of the Interior. In its proposed budget, OSM is requesting \$60.3 million to fund Title V grants to states and Indian tribes for the implementation of their regulatory programs, a reduction of \$11 million or 15% below the FY 2010 enacted/FY 2011 CR level. OSM also proposes to cut discretionary spending for the Title IV abandoned mine land (AML) program by approximately \$6.8 million, including the elimination of funding for the emergency program, and a reduction in mandatory AML spending by \$184 million pursuant to a legislative proposal to eliminate all AML funding for certified states and tribes.

The Compact is comprised of 24 states that together produce some 95% of the Nation's coal, as well as important noncoal minerals. The Compact's purposes are to advance the protection and restoration of land, water and other resources affected by mining through the encouragement of programs in each of the party states that will achieve comparable results in protecting, conserving and improving the usefulness of natural resources, and to assist in achieving and maintaining an efficient, productive and economically viable mining industry.

OSM has projected an amount of \$60.3 million for Title V grants to states and tribes in FY 2012, an amount which is matched by the states each year. These grants support the implementation of state and tribal regulatory programs under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) and as such are essential to the full and effective operation of those programs.

In Fiscal Year 2010, Congress approved an additional \$5.8 million increase for state Title V grants over the FY 2009 enacted level, for a total of \$71.3 million. This same amount was approved for FY 2011. For the first time in many years, the amount appropriated for these regulatory grants aligned with the demonstrated needs of the states and tribes. The states are greatly encouraged by the significant increases in Title V funding approved by Congress over the past three fiscal years. Even with mandated rescissions and the allocations for tribal primacy programs, the states saw a \$12 million increase for our regulatory programs over FY 2007 levels. As we noted in our statement on last year's budget, state Title V grants had been stagnant for over 12 years and the gap between the states' requests and what they received was widening. This debilitating trend was compounding the problems caused by inflation and uncontrollable costs, thus undermining our efforts to realize needed program improvements and enhancements and jeopardizing our efforts to minimize the potential adverse impacts of coal extraction operations on people and the environment.

In its FY 2012 budget, OSM has once again attempted to reverse course and essentially unravel and undermine the progress made by Congress in supporting state programs with

adequate funding. This comes at precisely the wrong time. The states are still in the process of putting the recent improvements in funding to work in their programs through the filling of vacant positions and the purchase of much needed equipment. As states prepare their future budgets, we trust that the recent increases approved by Congress will remain the new base on which we build our programs. Otherwise we find ourselves backpedaling and creating a situation where those who were just hired face layoffs and purchases are canceled or delayed. Furthermore, a clear message from Congress that reliable, consistent funding will continue into the future will do much to stimulate support for these programs by state legislatures and budget officers who each year, in the face of difficult fiscal climates and constraints, are also dealing with the challenge of matching federal grant dollars with state funds. In this regard, it should be kept in mind that a 15% cut in federal funding generally translates to an additional 15% cut for *overall* program funding for many states, especially those without federal lands, since these states can only match what they receive in federal money.

OSM's solution to the drastic cuts for state regulatory programs comes in the way of an unrealistic assumption that the states can simply increase user fees in an effort to "eliminate a de facto subsidy of the coal industry." No specifics on how the states are to accomplish this far-reaching proposal are set forth, other than an expectation that they will do so in the course of a single fiscal year. OSM's proposal is completely out of touch with the realities associated with establishing or enhancing user fees, especially given the need for approvals by state legislatures. IMCC's recent polling of its member states confirmed that, given the current fiscal and political implications of such an initiative, it will be difficult, if not impossible, for most states to accomplish this feat at all, let alone in less than one year. OSM is well aware of this, and yet has every intention of aggressively moving forward with a proposal that was poorly conceived from its inception. We strongly urge the Subcommittee to reject this approach and mandate that OSM work through the complexities associated with any future user fees proposal in close cooperation with the states and tribes before proposing cuts to federal funding for state Title V grants.

At the same time that OSM is proposing significant cuts for state programs, the agency is proposing sizeable increases for its own program operations (\$4 million) for federal oversight of state programs, including an increase of 25 FTEs. OSM justifies this increase based on its "new strategic direction", i.e. expanded and enhanced oversight of state regulatory programs and strengthened stream protections to maintain the hydrologic balance of watersheds pursuant to the June 2009 Memorandum of Understanding with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. However, as we have articulated on numerous occasions over the past 18 months in comments submitted to the agency, OSM has never fully explained or justified the basis for these new directions. In fact, OSM's annual oversight reports indicate that, in general, the states are doing a commendable job of implementing their programs.

In making the case for its funding increase, OSM's budget justification document contains vague references to the need for improvement in approximate original contour (AOC) compliance and reevaluation of bonding procedures in 10 states with respect to bond adequacy. OSM also notes a marked increase in the number of potential violations pursuant to enhanced federal oversight inspections during FY 2010. However, when placed in context, neither of these two explanations justifies the significant increase in funding for federal operations. Increasing

the number of federal inspections can logically be expected to generate more Ten-Day Notices, especially where state regulatory authorities are not invited to accompany federal inspectors (as required by OSM's own regulations). The oversight process can also be expected to identify areas of potential program improvement, especially where OSM has designated certain areas for more intensive, nationwide review, as it did in FY 2010 with regard to AOC and bond adequacy. Again, the overall performance of the states as detailed in OSM's annual oversight reports demonstrates that the states are implementing their programs effectively and in accordance with the purposes and objectives of SMCRA.¹

In our view, this suggests that OSM is adequately accomplishing its statutory oversight obligations with current federal program funding, and that any increased workloads are likely to fall *upon the states*, which have primary responsibility for implementing appropriate adjustments to their programs identified during federal oversight. In this regard, we note that the federal courts have made it abundantly clear that SMCRA's allocation of exclusive jurisdiction was "careful and deliberate" and that Congress provided for "mutually exclusive regulation by either the Secretary or state, but not both." *Bragg v. West Virginia Coal Ass'n*, 248 F. 3d 275, 293-4 (4th Cir. 2001), cert. Denied, 534 U.S. 1113 (2002). While the courts have ruled consistently on this matter, the question remains for Congress and the Administration to determine, in light of deficit reduction and spending cuts, how the limited amount of federal funding for the regulation of surface coal mining and reclamation operations under SMCRA will be directed – to OSM or the states. For all the above reasons, we urge Congress to approve not less than \$71 million for state and tribal Title V regulatory grants, as fully documented in the states' and tribes' estimates for actual program operating costs.²

With regard to funding for state Title IV Abandoned Mine Land (AML) program grants, Congressional action in 2006 to reauthorize Title IV of SMCRA has significantly changed the method by which state reclamation grants are funded. Beginning with FY 2008, state Title IV grants are funded primarily by mandatory appropriations. As a result, the states should have received a total of \$498 million in FY 2012. Instead, OSM has budgeted an amount of \$313.8 million based on an ill-conceived proposal to eliminate mandatory AML funding to states and tribes that have been certified as completing their abandoned coal reclamation programs. This \$184.2 million reduction flies in the face of the comprehensive restructuring of the AML program that was passed by Congress in 2006, following over 10 years of Congressional debate and hard fought compromise among the affected parties. In addition to the elimination of funding for certified states and tribes, OSM is also proposing to reform the distribution process for the remaining reclamation funding to allocate available resources to the highest priority coal

¹ While not alluded to or fully addressed in OSM's budget justification document, there are myriad statutory, policy and legal issues associated with several aspects of the agency's enhanced oversight initiative, especially three recently adopted directives on annual oversight procedures (REG-8), corrective actions (REG-23) and Ten-Day Notices (INE-35). IMCC submitted extensive comments regarding the issues associated with these directives and related oversight actions (including federal inspections) on January 19, 2010, July 8, 2010 and January 7, 2011.

² We are particularly concerned about recent OSM initiatives, primarily by policy directive, to duplicate and/or second-guess state permitting decisions through the reflexive use of "Ten-Day Notices" as part of increased federal oversight or through federal responses to citizen complaints. Aside from the impact on limited state and federal resources, these actions undermine the principles of primacy that underscore SMCRA and are likely to have debilitating impacts on the state-federal partnership envisioned by the Act.

AML sites through a competitive grant program, whereby an Advisory Council will review and rank AML sites each year. While we have not seen the details of the proposal, which will require adjustments to SMCRA, it will clearly undermine the delicate balance of interests and objectives achieved by the 2006 amendments. It is also inconsistent with many of the goals and objectives articulated by the Administration concerning both jobs and environmental protection, particularly stream quality. We urge the Congress to reject this unjustified proposal, delete it from the budget and restore the full mandatory funding amount of \$498 million. In this regard, we endorse the testimony of the National Association of Abandoned Mine Land Programs (NAAML), which goes into greater detail regarding the implications of OSM's legislative proposal for the states.

We also urge Congress to approve continued funding for the AML emergency program. In a continuing effort to ignore congressional direction, OSM's budget would completely eliminate funding for state-run emergency programs and also for federal emergency projects (in those states that do not administer their own emergency programs). When combined with the great uncertainty about the availability of remaining carryover funds, it appears that the program has been decimated. Funding the OSM emergency program should be a top priority for OSM's discretionary spending. This funding has allowed the states and OSM to address the unanticipated AML emergencies that inevitably occur each year. In states that have federally-operated emergency programs, the state AML programs are not structured or staffed to move quickly to address these dangers and safeguard the coalfield citizens whose lives and property are threatened by these unforeseen and often debilitating events. And for minimum program states, emergency funding is critical to preserve the limited resources available to them under the current funding formula. We therefore request that Congress restore funding for the AML emergency program in OSM's FY 2012 budget.

One of the more effective mechanisms for accomplishing AML restoration work is through leveraging or matching other grant programs, such as EPA's 319 program. Until FY 2009, language was always included in OSM's appropriation that encouraged the use of these types of matching funds, particularly for the purpose of environmental restoration related to treatment or abatement of acid mine drainage (AMD) from abandoned mines. This is a perennial, and often expensive, problem, especially in Appalachia. IMCC therefore requests the Committee to once again include language in the FY 2012 appropriations bill that would allow the use of AML funds for any required non-Federal share of the cost of projects by the Federal government for AMD treatment or abatement.

We also urge the Committee to support funding for OSM's training program, including moneys for state travel. These programs are central to the effective implementation of state regulatory programs as they provide necessary training and continuing education for state agency personnel. In this regard, it should be noted that the states provide nearly half of the instructors for OSM's training course and, through IMCC, sponsor and staff benchmarking workshops on key regulatory program topics. IMCC also urges the Committee to support funding for TIPS, a program that directly benefits the states by providing critical technical assistance. Finally, we support funding for the Watershed Cooperative Agreements in the amount of \$1.55 million.

Resolution

Interstate Mining Compact Commission

BE IT KNOWN THAT:

WHEREAS, Title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (SMCRA) established the Abandoned Mine Land (AML) reclamation program; and

WHEREAS, the Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC) is a multi-state organization representing the natural resource and environmental protection interests of its 24 member states, including the elimination of health and safety hazards and the reclamation of land and water resources adversely affected by past mining and left in an abandoned or inadequately restored condition; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the cooperative federalism approach contained in SMCRA, several IMCC member states administer AML programs approved, funded and overseen by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM) within the U.S. Department of the Interior; and

WHEREAS, SMCRA, Title IV establishes a reclamation fee on each ton of coal mined in the United States to pay for abandoned mine land reclamation; and

WHEREAS, SMCRA, Title IV mandates that fifty percent (50%) of the reclamation fees collected annually are designated as state share funds to be returned to the states from which coal was mined to pay for reclamation projects pursuant to programs administered by the states; and

WHEREAS, SMCRA, Title IV also mandates that a minimum level of funding should be provided to ensure effective state program implementation; and

WHEREAS, Congress enacted amendments to SMCRA in 2006 to address, among other things, continued collection of AML fees and funding for state programs to address existing and future AML reclamation; and

WHEREAS, the 2006 Amendments established new, strict criteria that ensure states expend funds on high priority AML sites; and

WHEREAS, the proposed 2012 budget for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement within the U.S. Department of the Interior would disregard the state-federal partnership established under SMCRA and renege on the funding formula under the 2006 Amendments by, among other things, eliminating mandatory funding for states who have certified the completion of their coal reclamation work and adjusting the mechanism by which non-certified states receive their mandatory funding through a competitive bidding process; and

WHEREAS, if statutory changes are approved by Congress as suggested by the proposed FY 2012 budget for OSM, reclamation of abandoned mine lands within certified states would halt; reclamation of abandoned mine lands in all states would be jeopardized; employment of contractors, suppliers, technicians and others currently engaged in the reclamation of abandoned mine lands would be endangered; the cleanup of polluted lands and waters across the United States would be threatened by failing to fund reclamation of abandoned mine lands; minimum program state funding would be usurped; the AML water supply replacement program would be terminated, leaving coalfield citizens without potable water; and the intent of Congress as contained in the 2006 Amendments to SMCRA would be undermined

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Interstate Mining Compact Commission opposes the legislative proposal terminating funding for certified states and altering the receipt of mandatory AML funding for non-certified states contained in the FY 2012 budget proposal for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement and instead supports the AML funding mechanism contained in current law.

Issued this 10th day of March, 2011

ATTEST:

Gregory E. Conrad
Executive Director

**Testimony before the
United States House Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies**

**Regarding the
FY 2012 President's Budget Request for the U.S. Forest Service**

**by
Tom Troxel, Executive Director
Intermountain Forest Association
Rapid City, South Dakota**

April 14, 2011

Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee. My name is Tom Troxel, and I am Executive Director of the Intermountain Forest Association, located in Rapid City, SD. I am testifying on behalf of the Federal Forest Resource Coalition, an informal coalition of forest industry trade associations from across the United States, with regards to the U.S. Forest Service's forest management programs. A complete list of Coalition members is included with this testimony.

The Federal Forest Resource Coalition supports management of the national forests to produce clean water, enhance wildlife habitat, produce timber, support jobs and communities, and to reduce the potential for catastrophic fires and insect epidemics. Collectively, our members represent every segment of the forestry and wood products value chain, from loggers and landowners to lumber, panel, pulp, and paper mills. The forest industry employs nearly 900,000 men and women, and ranks among the top 10 manufacturing sector employers in 47 states. Lumber, panel, pulp, and paper mills are the economic hub of many rural counties and communities, making the industry's health critical to the economic vitality of those communities.

Many of our member companies rely on the national forests to provide a consistent and sustainable timber supply. Forest products companies also provide the lowest cost and most effective tool for the Forest Service to improve the health of our national forests. Increased management and timber outputs would provide a much-needed economic boost to rural America, as well as improve the health and speed restoration efforts on the national forests. In short, as the Forest Service budget and timber outputs go, so go the health of the national forests, the forest products companies, and many of America's rural communities.

Integrated Resource Restoration

Our number one concern regarding the Forest Service's FY 2012 Budget Request is the proposed merger of several budget line items (Forest Products, Vegetation and Watershed Management,

Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat, Legacy Roads and Trails, Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Act (CFLRA), and non-Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Hazardous Fuels) into the “Integrated Resource Restoration” (IRR) budget line item. IRR was first proposed in the FY 2011 President’s Budget. Even though the Forest Service made significant changes to the IRR in the FY 2012 budget, adding targets and including non-WUI Hazardous Fuels, we believe that implementation of the IRR would inevitably lead to a loss of commitment and accountability for timber outputs, and, therefore, we must oppose the IRR concept.

Under the IRR concept, tracking and comparing timber program unit costs between various Forest Service units would be virtually impossible. Further, it would be impossible to compare timber program funding from one fiscal year to another.

Not all forest management is “restoration”, and very few of the forest plans, which were developed at great cost of time and money, provide direction for forest “restoration”. We have many underlying questions about how a national emphasis on “restoration” will affect timber sale programs on national forests that do not need “restoration”, or how a national emphasis on “restoration” would dovetail with the forest plans that do not contain “restoration” as a management goal or objective. Frankly, we believe the Forest Service’s timber sale program will continue to contribute toward the full spectrum of national forest management objectives, including “restoration”, without an IRR budget line item. In those areas where “restoration” is a necessary forest management objective, we do not believe the current budget structure presents any obstacle to achieving that objective on the ground.

We recommend the Committee reject the proposed IRR budget structure outright. We also recommend \$40 million in new funding for the CFLRA program, as a separate budget line item, a step we believe would lead to better accountability and oversight for program funding, costs, and accomplishments. Finally, instead of a competitive process for the \$80 million for ‘priority watershed’ improvement projects, we recommend that the Forest Service simply emphasize those projects in their direction for Vegetation and Watershed Management funds.

Timber Program Outputs

We recommend timber outputs consistent with the national emphasis on job creation and retention, forest management needs, industry infrastructure retention, and demand for national forest timber. The current annual harvest from national forest timberlands is less than 10% of annual forest growth and less than 50% of the cumulative Allowable Sales Quantity in the forest plans. The proposed FY 2012 increase from 2.4 billion board feet (bbf) to 2.6 bbf is helpful, but inadequate. Many of the rural communities close to the national forests have unemployment rates nearing 20 percent. Investing in the Forest Service’s timber program is a very effective job creator, generating 16.5 new direct and indirect jobs per million board feet of timber harvested, nearly twice any other sector of the economy.

We propose increasing the Forest Products funding by including the \$77 million of non-WUI hazardous fuels proposed for inclusion in the IRR. That would allow an increase in the FY 2012 target to 3.0 billion board feet, which would provide a much-needed boost to employment in rural America, and increase needed management of our national forests. Increasing the FY 2012 Forest Products line item target from 2.4 bbf to 3.0 bbf would generate 9,900 new jobs. Additional investments to increase timber harvests to 4.0 billion board feet would generate another 16,500 new jobs.

Finally, we recommend that the Committee include targets for each budget line item, and require an annual report from the Forest Service to the Congress on their annual accomplishments.

Roads

We are very concerned about the \$79 million cut proposed to the Roads Budget Line Item in the Capital Improvement and Maintenance Budget, and the statement (p 8-13) that “No [other than 4-6 miles on the Tongass NF] new roads are proposed for construction on NFS lands in FY 2012”. This blanket prohibition makes no sense from a policy or practical perspective. Some new roads are a necessity, and the combined effect of the budget reduction and the policy statement regarding “no new roads” would have a devastating effect on forest management and fuels reduction projects. We urge the Committee to restore the \$79 million cut to the Roads Budget Line Item, and reject the notion of “no new road construction”.

Administrative Review

We urge the Committee to promote strategies to increase the Forest Service’s cost effectiveness. One such strategy would be to authorize use of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA) Administrative Review Process for all national forest NEPA decisions. The FY 2011 President’s Budget contained a reference to a new “objection process”, presumably similar to the HFRA Administrative Review Process, but that proposal has not been enacted. We support the Forest Service’s recent proposal for a pre-decisional objection process for forest plan decisions, and we urge the Committee to do the same for project NEPA decisions.

Hazardous Fuels

The Forest Service has proposed a \$9 million reduction for the Hazardous Fuels line item. Considering the heavy fuels buildup and fire risks that many of our national forests are facing, funding for the Hazardous Fuels program is crucial. 60 to 80 million acres of national forests are classified at risk for catastrophic wildfire. Research has shown that mechanical thinning and active management of forests can lead to a 22 to 60% reduction in wildfires. We believe the Forest Service has placed too high a priority on the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). While the WUI is clearly important for the protection of property and lives, a higher percentage of the Class II and Class III fire class forests are found outside of the WUI. By employing mechanical

treatment of the Class II and III lands, the Forest Service can take advantage of the value of merchantable products to help offset the costs associated with reducing the fire risk. We recommend that 50% of the Hazardous Fuels funds be directed to the non-WUI areas.

Western Bark Beetle Epidemics

According to page 16-7 of the Forest Service's Budget Justification, bark beetles have killed or damaged 41.7 million acres of western forests since 1997, with "unprecedented" environmental and social impacts, and the epidemics are expected to continue another "five to ten years". The bark beetle epidemics threaten the health and stability of every forest program, every forest user, forest products companies, and communities. The bark beetle epidemics are the inevitable result of over-mature, even-aged forests that have not been adequately thinned or managed. Since the epidemics began, the Forest Service's response has been underfunded and, mostly, after the fact. The FY 10 accomplishments (page 16-10), as well as the proposed FY 2012 funding (page 16-11), are inadequate. We urge the Committee to recognize the catastrophic nature of the beetle epidemics, to fund forest thinning to prevent additional beetle epidemics, and to fund tree removal and fuels reduction where trees have already been killed.

Land Acquisition

Considering the budget issues facing our nation and the backlog of forest management needs on the existing national forests lands, we recommend no funding for the Forest Service to purchase additional lands and that the proposed funding for land purchases be redirected to addressing forest management needs.

On behalf of the Federal Forest Resource Coalition, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I would be happy to answer any questions.

**Written Public Testimony of John Shannon, Vice President
National Association of State Foresters**

**Submitted to the House Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies**

April 1, 2011

The National Association of State Foresters (NASF) appreciates the opportunity to submit written public testimony to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies regarding our Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 appropriations recommendations. Our priorities center on appropriations for the USDA Forest Service (Forest Service) State and Private Forestry (S&PF) programs. As states face the most challenging fiscal environment since the Great Depression, State Foresters fully appreciate the difficult choices that come with spending decisions. We therefore recommend that FY12 appropriations for S&PF be held at \$306 million, representing similar funding levels enacted in FY10.

State Foresters deliver technical and financial assistance and forest health, water and wildfire protection for more than two-thirds of America's forests. The Forest Service S&PF mission area provides vital support for delivering these services alongside other socioeconomic and environmental health benefits in both rural and urban areas. S&PF programs provide a significant return on the federal investment by leveraging the boots-on-the-ground and financial resources of state agencies to deliver assistance to forest landowners, tribes and communities. As state and federal governments face extremely tight fiscal conditions, State Foresters, in partnership with the S&PF mission area of the Forest Service, are best positioned to maximize the effectiveness of the limited resources available to respond to priority forest issues and focus efforts in those areas where they are needed most.

RESPONDING TO PRIORITY FOREST ISSUES, TRENDS AND THREATS

State Foresters have completed the Statewide Forest Resource Assessments and Strategies called for in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (2008 Farm Bill). Management activities are underway to implement these "forest action plans" and respond to the following trends, issues and priorities:

Forest Pests and Invasive Plants

Among the greatest threats identified in the forest action plans are exotic forest pests and invasive species. The growing number of damaging pests is often a result of the introduction and spread by way of wooden shipping materials, movement of firewood and through various types of recreation. A new damaging pest is introduced every two to three years. These pests have the potential to displace native trees, shrubs and other vegetation types in forests. Estimates indicate that 138 alien tree and shrub species have invaded native U.S. forest and shrub ecosystems while more than 20 alien species of plant pathogens attack woody plants. Plant pathogens alone have been estimated to result in the loss of \$7 billion of forest products each year. These losses do not account for the value of clean and abundant water, wildlife habitat, clean air and other environmental services that may be lost or impacted due to insect and disease infestation.

In response, the Cooperative Forest Health Management program provides technical and financial assistance to states and territories to maintain healthy, productive forest ecosystems on non-federal forest lands. The program treated native pest species on over 150,000 acres and non-native invasive species on over 500,000 acres in FY10. Funding for the program supports activities related to prevention, suppression, and eradication of insects, diseases, and plants as well as conducting forest health monitoring through pest surveys.

NASF supports funding the Cooperative Forest Health Program at the FY10 enacted level of \$60 million (i.e. \$49 million through S&PF and \$11 million through Wildland Fire Management). We believe the proposed reduction included in the President's FY12 Budget will expose more of the nation's forests to exotic and invasive pests such as the Emerald Ash Borer, Hemlock Woolly Adelgid, Thousand Cankers Disease, Goldspotted Oak Borer and others that—in some cases—are already eliminating certain tree species. This request is supported by a strong diversity of organizations including members of the Continental Dialogue on Non-native Forest Insects and Diseases (see letter of support at www.stateforesters.org).

Fuel Loads and Wildland Fire

More people in fire-prone landscapes, high fuel loads, drought and unhealthy landscapes are among the factors that have led State Foresters to identify wildland fire as a significant priority issue in their state forest action plans. These factors have created a wildland fire situation that has become increasingly expensive and complex and, in many cases, threatens human life and property. NASF alongside many other organizations in the forestry, conservation and environmental community agree that the Forest Service State Fire Assistance (SFA) Program and the Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund established under the Federal Land Assistance, Management and Enhancement (FLAME) Act are key tools in addressing the threat of wildland fire (see letter of support at www.stateforesters.org).

SFA is the fundamental federal assistance mechanism that states and local fire departments use to develop preparedness and response capabilities for wildland fire management on non-federal lands. The program has helped over 11,000 communities prioritize their preparedness and mitigation efforts through the development of Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs); yet, the threat of wildfire to life and property remains in more than 69,000 communities.¹ ***NASF recommends \$39 million for Cooperative Fire Protection SFA and \$71 million for Wildland Fire Management SFA to address the mitigation and preparedness backlog in communities at risk from wildland fire.***

In 2009, the FLAME Act established two funds—one for the Forest Service and another for the Department of the Interior (DOI)—to reduce the need for the agencies to transfer funds to wildfire suppression from other agency programs, which had historically led to considerable disruptions to important program functions. Congress included specific instructions that FLAME should be funded with improved estimates and that funding should not come at the expense of other agency programs. ***For FY10, the Forest Service received \$413 million. NASF and its partners support funding at equivalent levels for FY12.***

¹ NASF FY2009 *Communities at Risk Report*, February 2010

Working Forest Landscapes

Working forest landscapes are a key part of the rural landscape and provide jobs, clean water, wood products and other essential services to millions of Americans. For instance, 80% of renewable biomass energy comes from wood, 53% of all freshwater in the U.S. originates on forest land and more than \$200 billion in sales of consumer products and services are provided through the nation's forests each year.² Working forest landscapes contribute to a healthy forest products industry that employs more than one million people.³

Private forests make up two-thirds of all the forestland in the United States. Totalling 423 million acres, private forests support an average of eight jobs (per 1,000 acres) and provide 92% of trees harvested for wood products.⁴ The ability of working forests to continue providing jobs, renewable energy, clean and abundant water and other important services is in jeopardy as private forests are lost to development. The Forest Service estimates that 57 million acres of private forests in the U.S. are at risk of conversion to urban development over the next two decades. The Forest Stewardship Program, Forest Legacy Program and other programs within USDA are key tools identified in the forest action plans to keep working forests intact.

The Forest Stewardship Program (FSP) is the most extensive family forest-owner assistance program in the country. Planning assistance is delivered in cooperation with state forestry agencies primarily through the development of Forest Stewardship Plans. The program provides information to private landowners to help them manage their land for wildlife, recreation, aesthetics, timber production, and many other purposes. The technical assistance provided through the FSP is a gateway to other effective USDA, state and private sector programs designed to help keep working forests intact. For instance, the FSP enables landowners to participate in the Forest Legacy Program, Environmental Quality Incentives Program, and the Biomass Crop Assistance Program. The FSP also increasingly serves as the gateway to participating in forest certification programs and accessing renewable energy and carbon markets. ***NASF recommends \$29 million for the Forest Stewardship Program in FY12.***

Urban and Community Forest Management Challenges

Urban forests include the tree canopy cover above every neighborhood, town and city in America. They provide environmental, social and economic benefits to more than 80% of the nation's population. The forest action plans identified a number of benefits associated with urban forests including energy savings, improved air quality, neighborhood stability, aesthetic values, reduced noise and improved quality of life for communities across the country. At the same time, the forest action plans reported a number of threats to urban and community forests including fire in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), urbanization and development, invasive plants and insects, diseases and others.

Since its expansion under the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1990 (CFAA), the Forest Service's Urban & Community Forestry (U&CF) program has provided technical and financial assistance to promote stewardship that is critically important green infrastructure. The program is delivered in close partnership with State Foresters and leverages existing local efforts that have

² Society of American Foresters. *The State of America's Forests*. 2007.

³ American Forest and Paper Association. "Our Industry: Economic Impact." <http://afandpa.org> (accessed Friday April 1, 2011)

⁴ Forest2Market. *The Economic Impact of Privately-Owned Forests*. 2009.

helped thousands of communities and towns manage, maintain, and improve their tree cover and green spaces. For instance, the program leveraged an additional \$40 million in state and local support and provided 1,250 small grants to local communities in FY 2010 to help communities manage risk, respond to storms and disturbances, and contain threats from invasive pests. ***NASF and the broad urban forestry community support an appropriation of \$32 million in FY12 for the Urban and Community Forestry Program*** (see letter of support at www.stateforesters.org).

FLEXIBILITY FOR STATES TO APPLY RESOURCES WHERE THEY ARE NEEDED MOST

As part of the development of the forest action plans, each state underwent a comprehensive process that involved a wide range of partners and interagency cooperation to examine issues, structure priorities, and provide direction for those programs authorized under the CFAA. State Foresters are now in the operational phase of this process that includes implementation of the respective CFAA Programs consistent with national and state-specific priorities identified in forest action plans. While there is some consistency among states in program direction, the mix and configuration of CFAA programs and services that can deliver the greatest public value varies among states.

With completed forest action plans, states are now in a position to maximize the total public value from federal investment across the nation. NASF supports providing increased flexibility within CFAA program implementation through the states in order to ensure states collectively maximize their contributions to achieving the National Priorities expressed in the 2008 Farm Bill. We would like to see continued discussion and guidance from the Committee on possible alternative approaches to this matter that meet our shared desire to maximize the public's return on the investment of federal funds. Strong performance metrics for both the states and USFS should be part of this effort.

IMPORTANCE OF FOREST INVENTORY DATA IN MONITORING FOREST ISSUES

The Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program, managed by Forest Service Research, is the nation's only comprehensive forest inventory system for assessing the health and sustainability of the nation's forests across all ownerships. FIA provides essential data related to forest species composition, forest growth rates, and forest health data and is the baseline inventory estimates used in state forest action plans. The program provides unbiased information that serves as the basis for monitoring trends in wildlife habitat, wildfire risk, insect and disease threats, predicting spread of invasive species and for responding to priorities identified in the forest action plans.

The Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-85) mandated the Forest Service to partner with the states and non-governmental interests to implement a nationally consistent, annual inventory program in all states, ensuring timely availability of data and developing state-level reports every five years. Unfortunately, the President's FY12 Budget proposes an overall \$10 million reduction to FIA that will disrupt the inventory cycle length and otherwise dismantle program delivery. A solid inventory is essential to responding to contemporary forest issues such as estimating sustainable woody biomass supplies for renewable energy production, forest carbon inventories, and determining the timber supply available to support local mills and local jobs. ***NASF and many others in the forestry, conservation and environmental community recommend \$72 million for the FIA program in FY12***, with \$67 million funded through Forest and Rangeland Research and \$5 million through State & Private Forestry (see letter of support at www.stateforesters.org).

Testimony of Hank Kashdan
Legislative Director - National Association of Forest Service Retirees
Recommendations to the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
Fiscal Year 2012 Budget for the United States Forest Service
March 28, 2011

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, the National Association of Forest Service Retirees (NAFSR) respectfully submits the following testimony to the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies regarding the fiscal year (FY) 2012 budget. I am Hank Kashdan, Legislative Director for NAFSR. I recently retired from the Forest Service as its Associate Chief. Let me first express NAFSR's gratitude for this opportunity to provide recommendations on the proposed budget for the Forest Service. As noted in this testimony, NAFSR is recommending "budget neutral" adjustments totaling \$138.5 million. It is important to emphasize that NAFSR is fully aware of the challenges facing the Subcommittee in developing a FY 2012 budget and further understands the need to significantly reduce federal expenditures. In making these recommendations, NAFSR wants to be clear that it has empathy for the Subcommittee's challenges. In reviewing the President's Budget for FY 2012, NAFSR feels with some adjustment, key programs of the agency can be maintained while achieving overall budgetary reductions.

SUMMARY: As displayed in the following table, NAFSR, in general, recommends adjusting specifically noted budget line items to levels provided in the FY 2010 enacted budget. To achieve the FY 2010 levels for these line items, NAFSR recommends an appropriate "offset" by **NOT** focusing on the Administration's new America's Great Outdoors (AGO) initiative. The AGO initiative, although potentially having some positive benefit, is essentially being proposed at the expense of core multiple use Forest Service programs that focus on restoring the health and resiliency of Americas forests and watersheds. For this reason, if enacted as proposed in the President's Budget, it would have the effect of contributing to the further degradation of the health of the national forests.

FY 2012 Recommendations (\$ 000)

Account/Line Item	Proposed Funding	Proposed Decrease	Proposed Increase
S&PF- Forest Legacy	46,509	88,491	
Land Acquisition – National Forests	40,000	50,000	
Research & Development	312,012		16,239
CI&M – Roads	236,521		78,703
CI&M – Legacy Roads & Trails (1)	90,000		15,000
Wildland Fire – Hazardous Fuels (2)	(with IRR Line Item) 263,015 (w/o IRR Line Item) 340,285		9,000
NFS - Land Ownership Management	95,606		9,731
S&PF – International Programs	9,818		9,818

Footnotes:

1. The President's Budget proposes to fund Forest Legacy Roads and Trails in the new Integrated Resource Restoration (IRR) line item at a level of \$75 million. NAFSR recommends funding at \$90 million for this program whether the Subcommittee chooses to implement IRR or maintain this funding in the Capital Improvement and Maintenance account.
2. The President's Budget proposes to fund non-wildland urban interface fuels in the IRR line item and "moved" \$77 million to IRR from hazardous fuels. Overall the budget would result in a \$9 million reduction in hazardous fuels. NAFSR recommends funding hazardous fuels at the FY 2010 level.

KEY POINTS:

America's Great Outdoors: While NAFSR sees value in some of the Administration's AGO proposals, the large increases in funding for Forest Legacy and Land Acquisition are being proposed by the Administration at the expense of essential multiple use activities. The bottom line for NAFSR is that there is little logic in increasing the size of federal land ownership, when there are tens of millions of acres already in federal ownership that are in poor health. The need to focus on large scale restoration has been widely cited by many oversight and constituent groups including reports by the Government Accountability Office and the Western Governors Association. These reports have widespread support and serve as the basis for work currently underway and planned for the future. As proposed in the President's Budget, the AGO initiative would have the effect of taking needed resources from these important restoration activities. NAFSR strongly recommends against funding the AGO proposals unless important multiple use budget line items are restored to at least the FY 2010 level.

Funding Restoration Activities vs. Establishing an Integrated Resource Restoration Line Item (IRR): NAFSR sees some benefit in the proposed IRR budget line item. **HOWEVER**, rather than be distracted by budget structure, it is of greater importance to fund key multiple use programs of the agency that focus on **restoring and maintaining healthy, resilient forests and watersheds**. These programs are critical to the needs of the nation by providing clean water; protecting communities, forests and rangelands from the threat of catastrophic wildfire; providing a variety of forest and rangeland derived products including quality habitat for wildlife and fish, recreational opportunities; and by retaining important local and regional infrastructure that is important in assuring sustainable local communities and natural resources. Of significant concern is the Administration's proposed reduction to the Roads program within the Capital Improvement and Maintenance account. Not only is funding under this line item an essential aspect of restoration, the National Forest road system is critical to resource protection and management needs. Key activities within this budget line item include road decommissioning, maintenance to required standards, and making improvement to meet environmental and management needs. Further, the Administration is proposing an overall reduction in hazardous fuels funding; this as it finally releases "*A National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy*" to address communities and landscapes that are increasingly at risk from the threat of catastrophic wildfire. NAFSR feels these activities **MUST** be funded first before investing in the AGO program that would acquire new national forest lands or new easements. NAFSR recommends funding the key programs shown in the above table at the FY 2010 enacted levels.

As noted, NAFSR does see potential benefits in the proposed IRR line item, and thus, encourages the Subcommittee to consider providing authority for a pilot test in one or two regions of the Forest Service in order to allow the agency to demonstrate appropriate accountability and improved performance, while providing an opportunity for the Subcommittee to establish its oversight expectations under such expanded budget flexibility for the agency.

Research and Development: As noted in past testimony, NAFSR is very concerned about the continued erosion in the capacity of the Forest Service to conduct basic research in support of natural resource management. In addition to the reality that basic research is not significantly conducted anywhere else and/or is being concurrently reduced in colleges and universities, the ability to provide basic science is a cornerstone of successful multiple use management on the landscape. The availability of quality scientific information, and having the capacity to conduct research, is an essential element of supporting land managers in making decisions on management activities, as well as a key foundation in forest planning. The new proposed planning rule relies significantly on the capacity of the Research and Development program to support decision making based on the availability of quality science and an effective science based workforce. With 68 Forest Plans out of date (more than half being over 20 years old) and needing revision, the capacity to provide the “best science” in support of forest planning is essential. In addition, basic research to support the economic use of material removed in forest restoration activities will help make these renewable forest resources available to meet the Nation’s wood products and energy needs.

National Forest System – Land Ownership Management: NAFSR feels it is important to emphasize the critical nature of the funding contained in this line item. It is essential in providing basic services to America whether for a specific user of the national forests or the population as a whole. Funding for this line item has steadily eroded over time, yet the demands for the services provided have increased. The agency’s capacity to deliver such service has been seriously affected. Activities funded in this line item include assessing powerline location and environmental impacts, processing permit applications for numerous activities including water lines and buildings, identifying property boundaries, and responding to alternative energy proposals for such activities as wind, solar, and geothermal power generation. The Land Ownership Management line is also an essential part of being good neighbors to adjacent private landowners and to the many communities within and adjacent to the Forests. As noted in the table above, NAFSR recommends retaining funding in this line item at the FY 2010 level.

Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund (CFLR): The President’s FY 2012 budget includes full funding for CFLR in the IRR line item. NAFSR endorses fully funding this program. In recent years the Forest Service has demonstrated its ability to forge consensus among diverging interests through an intense focus on landscape scale cooperation. Full funding for CFLR offers one of the best authorities to effectively involve communities in collaboratively determining how to restore the health of public and private lands while improving rural economies. Notable collaboratives across the country including those in Idaho, Oregon, Arizona, New Mexico, and in the acquired lands of the east are improving the ability of the agency to be a partner in making important multiple use decisions about the future of the national forests and adjacent lands. NAFSR notes that these collaboratives have made frequent use of stewardship contracting authority to execute projects and has demonstrated the utility of

this tool in improving forest health, contributing to improving the economy of local communities, and reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire. Collaboratives that have their “feet on the ground” have achieved positive multiple use management outcomes and have increased the Forest Service’s ability to be highly valued partners in local communities. This program shows strong long term potential to be highly successful. NAFSR recommends the full funding of CFLR and further recommends that the Subcommittee continue its support for use of a variety of tools to facilitate these efforts, especially including support for a strong and permanent stewardship contracting authority.

Wildland Fire Management – Wildfire Suppression: NAFSR notes that the President’s FY 2012 Budget provides funding for wildfire suppression at approximately the 10-year average. It is important to emphasize the high probability that suppression costs will exceed the 10-year average due to increasing costs, expanding wildland urban interface, and the large areas of insect infested forests that are more prone to wildfire. In addition, due to budget pressures, the “carryover” of suppression funds from the last two years of lower than normal wildfire suppression expenditures, are no longer available to meet suppression funding needs in the event that the 10-year average is exceeded. NAFSR feels it important to point out that under the concept of the FLAME Act, these carryover funds would have been available if the 10-year average were exceeded. In the absence of the availability of these funds, NAFSR is very concerned that should suppression costs begin to exceed fund availability, Congress will need to enact supplemental emergency funding, OR the Forest Service will once again be forced to implement “fire transfers.” Such transfers will have major detrimental impacts on the ability of the agency to perform its mission.

State and Private Forestry – International Programs: The President’s Budget for FY 2012 eliminates funding for this program, but does not eliminate the program. Rather it proposes that the Forest Service will fund this program from within other line items. This essentially amounts to a \$9.8 million reduction to other programs or at least a partial reduction in the agency’s international efforts. The Forest Service is globally recognized as a natural resource leader. This directly strengthens the strategic standing of the United States in a key international arena. Further, this program leverages it’s funding from other sources at a ratio of approximately 4 to 1. Thus for \$9.8 million, the agency is able to achieve close to \$40 million in value.

In Closing, NAFSR would again like to emphasize that it has great empathy for the challenges the Subcommittee faces in finalizing a budget for FY 2012. With its understanding of the critical tradeoffs the Subcommittee must make, NAFSR has been conservative in its funding recommendations. NAFSR recognizes that not all programs can be funded at or above the FY 2010 level, so it has focused its recommendations for funding activities to address what prior NAFSR Board Chairman, George Leonard, described as a liability being caused by “overstocked, insect-infested, fire-prone, poorly maintained, and understaffed Forests.”

NAFSR deeply appreciates the Subcommittee’s consideration of these recommendations and for being invited to provide testimony at the Public Witness Hearing.



CIVIL WAR TRUST

*Saving America's
Civil War Battlefields*

Civilwar.org

Testimony of O. James Lighthizer, President Civil War Trust

Before the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies United States House of Representatives

April 14, 2011

Introduction

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is James Lighthizer, and I am the President of the Civil War Trust. I come before you today to respectfully request that the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies fund the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program (CWBPP), financed through the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the Department of Interior, at its authorized amount of \$10 million.

I would like to start by providing a little information about our organization. The Civil War Trust is a 55,000-member nonprofit organization — the only national one of its kind — dedicated to preserving America's remaining Civil War battlefields. To date, the Trust has permanently protected more than 30,000 acres of hallowed ground in 20 states, most of it outside National Park Service (NPS) boundaries.

I am here today to discuss with you the highly effective federal land conservation program that has made much of our success possible: the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program (CWBPP). This authorized competitive matching grants program, operated through the National Park Service (NPS) American Battlefield Protection Program office, requires a 1 to 1 federal/non-federal match, although on many occasions the federal dollars are leveraged much more than 1 to 1. The program has successfully promoted cooperative partnerships between state and local governments and the private sector to preserve targeted, high priority Civil War battlegrounds outside NPS boundaries. Since it was first funded in Fiscal Year (FY) 1999, the program has been used to protect more than 16,500 acres of our nation's hallowed ground.

The Opportune Time

This year marks the beginning of the sesquicentennial commemoration of the Civil War. It is an opportune time to recommit our energies to the protection of these hallowed grounds. Few commemorations are expected to generate more excitement and interest among Americans than this anniversary. Millions are expected to learn about our nation's unique history by visiting Civil War sites around the country in the next four years. This anniversary provides the perfect opportunity to promote preservation of Civil War battlefields. In late March, Secretary Salazar attended an event in Gettysburg to celebrate the preservation of some of the most blood-soaked ground still unprotected at Gettysburg. At that event, Secretary Salazar affirmed the Department of the Interior's commitment to promoting the 150th anniversary of the Civil War and the need to protect these hallowed grounds as legacies for future generations of Americans.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

John L. Nau, III
Houston, Texas
Chairman

O. James Lighthizer
Crofton, Maryland
President

Henry E. Simpson
Birmingham, Alabama
Vice Chairman

Mary Munsell Abroe
Wilmette, Illinois

Harrison M. Bains
New York, New York

Edwin C. Bearss
Arlington, Virginia

Kirk J. Bradley
Sanford, North Carolina

Paul W. Bryant, Jr.*
Tuscaloosa, Alabama

Walter W. Buckley, Jr.
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

Childs F. Burden
Middleburg, Virginia

Carlton B. Crenshaw
Pulmyra, Virginia

Beverly M. DuBose, III
Atlanta, Georgia

Michael Grainger
Franklin, Tennessee

John D. Haynes
Baldwyn, Mississippi

Jeffrey P. McClanathan
St. Petersburg, Florida

Stephan F. Newhouse
Summit, New Jersey

Libby O'Connell
Lloyd Harbor, New York

Cricket Bauer Pohanka
Alexandria, Virginia

Jeffrey R. Rodek
Columbus, Ohio

J. Dennis Sexton
St. Petersburg, Florida

Jeff Shaara
Sarasota, Florida

William W. Vodra
Alexandria, Virginia

Douglas W. Walker
Seattle, Washington

W. Denman Zirkle
Edinburg, Virginia

* Chairmen Emeritus

Battlefield Lands are Our Shared American Heritage

These battlefield lands are an irreplaceable part of our shared national heritage. These lands are consecrated with the blood of brave Americans who fought and died to create the country we are today. The private sector organizations engaged in battlefield preservation – and we are just one among many nonprofit battlefield preservation groups – are competing with developers to acquire this land. Once these hallowed grounds are lost, they are lost forever.

We estimate that 30 acres of battlefield lands are lost every day. These lands, when preserved, serve as outdoor classrooms to educate current and future generations of Americans about this defining moment in our nation's history. In addition, preserved battlefields are economic drivers for communities, bringing in tourism dollars that are extremely important to state and local economies.

Origins of the Program

In 1990, Congress created the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC), a blue-ribbon panel composed of lawmakers, historians and preservationists. Its goal: determine how to protect America's remaining Civil War battlefields. In 1993, the Commission released a study entitled "Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields." The report identified the 384 most historically important Civil War battlegrounds and further prioritized them according to preservation status and historic significance. Eighteen years later, this landmark report and a recent update conducted by NPS remain our guide for targeting only the most historically significant remaining Civil War battlefields.

In addition to creating a prioritized list of battlefield preservation targets, the Commission also recommended that Congress establish a federal matching grant program to help the nonprofit sector save high-priority Civil War battlefields. The Commission's proposal for a federal matching grant program was the genesis of the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program.

Congressional Funding and First Successes

Five years after the "Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields" was released, Congress acted upon the Commission's recommendation by setting aside \$8 million from the Land and Water Conservation Fund for Civil War preservation matching grants. This first appropriation for the program was made available over three years, and required a two-to-one non-federal/federal match. Grants were competitively awarded through the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP), an arm of NPS. Funding was solely for acquisition of properties outside NPS boundaries at battlefields identified in the 1993 report. Land could be purchased from willing sellers only; there was — and there remains — no eminent domain authority.

Thanks to the new program, there began an unprecedented and almost-immediate surge in Civil War battlefield preservation. The \$8 million appropriation generated \$24 million

for land acquisition by encouraging state and private investment in battlefield land protection. The program inspired the Virginia and Mississippi legislatures to appropriate \$3.4 million and \$2.8 million, respectively, to meet the federal match. The Civil War Trust alone contributed \$4 million in private sector funds to meet the match.

As a result of the non-federal funds generated by the program, battlefields like Virginia's Brandy Station and Manassas received a new lease on life. In addition, other sites such as Prairie Grove in Arkansas, Champion Hill in Mississippi, and Bentonville in North Carolina — just to name a few — were substantially enhanced. Largely because of the success of those first three years, Congress appropriated an additional \$11 million for the program in FY2002, this time with a 1-to-1 non-federal/federal match requirement.

Authorization of the Program

After approval of the FY2002 appropriation, authorization of the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program was the next logical step. Supporters on Capitol Hill felt that authorization of the program would convey to the Department of the Interior Congressional intent regarding the program's goals and objectives. Further, authorization would provide funding predictability for the program's non-federal partners, encouraging them to continue their involvement in battlefield preservation.

The authorization bill, entitled the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act of 2002, was introduced in the House and Senate in the summer of 2002. The bipartisan bill formally tied the program to the 1993 CWSAC report, creating a federal conservation program with a highly focused, prioritized list of acquisition targets. It also provided for an annual appropriation of up to \$10 million per year — the level originally recommended by the Commission in 1993. The Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act was passed with the unanimous consent of both the House and Senate in the fall of 2002, and was signed into law by President Bush on December 17, 2002 (P.L. 107-359).

Program's Continued Successes and Reauthorization

Since the program was first funded in FY1999, Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program grants have been used to protect 16,500 acres of hallowed ground in 14 states. Among the many battlefields that have benefited from this program are: Antietam, Maryland; Aversboro, North Carolina; Chancellorsville, Virginia; Chattanooga, Tennessee; Corinth, Mississippi; Harpers Ferry, West Virginia; and Perryville, Kentucky.

The Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program was reauthorized as part of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (H.R. 146), which President Obama signed into law on March 30, 2009 (P.L. 111-11).

Urgent Need for Funding

The program's entire FY2010 allocation has been obligated and spent to preserve more than 1,500 acres of sacred battlefield land. Under continuing resolutions, which the government has been operating under for FY2011, the program has effectively been frozen because the American Battlefield Protection Program is a small department within

NPS and therefore does not receive any allocation until a final spending bill is signed into law. This has already put a number of high-priority deals in jeopardy, as it is difficult to ask landowners, even when they are inclined to preserve their land, to wait for an extended period of time for funding to potentially become available. As a result of this situation, it is even more imperative that adequate funding is provided for the program in FY2012 in order to keep the program from grinding to a halt, in the midst of the Civil War sesquicentennial commemoration.

We respectfully ask the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies to fund the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program at its authorized amount of \$10 million. Please note that four members of the House Appropriations Committee sent a letter to President Obama in November 2010 requesting \$10 million funding for the program in FY2012. Recognizing the opportunity presented by the sesquicentennial, President Obama included a \$10 million request for the program as part of his FY2012 budget.

We recognize that these are difficult economic times and appreciate the constraints on this Subcommittee as you work to draft an appropriation bill that meets the needs of the agencies and programs under your jurisdiction. However, we believe that now is the opportune time to provide funding at the \$10 million level for the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program, especially with this being the first year of the 150th anniversary of the Civil War. Funding at this level will allow for the continued success of the program and the preservation of key battlefield lands that will serve as lasting, tangible legacies for the sesquicentennial. In addition, with time rapidly running out to forever protect these hallowed grounds, funding for this program will soon no longer be necessary. We estimate that in the next five to ten years the remaining Civil War battlefield lands will be either paved over or protected. That is why we must act now in order to preserve as much key battlefield land as possible before time runs out.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the Civil War was a defining moment in our country's history. For four long years, North and South clashed in hundreds of battles that reunited our nation and sounded the death knell for slavery. More than 625,000 soldiers and 50,000 civilians perished as a result of the war.

Preserved battlefields not only honor the memory of our Civil War ancestors, but all of our nation's brave men and women in uniform. Further, preserved battlefields serve as outdoor classrooms to teach new generations of Americans about the significance of the Civil War — and remind them that the freedoms we enjoy today came at a terrific price.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope you and your subcommittee will consider our request to provide funding of the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program at its authorized level of \$10 million. As noted, this is especially important as the nation begins the sesquicentennial commemoration of the Civil War. We look forward to working with you and other subcommittee members on battlefield protection and other historic preservation issues. Thank you for the opportunity to address the committee.

**Testimony of Trace Adkins
Country Music Singer-Songwriter, Avid Student of History, Descendant of
Civil War soldier**

**Before the Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
United States House of Representatives**

April 14, 2011

Introduction

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is Trace Adkins and I am a country music artist, an avid student of history and a descendant of a confederate soldier who fought in the Civil War. Throughout the years, I have visited many hallowed battlegrounds. Through the preservation of these sites, I was able to stand upon the ground where the soldiers stood and reflect upon the epic sacrifices made on those lands.

I come before you today to share my personal interest in the Civil War and why I believe it is so important to preserve the last tangible links to this history, the battlefield lands where hundreds of thousands of brave soldiers, including my great-great grandfather, fought and died. With this being the first year of the 150th anniversary of the Civil War, now is the opportune time to redouble efforts to forever protect these hallowed grounds.

My Personal Connection to the Civil War

Growing up in Sarepta, Louisiana and now living near Nashville, Tennessee I have spent much of my life surrounded by Civil War battlefields. My interest in the Civil War grew out of a conversation I had with my grandfather when I was 13 years old, during which he told me the story of my great-great grandfather, Henry T. Morgan. Henry Morgan was a private in the 31st Louisiana Infantry. He was wounded and taken prisoner at Vicksburg in 1863.

I was fortunate enough to be able to visit Vicksburg National Military Park, now a part of the National Park Service (NPS) system. During my first visit to Vicksburg I got to stand where I knew I was within 100 feet or so of where my great-great grandfather was positioned in that battle. Because of the preservation of that battlefield, I was able to look across the battlefield and see it the way it looked when my great-great grandfather was there. Words cannot describe what a spiritual moment that was for me. That moment would not have been possible had it not been for the preservation of that hallowed ground.

The Time is Now, Before These Lands are Lost Forever

The seriousness of the threat to these unique resources was truly brought home to me one winter day while I was stuck in traffic on Interstate 65 in middle Tennessee. I looked out the window of my truck and realized that I was stopped within site of Overton Hill. Overton Hill was the site of the Union attack on Confederate General John Bell Hood's right flank during the Battle of Nashville in December 1864. Although the initial charge failed, a second charge succeeded in forcing Hood's troops to retreat. Overton Hill is now occupied by a high school, football stadium and a smattering of small businesses.

As I was sitting in my truck on that December day, I realized that the date was December 15, the same day that the Battle of Nashville took place in 1864. I thought to myself that if I got out of my truck and went randomly walking up and down the backed-up interstate, knocking on a few people's car windows, asking them if they knew what happened on that hill 143 years ago on that very day, could they tell me? Sadly, I was forced to admit to myself that there likely was not a car within a half mile with an occupant who could recite the story of what happened on that hill. Writing of Overton Hill after the battle in December 1864, somebody wrote that you could walk from the bottom of the hill to the top without putting your foot on the ground – that you could walk on soldiers' bodies up that hill. Blood was literally flowing down that hill on the morning of December 15, 1864.

It was this moment that I realized the importance of preserving Civil War battlegrounds – now, before they are paved over and forgotten. The difference between a battle that is written about and taught to our children and one that is largely forgotten can be summed up in one word – preservation. I would like to highlight one such example. Contrast Pickett's Charge at Gettysburg and a similar frontal assault at Franklin, Tennessee, near where I live. Franklin had twice as many casualties, lasted two or three times as long and the attackers went twice as far against much greater odds. Yet, we remember and hear more about Pickett's Charge than Franklin. The reason for that difference is that Franklin was paved over around the turn of the twentieth century.

Preserved Battlefields are American Treasures

These historic landscapes are truly American treasures. Preserved battlefields are cultural and historic landscapes that serve as a constant reminder of the sacrifices our ancestors made to make this country what it is today. In addition, preserved battlefield lands become outdoor classrooms for today's visitors and those in countless generations to come – telling the story of the war: from the way people fought, to where they fought, and why they fought.

The protection of America's remaining Civil War battlefields will leave a legacy of national commitment to preservation and conservation. These lands will be open spaces for the public to enjoy, preserved in their natural and pristine state. Tourists will be able to come to these sites for the contemplative experience they desire; walking the grounds and seeing the landscape much the same as it would have been during the Civil War, just

as I did at Vicksburg National Military Park. This experience is unlike anything you can read in a book about the conflict. Preserved battlefields are a legacy we will leave for future generations – a tangible link to the history that defined our nation.

The Civil War Sesquicentennial Anniversary

The anniversary of the firing on Fort Sumter occurred just a few days ago on April 12. This marked the beginning of the 150th anniversary commemoration of the Civil War, which will last for the next four years. The sesquicentennial is expected to generate more public interest and visitation to Civil War battlefields than ever before. We need to take advantage of this anniversary to rededicate our efforts toward preserving these battlefields by instilling the protection of remaining Civil War battlefields as a cornerstone of this observance, creating a legacy that will long outlast the anniversary. This is really the last opportunity to make a strong commitment to the preservation of these historically significant sites.

We are in a race against time – 30 acres of battlefield land are lost every day. Development threatens to erase these sacred sites and with the loss of these tangible links our living history will consequently fade into distant memory, and all will be lost forever. Timing is especially critical in areas of the country experiencing rapid growth and development pressures. Places like the Atlanta suburbs, middle Tennessee and central Virginia have been experiencing this situation for more than a decade, and, even in these challenging economic times, the price of agricultural land in these regions remains high. Time is running out and opportunities are dwindling to forever protect these hallowed grounds.

Now is the time to take action to save our nation's treasured cultural and historic landscapes.

The Civil War Trust

I want to highlight an organization that has taken on the role of preserving these national treasures and for that reason I whole-heartedly support the efforts of this organization. The Civil War Trust is the only national nonprofit organization dedicated to the preservation of these hallowed grounds. The Civil War Trust has preserved more than 30,000 acres of battlefield lands in 20 states, including more than 2,200 acres in my home state of Tennessee.

The Trust works with willing sellers to either purchase the land fee-simple or place a conservation easement on the land, always at fair market value. The Trust raises money through donations from its more than 55,000 members nationwide, and then leverages those private dollars with local, state and federal grant monies. Congress has been an important partner in battlefield preservation, through funding of the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program (CWBPP), the primary source of federal funding for battlefield preservation. CWBPP is an example of a highly successful public-private partnership, helping to preserve more than 16,500 acres of battlefield land in 14 states.

Without the work of the Civil War Trust and the assistance provided by the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program, preservation of Civil War battlefield lands would be severely lacking. These tangible links to our nation's past would be dwindling at a faster pace than they are now, or in many cases they would be already lost.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, I hope that I have demonstrated how important I believe battlefield preservation is and why the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Civil War is the ideal time to redouble efforts toward preservation of these historically significant sites. These lands are our shared American heritage – sites where we can visit, reflect and contemplate the sacrifices made by our ancestors to make our country the great country it is today.

As a descendant of a Civil War soldier, I can think of no better tribute during the 150th anniversary of the Civil War than to make a firm commitment to the preservation of these hallowed grounds that saw such desperate combat. If adequate funding is provided, there are opportunities during the sesquicentennial to complete the preservation of a number of battlefields. What a fitting legacy to leave our children, grandchildren and all future generations of Americans – tangible links to our nation's past.

Thank you for the opportunity to address your committee.

Margaret M. Graves, President, Partners in Preservation

We are at risk of losing our heritage if we do not use innovative solutions like historic leases to meet the challenges the National Park Service faces as the primary steward of our historic built environment. According to the National Trust for Historic Preservation, 2,811 historic structures of national significance are in poor condition in the Park System. Fiscal common sense requires the Park Service to embrace private preservation minded partners like Partners in Preservation to stem the loss of historic resources.

The National Park Service Organic Act directs the National Park Service “to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” This directive presents a significant challenge for the National Park Service which is currently responsible for conserving 27,000 historic and prehistoric structures and 84 million acres of land.

The National Park Service is failing to fulfill its mandate to preserve the nation’s historic resources. The National Park Service estimates that its deferred maintenance needs are currently \$10.8 billion, \$3 billion of which is for structures listed on the National Register of Historic Places. This staggering sum represents more than simply leaking rooftops, it represents the potential loss of a historic legacy for future generations. Government funds alone will not resolve this crisis. The Fiscal Year 2010 budget for the National Park Service is \$3.16 billion. The NPS request for Fiscal Year 2011 is \$3.14 billion. Private funds are needed to save the nation’s historic resources.

Historic leases provide an opportunity to attract private capital and expertise to the challenges of preservation of park resources. Leases offer a cost effective tool to preserve historic park structures that are underutilized and therefore at risk of deterioration. In a historic lease, the lessee agrees to invest in the rehabilitation and maintenance of the leased structure in exchange for the right to use the structure. A historic lease shifts the burden of maintenance to the lessee for the duration of the lease term. Because many of the historic structures available for leasing are not in pristine condition, many leases provide for lessee performed rehabilitation in lieu of rent. Depending on the condition of the property at the beginning of the lease term, the lessee may be required to pay rent. This much needed boost in revenue remains in the park to be used for other park needs. Historic leases offer a win win solution because they provide for privately funded preservation and maintenance and an opportunity for enhanced revenue for public park purposes. A recent report prepared by the NPCA states that in fiscal year 2009, 26 parks reported leasing revenue totaling 4.3 million dollars.

The value of historic leases is not only in the dollars generated in revenue but also in value of rehabilitating, restoring and maintaining park resources with private funds, saving taxpayer funds for other national priorities. Given the current federal budget crisis, the National Park Service is

unlikely to ever have all of the funds necessary to preserve the 27,000 National Register listed structures within the Park System.

Unfortunately, the National Park Service has made only limited use of historic leases to date. According to the most recent information available from Advisory Council of Historic Preservation 2008 Progress Report, in Fiscal Year 2007, 48 parks leased a total of 147 historic properties.¹ This represents a small fraction of the historic properties eligible for historic leases. Bureaucratic reluctance to embrace private preservation partners must be overcome to save historic structures from demolition by neglect. As members of the Appropriations Subcommittee with control over the Park Service's budget, you have the opportunity to direct the Park Service to pursue more historic leases or risk losing more of the nation's historic assets.

The legal framework for historic leases is well established. Historic leases are authorized by Section 111 of the National Historic Preservation Act and comprehensive regulations are included in 36 Code of Federal Regulations Part 18. In addition, Director's Order 38, issued on January 20, 2006, and the NPS Leasing Reference Manual, issued in 2005, provide substantial regulatory guidance.

A recent report prepared by the Center for Park Management outlines the many benefits of historic leases. Benefits include:

- Underutilized park structures are restored
- Provides funding for historic preservation and maintenance
- Provides NPS with option to offer preservation tax credit, as only income producing properties are eligible
- NPS ownership of capital improvements made by the lessee
- Repairs, renovation and maintenance of park facilities and infrastructure
- Reduces workload for park maintenance staff
- Reduces liability for hazardous assets
- Additional revenue for park
- Park assets are refurbished with private sector development expertise and financing
- Assets continue to be well maintained, enhancing National Park Service mission
- Fosters economic growth in the local community
- Strengthens relationship between park and local business

¹ Advisory Council for Historic Preservation Progress Report dated September 30, 2008. Although there is no current inventory of historic leases, there is an ongoing effort to collect this information and make it accessible to park personnel.

- Outreach to community²

Historic leases have not been fully utilized in part because there is limited park-level knowledge and understanding of the leasing authority and program. Local superintendents are faced with a myriad of challenges and often lack the resources to explore creative solutions to management challenges and yet they have a great deal of discretion to make decisions that can directly impact whether a park's historic resources survive. I have seen historic resources demolished by benign neglect. Many park superintendents are unaware of historic leasing benefits and therefore do not pursue this option. I personally have found it necessary to educate park personnel at the local level about historic leases and the benefits they offer. Individual parks need to be encouraged to educate themselves about historic leases and to proactively identify leasing opportunities.

The parks that have pursued historic leases are enthusiastic about the benefits and believe that the program has real potential to address critical historic preservation needs. Historic leases have been granted in the following parks:

Acadia National Park
Antietam National Battlefield
Appomattox Court House National Historic Park
Boston National Historical Park
Buffalo National River
Cape Cod National Seashore
Cape Lookout National Seashore
Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historic Park
Chickamauga & Chattanooga National Military Park
Cuyahoga Valley National Recreational Area
Golden Gate National Recreational Area
Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site
Herbert Hoover National Historic Site
Hopewell Culture National Historic Park
Horse Shoe Bend National Military Park
Hot Springs
Independence National Historic Park
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore
John Day Fossil Beds
Keweenaw National Historic Park
Klondike Gold Rush

² National Park Service Leasing Program Assessment Final Report: Finding and Recommendations by Kristen McConnell, Stephanie Hester, Geoff Kish. November, 2010

Lincoln Home National Historic Site
Lowell National Historic Park
Martin Luther King, Jr. National Historic Site
Pea Ridge National Military Park
San Francisco Maritime National Historic Park
Shiloh National Military Park
Statue of Liberty National Monument
Valley Forge National Historic Park³

These leases include historic structures of all sizes and types and agricultural land. Each lease is crafted to the specific site's needs but all of the leases require that any rehabilitation or restoration work meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards guaranteeing only quality work.

Cumberland Island National Seashore offers a textbook example of how a historic lease could enhance the preservation of the Seashore's historic resources. Cumberland Island National Seashore was established in 1972 "in order to provide for public outdoor recreation, use and enjoyment of ... shoreline, and waters ... and to preserve related scenic, scientific, and historical values." 16 U.S.C.459i. The Seashore includes a myriad of diverse historic resources ranging from Native American shell middens to large historic mansions. The National Park Service is responsible for the preservation of 82 individual historic structures and 47 known archeological sites within the Seashore. In Fiscal Year 2009, the Seashore spent \$1.3 million on maintenance expenses and yet these funds were inadequate, a fact acknowledged by park personnel and outside advocacy organizations.⁴ In December 2010, the NPS gained control of the Grange and Beach Creek Dock House, two National Register listed structures highly visible to Park visitors. The National Park Service does not have a use for these structures nor the funds to preserve them. Partners in Preservation is willing to invest the necessary funds to rehabilitate these structures at an estimated cost of \$1 million to ensure they are left "unimpaired for future generations." Other National Register listed structures within the Seashore have been lost to demolition by neglect due to inadequate maintenance funds. A historic lease of these structures would guarantee their preservation and alleviate the maintenance burden on the National Park Service – a win, win, win for the public, the Park Service and future generations.

In sum, our nation's heritage is at risk of being lost due to the lack of necessary public funds to preserve and protect historic resources within the National Park System. If the National Park Service embraces historic leases as a flexible, cost effective tool, many historic resources can be saved for the benefit of future generations. The alternative is to leave future generations a crumbling legacy of diminished historic resources and a loss of national heritage.

³ Report of the National Park Service Sept.30,2004 pursuant to Executive Order 13287 "Preserve America"
Section 3 Improving Federal Agency Planning and Accountability

⁴ 2009 National Parks Conservation Association State of Parks Report for Cumberland Island National Seashore.

Testimony on behalf of the Federation of State Humanities Councils

Prepared for the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies by Trent L. Clark, Director of Public and Government Affairs for Monsanto Company; Board member, Idaho Humanities Council; Addressing the National Endowment for the Humanities, April 1, 2011.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to present testimony on behalf of the state humanities councils, the state affiliates of the National Endowment for the Humanities. I am the Public Affairs Director with Monsanto, an agricultural technology business whose western U.S. manufacturing is based in Soda Springs, Idaho, and I am here to support the humanities community request for FY 2012 of \$167.5 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities, including \$47 million for the Federal-State Partnership (combining the FY 2010 levels of \$40.3 million through the Federal/State Partnership and \$6.8 million through We the People).

As a businessman, I understand the importance of investment, and this is what the state council funding is—an investment in our communities. But what an investment! The \$47 million in funding for the state councils is allocated among the 56 councils and goes directly to the states for activities that educate and engage individuals and strengthen our communities. Our heritage, our culture, our stories, our ideals and values matter, and funding for what defines us as a people is as vital to our nation as is an investment in science and technology.

I also understand the importance of maximizing the return on investment, and this is what the state humanities councils do with the federal funds they administer. As full partners of the NEH, councils receive their core funding through the Federal/State Partnership line of the NEH budget and use that funding to leverage additional funds from such sources as state government, foundations, corporations, and private individuals. In 2010, every federal dollar the councils awarded through grants to local institutions leveraged, on average, \$5.50 in local contributions. Councils further extend their resources by forming programming partnerships with organizations and institutions throughout their states. As a taxpayer, I applaud the care with which councils use these funds; as a citizen, I appreciate the many benefits Americans gain through their programs. The funding you allocate to the state humanities councils represents an investment in the nation's communities, cultural and civic organizations, and educational infrastructure.

There are a number of other reasons that maintaining the current funding level for the state humanities councils is so important at this critical time.

1) **Council programs educate citizens across the country every day.** In my home state of Idaho, the Idaho Humanities Council awards over \$200,000 annually in grants. At a recent meeting, the council fielded an unprecedented number of requests for grant support and awarded more than \$85,000 to organizations to fund programs ranging from new museum exhibits in Bonners Ferry in Idaho's panhandle to a Welsh cultural festival in Malad in southeast Idaho, and from a project launched by the Fort Hall Shoshoni-Bannock Reservation exploring the history of the Fort Bridger Treaty to community-wide reading programs in Rexburg and Lewiston. In 2011 and 2012 the council will sponsor a tour of the Smithsonian traveling exhibit, "The Way We Worked," about the history of work in America, to six Idaho communities—Priest River, McCall, Coeur d'Alene, Burley, Twin Falls, and Bonners Ferry. The council will also sponsor

lectures by journalists and historians in three Idaho cities. These are examples from just one state of the array of council programs. The councils make education an accessible community experience, at very low or no cost.

2) Council programs reach communities in every corner of the states. In 2010 council programs reached 5,700 communities, many of them in rural areas where council programs were the only cultural or educational programs available to the citizens. These programs are tailored to the needs of the state and are often designed by local institutions and organizations. The Kansas Humanities Council, for example, in 2004 launched an initiative called “Kansans Tell Their Stories” to support projects allowing citizens of the state to explore their heritage and traditions. The initiative has so far supported 64 grant programs in 55 communities, engaging 314,440 Kansans either in person or online, in community-initiated programs including oral histories, research projects, museum exhibitions, television series, podcasts, and special speakers. As the librarian who hosted one of these programs said, “We can keep the doors open and provide basic services, but it’s the Kansas Humanities Council programs and projects that really kick us up a notch and enhance our library and community.”

Since 1992, the Kentucky Humanities Council’s Kentucky Chautauqua has educated citizens about the state’s history, heritage, and culture through engaging presentations by scholars portraying famous figures, such as Henry Clay and George Rogers Clark, and lesser-known but important Kentuckians such as Lt. Anna Mac Clarke, who was the first African American officer to command white troops. From 2008 to 2010, 726 Kentucky Chautauqua presentations took place, serving all of the state’s 120 counties and engaging 53,000 adults. During the same period, the Kentucky Chautauqua classroom programs provided education in American history and civics for 35,346 Kentucky schoolchildren.

Many programs and activities supported by council grants simply would not happen if council funding disappeared; citizens in thousands of communities across the country would be deprived of opportunities to learn about the events and ideas that shaped their state and nation.

3) Councils preserve and strengthen local institutions. Councils are the primary support structure for culture across their states. Over the past few years, as the economic downturn hit one organization after another, council grants and collaborations have made it possible for these organizations to continue providing programs that kept their communities vibrant. Because of the collaborations forged by state humanities councils, 175 organizations in each state, on average, were able to continue to serve their citizens. The councils are particularly effective at providing support that builds the professionalism of community institutions and organizations. A prime illustration is the Museum Interpretation Initiative in Utah, which helps Utah’s 255 museums strengthen their interpretation skills, create more effective exhibitions, provide more sophisticated learning experiences for their own community residents, and attract tourists to the area. A curator at one of the participating museums told the council, “Our museum’s capacity to provide interpretive programming has increased tremendously. Rather than just throwing together displays, we now know how to create interpretive exhibits, and supplement them with interactive elements, self-guides, and more educational tours and programs. I think we have become a very different and better museum.”

Museums and libraries are among the most important institutions in any community, and state humanities councils are principal supporters of both. Since 2009 the California Council for the Humanities, with financial support from NEH and the California State Library, has worked with the County Library Systems to train librarians to facilitate dialogue in their communities. Librarians in the participating systems develop their own programs and lead discussions of importance to their communities. As evidence of the benefits of this program to the libraries themselves, the Riverside Library System reported in 2009 that all 34 libraries in their system had formed new partnerships, forged closer relationships with civic and political leaders, attracted new volunteers, and strengthened professional relationships with other library branches. The initiative provided citizens of the communities with an opportunity for highly participatory conversations in a welcoming atmosphere about important questions affecting their day-to-day lives, while also transforming libraries into vital community centers.

4) Councils support K-12 education. In this economic climate, state budget cuts are not just killing innovative programs for students and teachers but in some states are eroding such basic programs as history, civics, and social studies. Councils are the only resource in many states providing professional development for teachers and are often the only entity providing support for civics education, an increasingly important area of learning for students. The state of Rhode Island recognized the seriousness of this need several years ago and created a commission that developed standards for civic education, but at the time, the fiscal environment made it impossible to implement the standards. A year ago the Rhode Island Council for the Humanities revived this effort with a statewide initiative called “Democracy Demands Wisdom: Grants for Civic Education.” Grants have been awarded to fund professional development for teachers, creation of curricular materials, and creative opportunities for students to learn about their responsibilities as citizens in a democracy.

Engaged and well-educated teachers are essential to ensure that our nation’s classrooms are a creative and vibrant learning environment. Humanities Texas offers a “Teacher Enrichment Program,” which enables classroom teachers to study important topics in U.S. and Texas history with the nation’s leading scholars. This program helps teachers expand their mastery of the subjects they teach and provides instructional resources such as facsimiles of historical documents and photographs as well as digital and online resources. The council actively recruits early-career teachers working in low-performing schools, thereby serving those in greatest need of training. Of the 492 teachers who participated last year, 85 percent teach in schools, districts, or areas in which students struggle on statewide assessments, and 54 percent have just five years or less of classroom experience.

Councils also provide grounding for teachers in subjects of specific importance to the students of their state. Last year the Ohio Humanities Council offered a two-week summer institute for teachers called “A People and their Homeland: the Miami Tribe,” which immersed teachers in the cultural history of the Miami as well the natural history of the tribe’s ancestral land, plants and animals.

Despite severe cutbacks in public education recently enacted by the Idaho State Legislature, the Idaho Humanities Council, with sufficient federal funding, will continue to provide transformative opportunities for K-12 teachers, including annual intensive week-long residential

summer institutes exploring such topics as Native American literature, the works of Mark Twain and Ernest Hemingway, the U.S. Constitution, Idaho history, and the presidencies of Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson. But the council already receives far more applications than it can accommodate each year, and a reduction of federal funding will further harm this program.

5) Councils help build understanding of community history and identity. The local history and heritage programs councils support are of tremendous value to the residents of the state, helping not only to promote understanding of the challenges and triumphs individual communities have experienced but also to unite them. A program funded by the Oklahoma Humanities Council, entitled “Drought, Determination, and Displacement: A Dust Bowl Symposium,” offered a day-long event that included lectures, exhibits, films, and oral histories commemorating the 75th anniversary of Black Sunday, the day the worst “duster” struck the area. Humanities scholars helped guide 675 individuals from Panhandle counties through an exploration of the cultural, social, and economic legacy of the Dust Bowl in one of its hardest hit areas. The program enabled citizens of all ages to explore a difficult but important period, engage in dialogue with their neighbors, and learn from the leading humanities scholars in the field. One participant commented, “This program was valuable since younger people need to know and understand the past.” The financing of the program was itself a demonstration of community cooperation—and of the multiplier effect of the federal dollars awarded by councils: a \$7,000 grant from the council leveraged \$50,960 from a local community foundation that included funds from several local banks, the local library, a utility company, and local citizens.

The Wyoming Humanities Council’s “A Wyoming Conversation” program several years ago drew more than 60,000 citizens into facilitated conversations in twelve communities on changes affecting Wyoming. The council followed this up in subsequent years with conversations on three topics of particular importance to the citizens of the state—family, newcomers, and the balance between preservation and development. These conversations were launched through a variety of formats, including radio programs, theater productions, newspaper editorials, and a public television forum with the Governor and First Lady participating in a citizen panel.

Council programs play a valuable role in helping communities put current issues in historical context. In 2008 the Tompkins County legislature approved a comprehensive county-wide plan to achieve an 80 percent reduction of carbon emissions by 2050. The New York Council for the Humanities funded an exhibit to educate residents about the local environmental sustainability movement. Displayed in the History Center in Tompkins County, it drew from a series of public programs involving experts and concerned citizens. The exhibit narrative spans hundreds of years, from the contributions of the Haudensaunee, or Iroquois, to the creation of local environmental and energy efficiency organizations, and illustrates the evolving meaning of environmental sustainability.

To help meet growing needs in their communities, councils have steadily expanded and diversified their funding base over the past decade, but the federal investment in these programs is critical to their ability to leverage other funds and maintain their core operations. We are asking you to provide funding that will allow them to continue to build on that federal investment to serve the citizens of your states and those of your colleagues across the nation.