

**STATEMENT OF KATHERINE H. STEVENSON, ACTING ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,  
BUSINESS SERVICES, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE  
INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS  
AND PUBLIC LANDS, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING  
H.R. 877, TO AMEND THE ADAMS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK ACT OF 1998  
TO INCLUDE THE QUINCY HOMESTEAD WITHIN THE BOUNDARY OF THE  
ADAMS NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.**

**March 6, 2008**

---

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 877, a bill to include the Quincy Homestead in Quincy, Massachusetts within the boundary of Adams National Historical Park.

The Department opposes H.R. 877, consistent with a 1994 National Park Service Special Resource Study that did not recommend adding this property to the Adams National Historical Park.

The Quincy Homestead was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2005 based on its architectural significance; its association with four generations of Edmund Quincys during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries; its long association with people of learning and mercantile achievement; its use as a progressive farm in the 18<sup>th</sup> century; its path-breaking early restoration by Joseph Everett Chandler in 1904, and from its association with the Society of Colonial Dames of America. The Homestead is also known as the “Dorothy Quincy House.” Dorothy Quincy, a daughter of Edmund Quincy IV, the last Quincy to occupy the Homestead, grew up in the dwelling and married John Hancock. The Homestead is owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and operated through agreement by the Society of Colonial Dames of America as a house museum.

The Quincy families were among the significant families of Massachusetts during their tenures of ownership of the property. All four generations associated with the site and the house played important roles in local and colonial military and political activities. Edmund I (1602-1635), who migrated to Boston from England, was a Boston representative in the General Court of the Province. Edmund II (1628-1696) was the first major and lieutenant colonel in Braintree, Massachusetts and representative to the Massachusetts General Assembly. Edmund III (1681-1738) was Judge of the Superior Court of Judicature and a member of the Board of Overseers of Harvard University. Edmund IV (1703-1788) was successful in partnership with others in mercantile trade.

The Homestead, during the period of occupancy by the Quincy families, went through a series of phases of construction, with the first being undertaken by Edmund Quincy II in 1686. Additions and alterations proceeded in the period 1706-1708 and again in 1737 by Edmund Quincy III. Circa 1750, Edmund Quincy IV carried out extensive remodeling of the interior of the structure. The property was sold by the family in 1763.

In 1994, pursuant to Public Law 101-512, the National Park Service completed a Special Resource Study of a number of historic resources in Quincy, Massachusetts. The Quincy Homestead was among the resources analyzed during the course of the study. The study did not recommend that any resources investigated become units of the National Park System or that the Quincy Homestead be added to the Adams National Historical Park. No information has come to the Department's attention that would alter the conclusions of the Special Resource Study.

The purpose of Adams National Historical Park is to preserve and protect the grounds, homes and personal property of four generations of the Adams family and to use these resources to interpret the history they represent and to educate and inspire current and future generations. We do not believe that the Quincy Homestead is related to the purposes for which the park was established, nor does it appear to have any direct relationship with the Adams family, other than the fact that John Adams was once a suitor to Dorothy Quincy and a visitor to the Homestead. While Abigail Adams had Quincy family ancestry on her mother's side, she never lived at the Homestead. There does not appear to be any direct connection between John or Abigail Adams and the Homestead that would categorize the structure as a closely related resource to those now within the boundary of the park. Since the Homestead is currently owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and operated as a house museum by the Society of Colonial Dames of America, we do not see a need for management of the resource by the National Park Service.

Although there is support at the county and local levels for inclusion of the Quincy Homestead into the National Park System as part of Adams National Historical Park, we cannot support the action without a finding that the resource meets congressionally required criteria for designation.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I am prepared to answer any questions from members of the Committee.

**STATEMENT OF KATHERINE H. STEVENSON, ACTING ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, BUSINESS SERVICES, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND PUBLIC LANDS, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING H.R. 1423, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO LEASE A PORTION OF A VISITOR CENTER TO BE CONSTRUCTED OUTSIDE THE BOUNDARY OF THE INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE IN PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA**

**March 6, 2008**

---

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 H.R. 1423, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease a portion of a visitor center to be constructed outside the boundary of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in Porter County, Indiana.

The Department supports enactment of H.R. 1423 with two amendments. The Administration transmitted a similar proposal to Congress on September 30, 2005.

H.R. 1423 would authorize the National Park Service (NPS) to use federally appropriated funds to lease space in the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center, a new visitor facility built by the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission (PCCRVC) outside the boundary of Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore (national lakeshore). It would also authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Porter County Convention, Recreation and Visitor Commission prior to entering into a lease agreement. The Memorandum of Understanding would outline the terms of the joint partnership, including cooperative management of the new visitor facility and sharing of operational activities.

The new Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center is located approximately three quarters of a mile south of the national lakeshore boundary on IN 49, the principal north/south artery into the national lakeshore. It is owned by the PCCRVC and space will be leased to the national lakeshore. The two parties will jointly plan and staff the new visitor center and offer “one-stop shopping” for the visitor with exhibits and theater space to educate them about the resources found in the park, aspects of threatened and endangered species management, habitat preservation, and wetlands restoration.

In 1998, the national lakeshore and the PCCRVC began to explore the concept of a joint visitor center to be shared by the PCCRVC, the national lakeshore, and the Indiana Dunes State Park. Both the national lakeshore and the PCCRVC suffer from low visitation at their respective visitor centers due to their poor locations away from the primary thoroughfares. Only about 66,000 visitors to the national lakeshore, just 3 percent of the park’s 2 million visitors, travel to the existing visitor center each year. Because of the existing visitor center’s inconvenient location, size, and layout, the national lakeshore’s General Management Plan recommended relocating the existing visitor center to the more heavily traveled IN 49 corridor. The old visitor center would then be used exclusively for school programs, which the national lakeshore currently hosts for over 50,000 students per year.

A partnership to acquire land for a new site was initiated. A more prominent location outside the national lakeshore but within the primary travel corridor to the dunes was selected. Using a series of Transportation Enhancement grants, the PCCRVC purchased the land and secured a

contract for construction. The new Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center was completed in October 2006. This site serves as the cornerstone of a small commercial center.

A transportation study indicated that the new visitor facility would increase revenue to the area by \$24 million and visitor center visitation by over 300 percent. Commercial tour bus operators would be advised of the new visitor center and could include it as the first stop on their way into the national lakeshore or state park for information and orientation to the area. Local schools also would be directed to the new visitor facility to begin their educational trips to the national lakeshore. Visitor contact facilities and waysides within both the national lakeshore and the state park would provide information regarding the new visitor facility and list its location.

H.R. 1423 would provide authority to Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore to expend federally appropriated funds outside the boundaries of the park in order to lease space for exhibits, offices, a book store, and a theatre from PCCRVC. It would also authorize the expenditure of funds for the planning, design and development of exhibits to be placed in the new facility in the NPS-leased space and provide NPS staff for visitor information and education.

Passage of H.R. 1423 would have minimal impact on the park's current budget. The space that would be leased by the NPS includes room for exhibits, offices, a theatre, and a bookstore that would be operated by the national lakeshore's cooperating association. Park staff would be relocated to the new visitor facility to provide education and information, so no additional FTEs are required or expected as a result of this proposal.

A one-time cost of approximately \$1,500,000 would be needed to design, construct, and install exhibits in space leased for the national lakeshore. Annual lease payments would be approximately \$70,000. This cost increase would be offset within the park's base budget with a reduction in lower priorities, so no additional operational funding would be requested or expected.

Two million visitors travel to Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore each year. Many of them are from the Chicago metropolitan area and are often unaware that the national lakeshore is a unit of the National Park System. By relocating the primary visitor contact point to a more prominent location, the park would have the opportunity to contact and educate four times as many visitors regarding the national lakeshore's programs and resources as well as helping them understand the mission of the National Park Service.

H.R. 1423 provides for the development of exhibits to be completed at a cost not to exceed \$1,200,000. Due to inflation since the legislative proposal was transmitted to Congress in 2005, the cost for development of exhibits could now run up to \$1,500,000. We recommend that the bill be amended to reflect the increase in costs. We also recommend that the title be amended to state that the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease a portion of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center as the new visitor center has already been constructed. The amendments are attached to this testimony.

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

Recommended amendments to H.R. 1423, the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Lease Act

On p. 3, line 8, strike “\$1,200,000” and insert “\$1,500,000”.

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease a portion of the Dorothy Buell Memorial Visitor Center for use as a visitor center for the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.”



**STATEMENT OF KATHERINE H. STEVENSON, ACTING ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,  
BUSINESS SERVICES, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE  
INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS,  
AND PUBLIC LANDS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON  
NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING H.R. 1693, A BILL TO AUTHORIZE  
NATIONAL MALL LIBERTY FUND D.C. TO ESTABLISH A MEMORIAL ON  
FEDERAL LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AT CONSTITUTION GARDENS  
PREVIOUSLY APPROVED TO HONOR FREE PERSONS AND SLAVES WHO  
FOUGHT FOR INDEPENDENCE, LIBERTY, AND JUSTICE FOR ALL DURING THE  
AMERICAN REVOLUTION**

**March 6, 2008**

---

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 H.R. 1693, a bill to authorize the National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia at Constitution Gardens previously approved to honor free persons and slaves who fought for independence, liberty, and justice for all during the American Revolution.

The Department supports the establishment of a memorial in the Nation's Capital that would recognize and commemorate the contributions of African Americans as they fought for independence, liberty and justice during the Revolutionary War. However, the Department opposes H.R. 1693 in its current form as it is inconsistent with the principles, processes and requirements set forth in the Commemorative Works Act, which has successfully guided the process for establishing monuments in the Nation's Capital since it was enacted in 1986. Over the course of the succeeding 20 years, 17 memorials have been planned, designed, and constructed following that process and an additional five memorials are currently in various stages of completion.

## **Background on the Commemorative Works Act and the Reserve**

In 1986, following what some characterized as "monumental chaos" over the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which was dedicated in 1982, Congress enacted the Commemorative Works Act to guide the process for establishing memorials in the nation's Capital. Since its enactment, the Commemorative Works Act has played an important role in ensuring that memorials in the nation's Capital are erected on the most appropriate sites and are of a caliber in design that is worthy of their historically significant subjects.

On November 17, 2003, Congress declared the National Mall complete by establishing the Reserve through an amendment to the Commemorative Works Act. The Reserve was designated in response to Congressional concern over the loss of open space on the National Mall to memorials. Between 1980 and 2000, seven new memorials were erected on the Mall. This trend foreshadowed a proliferation of commemorative works that could threaten the historic open space of the Nation's greatest symbolic landscape. As a result of a Congressional hearing in 1997, this committee expressed an interest in an evaluation of how the Commemorative Works Act was functioning. Pursuant to that request, the National Capital Memorial Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission established a Joint Task Force on Memorials.

The Joint Task Force recommended the establishment of a Reserve to preserve the monumental core and developed the Memorials and Museums Master Plan to redirect memorials throughout the city. The Reserve, an area where no new memorials would be constructed other than those previously authorized such as that honoring Martin Luther King Jr., was envisioned by the Joint

Task Force as generally encompassing the central cross-axis of the Mall from the U.S. Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and from the White House to the Jefferson Memorial. Congress expanded this area to include all of the area between Constitution and Independence Avenues from 17th Street west to the Lincoln Memorial, as well as lands south of Independence Avenue from the Tidal Basin to the Potomac River when it statutorily established the Reserve through passage of the Commemorative Works Act Clarification Act of 2003.

### **H.R. 1693**

While H.R. 1693 states that the memorial shall be established in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act, the bill also contains provisions that contravene several critical requirements of the Commemorative Works Act.

First, the provisions in H.R. 1693 would designate a specific site for the memorial, rather than allowing for the site selection process under the Commemorative Works Act to determine the appropriate location of the memorial. This site selection process requires consultation with the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission and approval by the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Park Service. Congress has traditionally provided that such site and design decisions be determined through established processes under the Commemorative Works Act, and we support this practice that has worked well for over 20 years.

The specific site identified in the bill is in Area I at Constitution Gardens which was approved for the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial in 1988, but expired in 2005 and is now

within the Reserve. In 2003, Congress declared the Reserve to be a completed work of civic art and precluded the establishment of new memorials. The Department supports Congress's prohibition of new memorial proposals within the Reserve. The Department recognizes the site selection process and the Reserve to be basic pillars of the Commemorative Works Act, a safeguard and a guide to the best use of the parklands of the Nation's Capital.

In addition, H.R. 1693 is inconsistent with the Commemorative Works Act provisions relating to the expiration of legislative authority, a separate but related issue. The Commemorative Works Act specifies that "upon expiration of the legislative authority, any previous site and design approvals shall also expire." In 1986, Congress authorized the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial Foundation to establish the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial consistent with legislation to establish the Commemorative Works Act, which was pending before Congress at the time and enacted later that year. In 1987, Congress enacted a second law authorizing placement of that memorial within Area I as it was then defined by the Commemorative Works Act. In 1988, the National Park Service, the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission approved a site in Constitution Gardens for the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial and, in 1996, approved the final design. Despite four extensions of the memorial's authorization over 21 years, the Foundation was unable to raise sufficient funds for construction, and the authority finally lapsed in October 2005.

The authority to construct a memorial is granted by Congress to a specific sponsor to establish a particular memorial typically within specified timeframes. The expired 1986 authorization was given to the sponsor, the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial Foundation, to establish

the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial. H.R. 1693 would authorize a different sponsor, the National Mall Liberty Fund D.C. to establish a memorial with a different name, and, as we understand it, a different design. It has been 19 years since the site was approved for the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial and 11 years since the design was approved. In accordance with the Commemorative Works Act, these previous site and design approvals expired in 2005 along with the fourth extension of the legislation authorizing that memorial. Given that the reservation of the site expired in 2005, and that there is a new sponsor, a new name, and a new proposed design, we believe that authorization to establish the National Liberty Memorial under H.R. 1693 should not be construed as an extension of an expired legislative authority for the Black Revolutionary War Patriots Memorial.

Thus, the Department finds that the National Liberty Memorial is a new proposal and should follow all the provisions of the Commemorative Works Act, including the site selection process. Unlike all memorial proposals that seek authorization by means of a discrete bill to recognize and designate an individual memorial subject matter and sponsor, H.R. 1693 would amend Public Law 99-558 to establish the National Liberty Memorial without complete compliance to the provisions and requirements of the Commemorative Works Act. We are concerned that allowing for what amounts to an extension of selected provisions of processes required under the Commemorative Works Act after they have expired is unfair to memorial sponsors who diligently meet the timeframes of their authorizations and creates an unwelcome precedent for future efforts to establish memorials through what has been an even-handed public process.

We also would like to point out that H.R. 1693 makes no provisions for the disposition of moneys raised in excess of funds needed for the establishment of the memorial or to hold in reserve the amount on hand should the authority to establish the memorial expire before completion.

We reiterate our support of the establishment of a memorial in the Nation's Capital that recognizes and commemorates the contributions of African Americans as they fought for independence, liberty and justice during the Revolutionary War. We look forward to the opportunity to work with the subcommittee to develop language that would provide for such authorization in a manner consistent with the principled processes set forth by existing authorities.

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

**Statement for the Record**  
**By the Bureau of Land Management,**  
**U.S. Department of the Interior**  
**H.R. 3651, Utah National Guard Readiness Act**  
**Before the House Committee on Natural Resources**  
**Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands**  
**March 6, 2008**

Thank you for providing the Department of the Interior the opportunity to present its views on H.R. 3651, the Utah National Guard Readiness Act. The Department supports the conveyance of the lands identified in H.R. 3651 to the State of Utah for homeland security or national defense purposes. However we have concerns with the bill as drafted; in particular we have substantive and technical concerns with the reversionary clause.

**Background**

Camp W. G. Williams is located approximately 25 miles south of Salt Lake City, Utah, in an area of expanding residential development. The 24,000 acre base is a National Guard training site administered by the Utah Army National Guard and includes training facilities for a variety of military purposes. Approximately 18,000 acres of the base are comprised of public land that has been withdrawn to the United States Army as a training facility for the Utah Army National Guard under the provisions of Executive Order 1922 and Title IX of Public Law 101-628, the Arizona Desert Wilderness Act of 1990.

**H.R. 3651**

H.R. 3651 directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Utah at no cost approximately 258 acres of the 18,000 acres currently withdrawn for the purpose of permitting the Utah Army National Guard to use the conveyed land. The legislation includes a reversionary clause to return the land to the ownership of the United States if attempt is made by the State of Utah to sell the land or use the land solely for non-defense purposes. The legislation also provides that it is not a violation for the State to lease the lands to commercial interests if the lease facilitates public-private partnerships that directly support the Utah National Guard defense missions or other public health, safety, or homeland defense purposes.

Within the last few months, the Department completed a complicated resurvey of lands within and adjacent to Camp Williams, which was performed at the request of Camp Williams as part of its concern regarding urban encroachment. The survey discovered errors in two surveys completed in 1856 and 1900. This recently completed “dependent resurvey” has resulted in the addition of 173 acres within the exterior boundary of Camp Williams identified in the original withdrawals covered by the Executive Order and P.L. 101-628. Therefore, the September 20, 2007, map that the BLM prepared for Congressman Bishop, the legislation’s sponsor, and which is referenced by this bill, does not reflect the new survey. We would like the opportunity to work with the sponsor to ascertain which of the lands covered by the new survey are intended to be included within H.R. 3651. We believe this may result in an increase in the acreage proposed for conveyance.

Because the public lands proposed for conveyance are currently withdrawn for the benefit of the United States Army, a portion of the overall withdrawal to the Army would need to be revoked by this legislation in order that the lands may be appropriately conveyed. We defer to the Department of Defense on their position on the partial revocation of the underlying withdrawal.

As we have expressed in prior statements, the Department generally supports a conveyance at no cost if the conveyed land is used for important national security and defense purposes. We would note that these lands are already withdrawn for military uses to the U.S. Army for use by the Utah National Guard. We would like clarification why it is necessary to convey land directly to the State of Utah for use by the National Guard.

We would like to work with the sponsor of the legislation on some substantive and technical considerations regarding the reversionary clause. Specifically, the reversionary clause language is broad and would be difficult for the Department of the Interior to oversee. For example, it is unclear what the definition of “public-private” partnerships means or what types of arrangements would qualify under the reversionary clause. Additionally, the Department would like any reversionary clause to be exercised at the discretion of the Secretary.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.