S. HRG. 110–266

MISCELLANEOUS NATIONAL PARKS LEGISLATION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 128	**S. 1476**
S. 148	**S. 1709**
S. 189	**S. 1808**
S. 697	**S. 1969**
S. 867	**H.R. 299**
S. 1039	**H.R. 1239**
S. 1341	

SEPTEMBER 27, 2007

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

40–443 PDF WASHINGTON : 2008

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico, *Chairman*

DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
RON WYDEN, Oregon
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
MARIA CANTWELL, Washington
KEN SALAZAR, Colorado
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
BLANCHE L. LINCOLN, Arkansas
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
JON TESTER, Montana

PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
LARRY E. CRAIG, Idaho
LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
RICHARD BURR, North Carolina
JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
BOB CORKER, Tennessee
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon
JIM BUNNING, Kentucky
MEL MARTINEZ, Florida

ROBERT M. SIMON, *Staff Director*
SAM E. FOWLER, *Chief Counsel*
FRANK MACCHIAROLA, *Republican Staff Director*
JUDITH K. PENSABENE, *Republican Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii, *Chairman*

BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
KEN SALAZAR, Colorado
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey
BLANCHE L. LINCOLN, Arkansas
BERNARD SANDERS, Vermont
JON TESTER, Montana

RICHARD BURR, North Carolina
LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
BOB CORKER, Tennessee
JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
GORDON H. SMITH, Oregon
MEL MARTINEZ, Florida

JEFF BINGAMAN and PETE V. DOMENICI are Ex Officio Members of the Subcommittee

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

	Page
Akaka, Hon. Daniel K., U.S. Senator From Hawaii	1
Allard, Hon. Wayne, U.S. Senator From Colorado	9
Biden, Hon. Joseph R., Jr., U.S. Senator From Delaware	4
Brooks, Tom, Assistant Vice President and Chief Engineer, Alaska Railroad, Anchorage, AK	41
Burr, Hon. Richard, U.S. Senator From North Carolina	9
Carlino, August R., CEO and President, Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, Homestead, PA	42
Casey, Hon. Robert P., Jr., U.S. Senator From Pennsylvania	3
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator From Massachusetts	3
Kyl, Hon. Jon, U.S. Senator From Arizona	4
Lautenberg, Hon. Frank R., U.S. Senator From New Jersey	5
Levin, Hon. Carl, U.S. Senator From Michigan	11
Menendez, Hon. Robert, U.S. Senator From New Jersey	7
Murkowski, Hon. Lisa, U.S. Senator From Alaska	6
Pascrell, Hon. Bill, Jr., U.S. Representive From New Jersey	16
Salazar, Hon. Ken, U.S. Senator From Colorado	14
Specter, Hon. Arlen, U.S. Senator From Pennsylvania	2
Wenk, Daniel N., Deputy Director, National Park Service, Department of the Interior	19
Zax, Leonard A., Partner, Latham & Watkins, LLP, on Behalf of the New Jersey Community Development Corporation	46

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to additional questions 61

APPENDIX II

Additional material submitted for the record 73

MISCELLANEOUS NATIONAL PARKS LEGISLATION

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2007

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

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:28 p.m. in room SD–366, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Daniel K. Akaka presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA, U.S. SENATOR FROM HAWAII

Senator AKAKA. Good morning, everyone. The Subcommittee on National Parks will come to order.

In an effort to address the many requests we have received for hearings on Park-related bills in as timely a manner as possible, we're going to continue our recent practice of considering as many bills as possible at each hearing.

This afternoon we will receive testimony on 11 different bills, including S. 128, to amend the Cache La Poudre River Corridor Act to designate a new management entity and make other amendments; S. 148, to establish the Paterson Great Falls National Park in the State of New Jersey; S. 189, to decrease the matching funds requirement and authorize additional appropriations for Keweenaw National Historical Park in the State of Michigan; S. 697, to establish the Steel Industry National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania; S. 867 and H.R. 299, to adjust the boundary of Lowell National Historical Park in the State of Massachusetts; S. 1039 to extend the authorization for the Coastal Heritage Trail in the State of New Jersey; S. 1341, to provide for the exchange of certain Bureau of Land Management in Pima County, Arizona; S. 1476, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resources study of the Tule Lake Segregation Center in California, to determine the suitability and feasibility of including the site in the National Park System; S. 1709 and H.R. 1239, to amend the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Act of 1998 to provide additional staff and funding to carry out the Act; S. 1808, to authorize the exchange of land between the National Park Service and the Alaska Railroad in Denali National Park in the State of Alaska; and S. 1969, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating Estate Grange and other sites related to

Alexander Hamilton's life on the island of St. Croix in the U.S. Virgin Islands as a unit of the National Park System.

After reviewing the Administration's testimony, I believe most of these bills will be non-controversial. However, there are two bills that propose new National Park areas despite a contrary recommendation from the Park Service Study. I'm concerned with any proposal that ignores the requirements and criteria for new park areas, that this committee helped put into place. I wanted to give the proponents of those areas a chance to present their views. So, we have included both bills on this agenda and we can review these in greater detail later in the hearing.

[The prepared statements of Senators Specter, Casey, Kennedy, Kyl, Biden, and Lautenberg follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ARLEN SPECTER, U.S. SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA, ON S. 697

Mr Chairman, thank you for including this legislation in your hearing today that will honor the importance of the steel industry in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the nation by creating the "Steel Industry National Historic Site" to be operated by the National Park Service. I have introduced this bill dating back to the 107th Congress and it is my hope it will at last become law. We came very close to passing this bill in the 108th Congress with its passage in various forms in the House and the Senate. However, Congress adjourned prior to final passage of the same bill in both chambers during the 108th and 109th Congresses.

The importance of the steel industry to the development of the United States cannot be overstated. A national historic site devoted to the history of the steel industry will afford all Americans the opportunity to celebrate this rich heritage, which is symbolic of the work ethic endemic to this great nation. There is no better place for such a site than in southwestern Pennsylvania, which played a significant role in early industrial America and continues today.

It is important to note why Pennsylvania should be the home of the national site my legislation authorizes. The combination of a strong workforce, valuable natural resources, and Pennsylvania's strategic location in the heavily populated northeastern United States allowed the steel industry to thrive. Today, the remaining buildings and sites devoted to steel production are threatened with further deterioration. Many of these sites are nationally significant and perfectly suited for the study and interpretation of this crucial period in our nation's development. The historic site would include three properties: the Carrie Furnace Complex, the Hot Metal Bridge, and the United States Steel Homestead Works. As testimony of the area's historic significance, on September 20, 2006, the Carrie Furnaces were designated as a National Historic Landmark by the Secretary of the Interior.

Highlights of such a national historic site would commemorate a wide range of accomplishments and topics for historical preservation and interpretation from industrial process advancements to labor-management relations. It is important to note that the site I seek to become a national site under this bill includes the location of the Battle of Homestead, waged in 1892 between steelworkers and Pinkerton guards. The Battle of Homestead marked a crucial period in our nation's workers' rights movement. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, individuals, and public and private entities have attempted to protect and preserve resources such as the Homestead battleground and the Hot Metal Bridge. For the benefit and inspiration of present and future generations, it is time for the federal government to join this effort to recognize their importance with the additional protection I provide in this bill.

I would like to commend my colleagues who have joined me in supporting the Steel Industry National Historic Site. Senator Casey joined as a cosponsor this Congress and Representative Doyle has been a longstanding leader in this preservation effort and has consistently sponsored identical legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives. I commend the southwestern Pennsylvania officials and Mr. August Carlino, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, who have worked tirelessly to bring this national historic site to fruition.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., U.S. SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA, ON S. 697

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding today's hearing and for giving me the opportunity to testify on S. 697, the Steel Industry National Historic Site Act. I am proud to join my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Senator Specter and Congressman Doyle, in sponsoring this legislation. The introduction of S. 697 and the House companion bill H.R. 285 is the culmination of our effort to establish a unit of the National Parks System that honors the contributions of Southwestern Pennsylvania to our nation's steel industry. The story of the steel industry is linked to the history and the identity of Pennsylvania, and we are very proud of this heritage.

With only 391 National Park sites across the country, additions to the National Park System must be reserved for locations with special historical or environmental significance. In my view, the assets of this particular site, including the Carrie Furnace Complex, the United States Steel Homestead Works, and the Hot Metal Bridge meet this high standard because of their central importance in the history of the steel industry to the development of both our country's unsurpassed economic vitality as well as the vigorous workforce that fueled such achievements.

The wide availability of domestically-produced steel has represented the backbone of the United States economy since the mid-19th century. It was at sites like the Carrie Furnace, which first opened in 1907, that fuel and ore would combine to produce pig iron, the main ingredient of steel. At its peak, Carrie produced 900 to 1000 tons of this every day, which, when combined with the massive steel production capabilities across the river at the Homestead Works, helped to establish the Pittsburgh region as the world's leading producer of iron and steel during the late 19th and 20th centuries. As a nation that relied upon these structures to produce the materials to build our national highways and railroads, fight two world wars, and erect the skylines of our most vibrant cities, we cannot afford to let them fall victim to the strains of age or the perils of redevelopment.

But the lessons that these sites have to impart to this and future generations extend far beyond the mechanics of pre-World War II iron and steel making technology. The rise of Pittsburgh's steel industry was naturally accompanied by the development of a large and organized workforce. Specifically, the experiences of the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steelworkers at the end of the 19th century at Homestead provide a troubling yet critical reminder of the sacrifices that organized labor has made in the pursuit of fair and equitable working standards for the millions who have and continue to toil in this industry every day. We owe these brave men and women a proper stage to tell their story, and this Congress has the opportunity to make this possible through the powerful and prominent dais afforded by a National Historic Site.

Thank you once again, Mr. Chairman, for including S. 697 in today's hearing. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Mr. August Carlino for offering his expert testimony and for responding to any concerns the committee may have. His tireless efforts over the last seventeen years are the primary reason that this effort has gained such widespread appeal.

I hope that the Subcommittee and the full Committee will act swiftly to report this measure to the full Senate so that we might move one step further towards its final passage in the 110th Congress.

Thank you.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, U.S. SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS, ON S. 867 AND H.R. 299

I commend Chairman Akaka and Senator Burr for holding this hearing. Senator Kerry and I introduced the Lowell Park Boundary Adjustment Bill last March, shortly after the House passed Congressman Meehan's identical legislation, and I appreciate this opportunity to emphasize my strong support for it, which will add an historically important recreational resource in Massachusetts.

The bill would authorize the National Park Service to acquire five tracts of land expanding the current boundary of the Park. The land totals less than one acre, but its inclusion in the Park will complete a 5 mile scenic walkway along Lowell's historic canal system. The finished walkway will improve public access to the Park and its vast collection of cultural relics and information about its famous canal-powered factories during the Industrial Revolution.

I had the privilege nearly thirty years ago, with Congressman Paul Tsongas and Senator Ed Brooke, to sponsor the original legislation creating the National Historical Park. Each year, it holds festivals, art exhibitions, community service events and concerts for three-quarters of a million visitors. In recent years, the National

Park Service has continued to work with the City of Lowell to maintain and develop the city's famous canal walkways and river-walk.

Passage of this legislation will enable the historic canal walkway project to be completed, so that visitors will have a fuller experience of the nation's industrial heritage.

I look forward to the enactment of this legislation and I commend the Subcommittee for holding this hearing.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JON KYL, U.S. SENATOR FROM ARIZONA, ON S. 1341

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for holding this hearing on S. 1341, the Las Cienegas Enhancement and Saguaro National Park Boundary Adjustment Act of 2007. I introduced this bill on behalf of myself and Senator McCain on May 9, 2007. An identical companion bill, H.R. 3617, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congresswoman Giffords.

This legislation directs the exchange of land in southeastern Arizona between the Secretary of the Interior and Las Cienegas Conservation, LLC. Through the exchange, the Secretary of the Interior would acquire two highly sought after private parcels of land. First, the Secretary would acquire the "Empirita-Simonson Property," approximately 2,392 acres of land adjacent to the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area (NCA). The Empirita-Simonson property lies within the "Sonoita Valley Acquisition Planning District" established by Public Law 106-538, which designated the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area. The Act directed the Department of the Interior to acquire lands from willing sellers within the planning district for inclusion within the conservation area. Acquisition of the Empirita-Simonson property for inclusion in the NCA will conserve and protect important wildlife corridors between the Sky Island mountains surrounding and adjacent to the Cienega Basin.

The Secretary would also acquire the Bloom Property, approximately 160 acres of land that was identified for inclusion in the Saguaro National Park during a boundary study conducted by the National Park Service in 1993. In 1994, using the data from the study, Congress enacted legislation expanding the park and changed Saguaro's designation from monument to park. At that time, the Bloom Property did not have a willing seller and, therefore, was not added to the Park. I am pleased to say circumstances have changed, and we are able to include it in this exchange. The Bloom Property lies just south of the Sweetwater Trail in Saguaro Park West. Acquisition of the Bloom Property will connect Saguaro National Park with the Sweetwater Preserve, an important wildlife corridor that offers hiking and wildlife viewing for nearby residents and visitors.

In exchange for these two properties, the Secretary of the Interior would transfer out of federal ownership the "Sahuarita property," approximately 1,280 acres of land south of Tucson near Corona de Tucson. The Sahuarita property is low-lying Sonoran desert and has been identified for disposal by the Bureau of Land Management through its land use planning process.

In addition to these important land acquisitions, the legislation also accomplishes two other important objectives. First, the bill limits water withdrawals at Cienega Creek. The land exchange is conditioned on Las Cienegas Conservation, LLC conveying a 98-acre well site to Pima County and relinquishing the water rights it controls. The net result is a water savings of 1,050 acre-feet per year. This will help preserve the Cienega Creek riparian area that provides habitat for many bird species including, the endangered Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, and important lowland populations of amphibians and reptiles. Second, the bill provides the Forest Service with badly-needed road access through the Empirita-Simonson property to the Whetstone Mountains, a popular recreation and hunting destination.

This legislation is the product of consensus-building between the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, local officials, and community groups. It is a balanced exchange that is fair and in the public interest. I urge my colleagues to work with me to approve this legislation at the earliest possible date.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., U.S. SENATOR FROM DELAWARE, ON S. 1709

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak in support of S. 1709, the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Reauthorization Act of 2007. I have introduced this legislation with my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator Specter,

and I am pleased that we are joined in this effort by Senators Alexander, Bayh, Cardin, Carper, Clinton, Cochran, Kennedy, Kerry, Levin, Nelson and Obama.

The original Act, signed into law in 1998, has increased public awareness of the Underground Railroad—a cornerstone in African American heritage and history—with sites and programs in 29 states and the District of Columbia. This is the only national program dedicated to the preservation, interpretation and dissemination of Underground Railroad history. Reauthorization of this bill will allow this important work to continue.

Throughout this nation there are sites in the Underground Railroad Network that, while still standing, have suffered structural damage. There are also many sites that no longer house a physical structure, but still are important to recognize. A good example is the Thomas Garrett House, located in Wilmington in my home state of Delaware. The Garrett House was the last station on the Underground Railroad before the slaves reached freedom in Pennsylvania. It has been estimated that Garrett, a well known Quaker, helped more than 2,000 runaway slaves escape from the Southern states. The legislation being introduced today will not only help pay to repair damaged structures, but also to educate the general public about those sites that are no longer in existence, like the Thomas Garrett House.

The Underground Railroad Network is a special part of American history that we cannot afford to let slip away. Our legislation will preserve these invaluable memorials and educational resources by raising the authorization level from $500,000 to $2.5 million. We must move now to ensure that the brave acts of these individuals, and the struggles of those who sought freedom, are preserved for future generations to observe and honor.

A companion bill was introduced in the House of Representatives, H.R. 1239, by Representative Alcee L. Hastings and my friend and colleague from Delaware, Representative Mike Castle. The House has passed the measure and I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will move quickly and act on this bill.

It is my honor, Mr. Chairman, to be here today, supporting this bill so that this part of our nation's past will not be forgotten.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY, ON S. 148

The Great Falls in Paterson is the place that Alexander Hamilton selected to launch what we have come to call the American Dream. In the 1790s, Hamilton announced to the world that Paterson would welcome workers and entrepreneurs and expand opportunities for people of all backgrounds, races, religions, and nationalities.

Unlike so many of Hamilton's contemporaries who called for a rural agrarian society based on slave labor, Hamilton's economy would be built through the work of free men and women. Hamilton's fight for immigrants, and his battle against slavery, was part of an inclusive view of how all Americans would benefit from a growing modern economy based on freedom. Much of this was rooted in the fact that Alexander Hamilton was himself a poor immigrant to America who believed that our nation's future was dependent on others who would work hard to take advantage of the boundless opportunities that America offered.

Hamilton sought to create an economic model in Paterson not dependent primarily on one industry, but rather focused on diverse manufacturers. In particular, his 1791 Report to the Congress called for a wide variety of industries in America—including cotton, sailcloth, flax, paper, nails, steel and ironwork for carriages, and silk. As a result, Paterson became a leading manufacturer in every one of these industries.

Paterson's water-powered mills were manufacturing cotton in the 1790s. These mills produced all of the sailcloth for every ship in the American Navy at one point in the first half of the nineteenth century. Paterson industrialists began silk production in 1827 and beginning in the late 1800's, Paterson became the largest silk manufacturing and dyeing center in the world.

One of America's leading economic historians, Professor Richard Sylla of the NYU Stern School of Business, said in his Senate testimony that Hamilton sought to make Paterson an "incubator" of entrepreneurial startup businesses. Paterson entrepreneurs succeeded in realizing Hamilton's vision.

I particularly appreciate Hamilton's efforts in Paterson because I was raised in Paterson as the son of poor, hard-working immigrant parents. My father worked in the silk mills of Paterson when Paterson was known as the Silk City. After serving in the Army during World War II, I joined with two friends who were brothers and whose parents also were immigrants to Paterson and together, we created in

Paterson America's first major payroll services company. We worked very hard to build this small entrepreneurial startup company into one of the largest computing services companies in the world.

Notwithstanding the objections of the National Park Service, Congress in 2001 directed the Secretary of the Interior to study making the Paterson Great Falls National Historic District a part of the National Park System. Now, six years later and after spending over $250,000 on the study, the National Park Service claims Hamilton's efforts and vision do not merit the designation of a national park.

More than 25 of the leading historians and other experts in America have documented why the draft National Park Service Study is wrong. It is shocking to read the way these distinguished scholars characterize the key Park Service findings: "a serious misreading of the historical record" . . . "seriously deficient" . . . "demonstrably wrong" . . . "analytically flawed and violates fundamental principals the professionals use in studying historic resources."

The fact is the Great Falls represent not only natural beauty, but also the beginnings of American industry. Alexander Hamilton saw the possibilities in 1778. He established the Society for Useful Manufacturers in 1791 and the Industrial Revolution was launched. Great Falls National Historic District still stands as a testament to the American Dream of economic independence and should become America's next national historical park.

At this time, I'd like to recognize a member, Senator Murkowski for any statement she may have to make.

STATEMENT OF HON. LISA MURKOWSKI, U.S. SENATOR FROM ALASKA

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to very briefly present my statement on S. 1808. I will not be able to stay with the subcommittee this afternoon, as I have a scheduling conflict with a hearing in Foreign Relations, as we speak.

S. 1808, the Denali National Park in Alaska Railroad Land Exchange Act of 2007 reflects a joint effort by the National Park Service and the Alaska Railroad. Mr. Wenk of the National Park Service and Mr. Brooks of the Alaska Railroad will, you'll hear from them. I want to welcome Mr. Brooks to the committee. He's come a long way to be with us and greatly appreciate the work that he does for the Alaska Railroad.

They will both explain S. 1808, which would allow both entities, both the Park Service and the Alaska Railroad, to exchange lands, so that the Alaska Railroad can build a much-needed train turnaround track in Denali National Park. This wide track would allow more frequent trains and more flexible rail schedules, thus accommodating the ever increasing number of rail passengers that visit our park.

In the words of Mr. Brooks, "This is a win-win for the Alaska Railroad, for the National Park Service, and the hundreds of thousands of visitors that would benefit from access to our Nation's treasured Denali National Park." I am also pleased to report that only did the National Park Service and the Alaska Railroad support the legislation, but the National Park Conservation Association also has submitted a statement in support of S. 1808.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that this statement be included as part of the hearing record.

I do appreciate, again, the opportunity to kind of go out of turn and appreciate the consideration of the Chairman and this consideration of this important legislation.

Senator AKAKA. Your statement will be included in the record.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much.
Senator Menendez.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me start off, Mr. Chairman, by thanking you and the Ranking Member for holding this hearing on various of these parks applications, but particularly on the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007. I look forward to working with both of you to try to enact this important legislation.

I know that we will be having witnesses today. I believe Congressman Pascrell is going to, hopefully, appear before the committee, Mr. Leonard Zax, who have been tireless advocates on behalf of the Park. My senior Senator, Senator Lautenberg has asked me to express his regrets for not being able to attend today's hearing, but he remains deeply and personally committed to seeing this legislation pass.

To understand Paterson and the Great Falls Park, one has to understand the man most responsible for the city's founding, Alexander Hamilton. He lived the American dream. When he came to this country as a teenager, he did not have wealth, he did not have land, and he did not have a respected family name. Hamilton came here with nothing other than his talent, his intellect, and his willingness to work hard to better himself. From these meager beginnings, Hamilton became a Revolutionary War Army officer, a lawyer, a founder of our Nation, a politician, a leading statesman, a financier, and perhaps America's most important political theorist.

Today, the concept of the American dream is so widely accepted, it is almost a cliché, but what people forget, is that at the time of our Nation's birth, there was no agreement on what achieving the American dream truly was. Some thought our future was largely an agrarian one, based on land ownership handed down from generation to generation. Others thought our society would be based on exploiting slave labor. Still others believed we needed to copy the model for success Europe by installing a class of elites to lead the country.

Alexander Hamilton's vision of the American dream was different. He, more clearly than any other American at the time of the founding, understood our future would be based on giving immigrants the opportunity to come to this country in freedom, use their natural talents to make a life for themselves and their families. In return for this opportunity, immigrants would help transform this country into the world's leading industrial power.

In order to make this idea a reality, Hamilton formed the Society for Establishing Useful Manufacturers. This company helped make Hamilton's vision a reality by making Paterson, New Jersey into an industrial giant. By 1816, Paterson became a national leader in textiles, paper, steel, and iron work. In the 1850s, Paterson was the Nation's leader in locomotive manufacturing, and later in the century, Paterson became the world's leader in the production of silk.

Over the years, these industries created jobs and opportunities for waves of immigrants, including the Irish, English, German, Polish, Jewish, Syrian, and Italian communities. Here they worked

hard, raised families, and achieved the same American dream that Hamilton himself enjoyed, and the same American dream he envisioned for the Nation.

Today, the American dream is alive and well in Paterson, as growing communities of Latino and Middle Eastern families make their homes here. This unique national historical treasure deserves to be a National Historical Park, but the National Park Service apparently disagrees.

The Park Service, when looking to see if a site can be added to the National Park system, evaluates the site on four criteria. The site must be nationally significant, the site must be a suitable addition to the National Parks system, must be a feasible addition to the system, and must be in need of direct National Park Service funding and management.

Any objective evaluation of the Great Falls, would find that the Park easily meets these criteria. Even the Park Service admits that the Great Falls is a nationally significant cultural resource. But the Park Service draft study of the park somehow finds that the Great Falls does not meet the other three criteria.

The Park Service seems to think that the Paterson Great Falls are not a suitable addition to the Park Service, because its characteristics are found elsewhere in the National Park system. I could not disagree more strongly.

As I described earlier, the Great Falls Park represents Alexander Hamilton's unique vision of America come true. No other site in the Nation more richly represents the remarkable transformation of a rural agrarian society based in slavery into a modern global economy based in freedom. I'm sure Mr. Zax, a witness here today, will go into much greater detail on this point.

Finally, in arguing that the Park does not meet the remaining two criteria, the Park Service seems to make two seemingly contradictory arguments. On the one hand, the Park Service argues that they can not afford the added expense beyond the committed State funds. But on the other hand, it says that the State will fully protect this site of national importance and properly present it to the public.

The truth is, is that the State has pledged to fund roughly half of the resources needed to make this site into a wonderful National Park. This makes the Park both affordable and feasible, but it also points out that without designating the Park a unit of the National Park Service, the Great Falls will not be presented or protected in the manner it deserves.

I therefore urge the committee to join me in supporting passage of the Great Falls National Park Act of 2007. This truly unique Park deserves Federal recognition and protection.

Last, Mr. Chairman, I want to briefly say that I support S. 1039 to extend authorization of the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Route by 4 years, from 2007 to 2011. In 1988, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to designate this route along coastal New Jersey to provide for public appreciation and enjoyment of important fish and wildlife habitats, geologic and geographical land forms, cultural resources, and migration routes in coastal New Jersey.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill, to extend funding for the important trail through September 30, 2011.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for putting this on, and the Ranking Member on your hearing list. I see my colleague from New Jersey, from the House of Representatives, who I have the privilege of serving with. I know the appropriate time, after Senator Levin and Senator Allard, you'll have the opportunity to recognize him.

Thank you.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Menendez.

Let me call on our Ranking Member, Senator Burr, for your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD BURR, U.S. SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be extremely brief. My apologies for my tardiness, because we do have a full agenda today, covering a wide range of topics, each important in its own way and we'll thoroughly cover those.

I wanted to take the opportunity to assure my colleagues that are here, that just because of the Burr historical relationship to Alexander Hamilton, I'm not going to recuse myself, but I will try not to let that influence how I judge this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for putting this panel together. I look forward to the testimonies.

Senator MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, we can, I can tell the Ranking Member, we're happy to weave that history into the process.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Burr.

Now I would like to call on Senator Allard for your testimony. Thank you so much for being here.

STATEMENT OF HON. WAYNE ALLARD, U.S. SENATOR FROM COLORADO

Senator ALLARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you, Chairman Akaka, as well as our ranking member Burr for the committee's consideration of Senate Bill 128. Its title is, the Cache La Poudre River and National Heritage Area Technical Amendments Act. That's what it is, it is a, basically its primary is that it is a technical amendment to the Cache La Poudre River National Heritage Area. I'd like to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment on this legislation and for your leadership on issues affecting our Nation's parks.

The area around the Cache La Poudre has a unique and rich history that, like much of the West, is tied to water. The Cache La Poudre River played an important role in the development of Water Law in the West, including the idea of prior appropriation of water. The Prior Appropriation of Water Law is unique, is universal throughout the Western part of the United States. Those of you who come from States where they have plenty of water use a different system of water tied to riparian rights.

Understanding the significance and history of prior appropriations is vital, as much of the Water Law in the Western United States is based on it. The objective of the Cache La Poudre Herit-

age Area is to interpret the area's cultural, historic, and natural resources within the theme of Western water development.

Under the original legislation established in the Heritage Area, the Secretary of Interior was to appoint a Commission to work with the National Park Service and manage the area. But because of a technicality, the Secretary was unable to appoint the Commission. In response, local citizens stepped forward and formed the Poudre Heritage Alliance. It's a volunteer organization that helps support the Heritage Area until an official Commission can be named and it can't be named until after we take care of those technical things that are in this bill.

The legislation being reviewed today would rectify this technical problem, would provide for the establishment of an official Commission to help manage the area. This bipartisan bill enjoys the support of numerous local citizens, elected officials, as evidenced by the letters of support that I will submit to the committee.

Senator ALLARD. I'm hopeful the committee will agree with these individuals and view this legislation favorably.

Chairman Akaka and Ranking Member Burr, thank you and the committee for your time and consideration.

[The prepared statement of Senator Allard follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. WAYNE ALLARD, U.S. SENATOR FROM COLORADO, ON S. 128

Thank you, Chairman Akaka and Ranking Member Burr, for the committee's consideration of S.128, the Cache la Poudre River National Heritage Area Technical Amendments Act.

I would also like to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to comment on this legislation and for your leadership on issues affecting our nation's parks.

The area around the Cache La Poudre River has a unique and rich history that, like much in the West, is tied to water.

The Cache la Poudre River played an important role in the development of water law in the west, including the idea of prior appropriation of water.

Understanding the significance and history of prior appropriation is vital, as much of the water law in the Western United States is based on it.

The objective of the Cache la Poudre Heritage Area is to interpret the area's cultural, historic and natural resources within the theme of western water development.

Under the original legislation establishing the Heritage Area, the Secretary of Interior was to appoint a commission to work with the National Parks Service and manage the Area, but because of a technicality the Secretary was unable to appoint the commission.

In response local citizens stepped up and formed the Poudre Heritage Alliance, a voluntary organization to help support the Heritage Area until an official commission could be named.

The legislation being reviewed today would rectify this technical problem and would provide for the establishment of an official commission to help manage the area.

This bipartisan bill enjoys the support of numerous local citizens and elected officials, as evidenced by the letters of support that I will submit to the Committee.

I am hopeful the committee will agree with these individuals and view this legislation favorably.

Chairman Akaka, Ranking member Burr, thank you and the Committee for your time and consideration.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Allard.

Now we would like to hear from Senator Levin.

STATEMENT OF HON. CARL LEVIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN

Senator LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Burr, and Senator Menendez, thank you for holding this hearing.

One of the items on your agenda today is a very important bill, not just to the State of Michigan, but to the Nation, because it regards an existing National Historical Park called the Keweenaw National Historical Park.

It's in that part of Michigan, which some of you are familiar with, which kind of looks like a little bit like a shark's fin, at the top of the upper peninsula. It's an extraordinary site. It's the site of the world's purest copper. It's the only place in the world where large scale economically recoverable, 97 percent pure native copper is found.

It was the site where, when Horace Greeley told young men in those days, to go west. "Go west, go west young man." That was the west he was referring to. It was the Keweenaw Peninsula up in Michigan. It had a major role in copper production and all the technologies which go into copper production. It produced, I think, about half of the world's copper during the 1880s, and had a major role in the Civil War. It has a major role in our social and labor history and in the history of mining, and a park was created there 15 years ago called the Keweenaw National Historical Park.

There has been some great progress made in that park. It's in a part of Michigan which doesn't have a lot of people, and has a lot of unemployment. But now, more and more visitors are coming to the area. It's a very strong visitors attraction because of the way the National Park Service has really done a wonderful job with local people, of growing a National Historical Park.

There are three parts to this amendment—or to this bill, excuse me—which are important to us. One has to do with the fact that one part of the area—and this is an Historical Park which covers a large area and has a lot of private in-holdings in it—one part of this is a former smelter, which is on a site that is polluted and will need to be cleaned up. The question is, should the Park Service be able to use their regular criteria on that, as to that site? As to whether to acquire it, and if so, under what conditions should they acquire it? They have criteria to protect the Treasury and the taxpayers from acquiring a site which should not be acquired until it's properly cleaned-up.

But we put something in the law 15 years ago which prohibits it. This criteria is unique, I believe, to this Park, and needs to be removed from the law so the National Park Service can apply the regular criteria, whatever they are. We're not trying to change the National Park Service criteria, in terms of acquisition of a contaminated site. We want them to have the discretion to apply their normal criteria to the acquisition of a contaminated site. So we want to remove a legal impediment to their normal criteria being applied.

In addition, this bill would also apply the usual match to this Park, in terms of public and nonpublic funding. Right now it's, I think, probably unique in the country, that the match requirement is four to one, $4 local for each Federal dollar. Most other national parks do not have this kind of a requirement. We're asking that a

one to one match be applied. Some parks have no local match at all. Others have a one to one or a two to one. This Park requires a four to one match.

The park is located in an area that can not possibly afford that kind of a local match and it should not be singled out, in effect, for that kind of a local match, when other units in the Park Service do not generally have that kind of a requirement.

Finally, there would be an increase in the authorization of appropriations. It's different amounts in different areas, so I won't go into the details of that, but there is an increase in authorization, which is requested in this bill. We would very much hope that the committee could be supportive of this legislation. Senator Stabenow, of course, is a co-sponsor of it.

One final thing. I just want to thank the Park Service for two things. No. 1, the way in which they have really taken to this park. They are an incredibly talented agency. They are a beloved agency of the people of the United States. I don't know what the public opinion polls would show in terms of the favorable, unfavorable position of the National Park Service, but I'm not sure there's any agency of the Government, perhaps, that's higher than them. They are truly respected.

We are grateful to them for all of the inputs and the efforts that they have made, and for all the restoration of buildings that has gone on already, making this into a true attraction. I believe that they support the bill. They'll be speaking for themselves later, but I think that they do support this legislation. I'll let, again, them speak for themselves.

But in any event, I thank them for that. I thank them for all they've done for all the parks in this country, including the ones in my home State of Michigan.

Thank you for holding this hearing, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Burr. Senator Salazar, nice to see you here.

[The prepared statement of Senator Levin follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CARL LEVIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN, ON S. 189

I want to thank Chairman Akaka and Ranking Member Burr for holding this hearing on important legislation relating to the Keweenaw National Historical Park.

This legislation would improve the park's ability to carry out its statutory mission to preserve the nationally significant historical and cultural sites, structures, and districts in Michigan's Keweenaw Peninsula for the education, benefit, and inspiration of present and future generations. The Keweenaw National Historical Park is home to an incredible treasure of historic resources. This area is the only site in the country where prehistoric, aboriginal mining of copper occurred. In the 1800s, reports of the vast copper resources prompted a mining rush, attracting entrepreneurs and tens of thousands of immigrants to the region. By 1849, the Keweenaw Peninsula provided 85 percent of the nation's copper production, powering America's industrial revolution.

The legislation that your subcommittee is considering today would do three things. The bill would: (1) change the matching requirement for federal funds from a 4:1 ratio to a 1:1 ratio; (2) increase the authorized level of funds to be appropriated for the park; and (3) eliminate the prohibition on the Department of the Interior from acquiring any lands that have become contaminated with hazardous substances.

CHANGE IN MATCH REQUIREMENTS

Unlike most National Parks, private individuals and groups own and operate most of the historic properties in the park. There are 19 of these partnership sites,

which are known as "Keweenaw Heritage Sites," that significantly contribute to the preservation and celebration of the cultural and natural resources of the area. The Keweenaw Heritage Sites include an underground mine with one of the world's deepest shafts, the oldest municipally-built opera house in the country (which continues to host a variety of theatrical and musical events), a Civil War fort, and a museum with one of the world's most extensive mineral collections. These cooperating heritage sites enhance the visitor's experience at the park. However, these sites are simply not in the position to raise the match of $4 for every $1 in federal funds, which is the current requirement in Keweenaw's enabling legislation. The heritage sites rely entirely on donations and/or nominal entrance fees. Also, the Keweenaw Peninsula is one of the most economically depressed areas in Michigan, having an unemployment rate last year of 9.9%, which was nearly double that of the national unemployment rate, and Keweenaw had a per-capita income in 2005 of $25,740, which was about 75 percent of the national average.

According to the National Park Service, most of the 391 NPS units do not require any non-federal match of federal funds. And, for those National Park System units that do require a match, it is typically in the ratio of 1:1 or 2:1. In contrast, the Keweenaw National Historical Park requires $4 in non-federal funds for every $1 of federal funds that are used to provide financial and technical assistance to mark, interpret, and restore non-federal properties within the park. This is an incredibly burdensome requirement for the private partners that help to carry out the mission of the park. This legislation would reduce the burden on the local community, while still requiring a match.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

The bill before you addresses another issue of fairness for the park. Unlike most other NPS units, the Keweenaw National Historical Park is prohibited from acquiring any land that has become contaminated with hazardous substances. S. 189 would restore parity to the National Park System by removing this restriction.

Importantly, this bill does not in any way force the National Park Service to acquire any such land, it simply removes the land acquisition restriction. Removing this restriction would increase flexibility for the Keweenaw National Historical Park, and would be especially helpful for properties that may have minimal contamination. Given the industrial history of the area, many of the historical properties may be contaminated. And even if the park were never to acquire a single additional property, removing this restriction would at the very least allow the park to consider acquiring certain parcels of land for preservation. As a partnership park, the majority of the historical buildings are not owned by the National Park Service; the NPS owns only five buildings within the park boundaries. However, at some point in the future, the park may be in the position to acquire property of historical significance that may be contaminated.

Importantly, one of the most valuable historic properties within the park's boundary is the Quincy Smelter site, which is one of the last 19th century copper smelter sites remaining in the world. The buildings on this site are quickly deteriorating, and the current owners are contemplating demolition of these historical treasures due to the complications surrounding stabilization and lack of funding. Even though it is the National Park Service's position that it will not acquire this property due to contamination and associated cost concerns, removing this restriction would allow the park service to at least consider acquiring the property after cleanup plans and funding are in place.

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION LEVELS

Finally, this bill increases the appropriation ceilings for three categories of park activity: (1) the authorization of appropriations for the development and acquisition of land would be increased from $25 million to $50 million; (2) the authorization for financial and technical assistance would be increased from $3 million to $25 million; and (3) the annual authorization for the Keweenaw Historic Preservation Advisory Commission would be increased from $100,000 to $250,000. These increases are necessary because as the park moves forward in assisting with the preservation and interpretation of the numerous historical properties within the park boundaries, the park will eventually hit these authorization ceilings. According to the National Park Service, the park has already spent $13.5 million on development activities. Although this is only about one-half of the current ceiling of $25 million, because the park is rather new, and does not even have a visitor center, from a long-term perspective it is important to increase this ceiling so that the park has freedom in moving forward into the future with acquisition and development activities.

The increase for the Keweenaw Historic Preservation Advisory Commission is especially important. As a partnership park, it is essential that the Advisory Commission has the funds necessary to carry out its statutory charge, which includes assisting the park with local and state government coordination, carrying out programs to enhance appreciation of park historic resources, and selecting sites for interpretation and preservation through cooperative agreements with non-Federal parties. At a $100,000 level, the Advisory Commission is limited in the assistance it can provide. At a level of $250,000, the Advisory Commission would be able to more fully meet its legislated responsibilities to advise and assist the park. With the increased level of appropriations authorized, the Advisory Commission could hire professional staff members and leverage corporate, foundation, and individual gifts for projects and programs in collaboration with the park and area partners. Of importance, the 19 heritage sites need the assistance of the Advisory Commission, and this increase would help improve these sites, and keep them in operation.

In summary, this legislation would help the park to fulfill its mission to preserve and bring to life the vibrant history of Michigan's "copper country"—an essential part of the nation's history of industrial and technological development, immigration, labor relations, and natural resources. Thank you for holding this hearing, and I look forward to working with the Committee to pass this important legislation.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Levin, for you. It sounds really personal, the way you provide your statement, and we thank you very much for that.

Senator LEVIN. It is indeed that. We put a lot of effort into this. One other quick comment.

This is way up in the most northern part of the State of Michigan, but it was such a booming mining area in the mid-19th century when Michigan became a State, that it's town called Kalumet, which was the middle of this mining bonanza, which brought all of the people from, a lot of people from the east, people from all over the world. So there's a huge ethnic diversity that came to that town, came to that area.

But it almost became the capitol of Michigan, although it's the most remote part of the State, a town called Kalumet, a very small town now. But the boom was so huge that it was a final contest between Lansing, our current capitol in the middle of the State, geographically central, but which had competition for the upper peninsula, Keweenaw Peninsula. That's how major an economic part of this State and country.

Again, was a major part of the Civil War and the reason the North prevailed, because of the copper that was available to the military in the Union, that was not available in the South. So there's huge history here, and thank you for considering this bill.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Levin.

Senator SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Senator Salazar.

Senator SALAZAR. If I may just say, as a surrogate son of Michigan, since I went to law school in Ann Arbor at the University of Michigan. I know this place and I think it is a great piece of legislation that Senator Levin has brought before the committee, and I hope that we favorably consider it.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much. Senator Salazar, let me call you for your remarks or testimony at this time.

STATEMENT OF HON. KEN SALAZAR, U.S. SENATOR FROM COLORADO

Senator SALAZAR. Thank you very much, Senator Akaka. You know that my colleague, Senator Allard, was here earlier on and

testified concerning the Cache La Poudre legislation that is before us.

I want to just spend a few minutes making a quick comment about that legislation. The bill itself is very straightforward. It fixes a problem in the law that was, for the Heritage Area that was established back in 1996. Because of the glitch in the statute, the Secretary of Interior has been unable to appoint a Commission to manage the Heritage area. The bill designates a local non-profit organization, the Poudre Heritage Alliance.

I'm familiar with the organization. It's a good organization. The organization is designated as the management entity for the Heritage area and extends the authorization for the area for an additional 10 years at a very modest funding level.

The bill has very strong support from communities and stakeholders in my State of Colorado, including the cities of Fort Collins, Greeley, Windsor, and the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District. We're proud of the Poudre River and its history. I will add, I will make the rest of my statement, I will just make it a part of the record. I would hope that the committee——

Senator AKAKA. We'll include it in the record.

Senator SALAZAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the committee helps us in moving this legislation forward.

[The prepared statement of Senator Salazar follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. KEN SALAZAR, U.S. SENATOR FROM COLORADO, ON S. 128

Thank you, Chairman Akaka and Ranking Member Burr, for holding this hearing today.

I want to talk for a couple minutes about S.128, a bill that Senator Allard and I introduced to amend the Cache La Poudre River Corridor National Heritage Area Act.

The bill itself is very straightforward. It fixes a problem in the law that established the heritage area in 1996. Because of the glitch in the statute, the Secretary of the Interior has been unable to appoint a commission to manage the heritage area. This bill designates a local non-profit organization, the Poudre Heritage Alliance, as the management entity for the heritage area, and extends the authorization for the area for an additional 10 years, at a very modest funding level.

The bill has the strong support of the local communities and stakeholders, including Fort Collins, Greeley, Windsor, and the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District.

We in Colorado are very proud of the Poudre River and the history that grew up along its banks. The river's name goes back to 1836, when a party of French fur trappers got stuck in heavy snow as they traveled along the Front Range. They had to lighten their loads before heading to the mountains, so they buried their excess supplies, mainly gun powder and lead shot, before moving on. One of the members of the expedition came back to the area later as settler, and remembered that it was the place where they "hid the powder," so the river took on the French name "Cache"—for hiding place—and "Poudre"—for powder.

As more settlers came to Larimer County and the banks of the Poudre River in the late 19th century, they built an expensive and expansive system of ditches to irrigate their fields. Farmers banded together on cooperative projects to reduce the labor required to move water from the Poudre River to their crops. Eventually, they established private irrigation companies—mutual ditch companies—to finance larger storage projects.

As their irrigation infrastructure became more sophisticated, the settlers of the area established a system for determining who had priority on the water in the river. The doctrine of prior appropriation which they helped develop has become the foundation of Colorado water law and of water law throughout much of the American West.

The Cache La Poudre National Heritage Area helps preserve and share these vital stories of the Poudre River and of the origins of our water law. It is a heritage of which are proud.

Mr. Chairman, thank you again for holding this hearing. I hope we can pass S.128 promptly out of this committee.

Thank you.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator.

Now, our next witness is Congressman Bill Pascrell, who is the—who is here to testify on S. 148, the Paterson Great Falls National Park proposal, and you sponsor a companion measure in the House of Representatives.

Congressman Pascrell, I want to welcome you to this subcommittee and look forward to your statement to the committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. BILL PASCRELL, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW JERSEY

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Senator. I wanted to be here and I want to thank the, yourself and the members of the committee for allowing me to discuss the Paterson Great Falls. I was the Mayor of Paterson before running for the Congress of the United States. I've lived there all my life, so I have visceral relationship here and I think you'll understand that.

I'm confident that you will find that the Great Falls Historic District is uniquely deserving of a National Park Service unit designation. Fifteen miles west of New York City, the Great Falls was the second largest waterfall in colonial America.

At the Great Falls, Alexander Hamilton conceived the plan to harness the force of water to power the new industries that would secure our economic independence. Hamilton told Congress and the American people that at the Great Falls, he'd begin to implement his ambitious strategy to transform an agricultural society dependent upon slavery, into a modern economy based on freedom.

True to Hamilton's vision, Paterson became a great manufacturing city, producing the Colt revolver, the first submarine, the aircraft engine for the first transatlantic flight, more locomotives than any city in this Nation, Mr. Chairman, and more silk than any city in the world.

Scholars have concluded that Pierre L'Enfant's innovative water power system in Paterson and many factories built later, constitute the finest remaining collection of engineering and architectural structures, representing each stage of America's progress, from a weak agrarian society to the leader in global economy.

In a special Bicentennial speech in Paterson, the late President Gerald R. Ford in 1976—I know this quite well, Mr. Chairman, because I introduced him on that day, a Democrat was introducing a Republican President—it was greatest, one of the great thrills of my life. "We can see the Great Falls as a symbol of the industrial might, which helps to make America the most powerful Nation in the world."

As a lifelong resident of Paterson and the city's former Mayor, I continue to live there, work there, in the shadow of the Great Falls of Passaic. I fought for many years to bring much-deserved recognition to this natural wonder and this historic landmark.

So many years later, we're at that much, we're much closer to making the dream of a National Park in Paterson a reality. The

legislation we are here to discuss today, that Paterson Great Falls National Park Act, would achieve this long sought after goal. The legislation enjoys bipartisan, widespread support. Every member of the Jersey delegation, Democrat and Republican, supports this piece of legislation and have put their name on in support, not afraid to do that.

National conservation and historic preservation organizations, our Nation's most renowned Hamilton scholars, distinguished professors at prestigious universities, have documented that this historic district is worthy of a national historic designation. Editorial boards, Federal, State, local officials and community groups have also endorsed the campaign to create a National Park Service.

Some have argued that because the State of New Jersey, the city of Paterson, and other entities are working to protect and preserve the Great Falls Historic District, that we do not need a National Historic Park there as well. This is completely false, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Corzine himself, has maintained that the State of New Jersey cannot preserve, protect the Falls Historic District of the public without Federal Government assistance. The National Park Service has a long history of Federal-State cooperation, from Lowell, Massachusetts to the redwood in California. It is Park Service policy to foster State and Federal partnerships to fund and manage parks. The Great Falls should be no different.

In conclusion, let me say this, Mr. Chairman. If the Great Falls district were added to the Park System, Federal resources could be leveraged to revitalize the Great Falls area. Not only is Paterson depending on this, but the entire area is depending on this, refurbishing this beautiful, the historic mill buildings, maintaining and protecting the waterfall.

Through this Federal partnership, the Great Falls would be transformed into an attraction for visitors and Patersonians alike, that could lead to the economic revitalization of my old city, my own city, being a living reminder of our Nation's rich industrial history.

Congress must act now to pass this vital piece of legislation. I really want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. I stand ready to answer any questions that you might ask. This is not important to me, it's important to the entire area and I trust that you will do the right thing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pascrell follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. BILL PASCRELL, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW JERSEY, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, I very much appreciate your having me here today to discuss the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007, which I introduced in the House of Representatives.

I am grateful for the opportunity to talk about an issue that is very close to my heart—the possible creation of a National Historical Park at the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey. I am confident that you will find that the Great Falls Historic District is uniquely deserving of being designated a National Park Service unit.

Fifteen miles west of New York City, the Great Falls was the second largest waterfall in colonial America. No other natural wonder in America has played such an important role in our nation's historic quest for freedom and prosperity. At the Great Falls, Alexander Hamilton conceived and a plan to harness the force of water to power the new industries that would secure our economic independence.

Hamilton told Congress and the American people that at the Great Falls he would begin to implement his ambitious strategy to transform a rural agricultural society, dependent upon slavery, into a modern economy based on freedom. True to Hamilton's vision, Paterson became a great manufacturing city, producing the Colt revolver, the first submarine, the aircraft engine for the first trans-Atlantic flight, more locomotives than any city in the nation, and more silk than any city in the world.

Scholars have concluded that Pierre L'Enfant's innovative water power system in Paterson, and many factories built later, constitute the finest remaining collection of engineering and architectural structures representing each stage of America's progress from a weak agrarian society to a leader in the global economy.

Notably, the Great Falls Historic District is the only National Historic District that includes both a National Natural Resource and a National Historic Landmark. In a special Bicentennial speech in Paterson with the spectacular natural beauty of the Great Falls in the background, the late President Gerald R. Ford said, "We can see the Great Falls as a symbol of the industrial might which helps to make America the most powerful nation in the world."

As a lifelong resident of Paterson and the city's former mayor, I continue to live and work in the shadow of the Great Falls of the Passaic. I have fought for many years to bring much deserved recognition to this natural wonder and historic landmark.

In the 1970s, I worked closely with Mary Ellen Kramer, who was the driving force in gaining Federal recognition of the Great Falls Historic District. I was there on that great day in June 1976 when President Ford came to Paterson and designated the Great Falls a National Historic Landmark. As Mayor of Paterson, I worked closely with fellow Patersonian Senator Frank Lautenberg, who was a warrior for this worthy cause.

Now, so many years later, we are that much closer to making the dream of a National Park in Paterson a reality. The legislation we are here to discuss today, the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007, would achieve this long sought-after goal. The House bill is cosponsored by every Member of New Jersey's Congressional delegation, both Democrats and Republicans.

National conservation and historic preservation organizations, our nation's most renowned Hamilton scholars, an esteemed former Smithsonian Institution curator, and distinguished professors at Yale, Princeton, Harvard, NYU, Brown and other universities have documented that this historic district meets all of the standards to become a National Historical Park.

Editorial boards, federal, state, and local officials and community groups, including New Jersey's Governor Corzine, have also endorsed the campaign to award a National Park Service designation to the Falls.

Some have argued that because the State of New Jersey, the City of Paterson, and other entities are working to protect and preserve the Great Falls Historic District, that we do not need a National Park there as well. This is completely false.

Governor Corzine himself has maintained that the State of New Jersey cannot preserve, protect, and present the Great Falls Historic District to the public without Federal Government assistance. Additionally, in order to attract private investment, it is imperative that the site be designated a National Park. In the long-term, major private donors will require the integrity, professionalism, continuity, and permanence of the National Park System.

The National Park Service has a long history of federal-state cooperation, from Lowell in Massachusetts to Redwood in California. It is Park Service policy to foster state and federal partnerships to fund and manage parks, and Great Falls should be no different.

Mr. Chairman, if the Great Falls District were added to the Park System, federal resources could be leveraged to revitalize the Great Falls area, refurbishing the beautiful, historic mill buildings and maintaining and protecting the waterfall.

Through this federal partnership, the Great Falls would be transformed into an attraction for visitors and Patersonians alike that could lead to the economic revitalization of Paterson, and be a living reminder of our nation's rich industrial history.

Congress must act now to pass this vital piece of legislation, so that we may fully recognize these cultural and historic landmarks that have played such a seminal role in America's history.

Thank you for your time.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Congressman. We appreciate your statement here and know also that this is very close to

you as former Mayor of that area. We'll certainly consider this when we consider all of these bills. Thank you very much.

Mr. PASCRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Yes.

Our next witness is Dan Wenk, the Deputy Director of the National Park Service, who will testify on behalf of the Administration on all 11 bills.

Dan, welcome back again, to the subcommittee. We will include all of your statements in the record and would appreciate it if you could briefly summarize the Department's position on each bill. Once you've completed you comments, we'll begin a round of questions. So thank you again, and you may begin with your statement.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL N. WENK, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. WENK. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to present the Administration's view of 11 subjects on today's agenda. I would like to submit our full statements on each of these subjects to the record and summarize the Administration's positions on these bills.

The Department supports the following bills: S. 189, which would amend the legislation that established the Keweenaw National Historical Park; S. 867 and H.R. 299, which would adjust the boundary for Lowell National Historical Park; S. 1039, which would extend the authorization for the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route for an additional 4 years; S. 1341, which would provide for a land exchange involving the Bureau of Land Management and a private developer that involves a boundary adjustment for the La Cienegas National Conservation Area and for Saguaro National Park; S. 1476, which would authorize a special resource study for the Tule Lake Segregation Center; S. 1709 and H.R. 1239, which would amend the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Act of 1998; S. 1808, which would authorize the exchange of exclusive use easements between the National Park Service and the Alaska Railroad within Denali National Park; and S. 1960, which would authorize a special resource study of Estate Grange and other sites related to Alexander Hamilton's life on St. Croix in the Virgin Islands.

In addition, the Department does not object to S. 128, which would amend the legislation that established the Cache La Poudre River Corridor.

The reasons for our positions on these bills are explained in detail in our full statements. For several of the bills I just mentioned, we are requesting the committee make minor adjustments or amendments to the bill language. Explanations of these requested amendments are also contained in the full statements.

The Department opposes the remaining two bills and I will briefly explain our position. S. 148 would establish the Paterson Great Falls National Park. The Special Resource Study conducted on this area, which is still under departmental review, has preliminarily concluded that the resources of this area do not meet the congressionally required criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park System.

Since a majority of the proposed unit is already being managed by the State of New Jersey as a State Park, there is no need for the National Park Service management of the area. In addition, the bill includes within the boundary of the proposed unit, a resource with no relationship to the documented period of significance, the Hinchliffe Stadium. The bill contains provisions that raise important concerns about how the proposed unit would be effectively and efficiently managed by the National Park Service.

The draft study for the Great Falls Historic District does suggest a pathway to effective partnership with the State of New Jersey, to protect and interpret the nationally significant resources of the district. That would be through a designation of the district as an affiliated area of the National Park System. That route would involve assistance from the National Park Service, but not direct management by the National Park Service.

S. 697 would establish the Steel Industry National Historic Site. The National Park Service completed a special resource study of the sites included in the proposed new unit in 2002. The study concluded that the sites were not feasible to administer as a unit of the National Park System, that the site of the Homestead Lockout, a Seminole event in American labor history, lacked integrity and there was no need for NPS management.

The study also concluded that local management framework could adequately protect and manage these historic resources, since they are all located within the Rivers of Steel Heritage area. Rather than establishing a new unit of the National Park System, the study recommended that the sites proposed for this unit and some other sites, be designated as an affiliated area of the National Park System, which would permit a viable Federal-local partnership for resource protection and public education.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement. I would be pleased to answer your questions.

[The prepared statements of Mr. Wenk follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DANIEL N. WENK, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

S. 148

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 148, a bill to establish the Paterson Great Falls National Park in the State of New Jersey. The Department opposes S. 148.

The Department has three main objections to the bill. First, the Special Resource Study authorized by P.L. 107-59 and still under final Departmental review, has preliminarily concluded that the resources of the Great Falls Historic District do not meet congressionally required criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park System. Second, the bill includes within the boundary of the proposed unit, a resource with no relationship to the documented period of historic significance of the Great Falls Historic District or of any determined national significance under established National Historic Landmark criteria. And third, the bill also contains a number of sections that raise crucially important concerns as to how the proposed unit would be effectively and efficiently managed by the National Park Service.

The history of the Great Falls Historic District is rich in the nation's late 18th and early 19th century movement into the industrial revolution. Conceived by Alexander Hamilton as the demonstration of his Report on Manufactures to Congress, the venture was of clear historic significance. While the Hamilton-inspired Society for the Establishment of Useful Manufactures (S.U.M.) did not achieve the early success envisioned by its architect, largely due to diversion of funds by its initial governor, William Duer, it became a very successful real estate leasing and water

power purveyor into the mid 20th century. The S.U.M. water power system at the Great Falls, designed by Pierre C. L'Enfant, and constructed between 1794 and 1827, was an engineering achievement of major importance.

Over time, industries at the Great Falls produced cotton and wool textiles, spun flax, hemp, jute, paper, and other products. The site was the location of Samuel Colt's unsuccessful first arms factory, and a major center for locomotive manufacturing and the production of silk fabrics. The latter activity of silk weaving and dyeing, which during its heyday produced half of the nation's silk products, earned Paterson the label of "Silk City." The District was also an important place in labor history, with the unsuccessful Silk Strike of 1913 involving an estimated 24,000 workers spurred on by the labor organization, the Industrial Workers of the World, often referred to as the "Wobblies." John Holland's first submarine, "The Fenian Ram," built in New York, was fitted with its engine at the Great Falls and made its maiden voyage on the Passaic River. While the District was plagued by arson impacting or destroying many of its earliest and most important mills, the remaining structures have integrity and have been and continue to be rehabilitated for housing and other public and private adaptive reuses.

During the course of the Special Resource Study and the public comment period for the report which ended on January 30, 2007, a number of Alexander Hamilton biographers, knowledgeable historians, and interested individuals have urged the designation of the District as a unit of the National Park System because of its seminal role in the industrial revolution and its association with Alexander Hamilton. The Department concurs that the history of the Great Falls Historic District and its remaining resources are of national significance. Its designations as a National Historic Landmark and National Natural Landmark attest to that significance.

National significance, although the first criterion analyzed in any Special Resource Study, does not alone result in a recommendation to Congress for unit designation. The resource being studied must also be judged suitable and feasible for designation, and a determination must be made that there is a need for National Park Service (NPS) management of the resource. The National Park Service does not believe that the Great Falls Historic District meets these critical criteria nor is there a need for NPS management of, or presence at, the site.

Suitability is the determination of whether comparable resources to those being studied are already adequately represented in the National Park System or protected by other public agencies including state and local governments or private organizations. The extant resources of the District primarily comprise the S.U.M. water power system and the remaining elements of a collection of 19th century mills used for the manufactures noted above. We believe that within the National Park System and among numerous other protected sites, there are similar resources adequate to interpret the major theme categories also associated with the Great Falls Historic District, whether they represent comparable manufacturing enterprises, early water power, labor unrest of the same period, or sites associated with Alexander Hamilton's contributions to our nation. In the National Park System, itself, Lowell National Historical Park contains comparable mill resources and tells the stories associated with our nation's industrial revolution, including those of immigrant workers and labor unrest. The John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Area contains Slater's Mill, the first successful textile manufacturing enterprise in the nation. The Special Resource Study documents many examples of similar resources and themes within and outside of the National Park System. NPS sites associated with Alexander Hamilton include his home, Hamilton Grange, in New York City and, of course, Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia.

The feasibility analysis conducted by the National Park Service estimates the costs for planning, developing and operating a unit at the Great Falls to range from $20 to $34 million dollars over a ten-year period. This estimate assumes a small staffing contingent and no major NPS ownership of resources at the site. In the difficult budget climate facing federal agencies, we believe these costs would negatively impact finite resources available to other units of the National Park System in the Northeast Region and that lesser and equally effective cost alternatives are available through a partnership between the NPS and the State of New Jersey. We believe the costs to implement the provisions of S. 148 would far exceed this estimate.

In late 2004 the State of New Jersey established the Great Falls State Park in the Historic District. The boundaries of the park contain the primary resources related to the S.U.M. water power system and the earliest mill sites. The State has recently completed a design competition for phase 1 of the park and has pledged $10,000,000 for park improvements. The Department believes that the Division of Parks and Forestry of the New Jersey State Department of Environmental Protection, which manages both natural and cultural resources of national significance

throughout the State, is fully capable of providing the stewardship necessary to protect the critical resources associated with Alexander Hamilton and the S.U.M. Therefore, we believe there is no need for NPS management of these resources. We understand that many state park systems are encountering necessary budgetary constraints similar to those of the National Park Service. We do not believe this constitutes a reason to supplant any state's management of resources.

The Department also has strong concerns with a number of provisions of S. 148 that go beyond the fact that the Great Falls Historic District fails to meet congressionally required criteria for designation. The bill includes Hinchliffe Stadium within the proposed boundary of the unit. Hinchliffe Stadium, built during the 1930s, has important associations with the Negro Baseball Leagues, serving during periods as the home field for the New York Black Yankees. It is also the site where Larry Doby, the second African American to play in the previously all white major leagues, played high school baseball. The site is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, but currently is listed as "locally," rather than "nationally" significant. To be considered as a unit of the National Park System, resources must be determined to meet the criteria for National Historic Landmark (NHL) designation. This resource is far from being considered for NHL status and no nomination for such a designation has been presented to the Department. Hinchliffe Stadium also has no connection to the NHL determined period of historical significance of the Great Falls Historic District, and we believe it should not be considered for unit designation. Costs associated with maintaining and improving the site would also be significant due to its present deteriorated condition.

S. 148 contains other provisions that cause the Department concern. In section 6(d), for example, the bill provides a process for approval of the park's management plan more common to Affiliated Areas of the National Park System or national heritage areas. In section 7, the bill creates a federal commission to coordinate management of the park. In section 8, an advisory council is provided, also appointed by the Secretary, to advise the group created in section 7. In section 10(c), the bill appears to provide for authority to the Secretary to condemn property for Federal ownership under certain circumstances. Congress has been reluctant to extend this authority in recent park legislation.

Section 11(b) provides a matching requirement that for every one federal dollar the value in cash or in-kind of three non-federal dollars must be available. In effect, annual funding to operate the national park unit would be contingent upon the availability of non-federal donations. The Department has concerns with taking on this permanent funding obligation under the assumption that some of the costs would be covered through private fundraising since appropriations would be required if private funds proved to be insufficient. While philanthropic donations can and do help to enhance park activities, facilities and resources, they should not be relied upon to support core operations, including the salaries for permanent staff.

We have specific concerns about the viability of raising funds for this purpose based on our past experience working in Paterson. While during the study period, advocates for unit designation have stated (as does section 2 (a)(10) of the bill) that significant funding for the park will be available from private donors if the unit is established, attempts to verify any tangible evidence of private funding interests were met with the simple explanation that "They will not identify themselves unless and until the park is created." In 1996, Congress authorized $3.3 million through the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act (section 510) in technical assistance, grants, and infrastructure improvements. All funding required a 50 percent local match, yet over the past 11 years, no local matching funds have been made available under this authority.

S. 148 contains other technical and substantive provisions of concern that are incompatible with current unit designation and park management practices.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the Special Resource Study of the Great Falls Historic District does suggest a pathway to an effective partnership with the State of New Jersey to protect and interpret the nationally significant resources of the District. It provides for possible congressional consideration of a Great Falls National Historic Site, as an Affiliated Area of the National Park System, with technical and financial assistance provided by the Secretary of the Interior to the State of New Jersey. We believe that time spent exploring this alternative could enhance the protection of the District's resources by establishing a strong partnership between the NPS and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, one not dissimilar to the very productive partnership we have enjoyed with the State of New Jersey in its 25 years of management of the congressionally designated 1.1 million acre New Jersey Pinelands National Reserve.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the Department's position on this bill. This concludes my prepared remarks and I would be glad to answer any questions that you or the members of the committee may have.

S. 189

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 189, a bill to remove the restriction on land acquisition, to decrease the matching funds requirement and to authorize additional appropriations for Keweenaw National Historical Park in the State of Michigan.

The Department supports enactment of this legislation with one amendment described later in this statement.

S. 189 would amend P.L. 102-543 to remove the restriction on acquiring contaminated property and decrease the ratio for matching fund requirements. It also would increase the appropriation ceilings for development and for financial and technical assistance to owners of non-Federal property, and increase the ceiling for the operations of the Keweenaw National Historical Park Advisory Commission. These changes would enable Keweenaw National Historical Park to acquire land in a manner consistent with other national park units, to better preserve nationally significant resources inside as well as related resources outside of park boundaries, and to better implement the operation of the park's Advisory Commission as envisioned for this ground-breaking partnership park.

The Keweenaw National Historical Park was authorized by Congress in 1992 through Public Law 102-543 to preserve a portion of the Keweenaw Peninsula in the State of Michigan where the prehistoric, aboriginal mining of copper occurred. Artifacts made from this copper were traded as far south as Alabama.

The ensuing copper mining industry "pioneered deep shaft, hard rock mining, milling, and smelting techniques and advancements in related mining technologies later used throughout the world." The picture of copper mining is best represented in the Village of Calumet, the former Calumet and Hecla Mining Company properties, and the former Quincy Mining Company properties. The Calumet National Historic Landmark District and the Quincy Mining Company National Historic Landmark District comprise the vast majority of the land within park boundaries. However, other resources outside the park boundary significantly contribute to "interpret[ing] the historic synergism between the geological, aboriginal, sociological, cultural, technological, and corporate forces that relate the story of copper on the Keweenaw Peninsula."

The park has been unable to acquire key historic sites within the park boundaries because of the park-specific restriction in Section 4(d) of Public Law 102-543 on acquiring contaminated property. For example, the park was unable to pursue acquisition of the "Coppertown" site, which includes the historic Calument & Hecla (C&H) Pattern Shop, the C&H Pattern Storage Warehouse, and the associated lands contributing to the cultural landscape of Calumet's core industrial area, due to contamination revealed in environmental site assessments. This acquisition restriction stopped the National Park Service (NPS) from further action on these important sites despite the limited extent of contaminants at this property and the desire of the park's Advisory Commission and the local community to consider their acquisition.

Existing Department of the Interior policies and procedures require a thorough environmental assessment and review prior to acquisition of real property, with an additional review and professional assessment of those areas found to possess contamination issues. Those areas are then subjected to a graduated approval process, beginning at the Regional Director level, going through the NPS Director, and on up to the Secretary of the Interior, depending on the projected costs of remediation.

The park-specific ban from NPS ownership of contaminated property applies even when mitigation has been undertaken to meet U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Michigan Department of Environmental Quality requirements. This ban also prevents the park from considering alternatives such as acquiring preservation easements. The current restriction would prohibit acquisition even after a common remediation action such as capping contaminated soils is completed since the site would still contain contaminants. S. 189 would strike Section 4(d) of Public Law 102-543, allowing the NPS to acquire or to enter into partnerships for the acquisition of at-risk sites and other historic properties within the park boundaries while still requiring the areas to be subject to existing Servicewide safeguards. Those safeguards include a requirement in the National Park Service acquisition regulations that a contaminants study be prepared before the acquisition of park lands. In addi-

tion, the NPS will consider requiring indemnification agreements from current owners before acquisition of previously contaminated lands for this unit.

The Keweenaw region was built by and subsisted entirely on the wealth generated by the copper industry for more than 100 years. When the industry collapsed, the companies departed, leaving the Copper Country economically depressed. Community expectations of the establishment of a national park on the Keweenaw Peninsula included the development of heritage tourism to assist in economic recovery. In the fifteen years since the inception of the park, even though the park was given authority to provide financial assistance to owners of property containing nationally significant resources to foster historic preservation and visitor services development, there has rarely been an opportunity for the park to provide assistance due to the uncommonly high 4 to 1 match requirement. Depressed communities are hard pressed to provide four-fifths of the cost of preservation projects. The park's ability to foster a preservation ethic of nationally significant resources through partnerships rather than ownership and improve visitor services goals would be significantly enhanced by a decrease in the match requirement for financial and technical assistance to the more common 1 to 1 ratio. The increased ability to effect bricks-and-mortar preservation projects will, in turn, benefit the economic health of these communities. S. 189 would change the ratio from 4-to-1 to 1-to-1, providing a greater opportunity for the park to work with partners and to support the preservation and interpretation of the rapidly deteriorating resources of the park.

S. 189 also would raise the appropriations authorization ceiling for development from $25 million to $50 million. Since 2000, approximately $6 million has been spent on park-owned facilities for administrative use, and it is anticipated that another $7.5 million will be spent for both administrative and visitor use over the next three years. The park's General Management Plan (GMP) called for the early development of partnerships and assistance programs, followed by park-owned visitor facilities. The park is now poised to enter into this facility development phase as prescribed. While the park does not know the total amount that would be spent on implementing this phase of the GMP, having an increased ceiling would allow the park to proceed with the plan and not be hindered by reaching a specific ceiling in the midst of planned activities.

Additionally, S. 189 would authorize Congress to appropriate up to $250,000 annually to meet the needs of the Keweenaw National Historical Park Advisory Commission and would eliminate a required match of funds by the Commission. The Commission was authorized in 1992 to interface with the park's external partners and owners of historic properties and raise funds for park purposes. It has also been charged in part, to "carry out historical, educational, or cultural programs which encourage or enhance appreciation of the historic resources in the park, surrounding areas, and on the Keweenaw Peninsula." Although the Commission has put forth valiant efforts to meet its charge, it will be unable to effectively fulfill its mandates without recurring base funding. The present limit of $100,000 on appropriations for the Commission would fund only the most minimal staff, or allow the Commission to only minimally reimburse the NPS for NPS-supplied-staff as required in the enabling legislation. This increase in the authorization ceiling and the elimination of matching requirements would allow for the sustained and viable operation of the Commission. With sustained operations, the Commission would be able to raise funds for park purposes, including financial and technical assistance to partner sites, and to fulfill its charge to carry out historical, educational, or cultural programs.

Finally, we recommend striking a provision in S. 189 concerning the ceiling on technical and financial assistance. The park has provided financial and technical assistance to owners of historic properties nearly entirely out of park operating funds. It is a primary function of this partnership park. It is expected that such assistance will continue through the use of discretionary park funds rather than specific appropriations for such purposes. Therefore, we recommend striking the language from the bill that seeks to increase the ceiling on financial and technical assistance from $3 million to $25 million and inserting language that eliminates this ceiling. This will result in the law not identifying a specific amount for the park to provide for such purposes and in having the park continue to fund this assistance through the park's base budget rather than providing a separate authorization for it. We have attached the proposed amendment to the testimony.

If enacted, the amendments in S. 189 would significantly enhance park development and operations by eliminating overly restrictive property acquisition criteria, by reducing unrealistic matching fund requirements, by increasing appropriation ceilings to levels that would support the mandates and purposes of the park, and by fulfilling the partnership provisions that are unique to this park unit.

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

Suggested amendment to S. 189

On page 2, line 10 strike subparagraph (B) in its entirety and insert a new subparagraph (B):

> (B) by striking ", and $3,000,000 for financial and technical assistance to owners of non-Federal property as provided in section 8".

S. 867 AND H.R. 299

Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 867 and H.R. 299, bills to adjust the boundary of Lowell National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The Department supports enactment of these bills.

These bills would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire five small tracts of land, totaling less than one acre, and to include these tracts in the boundary of the Lowell National Historical Park. These five small parcels are important to the park's operation.

Lowell National Historical Park preserves and interprets the nationally significant historic and cultural sites, structures and districts in Lowell, Massachusetts, that represent the most significant planned industrial city in the United States and symbolize, in physical form, the Industrial Revolution. The park tells the human story of the Industrial Revolution and the changing role of technology in a 19th and 20th century setting. The cultural heritage of many of the ethnic groups that immigrated to the United States during the 19th and early 20th century, and which continues today, is still preserved in Lowell's neighborhoods. The park provides a vehicle for economic progress in the community, encouraging creative and cooperative preservation and interpretive programs.

The tracts included in this bill are needed to complete development of the Canalway, a linear park and walkway along Lowell's 5.6-mile historic power canal system. The acquisition of these tracts will provide the access points necessary for development, maintenance, and visitor protection in order to complete the Canalway. Approximately two miles of the walkway along Lowell's 5.6-mile canal system remain incomplete. Acquisition rights and associated boundary changes are needed to ensure that park visitors will have access to the entire system and to give the park the right to develop and maintain these canal walkways.

S. 867 and H.R. 299 would authorize the Secretary to acquire the tracts in fee, or by easement, purchase or donation, and if necessary, by means of condemnation. The original 1978 legislation establishing Lowell National Historical Park contains condemnation authority for the Secretary and the now defunct Lowell Historic Preservation Commission. The National Park Service (NPS) inherited the assets of the Commission when it ceased operations in 1995. Although condemnation authority has not been used in 20 years, it is needed now because NPS has been unable to obtain clear title to one of these small tracts through the usual means of title and record searches.

Dating back to the 1800s, tract ownership is uncertain and NPS has not been able to locate or determine the owners. The NPS would use condemnation authority to gain clear title only if owners of the parcels cannot be identified after further attempts through notice in local newspapers is unsuccessful. The Lowell City Council will be consulted and condemnation authority will be used only with its concurrence, as required in the park's enabling legislation. If the Lowell City Council would oppose our intention to use condemnation authority, the park would not proceed.

As has been the practice of the Lowell National Historical Park throughout its Canalway acquisition program, donated easements and fee acquisition will be sought as a first course of action. In the event that property owners are unwilling to donate fee or easement rights, funding for these acquisitions will be sought through public and private funding sources.

The proposed legislation is supported by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the City of Lowell, the Lowell Historic Board, and the Lowell Plan/Lowell Development and Financial Corporation.

Mr. Chairman that concludes my testimony and I will be happy to answer any questions from you or members of the subcommittee.

S. 1341

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on S. 1341, the Las Cienegas Enhancement and Saguaro National Park Boundary Adjustment Act.

S. 1341 provides for the conveyance of Federal land managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in southern Arizona to a private developer in exchange for environmentally significant lands to be included within the Saguaro National Park and the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area (NCA). During the 109th Congress, the BLM testified before the House Resources Committee on legislation that provided for the exchange of the Las Cienegas NCA parcel but that did not include the Saguaro National Park parcel, and, at that time, suggested a number of modifications to that legislation.

The Department appreciates that S. 1341 incorporates the vast majority of our recommendations. We support S. 1341 and would like to provide a few additional amendments to ensure that the bill is in keeping with our land exchange practices.

S. 1341 authorizes an exchange of land between the Department of the Interior and Las Cienegas LLC. The federal land to be conveyed totals approximately 1,200 acres and is referred to in the bill as the "Sahuarita parcel of land." This property is BLM-managed land south of Tucson near Corona de Tucson. The land is low-lying Sonoran desert and has been preliminarily identified for disposal by the BLM through its land use planning process.

The bill would bring two parcels of land into Federal ownership. The first is approximately 2,392 acres of land referred to in the bill as the "Empirita-Simonson parcel of land." This property lies north of the Las Cienegas NCA managed by the BLM in southern Arizona. The lands are currently private property but mostly lie within the "Sonoita Valley Acquisition Planning District" established by Public Law 106-538, which designated the Las Cienegas NCA. The Act directed the Department of the Interior to acquire lands from willing sellers within the planning district for inclusion within the NCA to further protect the important resource values for which the NCA was designated. In addition, these lands would provide important access to the Whetstone Mountains which are managed by the Forest Service. Upon acquisition, the bill provides that the parcel would be administered as part of the La Cienegas NCA.

The second parcel of land consists of 160 acres and is referred to as the Bloom property. This tract is undeveloped and is immediately adjacent to the boundary of the West District of Saguaro National Park. Park planning documents dating back to 1993 have identified this property for acquisition, if available. This tract contains important wildlife corridors and high resource values that would complement the resources already present in the park. The area surrounding the park has seen significant population increases during the last decade and protecting remaining undeveloped areas is a priority for both the park and local communities. Upon acquisition, the bill provides that the parcel would be administered as part of Saguaro National Park.

We recommend three modifications to the bill. First, we would recommend striking section 3(b)(3)(B), which allows a waiver of section 206(b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)) with regard to limiting equalization payments to 25 percent of the value of the Federal land. The inclusion in the bill of section 3(b)(3)(A)(iii), which allows for the reduction of acreages to bring the exchange within the 25 percent ceiling, eliminates the need for section 3(b)(3)(B) and is consistent with BLM policy on equalization of payments. Second, we urge that the timeframes for completing the land exchanges in section 4(e) be extended from one year to 18 months to allow adequate time to complete all of the actions necessary for a land exchange. Third, we would suggest a technical correction to the acreage total for the Empirita-Simonson parcel of land.

We support section 4(b) of the bill to remove the Elgin Landfill from the boundaries of the Las Cienegas NCA; its inclusion within the boundaries of the NCA was an error in need of correction and this provision will address that problem.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on S. 1341, I will be happy to answer any questions.

S. 1709 AND H.R. 1239

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1709 and H.R. 1239, bills to amend the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Act of 1998. Both bills would adjust the authorized funding levels for the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program and for the associated grant program. S. 1709 would also require a minimum number of staff for the program.

The Department supports enactment of H.R. 1239 as passed by the House. We support increasing the authorization ceiling for operation of the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom program and decreasing the authorization for the associated grant program, as both H.R. 1239 and S. 1709 would do. However,

we object to requiring a minimum number of staff for the program, as S. 1709 would do. That provision was also included H.R. 1239 as introduced, but H.R. 1239 was amended to remove that provision before it was passed by the House.

The Network to Freedom program was authorized by Congress in 1998 through Public Law 105-203 to coordinate and facilitate Federal and non-Federal activities to commemorate, honor, and interpret the history of the Underground Railroad—the story of extraordinary actions of ordinary men and women working in common purpose to free a people. The law calls for producing and disseminating educational materials, entering into agreements to provide technical assistance to a variety of public and private entities in the United States, Mexico, Canada, and the Caribbean, and creating a symbol for the network. The network was to include both units and programs within the National Park Service and other entities outside the Service that had a verifiable connection to the Underground Railroad story.

Since the program was established, 328 sites, programs, and facilities in 30 States and the District of Columbia have been included in the Network to Freedom. Through this program, which is national in scope but managed from the Midwest Regional Office, the National Park Service coordinates preservation and education efforts nationwide, integrating local historical sites, museums, and interpretive programs into a mosaic of community, regional, and national stories of the Underground Railroad.

In 2000, Congress authorized the Underground Railroad matching grants program through Public Law 106-291 to provide support for preservation of buildings and other structures and related research to members of the network. Funds for these matching grants have been appropriated three times—$250,000 in Fiscal 2002; $295,800 in Fiscal 2005, and $375,000 in Fiscal 2006. In total, 52 grants have been awarded for projects. Several projects involved stabilizing and preserving historic buildings, such as Eleutherian College in Indiana, Constitution Hall in Topeka, Kansas, Mayhew Cabin in Nebraska, and the Oswego School District Public Library in New York. Other projects focused on expanding research in support of site interpretation, such as the archeological survey at John Rankin House in Ohio, or education, such as the "Discovering New Bedford's Underground Railroad History" program in Massachusetts, a cooperative project among three local partners.

Through its establishment, the Network to Freedom has brought traditional National Park Service strengths in preservation, interpretation, and planning to new communities. The program carries the message about the cultural and historic aspect of national parks directly to communities of color and opens the door for public participation in the expansion and design of the program at a grassroots level. The program has become an essential part of our ongoing effort to enhance diversity in our parks and programs.

The Network to Freedom's work with outside partners led to the establishment of Friends of the Network to Freedom in 2006. The Friends group will work to raise funds to support cooperative projects, but the funding will not substitute for regular operations funding.

H.R. 1239 and S. 1709 would increase the authorization ceiling for operating the Network to Freedom program from $500,000 annually, the amount that was set in the 1998 law, to $2 million. Along with increasing the funding level, S. 1709 would require the Secretary to appoint at least eight full-time equivalent staff to carry out the program. In addition, both bills would reduce the authorization ceiling for the Underground Railroad grant program from $2.5 million annually, the amount set in the 2000 law, to $500,000.

When the Network to Freedom program was first authorized, it appeared that $500,000 annually would be sufficient to operate the program. However, with the addition of the grant program, the growth of the network to more than 300 members, and nine years worth of increases in pay and other fixed costs, the program could justify more than $500,000 a year in subsequent budget requests. NPS is spending $487,000 in FY 2007. An authorization ceiling of $2 million would enable the Administration to request, and Congress to appropriate, additional funding for this program, subject to overall NPS priorities and the availability of funds.

For the grant program, we believe it is appropriate to reduce the authorization ceiling from $2.5 million annually to $500,000. In the seven years of its existence, Congress has not appropriated any amount larger than $375,000 for grants. With the amounts provided, program staff has been able to provide grants to nearly all network members who have sought them and who have also been able to raise the necessary matching funds.

S. 1709 would require NPS to increase the staff of Network to Freedom program from six to eight. We do not believe it is appropriate to establish a minimum staffing requirement in law. The National Park Service needs to have the flexibility to determine appropriate staffing based on program needs and available funds. Estab-

lishing a minimum number of staff in law could hinder efforts to achieve management efficiencies. If the committee acts on S. 1709, we recommend striking Section 2, as was done in the House-passed version of H.R. 1239.

In addition, we do not support providing for funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization to remain available until expended for operations funding, as S. 1709 would do. Allowing such funding to be available until expended would establish budgetary treatment for this program that is different from all other operations funding in the National Park Service. We do support allowing funding for grants to be available until expended, as S. 1709 would also do. If the committee acts on S. 1709, we recommend amending Section 3 to make this distinction. H.R. 1239, as passed by the House, does not provide for funding to be available until expended for either type of spending.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony and I am prepared to answer any questions that you or other members of the committee might have at this time.

S. 1969

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to provide the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1969, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating Estate Grange and other sites related to Alexander Hamilton's life on the island of St. Croix in the United States Virgin Islands as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

The Department supports S. 1969. However, the Department feels that priority should be given to the 37 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic River System that have not yet been transmitted to the Congress.

Studies of this type typically take approximately three years to complete after funds are made available. We estimate the cost for this study to be approximately $250,000.

S. 1969 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Governor of the Virgin Islands, to conduct a special resource study of Estate Grange and other sites and resources associated with the life of Alexander Hamilton on St. Croix, in the U.S. Virgin Islands. The study would evaluate the sites according to established criteria to determine whether it is appropriate for addition to the National Park System, or whether it is better suited to protection by another entity.

Hamilton was born out of wedlock in Charlestown, Nevis, the capital of the island of Nevis, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Leeward Islands, West Indies to James A. Hamilton, the fourth son of a Scottish laird, and Rachel Faucett Lavien, of part French Huguenot descent. There is, however, some evidence that Hamilton's biological father may have been a Nevis merchant named Thomas Stevens.

In 1765, a business assignment led James Hamilton to move the family to Christiansted, St. Croix. James then abandoned Rachel and their two sons. After James left, Rachel supported the family by keeping a small store in Christiansted. She contracted a "severe fever" and died on February 19, 1768, leaving Hamilton effectively orphaned.

After his mother's death, Hamilton was twice adopted and worked as a clerk with a local import-export firm with ties to the New York area. Impressed with his writings, the local community created a fund to send him to New Jersey for a formal education. He was attending King's College in New York when the Revolutionary War began.

During the Revolutionary War, Hamilton served as an artillery captain, was an aide-de-camp to General George Washington, and led three battalions at the Battle of Yorktown.

One of America's first constitutional lawyers, he was a leader in calling the U.S. Constitutional Convention in 1787 and was one of the two chief authors of the Federalist Papers, the most cited contemporary interpretation of intent for the United States Constitution. Under President Washington, Hamilton became the first Secretary of the Treasury.

The Estate Grange, a former rum factory and sugar plantation, was once the home of Hamilton's mother and she is buried on the premises. The 115-acre estate is situated approximately 1.5 to 2 miles southwest of Christiansted National Historic Site and is owned by the Armstrong Trust.

In 1886, the Great House, which has five bedrooms and four baths, was used as a convalescent home for Danish gendarmes stricken by yellow fever at the Christiansted barracks. In later years the Great house was modified, by subsequent owners, by adding a grand staircase on the southwest corner of the building and con-

verting the gallery to a dining room. The basement, with arched window openings and passageways, includes stone and coral-walled bedrooms, as-well-as storage areas.

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

S. 128

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 128, a bill to amend the Cache la Poudre River Corridor Act to designate a new management entity, make certain technical and conforming amendments, enhance private property protections, and for other purposes.

The Department has no objection to S. 128 if amended as described in this testimony to make the bill similar to other recent national heritage area bills. The Administration usually does not support extending the time period for financial assistance to national heritage areas, but is willing to accept an extension in this case, given the statutory problems in establishing a management entity.

The Cache la Poudre River Corridor was established on October 19, 1996 by P.L. 104-323. The National Park Service (NPS), working with former Senator Hank Brown and members of the community, completed a resource study that focused on the area's history of water and water rights. Water rights continue to be an important issue in the west, and the Cache la Poudre River Corridor provides a unique opportunity to tell the story of the natural history of 19th century settlement, irrigation, and establishment of water rights in an arid environment.

S. 128 would correct a number of technical errors, provide a more accurate definition of the national heritage area's boundary, change the management of the heritage area to a private not-for-profit organization from a federal commission, include the proper spelling of the Cache la Poudre River, and change the name of the area to more accurately reflect the purpose for which the area was established.

Congress established the Cache la Poudre River heritage area in 1996, however, it has never been fully operational due to concerns from the Department of Justice over language used in the law to appoint members to the operating commission that potentially conflict with the appointments clause of the Constitution. The NPS and members of the Colorado delegation have been working for several years to reach an agreement on legislative language that meets the concerns laid out by the Department of Justice, preserves the regional administration of the area, and protects private property rights. S. 128 meets these goals.

The most significant change in S. 128 is the management entity. It replaces a federally appointed advisory commission with a local 501(c)(3) organization, the Poudre Heritage Alliance. Established in 2002, this group has continued to lead the program, meeting regularly with the public, conducting research and developing the elements of the required management plan. The Alliance represents a broad spectrum of the area's residents, organizations, and agencies that were involved in the planning for the National Heritage Area.

The NPS exercises limited oversight of national heritage areas. The current management of those areas is the responsibility of qualified management entities, with NPS providing financial and technical assistance to help with visitor education and planning if needed. Cache la Poudre, however, has received limited financial assistance, because of the problems in establishing a qualified management entity. NPS has provided some planning and research assistance over the past 10 years.

S. 128 would extend the authority to receive financial assistance until 10 years after enactment of this bill. In most cases, that would raise concerns about postponing the time when the heritage area becomes self-sufficient. In this case, however, the previous delays in designating a qualified management entity have significantly limited both the progress in establishing the heritage area and the financial assistance provided. Over 10 years, NPS has provided approximately $340,000 in financial assistance to the Cache la Poudre River heritage area, which is less than one-tenth of what was provided to other heritage areas established at the same time.

The bill also authorizes the development of a management plan within three years of enactment and authorizes the use of federal funds to develop and implement that plan. If the plan is not submitted within three years of enactment of this Act, the Heritage Area becomes ineligible for federal funding until a plan is submitted to the Secretary. Additionally, the Secretary may, at the request of the management entity, provide technical assistance and enter into cooperative agreements with other public and private entities.

S. 128 contains safeguards to protect private property, including a prohibition on the use of federal funds to acquire property. The bill proposes no new restrictions with regard to private property rights and does not convey any water right or water restrictions to the federal government.

S. 128 would also correct a number of errors in the original legislation. The first correction would be the proper spelling of the river, with a lower case "l" for Cache la Poudre. It replaces the original name of the heritage area from Cache La Poudre River Corridor to Cache la Poudre River National Heritage Area. It also replaces a listing of flood plain map references with a map developed specifically for the area.

It appears that the amendments that the bill suggests to P. L. 104-323 result in contradictory language regarding land acquisition within the heritage area. We would like to work with the Subcommittee to clarify this language and make it similar to other heritage areas.

We also suggest including an additional requirement for an evaluation to be conducted by the Secretary, three years prior to the cessation of federal funding under this act. The evaluation would examine the accomplishments of the heritage area in meeting the goals of the management plan, analyze the leveraging and impact of investments to the heritage area, identify the critical components of the management structure and sustainability of the heritage area, and recommend what future role, if any, the NPS should have with respect to the heritage area.

Lastly, legislative language regarding National Heritage Areas has evolved since 1996 when the Cache la Poudre Heritage Corridor was enacted. We recommend amending the bill further to make the amended act similar to other, more recent heritage area legislation. We would be happy to work with the Subcommittee to develop these amendments.

Mr. Chairman that concludes my prepared remarks. I would be pleased to answer any questions you or other members of the Subcommittee may have.

S. 697

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 697 to establish the Steel Industry National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania.

The Department opposes enactment of this legislation.

S. 697 would establish a unit of the National Park System comprising resources related to the former United States Steel Homestead Works in the boroughs of Munhall, Rankin, and Swissvale, Pennsylvania. The resources include the site of the Battle of Homestead, which is important to labor history in the United States, the remnants of the Carrie Furnace, and the Hot Metal Bridge connecting mill sites in Rankin and Munhall.

The resources cited in the bill are representative of what was once a larger and historically important steel industry complex in the Pittsburgh region and the rise of the labor movement by steelworkers. The "Homestead Lockout," is one of the seminal events in American Labor history. We believe the resources are worthy of preservation and have significant interpretive value to the people of the United States and to those who may visit the site from other nations. They enable visitors to understand the role of steel manufacturing in our nation's history and the manner in which labor and management interacted before and during a most important time in the development of organized labor in the United States. This is the place that enriched men such as Andrew Carnegie and J.P. Morgan, and in which immigrant workers and their descendents produced quality steel for U.S. and world markets.

The National Park Service (NPS) completed a Special Resource Study involving these sites in 2002. The study concluded that the sites were not feasible to administer as a unit of the National Park System; that the site of the "Homestead Lockout" lacked integrity; and, that there was no need for NPS management. The configuration and condition of the resources—scattered sites in varying states of repair, uncertainty regarding the protection of the resource setting over time (e.g. the area adjacent to the Homestead Landing Site is now a shopping center), and significant improvement and operational costs exposure—led to the conclusion that the site did not meet criteria for designation as a unit of the National Park System. The costs associated with stabilization and rehabilitation of the Carrie Furnace and the Homestead Site, alone, were estimated in the study to be in excess of $14 million. With the addition of costs for exhibits and visitor services facilities, the total capital costs would rise to over $36,600,000.

The study also concluded that a local management framework could adequately protect and manage these historic resources since they are all located within the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area. Rather than establishing a unit of the Na-

tional Park System, the study recommended that these and additional historically important resources, including properties in the Homestead National Register Historic District and the Bost Building (a National Historic Landmark and the site of union headquarters during the strike), be designated as an affiliated area of the National Park System. An affiliated area designation would suggest a significantly reduced federal contribution for capital and associated operational costs, while increasing the opportunities for a wider scale of resource protection measures and visitor experiences at nearby critically related resources. Local partners would contribute the larger share of costs for rehabilitation and interpretive facilities and services. The Bost Building, now owned and operated by the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, the management entity for the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, would be the initial focal point of the affiliated area. We believe that an affiliated area status would permit a viable federal/local partnership for resource protection and enjoyment.

Establishment of a national historic site, as an affiliated area, would include a wider array of relevant resources than proposed in S. 697, without NPS ownership and management, but with technical and financial assistance, appears to be a better approach to protecting these resources for public education and enjoyment. This level of federal recognition and involvement could be a catalyst for greater local commitments and initiatives, and would serve to enhance public understanding, interest and appreciation of the roles of labor and management in the "Big Steel" era. We believe, based on the financial leveraging history of the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, that there is sufficient local capacity to contribute substantially to the preservation and interpretation of these resources.

Mr. Chairman that concludes my statement and I am prepared to answer any questions that members of the subcommittee may wish to ask.

S. 1039

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the Department of the Interior's views on S. 1039 a bill to extend the authorization for the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route for an additional four years.

The Department supports enactment of this bill with two amendments.

The Act of October 20, 1988 authorized the Secretary to designate a vehicular tour route in coastal New Jersey and to prepare an inventory of sites along the route. An interpretive program was also mandated to provide for public appreciation, education, understanding and enjoyment of important fish and wildlife habitats, geologic and geographical landforms, cultural resources, and migration routes in coastal New Jersey. The Secretary was authorized to provide technical assistance, prepare and distribute information, and erect signs along the route. The trail links national wildlife refuges, national parklands, National Historic Landmarks, and National Register sites with important historic communities, state parks, natural areas, and other resources to tell the story of New Jersey's role in shaping U.S. history and in providing internationally important habitats for bird and other migrations.

The trail, an affiliated area of the National Park System, is a partnership among the National Park Service, the State of New Jersey, and many local government and private non-profit partners. Through interpretation of five themes (Maritime History, Coastal Habitats, Wildlife Migration, Relaxation & Inspiration, and Historic Settlements), the trail brings attention to important natural and cultural resources along coastal New Jersey. The trail demonstrates the potential of new public/private partnerships that allow the National Park Service to meet its core mission of natural and cultural resource preservation along with interpretation and public education in a cost-efficient manner through technical assistance while reducing operational responsibilities. No federal funds are used for operations, maintenance, or repair of any road or related structure.

Extending the authorization of the trail would enable the National Park Service to complete implementation of the trail plan, as supported by the public and our partners. Without additional time and funding, the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route will be left incomplete. Implementation of the plan is also critical in building a base of sustainable partners and developing a strategy for the long-term management of the trail. Additionally, commitments to trail partners would go unfulfilled, and many additional natural and cultural resources would not receive the partnership assistance leveraged by the trail.

Public Law 109-338, the National Heritage Areas Act of 2006, reauthorized federal funding for the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route until September 30, 2007, while also requiring a strategic plan to be prepared by the Secretary three

years after funds are made available. The current sunset date of September 30, 2007 does not provide adequate time to complete the preparation of the strategic plan. The strategic plan is an important tool to help the trail develop a long-term management strategy that includes a variety of options for sustainability of the trail. In order to carry out this provision, the authorization for federal funding for the trail should be extended to September 30, 2011, to match the time period for the completion and transmittal of the strategic plan.

The Department recommends two amendments to the bill. First, we recommend that the long title of the bill be amended to use the generally accepted name of the trail, which is the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route. Second, the current authorization of appropriations for the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Route is limited to the Secretary providing technical assistance and funds for the design and fabrication of interpretive materials, devices and signs. All federals funds under the enabling legislation require a non-federal, one-to-one match. We recommend that S. 1039 be amended to authorize the Secretary to use federal funding to complete the strategic plan since the current authorization does not allow for funds to be used for this purpose.

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

S. 1476

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1476, a bill to conduct a special resources study of the Tule Lake Segregation Center in Modoc County, California, to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing a unit of the National Park System.

The Department supports this legislation with amendments described later in this statement. The study authorized by S. 1476 would provide the opportunity to evaluate options for preserving and interpreting the largest and most heavily guarded of the ten internment camps where Japanese American citizens from west coast states were forced to live during World War II under Executive Order 9066. However, the Department feels that priority should be given to the 37 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic River System that have not yet been transmitted to the Congress.

Tule Lake, which housed more than 18,000 internees at its peak, was the only internment camp that was converted to a maximum-security segregation center for evacuees from all the relocation centers who resisted internment. It was the only camp that had its own jail. It had the most guard towers and the largest number of military police of any of the camps. During its operation, the center was the site of several acts of resistance and declarations of martial law and military control.

The Tule Lake site features more surviving historic features and resources in original locations than all of the other former internment camps combined. The original jail structure is, for the former internees, the most significant symbol of internment anywhere in the United States. In 2006, the Secretary of the Interior designated 42 acres of the Tule Lake Segregation Center as a National Historic Landmark. The designation confirmed the national significance of the site, one of the key criteria a resource must meet to be considered an appropriate candidate for establishment as a unit of the National Park System. The work done on the nomination for National Historic Landmark designation would provide a foundation for the study that would be authorized by S. 1476.

The National Park Service administers two sites that were used as internment camps for Japanese Americans during World War II: Manzanar National Historic Site, in central California, which was authorized by Congress in 1992, and Minidoka Internment National Monument, in southern Idaho, which was established by presidential proclamation in 2001. However, neither site has the unique historic resources or story that Tule Lake has as the only designated segregation center among the ten internment camps.

The study would evaluate the site according to criteria provided by law to determine whether it is appropriate for addition to the National Park System, or whether it is better suited to protection by another entity. In carrying out the study, the National Park Service would work closely with the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, and the California Department of Transportation, which are the primary land managers, as well as private land owners in the area, local agencies, and groups interested in the preservation of Japanese American internment sites, including the Tule Lake Committee. The study would cost an estimated $150,000 to $200,000.

S. 1476 provides for the study to be completed within one year after funds are made available for it. We recommend that the bill be amended to provide for the study to be completed within three years after funds are made available, which is the standard time frame for conducting special resource studies. We would also like to work with the committee to simplify the language of S. 1476 in several places.

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

S. 1808

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 1808, a bill to authorize the exchange of exclusive use easements between the National Park Service and the Alaska Railroad within Denali National Park.

The Department supports S. 1808.

S. 1808 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Alaska Railroad (Railroad) an exclusive use easement to not more than 25 acres of land in exchange for the Railroad's relinquishment of an exclusive use easement of equal size to the federal government. The bill would limit the use of the easement conveyed to the Railroad to activities necessary for the operation of the railway. The bill would also require the Railroad to pay the costs associated with the exchange, including the costs for surveys and compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). To complete the exchange, the Alaska Legislature would have to approve any release of Railroad land interests as the Alaska Railroad is a state-owned corporation. The exchange would have to be carried out within five years after enactment.

Both easements in question are located within Denali National Park on land owned by the federal government. The exchange of easements would not affect federal ownership of underlying lands. The easement conveyed to the Railroad would be used to build a train turn-around at Denali National Park. The easement relinquished by the Railroad would be managed in its natural state as part of Denali National Park. If it is adjacent to the Denali Wilderness, this bill would add the land to the wilderness.

The Alaska Railroad provides passenger rail service from Whittier, Anchorage, and Fairbanks to Denali National Park. In 2005, the Alaska Railroad carried more than 260,000 passengers to Denali National Park. In 2006, that number rose to over 300,000. The Railroad's ability to manage this increasing traffic is limited by the lack of a turn-around at Denali. Under current conditions, trains carrying visitors from Anchorage to Denali must continue to Fairbanks. Trains traveling south from Fairbanks to Denali must likewise continue to Anchorage. To accommodate existing traffic, the Railroad concentrates passenger service into two trains to Denali per day, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. These trains average 20 coach cars in length and carry up to 1,500 passengers each. The arrival of so many visitors to the park at one time often causes congestion, crowding, and traffic. For example, visitors who travel by train to Denali Park Station must travel by bus to enter the park. The concentration of rail traffic results in two major "pulses" of buses that leave the park entrance and travel into the park each day.

A turnaround would allow trains to run round trips from either Fairbanks or Anchorage to the park. It would offer the Railroad the ability to economically use smaller trains and to offer more trips to the park each day. This expanded schedule would, in turn, allow the park to smooth out the bus schedule and provide a less crowded experience for visitors.

The lands that would be affected by this bill are within the boundary of Denali National Park and owned by the federal government. The Alaska Railroad Transfer Act of 1982 (45 U.S.C. Sections 1201-1214) conveyed to the state an exclusive use easement to the Railroad for the approximately 35 miles of track through park. This Act limited the use of the easement to activities necessary for the operation of the railway and mandated that the state operate the Railroad subject to laws and regulations for the protection of park values. S. 1808 would apply these same conditions to the easement it conveys to the Railroad.

Although not specified in the bill, the proposed location of the turn-around is approximately four miles south of Denali Park Station on land that has been determined to be unsuitable for wilderness designation. The Railroad has identified four parcels of land that are of interest to the National Park Service.

The National Park Service believes that full public involvement in the planning process should occur prior to deciding if a land exchange should occur. This would occur through the NEPA compliance that is provided for in the proposed legislation.

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

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Wenk.

As I noted in my opening statement, most of these appear to be non-controversial. So I'd like to take a minute and focus on the bills that you raise concerns about.

S. 148, Paterson Great Falls National Park, the proponents of S. 148, the Paterson Great Falls National Park Bill contend that the Park Service study is flawed. That many noted historians and scholars have criticized the Park Service's findings. Are you aware of these criticisms and do you have any comment to make on them?

Mr. WENK. Yes, we are. We're currently in the process where we're evaluating or looking at our responses to the public comments. We are aware of the opinions that have been generated by individuals from throughout the country. We are, that will be part of our response when we send the package up to Congress early in 2008.

Senator AKAKA. Your testimony notes that one of the Park Service concerns with S. 148 is that there are other sites in the National Park System that interpret similar themes, as the proposed Paterson Great Falls Park would. But isn't it common to have several parks that interpret related themes? If the resources at Paterson are nationally significant, as your testimony suggests, why is it a problem to add one more site to help tell these stories?

Mr. WENK. The question, certainly there are other sites. There's sites such as the Lowell National Historical Park, there's Slater's Mill within the John H. Chafee Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor, that are protected as similar resources.

I believe that we are looking at the cost that's associated with the site, the fact that there are limited resources for the protection of these areas. We think that the story of that era is adequately told in the other areas, and so that it is not necessary.

It also has already been afforded protection by the State and local governments, for protection of the area.

Senator AKAKA. My next question concerns S. 697, the proposed Steel Industry National Historic Site. Is your primary concern that the site would be too expensive to administer or is it that the resources are not nationally significant and appropriate for National Park designation?

Mr. WENK. The Carrie Furnace area has been determined to have national significance, however the cost—one of the sites that was identified, the Bost Warehouse, that site is actually outside of the proposed boundary.

The Homestead area, that area lacks integrity for consideration as part of the site.

Having said that, the cost is a major component. Between the cost of rehabilitation and the interpretive work that would need to be done, we believe the cost would approach $40 million if this was determined to be a Historical Park.

Senator AKAKA. My next question is on S. 1341, the land exchange in southern Arizona.

I understand that this bill primarily affects the Bureau of Land Management. But I wonder if you can clarify one issue. The bill requires the lands to be exchanged, to be of equal value as of the

date of enactment. My understanding is that the standard valuation practice is to require the values to be equal at the time the lands are appraised. Does the Department have any concern with this provision?

Mr. WENK. I think you're correct, that is our position, that it is at the time of the appraisal. I think that is a correction that would need to be made to make it consistent with other exchanges that we have throughout the country. Thank you.

Senator AKAKA. My final question to you concerns S. 1808, the authorization for the land exchange between the National Park Service and the Alaska Railroad at Denali National Park.

This bill requires the lands exchange to be on an equal acre basis, not equal value. Why is it appropriate to focus on acreage instead of value as is more typical for land exchanges?

Mr. WENK. This is all currently Federal land and these are easements that we're exchanging. So the exchange of the easement would, we believe is an appropriate equal—acreage would be an appropriate way to look at the exchange. We believe there's sufficient acreage and believe it's an appropriate thing to do to improve, both our ability to manage and the delivery of visitors to the Park.

Senator AKAKA. The bill doesn't specify which particular lands or easements are to be exchanged. Would it be appropriate to specifically identify in the bill the parcels to be exchanged?

Mr. WENK. We've not yet done the environmental analysis to look at all the various options that would be available for exchange. Until that is done, we do not know which parcels may be the best interest of the exchange for the public.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Wenk.

Senator.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Senator Burr.

Senator BURR. Welcome. I'll try to run through these as quick as I can.

Paterson Great Falls Park—how many acres of the proposed area are in private ownership and how much will remain in private ownership, were it designated?

Mr. WENK. It's my understanding that there, that the only thing that would be looked at for Federal ownership would be those areas necessary for the administration. I can't give you a specific number. I know that we do not intend to acquire, we would only acquire land through willing sellers.

Senator BURR. I get the impression that we've already got a Historic District Congressionally created. We're trying to rectify elsewhere in the country, in holdings that might exist. Wouldn't this go against the grain of what we're trying to rectify out there, were we to?

Mr. WENK. I believe that we're looking at this, the overall management of the site is one of the issues that we have in terms of the criteria, in terms of the feasibility of managing the site. So certainly, we are concerned about all aspects that would relate to difficulty with that management.

Certainly we do try to eliminate in-holdings when we believe they're in parks across the country, when they're important to the overall management of the park area. I believe, as this is proposed,

that I think about a third of the proposed National Historic Site would include a State park within the boundary of the park area, as it's proposed.

Senator BURR. OK. The Keweenaw National Historic Park matching funds. Do you know how many parks we have that in their enacting legislation, provided for matching funds, based upon some leverage of private funds?

Mr. WENK. It's not uncommon, but I cannot give you the number. We can provide the number for you, I'm sure.

Senator BURR. Let me ask you, and if you don't know the answer, would you get it back for us?

Mr. WENK. Sure.

[The information follows:]

The National Park Service does not know the exact number of parks whose enabling legislation requires matching federal funds with non-federal funds. A few examples of parks that do have this requirement include Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, in Massachusetts, that requires a 3:1 match of non-federal dollars to federal dollars, and New Bedford Whaling National Historical Park, also in Massachusetts, that requires a 3:1 match for cooperative agreements and a 1:1 match for visitor and interpretive facilities. The majority of park units do not require a non-federal match for operations.

Senator BURR. Under the Centennial Fund, would that create an opportunity for this park, or any park that currently has matching funds, to then double dip?

Mr. WENK. Currently, we are not including land acquisition. The projects that were presented to Congress, in terms of the centennial challenge, I believe, about 200 different projects that we had certified eligible, none of those were land acquisition projects. We are looking at those separately to try and to determine the criteria that should be used. So I believe the answer is, we do not yet know on the land acquisition side, how we're going to look at the Centennial Challenge funds. That's something we're still developing.

Senator BURR. Can I just throw that out as a cautionary note?

Mr. WENK. Yes.

Senator BURR. It's one of the things, as we try to come to some finality on that legislation, that the intent here is not to create additional pots—it is to have a program leveraging private support with matching Federal support, which I embrace, wholeheartedly.

The Steel Industry National Historic Site Designation. Clearly, I understand the cost that would be incurred of repairs to the structures. How many other National Heritage Areas or portions of such areas have been designated within the National Park System?

Mr. WENK. National Historic Heritage Areas, we have 37 that have been designated, to date. If you're asking me how many different park areas have been designated within those National——

Senator BURR. As units?

Mr. WENK. Once again, I will have to get you that number, sir.

Senator BURR. Thank you.

Mr. WENK. To give you, specifically.

[The information follows:]

Of the 37 National Heritage Areas, none are units of the National Park System. However, 28 contain within their boundaries, one or more units of the National Park System.

Senator BURR. How many structures are there on this proposed site?

Mr. WENK. I'm sorry, I do not know the answer.

Senator BURR. OK. Has a study been conducted to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the site as a unit of the National Park System and if it was, what were those findings?

Mr. WENK. The Carrie Furnace site has been designated a National Historic Landmark, I believe, and that in itself gives it national significance.

Excuse me for 1 minute.

Yes, I'm sorry. There was study done. It was done in 2002 and it determined that it did not meet the criteria for inclusion as a National Park Area.

Senator BURR. Thank you. I'd be remiss if I didn't ask this last one, relative to the Alexander Hamilton Site Study at Virgin Islands. How many existing National Park Units currently interpret the life and contributions of Alexander Hamilton?

Mr. WENK. Certainly, the Hamilton Grange, his home, Independence in Philadelphia, Federal Hall in New York all have a significant interpretation, I believe, of Alexander Hamilton.

Senator BURR. Do we know what it would cost to conduct the proposed study?

Mr. WENK. The study itself would probably cost around $200,000. We would look at about a 1-year period of time to complete it.

Senator BURR. Great. Thank you.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Burr.

I want to thank you very much. I'm sorry.

Senator Menendez, your questions?

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

Mr. Wenk, even though the hearing today is before the Senate bill, you're familiar that there is a House bill that has passed the committee, are you not?

Mr. WENK. Yes, I am familiar.

Senator MENENDEZ. In that House bill, it has been amended in various ways, rather significant ways. They eliminated a section allowing the NPS to exercise eminent domain. They streamlined the management and advisory committee. They changed the designation to a National Historical Park. They eliminated Hinchliffe Field, which you mentioned as one of your objections from the park because it was not studied. If those amendments were made to the pending Senate bill, would you still be in opposition to it?

Mr. WENK. Yes, we would. The questions of suitability and feasibility still remain on the criteria.

Senator MENENDEZ. All right. So you oppose the House bill that has passed the committee?

Mr. WENK. Yes.

Senator MENENDEZ. OK. That will likely pass the House of Representatives in full, shortly. All right.

Let me ask you this. At an early stage of the Paterson's Great Falls study, the National Park Service launched a special web page devoted to the Paterson study. For all the years the study continued, the web page noted that the Administration, "Does not support addition of new units to the National Parks system." What effect did the Administration policy have on the Paterson study?

Mr. WENK. I guess I'm not able to quantify.

Senator MENENDEZ. But it had some effect, did it not?

Mr. WENK. I would—I'm not aware of any effect that it had on it.

Senator MENENDEZ. Why would you have put, during all of the period of time of the Paterson study, right on that web page where you were soliciting, supposedly, commentary and invitation during the comment period, that the Administration does not support addition of new units to the National Parks system. Doesn't that undermine the very essence of why we seek public comment? I tell people we, "Well, the Administration doesn't want any more parks so——"

Mr. WENK. I believe the statement is made so that we are, we have not taken a position while we're in the study period.

Senator MENENDEZ. That's a very unique reason. Did you do that with every website that you put out?

Mr. WENK. I would have to check and see, sir.

Senator MENENDEZ. Would you answer that for the committee, please?

Mr. WENK. Yes, I will.

[The information follows:]

The message on the website was inadvertently placed there and once discovered, was immediately removed since it did not reflect current Departmental policies regarding new areas. I am unaware if this occurred on ony other Nationl Park Service websites during the study period. The National Park Service follows standard guidelines and requirements for conducting special resource studies as directed by Congress. Given the high number of public comments submitted in support of designation during the study period, it would seem that the message did not have an impact on public input.

Senator MENENDEZ. The Park Service published a draft of the Paterson Great Falls study for public comment in November 2005 and invited the public to provide comments by January 30, 2006. It's astonishing to read the letters of some of the most distinguished scholars in America, characterize what the Park Service did in the Paterson study.

Let me just use a few of their words. The use words like "misreads the historical record," "seriously deficient," "demonstrably wrong," "false," "a serious misreading of the historical record." As a result of getting all these letters from leading scholars, what changes did the Park Service make in the draft study? Any?

Mr. WENK. I'm not aware of the specific changes. I do know that we're, at the present time, looking at all the public comments and that will be part of our transmittal to you early in 2008.

Senator MENENDEZ. But you haven't made any changes in the draft study, as a result of all those comments.

Mr. WENK. Those, the changes will be made in the subsequent document, sir.

Senator MENENDEZ. Now, the Park Service says that the Paterson, what Paterson represents is already covered elsewhere in the National Park System, in part because water, power, and industry are covered in Lowell National Historical Park.

Let me read to you testimony that I think is before the committee, Mr. Chairman, from Eric DeLony, the former chief of the Historic American Engineering Record of the National Park Service, the U.S. Department of Interior. He says, "The range of these

works is unique in the nation." He goes on to say, "Paterson's varied and evolving nature of manufacturing also differentiates the area from other National Park System sites that deal with the discrete aspects of industry.

Although Lowell serves a valuable role in the National Parks system as an example of the 19th century cotton industry, Paterson represents so much more. Paterson ventured into silk textiles as early as the 1830s, eventually becoming the largest silk producer in the world," not America, in the world, "and making America a major force in international commerce."

It goes on to talk about it being a hub for non-textile manufacturing, the first revolving pistol assembled in Paterson, of the Colt gun mill. During the 19th and 20th century, Paterson playing a major role in producing forms of nearly every type of transportation, locomotives, submarines, bridges, the engine for the Spirit of Saint Louis, the B–17 Flying Fortress of World War II. "No other site," this is his testimony, "in the National Park Service, not even those that illustrate the cultural theme of industry, comes close to the breadth of Paterson's story."

Now, how does that reconcile, you gave an answer to Senator Akaka about, this is taken care of by Lowell. That's seems to be a far different cry.

Mr. WENK. These are all, I understand the question. I understand the presentation of the differences between the two site areas. That is part of the things that we will be resolving as we're looking at the comments and as we transmit this to the Senate.

Senator MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have your indulgence for another 2 minutes?

Senator AKAKA. Yes.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you.

Mr. Wenk, to suggest, when the Park Service says that what Paterson represents is already covered elsewhere, lies in Lowell. Would that mean that the Air and Space Museum would not have been built because of the Wright Brothers National Memorial at Kittyhawk?

Mr. WENK. I don't——

Senator MENENDEZ. Would that mean that the World War II Memorial would not have been built because the U.S.S. Arizona Memorial, where the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor would have been ineligible?

Mr. WENK. I don't believe so.

Senator MENENDEZ. Finally, did not Governor Corzine write a letter to Secretary Kempthorne on September 11th of last year, that said, "The State of New Jersey alone, can not, can not protect the resources of the Great Falls and properly present them to the public without an NPS unit in Paterson."

How is it that when you have a State that can't meet the wherewithal on its own to protect what you, yourself, as an agency says, has national historical significance—how can you conclude that the, how the study concluded the State would be doing, or including the fact that the State of New Jersey is willing to put down $10 million toward this? But that, in fact, it is unfeasible when the State is willing to put $10 million down? It doesn't have the money to

achieve what your estimate is, but when the State puts $10 million down, I don't know how often you get those type of offers.

Mr. WENK. I would suggest we are—the offer is, while it's not unique, it's not common. I think that we're looking at it as a——

Senator MENENDEZ. It's a very significant park.

Mr. WENK. It is. We're looking at it as, the study recommends that we have a pathway to a future through an affiliated area, and that kind of an offer would coincide very directly with an affiliated area that we would work with the State to manage.

Senator MENENDEZ. Finally, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Zax who, I think, may offer testimony at some point today—but I want to, while I'm here, draw our attention to page 19 of, well this was a submission to Secretary Kempthorne.

It says, "The draft study clearly errs in concluding that Hamilton's economic vision as realized not by the SUM in Paterson, but by the Boston Associates in Lowell, and other New England mill towns.

Hamilton worked to create an economy that would allow immigrants to share directly in America's boundless opportunities. Contrary to the draft study's strained argument, the Boston Associates—a group of wealthy Boston Brahmian families, connected through interlocking corporate directorates and marriage—never sought to achieve Hamilton's vision of opportunity for all. Unlike Hamilton, one of the most ardent opponents of slavery at the time, the Boston Associates played a role in attempting to quell the Northern anti-slavery crusade."

Now, these historians seem to me to have a far better grasp of why the Paterson Great Falls should be a National Park. It seems like the Park Service is way off base with this historical aspects of this.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have a lot more which I will include for the record, with the Chair's permission, and also a series of questions for the Service. So, not to delay the committee any longer, but there is a very compelling side, and even the descendants of Aaron Burr, I know, believe in truth and justice, and will give us an opportunity for a fair hearing in the process.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you, Senator Menendez.

Ranking Member Burr, do you have any further questions?

Senator BURR. I don't think so.

Senator AKAKA. I want to thank you for your responses and we will see you again.

So, at this point, I want to call the next panel, and ask them to take a seat at the witness table.

The panel includes Mr. Tom Brooks, the Chief Engineer for the Alaska Railroad from Anchorage, Alaska and Mr. Augie Carlino, the President and CEO of the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, from Homestead, Pennsylvania, and Mr. Leonard Zax, a partner with the Latham & Watkins law firm here in Washington, who is representing the New Jersey Community Development Corporation.

I want you to know that we'll include your complete statements in the hearing record, and I'd ask each of you to please summarize your testimony, and limit your remarks to no more than 5 minutes.

Mr. Brooks, will you please proceed?

STATEMENT OF TOM BROOKS, ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF ENGINEER, ALASKA RAILROAD, ANCHORAGE, AK

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to speak to you today, on behalf of the Alaska Railroads.

My name is Tom Brooks, and I'm the Assistant Vice President, and Chief Engineer with the Alaska Railroad. The Alaska Railroad is a State-owned railroad, carrying both passengers and freight. It was originally built, and operated, by the U.S. Government in the early 1900s through the enabling statute adopted by Congress in 1914.

It was sold to the State of Alaska in January 1985. The 500-mile long mainline runs from the South-Central city of Seward, to the interior city of Fairbanks, as the enabling act required. The Alaska Railroad carried over a half a million passengers in 2006.

The Alaska Railroad provides passenger service to Denali National Park through S. 1808. The bill being considered at this hearing, the Alaska Railroad with the help of Senator Murkowski, seeks to exchange up to 25 acres of Denali National Park land for an equal amount of Alaska Railroad land, in order to build a turnaround for our trains. The formerly Alaska Railroad land given to the National Park Service would be designated as wilderness lands.

The Alaska Railroad has been carrying passengers to this National Park since the early 1920s, long before rail access to our National Parks came into vogue. The number of rail passengers to Denali National Park has been increasing each year, and in 2001 about 200,000 passengers used the Denali rail station, and in 2006, the number grew to over 300,000.

The Alaska Railroad has accommodated this growth by adding additional direct trains, however, the options to improve service further are limited because our trains can not be turned around.

The existence of a turnaround track, known as a wide track, in Denali would allow more frequent trains and more flexible rail schedules, thus accommodating the continued growth and development of rail access to the Park.

There was originally a turnaround track at the Denali rail station, which was too short for modern train lengths, and thus with Railroad concurrence, converted to Park Service use in the 1980s.

Besides enhancing visitor access options, there are other public benefits of a turnaround track at the Park. The rail mode of transportation offers less highway congestions, improved public safety, and less environmental impact than the highway alternative. Improved access to Park land through public transportation is a national policy goal, as evidenced by the Department of Transportation's Transit in the Parks Program, created by Congress in 2005.

The National Park Service and the Alaska region of the National Parks Conservation Association both support the land exchanges described in the bill. The Association has written a letter of support, which I will submit for the record, and we are pleased that there is a companion bill in the other body.

Thus, S. 1808 is a win-win for the Alaska Railroad, the National Park Service and the hundreds of thousands of visitors who would benefit from access to our Nation's treasured Denali National Park.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the committee today, and I'll be happy to answer any questions the committee might have.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Brooks follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TOM BROOKS, ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT AND CHIEF ENGINEER, ALASKA RAILROAD, ANCHORAGE, AK, ON S. 1808

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, for your invitation to speak with you today on behalf of the Alaska Railroad. My name is Tom Brooks, and I am Assistant Vice President and Chief Engineer at the Alaska Railroad.

The Alaska Railroad is a State-owned railroad carrying both passengers and freight. The Alaska Railroad was originally built and operated by the U.S. Government in the early 1900's through the enabling statute adopted by the U.S. Congress in 1914. It was sold to the State of Alaska in January 1985. The 500-mile-long mainline runs from the south central city of Seward to the interior city of Fairbanks as the enabling act required. The Alaska Railroad carried over a half-million passengers in 2006.

The Alaska Railroad provides passenger service to Denali National Park. Through S. 1808, the bill being considered at this hearing, the Alaska Railroad, with the help of Senator Murkowski, seeks to exchange up to 25 acres of Denali National Park land for an equal amount of Alaska Railroad land, in order to build a turnaround for our trains. The formerly Alaska Railroad land given to the National Park Service would be designated as wilderness lands.

The Alaska Railroad has been carrying passengers to this national park since the early 1920s, long before rail access into our national parks came into vogue. The number of rail passengers to Denali National Park has been increasing each year. In 2001, 198,737 passengers used the Denali Park Rail Station, and in 2006 that number grew to 303,741 passengers. The Alaska Railroad has accommodated this growth by adding additional direct trains; however, the options to improve service are limited because trains cannot be turned around. The existence of a turnaround track, known as a "wye track," at Denali would allow more frequent trains and more flexible rail schedules, thus accommodating the continued growth and development of rail access to Denali Park. There was originally a turnaround track at the Denali Rail Station, which was too short for modern train lengths and thus, with Railroad concurrence, converted to Park Service use in the 1980s.

Besides enhancing visitor access options, there are other public benefits of a turnaround track at Denali National Park. The rail mode of transportation offers less highway traffic congestion, improved public safety, and less environmental impact than the highway alternative. Improved access to parkland through public transportation is a national policy goal, as evidenced by the Department of Transportation's Transit in the Parks program created by Congress in 2005.

The National Park Service and the Alaska Region of the National Parks Conservation Association both support the land exchange as described in the bill. The Association has written a letter of support, which I will submit for the record. We are also pleased that there is a companion bill in the other body.

S. 1808 is thus a win-win for the Alaska Railroad, the National Park Service and the hundreds of thousands of visitors that would benefit from access to our nation's treasured Denali National Park.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Committee today. I will be happy to answer any questions the Committee might have.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much.

Now we'll hear from August Carlino.

STATEMENT OF AUGUST R. CARLINO, CEO AND PRESIDENT, STEEL INDUSTRY HERITAGE CORPORATION, HOMESTEAD, PA

Mr. CARLINO. Mr. Chairman, good afternoon. Thank you for inviting me here to testify on S. 697, the Steel Industry National Historic Site Act.

I've submitted my testimony for the record, and I won't go into the detailed history of the significance of Homestead Works Steel Mill, that's outlined in my testimony, has been written about by scholars, worldwide.

I will tell you that this bill is strongly supported by the Pennsylvania delegation, and I'm grateful to our two Senators, Senator Specter, for his long support, and Senator Bob Casey for his support, as well.

This effort dates back to try and designate portions of the Homestead Works as a National Park Service, actually, to Senator John Heinz when he was a member of this esteemed body. This effort has taken almost 20 years to get to this point, and I'm grateful for the committee for having a hearing here today on the bill.

I would just go off-track a little bit from my written testimony and summary, and say to you that I think Senator Menendez from New Jersey has uncovered some serious problems with the way feasibility studies and suitability studies are conducted, particularly with relationship to industrial sites, that can create contradictory findings.

I won't profess to know everything that my colleague sitting next to me knows about Paterson, but as a person who has worked in Homestead for almost 20 years, and has studied it, I will tell you that the suitability and feasibility and the Special Resource Study is flawed when the process starts—as the Senator pointed out—with the statement that, "We will not create any new National Parks."

When that is the determined outcome at the beginning of a Special Resource Study, the results are basically predictable as to what you would get, and that is a recommendation that comes out—for which Homestead's did—of not recommending it as a National Historic Site, a unit of the National Park Service.

In fact, as we went through the National Historic Landmark process to nominate the Carrie blast furnaces in the Battle of Homestead Site, two very interesting scenarios came up. We were planning to submit the whole National Historic Landmark Study as one basic application, but we were advised by the Park Service to split the properties up into three, one of which included the blast furnace, one of which included the battle site, and the other which included the Boast Building, which was the headquarter for the Union in 1892, during the strike.

The Boast Building was designated, the Carrie Furnace National Historic Landmark, was basically stonewalled, and the battle site was rejected. Rejected not because it lacked integrity—because it's all there—the landing site is there, the war facility is there, the building that existed at the time of 1892 that was the command battle site was there.

What caused the integrity problem was that a building identical to the pump house was added onto it in 1896. As steel mills would do—they were in expansion mode at that point—to build the United States.

So, the new building, which didn't date to 1892, but was identical in specifications, was added to it. I offered that there was a simple solution to it—not that I would propose doing it—but we could have torn down that 1896 building, and met, then, the historic

standards. None of the Park Service historians in the room supported that.

They also asked us to do a Special Resource Study of national view, in order to support the Carrie Furnace contentions we were making in the landmark study. Our Congressman, Mike Doyle, had a meeting with Park Service administration, and suggested that wasn't our responsibility, it was the Park Service's responsibility to do so.

So they set out on a National Historic Context Study, to determine if the application that we submitted for a National Historic Landmark was actually true. If came in stronger in recommendation for Homestead and Carrie Furnaces than our own application was submitted, and it is what allowed, I believe, Carrie Furnaces to be designated in 2005 as a National Historic Landmark.

Senator, and members of the committee I will say this—there are other places where you can interpret steel history, just as there are other places in the system of the National Parks that you can interpret, for example, Civil War history. But, if you interpret those sites of steel history without Homestead, it would be like interpreting the history of steel without—or the history of the Civil War without Gettysburg. That's how significant this site is.

If it is not designated, these resources will be lost. There is no capacity, locally, for long-term management. The other contradictory part of the Park Service testimony is, they suggest that we have the opportunity for long-term management, and yet just two or 3 months ago, they were here before this committee testifying against our reauthorization.

This is truly a rare industrial resource that, if it is lost, it will be gone forever, and the story of that element of America's rise of industrial might as it's related to steel will not be able to be told anywhere else in this country. I implore you to consider this bill for your approval.

Thank you for your time.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Carlino follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AUGUST R. CARLINO, CEO AND PRESIDENT, STEEL INDUSTRY HERITAGE CORPORATION, HOMESTEAD, PA, ON S. 697

Mr. Chairman and other distinguished members of the subcommittee, my name is August R. Carlino and I am President and Chief Executive Officer of the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation. The Steel Industry Heritage Corporation (SIHC) is a non-profit heritage tourism and economic development organization based in Homestead, Pennsylvania. SIHC is the management entity for the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, one of 37 National Heritage Areas designated by Congress.

Thank you for inviting me to testify today before the Subcommittee on National Parks on S. 697, the Steel Industry National Historic Site Act. I am grateful to Senator Arlen Specter and Senator Robert Casey for their willingness to sponsor, and support, this legislation you are considering today.

The Steel Industry National Historic Site Act has had a very long life, and has been introduced and re-introduced many times over the past several Congresses. In fact, the consideration of a National Historic Site for the properties included in S. 697 dates back to the late 1980s, as the permanent closure and dismantling of many of the steel mills in the Pittsburgh Industrial District began to occur. At that time in Pittsburgh, civic, corporate, labor and community groups realized the demolition of mills would cause a lasting change to the region's socio-economic landscape and have national implications. It was their vision to preserve a part of a steel mill to tell the story of Pittsburgh's steel-making history to the nation.

During the late 19th and 20th centuries, the Pittsburgh region was the world's leading producer of iron and steel. The region's proximity to raw materials, ease of shipping and abundant capital wealth and labor encouraged the construction of

huge integrated production facilities, bordered by supporting manufacturing facilities, coal mines, coking ovens, machine shop and foundries, all of which were linked by an expanse of railroads. This and the Allegheny, Monongahela and Ohio rivers made it the center of the nation's iron and steel industry. The centerpiece of this industrial complex was the U.S. Steel Homestead Works, located on the shores of the Monongahela River just upstream from the City of Pittsburgh. It was the closing of this mill in 1984 which sparked a regional effort to save its most significant features and to pursue its designation as a unit of the National Park System.

The Homestead Works, which date back to Andrew Carnegie, has a storied and turbulent history. Built in 1906-1907, the Carrie Blast Furnaces enabled the Homestead Works to become the largest producer of iron and steel in the world. The Furnace's output of iron often set production records with each shift, and helped set the daily commodity price for steel. By the end of World War II, Carrie Blast Furnaces 6 and 7, located on the northern shore of the Monongahela River in the Boroughs of Swissvale and Rankin, were each producing between 900 and 1,000 tons of iron daily, or between 300,000 and 350,000 tons of iron each year per furnace. Iron from the furnaces was made into steel on the southern side of the mill, transported from the furnace complex to the steel mill side across the Rankin Hot Metal Bridge. On the southern shore in the Boroughs of Homestead, West Homestead, Munhall and Whitaker, the massive mill complex of the Homestead Works made the steel that went into many of America's and the world's most prominent structures including the Panama Canal lock gates, the George Washington Bridge, the Empire State Building, the Chrysler Building, Rockefeller Tower, the Sears Tower, the Golden Gate Bridge and the United Nations Building. Additionally, Homestead was the center of armament production for the United States during both world wars, turning out armor plate, munitions, weapons and steel for America's war needs.

Of all the remaining blast furnaces nationwide, Carrie 6 and 7 have the greatest concentration of pre-World War II equipment. The facility was the cornerstone of the Pittsburgh Industrial District, a sprawling interconnected mosaic of mills, mines, aluminum and glass factories, machine shops, foundries, railroad, and river barge facilities that stretched more than 150 linear miles along the shores of the region's rivers.

The proposed National Historic Site in S. 697 also includes the Pump House and Water Tower, a five-acre site situated within the Homestead Works in Munhall Borough, directly across the river from the Carrie Furnaces. It was at this site, a river landing within the Homestead Works for off-loading of materials, that the infamous Battle of Homestead occurred between Pinkerton Guards and striking steel workers who had been locked out of the mill. This battle, which took place on July 6, 1892, was a pivotal moment in United States labor-management history. As much as it is studied today, the consequences of that day still has ramifications in labor relations in the U.S., and is viewed as hallowed ground by organized labor and the community for the lives that were lost there. The dramatic events of that lockout and battle, are "among the most famous of American history" and a "savage and significant" story, according to labor historian Paul Krause. At the root of the battle in 1892 was Carnegie, with his determination at any cost to drive down wages through modernization and technology advancements in iron and steel production, matched against the might and strength of the most powerful union remaining in the steel industry, the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steelworkers, who desired to protect wages and jobs as the mill's and the steel industry's production processes advanced.

Individually, these sites would warrant some form of protection and preservation as they represent significant elements of America's industrial legacy. Collectively and when linked by the Rankin Hot Metal Bridge, the Battle of Homestead site and the Carrie Furnaces are monuments of national significance which tell a story of America's rise as the world's greatest industrial and economic power. This is a story that cannot be told or interpreted anywhere else in the United States, and the reason why S. 697 proposes the creation of a National Historic Site for the properties.

In the early 1990s, this fact was recognized by the late Senator John Heinz. Through his efforts, feasibility plans and studies were conducted by the National Park Service and the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission to determine what properties of the closed Homestead mill needed to be saved from demolition, and how those saved sites might be preserved and interpreted. While his death was unfortunate, the project moved forward with strong leadership and legislative sponsorship from Senator Specter and Congressman Mike Doyle. The support for S. 697 is widespread, including past funding for planning and development, and the potential for substantial capital funding from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the many Pittsburgh-based foundations, and a planned capital campaign to be con-

ducted by the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation, chaired by top executives of the U.S. Steel Corporation and the United Steel Workers of America.

Local governments have also committed to the long-term preservation of these resources, as Allegheny County has purchased the Blast Furnace complex and its surrounding 130-plus acres with plans of revitalizing the brownfield into a modern mixed-use industrial and commercial complex with the proposed National Historic Site as the anchor for the redevelopment project. The Rankin Hot Metal Bridge will serve as an interpretive link between the iron and steel sides of the mill, and as transportation link between the two sides, as both a roadway and a connector in the soon-to-be-completed rail-trail, the Great Allegheny Passage, which will connect Pittsburgh with Washington, DC by 2010.

The properties included within S. 697, the Steel Industry National Historic Site Act, represent a rare, if not the only, opportunity to preserve one of the nation's most significant industrial complexes. Homestead's association with steel making, labor organizing, great American capitalists like Andrew Carnegie and Henry Clay Frick, and its extant working-class communities with ancestries rooted in Eastern, Southern European and African American traditions, present the opportunity to develop a National Historic Site that tells a part of the story of America that is unrepresented in the National Park System today. All of the partners, both public and private, have diligently, at times doggedly, worked to get to the point we are at here today—this esteemed body's consideration of the legislation that would preserve Homestead's legacy for future generations in the world's most premiere historical conservation institution, the National Park System. I urge your favorable consideration of S. 697, and I am happy to answer any questions you might have.

Thank you for your consideration of this important legislation.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Carlino.

Now we'll hear from Mr. Zax.

STATEMENT OF LEONARD A. ZAX, PARTNER, LATHAM & WATKINS, LLP, ON BEHALF OF THE NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. ZAX. Thank you, Chairman Akaka, and Ranking Member Burr.

On behalf of the New Jersey Community Development Corporation, I am honored to testify in support of the Paterson National Park legislation. My colleagues in my New Jersey and Washington offices and I take special pride in our pro bono work for New Jersey Community Development Corporation, a private non-profit corporation, whose mission is to improve the quality of life for low and moderate-income citizens.

NJCDC joins many national organizations, including the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Parks Conservation Association, the NAACP, and the Sierra Club, that urge the creation of the Paterson National Park.

Also supporting the Paterson National Park are former Cabinet member who served in the Administrations of Presidents Gerald R. Ford, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush.

Local and National newspapers have published many editorials that support making the Paterson Great Falls National Historic District a part of the National Park System. The New York Times just published its third editorial, this one referencing the hearing today, in urging Congress to create this National Park.

The Paterson Great Falls is the place that Alexander Hamilton selected to begin to attain two quintessential American goals. First, to achieve economic independence and second, to launch the American dream. At the Great Falls, Hamilton began to create an economy requiring not slavery, but freedom, rewarding not social sta-

tus, but hard work, and promoting not discrimination against some, but opportunities for all.

He outlined these goals in his great State paper delivered to the Congress, the Report on Manufacturers, explaining that the United States must produce its own goods to avoid dependence on foreign products, particularly for military supplies.

His report specifically refers to his plan to create the city of Paterson to begin implementing his strategy. He was not content to have, simply, a theoretical treaty to deliver to the Congress, he wanted to show how it could be done. How, through the spirit of imitation, other cities, some 25 and 30 years late, like Lowell, could begin to implement similar plans involving different individual manufacturing enterprises.

Following Hamilton's plan for Paterson, the city became a great manufacturing city. Paterson factories produced the first sail cloth, a new form of cotton cloth that would not mildew, for every ship in the American Navy. The first Colt revolvers and the first motorized submarine. Famed products of the plants of Paterson, eluded to briefly, include the aircraft engines for the Spirit of Saint Louis, for many World War II bombers, and for the Enola Gay that dropped the bomb that ended the war.

Hamilton created opportunities for all in Paterson, and that was a radical thing to suggest and try to achieve in his day. Hamilton worked to create an economy in Paterson, driven by the labor of free men and women, rather than slaves, in a society that rewarded hard work, rather than inherited privilege.

The testimony of scholars submitted to this committee sharply criticized the Park Service study. I'll say only in my limited time, and expand for the record, that this Park Service draft study distorts and ignores crucial evidence of Paterson's role in American history, violates the Park Service's own policies, and makes unsubstantiated conclusions in the face of direct and compelling evidence presented by distinguished scholars to the contrary.

More that 30 million citizens live within a 3-hour drive of the Paterson Great Falls. Many citizens who feel little or no connection with our National Parks and the Founding Fathers will find much greater meaning within Paterson's authenticity and diversity. That is just one reason why support for the Paterson National Park continues to grow.

Hispanic and African-American, Muslim and Jewish, Catholic, and Baptist citizens support a National Historical Park in Paterson. Corporate executives and laborers, environmentalists and property right advocates, bankers and community activist, scholars and school children, historic preservationists and developers, and I will add, Republicans and Democrats support this cause. Only the Administration now opposes it.

I have never in my 30-some years working in housing and community development efforts around the country, seen a project that enjoys this breadth and depth of public support. So we urge you to support this legislation, to create the Paterson Great Falls National Park.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Zax follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LEONARD A. ZAX, PARTNER, LATHAM & WATKINS, LLP, ON BEHALF OF THE NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Chairman Akaka and Senator Burr: On behalf of the New Jersey Community Development Corporation (NJCDC), I am honored to testify in support of the Paterson National Historical Park legislation. My colleagues in our firm's New Jersey and Washington offices and I take special pride in our pro bono work for NJCDC, a private nonprofit organization whose mission is to improve the quality of life for Paterson's citizens.

NJCDC joins many national organizations—including the National Trust for Historic Preservation, National Parks Conservation Association, NAACP, and the Sierra Club—that support the Paterson National Historical Park. Also supporting a Paterson National Historical Park are former Cabinet members who served in the Administrations of Presidents Gerald R. Ford, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush. (Exhibit 1 lists supporters.)*

Leading newspapers have published many editorials that support making the Paterson Great Falls National Historic District a part of the National Park System. The New York Times just published its third editorial endorsing the park.

The list of individual supporters includes the preeminent Hamilton biographers of our time, renowned former Smithsonian curators, the former chief of the National Park Service Historic American Engineering Record, professors at every university in the Ivy League, N.Y.U., Duke, Williams—and at state universities from Massachusetts to Michigan and Arizona.

Three generations of my family came of age in Paterson during the twentieth century. My grandparents settled in Paterson in the early 1900s, coming to America from Eastern Europe to seek freedom and opportunities. One of my grandfathers worked in a silk mill at a time that Paterson was known throughout the world as the Silk City. My other grandfather built modest housing for immigrant families, including his own—and also including Senator Lautenberg's family. My father, a lawyer who chaired the local bar association committee on immigration, for many years presented a copy of the Bill of Rights to new citizens who left other countries and came to Paterson seeking a better life for their families.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON AND THE PATERSON GREAT FALLS

At the Great Falls in Paterson, Alexander Hamilton began implementation of his far-reaching plan to achieve the economic independence that secured America's future and launched the American dream.

At the Great Falls Hamilton began to create an economy requiring not slavery but freedom, rewarding not social status but hard work, and promoting not discrimination against some but opportunities for all.

On a special Bicentennial visit to Paterson, President Gerald R. Ford proclaimed the unique place of the Paterson Great Falls in American history:

> The industrial history of the Great Falls goes back to the very first years of our United States, and this engineering achievement embodied our most basic political and economic goals—independence and prosperity.

In 1792 Hamilton announced to Congress and the American people that at the Great Falls in New Jersey he would found the City of Paterson as the first major step in his ambitious plan to secure the new nation's economic independence and begin transforming a rural agrarian society based in slavery into a modern economy based in freedom.

Though today we often take America's economic power and liberties as given, in Hamilton's time neither was guaranteed. Political independence proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence and won in the Revolutionary War did not secure economic independence. Long after the British surrendered, America remained heavily dependent on England for virtually everything from clothing to military supplies.

Hamilton believed that political independence was only the first step toward achieving economic independence. He wrote that America would never be free from Britain, nor from any other foreign oppressor, so long as our nation remained dependent on foreign manufacturers.

Hamilton alone among America's Founders championed the spirit of enterprise and opportunity that would transform a Third World nation into the greatest economic power ever known.

---

* Exhibits 1–3 have been retained in subcommittee files.

PATERSON GREAT FALLS NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

Although Hamilton's economic and political legacy is now secure, the fate of the Paterson Great Falls Historic District—so central to that legacy—is much less certain.

More than 25 distinguished historians, city planners, and historic preservation experts have analyzed the unique resources and narratives that a national historical park in Paterson would add to the National Park System.

These scholars conclude:

> (1) Hamilton's vision of economic independence and economic opportunity is a critical theme of American history not adequately represented in the National Park System or anywhere in the United States.
>
> (2) The Paterson Great Falls National Historic District is the best place to present and interpret Hamilton's vision of economic independence and of economic opportunity for all Americans.

UNIQUE COMBINATION OF NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The Great Falls provides not only stunning natural beauty for a National Park Service unit in Paterson. All of the members of the New Jersey Congressional Delegation point out in a letter to the Secretary of the Interior that "New Jersey's Great Falls is the only National Historic District that includes both a National Natural Landmark and a National Historic Landmark." (Exhibit 2)

And the National Parks Conservation Association points out, "No other natural wonder in America has played a more important role in our nation's historic quest for freedom and prosperity." (Exhibit 3)

During the Revolutionary War, Hamilton met with the Marquis de Lafayette and George Washington at the Great Falls, where General Washington established his headquarters for a time. After the war, Hamilton chose to begin implementing his industrial plan at the Great Falls to use the awesome force of the Great Falls to provide power for future factories. Hamilton commissioned Pierre L'Enfant—who had just completed the plan for Washington, D.C.—to design an unprecedented water power system in Paterson.

As the President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Richard Moe, writes in a letter to the Director of the National Park Service, "Scholars have concluded that Pierre L'Enfant's innovative waterpower system at the Great Falls—and many factories built later—constitute the finest remaining collection of engineering and architectural works representing each stage of America's progress from Hamilton's time to the twentieth century."

L'Enfant's water power system in Paterson is the only one in America that is directly linked to the Founding Father who set America on the path of its industrial development. The Great Falls was central to Hamilton's plan for a nation whose security would be bolstered by its economic independence, and whose modern economy would provide opportunities for immigrants.

The distinguished former Smithsonian curator Robert Vogel writes:

> Paterson is the one place in America where it is possible directly to connect the 18th century vision of a great manufacturing nation, articulated by one of our Founding Fathers, with the actual fruits of that vision in the following centuries.
>
> Paterson's Great Falls Historic District includes a combination of natural resources and buildings not represented anywhere else in America. In Paterson there is a Pantheon of important historical events in American industry: the Great Falls that inspired Hamilton, the L'Enfant plan of hydraulic raceways harnessing the power of a major river, the initial Colt Revolver plant, the Holland submarine, the greatest grouping of locomotive builders in America, and the largest silk-producing center in the world.

HAMILTON'S SUCCESS IN PATERSON

Hamilton's vision of an economically independent America with opportunities for all succeeded in Paterson before any other place in America.

Ron Chernow, author of the acclaimed biography of Alexander Hamilton, explains that Paterson "became the home for this industrial laboratory, this futuristic city, this model of what America could be."

Hamilton wrote the charter for the Society for the Establishment of Useful Manufactures (S.U.M.), the first corporation in New Jersey. Because Hamilton recognized that the S.U.M. likely would suffer losses in its first manufacturing experiments,

Hamilton's charter endowed the S.U.M. with broad powers to continue encouraging industries in Paterson through successive generations and economic cycles.

Harvard University Professor Joseph Stancliffe Davis wrote in the definitive history of the S.U.M. that "the Society's stock became a highly profitable investment." Professor Davis wrote in 1917 that the S.U.M. "is one of the very few companies of the time to survive the vicissitudes of a century and maintain an unbroken existence down to the present day."

Over one hundred and fifty years after Hamilton founded the City, the WPA Federal Writers Project concluded that Paterson "is one of the few American cities that have turned out almost exactly as they were planned."

HAMILTON ACHIEVED ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE WITH PATERSON MANUFACTURES

Hamilton wrote the Report on Manufactures, his great report to the Congress in 1791 explaining that the United States must produce its own goods to avoid dependence on foreign products, particularly for military supplies.

In the first decades of the nineteenth century, John Colt, Deputy Director of the S.U.M. in Paterson, invented a form of cotton cloth that did not mildew and contributed to America's military self-sufficiency by manufacturing the sailcloth for every ship in the United States Navy. Samuel Colt invented and first manufactured the Colt revolver in Paterson.

Paterson was the birthplace of the world's first motorized submarine, and the City's role in the forefront of manufacturing for war and peace would continue well into the twentieth century. Paterson's factories produced nearly 140,000 aircraft engines, surpassing all other American cities. During World War II, Jimmy Doolittle raided Tokyo in daylight in planes powered by engines made in Paterson, and the Enola Gay bomber ended the war on a flight with Paterson engines.

Paterson produced a wide variety of goods securing America's economic independence and helping make the nation a leader in international commerce. Paterson represents Hamilton's vision of diverse manufactures and economic independence in a way that no other place in America does or can.

HAMILTON CREATED OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL IN PATERSON

Hamilton worked to create an economy in Paterson driven by the labor of free men and women rather than slaves, and a society that rewarded hard work rather than inherited privilege. As Ron Chernow observes in his bestselling biography of Hamilton:

> His America would be a meritocracy of infinite variety, with a diversified marketplace absorbing people from all nations and backgrounds . . . Hamilton's ideal economy is devoid of the futile barbarities of the Southern plantations. Hamilton's list of the advantages of manufacturing has a quintessentially American ring: "Additional employment to classes of the community not ordinarily engaged in the business. The promoting of emigration from foreign countries. The furnishing of greater scope for the diversity of talents and dispositions which discriminate men from each other."

Paterson is the best place to interpret Hamilton's industrial vision because—in sharp contrast to the New England mill towns built by the wealthy elite called the Boston Associates—Paterson actually provided the very opportunities that Hamilton sought.

True to Hamilton's fervent desire to end slavery, some Paterson manufacturers were among the local visionaries of the larger national movement that became known as the Underground Railroad. Frederick Douglass wrote in his autobiography of escaping through Paterson following the John Brown uprising in Harpers Ferry.

The Paterson industries not only provided entry-level jobs but also gave poor immigrants a genuine opportunity to rise to the top of society. The noted social historian Herbert Gutman systematically studied the leading mill owners in Paterson and concluded that "the rags-to-riches promise was not a mere myth in Paterson."

Building upon the research from a series of articles in Scientific American in the nineteenth century, Professor Gutman wrote:

> Scientific American, groping for a simple sociological generalization about these men, praised Paterson's early enterprisers in these words: "In the eastern states, flourishing cities have been built up by corporations of wealthy capitalists . . . . In Paterson, it was different. With few exceptions, almost every manufacturer started, financially, at zero, enlarging his establishment as the quicksilver expanded in his purse." Scientific American was not guilty of mouthing abstract rhetoric or just putting forth a paean of traditional tribute to an invisible hero, the "self-made man." Instead, it accu-

rately described the successful locomotive, iron, and machinery manufacturers of the era, and what it wrote applied as well to a group in 1840 and 1880 as in 1859.

HAMILTON ACHIEVED DIVERSE MANUFACTURES IN PATERSON

By 1816, Paterson was already a national leader in the production of many of the goods Hamilton listed in the great state paper he submitted to Congress, the Report on Manufactures. Just as Hamilton urged, Paterson avoided excessive dependence on any one industry and became an extraordinary center of invention and a major producer of a wide variety of goods.

The author Christopher Norwood writes:

> In Paterson people did not just invent; they tried everything—a repeating revolver, a submarine, an airplane that could fly across the Atlantic. And Paterson did not just manufacture; it produced articles that redefined the limits of life. It is impossible to think of any other city whose products cut so deeply into the texture of the United States and not only transformed its national character, but revolutionized American relations with the world.

CHANGING ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE WORLD COMMUNITY

In addition to interpreting Hamilton's economic vision of independence and opportunity, a Paterson National Park would be a place to feature other important supporting stories. The allotted time permits me to mention only one such supporting story that speaks directly to the times in which we live: the Silk City and the Silk Road today.

National Park Service policies require that studies of potential new national parks analyze the "multiple layers of history encapsulated within each resource." The NPS policies emphasize the importance of potential new national parks that represent "the interaction between the United States and the world community."

Hamilton recognized the opportunity that silk production presented to American economy. His Report on Manufactures encouraged silk production, a recommendation that would increase America's involvement in international commerce.

As early as 1794, the S.U.M. authorized the culture of mulberry trees in Paterson to promote the cultivation of silk. In the nineteenth century, industrialists would make Paterson the Silk City—the largest manufacturer of silk goods in the world. Silk holds a very special place in history. Paterson's central role in silk manufacturing formed a connection between America and the Asian, Middle Eastern, and European cultures that also cherished silk.

As Richard Kurin of the Smithsonian Institution explains, "Silk both epitomized and played a major role in the early development of what we now characterize as a global economic and cultural system."

In the late nineteenth century, historians began to describe the old routes of the global trade of silk as the "Silk Road." In recent years, historians at the Smithsonian and universities around the world have expanded the traditional view of the Silk Road and have recognized that the historical connection between East and West exists to this day.

In 1998 the cellist Yo-Yo Ma created the Silk Road Project, celebrating how people shared art and music along the modern Silk Road and promoting continuing cultural collaboration between Asia, Europe, and the Americas. The Aga Khan, Imam of the Shia Imami Ismaili Muslims and direct descendant of Muhammad, has contributed generously to the Silk Road Project, particularly in the Muslim nations.

The Smithsonian organized—and the Park Service cosponsored—the 2002 Folklife Festival to celebrate the modern Silk Road. The Aga Khan and Yo-Yo Ma joined Secretary of State Colin Powell in opening the festival.

During the Folklife Festival, Richard Kennedy of the Smithsonian Institution observed:

> The Silk Road has extended to the United States and, since the tragic events of September 11, understanding that connection clearly has become more important. There is no better time, then, to learn more about the roots of this vital connection and to celebrate the long-standing relationships that have existed between east and west and north and south.

A Paterson National Historical Park would preserve and present a station on this contemporary Silk Road, providing a unique opportunity to connect with other cultures and build trust between cultures of the global Silk Road. Mohamed El-Filali, a leader of the Islamic community in Paterson, writes that a national park in

Paterson would help Americans "reach out and attempt to understand how other cultures can affect and enrich America's culture."

The National Parks Conservation Association points out that "Paterson can become the first NPS unit with strong Muslim American support in a city that has the second largest number of Muslims in any American city."

Dr. Alvin Felzenberg, a political scientist and an expert on New Jersey history, explains that Paterson is a station on the Silk Road not just because of its history as the Silk City but also because "large numbers of Islamic citizens continue to work in Paterson textile businesses, coming from places like Damascus to Paterson because of textile manufacturing in both cities." Dr. Felzenberg, who also served as the Principal Spokesman for the 9/11 Commission, writes that a Paterson National Park would create a connection between Muslims and the Park Service, while promoting valuable cultural interchanges between Muslims and other Americans.

This supporting story of the modern Silk Road in a Paterson National Park would help prepare new generations of Americans for global citizenship.

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

Many citizens who today feel little or no connection with our national parks and the Founding Fathers will find much greater meaning within Paterson's authenticity and diversity. The proposed Paterson National Park legislation has captured the imagination and spirit of a diverse group of citizens.

- Latino citizens.—who make up more than half of Paterson's population—support the Paterson National Park because Hamilton was the most forceful advocate among the Founding Fathers for the view that immigration strengthens the nation. They also seek to celebrate Hamilton's role in helping to spread the cause of freedom to the Spanish colonies in the Americas.
- African-Americans.—who make up over one quarter of Paterson's population—recognize Hamilton's vigorous fight against slavery was an essential part of his inclusive view of how all Americans would benefit from the growing modern economy that he began in Paterson. African-American leaders also note that Hinchliffe Stadium—the landmark home of the N.Y. Black Yankees and the N.Y. Cubans in baseball's Negro Leagues—was sited and planned by the renowned Olmsted Brothers firm right next to the Great Falls.
- Arab Americans.—who make up more than one-tenth of Paterson's population—support the Paterson National Park as a continuation of the Silk Road that united their homelands in Central Asia with China and the West.

NEED FOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE IN PATERSON

The record clearly supports the need for a National Park Service unit in Paterson. The Park Service's own cost estimates demonstrate that the $10 million assistance from the State of New Jersey is not sufficient funding to preserve the Great Falls Historic District and present its resources to the American people.

As Governor Jon Corzine writes to the Secretary of the Interior: "The State of New Jersey alone cannot preserve and protect the Great Falls National Historic District and properly present it to the public without a National Park Service unit in Paterson."

THE PARK SERVICE STUDY

Despite opposition from the Administration for budgetary reasons, both the House and the Senate passed legislation by unanimous votes directing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of whether the Paterson Great Falls National Historic District should become a part of the National Park System.

Five years after President Bush signed the legislation into law, in November 2006 the National Park Service finally published its Paterson Study and invited comments from the public. As the House Resources Committee emphasized in its Report on this legislation, distinguished scholars sharply criticized the Study in detailed letters drawing from seminal texts and recent research.

Here are typical phrases that some of America's most distinguished scholars use to describe the Park Service Study's conclusions: "misreads the historical record" . . . "seriously deficient" . . . "truly absurd" . . . "demonstrably wrong" . . . "false" . . . "a serious misreading of the historical record" . . . "again, judging by the results of recent scholarship, the Study is wrong" . . . "analytically flawed and violates fundamental principles that professionals use in studying historic resources."

A former senior Massachusetts official who worked on the creation of the Lowell National Historical Park and the Blackstone Valley National Heritage Corridor

writes that the Study "creates a false account that destroys the integrity of our nation's history."

The scholars dispute every supposed fact that the Park Service Study uses to conclude there should not be a Paterson National Park, including the Park Service claim that Hamilton's economic vision was first realized not in Paterson but by the Boston Associates at what is now the Lowell National Park.

Historians find the Park Service's claim about Lowell reflects a fundamental misunderstanding of history because Hamilton's economic vision included two fundamental principles:

(1) no tolerance for slavery; and

(2) opportunities for poor immigrants lacking any social pedigree to rise to the top of American society.

Historians point out that in many respects Lowell represented the precise opposite of Hamilton's vision. The Boston Associates were members of what Professor Robert Dalzell of Williams College called the "Enterprising Elite"—wealthy families of Boston's high society whose primary mission was to achieve "for both themselves and their descendants, what had always mattered most: a secure and remarkably durable position at the top of the social order."

Contrary to the Park Service Study's argument, the Boston Associates—a group of wealthy Boston families connected through interlocking corporate directorates and marriage—never sought nor achieved Hamilton's vision of opportunities for all.

Unlike Hamilton, the most ardent opponent of slavery among the Founding Fathers, the New England mill owners played a role in attempting to quell the Northern anti-slavery crusade. United States Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts spoke of the "unholy union . . . between cotton planters and flesh mongers of Louisiana and Mississippi and the cotton spinners and traffickers of New England—between the lords of the lash and the lords of the loom."

Even the NPS Handbook for the Lowell National Historical Park recognizes:

> When an anti-slavery speaker came to Lowell in 1834, he drew an angry stone-throwing mob. Mill owners and workers depended on Southern cotton, and anyone who threatened the system was unwelcome.

The testimony from scholars provides more details on the numerous serious errors and flaws in the Park Service Study. The Study distorts and disregards crucial evidence of Paterson's role in American history, violates Park Service policies, and makes unsubstantiated conclusions in the face of direct and compelling evidence presented by distinguished scholars to the contrary.

CONCLUSION

S. 148 is the Senate version of H.R. 189. The House Report on H.R. 189 responds to concerns the Administration raised in the House National Park Subcommittee hearing and repeats in the Administration's prepared testimony for today's Senate hearing. The Senate could support an amendment of S. 148 to reflect the amendment of H.R. 189 as reported by the House Resources Committee.

National and local support for the Paterson National Historical Park continues to grow. Latino and African-American, Muslim and Jewish, Catholic and Baptist citizens support a national historical park in Paterson. Corporate executives and laborers, environmentalists and property rights advocates, bankers and community activists, scholars and schoolchildren, historic preservationists and developers support this cause.

We live today in the economic world Hamilton envisioned and—starting at the Great Falls in Paterson—played a major role in creating. We urge members of this Subcommittee to support the legislation to create the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much for your testimony.

My first question is to Augie Carlino. Mr. Carlino, according to the Park Service, their study concluded that since the proposed National Historic Site was within the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, which you oversee, there is no need for National Park Service management. What is your response to this?

Mr. CARLINO. Mr. Chairman, as I said in summarizing and adding to my testimony, we are one of 37 National Heritage Areas, as you know, but we operate with very finite resources. That money

goes into grants that go into Heritage Development Programs in seven counties in Southwestern Pennsylvania.

As part of that work, and actually it was this project, the Homestead Works, which gave rise to the National Heritage Area, not the opposite. The Heritage Area didn't discover the Homestead Works site to propose it as a National Park. It was just the opposite.

Because of that work, our capacity to own and manage a steel mill that remains of a 550-acre site, would be beyond our capacity. Over the time of our planning that we did in order to designate the National Heritage Area, with the Park Service involved in that planning, it became very clear during that planning effort that the National Park Project was going to be one of the projects proposed by the management plan of the Steel Industry Heritage Task Force at that time, which was the predecessor to the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area Corporation. Park Service supported that as a recommended project of the management plan.

So at this point in time, for them to say, "We can operate it." As I said, with them coming to testify against our reauthorization, is contradictory. It also doesn't meet with what meets our management plan, in which the management plan called for the creation of a National Historic site at Homestead, which was approved and forwarded to this body by the National Park Service in 1996.

Senator AKAKA. The National Park Service is recommending that the proposed National Historic Site be administered as an affiliated area of the National Park System, which, in their words, "Would suggest a sufficiently reduced Federal contribution, while having local partners contribute the largest share of costs." Do you have any comments on the affiliated area proposal?

Mr. CARLINO. I do, yes, sir. That was one of the questions that was vetted during the management planning process. It became clear, and it still is evident today, that while there is—and we enjoy substantial support of potential funding partners, including the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which has authorized line items in its capital budget for the creation of this site. From our many Pittsburgh-based foundations, including the Heinz Foundation, which is part of the Senator's legacy.

The conclusion of all of those parties are that they would like to see a role for the Federal Government in this, but that role for them would need to be a way that the Federal Government comes in and owns and operates with their support coming in financially. So, if we lose the opportunity for the Park Service to be a management entity for this site, we will lose all the State and local support that is committed for the preservation of the site's long-term benefit.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Carlino.

Mr. Zax, your testimony takes issue with the Park Service's study. As I understand the Park Service's opposition, though it's not questioning the significance of the historic events that occurred in Paterson, but rather, they're saying that the site isn't suitable or feasible for Park Service management. What are your comments about these concerns?

Mr. ZAX. Surely. My comments are essentially the same as the scholars. The scholars addressed the issue of suitability. They ad-

dressed the claim and found it false, that what Paterson represents is already adequately represented within the National Park system at such places as Lowell. With all due respect to my friends from Massachusetts, Lowell is a wonderful National Historical Park.

Interestingly enough, the National Park Service testified against creating the Lowell National Park during the Carter Administration. But the Congress created the National Park anyway and now the Park Service holds it up as a great example and a reason to deny funding to Paterson.

But the business plan that Francis Lowell and his colleagues had in Lowell, was diametrically opposed to Hamilton's vision for Paterson. Their vision was—and they began implementing it generations later than Paterson's founding—their vision was that daughters of farmers in Western Massachusetts and Canada could come to Lowell, live in dormitories, work for three or four or 5 years, get enough money so they've earned their dowry, so they could go back to Western Massachusetts or back to Canada and get married to their farmer boyfriends there. It's beautiful to see this description of how that system works in Lowell.

But frankly, that is not what Paterson is about. It's not what Hamilton envisioned. The Senator from New Jersey, Senator Menendez alluded earlier to the fact that, because Lowell was a cotton producing town. The power structure in Lowell looked the other way, with respect to slavery. One member of this body, the United States Senator from Massachusetts, Charles Sumner, referred to the relationship between the mill owners in Lowell and the slave holders of the South as an unholy alliance between the lords of the loom in Massachusetts and the lords of the lash on the plantations.

Hamilton was, among our Founding Fathers, the most vigorously anti-slavery advocate. He was, himself, one of the first organizers of the New York Abolition Society, to fight slavery.

Many of our founders had slaves. I'm not saying Francis Lowell and his colleagues, the Cabbots and the Lodges and the Appletons, who sat at the top of Boston society—I'm not saying they were pro-slavery, I'm sure they were not. But they were prepared to make a deal because they needed the cotton produce from the South. They needed the support of the Southern Senators and Congressman for tariff protections.

That's just because in Lowell they had a very, very different business plan. Hamilton's business plan really bears much more of a relationship to what sustained this country between 1790 and between the War of 1812 and 1820 and 1825, before Lowell began.

We were not economically independent. We were dependent upon Britain and Europe for every manufactured item, from clothing to military supplies. The Congress asked Alexander Hamilton, then the first Secretary of the Treasury, to produce a report on how we could make America less dependent on foreign production for essential supplies. A report that really resonates in the times in which we live, because of our excessive dependence on imported oil.

Hamilton took a year, produced this extraordinary report, wrote most of it himself. Part of what he recommended was that this town of Paterson be created. He wrote the corporate documents for the first corporation. He hired Pierre L'Enfant to produce the com-

plex water power system. He attended meetings of boards of directors. He secured an extraordinary charter, one of the first corporations in America, to provide for the assembly of land and the hiring of L'Enfant to create this power system, to show in a very visible and successful and effective way how to implement his dream for America. In Paterson, gentlemen, he succeeded.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much.

Let me ask a question now to Tom—Tom Brooks.

Mr. Brooks, is land within Denali National Park the only option for construction of a turnaround or is there a State land that could be used?

Mr. BROOKS. The railroad has lands that could be used for turnaround, but they're very inferior and wouldn't be able, we would not be able to provide the level of service that we would be able to do if we had a turnaround right at the Park.

The most likely place is about 10 minutes or, excuse me, 10 miles north of the Park. It goes, the track goes through a dangerous—dangerous may not be the right word—a narrow canyon with tight curves and it would take us about 2 hours from the time we arrived at the Park to until we got turned around and back to the Park. With the site that we're considering with the Park Service, we estimate we can get turned around in less than half an hour.

Senator AKAKA. Let me end with a similar to one I asked Mr. Wenk earlier. Have you identified specific parcels to be exchanged? If so, is there is a problem with specifying that in the bill?

Mr. BROOKS. We have talked, generally, with the Park about where the location of a turnaround track could be and where the lands for exchange would be. But we have not identified them specifically and we have agreed with the Park Service that we need to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act, which, in that process, we can't pin things down until we've done a thorough environmental analysis.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much.

Senator Burr.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Brooks, can I assume from your answer to Senator Akaka, that all the land that's exchanged is for the purposes of a turnaround?

Mr. BROOKS. The land we are obtaining is, and the land we're giving up isn't.

Senator BURR. Correct. The land you're accessing from the Park——

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Senator BURR [continuing]. Is for the sole purpose of a turnaround?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Senator BURR. OK. Thank you.

Mr. Carlino, are there any businesses located within the Historic Site designation?

Mr. CARLINO. There are no businesses located within the properties, as proposed in the bill. There are, adjacent to the Battle of Homestead site, there is a remnant of the steel mill of Homestead that is now being operated by an Italian steel company. Across the road, as a part of the old mill——

Senator BURR. But that is not, that's not——

Mr. CARLINO. That's not in the—no, sir.

Senator BURR. Thank you. How many structures are on the proposed site and what's the estimated cost of repair, and do you have an estimate of the annual maintenance cost?

Mr. CARLINO. We don't have an estimate of the annual maintenance cost. I believe CBO did a study on that a few years ago, when the Special Resource Study was done. I don't know what the numbers on that were, sir. But I could get those for you, I'm sure, or they might be available through Congressional Budget Office.

At the Battle of Homestead site there are two buildings, the pump house and the water tower. That's about five acres of that surround those two buildings. There is a hot metal bridge, which is basically a railroad structure that was a connector between the iron producing side of the site, which is where the Carrie Furnaces are, and the steel mill side of the site, which is where the battle site is.

Then at the Carrie Furnaces, there is two blast furnace complexes which make up a series of buildings, including ovens and stoves, a cast house, a blowing engine house, and another large building. I forget the name of that building right now, sir. But there's about five or six buildings there.

Senator BURR. You are in year 10 of, if I remember correctly, the National Heritage Area expires in 2012 for you?

Mr. CARLINO. It would expire in 2012 or cap on the funding at $10 million.

Senator BURR. You're close to having hit the cap, aren't you?

Mr. CARLINO. Yes, sir.

Senator BURR. What is the annual budget for that Heritage Area?

Mr. CARLINO. On average we have a budget of about $2.5 million a year that includes——

Senator BURR. Does that include the $1 million that the Federal Government has kicked in?

Mr. CARLINO. When it has been $1 million, yes sir. That's why I say, it's on average about $2.5 million. Last year's appropriation was $780,000.

Senator BURR. But you're at year 10.

Mr. CARLINO. Yes, sir.

Senator BURR. You've almost hit your $10 million cap?

Mr. CARLINO. Yes, sir.

Senator BURR. We have a $1 million annual cap. So you've been pretty close to a million dollars a year.

Mr. CARLINO. Yes, sir.

Senator BURR. What percentage of that annual budget goes to personnel?

Mr. CARLINO. About 35 to 40 percent of that in various costs.

Senator BURR. Over this 10-year life so far, how much money has been spent on repair and maintenance of the structures proposed for designation as the National Historic Site?

Mr. CARLINO. We were donated the pump house and water tower by the developer, which bought the property in 2000. We've spent roughly $200,000 to $300,000 on that. It's part of a trailhead site, the connection of the Great Allegheny Passage Trail that con-

necting Pittsburgh to Washington, D.C. We've made some other safety improvements on the site because people wanted to visit it.

At the Carrie blast furnaces, we don't own it right now, Allegheny County owns it. They have asked us, as they just acquired it, to raise capital in order to begin the necessary stabilization of that property. We've raised approximately $1 million for stabilization of that site, but we've not spent any yet on that site.

For the railroad bridge, that was donated to us by Union Railroad back in 1999. That is such a huge engineering structure that we've had to do very little maintenance to that facility, except for changing navigational lights, in order to keep the channels on the Monongahela River signaled properly. So that maintenance and operation, I would say, including insurance, is about $100,000 a year.

Senator BURR. OK. So roughly a million dollars over the 10 years that you've put into restoration, reconstruction of buildings?

Mr. CARLINO. For the properties that we have access to, yes sir. Like I said, the Carrie Furnaces, that's still a rather crude abandoned site that has limited access.

Senator BURR. Thank you.

Mr. Zax, do you have any idea how many acres the proposed area covers?

Mr. ZAX. It covers about 108 acres.

Senator BURR. How many people live within the boundaries that are proposed?

Mr. ZAX. I'd like to verify that with certainty, rather than estimating.

Senator BURR. I'll take a guesstimate and we'll look for the certainty in a follow-up.

Mr. ZAX. I'd feel better just submitting for the record. I've been pressing Park Service to be so accurate. I don't want to——

Senator BURR. I appreciate——

Mr. ZAX [continuing]. Be guilty myself.

Senator BURR. I appreciate that. Can you give me an idea of how many businesses operate within the proposed boundaries? How many, if any of those, would become National Park Service concessions operations after the designation?

Mr. ZAX. Let me get to, if I may, what I think is the heart of your question. Everyone who lives, works, own property, or rents property in this area, supports this National Park. No privately owned property is necessary for this National Park. There will be private properties within the boundaries of the part, just are there are in Lowell.

Senator BURR. What I'm trying to ascertain here, just for the purposes of the Chairman and myself and the members, is that where we have concessionaires on National Parks, we have the ability to charge franchise fees. We have the ability to compete those concessionaires. If in fact, incorporated in the boundaries are private businesses that then become concessionaires. We don't have the ability for franchise fees, we don't have the abilities to compete the businesses. My only point is to try to lay out for all the members what the precedent is we might set, whether it's Paterson or anything else.

Because I have learned in the 13 years that I've been here, as soon as we deviate from what might be a historic pathway, we have

a number of people beating at the door ready to go down that new pathway, which might send me to the, sort of the last question that I had, which was who would control the land use within the boundaries of this unit that's designated? Is it the Park Service?

Mr. ZAX. There is now local zoning that applies and local Historic Preservation Protection that applies, within the boundaries of the area. We would seek to have that continued. As I'm sure you and your staff know, upon passage of this legislation, there would be a period of time to produce a general management plan that would address all of the issues that you raise.

I will say only that, in the case of Paterson, it's much easier than in the case of Lowell. Though the Park Service today tells us they're worried about the management problems in Paterson, it's going to be much easier to manage in Paterson than in Lowell. In fact——

Senator BURR. Please——

Mr. ZAX [continuing]. Lowell has not been a problem in this regard.

Senator BURR. Please understand, this is one member of the Senate that's not comparing this with something else. I'm purely focused on the precedent that we would set—if there is one—that differs from the precedent in place. I will assure you prior to the consideration by the committee of the bill, I'll do the remainder of my homework to find out. Do we have other facilities in the country, where we have a concentration of private business operating within the boundaries of a park? Do we have dual control agreements, where the Park Service is in control of some things, but private entities, companies, individuals, or—I guess, to have zoning you have to have some type of corporated or unincorporated city within the boundaries or town, however we want to call it.

If in fact we don't find other properties that have that, then an additional consideration of the committee has to be, is that a precedent that we want to set for the future? It was not a series of questions that I asked the Park Service. I can follow-up with them in some written questions.

Mr. ZAX. I would like to respond for the record, as well.

Senator BURR. Sure.

Mr. ZAX. Because one of the things that really made me and representatives of private foundations very interested in supporting other efforts around the park, to go to Lowell during the earlier part of this month, was to look at exactly this question. So let me, we have a little more work to do, but I certainly could respond to those inquiries during the 2-week period that this committee allows.

Senator BURR. I would be grateful to you——

Mr. ZAX. Perfect.

Senator BURR [continuing]. If you would provide that. Thank you.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Senator Burr.

I want to thank our witnesses for testifying this afternoon. Some of you, Mr. Brooks in particular, have traveled a long way to appear here today, and I want to let you know that we appreciate

your willingness to come to Washington to help us better understand these issues.

Some members of the committee were not able to attend this hearing, and they may submit additional questions in writing. If we receive any, we'll forward them to you and ask that you respond to those, and we may include both the questions and answers in the official hearing.

We have also to include in the record the testimonies for the record of Senator Biden and Senator Lautenberg, and we'll have a spot on the record.

So again, thank you very much and thank you again for your testimony. The subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:08 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX I

Responses to Additional Questions

RESPONSES OF AUGUST R. CARLINO TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BURR

Question 1. Steel Industry National Historic Site Designation (S. 697): How was it determined that a National Historic Site was the most appropriate designation?

Answer. The Steel Industry National Historic Site was first proposed as the Steel Industry National Historic Park Act (H.R. 5030) in the 106th Congress by Congressman Mike Doyle of Pennsylvania. In the 107th Congress the bill was reintroduced, and considered by the House Resources Committee, chaired then by Congressman Richard Pombo. It was the decision of the Chairman to re-title the bill to be a "National Historic Site" when the legislation was marked-up in Committee.

Question 2. Steel Industry National Historic Site Designation (S. 697): How many structures are on the proposed site and what is the estimated cost of repairs and annual maintenance?

Answer. The property and structures to be designated in the bill include the Battle of Homestead site, Carrie Furnaces No. 6 and No. 7, and the Rankin Hot Metal Bridge. The Battle site includes two (2) structures, the pumphouse and water tower. The blast furnaces site includes the twelve (12) structures which make up the National Historic Landmark, including Carrie Furnaces No. 6 and No. 7, stationary car dumper, ore yard, ore bridge, stocking trestle, stock house, hoist house, cast house, blast plant, blowing engine house and AC power house. Also included in the NHL and a part of the site, is the Rankin Hot Metal bridge. In total, the S. 697 proposes fifteen structures (15) as a part of the proposed Steel Industry National Historic Site.

In 2002, the Congressional Budget Office prepared an estimate for the cost of the legislation. CBO reported the cost to be slightly more than $53 million over a five-year period, including capital costs, operations and maintenance, and cooperative agreements.

Question 3. Steel Industry National Historic Site Designation (S. 697): How much has been spent on repair and maintenance of the structures proposed for designation as a National Historic Site each year in the past 10 years?

Answer. Since SIHC acquired the Battle of Homestead site (pumphouse and water tower) in 2003, $83,939 has been expended on the site including insurance, utilities and restoration and repairs. As for the Carrie Furnaces, this site is owned by Allegheny County, and except for the costs incurred by SIHC to open the site for tours—insurance and site preparation totally $29,261 since 2006—there has not been any work performed in association with the maintenance or restoration of this facility. Since 2001, when SIHC acquired the Rankin Hot Metal Bridge by donation from Union Rail Road, $56,315 has been spent on maintenance, security and insurance.

Question 4. Steel Industry National Historic Site Designation (S. 697): Have you received any opposition to this designation? If so, who has opposed the designation and why?

Answer. The only opponent to the legislation was the previous owner of the site, The Park Corporation. Their opposition is no longer a factor since they willingly sold all of their holdings in the entire brownfield site that includes the Carrie Furnaces to the County of Allegheny in 2005. The legislation is supported by Allegheny County, owners of the Carrie Furnaces, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the surrounding boroughs, numerous civic and community organizations, along with local philanthropic foundations.

Question 5. Steel Industry National Historic Site Designation (S. 697): Will the Federal government be expected to purchase any of the land, buildings, or other property within the National Historic Site? If so, who is the current owner, how long have they owned the property, and what is the estimated cost?

Answer. The legislation specifies that all land and structures within the proposed Steel Industry National Historic Site are to be transferred to the National Park Service by donation. This provision of the legislation is supported by both Allegheny County, which owns the Carrie Furnaces (since 2005) and the Steel Industry Heritage Corporation which owns the Battle of Homestead site (since 2003) and the Rankin Hot Metal Bridge (since 2001).

RESPONSES OF TOM BROOKS TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BURR

Question 1. Denali National Park/Alaska Railroad Land Exchange (S. 1808): What is the historical use of the non-Federal land being transferred to the National Park Service as a result of S. 1808?

Answer. Basically, there has been little use of the land. The non-Federal land was Federal until the Alaska Railroad was sold to the State of Alaska in 1985. While in the Federal domain, the railroad used minor portions of this area to ditch for drainage. In 1985, the land was reserved to the railroad for maintenance of the track and future rail realignment. This area is called the "Moody Slide", and is an area of naturally unstable ground. The lands proposed for exchange in S. 1808 are along the top of the slide.

Question 2. Denali National Park/Alaska Railroad Land Exchange (S. 1808): Does the non-Federal land involved in this exchange contain any form of development or history of hazardous waste contamination?

Answer. As noted above, the land was used for minor drainage ditching when under Federal control. In addition, in about 1980 the Federal government permitted construction of an electrical pole line in this area. This pole line remains in service today and is the source of electrical power for the NPS Denali Park entrance area. The Alaska Railroad is not aware of any contamination in this area.

Question 3. Denali National Park/Alaska Railroad Land Exchange (S. 1808): How does the Alaska Railroad intend to use the land it obtains as a result of this exchange?

Answer. The Alaska Railroad intends to use the land to construct track to turn trains around at Denali Park. Alternatives to a turnaround track are not viable. If a turnaround track is not created, options to expand and improve rail service to Denali Park will be limited.

RESPONSES OF LEONARD A. ZAX TO QUESTIONS FROM SENATOR BURR

Question 1. Many structures within the area of the proposed National Park Unit were originally constructed for manufacturing purposes. How many of the original manufacturing buildings remain, what was the original use of each structure, and what is the current use?

Answer. Some 40 structures and complexes originally constructed for manufacturing purposes are within the area. Tables A through D on attached Schedule 1 set forth the number, original use and current use.

Although many of the structures within the boundaries of the proposed National Park Unit were originally constructed for manufacturing purposes, Alexander Hamilton and Pierre L'Enfant planned for Paterson to include housing as well. Some manufacturing continues there, but other industrial buildings have been restored for adaptive reuses, including housing, consistent with the best practices in historic preservation.

Question 2. How many acres does the proposed area cover and approximately how many people live within the proposed boundary? What type of residences currently exist (e.g., single family homes, town homes, apartments, condominiums)?

Answer. The proposed area covers approximately 115 acres, including the Hinchliffe Stadium property that is not in the bill the House enacted last night. The population is about 1,000 persons, with the majority residing in apartments. There are no single-family homes or townhouses. There are rental apartments and condominium units located in several rehabilitated mill structures. There are also other rental apartments in structures never used for manufacturing.

Question 3. Will any of the historic structures within the proposed boundary of the national park be adaptively reused for residential buildings such as apartments or condominiums after designation? If so, what was the original use of the future residential building and how has the use changed since first built?

Answer. There are seven historic mill renovation projects planned with private financing. Six of the historic buildings are planned as condominium or rental apartments. The seventh historic structure is proposed as commercial offices. Table C of Schedule 1 provides additional details.

Question 4. How many businesses operate within the proposed boundary and how many of those would become National Park Service concessions operations after designation? Will the merchants pay any fee to the National Park Service or the U.S. Treasury for operating within the boundaries of a national park unit?

Answer. Approximately 125 businesses operate within the proposed boundaries. More than half of those are manufacturing or offices.

At the Subcommittee Hearing, Senator Burr expressed a concern that the passage of this legislation might create an unusual new precedent, perhaps with unintended consequences, for Park Service concessions in an urban national park. We believe that the Paterson National Park would not create a new or untested precedent.

Even though the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park would be located in the heart of a city, the regular National Park Service concessions guidelines would apply to any concession operation on park lands. After the passage of this legislation, the National Park Service will prepare a General Management Plan for the new park that will address the number and location of NPS concessions.

In urban national historical park settings like Boston, Philadelphia and Lowell, NPS units have been operating successfully in cooperation with established businesses on private property within park boundaries. The National Park Service concessions laws and policies would apply to the same extent in Paterson with respect to the payment of any fees to the National Park Service or the U.S. Treasury for commercial service operations that take place on national park lands.

Question 5. How many acres of land within the proposed boundary are in private ownership? How much of the land is Federal? How much of the land is state? How will land ownership change if S. 148 is enacted?

Answer. About 35 acres are privately owned. None of the land within the boundaries is currently owned by the United States. The State of New Jersey owns about 5 acres. The City of Paterson owns about 57 acres. Streets account for about 15 acres.

Ownership would not change if Congress enacts this legislation.

We understand that the National Park Service is also responding to this question and some of the other questions herein. Park Service officials may be in a better position to provide more precise responses.

Question 6. Who currently controls land use within the proposed boundary of the Paterson Great Falls National Park and who will control land use after designation?

Answer. The City of Paterson now controls land uses through zoning and historic preservation guidelines, but historic preservation laws currently provide a limited role for the State and Federal governments in certain circumstances. After designation, and pursuant to the NPS General Management Plan, land use will also be controlled pursuant to cooperative agreements between the City of Paterson, the State of New Jersey, and the National Park Service.

Question 7. What is the estimated cost to repair and rehabilitate the structures included in the area proposed for designation as a unit of the National Park System and who will be responsible for such efforts?

Answer. The National Park Service estimates that the costs for repair and rehabilitation of structures would be: (i) $3 million to $5 million to refurbish a facility for visitor services and administration needs; and (ii) $10 million to $15 million for historic preservation grants.

As explained in further detail on Tables B and C on Schedule 1, several buildings have already been rehabilitated and the private sector will bear responsibility for almost all future renovation costs.

Question 8. How will the American public benefit from this designation?

Answer. The Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park will provide benefits to everyone in America. Many citizens who today feel little or no connection with our national parks and our national heritage will find much greater meaning in the interpretation of American history within Paterson's gritty city setting of cultural diversity.

Thirty million Americans-more than one in ten Americans-live less than a three hour drive from the Great Falls in Paterson. For many of them, the great national parks of the west are something they have seen only in photographs. Paterson offers a unique opportunity to provide a new Park Service unit in a setting that Hispanic, African-American, Arab-American, Islamic, Jewish, and Christian organizations have recognized as a place to connect with American history and the National Park System.

These diverse groups come together for many reasons. They have seen the spectacular beauty of the Great Falls-the second largest waterfall in the eastern part of the United States. They increasingly recognize that no other natural wonder in America has played a more important role in our nation's historic quest for freedom and prosperity.

The history of the Paterson Great Falls has captured the imagination and spirit of a broad and diverse group of citizens throughout America. Hispanic citizens, who constitute a majority of Paterson's 180,000 residents, support the this new national historical park in part because Hamilton played such an important role in expanding opportunities for immigrants and helping to spread the cause of freedom to the Spanish colonies in the Americas. African-American leaders recognize Hamilton's vision of an American economy beginning at the Great Falls and built through the work of men and women dedicated to freedom.

Paterson would become the first NPS unit with strong Arab-American support in a city that has the second largest concentration of Arab-Americans in any American city. Islamic leaders support the Paterson National Park as a continuation of the Silk Road that united their homelands in Central Asia with China and the West. They note that Paterson became the largest silk manufacturing center of the world at the end of the 19th Century and was long known as the Silk City. As Richard Kennedy of the Smithsonian Institution has pointed out:

> The Silk Road has extended to the United States and, since the tragic events of September 11, understanding that connection clearly has become more important. There is no better time, then, to learn more about the roots of this vital connection and to celebrate the long-standing relationships that have existed between east and west and north and south.

National and local support for the Paterson National Historical Park continues to grow. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, the National Parks Conservation Association, the NAACP, and the Sierra Club have written letters and submitted testimony to support this new national historical park. Also supporting a Paterson National Park are former Cabinet members who served in the Administrations of Gerald R. Ford, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush.

Corporate executives and laborers, environmentalists and property rights advocates, bankers and community activists, scholars and schoolchildren, historic preservationists and developers support this new park. All Americans will benefit from making this very special place a part of the National Park System.

Question 9. Can the proposal be modified so that the boundary of the park unit includes only land and structures that will convey to the Federal government and excludes all private property? By doing so, it will be clear from the start that there are no private in-holdings within the boundary of the National Park unit.

Answer. Although it is theoretically possible for the Congress to exclude lots that are privately owned from the national historical park, neither precedent nor policy would support such an unnecessarily complicated patchwork of boundaries for a national historical park in an urban setting. Eliminating private lots from the proposed park boundaries of Paterson would increase NPS management difficulties, increase Federal costs, frustrate historic preservation best practices, and create a problematic precedent for our National Park System.

The boundaries in the bill are based on resource significance and opportunities for high quality visitor experiences. The private owners support having their properties within the proposed park boundaries. Keeping these private lands within the boundaries will help encourage private funding for restoration and maintenance. These properties would remain in private ownership in accordance with a General Management Plan and cooperative agreements between the NPS, State and local governments. Excluding some or all of the private lands would not enhance management efficiency nor would it reduce costs to NPS for operations.

Many private properties are included within the boundaries of urban national historical parks such as Independence National Historical Park, Boston National Historical Park, Lowell National Historical Park, and Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historical Park in California. Even though the Park Service had opposed creation of Lowell National Historical Park in the Carter Administration, since Congressional passage of the legislation the Park Service professionals have done a highly-effective and very impressive job of administering this historical park in the heart of the city.

The proposed boundaries are important for maintaining the integrity of the Paterson Great Falls National Historic District. As the President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Richard Moe, observed: "Scholars have concluded that Pierre L'Enfant's innovative water power system at Great Falls-and many fac-

tories built later-constitute the finest remaining collection of engineering and architectural works representing each stage of America's progress from Hamilton's time to the twentieth century."

Despite changes in private owners and uses, the historic built environment of the district endures. The Pulitzer Prize winning architecture critic of the New Yorker, Paul Goldberger, has written of this Paterson historic district: "The visitor comes back, again, to the remarkable mill and factory architecture, for it is the real gem of this city. Streets and buildings form a surprisingly cohesive urban composition. Here, the rich brick facades of the mills and the crisp forms of the smokestacks play off against one another, with the cliffs of the Great Falls providing a serene background."

To secure the benefits of the entire national historic district for the American people, we believe the Paterson Great Falls National Historical Park should include the private properties.

SCHEDULE 1.—MAJOR HISTORIC STRUCTURES & COMPLEXES

Table A.—Public Historic Properties in Need of Rehabilitation

Location	Historic Name	Historic Use	Year Built	Comments
upper, middle & lower channels	S.U.M. Raceway	Industrial: Power Canal	1794-1839	Conceived by S.U.M., first designed by Pierre L'Fant, implemented by Peter Colt. Unique 3-tier canal system to provide water power to mills. Fully intact, with running water and partially rehabilitated.
Passaic River	S.U.M. Dam	Industrial: Power Canal	1838	Built across Passaic river to impound water for use in the raceway system. Still in functional use today as part of the hydroelectric generating station.
former ATP site	Colt Gun Mill	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1836	Constructed by the Colt family where Samuel Colt produced the first Colt firearms, and later where the first skein of silk was produced in Paterson. Currently a stabilized ruin but will be incorporated into park design.
lip of the Great Falls	Passaic Water Co. Dam	Industrial: Utilities	1860-1870s	Masonry dam constructed to impound water before it flowed over the waterfall for the purpose of pumping into nearby reservoirs. Part of Paterson's first fire and domestic water supply system. Severely threatened.
south bank of Passaic River	River Wall	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1850-1860s	Stone masonry river wall running 1,000 ft. along river bank functioned to separate the river from a heavily industrialized campus. Severely threatened.
former ATP site	various mill remnants	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1870s-1930	Various mill remnants that are worthy of stabilization that resulted from several 20th century fires that consumed the former ATP campus. Includes one smoke stack, steam power plant, and mill components. Threatened.
2 Market St	Rogers Loco. Shop Bld.	Industrial: Locomotive	1850s-1870s	Site of the Paterson Museum, this impressive iconic structure was rehabilitated in 1980 and has since been in use. Suffers from deferred maintenance. Needs some capital improvements.
100 McBride Ave	S.U.M. Hydro electric Sta.	Industrial: Utilities	1912-14	Operated from 1914-1967. Producing power since reactivation in 1986. Suffers from deferred maintenance.
100 McBride Ave	S.U.M. Steam Plant	Industrial: Utilities	1912-14	Constructed by the S.U.M. to replace water power to mills with electrical power generated by coal. Demolished in the 1960s leaving massive foundation that is in need of rehabilitation and reuse as park infrastructure.

*Source: City of Paterson

Table B.—Completed Rehabilitations

Address	Historic Name	Historic Use	Year Built	Current Use			
				Industrial	Residential	Educational/Public	Commercial
24 Mill St.	Essex Mill (complex)	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1807-1870s		Artist housing		
33-35 VanHouten St.	Phoenix Mill (complex)	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1813-1870s		Artist housing		
9 Mill St.	Ryle & Thomson houses	Residential	1815				Offices, rental
16-26 Mill St.	Hamil & Hamilton Mills	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1857,1877		Rental Housing		Retail rental spaces
18 Market St.	Cooke Mills (complex)	Industrial: Locomotive	1870s	Industrial incubator			
19 Market St.	Cooke Loco. Admin. Bld.	Industrial: Locomotive	1881		Condominium		
20-24 Mill St.	Pub. School #2	Educational: School	1871-1930s			Public school (Elementary)	
1 Market St.	Rosen Mill	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1891			Day care/elem. school	
31-35 McBride Ave.	Hayes Mfg. Co (Demolished)	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1910			1950s bld: Day Care	
16 Spruce St.	Rogers Loco. Admin Bld.	Industrial: Locomotive	1880			CDC/social services	
10 Spruce St.	Ivanhoe Mill Wheel-house	Industrial: Paper Mfg.	1840			Artist public gallery	
49 Spruce St.	Pub. Utilities Offices Bld.	Industrial: Pub. Utili-ties	1930s			Day Care	
32 Spruce St.	Rogers Loco. Shop Bld.	Industrial: Locomotive	1870s			CDC Day Care & high school	
2 Market St.	Rogers Loco. Shop Bld.	Industrial: Locomotive	1850s-1870s			Paterson Museum	Offices, rental
7 Mill St.	Argus Mill	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1900			Day Care & services	
16 McBride Ave	Franklin Mill	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1870-1915				Offices, rental
100 McBride Ave	S.U.M. Hydro electric Sta.	Industrial: utilities	1912-14				Generates electricity

*Source: City of Paterson

Table C.—Rehabilitations in Progress or Planned

Address	Historic Name	Historic Use	Year Built	Current Occupancy Status	Proposed Uses			
					Industrial	Residential	Educational/Public	Commercial
101 W. Broadway	Old Hotel	Commercial: Hotel	1845	Vacant				Offices
24VanHouten St.	Harmony Mills (complex)	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1850-1870s	Vacant		Rental Housing		
50 Spruce St.	Rogers Loco. Shop bld.	Industrial: Locomotive	1870s	Vacant		Condominium		
68 Ryle Ave.	Addy Mill	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1850s	Vacant		Condominium		
50 Ryle Ave.	Venerable Mill	Industrial: Machine Mfg.	1870s	Vacant		Condominium		
13VanHouten St.	Congdon Mill	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1907	Vacant		Condominium		
28-42 Ryle Ave.	National Silk Dyeing Co.	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1915	Vacant		Condominium		

*Source: City of Paterson

Table D.—Private Historic Properties, Not Rehabilitated

Address	Historic Name	Historic Use	Year Built	Industrial	Residential	Educational/Public	Commercial
70 Spruce St.	Barbour Flax Spinning Mills	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1860s	Manufacturing and industrial			
70 Spruce St.	Dolphin Jute & Twine Co.	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1874-1880	Manufacturing and industrial			
183-229 Grand St.	Granite Mill	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1881-1908	Warehouse			
2-50 Jersey St.	Cooke Loco. Shop Bld.	Industrial: Locomotive	1870s	NJ Transit: Bus depot			
17 River St.	Society Island (S.U.M.)	Commercial: Market	1915				Furniture
44-48 Ryle Ave.	National Silk Dyeing Co.	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1915	Manufacturing			
38 VanHouten St.	Edison Illuminating	Industrial: Utilities	1894-1910		Salvation Army		
Upper Raceway Park	Rogers Loco. Storage Bld.	Industrial: Locomotive	1870s				
37-53 McBride Ave.	Oppenheimer Mill	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1915	Manufacturing			
23-29 McBride Ave.	Fine Colors Co. (complex)	Industrial: Textile Mfg.	1910				

*Source: City of Paterson

[Responses to the following questions were not received from the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, at the time the hearing went to press:]

QUESTIONS FOR DANIEL N. WENK FROM SENATOR MENENDEZ, ON S. 148

Question 1. How many National Historic Districts include both a National Natural Landmark and a National Historical Landmark?

Question 2. What other places in America now interpret Hamilton's vision of economic independence, particularly for military supplies?

Question 3. Hamilton biographers emphasize that Hamilton's economic vision had two critical aspects: (i) zero tolerance for slavery; and (ii) opportunities for poor immigrants with no social pedigree to rise to the top of American society. What other places in America connected with Hamilton interpret this extraordinary vision of a Founding Father?

Question 4. What National Park Service units have a relationship to Muslim Americans?

Question 5. What National Park Service units interpret the modern Silk Road that was the theme of the Smithsonian Folk Life Festival on the National Mall in 2002?

Question 6. On the same day that the Administration testified against the Paterson National Park, the Administration testimony on S. 187 stated that Lowell, Massachusetts is "the most significant planned industrial city in the United States." Why is Lowell more significant than Paterson, which was planned as an industrial city a generation earlier than Lowell by one of our Founding Fathers and Pierre L'Enfant?

Question 7. The Park Service testified that Hamilton is represented three places in the National Park System. But scholars point out that he lived in Hamilton Grange only the last two years of his life—many years after his service in government—and the Grange has nothing to do with his industrial vision and its primary importance is as a remaining 18th century house. Independence Hall does not interpret Hamilton's vision of the American economy or economic independence. And Federal Hall is a welcome center for the entire New York region that has only a very limited display on Hamilton's contributions. How can these three sites be used as a justification for rejecting the Paterson National Historical Park legislation?

In addition, while I did ask these questions at the hearing I would like a more complete answer from the National Park Service on these questions in writing if possible.

Question 8. At an early stage of the Paterson Great Falls Study, the National Park Service launched a special webpage devoted to the Paterson Study. For all the years the Study continued, the webpage noted that the Administration "does not support addition of new units to the National Park System." What effect did the Administration policy have on the Paterson Study?

Question 9. The Park Service published a Draft of the Paterson Great Falls Study for public comment in November 2006 and invited the public to provide comments by January 30, 2007. It is astonishing to read the letters of some of the most distinguished scholars in America characterize what the Park Service did in the Paterson Study. They used words like: "misreads the historical record" . . . "seriously deficient" . . . "truly absurd" . . . "demonstrably wrong" . . . "false" . . . "a serious misreading of the historical record." As a result of getting all these letters from leading scholars, what changes did the Park Service make in the Draft Study?

Question 10. Governor Corzine wrote a letter to Secretary Kempthorne on September 11, 2006 that said: "The State of New Jersey alone cannot protect the resources of the Great Falls and properly present them to the public without an NPS unit in Paterson." How can the Park Service Draft Study conclude that the State will be doing all that is necessary at the Great Falls when the New Jersey contribution to the Park is $10 million and the Park Service numbers make it clear that $20 million is necessary?

QUESTIONS FOR DANIEL N. WENK FROM SENATOR BURR

Question 11. Cache la Poudre River National Heritage Area Amendment (S. 128):

a. Why has this National Heritage Area been inactive since it was first established in 1996?

b.Have any other National Heritage Areas or Corridors encountered similar management challenges to those found at Cache la Poudre River? If so, how were the problems resolved?

Question 12. Paterson Great Falls Park Act (S. 148):

a. What is the status of the suitability and feasibility study conducted by the National Park Service for the Paterson site?

b. How many acres of the proposed area are in private ownership and how much will remain in private ownership after designation?

c. The House companion bill, H.R. 189, has been reported out of the Natural Resources Committee with an amendment. The National Park Service opposed the House bill as introduced. Does the National Park Service support the amended version of H.R. 189? If not, why?

d. Who will control land use within the boundaries of the unit after designation?

e. How many private businesses exist within the proposed boundaries of the Paterson National Park? What other units of the National Park System contain a concentration of private businesses similar to Paterson? Does the National Park Service collect a franchise fee or business use authorization fee in such cases?

f. It is my understanding that the proposed Paterson National Park site currently contains apartments, affordable housing, and proposed condominiums as adaptive reuse of historic structures. Do any other units of the National Park System contain private residential structures of this type? If so, where and to what extent? Would the National Park Service support adaptive reuse of historic structures for condominiums in a national park unit?

Question 13. Keweenaw National Historical Park Matching Funds Reduction (S. 189):

a. The amendment removes a provision that prohibits the Secretary from acquiring lands that have become contaminated with hazardous substances. Under what circumstances would the National Park Service feel compelled to purchase lands that are contaminated with hazardous substances?

b. Why is it necessary to delete a provision that prohibits the acquisition of lands contaminated with hazardous substances?

c. How will this amendment improve the visitor experience to Keweenaw National Historical Park?

d. How many units of the National Park System have matching funds requirements as part of their enabling legislation or subsequent amendments? What is the range of matching fund requirements (e.g., 1 federal to 1 non-federal or something less being the smallest to 1:4 or something greater being the largest)?

e. Would Keweenaw or other units having a matching fund requirement be able to apply the non-federal match toward the enabling legislation requirement and the Centennial Challenge program, if enacted, and essentially "double dip"?

Question 14. Steel Industry National Historic Site Designation (S. 697): The site is part of the Rivers of Steel National Heritage Area, which was designated a National Heritage Area in 1996. It preserves and interprets the role of the steel industry in the development of a nation. The site contains several structures that are in need of over $30 million in repairs. If designated a National Historic Site, it would become a unit of the National Park System and the Federal government would be responsible for the repairs.

a. How many other National Heritage Areas or portions of such areas have been designated as units of the National Park System?

b. How many structures are on the proposed site and what is the estimated cost of repairs and annual maintenance?

c. Has a study been conducted to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the site as a unit of the National Park System and what were the findings?

Question 15. Lowell National Historical Park Boundary Adjustment (S. 867):

a. How many acres affected by this amendment are currently in private ownership and how many owners are involved?

b. Do any of the owners object to this amendment?

c. What is the estimated cost of the land included in this amendment?

d. How will this amendment support the purpose for which the Lowell National Historical Park was established?

Question 16. New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail Reauthorization (S. 1039): The Trail was reauthorized last Congress, but the final version signed into law inadvertently extended the authorization for one year instead of five. S. 1039 corrects the error by extending the authorization to 2011. The law passed in the 109th Congress also directed the National Park Service to prepare a strategic plan for the trail.

a. S. 1039 extends the authorization from 2007 to 2011. Does the National Park Service know of any other corrections we should take care of regarding the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail?

b. What is the status of the strategic plan being prepared for the New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail?

Question 17. Saguaro National Park Boundary Expansion Act (S. 1341):

a. What is the estimated cost of the property proposed for addition to the Park and the Conservation Area?

b. Are any of the lands included in the expansion area in private ownership?

Question 18. Tule Lake Segregation Study (S. 1476):

a. S. 1476 requires the National Park Service to complete a study within one year. The National Park Service is usually given three years to complete a study. Can the study authorized by S. 1476 be completed in one year or will you require more time?

b. How many acres does the Tule Segregation Center occupy and what original structures remain on the site?

Question 19. Underground Railroad Amendment (S. 1709/H.R. 1239):

a. Section 2 of S. 1709 specifies that "the Secretary shall appoint at least 8 full-time equivalent staff to assist the Secretary in carrying out duties under this act." What other park units or park programs have legislation that specifies the number of full-time equivalent staff that the Secretary shall appoint?

b. How many full-time equivalent staff has the Secretary appointed to the National Underground Network to Freedom program in 2007?

Question 20. Denali National Park/Alaska Railroad Land Exchange (S. 1808):

a. How will the proposed land exchange between Denali National Park and the Alaska Railroad improve the visitor experience?

b. Does the non-Federal land involved in this exchange contain any form of development or history of hazardous waste contamination?

c. What is the historical use of the non-Federal land being acquired by the National Park Service as a result of S. 1808?

d. How will Denali National Park benefit from this land exchange?

e. Will the Alaska Railroad use the land it receives as a result of this exchange in a manner consistent with the purpose for which Denali National Park was established?

Question 21. Alexander Hamilton Site Study at Virgin Islands (S. 1969):

a. How many existing National Park Units currently interpret the life and contributions of Alexander Hamilton?

b. How much will it cost to conduct the proposed study?

APPENDIX II

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

NORTHERN COLORADO WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT,
Berthoud, CO, September 24, 2007.

Hon. WAYNE ALLARD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you to encourage your support for the Cache la Poudre Heritage Area bill (SB128) pending in the United States Senate. Senate Bill 128 is a technical corrections bill that will rectify some errors in the boundary description in the original bill, and designate the Poudre Heritage Alliance, a non-profit 501(c)(3) organization, as the management entity for the Heritage Area.

The Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District is a member of the Alliance, and has long supported the efforts to pass this bill. This bill is needed to assure proper administration of the National Water Heritage Area designation given the Poudre in 1996. It has been more than a decade since that designation, and we believe it to be imperative that we take this final step necessary to implement the intent of the designation.

Your support of Senate Bill 128 which will allow implementation of the original Cache la Poudre Heritage Area bill will be most appreciated when this bill comes before of the National Parks Committee on September 27, 2007.

The Heritage Area has widespread support throughout Northern Colorado and this federal legislation will strengthen an already successful heritage area.

Sincerely,

ERIC W. WILKINSON,
General Manager.

TOWN OF WINDSOR,
Windsor, CO, September 25, 2007.

Hon. WAYNE ALLARD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you to encourage your support for the Cache la Poudre Heritage Area bill pending in the US Senate. Senate Bill 128 is a technical corrections bill that will rectify some errors in the boundary description in the original bill and designate the Poudre Heritage Alliance, a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization, as the management entity for the Heritage Area.

Since its inception the Heritage Alliance has provided support with the help of the National Park Service at Rocky Mountain National Park in educating the public and promoting the Heritage Area. The Poudre Heritage Alliance has hosted two (2) national conferences and given numerous tours of the Heritage Area. The Heritage Alliance has negotiated with the Colorado Department of Transportation to locate two (2) large infonnational signs along I-25 where the Heritage Area and Poudre River cross the interstate. Twenty wayside signs have been installed along the trail that borders much of the Heritage Area's forty-four (44) mile corridor.

Additionally, a Heritage poster, passport stamp program, brochures, an ethno history and website have all been created.

A historical and cultural handbook has also been drafted and thanks to some nonprofit grants will be printed and distributed in the near future.

Your support to finalize the intent of the original Cache la Poudre Heritage Area bill is most appreciated when this bill comes up in front of the National Parks committee on September 27, 2007.

The Heritage Area has widespread support throughout Northern Colorado and this federal legislation will strengthen an already successful heritage area. The Town of Windsor is an active member of this Alliance.

Cordially,

ED STARCK,
Mayor.

SKY ISLAND ALLIANCE,
Tucson, AZ, September 25, 2007.

Hon. JON KYL,
730 Hart Senate Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KYL, We appreciate the opportunity to support the Las Cienegas Enhancement and Saguaro National Park Boundary Adjustment Act (S. 1341) which will be heard in the Subcommittee on National Parks on Thursday September 27th.

Sky Island Alliance has been party to negotiations concerning this bill since its original inception in February 2003. The legislation provides for the important acquisition of lands adjacent to the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area, lands adjacent to Saguaro National Park. and the net retirement of almost 1000 acre-feet of water rights on Cienega Creek. These actions combined will increase the integrity of the NCA and help ensure its core value—Cienega Creek—retains critical above-surface flows. S. 1341 also improves landownership patterns within the Sky Island region, and reduces the threat of ex-urban development largely outside of the Tucson metropolitan area, in turn keeping the Whetstone-Rincon wildlife linkage largely intact.

Another beneficial aspect of S—1341 is Section 3(b)3(C)ii where cash equalization payments made to the Secretary must be used for the acquisition of lands or interests in southern Arizona. With more than 70,000 acres of non-federal land within the Sonoita Valley Acquisition District alone, we appreciate your support of ensuring that equalization payments stay within southern Arizona.

In relation to Section 4(c) which directs the Secretary to provide a road easement to the Forest Service boundary. we ask that the committee report further clarifies that new road construction into the Forest is not expressly authorized by this legislation and because of the existing access route, is not warranted.

The expansion of the National Conservation Area and National Park arc worthy conservation measures that will have lasting beneficial impacts on our region's natural heritage. We look forward to the bill's passage.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MATT SKROCH,
Executive Director.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE,
PIMA COUNTY GOVERNMENTAL, CENTER,
Tucson, AZ, September 26, 2007.

Hon. JON KYL,
U.S. Senate, 730 Hart Senate Building, Washington, DC.

Re: Pima County Support for S.1341, the Las Cienegas Enhancement and Saguaro National Park Boundary Adjustment Act

DEAR SENATOR KYL: Pima County has long supported the conservation of lands in the Cienega Corridor, as well as expansions of the Saguaro National Park, East and West. We continue to support the most recent iteration of this bill, S. 1341, The Las Cienegas Enhancement and Saguaro National Park Boundary Adjustment Act.

The Act would conserve the 2,700-acre Empirita Simonson property in the Cienega Corridor east of Tucson. This property was identified for conservation as part of the Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan and subsequent voter-approved bond election. Conservation of the property would expand significant conservation investments made by the National Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Pima County, in this important biological and cultural landscape. In addition, this Act will expand the boundaries of Saguaro National Park along the important Rincon Creek and along the eastern slopes of the Tucson Mountains. This legislation will also conserve the Bloom property, a large 160-acre property adjacent to Saguaro National Park East and within the boundary expansion area.

Thank you for your continued efforts to make this land exchange a reality.

Sincerely,

C.H. HUCKELBERRY,
County Administrator.

STATEMENT OF JIM STRATTON, NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, ON S. 1808

The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) works to protect, preserve, and enhance America's national parks for present and future generations. On behalf of NPCA's 325,000 members, and especially its members in Alaska, we appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments for the record.

Several months ago we received a briefing on the proposal land exchange by representatives of the Alaska Railroad. Subsequent to that briefing, the National Parks Conservation Association reviewed the specific language of S. 1808, the Denali National Park and Alaska Railroad Land Exchange Act of 2007, to evaluate its potential impact on park resources. That review found the proposal to have minimal impact on the park and, therefore, we have no objection to the bill.

We recognize the Alaska Railroad's need to build a turnaround for its trains and we understand the benefit that it will bring to both the economic viability of passenger service and the advantage for those seeking to travel to Denali by rail rather than the highway.

We support the acre for acre provision with its upward limit of 25 acres. This clearly establishes the minimal scope of the exchange. We endorse the section establishing newly acquired parkland under the exchange as designated Wilderness. And we further endorse the 5-year timeline to ensure this project is completed in a timely fashion.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD BROOKHISER, HISTORIAN, ON S. 1969

To understand the United States we have to understand Alexander Hamilton, and to understand Alexander Hamilton we have to understand his time on St. Croix. Hamilton, more than any of the founding fathers, worked to make America a prosperous modern nation; St. Croix, where he passed his early youth, taught him several key life lessons.

Hamilton came to St. Croix with his parents in 1765. He left it for North America, alone in world, in 1772. Those seven years exposed him to capitalism, slavery, journalism and shame.

In 1768 Hamilton, age 11, was apprenticed as a clerk to the merchant firm of Beckman & Kruger. This was a trading company, headquartered in New York, with branches throughout the Atlantic world. Hamilton worked in its Christiansted office. From errands and scut-work he rose to a position of real responsibility, minding the store when his boss was off island. He learned how trade and credit spanned international borders, and how your own backyard could be plugged into the global economy. He learned the importance of opportunity in his own life, and potentially in the lives of others. Years later, when as first Treasury Secretary of the United States, he wrote that a country's "spirit of enterprise" depended on the "variety of...occupations" it could offer its people, he was reflecting on the occupation he had been lucky enough to find at Beckman & Kruger.

Most people on St. Croix were involved in growing sugar and cotton, and Hamilton learned about that too. He had seen plantations in his birthplace, Nevis, and he would see more in his years in America. But his time at the Grange on St. Croix, the plantation owned by his mother's in-laws, first thrust him into that world. It had opportunities of its own—for polish and civility. But it was based on the brute exploitation of slave labor. We do not know exactly when Hamilton adopted the abolitionist views of his adulthood. But when he wrote, as early as 1779 (84 years before the Emancipation Proclamation) that the "natural faculties" of blacks "are probably as good as ours," he was drawing on observations he had first made in Caribbean slave society.

St. Croix also had a newspaper—the Royal Danish American Gazette (ancestor of the Avis, still in business). Hamilton's first work of reporting and opinion was an account of the hurricane of 1772, with his judgments of the conduct of local officials. (He thought the governor did a good job—21st century officials take note). This was the start of a lifelong romance with printer's ink. Hamilton's contributions to the newspapers run to hundreds of thousands of words. The Federalist Papers, the 1787-8 newspaper campaign to ratify the Constitution, was his idea, and he wrote

almost two thirds of the essays. The New-York Evening Post, the paper he founded in 1801, is also still in business. "My arguments," Hamilton wrote in Federalist #1, "will be open to all and may be judged of by all." It was his credo, and he adopted it on St. Croix.

His curse also began on St. Croix—the searing brand of shame, and a lifelong preoccupation with honor. Hamilton was taken to the island by his parents, James Hamilton, Sr. and Rachel Faucett. They were not married. In 1765, the year of their arrival, James took off. In 1768, Rachel died (she was buried at the Grange). Hamilton knew illegitimacy, abandonment and loneliness. Like troubled young men today, he was touchy about such matters all his life. His life ended, in 1804, because of a duel with Vice President Aaron Burr, fueled by his obsession with honor.

"The child is father of the man," wrote the poet William Wordsworth, a contemporary of Hamilton's. And the child raised on St. Croix became a founding father of the United States. We understand him, and ourselves, by understanding his St. Croix experience.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN P. DE JONGH, JR., GOVERNOR, U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS, ON S. 1969

Chairman Akaka, Ranking Member Burr, and Members of the National Parks Subcommittee, on behalf of the people of the Virgin Islands, thank you for the opportunity to present testimony in support of S. 1969, "The Alexander Hamilton Boyhood Home Study Act of 2007" Virgin Islanders are grateful to Senator Orrin Hatch for his friendship, and his leadership on behalf of all Americans, including those residing in the territory of the Virgin Islands. Senator Hatch has a special understanding of American history and an appreciation of St. Croix' important role in early history of the Republic. He is an invaluable asset to the Senate and to the nation. I would also like to thank the original cosponsors of this Bill, namely Senator Jay Rockefeller, Senator Sam Brownback, Senator Evan Bayh, Senator Bill Nelson, Senator Mike Crapo, and Senator Tom Harkin, for their support of S. 1969.

S. 1969 calls upon the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability of designating Estate Grange and other sites related to Alexander Hamilton's life on St. Croix as a unit of the National Park Service. This study is to be conducted in collaboration with the Government of the Virgin Islands.

We know that Alexander Hamilton was 10 years old when he moved to St. Croix from St. Kitts, with his mother, Rachael Faucette Lavien, his brother, James Junior, and his father, James Hamilton. His mother Rachael had strong family ties on St. Croix. Her mother lived on St. Croix. She was married and divorced on St. Croix to Johann Michael Lavien. We know that she was charged with abandoning her husband, and was briefly imprisoned in Christiansted before departing for Nevis. Her mother owned land on the island and her older sister, Anne and her husband James Lytton owned a small sugar plantation named The Grange. When Rachael, and her family returned to St. Croix, they took up residence at The Grange.

In 1764, the island of St. Croix was one of the leading centers of commerce in the Caribbean. Tens of thousands of imported African were worked to death in major sugar plantations throughout the island. The harbors of Christiansted and Fredericksted were busy loading sugar and rum to commercial centers in New York and Europe, and off-loading slaves from Africa. Rachael operated a ship provisions business in downtown Christiansted from 1765 until she died in 1768. She was buried at The Grange.

After his mother's death, Alexander Hamilton went to work as a clerk for Beekman and Cruger, a New York based shipping agent with offices in key sugar producing Caribbean islands. He departed St. Croix in 1773 to attend college in New York, and participate in the American Revolution. He wrote most of the Federalist Papers, served as our first Secretary of the Treasury, created the Bank of the United States, and founded our Coast Guard. He is rightfully viewed as one of our greatest Founding Fathers.

St. Croix had a profound effect Alexander Hamilton's fundamental ideas. Leading scholars have credited Alexander Hamilton's experiences on St. Croix for his financial acumen and his vision of America as a world industrial and commercial power. Leading scholars agree that his mother's literary interests, including her extensive collection of books, inspired Hamilton's intellectual curiosity and writings. Scholars also agree that his first hand observations about the horror of slavery on St. Croix inspired his abolitionism, the creation of the Manumission Society, which inspired the end of slavery in the state of New York. Hamilton purchased a vacation property in Harlem, which he named The Grange, in honor of his childhood home on St. Croix.

I hope to see Estate Grange and other associated sites on St. Croix transformed into a site of national significance, a center for the study of Alexander Hamilton's life, and the study of the influential role of the triangle trade in sugar, rum and slaves on colonial America.

Estate Grange comprises 115 acres. The plantation is privately owned, and is largely intact from the days of Alexander Hamilton. It includes the Great House where Hamilton lived, a tombstone dedicated to his mother Rachael, and other buildings, including slave quarters, throughout the property. We envision a place where tourists and residents on St. Croix can experience pre-Revolutionary War plantation life, and where leading scholars and researchers can study and participate in discussions about Alexander Hamilton and the political climate that influenced his world-view. We hope that this study will lead to the restoration of other important locations on St. Croix, such as the Beekman and Cruger warehouse where he worked.

My administration will collaborate closely with the Committee and with the National Park Service in implementing this important resources study. We believe that once completed, this project will be an important addition to the National Park Service system, and a model of cooperation on projects of significance, both locally and nationally.

I appreciate this opportunity to present testimony on this important legislation. I once again, thank Senator Hatch and the other cosponsors of their leadership on behalf of the memory of Alexander Hamilton, and I urge passage of this legislation.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, NJ, September 27, 2007.

Hon. DANIEL AKAKA,
Chairman, Senate Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD BURR,
Ranking Member, Senate Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN AKAKA AND RANKING MEMBER BURR: As the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks considers S. 148, the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007, introduced by Senator Frank Lautenberg and cosponsored by Senator Robert Menendez, I would like to take this opportunity to register my strong support for this important legislation. The Great Falls in Paterson is a site of tremendous historical, natural, and economic significance and would be a worthy addition to the National Park System.

Alexander Hamilton, a founder of our nation and its first Secretary of the Treasury, chose Paterson as the nation's first planned industrial city just after the end of the Revolutionary War in an effort to establish our economic independence from England. Hamilton saw that the waters of the Great Falls—the second largest waterfall east of the Mississippi—could be the engine to power our growth into an industrial, self-sufficient nation.

Though Hamilton's life ended far too soon afterwards in the nearby palisades of Weehawken, New Jersey, the success of his integration of the water power system with his urban and industrial planning forever attached the label "Cradle of American Industry" to Paterson, New Jersey. Beginning with the establishment of the first water-powered cotton spinning mill, the city became a great manufacturing center at a time when most of our society was still agrarian. A candlewick-spinning mill in 1800 and a paper mill in 1804 followed the establishment of the cotton mill. By 1837, the city was the nation's largest silk producer and eventually became the largest producer of the material in the world. The "Silk City," as Paterson came to be known, went on to produce and test the nation's first modern submarine, the engine for the first trans-Atlantic flight, and more locomotives than any city in the nation. Paterson was also home to one of the world's first hydroelectric plants, which was constructed to harness the power of the mighty Passaic River with the assistance of Thomas Edison, who helped usher in the modern age from his laboratory in nearby West Orange.

Clearly, the Paterson Great Falls Historic District's qualifications for National Historic Park status are numerous, diverse, and beyond question. The federal government has long acknowledged the historical, natural, and economic significance of Paterson and the Great Falls, beginning with the Washington Administration's efforts to industrialize our nation. More recently, over the past two decades, the federal government repeatedly has partnered with New Jersey and the City of Paterson

through the National Historic Preservation Act to assist in preserving the Great Falls Historic District and its structures.

New Jersey, too, has continually recognized the historic and natural importance of the Great Falls area, most recently by designating the district as a State Park. However, the planned State Park is not a substitute for a National Park in Paterson. The State of New Jersey alone cannot preserve and protect the Great Falls National Historic District and properly present it to the public without a National Park Service unit in Paterson. This is a site of national historical importance that clearly deserves and needs the federal government in a lead role.

Recognizing that National Park Service officials may have fiscal concerns about partnerships with states, we have worked very hard to create a real partnership with a strong financial commitment from the State, as well as the City of Paterson, which owns many of the historic structures. There are numerous successful precedents for such a Federal-State partnership, including the Pinelands National Reserve in southern New Jersey. Within the National Park System, there are numerous examples of co-located state and National Parks, from Lowell in Massachusetts to Redwood in California.

Nor would this be a purely public venture. Because a central theme in the history of Paterson and the Great Falls involves Alexander Hamilton and American industry, we have the opportunity to attract substantial private donations from individuals and foundations outside of New Jersey.

As the United States continues to prosper and grow, we must not neglect the history that has made our nation into the great superpower of economic and political freedom it is today. Hamilton's vision of combining the power of nature, business, and government—realized, nurtured, and preserved in the Great Falls Historic District of Paterson—is the foundation of our nation's current economic prominence. The House Natural Resources Committee has approved a companion bill, H.R. 189, authored by Congressman James Pascrell, Jr. and cosponsored by the other twelve Members of the House of Representatives from New Jersey. I urge you to honor Hamilton, his vision, and our nation by offering your support to the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007.

Sincerely,

JON S. CORZINE,
Governor.

STATEMENT OF FRANCIS J. BLESSO, CONSULTANT, PATERSON, NJ, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony here today.

Please consider the following comments I sent to the National Park Service, responding to their Special Resource Study.

I've been intimately involved with the Great Falls area for almost forty years since I arrived in Paterson in 1968 to begin working on the city's redevelopment program in the first term of Mayor Lawrence "Pat" Kramer, Jr.

While the National Register Nomination Form which resulted in the Great Falls/S.U.M. Historic District being entered on the National Register on April 17, 1970 was researched and documented almost exclusively by John Young, a Columbia University graduate student, I was also one of the preparers. The dedication of the Great Falls Power and Receway System as a National Civil and Mechanical Engineering Landmark, on May 19, 1979, the 50th anniversary of Lindbergh's crossing the Atlantic (powered by a Wright Aeronautics engine made in Paterson) was a result of my documentation and nomination to the American Society of Civil Engineers. The fact that it is also a Mechanical Engineering Landmark was omitted in your report.

In November 1993, I testified before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands at a hearing on a bill which initially failed, but ultimately survived, as P.L. 104-333, which is still an act without appropriation. The NPS was also at the hearing to testify against funding for Paterson.

Since 1992, I have served as Paterson's contact person working under the mayor and with the Core Advisory Group in the administration of the $4.147 million New Jersey Urban History Initiative.

In the early '70s, after the Great Falls/S.U.M. District was entered on the National Register, Mary Ellen Kramer, the mayor's wife, called upon the National Park Service and the Smithsonian Institution to evaluate the area in terms of national significance. Field visits were made by both agencies in 1972. Robert M. Vogel, an industrial expert from the Smithsonian Institution wrote:

> No other American city has the prospect for the imaginative development of a historically important industrial area than is now Paterson's.

While you consulted Mr. Vogel as part of this report, I deeply regret that you did not give us the benefit of his current views. The early field visits and reports, including two summers of study by teams from the Historic American Engineering Record, provided additional national credibility to the area.

I was not surprised to read your conclusion that the Great Falls Historic District does not meet all of the criteria to become a unit of the national system. Little has changed since the early '70s when I accompanied Mary Ellen Kramer and several other citizens on a trip to Washington, D.C. in an effort to meet with NPS officials to discuss the possibility of a national park. We received the cold shoulder then and were basically told that the NPS was not interested in taking on any new parks.

Your report, by using selective quotes from selected biographers and your own writers, claims that Hamilton's S.U.M. proposal was a failure because it " . . . did not fulfill the vision of its founders . . ." and later that "The S.U.M. did not become the manufacturing colossus Hamilton envisioned: rather it became a real estate venture . . . " This most egregious distortion is used to fulfill your pre-ordained conclusion. In modern financial parlance the S.U.M.'s early problems would have probably been handled as a Chapter 13 Bankruptcy—Reorganization not, as you imply, a Chapter 7—Liquidation. The reality is that the S.U.M. was America's first industrial park and continued and sustained itself for more 150 years. What is a new planned manufacturing city if not a real estate venture? You treat the phrase real estate venture as a pejorative—as if Hamilton had created a used-car lot.

The NPS is forced to concede the national significance criterion by virtue of the NHL designation. In the suitability analysis of cultural resources, the NPS selected three of the eight evaluation concepts. A strong argument can be made that each of the concepts is applicable and should have been evaluated.

In an effort to support its conclusions, your report lists many protected resources which contain elements similar to those in Paterson. There is some redundancy of resources, many of which are units of the national park system, such as Lowell National Historical Park and the Steamtown National Historic Site. I wonder how many of those cited NPS resources received a favorable recommendation from the NPS, yet were established by Congress anyway. While there are many similar individual elements in other places, it is only in Paterson where they all come together.

The three main factors that justify inclusion of the GFHD as a unit of the NPS are: planning, Hamilton and manufacturing creativity.

Paterson was "planned." It didn't just happen. Sure the plan—created by the greatest financial and engineering minds at the time—required modification, as all plans do. But it worked. Its implementation attracted people with creative minds and innovative ideas that led to the many inventions and products that were produced here, products that changed our country. The list is long, varied and well-known.

I couldn't agree more with your assertion that Hamilton is not as well represented in the national park system as his contribution deserves. There is simply no more effective or appropriate way to pay deserved tribute to Hamilton than through the GFHD. Recognizing Hamilton's contributions in this way is long overdue. The report states " . . . there are no other resources at Great Falls save the falls and the S.U.M. constructed water raceways that reflect the period of his association." What about his greatest remaining resource—the city itself? Hamilton could have easily called his new city "Hamilton" had he not been so politically astute as to name it after the state's Governor.

The most significant and obvious similar resource already represented by the NPS is Lowell National Historical Park. The NPS has done a fantastic job in preserving and interpreting the Lowell resources, thanks to substantial and continuous federal funding since 1978. The web site photo shows a staff of over 70! There have been numerous economic and cultural spin-offs from the NPS involvement. The park is promoted with NPS signs along Interstate 495, including one encouraging motorists to dial an AM station at the end of the dial for information. It irritates me, to no end, to tune in and hear a welcome to Lowell " . . . home of the first successfully planned American industrial city." The claimed "first," is an outright lie. It rightly belongs to Paterson and it is time that the NPS correct this.

Paterson singularly reflects the contributions of Alexander Hamilton to the United States. Despite the negative twist given in your report, it did come to embody Hamilton's dream of America as a mercantile powerhouse. This was his vision, this is what America became, and it all started when he looked out at the Great Falls.

I follow University of Connecticut basketball, having attended the University and grown up in Hartford, where Sam Colt returned to the easier part of his very successful enterprise, mass producing, with a booming war-fueled demand, the revolver he created in Paterson. Gino Auriema, the Hall of Fame women's coach, in talking about his team versus arch rival University of Tennessee in reference to All-American and 2003 National Player of the Year, Diana Turasi, told the press: "We've got Diana, and they don't." Well, we have Hamilton, and they don't! It's just that simple.

Paterson has received a great deal of federal and state assistance and has invested its own resources in the Great Falls area and has accomplished much. The staffs of the NPS and many state agencies have been very helpful. The resources, however, are still threatened. The raceway system, although partially restored, is still in need of major costly repairs. The 19th century masonry dam at the top of the falls continues to lose stone each year affecting not only the flow and view of the falls, but the ability to interpret Paterson's first water-supply system. The remaining resources in the seven-acre former ATP site, except for the now stabilized Colt Gun Mill ruins, continue to erode and deteriorate. The City of Paterson constantly struggles to maintain the district's public spaces and facilities, the cost of which must compete with essential public services such as police, fire and schools.

Your report, to buttress its negative conclusion, cites the 2004 designation of the Great Falls State Park, the recent completion of the design competition and the commitment of $10 million for public improvements. Actually, no improvement funds have been appropriated to date and the prospects for a single appropriation do not look good despite Governor Corzine's strong support. In your magnanimous gesture to steer the GFHD to the affiliated area category, you gloss over the fact that state and national parks do successfully partner and co-exist. They enhance each other. Even if the state comes through with the $10 million, it must still find operating and maintenance funds on an annual basis. The state funds, as challenging as they are to secure, are like a barrel of water over the falls in comparison to the NPS's own estimates to create and manage the park. Incidentally, your estimate of 5 to 10 full-time equivalent staff positions pales in comparison to the staff currently being utilized in Lowell. Federal financial resources are warranted and direct NPS management and protection is desperately needed.

The NPS in this report and in previous testimony before Congress has consistently opposed funding for the GFHD including its testimony against P.L. 104-33 and P.L. 107-59. Paterson shouldn't continue to be penalized because it didn't possess the political muscle that Lowell had when both cities were competing in the '70s for national park designation. Our efforts were hindered by having a mayor and congressman of different political parties, fear of losing local control, as well as the prospect of a major federal flood control project proposed for the Passaic River which would have greatly affected the intensity and scenic elements of the Falls.

Now, 30 years later, the situation has changed. The mayor, congressman, the entire New Jersey congressional delegation, the governor, as well as local citizen organizations (as exemplified by the New Jersey Community Development Corporation) all stand unified in their support for park status. What hasn't changed, however, is the attitude and bias of the leadership of the NPS. They continue to oppose the addition of any new parks in general, and Paterson in particular.

The time has come for a change and to finally grant Paterson the recognition and support it deserves.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD SYLLA, PROFESSOR, STERN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, I am grateful for being invited to submit testimony about the proposal for a National Historical Park at the Great Falls of the Passaic River in Paterson, New Jersey. In the course of a four-decade career of research and teaching on the economic, business, and financial history of the United States, I have developed a great appreciation of the significance of the Paterson site for our understanding of how the United States, within a century after the Constitution created our current form of government became, became the world's largest economy, its leading manufacturing nation, and a magnet of opportunity for both free American labor and the immigrant workers of other nations, among them my own German and Irish ancestors, who were drawn here to contribute to and participate in the American dream. A National Park Service facility at Paterson would do much to remind us as a people of who we were

and how we came to be what we are, namely, the largest, wealthiest, and freest economy and society in the world's long history.

WHAT PATERSON UNIQUELY REPRESENTS

The Paterson site is unique in U.S. history in a number of ways. It was there that one of our greatest of our founders, Alexander Hamilton, himself a talented immigrant who took advantage of the opportunities America afforded to help shape them for others who came later, launched the Society for establishing Useful Manufactures (S.U.M.). Hamilton wrote the S.U.M. charter, which was enacted as New Jersey's first business corporation in 1791. This was the same year that Hamilton presented to Congress his classic Report on Manufactures, a visionary document of America's diversified industrial future. In the Report on Manufactures, Hamilton specifically mentioned a number of industries that the United States should pursue: Iron (including steel, nails and spikes, and firearms), Copper, Coal, Flax and Hemp, Cotton, Wool, Silk, Glass, Gunpowder, Paper, Printed Books, and Refined Sugar and Chocolate. Paterson became a center of a number of these industries.

The S.U.M. at Paterson, our first planned industrial community, was to be a concrete embodiment of Hamilton's vision. It was to be, in today's terms, an "incubator" of entrepreneurial manufacturing start-ups, and it became exactly that. The original plans for the city and its manufactories were the product of the famous immigrant architect L'Enfant, who also left a large imprint on Washington, D.C. The raceways L'Enfant designed to channel waterpower to manufactories are still there. Paterson grew up as an important, diversified manufacturing center around the site. Many evidences of that development as it played over the course of the 19th century remain, for example, silk mills, locomotive works, and the site where Colt first began to manufacture firearms. Much of Hamilton's 1791 vision is thus preserved at Paterson. Also at Paterson one can access S.U.M. records and other corporate documents, and study original letters that Hamilton and L'Enfant wrote to advance the industrial incubator. As a scholar, I assure you that these resources can be used to illustrate the connections between ideas, actions, and results.

As a professional economic and business historian, I have visited related sites such as the Old Slater Mill at Pawtucket, RI; the wonderful National Park Service restoration at Lowell, MA; and the Hamilton Grange site in New York City. Slater's mill is just a small factory; it was never intended to be an incubator of diversified manufacturing. Lowell, on a grander scale, represents just one industry, cotton textile manufacturing. Hamilton Grange honors the memory of a great founder, but it is just a house which Alexander Hamilton built and lived in during the last three years of his foreshortened life, and it will remain just a house, albeit a much more attractive house, once the contemplated move of it is realized.

What is unique about Paterson is that it embodies in a concrete and developing way that can be traced in the waterworks, the buildings, and so on, the vision of diversified manufacturing and industrial power under corporate auspices that, along with our public and private financial system, is one of Hamilton's great legacies to his country.

In my estimation, the National Park Service is the only organization capable of presenting and interpreting the national significance of the Paterson site. Equally important, National Park Service adoption of the site as one of national significance would do wonders in attracting corporate and other private donations to preserve the site and bring it to life. To have such a Park Service site in the densely populated tri-state region centering on New York City would be a boon to school children and indeed children of all ages who are curious about the origins of U.S. economic might based on free and open opportunity for all who were here and came here.

FLAWS IN THE NPS SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY OF PATERSON

Given the professional and personal opinions I have just stated, I was disappointed by the National Park Service's Special Resource Study: Great Falls Historic District, Paterson, New Jersey, dated November, 2006. That study used strained reasoning and faulty interpretations to reach a conclusion that the Paterson site failed to meet the criteria for suitability, feasibility, and need for NPS management.

I believe the Special Resource Study misreads the historical record when it asserts in two places that the Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures (S.U.M.) at Paterson was intended to become "a manufacturing colossus" (pp. 22 and 55), and that its failure to become a manufacturing colossus is one reason why it is unwarranted to have a national park at Paterson. That is incorrect. Alexander Hamilton's plan for the S.U.M., as I noted earlier, intended the new company to be what today we would call an "incubator" of entrepreneurial start-ups. My point was not new or

original. An early historian of the S.U.M., Joseph Stancliffe Davis of Harvard, made the point in his 1917 study of the company's history, noting that the stock of the company "became a highly profitable investment and the corporation proved itself no insignificant factor in promoting the development of a 'considerable manufacturing town,'" and concluding that, "The event has thoroughly justified the farsightedness, if not the sense for immediate profit, which was shown by the original entrepreneurs" (Davis, Essays on the Earlier History of American Corporations (1917), vol. 1, p. 518).

In short, by providing factory sites and waterpower to entrepreneurs in the years and decades after its founding, the S.U.M. at Paterson achieved the primary objective of Hamilton and its founders. It became an incubator of manufacturing start-ups, demonstrating the value of manufactures to secure America's independence and providing growing opportunities for immigrants to begin to realize the American dream. It was not an enterprise failure.

Another serious misinterpretation of the National Park Service Study is to read a provision of the S.U.M. charter saying, " . . . the said corporation shall not deal, nor trade, except in such articles as it itself shall manufacture, and the materials thereof, and in such articles as shall be really and truly received in payment and exchange therefore"—in an expansive way, as implying: "This was envisioned as no mere business or holding company enterprise, but one that manufactured the products and gathered the resulting profits at a scale previously unknown in the new nation" (NPS Special Resource Study: Great Falls Historic District, Paterson, New Jersey (November, 2006), p.17. Historian Davis, in a contrast with which I agree, concluded that its main intent was to limit rather than expand the scope of the enterprise: " . . . the Society was prohibited from becoming a general trading or banking company . . . "(Davis, Essays, I, p. 380). Such limiting provisions were common in early U.S. corporate charters. Alexander Hamilton, the author of the S.U.M. charter, had included similar limiting provisions in the charters he wrote for the Bank of New York and the Bank of the United States.

I would also question the Study's conclusion (on page 55) that " . . . the fact of the matter is that the Paterson venture, as envisioned, failed early-on due to the major weaknesses of its governor/director participants. The S.U.M. did not become the manufacturing colossus Hamilton envisioned." This is a misinterpretation because Hamilton did not envision the company becoming a manufacturing colossus. He envisioned it as a pilot and learning project that would serve as an incubator of manufacturing start-ups and a stimulus to industrial entrepreneurship in Paterson and elsewhere in America. In the long run, the S.U.M. succeeded in realizing that vision, and it was the long run that mattered most to Hamilton.

Yes, in the short run the S.U.M. did have managerial problems. But those problems were not the sole reason for suspension of its factory operations in the mid 1790s. After the S.U.M. received its New Jersey charter in 1791, war broke out in Europe between Britain and France, creating new international commercial opportunities for the neutral United States. That shifted profit opportunities as well as labor and capital away from domestic manufacturing and toward international commerce. When French armies conquered the Dutch Republic in 1795, America's access to the Amsterdam capital market was cut off, raising the cost of capital for U.S. manufacturing and the United States in general. There were a number of reasons why the S.U.M. put its plans on hold in the mid 1790s, and managerial problems were most likely not the most important of them. As the international and domestic situations of the United States changed in the late 1790s and early 1800s, it did not take long for many new factories to be built at Paterson, using sites and power provided by the S.U.M.

Again, judging by the results of recent scholarship, the NPS Study is wrong in contending that "Hamilton's vision of an industrial society was achieved in the United States, and in Paterson, but after the early decline of the S.U.M., more quickly and wide-spread in places like Lowell and Waltham, Massachusetts and other New England cities that were built on the firm stepping stones of less grandly conceived endeavors" (p. 55). The Waltham textile factory of the Boston Associates did not open until 1815, and Lowell was not founded and did not become a major center of textile production until the 1820s. That might not matter if economic historians still believed, as they once did, that industrialization and factory manufacturing production did not take hold in the United States until 1815 or after. Recent economic historical research findings—considered to be so important that they were published in a leading economics journal—indicate, however, that industrialization took hold during the 1790s, not a quarter century later. A new index of U.S. industrial production, 1790-1915, shows that industrial output grew at a rate of about 5% per year for the entire 125-year period, with no tendency for it to accelerate after any particular date such as 1815 (J. H. Davis, "A Quantity-Based Annual Index of

U.S. Industrial Production, 1790-1915," Quarterly Journal of Economics 119 (Nov. 2004), 1177-1215.). Waltham and Lowell sustained a rate of industrial growth that already had been established during the previous quarter century. The S.U.M. and Paterson played a critical role in the industrial upsurge that began during that quarter century, many years before Lowell and Waltham opened their factories.

Let me note just one more area in which the NPS Study, by ignoring the findings of more recent scholarship, seems to me to be seriously deficient. The Study says on p. 15 that Hamilton's Report on Manufactures of December 1791 " . . . was not received favorably by Congress . . . ," and supports that by quoting Hamilton biographer Richard Brookhiser on p. 22 to the effect that " . . . the 'Report on Manufactures' was a dead letter." But recent research demonstrates that virtually every tariff recommendation contained in Hamilton's Report on Manufactures—and these policy recommendations were key parts of the Report—was adopted by Congress by May 1792, that is, within five to six months after Congress received the Report from Hamilton. The tariff increases recommended by Hamilton and adopted by Congress were modest—contrary to many depictions, Alexander Hamilton was not a protectionist—but in keeping with Hamilton's intent, they did provide added stimulus to the rapid growth of U.S. industrial production that began during the 1790s.

In summary, a proper interpretation of the goals envisioned by Hamilton and others for the S.U.M. at Paterson, when combined with the recent findings of scholars on the industrial expansion of the U.S. economy starting in the 1790s and on the favorable reception by Congress of key recommendations of Hamilton's Report on Manufactures, greatly strengthens the case for a national park at the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey. The NPS Study notes, "Alexander Hamilton, the person, is not as well represented in the national park system as his significant contributions to American history deserve, but it is largely through a failure of the Service to fully interpret his recognized achievements . . . " (p. 56). At Paterson, the National Park Service has a unique opportunity to interpret both Hamilton's achievements and the earliest and most important foundations of U.S. industrialization. I suggest that Congress encourage NPS to seize this opportunity.

Lowell National Historical Park and the other parks listed in the Study provide no basis for concluding that what Paterson represents is already adequately represented elsewhere in America. Lowell, for example, was a cotton textile and textile machinery center established in the 1820s, in the midst of an industrial upsurge that began at least a quarter century earlier. Paterson in contrast became a leading national center for a wide range of industries. In that sense Paterson, much more than Lowell and much earlier than Lowell and other New England textile mill towns, came to embody the diversified industrial base for the United States that Alexander Hamilton envisioned and promoted. Hamilton detested slavery more than any of the great founders (a number of whom owned slaves), and he wanted America to have a broad industrial base so that our manufacturing sector would do much more than process cotton grown in the South by slaves. He envisioned Paterson becoming a center of opportunity for free laborers, including hard-working immigrants, who would do far more than spin and weave a raw material produced by slave labor. Paterson fulfilled that vision in a way that Lowell and the other New England mill towns did not.

CONCLUSION

Indeed, Paterson is the only place in America where it is possible to connect Alexander Hamilton's prescient vision of a great manufacturing nation in the 18th century with the actual fruits of that vision realized in the 19th and 20th centuries. Even if the Bush Administration cannot support funding now for a Paterson National Historical Park, the National Park Service has an obligation to American history to draw the proper conclusion that what Paterson represents is not adequately represented anywhere else in America. What is unique about Paterson is that it embodies—in a vivid, concrete, and developing way that can be traced around the Great Falls in the waterworks and mills—the vision of diversified manufacturing and industrial power under corporate auspices, with all the opportunities that represented for entrepreneurs and free labor, that is one of Hamilton's greatest legacies to our nation. I very much hope that Congress in this, the 21st, century will see fit to support a Paterson National Historical Park that will portray and interpret how our diversified economy developed from its roots in the 18th century into and through the 19th and 20th centuries.

I thank the subcommittee for allowing me to present these views and interpretations of Paterson's unique significance in the development of the American economy in many crucial areas not now adequately represented in the National Park System or anywhere else in the United States.

STATEMENT OF RONALD J. TIPTON, SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT OF PROGRAMS, NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, ON S. 148

Chairman Akaka, Ranking Member Burr, and other distinguished Members of this Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony on this very important issue.

The National Parks Conservation Association strongly supports the proposed new National Park unit in Paterson, New Jersey. We believe that a National Park Service unit in Paterson is especially important now because the National Park Service must do more to establish connections with the millions of Americans who feel little or no connections to our National Parks. Paterson offers a unique opportunity to provide a new Park Service unit in a setting that Hispanic, Latino, African American, Muslim, Islamic, Jewish and Christian organizations have recognized as a place to connect with American History and the National Park System.

These diverse groups come together for many reasons. They have seen the spectacular beauty of the Great Falls—the second largest waterfall in the eastern part of the United States. They increasingly recognize that no other natural wonder in America has played a more important role in our nation's historic quest for freedom and prosperity. Paterson is the only National Historical District that includes both a National Natural Landmark and a National Historic Landmark.

America's First Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, conceived and implemented a plan with the help of Pierre L'Enfant to harness the force of the Great Falls to power the new industries that would secure America's economic independence. Leading scholars have determined that the Great Falls National Historic District contains the finest remaining collection of structures representing each stage in the transformation of America from a rural agrarian society based on slavery into a modern economy based on freedom.

The history of Paterson has captured the imagination and spirit of a broad, diverse group of citizens throughout America. Hispanic and Latino citizens, who constitute most of Paterson's 150,000 residents, support the Paterson National Park in part because Hamilton played such an important role in expanding opportunities for immigrants and helping to spread the cause of freedom to the Spanish colonies in the Americas.

African Americans recognize Hamilton's vision of an American economy beginning at Paterson's Great Falls and built through the work of men and women dedicated to freedom. Alexander Hamilton was an organizer of New York's first anti-slavery organization and Hamilton's fight against slavery was part of his inclusive view of how all Americans would participate in and benefit from a growing modern economy that would begin in Paterson.

Continuing in the spirit of Hamilton's strident anti-slavery beliefs, Paterson became an important stop on the Underground Railroad in the 19th Century. Paterson also contains a 20th century landmark in African American history, Hinchliffe Stadium, the home to the New York Black Yankees and the site of the Colored Championship of the Nation in the 1930s. Baseball legends such as Satchel Paige, Josh Gibson, and Hall-of-Farmer and Paterson-native Larry Doby—the first African American to play in the American League—regularly played baseball at Hinchliffe. A Paterson National Historical Park will help preserve and protect this historic stadium that Preservation New Jersey, another supporter of a Park Service unit in Paterson, has listed as one New Jersey's Ten Most Endangered Historic Sites.

Paterson can become the first NPS unit with strong Muslim-American support in a city that the second largest number of Muslims in any American city. Islamic citizens support the Paterson National Park as a continuation of the Silk Road that united their homelands in Central Asia with China and the West. They note that Paterson became the largest silk manufacturer of the world at the end of the 19th Century and was long known as the Silk City. As Richard Kennedy of the Smithsonian Institution observes, "The Silk Road has extended to the United States and, since the tragic events of September 11, understanding that connection clearly has become more important. There is no better way, then, to learn more about the roots of this vital connection and to celebrate the long-standing relationships that have existed between east and west and north and south."

The National Parks Conservation Association proudly joins with an extraordinarily diverse group of Americans and scholars in calling for the creation of the Paterson National Historical Park. We urge the Department of Interior to endorse establishing this worthy addition to the park system.

Thank you for your consideration.

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN H. IRVIN, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for permitting me to submit testimony regarding the proposed National Historical Park at the Great Falls of the Passaic River in Paterson, New Jersey.

PATERSON'S HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The Paterson Great Falls National Historic District is situated upon the Passaic River at the enormous Passaic Great Falls, whose awesome power inspired the first U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, to choose that location as the site for his Society for the Establishment of Useful Manufactures. From this auspicious beginning, Paterson emerged as one of the world's foremost producers of silk. It also became home to the Colt gun manufactory as well as numerous locomotive works. For these reasons, the Paterson Great Falls National Historic District must be understood as one of the most important birthplaces of American industry. Additionally, as the scene of the notorious Silk Strike of 1913, Paterson is a vital landmark in the history of American labor and immigration. More recently, Paterson was the venue for Hinchliffe Stadium, which was not only a marvelous example of art deco architecture but more importantly was also the home to the New York Black Yankees and the New York Cubans baseball teams. Paterson is thus a place of great consequence to African American history.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL PARK SERVICE UNIT AT THE GREAT FALLS NATIONAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

The Paterson Great Falls National Historic District contains cultural resources not adequately represented in any other National Historical Park. It uniquely combines a National Natural Landmark and a National Historic Landmark. But the State of New Jersey cannot protect this precious historical and cultural resource without assistance from the National Park Service.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, I implore you to disregard the National Park Service's shortsighted Draft Special Resource Study, which misguidedly underestimated the historical value of the proposed park while simultaneously overestimating the State of New Jersey's capacity to maintain the site. Rather, please fight for the creation of a National Park Service unit at the Paterson Great Falls National Historic District. Do not consign Paterson or its magnificent and historical Great Falls to the dustbin of unpreserved national treasures.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL J. WALKOWITZ, PROFESSOR, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee: Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony on this very important issue.

I urge you to make the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, a unit of the National Park Service.

As a labor and social historian, I was consulted for the National Park Service's November 2006 report, Special Resource Study: Great Falls Historic District, Paterson, New Jersey and supported the designation of the Great Falls site as a national historic park. I was surprised, therefore, to read the report's conclusion that Paterson did not warrant such designation because Alexander Hamilton's plan for the city and the establishment of early industrialization was realized elsewhere, most especially in the role of the Boston Associates in Lowell. I respectfully submit this is a serious misreading of the historical record.

Lowell is a wonderful site for exploring the development of the cotton industry and the early role of native American farm girls. However, the Lowell experience of the 1820s and 1830s so well recounted in the romanticized story of Lucy Larcom and the mill girls' magazine, The Lowell Offering, is precisely not typical of the American industrial experience. Lowell is a wonderful story but an out-of-date paradigm. Work now twenty years old by Raphael Samuel on the persistence of hand craft and Sean Wilentz on metropolitan industrialization in New York has pointed out that industrialization was neither defined by textile machines or large factories and was a more gritty tale of immigrant dependent labor across a multitude of industries.

Paterson only becomes the "silk city" in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century; it is early home to the full range of early industrial industries and, of course, notably both iron and textile manufacture. The city also reflects the early and dominant role of both native and immigrant entrepreneurs and labor in industrialization. For instance, the late Herbert G. Gutman, who was the doyen of the new social history and remains unquestionably the leading historian of Paterson's industrialization, long ago complicated the rags-to-riches story which notes how top manufacturers (in textile centers in places like Lowell) came from privileged backgrounds. Paterson again tells a different tale. In Paterson most middle-level manufacturers came from immigrant backgrounds and lacked an inheritance of money or established social pedigree.

But before concluding, let me return to the Special Resource Study's effort to connect Hamilton to the Boston Associates. Two positions held respectively by Hamilton and the Associates are critically divisive issues that characterized the early Republic: the role of slavery and immigrants. In his seminal work on the Boston Associates, Enterprising Elite: the Boston Associates and the World They Made (Harvard University Press, 1987), retired Williams College Professor Robert F. Dalzell Jr. makes it clear that the Associates played a troublesome role in attempting to quell the northern anti-slavery crusade. Dalzell also demonstrated that their highest priority was continuing their secure position at the top of the social order to the exclusion of poor immigrants. On both scores, Paterson better reflects Hamilton's values then: the role of immigrants in industry is noted above; and since Paterson's primary textile industry was silk rather than cotton, Paterson's industries were not economically tied to the continuation of slavery. Indeed, at least one Paterson cotton manufacturer opened his home to runaway slaves on the Underground Railroad.

In sum, I realize that several American cities lay claim to being the "birthplace of the American industrial revolution." Lowell and Troy, a city about which I have written, are important parts of that story. But Hamilton in proposing the development of American manufacture chose Paterson as the site, both for its water power—the magnificent falls—and its centrality to urban markets and natural resources. Hamilton's vision and values, in truth, are most accurately reflected in the Paterson experience and its people. Early industrialization is now understood and taught as more than machines and large factories—it is changing rhythms of work, increased scale of production and the division of labor, the rise of wage labor—changes well in place well before the 1830s and not well represented by mill girls who imagined themselves becoming teachers! This modern scholarship on social and economic history points to the importance of Hamilton's vision for America. The National Park system, however, has not adequately accounted for these developments and the central role Hamilton played in them. It is time the Park System to fill this gap, and Paterson's Great Falls is an excellent place to do so.

STATEMENT OF RON CHERNOW, AUTHOR, BIOGRAPHER OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony today.

As author of the bestselling biography of Alexander Hamilton published in 2004, I am writing to endorse, in the warmest terms, the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007, S. 148. This is not only a spot of spectacular natural beauty that deserves to be far better known, but one that occupies a place of supreme importance in the annals of American economic history. For it was at this very spot hat Alexander Hamilton, George Washington, and the Marquis de Lafayette paused to picnic on a day during the American Revolution and it was here that Hamilton first envisioned the enormous economic potential of the great waters thundering over the falls.

As our first Treasury Secretary, Hamilton personally composed four great state papers. Easily the most sweeping and prophetic among them was his "Report on Manufactures." At a time when America was an agrarian society and the other Founders pictured the country remaining a rural paradise of yeomen farmers, the audacious Hamilton dared to conjure up quite a different America—one that bears a startling resemblance to the advanced industrial society that we inhabit today. This America would honor traditional agriculture, but it would also be a bustling, diversified place with manufacturing, trading, banks, and stock exchanges. Only in retrospect, after two centuries, can we appreciate the uncanny prescience of Hamilton's vision and its abiding relevance.

To demonstrate the practicality of his far-sighted vision, Hamilton, as Treasury Secretary, spearheaded the creation of the Society for Establishing Useful Manufac-

tures. The Great Falls of the Passaic became the home for this industrial laboratory, this futuristic city, this model of what America could be. Although the project faltered after the initial creation of a cotton spinning mill, the spirit of Hamilton's vision was ultimately to thrive in Paterson. As I write in my book: "Hamilton's faith in textile manufacturing in Paterson was eventually vindicated in the early 1800s as a 'raceway' system of canals powered textile mills and other forms of manufacturing, still visible today in the Great Falls Historic District. The city that Hamilton helped to found did achieve fame for extensive manufacturing operations, including foundries, textile mills, silk mills, locomotive factories, and the Colt Gun Works."

It has always saddened me that we do so much better a job in our schools in instructing students in the rich political history of our country than in the no less stirring saga of our economic development. A National Park Service site in Paterson would prove an especially vivid and dramatic way of educating our citizenry in America's economic history. At the same time, it could serve to revitalize one of the major cities in New Jersey and help to restore the luster that it once enjoyed and could enjoy again. All in all, this would be a timely and imaginative project for the Interior Department to undertake and one that would certainly redound to the future glory of any Interior Secretary. I urge the Committee to mark up the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007 as soon as possible.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

STATEMENT OF MOHAMED EL FILALI, OUTREACH DIRECTOR, ISLAMIC CENTER OF PASSAIC COUNTY, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony on this very important issue.

I have reviewed a copy of the National Park Service draft Special Resource Study on the proposed Great Falls National Park. The Study incorrectly concludes that Paterson does not have unique resources or stories when compared to those already represented in the National Park System or interpreted by other public bodies. The NPS lists about a dozen different places ranging from Angel Hill State Park in California (where Chinese immigrants were detained) to the Danish Immigrant Museum in Elkhorn, Iowa and the Museum of Work and Culture in Woonsocket, Rhode Island (that "interprets the compelling stories of French Canadian immigrants seeking economic improvement"). But none of the examples the National Park Service lists has anything to do with the Muslim immigration to Paterson, or anywhere else for that matter.

In my August 15, 2006 letter to the National Park Service, I explained that many citizens support a Paterson National Park, and I want you and the National Park Service to understand why it is especially important to the Islamic community. Paterson has the second largest number of Muslims in any city in America, and New Jersey is the home of almost half a million Muslim-Americans. In that letter, I suggested a Paterson National Historical Park could achieve two important goals.

First, I explained that a National Park in Paterson would provide Muslim-Americans with a meaningful opportunity to establish some connection with American history. There are special relationships between Paterson's history and the hopes and aspirations of the Islamic community in America today. Paterson's founder, Alexander Hamilton, invited immigrants from many different cultures to Paterson in order to build a new economy of opportunities. Hamilton welcomed immigrants at a time that other American leaders favored rewarding those who had been here longer or had come from families with more money or higher social status. Hamilton opposed slavery and created a new economy in Paterson that provided freedom and opportunities to immigrants from different cultures.

Second, a Paterson National Park could increase America's understanding of Muslim-Americans. Such understanding is critical today. Since the tragic events of 9/11, many journalists and government investigators have come to Paterson and claimed that some of the hijackers stayed here. The novelist John Updike came to Paterson and wrote a novel called Terrorist, which was intended to be a work of fiction but which nonetheless has contributed to the negative views about Muslim-Americans. The Islamic community, however, sees Paterson's heritage as a way of showing how it connects with the American experience.

Yo-Yo Ma's "Silk Road Project," which is supported by His Highness The Aga Khan, highlights these points. It celebrates the connections between the West, Asia, and the Middle East formed by the global silk trade—connections of not just commercial, but also cultural, artistic, and religious interactions. Paterson, whose silk mills drew many Muslim immigrants from afar, is our stop on the great Silk Road,

and it provides an example for Muslim and non-Muslim Americans of how we can affect and enrich each other's culture even as we share a common home.

The draft study addressed none of these points. It is clear to me from reading the study that the National Park Service is under a lot of financial pressure not to create new national parks and the study's conclusions appear driven by a desire to reject a Paterson National Park.

I sincerely hope, however, that this Committee recognizes the importance that a National Park in Paterson will have for the Muslim-American community. Please support the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

STATEMENT OF ALISON K. HOAGLAND, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION, MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony on this very important issue.

I urge you to make the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, a unit of the National Park Service. Paterson's significance to the history of our nation is undoubtedly well known to you. As the site of one of the first deliberate industrial enterprises of the young republic, as the location of an innovative water power system, and as a tangible representation of the influence of such important personalities as Alexander Hamilton and Pierre Charles L'Enfant, this historic district is one of the pre-eminent sites in the history of the establishment of the new nation.

During my long career in historic preservation I have studied and advocated for many historic sites. In the fifteen years that I worked for the National Park Service, I undertook projects with a number of parks, including Illinois & Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor and America's Industrial Heritage Project in southwestern Pennsylvania. I was an active volunteer preservationist as well, serving as an officer of the D.C. Preservation League in Washington, DC, and on the Board of Advisers of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. I am currently a professor of history and historic preservation at Michigan Technological University (and am proud to note that one of the graduates from our M.S. Program in Industrial Archaeology now works for the City of Paterson).

I would like to offer the combined perspective of an educator and a public historian. I teach a course called History of American Technology to engineering students. In that course, I discuss the Society of Useful Manufactures' establishment at Paterson as an example of Hamilton's commitment to the nation's industrial self-sufficiency. His debate with Thomas Jefferson over the role that industry should play in the new republic, as articulated by his Report on Manufactures, is one of the most significant turning points in the economic development of our country. Hamilton expressed his ideas in words and he built them in brick and stone in Paterson.

As a public historian, I chair the Advisory Commission of the Keweenaw National Historical Park, which commemorates copper mining, the industrial history of this part of Michigan. From this perspective, I see the impact that a national park can have in drawing attention to our industrial resources and in explaining that history to the public. Industrial sites, so vital to the development of our nation, are more subtle in the way they present their significance. For years, people may walk on bridges over raceways, oblivious to their significance until it is explained to them. The promotion of industrial heritage can help residents take pride in their past, which in turn engenders confidence in the future. Industrial heritage is also an attraction for tourists, an important factor in a now-deindustrialized area.

I understand that there is some concern that the industrial heritage found in Paterson is already adequately represented in the National Park Service. I assure you that that is not the case. Paterson pre-dates Lowell by thirty years, or a generation of thinking about industrial enterprise and development of water-power technology. Similarly, the Blackstone River Valley NHC interprets a later period. Other industrial history parks include Steamtown NHS and Dayton Aviation Heritage NHP, but they are obviously ordered around very different industries. The Erie Canalway NHC and Delaware and Lehigh NHC might be as interested in water systems, but it is water for transportation, not industry. No other National Park Service site comes close to embodying the role that Paterson played in developing the nation's industry.

It is also important that this be a national park, not just a state park. Paterson has the ability to draw support nationwide—including some very well-connected people who come from Paterson but no longer live there—but that support would

probably not be forthcoming for a state park. The connection with Alexander Hamilton in particular offers an attraction to out-of-state donors. The prestige and visibility of a national park are essential for serious private-sector support. Keweenaw NHP is established along a private-public model, one that is engineered to bring in private monies. In a deindustrialized region, that sort of support is not available locally. National donors must be tapped, and only a national park will be attractive to them.

I particularly want to address the National Park Service's Special Resource Study on the Great Falls Historic District, in which I am deeply disappointed. The Draft Study, which seems to be a thinly veiled attempt to justify a predetermined conclusion, is analytically flawed and violates fundamental principles that professionals use in studying historic resources. Most significantly, the authors utilize a disturbingly narrow interpretation when it suits them, or an excessively broad one when that seems to fit the case they are making. It is hard to believe that this study was undertaken with a truly open mind.

One example of this problem involves the boundaries. The authors narrowly interpret their charge to never take even a single step outside of the National Register-listed Great Falls Historic District. It is unfortunate that responsible professionals would lock themselves into the boundaries set decades ago and not go a few feet further to the adjacent National Register-listed site, Hinchliffe Stadium. Inclusion of the Stadium, the home of the New York Black Yankees, would provide a highly relevant dimension to a potential park, while being consistent with the larger themes of the Historic District through its origins as a municipal amenity for, and with funding from, workers in Paterson's mills.

Similarly, the Study adopts an indefensibly narrow period of significance. The first National Register nomination was written in 1970 and examined resources that were more than fifty years old. Subsequent nominations (the National Historic Landmark in 1976 and expansions of the National Register district in 1975 and 1986) did not re-examine this assumption. Thirty-six years have elapsed since the original nomination, yet the authors of this Study did not think to re-examine the period of significance. If they had looked at the 1920-1956 period, surely Hinchliffe Stadium would have been included.

The boundaries and period of significance in National Historic Landmark documents prepared decades earlier is only a starting point; they must not limit proper study today.

Another example of this narrowness is when the Study notes that Pierre L'Enfant's drawings for Paterson do not survive, yet the authors apparently declined to read L'Enfant's letters in Paterson at the Passaic County Historical Society, which detail his plans. More importantly, the Study chooses to examine the Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures (SUM) with a single narrow purpose, concluding that it was a failure, yet overlooking its 153-year existence; arguing that it was a private enterprise, yet overlooking its origins as a publicly chartered organization; and highlighting its first cotton mill, yet overlooking Alexander Hamilton's goal of fostering a number of different kinds of industries, which it did: sailcloth, locomotives, revolvers, silk and submarines being among those mentioned in this Study.

This implicit branding of Paterson as a "failure" is disturbing for another reason, as if failure alone would disqualify it from being a national park. In fact, important events in history are often failures; we can learn from them as much as from successes. But Paterson was a "failure" only in the narrowest terms; instead, Hamilton successfully fostered a thriving industrial community. It may not have happened in his life time, but he is responsible for beginning a complex water-powered industrial park.

When this Study looks for comparisons, though, it casts the broadest net and chooses to define Paterson as an unexceptional, common undertaking. The comparison of the Great Falls of the Passaic with waterfalls at Yellowstone and Yosemite is truly absurd. The idea that immigrant labor is a theme well-covered in national parks does not take into account which immigrant groups are best identified with which park; it is as if all immigrants and their experiences are the same, regardless of their country of origin, location in the U.S., or industry in which they work. Similarly, there might be several parks addressing industry, engineering, and technology, but the kinds of industry, engineering, and technology that could be interpreted at Paterson are distinctly different.

Paterson's Great Falls deserve to be considered for national park status in a way that honestly assesses their merits. If Paterson were judged in appropriate contexts, we would see that it represents a unique chapter U.S. history; that it constitutes tangible evidence of an idea of industrial development articulated by one of our leading founders and developed by one of our significant early architect-engineers;

and that it does not replicate anything else in our national park system. I urge you to recommend that Congress create the Paterson National Historical Park.

The Great Falls Historic District in Paterson is eminently worthy of inclusion in the National Park Service system, and I hope that you will do all in your power to make that possible. Thank you for your consideration.

STATEMENT OF STEVEN LUBAR, DIRECTOR, THE JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION, PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF AMERICAN CIVILIZATION, BROWN UNIVERSITY, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony for this important hearing. The following is my response to the National Park Service's Great Falls Historic District Special Resource Study.

I write in reference to the ongoing Great Falls Historic District Special Resource Study. Great Falls occupies a distinctive place in American history, and I urge you to carefully regard its long history and unique resources as you consider the possibility of making it a unit of the National Park Service. I write both because I believe that America's industrial history is important, and because I believe it is important for the public to understand our industrial past, and because I believe that Paterson is an important part of that history. In my books Engines of Change: The American Industrial Revolution and Philosophy of Manufactures I highlighted the important role of Hamilton's Society for Encouraging Useful Manufactures. When I was a curator of industrial history at the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History, I was pleased to be able to include its history in the Smithsonian's industrial history exhibition, "Engines of Change."

I am sure that your team of historians knows well the long and important technological, industrial and labor history of Great Falls and Paterson, with its eighteenth- and nineteenth-century waterpower systems, its key role in locomotive and armament manufacture throughout the nineteenth century, and the union activity that made Paterson famous into the early twentieth century. These activities, and the cultural resources, which are well described in the district's National Register nomination, represent important areas of American history that are under-represented in the National Park System, and which deserve greater representation as key elements in our nation's history. True, there are elements of the earlier industrial story told at Slater Mill (Blackstone Heritage Corridor), Lowell, and elsewhere. But those are local stories. Paterson represents the origin of American industrial policy; it is where national politics, economics, and industry were first joined. It is the first chapter in a story that came to define the American industrial system.

Beyond the industrial story, there are also two other areas represented by the Great Falls Historic District that might not be as obvious, are not as well described in the nomination, and which I also believe are underrepresented among the National Park Service's holdings. While politics, in general, is very well represented, economics and economic and industrial policy—a key element in U.S. history throughout the life of the nation—is not. Alexander Hamilton's Society for Encouraging Useful Manufactures, which founded Paterson, was a key part of Hamilton's attempt to define the United States as an industrial nation. The Park Service preserves Hamilton's house, but his work, his philosophy, and his economic and political theories are better represented by the industrial structures at Paterson. With a few exceptions, they may not date from his time; but they are the result, in many ways, of Hamilton's ideas about America as an economic and industrial power.

These cultural resources are enhanced by the Great Falls as a natural resource—and one that tells us about the changing history of the appreciation of natural resources in the United States. To an America used to the wonders of the West, the Great Falls of the Passaic River at what is now Paterson may not seem an extraordinary site, or sight. But they were one of the great natural wonders of the eighteenth-century America. Along with the Great Falls of the Potomac and Niagara Falls, the Great Falls of the Passaic were one of the sites that evoked feelings of awe and wonder. They captured the emotion the era called "the sublime." Jedidiah Morse's American Gazetteer of 1798 called the Great Falls "one of the greatest natural curiosities in the State." It continues:

> The river is about 40 yards wide, and moves in a slow, gentle current, until coming within a short distance of a deep cleft in the rock, which crosses the channel, in descends, and falls about 70 feet perpendicular, in one entire sheet, presenting a most beautiful and tremendous scene.

There are not many of these sites important to the cultural landscape history of the country remaining, and including the Great Falls as a National Park will ensure that this one survives.

I hope that the Park Service will give the Great Falls Historic District the careful and thoughtful consideration it deserves as you consider its possible inclusion in the National Park system. Even should it become a state Park, its designation as a National Park remains important, both to insure that national story be told, and to connect the story of Paterson to the rest of our national history. Paterson tells a key part of our nation's story. It is a unique and important site, and could allow the nation's parks the chance to tell important stories not currently told.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD MOE, PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, my name is Richard Moe and I am the President of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. I would like you to know that the National Trust strongly supports S. 148—The Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007 introduced by Senator Lautenberg. The historic and natural resources at Great Falls in Paterson, New Jersey, are extraordinary and meet the National Park Service's criteria for suitability, feasibility, and management.

Founded in 1792 by Alexander Hamilton, Paterson is the place he chose to implement his economic vision for new industry necessary to secure America's economic independence as an emerging nation. At the heart of the Great Falls Historic District lies the Passaic River and the second-highest waterfall on the East Coast. Hamilton hired Major Pierre-Charles L'Enfant, the famed planner of the Federal City, to harness the tremendous power of the Passaic and create the industrial opportunities he imagined. L'Enfant designed a series of raceways to divert river water and channel it to operate mills along its route. As a result, Paterson has the distinction of being the county's first planned manufacturing city and one of the preeminent textile producing centers in the United States.

Silk manufacturing first began in Paterson in 1840 replacing earlier cotton mills that had mainly relocated to New England. Within ten years, it became known as "Silk City." Except for the cultivation of silkworms, all other stages of silk production took place there and by 1870 it processed fully two-thirds of imported raw silk.

Located just 12 miles west of New York City, this part of the metropolitan area is now under tremendous development pressure and its overall historic integrity is increasingly threatened. Though the Great Falls district has been designated a National Historic Landmark and a New Jersey state park, safeguards ensuring its long-term protection and public benefits are limited. L'Enfant's innovative water power system and many of the adjacent factories comprise the finest remaining comprehensive collection of engineering and architectural industrial works. These showcase almost every stage of America's manufacturing progress from the Hamilton era to the twentieth century. The best way to protect and interpret this extraordinary natural, historic, and cultural resource is through the creation of a national park in a partnership with the State of New Jersey. This is what Senator Lautenberg's measure would do and we urge you to support it.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, Great Falls is the only Congressionally-created historic district that includes both a National Historic Landmark and a National Natural Resource. In this one place the American public can behold the panorama of this nation's industrial revolution and development, and its story should be fully interpreted and protected for future generations. Designating a national park is the first step in this process. Thank you for holding this hearing and providing the National Trust to present its views.

STATEMENT OF GIANFRANCO ARCHIMEDE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CITY OF PATERSON HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony today.

I am providing the following comments on the National Park Service's Special Resource Study of the Great Falls Historic District. What follows is my professional response to the study. It is not the official response of the City of Paterson Historic Preservation Commission, nor of the City of Paterson. As staff to the Commission and to the City of Paterson, it is my responsibility to provide this assessment. These points were distributed locally for comment and I can say that many of them were strongly supported by colleagues and Commissioners here in Paterson.

1. The study goes into detail where necessary in support of its negative conclusions, and becomes apparently thin in areas where scholars, both local and of national stature, have supported opposite conclusions. I am referring to the body of documents sent to the NPS during the study process that are referred to in the Consultation & Coordination section on page 72. None of these documents are apparently referred to in the study and the extent of their influence on the NPS research does not come across.

Furthermore, there is little explanation why these letters are not reproduced for direct reference in Appendix Two, while others between the NPS and NFWS and Native-American Tribes were. I can infer that these are the groups the NPS is required to formally consult with under NEPA and NHPA, while "public consultation" is more one-sided; the NPS requests input in general, gets it, makes their conclusions either way and then opens a comment period. This process may amount to little more than a pro forma exercise if the correspondence, especially from the body of scholars that responded, are not referred to nor reproduced for inspection. I imagine that Congressmen would also like to know more specifically the results of the local consultation without having to go to Chestnut Street in Philadelphia to view the documents.

2. The study pays too much attention to revisiting well-known history to establish criteria 1, that the GFHD possesses nationally significant natural and/or cultural resources. Page 44 of the study states that areas already listed as NHLs or NNLs are pre-qualified under criteria 1. There is no need, then, for the study team to revisit national historic significance other than to misrepresent it in a way that supports the study's negative recommendations. There is an obvious push by the narrative to lay out "historical realities" in a way that refutes several key arguments traditionally made by scholars in support of Paterson's national significance. Of particular concern is the nit-picking of the S.U.M. as a conceptual failure in context of a) Hamilton's other great contemporary successes, b) later developments, both locally and nationally, and c) relationship to other extant resources in the district. There seems little reason to pursue this thread other than to debunk or at least to obfuscate the association between the resources and the unique significance that Hamilton provides Paterson and the Great Falls.

This is, in my opinion, suggestive of doing "What If" (counterfactual) history. If, as the study states, the S.U.M. "was ultimately to prosper as a real estate venture, rather than a manufacturing colossus" (pg 22.) then "what if" Hamilton intended it to be a real estate venture? Would the S.U.M be more significant, given the same subsequent development of Paterson? Hamilton's preoccupation with dishonor to his reputation over the bankruptcy of the S.U.M. further proves what exactly? That he did not lead the S.U.M. to subsequently develop and expand its existing crude raceway system beginning in 1794? The same raceway that the study says, "remains the most significant resource of the GFHD" was built by Hamilton's S.U.M., an experimental industrial venture. Another example is the statement that "the real first step in America's industrial revolution, however, took place in another former colony—Rhode Island," referring to the NPS' Slater's Mill NHL, that took off in 1792. This line of commentary appears clearly leveled at undermining the long-held propriety of Paterson as the experimental seat of the American industrial economy as envisioned and carried out by A. Hamilton.

3. The GFHD resource inventory begins on pg. 39 and provides an overview of extant cultural resources by listing the large, early to mid nineteenth-century mills with obvious purpose of showing the resources are "typical of many northeastern cities that experienced industrialization in the nineteenth century." Perhaps all of these typical cities should also be National Historic Landmarks, like the GFHD, which enjoys the highest level of historic status that can be bestowed on an historic district by the NPS.

If, as the study alludes, a primary reason for NHL designation is the early water power system, then the system should be designated alone, and the period of significance limited to about 1830, for there were few improvements made thereafter. This, however, would be a serious oversight of interpretation, taking the artifact without regard to its context. This thread is obvious throughout the report and in its conclusions: that on most of the evaluated criteria—significance, representative resources, integrity, feasibility, etc. Paterson is typical, ordinary and already represented in other parks—and especially in Lowell National Historic Park. Lowell is referred to in each and every evaluated category in Chapter Three except for asso-

ciation with Alexander Hamilton. It is apparent that the study has gone out of its way to make this point emphatically known.

4. When accounting for the resources within the district, I am surprised that the content of the NRHP nomination forms was not mentioned. Such germane documentation should be brought to light so that an understanding and evaluation of the district's resources would have a broader base for understanding "representative comparisons" than those given. This is especially the case if there exists oversights, discrepancies or incompleteness in the NRHP documentation. In my opinion, the study overlooks an essential opportunity to revisit the district's boundaries and constituent resources in this way. For example, to posit in the study that other NPS sites have mills with intact and working machinery while the GFHD does not seems simple enough, but is essentially the beginning of a comparative inventory that is not fully informed. Such an inventory, though, could and should be used effectively for evaluating important comparative and thematic significance criteria.

The GFHD National Register nomination forms as they are, however, have but a sketchy inventory of GFHD resources and a primarily narrative evaluation of their contributing or non-contributing status. Defining such status is an essential step to delineating boundaries in a historic district nomination endeavor. To those who know the district, there are many cases where the forms and amendments do not help determine the status of particular resources, or flat out contain no information. Areas of archaeological potential and evaluation of the district under criterion D, for example, may not have been adequately addressed initially. Perhaps the Passaic Water Company pump houses extant at Mary Ellen Kramer Park, or the masonry dam constructed along the lip of the Great Falls, or the archaeological deposits of the Cottage on the Cliff dump site along the river across from ATP, or perhaps Hinchliffe Stadium should be included as contributing resources in such an inventory. There is a hydroelectric plant, a stadium, raceways, a waterworks, one extant reservoir and the remains of another (adjacent to the stadium and within the boundary) archaeological deposits, and a NNL waterfall—all practically touching each other, but not all included or adequately inventoried in the NRHP documentation. For this study to now sweep the resources of the GFHD into a typical collection of mid to late nineteenth-century mill buildings, save for the raceway (pg. 41) and to give negative comparative examples to the inventories of other parks, is particularly out of hand. Given the paucity of a comprehensive resource inventory and conditions assessment at the time of the study, I imagined the study team would have the opposite reaction, such as an explanation that the district's resources had not been thoroughly documented, followed by a recommendation to do so. Rather, lumping them into two representative architectural/engineering periods followed by specific comparisons with inventories of other parks is to set up a predictable conclusion.

5. Of the eight points of the Thematic Framework used for evaluating Suitability, only three themes were determined as relevant for review in the GFHD. What follows is a brief discussion of how each of the three relates to the GFHD, and comparisons with other existing NPS entities interpreting that theme: immigration, waterpower, engineering, and industry/labor. The significance of Hamilton's involvement in Paterson falls under "industry" and his involvement in Paterson is significant insofar as it gave rise to the same "phenomenon that occurred in other locations all over the Northeast and the nation at the same time." This can only mean then that Hamilton's involvement in Paterson is trite considering the national context—Paterson may as well be Newark. In my opinion, the GFHD easily qualifies for evaluation under all the themes, or at very least six of the eight. The three covered oversimplify the interpretation of the district's cultural significance in the same way as describing the district as a collection of typical nineteenth-century mills did earlier. There is little explanation of why the other five themes did not apply.

6. As for Feasibility, the GFHD is sufficient in terms of access for visitation, but on pg. 65, "Traffic congestion, noise and exhaust odor impact the visitor experience negatively." Perhaps those who visit are expecting Vermont? There is a unique opportunity provided by the synergy of both the Great Falls and a National Park at the center of a stressed, dense urban area that the study team simply did not grasp. It is the crux of the argument for the State Park, on the other hand. This comment about exhaust odor exemplifies that oversight perfectly.

7. On-going state, county and city efforts are referenced but not genuinely addressed in this study, and in the feasibility section, are beguiled with deep negativity and doubt. I will focus my brief comments only on city efforts. In 1986-87, the City of Paterson adopted a historic preservation ordinance that created a Historic Preservation Commission. Paterson remains today as one of about forty Certified Local Governments in New Jersey, serving the largest population of all other CLGs in the state. The State's historic preservation plan and Smart Growth master plan are supported by preservation planning efforts in Paterson. The Commission adopted the National standards and criteria for the preservation and evaluation of significance of historic resources—those published in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior and applied by the NPS. Since then, the City and the Commission have worked on a myriad of projects on public and private land, often times in partnership with the State and county entities. Project values managed through this process over the years are conservatively estimated to be over $150 million. There is no reason, then, other than for a lack of public funding perhaps, to believe that the City and State have not "made a commitment to manage the resources they own within the parameters of the NPS management policies" as stated in the study.

For many years there has been firm agreement that the GFHD meets criteria for national significance especially by association with the S.U.M. and A.Hamilton. Congress has, over these years, authorized and appropriated funding used for planning and protection of some key resources, such as the Colt Gun Mill and the raceway. It is not the case that more federal funds have been invested than the local share, however, while local planning for these public resources in the GFHD has been largely consistent with federal standards. There has not been enough Federal investment made on behalf of these irreplaceable nationally-significant resources, however, in terms of consistent preventative maintenance, stabilization and restoration. This kind of federal assistance is required to get the resources to the stable condition that the study suggests they are in. While I agree with the statement regarding the competence of the New Jersey Parks Commission as stewards, there needs to be a larger role played by the NPS in both financial and technical assistance on a continuing basis for its NHLs if national park status and outright federal ownership is not possible. The ability of local government to bring to bear the sizable investments required on behalf of nationally-significant, district-level resources for their stewardship (to national standards no less) in perpetuity is not realistic in most cases. The study's claim that adequate local stewardship exists without additional federal involvement is false.

8. The overall feasibility conclusion for the NPS is that for between $35 and $55 million (pg. 66), they could establish, staff and maintain a park at the Great Falls, but given other factors, they do not have that kind of funding to do so. If the NPS does not have the ability or responsibility to offer as much as $55 million to manage nationally-significant, qualified resources that are rapidly deteriorating, can it argue that others must demonstrate that they can provide this level of sustenance prior to affiliating with them? Why then would the city or state need any assistance from or affiliation with the park service, as it already has national-level historic status and recognition? The arguments made regarding pledges, lack of local commitment and third-party investment seem backwards. There is no comparison to managing a Park with the NPS' recommended $55 million to leveraging $3 million from P.L. 104-333 (1996), even with the $10 million promised for the State park development as suggested by the study.

Please realize the far-reaching impact this study, published by the NPS and funded by Congress, will have locally. It is in the spirit of our shared commitments to preserving our national heritage that the charge of stewardship and legacy of these resources has been passed by those before us. By both small and large endeavors, we here in Paterson and New Jersey are doing our part.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

STATEMENT OF ERIC DELONY, FORMER CHIEF, HISTORIC AMERICAN ENGINEERING RECORD (HAER), NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony on this very important issue.

I write to express my strong support for designation of the Great Falls National Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park Service.

My support for the site is based on my intimate familiarity with the unique historic and cultural resources available in Paterson and the goals of the National Park Service. Until my retirement in October 2003, I worked with the National Park Service through the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), a Federal program established in 1969, to create a national record of America's engineering, industrial and technological heritage. My tenure at HAER extended for 32 years, half that time as senior program manager. I administered the program in such a manner that the act of documentation not only created a permanent record of drawings, photographs and histories for the Library of Congress, but also promoted the physical preservation of that technological heritage. As chief of the Historic American Engineering Record, I served as the Department of the Interior and National Park Service senior authority on engineering and industrial heritage.

In 1973 and 1974, I was the project leader for two HAER recording teams that documented the power canals, silk mills, rail locomotive shops, and the related industries and neighborhoods of Paterson and the Great Falls area. The records created by this project led to the original designation of Paterson's Great Falls as a National Historic Landmark.

The Paterson Great Falls site is the first planned industrial development in the United States—the place Alexander Hamilton selected to implement his vision of the United States as an urban, industrial nation. Hamilton created the concept of planned industrial development and America's first public/private partnership for economic development, the Society for Useful Manufactures (SUM). Hamilton selected the skilled city planner and engineer Pierre Charles L'Enfant to bring the plan to life with a raceway system that harnessed the power of the Great Falls for use in manufacturing. L'Enfant began the raceway system in 1793. Paterson's raceway system, the nearby dam across the Passaic River, and the buildings accommodating many industries represent the finest remaining ensemble of engineering, architectural structures and city planning from the 120-year period when America was becoming the great industrial nation Hamilton envisioned. The growth and changes in industrial planning, engineering, alternative energy sources, and architecture that took place in America are clearly shown in the works of the Paterson Great Falls Historic District that remain to this day. The range of these works is unique in the Nation.

Based on my experience with the National Park Service and in Paterson, I firmly believe that the resources and historic and cultural themes present in Paterson are in no way adequately represented in any of the 388 units of the National Park System—not in Lowell, Hamilton's Grange, Steamtown, or any other NPS unit that touches on various aspects of the evolution of American industrialization and technology from the late-18th and early-19th century. I am familiar with the engineering and industrial heritage units of the National Park System having helped get some of them established. HAER has documented sites in most of these units over the years.

One critical difference I see comparing Paterson with other industrial units of the National Park System such as Lowell, Saugus, Hopewell and Steamtown, is Paterson's industrial diversity. Paterson was not just a textile, iron site, locomotive shop, power canal or single industry community. Paterson is the finest illustration of Hamilton's vision to create an America based on diversified industries, thus enabling America to compete more successfully in the international marketplace. Hamilton's dream was realized through the creation of the planned industrial center in Paterson and through the evolution of industries throughout the past 200 years. As he explained in his Report to the Congress on Manufactures, Hamilton believed that America could compete economically with Europe only if America embraced new and varied types of manufacturing. Paterson represents this vision demonstrating the results of Hamilton's economic dream through the creation and evolution of the raceways, mills, locomotive plants and other diverse industrial factories. Paterson and the Great Falls Historic District represent the fruits of Hamilton's vision better than any other location.

Concerning 21st century relevancy, Paterson, because of its economic and racial diversity, is relevant to contemporary America because the City engages all citizens—black and white, Italian, Hispanic, African American, Muslim and Jewish—especially those of the laboring, working class and the lower end of the economic scale. No other National Park unit has the potential of embracing and interpreting such a vast cross section of the United States—the culture, history and mores of the common laborer—better than Paterson. A National Park Service unit in Paterson will provide the opportunity to interpret these values with special relevance to labor and working class America through the physical workplace and surrounding neighborhoods. America's working class and minority citizens today have little stake in our great National Park System. The industrial fabric, power canals

and associated neighborhoods of the Great Falls/SUM Historic District in Paterson have the potential to interpret those values for the edification and enjoyment of future generations better than any other place in America.

Paterson's varied and evolving nature of manufacturing also differentiates the area from other National Park System sites that deal with the discrete aspects of industry. Although Lowell serves a valuable role in the National Park System as an example of the nineteenth century cotton industry, Paterson represents so much more. Paterson ventured into silk textiles as early as the 1830s, eventually becoming the largest silk producer in the world and making America a major force in international commerce. Paterson also became a hub for non-textile manufacturing, as the first revolving pistol was assembled in Paterson at the Colt Gun Mill. During the nineteenth and twentieth century, plants in Paterson played a major role in producing forms of nearly every type of transportation, including locomotives, submarines, bridges and the engine for the "The Spirit of St. Louis" and the B-17 "Flying Fortresses" of World War II. No other site in the National Park Service, not even those that illustrate the cultural theme of industry, comes close to the breadth of Paterson's story.

Paterson is particularly suitable for inclusion in the National Park System because resources abound to illustrate the unique stories told in Paterson. The story of Hamilton, L'Enfant and the SUM is present in the Great Falls and raceways. Paterson is also the site of an instructive collection of Hamilton and L'Enfant's writing on industry, city planning and engineering. These letters, which help make history come alive, provide a dimension of insight into history and will be eminently useful in interpreting and understanding the area. The evolving nature of industry in the United States is also present in the three-tiered power canal system, the associated rail and silk mill buildings such as: the Rogers, Grant, Danforth-Cooke locomotive works; Dolphin, Barbour, and Phoenix, Congdon and Harmony mills; the Ivanhoe Mill wheelhouse; and the former site of the Colt firearms manufactory. Paterson retains examples of nearly all the varied types of industry present in the town for the past 200 years.

In 1976, following my work with HAER in Paterson, the National Park Service named Paterson's Great Falls a National Historic Landmark. To celebrate the spirit of economic independence, President Gerald Ford paid a visit to Paterson during a special Bicentennial tour of the country. During his visit, President Ford recognized that, though there are many important national parks and landmarks, "this site has a very particular significance within that very select group." The President pointed out that Hamilton founded Paterson "as a place to encourage America's economic independence and demonstrate the value of American industry" and observed that "we can see the Great Falls as a symbol of the industrial might which helps make America the most powerful nation in the world . . . We can see it as a symbol of industrial democracy, which makes a vast array of material goods available to our people."

Indeed, the fact that Paterson is a symbol of industrial democracy of the nation necessitates a national presence at the site. Although I understand the State of New Jersey is taking steps that may result in a State Park in Paterson, the possibility of a State Park must not be used to deny the eligibility of the Great Falls Historic District as a unit of the National Park System. Because Paterson's Great Falls Historic District is deeply rooted in the vision of one of the Founding Fathers of creating a great industrial nation able to compete successfully in the international marketplace, this site should be made a part of the National Park System. If the State does implement its announced plan to create a State Park in Paterson, then there would be the opportunity to have—as there is in Lowell—State financial assistance that helps fund activities related to a National Park.

Because a central part of the Great Falls story involves Alexander Hamilton and American industry, there is in Paterson the genuine opportunity to attract substantial private donations. This realistic opportunity would be rendered virtually impossible if the National Park Service were to determine that the Great Falls Historic District is not eligible to be part of the National Park System. The kind of major private donors who would make substantial donations to present the history of Hamilton and American industry will demand the integrity, high professionalism, continuity and permanence of the National Park System.

The story of Hamilton and American industry is not a story of the State of New Jersey; it is the story of our nation. The Great Falls Historic District should be a unit of our National Park System. Once part of the National Park System, it will be possible to link the presentation in Paterson with other elements of our National Park System involving Hamilton in Philadelphia and New York, and industry in Lowell and Steamtown. A National Park Service unit in Paterson will enhance NPS

sites in Philadelphia, New York, Washington and other units of the National Park System.

Paterson's Great Falls Historic District is clearly eligible to be a unit of the National Park Service. Because of the great interest that private donors have expressed in the story of Hamilton and American industry, in recent years, the timing is perfect for the site to become a unit of the National Park Service. I urge you to support the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act of 2007.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

STATEMENT OF RON EMRICH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PRESERVATION NEW JERSEY, ON S. 148

I am writing on behalf of the Board of Directors and more than 1,000 individual and organizational members of Preservation New Jersey to urge you to actively assist in the creation of a Great Falls National Historical Park—the site Alexander Hamilton selected to implement his vision of America's economic independence—in Paterson, New Jersey.

As you know, after the Revolutionary War, America was dependent on Europe for most manufactured products, from clothing to military supplies. Alexander Hamilton, America's first Secretary of the Treasury, recognized this economic dependence as dangerous for the new nation, and he conceived and implemented a plan to harness the force of New Jersey's Great Falls to power the new industries that would secure our economic independence. His ambitious vision was based on an intent to transform a rural agrarian society dependent upon slavery into a modern economy. True to Hamilton's vision, Paterson became a great manufacturing city, producing the Colt revolver, the first submarine, the aircraft engine for the first transatlantic flight, more locomotives than any city in the nation, and more silk than any city in the world.

New Jersey's Great Falls is the only National Historic District that includes both a National Natural Resource and a National Historic Landmark. We understand that numerous scholars have weighed in with their support for a National Historical Park for the Great Falls Historic District. Many of these educators have concluded that Pierre L'Enfant's innovative waterpower system and the factories powered by it constitute the finest remaining collection of engineering and architectural structures representing each stage of America's progress from a weak agrarian society to a leader in the global economy.

Because the City of Paterson owns the key properties, buildings, and valuable historical documents and the State of New Jersey will provide at least $10 million in financial assistance, a National Park unit at the Great Falls will not be costly for the Federal government. We are confident that private donors will also make significant contributions to a Paterson National Park interpreting Alexander Hamilton's vision of economic independence and freedom.

Therefore, Preservation New Jersey is pleased to ask for your active support in recognizing that our nation's economic independence began in Paterson. We urge you to support the Paterson Great Falls National Park Act, and to work to create a national historical park at the Great Falls to interpret America's rich economic history

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF FLAVIA ALAYA, PROFESSOR EMERITA, RAMAPO COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY, AND CO-FOUNDER, FRIENDS OF HINCHLIFFE STADIUM PATERSON, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony on this important legislation.

As an educator as well as author, co-author and editor of a number of studies in Paterson hisotry and culture, and as co-founder of the 501(c)(3) non-profit Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium, I write in vigorous support of S. 148 proposing to create a Great Falls/SUM National Park in Paterson, New Jersey, and especially to endorse the inclusion of Hinchliffe Stadium among the landmarks integrated into this richly interpretable site.

The collaboration that established the Friends in 2002 had as its first goal inscribing the Stadium into the history of the Great Falls area by establishing its importance as a site of Negro League baseball. It is our conviction that the work that won it a place on the National Register in 2004, together with our ongoing research and interpretation (available via the Friends' recently-launched website: www.hinchliffestadium.org), enhances its national significance and convincingly affirms its potential as a National Landmark. We believe that if it is repositioned

within the Great Falls and S.U.M. District boundaries from which it was originally excluded, it has the power to give this extraordinary area true narrative fullness and closure.

That the Park Service has chosen to disparage such potential is puzzling in light of their own effort to bring the Stadium to national and even global attention in 2005, when their American Memory website made it the African-American site of the year. Indeed we allowed ourselves to think of this Park Service accolade as a kind of reverse rebuke for the bureaucratic error that sent the Stadium application to the Register as merely "locally significant," an error the we and the New Jersey Preservation Office have been working to correct ever since.

But the Park Service evidently speaks with many voices. Their recent statements on the proposed legislation before Congress are literally a different story: not only do they disparage the Stadium's story-power, but they deny the dynamic character of public culture generally. If this denial is a true reflection of policy, it would, I think, also reflect a monumental failure of imagination in their role as guardians of our national narrative.

The central claim of both Study Report and testimony appears to be that the National Park at Lowell, which placed America's complex industrial past on the American cultural landscape for the first time almost a half-century ago, can still tell us (if it ever could!) all we know or need to know about our industrial origins and development; that, even leaving aside Alexander Hamilton's crucial contribution to this story, the Lowell catechism can answer all our questions about the checkered making and re-making of American industrial might.

Such assumptions carry these documents into almost preposterously reductive absurdities: e.g., characterizing the Paterson locomotive "first" at the intercontinental spike as an accident, nothing more than a contingency plan; comparing the culture-imbued Great Falls of the Passaic with the unspoilt natural wonders of Yosemite; counterweighing the major water-power innovations of the Society for Usefull Manufactures with Mr. Slater's mill-wheel. Employing another disingenuous rhetorical device, the testimony applies the drumlike repetition of the word "unsuccessful" to virtually every Paterson claim to innovation, hoping to persuade Congress via hypnotic suggestion, perhaps, that a Paterson National Park would be a permanent American shrine to failure.

And yet what a gallery of extraordinary Paterson photographs accompanies this Study Report—page after page exhibiting not just the grandeur but the staying power of the venture capitalism of the S.U.M! Not only do these images visually repudiate everything the report actually says, they repeat what dozens of historians have already told us: Go ahead, circumnavigate the U.S., stop at every one of the places named in the NPS study; you will still not have the grasp of this nation's industrial history, or plumb its meaning to an incredibly varied workforce, or catch its entrepreneurial élan, or connect it to the competitive national spirit, or come to the level of insight into the essential, intricate integration of all these disparate, scattered parts of industrial development, including—yes—failure as well as success—success beyond failure, that would be made possible, visible, intelligible, in a single visit to a Great Falls National Park.

Of course I include Hinchliffe Stadium in this missed interpretive potential. It offered the Park Service an obvious opportunity to join the authors of the proposed legislation outside the box. There is no news in pointing out that the Stadium falls technically beyond both the physical boundaries and "period of significance" of the existing landmarks, or that it has not yet been given the full landmark stamp of approval. But to say this and no more is to remove everything dynamic from the process that adapts interpretation to new scholarship and insight.

One such missed opportunity would have served a critical contemporary project of public culture as well, indeed one of the legislated imperatives of the Park Service itself: to tell more African-American history on our cultural land-and cityscapes. S.148 is forthrightly consistent with this mission. It cites Hamilton's abhorrence of slavery and Paterson's repudiation, from its founding moment, of an economy dependent on it, a story no other National Park related to American industrial history, least of all Lowell, will ever be able to tell. Nevertheless, the Study Report's only mention of Hinchliffe Stadium's stellar connections to Black sports sidesteps entirely its potential to narrate such an important piece of under-written African American history.

Nonetheless, the Stadium does have this power. It is the power to tell a thrillingly positive story, evoking the ongoing dynamic of sports as a key means by which African Americans have challenged racism. As a major site of Negro League baseball, Hinchliffe is likely to prove one of only a handful of stadiums left in the U.S., certainly of any size, stature, or integrity, to tell this story, let alone tell it so brilliantly. We know that over the course of twelve full seasons here many of the Negro

Leagues' greatest Hall of Fame superstars gave some of the best performances of their lives. As for Larry Doby, to see Hinchliffe as nothing more than the site of his early life as a high school athlete is to flout the obvious: its inspirational influence as scene of such great Negro League play, brilliant role-modeling for a talented poor kid dreaming of a career in professional baseball. For those of us who know this story from Doby himself, it is merely the crowning touch that he was ultimately scouted by the Newark Eagles at Hinchliffe, a touch that if it weren't absolutely true would sound like Hollywood fiction. This was a defining moment not just for him but for the rest of us, the break that led to his 1947 American League breakthrough and gave the final death-blow to Jim Crow baseball in the American major leagues.

There is still, of course, a more complex interpretive task: bringing this recreational structure into the narratives of industrial development so deeply scored on the surrounding cultural landscape. Yet it is—or ought to be—an exciting and rewarding one. Since the years in which the Great Falls/S.U.M Landmarks were defined, scholarship has helped us reclaim the meaning of the Stadium's proximity to both. Steven A. Reiss's work, including City Games: The Evolution of American Society and the Rise of Sports (1989) and Sport in Industrial America 1850-1920 (1995), are just two recent studies in social history that link the evolution of American sports directly to technological innovation, work, and social movements, bridging the gap between industrial work and play. The Friends' own research, both in preparing the National Register application and the Stadium website (www.hinchliffestadium.org), has shown how the social and historical context of the Stadium's creation offers critical insight not only into millowner/leading-citizen attitudes toward the purifying power of athletics but into working-class consciousness of the meaning of sport and play.

This was the same worker culture, after all, whose slogan for the eight-hour-day movement (a movement the Park Service testimony so glibly characterizes as "unsuccessful"!.) was: "Eight hours for work, eight hours for sleep, and eight hours for what we will!" It was a demand that laid fresh claim to the part of life that work was not, and Hinchliffe "City" Stadium planted it large on the landscape. Justly called "The House that Silk Built," it was paid for by the donations and self-sacrifice of the workers of this dominant industry and was constructed largely by and for working people. Completing it gave saving temporary livelihoods to men just thrown out of factory jobs. The dyers union local celebrated the successful end of an early-Depression strike here.

Even in its design and construction the stadium is rooted in the worker community, having been planned with instinctive respect for a scene long associated with popular recreation that includes the unique surround of the Great Falls and the Valley of the Rocks. Olmsted Brothers of Brookline, Massachusetts, direct descendants of the designers of New York's Central Park and originators of some of America's most visionary and people-centered environmental planning, engaged in a consultative process that interacted directly with the community. They succeeded in resolving, in an amazingly successful way, site considerations that included proximity to what they knew to be one of the nation's great natural wonders. They thus managed to preserve the awesome dignity of the Falls without sacrificing either the Stadium's visual grandeur or the 10,000-person seating capacity that represented its lifeline to economic survival.

Folded together—as they should be—as they can be—such people-centered narratives of race and industry, environment and sport, can invigorate and inspire. Here is a people's park, making no invidious distinctions of national origin or class or color or religion or gender, a place that made Eleanor Egg, one of America's earliest great female runners, its first honored athlete in 1932. Hinchliffe stories like these—and they are legion—add depth to a Paterson narrative that already underscores the equalizing force of talent and "industry." Stories of Black industrial entrepreneurship in this city, of its counter-intuitive support for abolition and of Underground Railroad activity among its mid-19th-century manufacturers, all gain force by having Hinchliffe's empathy with underprivilege and the community's vigorous welcome of Black baseball as their sequel.

It is sad to find the NPS unwilling to take on such an interpretive challenge, or even to define it as a challenge worth taking on. Although even the Study Report admits that a proper reading of American industry should include its "path of decline" and take us into the Great Depression, its own "period of significance" analysis instead makes 1914 a chokehold, not only denying the full curve of industrial change into the Great Depression, but cutting us off from every advance in social history since the 1970s. Most egregiously, it shows a refusal to address the insight we now have into Paterson's long adventure, and investment, in the egalitarian thrust of American capitalism, our awareness that it is a story about both entre-

preneurs and workers, not one to which workers' contributions can be summed up, as the Park Service document does, in the phrase, "labor unrest," as if labor contributed nothing more to our industrial economy than an "unsuccessful" effort to undermine it. As Herbert Gutman's Paterson historiography has unequivocally proved, the true story about American industry is really two stories held in wonderful tension: one of individualist entrepreneurial workers making it "from rags to riches" and another of collective workers claiming their rights to work and wages and reasonable conditions of both.

And also, yes, their right to play. Hinchliffe Stadium, as part of a larger national stadium movement that climaxed the growth phase of American industrialization, objectifies these ideas and brings them into focus. It was product of decades of local planning and dreaming, designed to be a statement of working people's investment, financial no less than moral and social, in the physical education of their aspiring young, in the fuller humanity represented by their own leisure time. When it was finally constructed, in the midst of economic calamity, it was explicitly meant to shout back the triumph of industrial America over adversity. Its very construction was made possible because the all parts of government and community worked together, exemplifying the best of the New Deal. To recount the litany of great athletes at Hinchliffe is to represent the full spectrum of our rainbow of national origins. It is to describe how work, decency, and sport are intertwined uniquely on the American scene. It is to show how the culture of striving, and the essentially hopeful, egalitarian, aspirational character of both our industrial culture and our cultural diversity are represented, literally and symbolically, by the "level playing field."

Ultimately what the National Park Service has failed to acknowledge, even in the face of some of its own evidence, is the single thing that Paterson owns, missing from all the separate theme-representing places they allege can tell the tale. That missing thing is synergy. It is a synergy both structural and human. Fully interpreted, allowed to do the work it can do, it can tell the story of industrial capitalism in all its sometimes beautiful, sometimes irritating, sometimes fractious and unsettling and difficult complexity and interrelatedness, all in one astonishing little educational universe. It is a synergy not just enriched but secured by the inclusion of Hinchliffe Stadium, a synergy that will guarantee a Paterson Great Falls National Park greater than the sum of its miraculously serendipitous, if far from accidental, assemblage of proximate parts.

With S. 148, the legislative process stands poised to create this interpretive synergy. It is my deepest hope that your committee will thoroughly endorse this effort, in spirit and letter.

I thank you again, especially on behalf of my colleagues among the Friends of Hinchliffe Stadium, for the opportunity to offer this testimony.

STATEMENT OF MARIA MAGDA O'KEEFE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, HISPANIC MULTI-PURPOSE SERVICE CENTER OF PATERSON, NJ, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony on this very important issue.

As one of the leaders of the proud Hispanic and Latino community in New Jersey, I am testifying today because we urgently need your help in creating a Paterson National Park at the site that Alexander Hamilton chose to invite immigrants to America to participate in the new and growing economy Hamilton sought to begin in Paterson. Paterson is the home to over 150,000 residents, with more than half coming from Hispanic or Latino origins, and New Jersey is the home of almost 1.5 million persons of Hispanic or Latino origin.

In proposing a modern American economy that would begin at the Great Falls in Paterson, Hamilton rejected the prevailing cultural standard of the time that rewarded the rich solely for the accident of birth and social status. Hamilton welcomed immigrants and believed deeply in a meritocracy that embraced hard work and accomplishments.

At the end of the Eighteenth Century, Alexander Hamilton announced to a new nation and the world that Paterson welcomed entrepreneurship that would expand opportunities for people of all incomes, races, religions, and nationalities. It was a radical notion then and we still have a way to go to realize every element of Hamilton's dream. Today, Paterson's first Hispanic mayor continues to welcome immigrants and low-income families to Paterson's many ethnic neighborhoods and cultures.

The National Park Service has finally come to recognize that many Americans—including many Hispanics—feel little or no connection to the National Park System

and our Founding Fathers. We want you to know that the Hispanic community does feel a deep connection to Paterson's Great Falls National Historic District. We see it as the symbol of one Founding Father's efforts to shape our nation's economy to provide increased opportunities for immigrants.

Alexander Hamilton is one of America's greatest immigration success stories. His personal triumph over elitism and classism in early American society and his belief that America's economy can help people from all walks of life will resonate with everyone visiting a Paterson National Park. Paterson's Great Falls National Historic District provides a unique representation of immigrant and American economy history that presents an inclusive story of the diverse American experiences going back to the vision of one of America's Founding Fathers.

We believe a Paterson National Park will help Hispanic citizens from across New Jersey, across the New York Metropolitan area, and across the nation to take special pride in America's past, which engenders confidence and a stake in America's future. Paterson's story of a diverse group of hard-working immigrants will touch many members of America's Hispanic community who have felt little or no connection with our National Park System. We also see the Paterson National Park as an opportunity to recognize Hamilton's efforts to liberate Spain's American colonies.

The Hispanic and Latino community needs you to support a Paterson National Park now. Please do not let us down.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER MACGOWAN, PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, ON S. 148

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the opportunity to submit testimony on the proposed Great Falls National Historic Park.

I write to draw your attention to an important feature of the Great Falls Historic District—the unique place of the Great Falls, its history, and that of the industry and city that grew up around it, in American literature. Poetry, and literature generally, are cultural elements not adequately represented in American parks.

Much of my scholarship has centered upon the Pulitzer prize-winning poet who wrote the best known literary work associated with the Great Falls, William Carlos Williams (1887-1963). Williams' 240 page Paterson is directly related to the National Natural Landmark and to the National Historical Landmark, both of which are within the Paterson Great Falls Historic District. Paterson initially appeared separately in five books in 1946, 1948, 1949, 1951 and 1958. I edited the current edition of the poem for Williams' estate and publishers (New Directions) in 1992. Book III won the first National Book Award for Poetry in 1950, and two of the other books of Paterson were nominated for the award when they first appeared. Robert Lowell, writing on the poem's use of the city and the Falls in a 1947 review of Book I, observed, "Taken together, Paterson is Williams' life, and Williams is what makes Paterson alive." Reviewing Book II in 1948 Lowell wrote, "Paterson is Whitman's America" grown tragic in the 20th Century, "No poet has written of it with such a combination of brilliance, sympathy, and experience, with such alertness and energy." John Berryman, reviewing Book V in 1959, declared, "I wish everyone would read it."

The poem has never been out of print. Its first printings of 1,000 copies are now rare books, but New Directions issued cheap pocket editions of the poem as its first editions quickly sold out, and paper and hardcover editions are now readily available. Williams is standard reading on campuses in literature and creative writing courses; the poem is anthologized in all the standard undergraduate college text books, and the complete poem is taught in American literature graduate courses across the nation and internationally. I know of German, French, Italian and Spanish translations currently in print. Recently, to give another example of this poem's international fame, I was asked by a leading Norwegian Art Museum to write an introduction to the poem and to the history of Paterson and the Falls to accompany an exhibition of paintings inspired by the poem.

Williams' poem is about a nation not a state, and recognizes the national importance of Paterson and the Great Falls. His intention, in writing a long poem about America and the city that marked its industrial beginnings, was to answer the long poems of his contemporaries T.S. Eliot and Ezra Pound. Both The Waste Land and the Cantos foreground European history, myth and culture. Williams' poem begins with the landscape itself and the early myths associated with Garret Mountain and the river. In the course of its five books it includes the history of Native American settlement, the violence of the Dutch era, Hamilton's interest in the area and the

founding of SUM, the city's industrial expansion and decline, major catastrophes, recreation activities (daredevil stunts across the Falls, the circus, Sundays in Garret Mountain Park), the 1913 strike, and the contemporary city. Williams' sources include a number of 19th and early 20th Century histories, newspaper accounts, assorted documents (e.g. a will, a drilling chart), and letters. Some of this material is reprinted as prose documents within the poem, for Williams recognized, as recent literary scholarship has come to acknowledge, that history and literature are not absolutely separate categories but enrich and inform each other in important ways (as Williams' poem would demonstrate as part of the exhibits of a National Park).

The major themes of the poem include the tension between the natural beauty of the falls and its exploitation by industry; money and economics; the sometimes misleading language of historical record; the role of religion; and the impact of class, gender and industry on the cultural life of the city and beyond. At the center of the poem is the Falls itself to which the poem returns again and again. The Falls serve as the focal point of the histories that the poem uncovers, and as a sound and force which—in the poem—represents an unheard call to recognize the beauty of the landscape and rediscover a neglected heritage, a heritage that could, if uncovered, help to bring direction and renewal to an American culture threatened, as Williams saw it, by a language and imagination rootless and unfulfilled.

In the exhibits of a National Park extracts from Williams' poem would surely help tell the story of the people who made and lived the history of the Great Falls, and would itself be part of that story. It offers an interpretation of the role of Hamilton, and covers the history of the area both before and after his important actions. The poem would contribute a good deal to the broader educational mission of a Great Falls National Park, a mission that would conceive of the cultural heritage of a site as including more than just an important historical record.

This cultural heritage includes, along with Williams' famous epic poem, Washington Irving's "On Passaic Falls" (1806), the 150 page poem on the Passaic by Thomas Ward (1842), the 18th Century engravings by Paul Sandby, the many later paintings of the Falls across two centuries, and more recently the poetry of Allen Ginsberg. It also includes the many eighteenth and nineteenth century tourist accounts of the Falls, themselves an important part of the national and international story this unique site has to tell.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

○