



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Washington, DC 20240

FEB 26 2016

The Honorable Rob Bishop
Chairman, House Natural Resources Committee
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Bishop:

Enclosed are responses to the Committee's written questions received after the December 9, 2015, hearing on the Animas River spill.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this material to the Committee.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Salotti
Legislative Counsel
Office of Congressional
and Legislative Affairs

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Raúl M. Grijalva
Ranking Member

**Committee on Natural Resources
Oversight Hearing on Animas River Spill
December 9, 2015**

Questions from Chairman Bishop

1. What is the factual or documentary basis for the Bureau of Reclamation's (BOR) assertion that portions of the pipes that the Colorado Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety (DRMS) installed in 2009 were excavated and removed in 2014?

Response: The work performed by DRMS in 2009 is shown in figures 18 and 20 of the BOR Report. The 2014 excavation of a portion of the two pipes, along with part of the concrete flume, is shown in figure 25 of the report. The work accomplished by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2014 was described to the evaluation team and is cited in the BOR report on page 89 (Way 2014b).

2. What is the basis for BOR's assertion that the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) plan was to insert a stinger and use a pump to drain water impounded in the mine (i.e., was this information communicated verbally by an EPA employee/contractor, or was it contained in a specific document that BOR reviewed)? If this information came from a specific document, which document?

Response: The plan was communicated by the EPA and its contractor at a site review meeting attended by the BOR evaluation team and peer reviewers in early September 2015.

3. Did BOR interview all of the individuals on site on August 5, 2015? If not, please explain why BOR did not conduct interviews with each individual who witnessed the blowout?

Response: BOR interviewed individuals from the EPA, its contractors, and DRMS to formulate a good understanding of the site conditions and actions that led to the incident. Some of these individuals were onsite at the time of the blowout, and there was video documentation of the blowout itself. Additional eyewitness interviews of every person present at the time of the blowout would have been redundant to the information already gathered.

4. Were the authors of the BOR report aware that the image shown in Figure 39 was drawn on August 11, 2015 (after the spill)? If so, why did they not include this important information in the report?

Response: The image shown as Figure 39 was cited in EPA's initial internal review of the incident and had been referred to by others during the BOR review. It is not dated, and those interviewed did not identify the date of its preparation. The BOR evaluation team viewed that the most important aspect of the figure was its consistency with the statements provided to the evaluation team from EPA, the contractor, and DRMS that the water impounded in the mine adit was not full to the top of the adit, nor was it under pressure. The assumed water conditions in the adit are clearly described in the Figure 39 image, and clearly presented in the BOR Evaluation Report. When the figure was actually prepared is not important, given that the assumed water conditions were not correct and, as noted in the report, the mine blowout and release occurred due to a combination of misinterpretation of the groundwater conditions, along with an inadequately designed closure of the portal in 2009.

5. Why did BOR omit the affiliation of the BOR peer reviewer on the cover and only list the affiliations of the other two peer reviewers on page 3 (PDF) of the report?

Response: The cover page indicates that the Bureau of Reclamation prepared the report and that it was peer reviewed by two additional organizations. The names and affiliations of each of the evaluation team members and the peer reviewers (both internal and external) are provided on pages 6 and 7 of the report.

6. Was DOI aware that there was no pump and stinger at the Gold King Mine site before it produced its report? If so, why was this not mentioned in the report?

Response: BOR was not specifically aware that there was no pump and stinger at the Gold King Mine site. However, the individuals from EPA, the contractor, and DRMS indicated that the plan was to perform some initial excavation at the portal, and anticipated using a pump and stinger to remove the water from the mine, as had been done at other mines. The pumping was reportedly to have taken place at a later date. The equipment to perform the pumping would be relatively easy to obtain and transport to the site at the time it was needed. The evaluation team

did note the presence of a manifold and small pond nearby the adit portal, indicative of preparations for planned pumping.

7. Did BOR receive maps or photographs from DRMS or EPA showing or depicting the DRMS work done at the Gold King Mine in 2009, other than what is cited in the Technical Review?

Response: DRMS made available electronic project files from which the evaluation team selected information, including maps and photographs deemed pertinent to the technical review, for inclusion in the report.

Questions from Rep. Newhouse

1. Do you think having a Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) employee—who is a subordinate of the BOR evaluation team members— peer review his bosses' report makes for a very robust peer review process?

Response: The Technical Service Center (TSC), like many large engineering firms, functions as a matrix organization where work products are produced by an ad hoc assembly of team members. The team members providing the work product are chosen based on their technical background, and may sometimes, but not always, include managers. Likewise, a peer reviewer is selected because of his or her knowledge of and experience with the technical practices involved in the development of the work product. In the case of the Gold King Review, the peer reviewer's manager was not part of the BOR evaluation team.



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Washington, DC 20240

FEB 12 2016

The Hon. Doug Lamborn
Chairman
Committee on Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Enclosed are responses prepared by the Department to the questions for the record submitted following the December 8, 2015, hearing on "*Ensuring Certainty for Royalty Payments on Federal Resource Production.*"

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this material to the Committee.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Salotti
Legislative Counsel
Office of Congressional and
Legislative Affairs

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Alan Lowenthal, Ranking Member
Committee on Natural Resources,
Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources

**Committee on Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources
1324 Longworth House Office Building
Tuesday, December 08, 2015
10:00 AM**

Oversight hearing on:

"Ensuring Certainty for Royalty Payments on Federal Resource Production"

Questions from Chairman Lamborn for Gregory Gould, Director, Office of Natural Resources Revenue

- 1) **Please provide a list of all upcoming plants the Office of Natural Resources Revenue will unbundle.**

Response: Over 200 plants process natural gas from Federal and Indian leases. Out of those 200, ONRR has designated 26 plants as "high priority" because collectively they process more than 80% of Federal and Indian gas volumes. As of January 2016, ONRR has "unbundled" 15 of the 26 high priority plants. A listing of these plants and their associated Unbundling Cost Allocations (UCAs) are available on ONRR's website at <http://www.onrr.gov/unbundling>. For the remainder of Fiscal Year 2016, ONRR plans to obtain data and unbundle a number of additional high priority processing plants including Eunice, Toca, and Venice Gas Plants, which are all located in Louisiana and primarily process offshore natural gas.

- 2) **"Dear Reporter" letters are considered non-binding documents for the agency that serve as "guidance for determining appropriate transportation and processing allowances." That said, the Office of Natural Resources Revenue "may use the factors provided under [Dear Reporter letters] in conducting audits and as a basis for demanding additional royalties." In the case of unbundling, the predecessor to the Office suggested bundled costs may be deductible in certain instances through a Dear Report letter. How is a producer to ascertain when it is appropriate to follow the guidance issued by a Dear Reporter letter; and if the Office reneges on its prior position, what can a producer do to protect itself against the Office's change in position?**

Response: ONRR and other Federal agencies provide guidance documents, such as Dear Reporter letters, as a way to interpret existing law or clarify how to tentatively treat or enforce a governing legal norm. Dear Reporter letters allow ONRR to respond quickly to court decisions that affect current regulations. This is most often an interim step between the court decision and a future rulemaking. Dear Reporter letters give industry notice of ONRR's expectations and ensure equal treatment of similarly situated parties. If a company disagrees with and chooses not to follow the

guidance in a Dear Reporter letter, they may be subject to findings during our audit and compliance review process. If ONRR issues a company an Order to Pay to address audit findings, the company has the opportunity to appeal ONRR's interpretation of that fact-specific case to the Director, the Interior Board of Land Appeals, and District Court.

- 3) **The proposed rule predicts industry-wide compliance to cost \$80 million – nearly all of which will result in greater royalty payments to the federal government. However, this rule does not assess the potential cost of accounting changes that will need to be made for the reclassification of Percentage-of-Proceeds contracts, nor does it examine the cost of the default provision. The Council of Petroleum Accountants Societies, in its comments, argues that the unanalyzed costs to the government will end up exceeding \$100 million. This means the proposed rule is a significant regulatory action that would require further analysis. Has the Office of Natural Resources Revenue performed the requisite level of analysis required for a significant regulatory action – and if not, do you plan on doing so, or will you consider stripping these costly provisions from the final rule?**

Response: ONRR did analyze and consider the costs associated with both the default provision and the reclassification of Percentage-of-Proceeds in the "Summary and Cost and Royalty Impact" data section of the January 6, 2015, Proposed Rule.

The default provision does not alter the underlying principles of the previous regulations. The mineral statutes and lease terms give the Secretary the authority and considerable discretion to establish the reasonable value of production by using a variety of discretionary factors and any other information that the Secretary determines is relevant. The default provision simply codifies the Secretary's authority to determine the value of production for royalty purposes and specifically enumerates when, where, and how the Secretary can exercise that discretion. ONRR anticipates using the default provision only in very specific cases where we cannot determine proper royalty values through standard procedures. In its analysis, ONRR provided that assigning a royalty impact figure to the default provision would be speculative because (1) each instance would be case-specific, (2) we cannot anticipate when we would use the option, and (3) we cannot anticipate the value we would require companies to pay. Moreover, the royalty impact will be relatively small because the default provision will always establish a reasonable value of production using market-based transaction data, which has always been the basis of royalty valuation.

The proposed reporting change for arm's-length Percentage of Proceeds contracts will similarly not require significant system changes by ONRR or industry for two reasons. First, because recent court decisions (*Citation Oil and Gas Corporation, IBLA 2005-245 (Mar. 31, 2008), aff'd Citation Oil and Gas Corp. v. Dept. of the Interior, No. H-8-1977 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 13, 2010), aff'd No. 10-20729, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 21448*

(5th Cir. Oct. 21, 2011)) require that industry unbundle the costs of transportation and processing under these contracts, industry will necessarily already have all the information they need to change from reporting unprocessed gas to processed gas with allowances. Secondly, under the existing regulations, companies with this type of contract are required to compare and pay the higher of either their gross proceeds (what they are paid plus non-allowable deductions added back) or 100 percent of the value of their residue gas. Under the proposed methodology, companies will no longer have to make this comparison, which will save administrative costs.

- 4) Many in industry tasked with unbundling, and indeed Judith Matlock at the hearing, described unbundling as a complicated and costly process. Going forward, how will the Office ensure unbundling is an easier and fair process for producers?**

Response: In addition to hosting numerous unbundling outreach and training sessions, ONRR has taken a number of steps to simplify the unbundling process for producers. Specifically, ONRR has reduced the burden on producers by publishing Unbundling Cost Allocations (UCA) for specific transportation systems and gas plants that companies are encouraged to use to calculate transportation and processing allowances. In addition, ONRR has published examples of how to use the published UCAs and how to calculate UCAs for other transportation systems and gas plants, including detailed examples of engineering and accounting/cost data requirements. Going forward, ONRR will continue to expand these efforts, as well as, our collaborative work with producers to timely evaluate and approve the unbundling methods they submit to ONRR.

- 5) The Office of Natural Resources Revenue is alleged to be seeking to unbundle oil processing costs as well. Please provide justification for such an action, and provide a timeline as to when industry can expect to be burdened with this, and how far in the past industry would be required to comply with this new interpretation.**

Response: ONRR is not seeking to unbundle oil processing costs because oil processing is not a function performed to market or sell oil that is produced. For the purposes of ONRR's valuation regulations and unbundling efforts only natural gas is processed.



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Washington, DC 20240

FEB 26 2016

The Honorable Lisa Murkowski
Chairman
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Murkowski:

Enclosed are responses to follow-up questions from the legislative hearing on December 8, 2015, on S. 2257, a bill to prepare the National Park Service for its Centennial in 2016 and for a second century of protecting our national parks' natural, historic, and cultural resources for present and future generations and for other purposes. These responses were prepared by the National Park Service.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this material to the Committee.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Salotti
Legislative Counsel
Office of Congressional
and Legislative Affairs

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Maria Cantwell
Ranking Member

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Questions from Chairman Lisa Murkowski

Question 1: Can the National Park Service currently transfer appropriated funds, fees, or donations to the National Park Foundation to be used to match private dollars or to be placed in an interest-bearing fund, such as an endowment? If the NPS does not have the authority, do you think Congress should consider granting authority to the NPS to transfer donations, and possibly appropriated funds or fees, to the National Park Foundation to be used as matching funds or to be placed in an endowment?

Answer: No, there is no authority for the NPS to transfer appropriated funds, fees, or donations to the Foundation to place in an interest-bearing account, such as an endowment.

Also, the NPS does not believe having the authority to make direct transfers from existing funds to the Foundation to be used as matching funds or to be placed in an endowment would provide a better way to leverage private funding for park purposes. Such authority would not generate new funds for immediate use and, to the extent the authority was used, it would reduce the amount of donations, appropriated funds and fee revenue the NPS relies on to address critical needs.

Question 2: When considering deferred maintenance on all non-transportation assets, what percentage of the maintenance backlog comes from concessioner-operated buildings and facilities?

Answer: At the end of FY 2014, there were 65,047 non-transportation assets with a total documented deferred maintenance backlog of \$5,860,326,878. Of these, 4,668 were concession-occupied with a total documented deferred maintenance of \$326,466,469 which was 5.57% of the above documented non-transportation deferred maintenance total.

Question 3: What is the total leasehold surrender interest (LSI) and possessory interest (PI) associated with concessions contracts in the National Park Service? Please also include a list of the 10 park units with the highest LSI or PI and how much LSI or PI each of those park units has.

Answer: There are a total of 42 contracts with a total estimated PI/LSI of \$466.4 million. Of that total:

- There are 29 LSI contracts with a total estimate of \$276.4 million.
- There are 13 PI contracts with a total estimate of \$190 million.

**U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis**

The 10 parks with the highest LSI or PI are listed below. Note that the PI or LSI values are estimates only. Technically, we consider the numbers proprietary and they are not normally released to the public.

Rank	Park	Park Name	Contracts with PI and/or LSI	Estimated PI or LSI Value
1	GLCA	Glen Canyon National Recreation Area	3	\$104,889,163
2	GRCA	Grand Canyon National Park	2	\$98,710,222
3	LAKE	Lake Mead National Recreation Area	7	\$60,628,000
4	GRTE	Grand Teton National Park	3	\$58,143,697
5	NAMA	National Mall and Memorial Parks	2	\$26,183,053
6	GLAC	Glacier National Park	1	\$22,000,000
7	YELL	Yellowstone National Park	2	\$21,503,541
8	SEKI	Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks	2	\$12,962,341
9	OLYM	Olympic National Park	3	\$10,756,931
10	CRLA	Crater Lake National Park	1	\$6,271,838

Question 4: What percentage of hotels and other lodging accommodations located inside of a national park unit charge local or state taxes on lodging?

Answer: Forty-eight out of 51, or 94%, of lodging accommodations located inside of national park units charge local or state taxes.

Questions from Senator John Barrasso

Question 1: One of the primary concerns I have for future management of the National Park Service is the significant deferred maintenance backlog the agency has accrued. This \$11.5 billion backlog, coupled with increased visitor traffic and a concessionaire system that may dissuade long-term private investment poses a significant threat to the longevity of our cherished public spaces. In Olympic National Park in Washington, the deferred maintenance backlog has grown to \$133 million. An article last week reported that in the case of Grand Canyon National Park, the maintenance backlog has increased to \$339 million. In Wyoming, Yellowstone National Park faces a backlog of over \$633 million. Failure to decrease the maintenance backlog undoubtedly jeopardizes the ability of families to be able to visit and enjoy these iconic locations. Ultimately, this total is a threat to the future of the National Park System. Given the current budget climate and national deficit, what is the most effective way to reduce the maintenance backlog to ensure people will be able to enjoy these special places for another 100 years?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Answer: The NPS is taking a number of steps to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog. However, reduction of the deferred maintenance backlog will not be solved without significant additional federal investment. The NPS has recently issued a new policy requiring that 55% of recreational fees collected be spent on deferred maintenance projects, targeting highest priority assets. A number of NPS partners have recently made donations for historic structure restoration and trail rebuilding, reducing deferred maintenance on these critical facilities. We are also working to expand our leasing program by transferring the responsibility for routine and deferred maintenance to lessees for facilities that are not needed for park operations. We are also engaging youth to accomplish deferred maintenance work while learning skills and developing an understanding of history and nature. However, these alternative approaches will only be able to address a relatively small portion of the deferred maintenance problem, and will not substantially reduce the backlog. Significant federal investment in park roads, bridges, utility systems and visitor facilities will be required to repair our park facilities.

To focus the limited resources available toward our most important assets, the NPS developed and implemented the Capital Investment Strategy (CIS) for Line Item Construction, Repair/Rehabilitation, and Recreation-Fee-funded Facility Maintenance projects. The CIS evaluates four elements of a project: Financial Sustainability, Visitor Use, Resource Protection, and Health and Safety and creates a numeric project ranking pool of high-priority projects.

Question 2: When the National Park Service acquires or considers acquiring a new park unit, are the condition of the deferred maintenance backlog at the time of the acquisition and the expected future management costs of the potential unit considered as significant factors in the decision?

Answer: The NPS only acquires property for a new park unit after the unit has been designated by Congress or by the President through use of the Antiquities Act. If the NPS conducts a Special Resource Study (SRS) prior to Congressional designation of a new park unit, which it has done for most of the recently designated new units, the NPS will have information about impacts to deferred maintenance (existing and forecasted facility conditions). In a SRS, the NPS evaluates a potential new unit against 4 criteria: national significance, suitability, feasibility and the need for NPS management. The feasibility analysis looks at the costs to manage the new unit, including the investment required to restore facilities in the new unit to good condition, as well as the ongoing maintenance costs of the facilities that would be acquired. In recent SRSs, the NPS has utilized a Total Cost of Facility Ownership (TCFO) analysis, estimating life cycle costs of physical assets, including all activities that occur over its lifetime and the organizational resources and capacity required to perform those activities.

Question 3: Title II of S. 2257 creates the National Park Centennial Challenge Fund (NPCCF) in the Treasury, which creates an account specifically for the National Park Service. An additional provision in Title IV creates the Public Lands Centennial Fund,

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

which includes an additional \$100 million in mandatory appropriations over three years for the BLM, Forest Service, and other agencies. The National Park Service seems to be able to seek monies from both of these funds. Why is the National Park Service included as a potential financial recipient of the Public Lands Centennial Fund when the bill creates the fund (NPCCF) dedicated solely to the Park Service?

Answer: While the National Park Centennial Challenge Fund would be solely dedicated to the needs of the National Park Service, the scope and breadth of NPS lands, responsibilities, and needs, including the deferred maintenance backlog, are such that any available additional funds are welcome in addressing them. Allowing the NPS to compete for funds within the Public Lands Centennial Fund would provide flexibility to target funds to the highest priority needs both within all public land management agencies, including the NPS.

Questions from Senator Debbie Stabenow

Question 1: According to your statement, the 292 million people that visited National Parks in 2014 were record highs. The five parks in the State of Michigan attracted nearly 2 million visitors, which generated \$173 million in economic activity and supported nearly 3,000 local jobs. With the Centennial of the National Park Service in 2016, the expected increase in visitation will only place additional strains on the Service's already tight budget.

I understand that enacting the National Park Service Centennial Act would help to supplement, not supplant, current funding. I am particularly interested in the provisions in the bill that would formally establish the Centennial Challenge Fund and dedicate \$100 million for it in each of the next three years. In 2015, this program helped support youth crews that worked to preserve and provide maintenance of cultural landscapes and historic activities at Keweenaw National Historical Park and refurbish a historic log cabin at Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore.

Can you describe the interest from foundations, private businesses, and others to provide funds to match the proposed federal investment of \$100 million a year?

Answer: Throughout 2015, the National Park Service and the National Park Foundation tested new funding models to supplement federal discretionary appropriations and prepare the national parks for the next 100 years. Through this process, we developed a better understanding of the types of projects that are most attractive to foundations, non-profit organizations, individuals, and corporate partners. We saw first-hand how providing incentives to donors can be critical in attracting both small and large gifts. Matching a federal investment provides donors with a level of certainty they need to make a gift and motivates giving as donors can see the larger impact their gift can make.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

For FY 2015, Congress appropriated \$10 million for the Centennial Challenge Fund. In less than 6 months, the National Park Service was able to generate \$15.9 million in commitments from more than 90 organizations to leverage the federal funds. These projects ranged from \$5.2 million to rehabilitate and restore the Mariposa Grove of giant sequoias at Yosemite National Park in partnership with the Yosemite Conservancy, to under \$10,000 to raise the sunken walks at the Raspberry Island Light Station of Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in partnership with the National Parks of Lake Superior Foundation.

The proposal to create a Centennial Challenge Fund was promoted by former Secretary of the Interior Dirk Kempthorne in 2008. Although the fund was not enacted, his proposal for a \$100 million fund generated 210 project and program proposals and commitments of \$215 million in non-federal support.

The Centennial Challenge Fund is also an important tool for engaging more and diverse individuals and organizations in park philanthropy. For many of our smaller philanthropic partners, a federal match presents the opportunity to accomplish important park projects that would otherwise be beyond their reach. Successfully completing these larger projects demonstrates to other potential donors a partner's ability to tackle even larger and more impactful work. For our larger partners, a federal match allows them to work with a park to complete increasingly ambitious and challenging projects.

Question 2: As you are well aware, funding offsets are hard to find in this difficult budgetary environment. The National Park Service Centennial Act provides two offsets from increased user fees in a fund called the National Park Service Second Century Fund. How much would these offsets raise, and what amount is actually necessary to address operations and construction shortfalls in our parks? I understand the parks in Michigan have a backlog totaling nearly \$50 million.

Answer: The NPS estimates the two offsets included in the Centennial Act would raise an additional \$40 million per year depending on how the charge is calculated and occupancy rates in a particular year; these funds would be leveraged with matching private donations of funds, goods or services for a total combined benefit to the NPS of at least \$75.2 million annually. These funds, combined with the other mandatory proposals, would help to ensure the NPS entered its second century of operations with the capacity to continue engaging a growing number of visitors and to protect the incredible natural and priceless cultural resources entrusted to its care. This includes addressing the deferred maintenance backlog, which stood at \$11.5 billion as of the end of FY14. Of this backlog, \$2.2 billion represents deferred maintenance on the highest priority, non-transportation assets of the NPS.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Questions from Senator Jeff Flake

Question 1: I understand that at Grand Canyon National Park there is a program allowing certain vendor partners to sell park entrance passes as well as a contract for a third-party vendor to sell passes through automated fee collection machines.

- a. What other similar arrangements to sell park entrance passes exist at other parks?

Answer: The NPS generally sells park entrance passes at entrance gates, visitor centers or other visitor contact stations within a park, automated fee collection machines and/or through third-party vendors such as local gateway community businesses. Some parks sell park entrance passes on-line as well. Interagency annual passes are available at staffed federal public lands sites, Recreation.gov, the USGS website, or third-party vendors such as REI and AAA.

- b. What authorities does the NPS use to allow third-party sales of park passes?

Answer: Third-party agreements may be entered into under the authority of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act of 2004, 16 USC 6801-6814 *et seq.*, as well as the following National Park Service and departmental authorities supporting promotion and protection of public lands: Management Policies 2006; Director's Order #20: Agreements; Director's Order #22: Recreation Fees; Reference Manual 22A: Recreation Fees, Chapter 11 Fee Collection Methods, Section 11.4 Fee Collection and Pass Sales by Third Parties; The "America the Beautiful-the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass" Interagency Standard Operating Procedures.

- c. What guidance does the NPS use to establish the amount that the third-party vendor earns for the sale of a park pass?

Answer: Parks may sell entrance passes and pre-printed entrance receipts to third parties at a 10% discount. For example, a park may sell an \$80 Interagency Annual Pass to an authorized third-party for \$72, a \$30 park-specific annual pass for \$27 or a \$25 entrance receipt for \$22.50.

- d. Service-wide how many of the park entrance pass sales are made through a third-party vendor each year?

Answer: The NPS has third-party agreements to sell interagency annual passes with 35 national vendors, including companies like AAA, REI, and Trailfinders Limited. In 2015, these vendors sold 20,015 Interagency Annual Passes that brought in \$1,461,132 in revenue. The NPS cannot provide the number of park-specific entry passes sold service-wide through local third-party vendors since those arrangements are overseen locally at the park level.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Question 2: The Park Service is evaluating potential solutions to the water pipeline challenges at the Grand Canyon National Park by developing a water-delivery study. In response to a question following the February 24 hearing on the Department of the Interior's FY16 budget request, Secretary Jewell indicated that the NPS intended to begin the NEPA process for the Grand Canyon National Park this summer and that Grand Canyon National Park was a member of two collaborative workgroups considering regional water-supply solutions. A recent E&E story ("Park's Crumbling Water System Tests Cash-Strapped NPS", Greenwire, December 2, 2015) highlighted regional solutions including a Lake Powell pipeline and a refurbishment of the Black Mesa coal slurry pipeline. Please provide an update on the Grand Canyon National Park's water supply solutions including the NPS's involvement with the various regional pipeline proposals.

Answer: The NPS is currently conducting multiple engineering and hydrologic studies to establish baseline information about the water supply at Grand Canyon National Park that will inform the planning process.

The NPS plans to initiate the NEPA process with public scoping in the spring of 2016. Despite delaying initial public scoping, the NPS still expects to have a recommendation for a preferred alternative by late 2016 as originally planned. The preferred alternative will include information needed to proceed with project development and cost estimates.

The park continues to participate as a member of the Coconino Plateau Water Advisory Counsel and Watershed Partnership as well as the group's technical advisory committee. These are regional, collaborative workgroups that include representatives from the county, city, state, tribal governments, and federal agencies working to address regional water issues. These groups have considered various options for providing water to the park and surrounding communities. However, replacement of Grand Canyon's water distribution system is needed immediately and, to our knowledge, a viable method for providing water on a regional basis has not been identified at this time. The NPS will continue to evaluate all options to ensure the park maintains an appropriate water supply.

Question 3: The Grand Canyon Bison Management Plan was described by Associate Director Knox as "a high priority planning project" on which the NPS "is diligently working with [our] partners" (June 10th hearing by Subcommittee on National Parks). Following the March 12th hearing on the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2015 you sent Chairman Murkowski a letter stating that Grand Canyon National Park expected to have a draft EIS for the Bison Management plan "out for public review and comment this fall." Please provide an update on the status of the EIS and the Service's collaboration with the Arizona Game and Fish Department.

Answer: The NPS is in the process of working with our partners - the Arizona Game and Fish Department, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management - to focus the scope of the NEPA review on the immediate need for herd reduction and

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

protection of other sensitive park resources. The NPS expects to complete the NEPA review in 2016 and to begin implementation shortly after. We will continue to provide opportunities for public participation and expect to re-engage the public in early spring 2016. The park continues to monitor the effects of bison on other park resources and will use these results in the planning effort.

Question 4: As you know I have expressed opposition to any unilateral executive action to designate more national monuments in Arizona. Is the Department working with the President to prepare a monument designation for the Grand Canyon watershed?

Answer: The Department has no current plans to propose a designation of monuments in Arizona under the authority of the Antiquities Act. Moreover, the Department engages in robust consultation with national, state, local, and tribal stakeholders prior to the designation of any monument, in keeping with the President's commitment.

Questions from Senator Joe Manchin III

Question 1: Constituents in my state have raised concerns over the ban on sales of bottled water within national parks. Is the NPS looking for more ways to increase the availability of clean and safe drinking water for all visitors?

Answer: The NPS provides clean and safe drinking water for its visitors as a matter of routine in virtually all of our developed parks and is exploring options to provide greater access to water for visitors through the installation of more water bottle filling stations.

Question 2: Is the NPS tracking whether the bottled water sales ban is reducing waste significantly?

Answer: The National Park Service is exploring ways to quantify the waste stream reduction impacts that have resulted from the 2011 disposable water bottle reduction and recycling policy and plans to evaluate the cost and resources required to track this waste reduction. A major challenge in capturing the data is that, typically, disposable plastic water bottles placed in recycling bins at the parks are comingled with other recyclable containers such as bottles and cans, making it labor intensive and difficult to measure reductions in visitor-generated plastic containers. Additionally, there is currently no mechanism for monitoring the number of plastic water bottles placed into trash receptacles and not recycled.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Questions from Senator Bill Cassidy

Question 1: When we spoke a few months ago, you were candid about the realities of trying to authorize \$1.5 billion of mandatory spending without any offsets. I asked if the Park Service had a backup plan in the absence of mandatory funding. We didn't have an opportunity to discuss that plan at the time at length.

- a. What is the Park Service's funding plan in the absence of the mandatory spending requests being fulfilled?

Answer: The NPS is making every effort to leverage its federal funding to accomplish its Centennial goals. In 2015, for the first time since 2008, parks were authorized to increase their recreation fees, following extensive public engagement efforts to ensure that fee increases satisfied both parks and visitors. The NPS estimates these fee increases, when fully implemented over the next several years, could raise an additional \$45 million annually. Recreation fee revenue is used exclusively for visitor services improvements, and the NPS intends to use the increased revenue to defray the growing deferred maintenance backlog. The NPS is also growing its partner relationships, both corporate and local. Beginning in 2014, the National Park Foundation embarked on the quiet phase of a multi-million capital campaign; the public campaign will be released in 2016. The NPS will also more than double the federal funds provided in FY 2015 and FY 2016 for the Centennial Challenge program with non-federal partner donations to accomplish signature projects and programs at national parks. Finally, the Centennial legislation includes new proposals to increase funding streams, including establishing a National Park Service Second Century Fund, which would be supported by increasing the cost of a lifetime senior pass and charging a modest fee for lodging or camping within a unit of the national park system.

Question 2: In the next year and in future years, how will the Park Service balance the Public's right to access with the need for Park preservation and protection?

Answer: So long as the National Park Service Organic Act of 1916 remains the fundamental law governing the management of park resources, the NPS will be required to conserve the special places under our stewardship in a manner and leave them unimpaired for future generations. In providing for their enjoyment, the NPS will need to continue to place a higher priority on protection of park resources.

That said, the NPS strives to be as welcoming to visitors as possible and to maximize public access to parks. We do this in multiple ways: by partnering with businesses and organizations that provide necessary services to visitors; by providing a variety of opportunities for visitors to learn about and gain a greater appreciation for park resources; and by attracting the public to the parks. The primary focus of our efforts around the NPS Centennial is getting the word out to all Americans that national parks are theirs to

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

experience and enjoy. We are doing that through the "Find Your Park" campaign, the "Every Kid in a Park" initiative, and a multitude of other efforts that the NPS and our partners are engaged in. We hope that long after the Centennial is over, these efforts will continue.

We anticipate that in the future, as in the past, there will be situations where access and resource protection come into conflict. Protecting resources will continue to be of paramount importance, but when such cases arise, we will strive to give full consideration to all points of view and to resolve the conflict in a practical and fair manner that is well understood by the public.

Question 3: According to the February Department of Interior Inspector General's Report on the Park Service's fee structure, in 2012, 500,446 Senior Passes were issued. This legislation proposes to raise the Senior Pass from \$10 to \$80 and use that difference to establish a Second Century Fund. Raising the fee would yield the Park Service more than \$35 million using the 2012 numbers.

- a. How many Senior Passes were issued by the Park Service in 2013 and 2014?

Answer: The NPS issued 515,238 Senior Passes in 2013 and 508,648 in 2014.

Question 4: Mr. Shafroth stated in his testimony that "adding cellular service and mobile phone applications to enhance the experience of park visitors tend to be the types of projects that generate non-federal partner interest in making donations or sponsorship investments". The Pope's recent visit to DC highlighted the need for enhancements in our telecommunications system along the National Mall and the potential for the kind of partnerships you discuss.

People waited for hours on the Pope's arrival and despite best efforts by the wireless carriers through installation of temporary antennas, or "Cell on Wheels", to boost capacity, the National Mall and the Capitol grounds were effectively a "dead zone" when it came to wireless coverage. The lack of cell coverage is more than merely an inconvenience as most Americans now rely on cell connectivity to communicate, download information and learn about their surroundings. This disruption in service during large scale events (Presidential Inaugurations, 4th of July's, Pope's visit, etc.) could be disastrous in an emergency. The National Mall is not a remote location. The expectation in America's Front Yard is that the experience is able to be shared via connected wireless devices.

- a. With the investment of millions of dollars in the National Mall, what is the National Park Service's plan to bring permanent cell connectivity to the Mall?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Answer: The NPS issued a Request For Information (RFI) in 2014 so that it might better understand the potential benefit of deploying a Distributed Antenna System (DAS) and the likely impact of its installation on the treasured landscape of the National Mall. The NPS is reviewing the multiple responses to the RFI, and it is evident that installation of a DAS will require an exacting design effort, substantial environmental and historic preservation compliance, and approvals from the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Planning Commission.

In concert with the technical review of RFI submissions, the NPS is working to address several critical issues for the installation of a DAS, including determination of the appropriate method of authorization (lease, concession, permit, or commercial use authorization), and coordination with Mall “neighbors” (the Smithsonian Institution and the Architect of the Capitol). A survey of potential equipment locations on the Mall has been undertaken to assist in the identification of feasible locations for equipment installation. The NPS is also exploring cooperation with the District of Columbia Government to leverage the District’s existing and substantial fiber optic infrastructure.

- b. How does NPS plan to solve the problem in advance of the 2017 Presidential Inauguration?

Answer: The NPS recognizes the complications with cellular service that arose during the 2009 Presidential Inauguration. In an effort to avoid lapses in service for park visitors, the NPS took additional steps during the 2013 Inauguration as well as during the Pope’s visit in 2015 to ensure adequate cellular service coverage. The NPS will continue to use strategic placement of COWs (Cell on Wheels) as an interim strategy that can be used to serve park visitors until a comprehensive Distributed Antenna System (DAS) can be permanently installed.

In addition, the NPS is working with multiple partners to provide free Wi-Fi service at several locations on the Mall, including the World War II Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, and the Washington Monument. The Wi-Fi systems provide less expansive coverage and less bandwidth than a DAS system but they require less substantial infrastructure and installation is virtually invisible. The first of these systems should be functioning within a few months.

Question 5: In 2011 the National Park Service adopted a policy allowing national park units to ban the sale of bottled water in plastic containers. This policy contradicts the Administration’s ambitious healthy foods initiative as well as the First Lady’s efforts to encourage people to drink more water, including bottled and tap.

You acknowledged that banning the sale of water bottles “runs counter to our healthy food initiative as it eliminates the healthiest choice for bottled drinks, leaving sugary

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

drinks as the alternative. You also said that a ban could pose challenges for diabetics and others with health issues who come to a park...”

The Park Service also admitted that parks that have bans in place do not report separately on their recycling quantities based on type of material, and therefore “do not have the data available to conduct any post-ban analysis.” So it appears they are not tracking whether the bottled water sales ban is reducing waste or benefits visitors.

- a. Recognizing that there could be adverse health consequences from such a policy, why did the Park Service specifically elect to single out bottled water in adopting this policy?

Answer: The NPS disposable water bottle recycling and reduction policy seeks to counter any potential water-need problems associated with the elimination of sales of bottled water by eliminating sales only in park locations where sources of public drinking water are available and refillable water bottles are available for purchase.

- b. The overwhelming majority of the Parks that have enacted this ban all are located in parts of the country with notoriously dry climates. I understand that visitors are free to bring their own water bottles and can likely refill it in different areas of the parks, but not everyone may do so.
 - i. Has the Park Service had any incidents of visitors suffering from dehydration, heat exhaustion or needing some type of emergency medical care at these parks since the Park Service adopted this policy?

Answer: No, the NPS has not observed an increased incidence of heat-related illness that may be associated with disposable water bottle access at parks that have adopted this policy. We will continue to educate our public about the risks of heat exhaustion and dehydration and encourage them to remain well-hydrated while enjoying our parks.

Questions from Senator Rob Portman

Question 1: It is my understanding that the NPS currently charges seniors \$10 for a lifetime pass. How long has this been the price, and on average, how many senior passes does NPS sell a year?

Answer: The original Senior Pass - the Golden Age Passport - was first established as a free annual pass in 1972. In 1974, it became a free lifetime pass. In 1994, a \$10 fee was established for the lifetime pass. The NPS issued 508,648 senior passes in 2014. In recent years the average has been around 500,000.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Question 2: Have you vetted an increase with senior groups like AARP? If so, what has been the response?

Answer: Based on informal discussions, the AARP and various other senior groups are supportive of an increase.

Question 3: With regards to the lodging fee: As you heard from Mr. Crandall, the National Park Hospitality Association is opposed to the new lodging fee. Mr. Crandall argues that the fee would: be borne by a small portion of all park visitors; be a deterrent to efforts to attract visitors during off-seasons; have a negative impact on guest donation programs; and, be an administrative burden on concessioners. What are your opinions regarding his concerns?

Answer: Mr. Crandall is correct that the lodging fee would be borne by those visitors who choose to stay at NPS lodging facilities and not all visitors. However, these overnight stay visitors are more likely to spend more time in the park and use more facilities and infrastructure such as roads and utilities than day-use visitors and therefore we believe a modest fee to help address the Service's need for additional funding is reasonable. The fee is within the range of similar "resort" fees seen in many private sector resorts. Lodgings in parks traditionally experience higher than comparable occupancy rates even in shoulder seasons and therefore it is not anticipated that the additional lodging fee would be a significant deterrent to park visitation. In addition, we do not anticipate that the lodging surcharge would be administratively complicated as it would be consistently applied through the concessioner lodging systems in the same way that other fees such as state and local taxes are applied.

Question 4: What is your opinion of the National Park Hospitality Association's alternative, a \$1 Centennial surcharge on all entrance fees?

Answer: Entrance fees are set through a process of public engagement, so the addition of a \$1 Centennial surcharge on entrance fees without public involvement, would be inconsistent with NPS practices. The NPS has recently raised fees in many of its locations through this public process, and adding a surcharge to the entrance fee may cause confusion for visitors.

Question 5: The Administration Centennial proposal includes \$1.5 billion in new spending, but was only able to identify less than \$50 million in offsets. Were you able to identify any other potential offsets that were not included in the proposal?

Answer: The proposal is part of the President's Budget for FY 2017, which includes potential offsets that are not specific to the proposal.

Question 6: In addition to being an incredible place to visit and spend time outdoors, the Cuyahoga Valley National Park (CVNP) has gone to great lengths to establish a model

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

education program. The program has grown to become a core part of school curriculum in North East Ohio. The park serves over 3,500 children in week long residential programs and 8,000 in field trips and day camps. This has helped the park reach out to underserved communities and develop innovative programs to work with urban neighborhoods in Cleveland and Akron. Much of this work is funded via philanthropic support. How would the Administration's Centennial proposal support parks like CVNP in their efforts to provide urban outreach and education?

Answer: The National Park Service enabling legislation specifies preserving resources and providing for public enjoyment as the bureau's mission. It does not specifically refer to the role of education as an important component of carrying out the mission. However, interpretation and education are critical to the long-term preservation and enjoyment of park resources. Through interpretation, education, and service, people form deep personal connections to these special places, and become stewards of the parks. As the keeper of our nation's historic places and critical ecosystems, the NPS is an important educational resource, promoting historical and scientific literacy and civic engagement skills. The Centennial legislation would clarify that interpretation and education are key functions of the National Park Service. This will ensure that park education programs like the one at Cuyahoga Valley National Park continue to receive management support into the future.

Question 7: CVNP has grown its volunteer program, co-managed by the park and the Conservancy, to 5,900 volunteers and over 200,000 hours annually. Their volunteers include youth, families, corporations and individuals from diverse backgrounds. Would the Administration's Centennial proposal address policies to support philanthropy and the CVNP's mission to attract new volunteers?

Answer: The legislation proposed by the Administration, S. 2257, would expand the Centennial Challenge, which would be an important incentive for private philanthropy at all levels. It would allow smaller philanthropic partners to demonstrate a greater impact and more established partners to take on increasingly ambitious projects.

Also, the proposed legislation would create the Second Century Endowment that would provide a long-term funding source for important park projects and allow the National Park Service, National Park Foundation, and local partners to more successfully engage in longer-term projects or multi-year relationships with donors.

Finally, the proposed legislation contains language that would eliminate the spending cap on the NPS Volunteer Program, which is currently set at \$7 million. The Volunteer Program is core to the NPS mission. Volunteering is one of the best ways to form deep lasting bonds between people and their national parks. It is also critical for operating parks. In FY 2015 there were over 400,000 NPS volunteers leveraging a value of more than \$180 million. However, volunteers require management including, recruiting, security vetting, supervision, and recognition. Removing the spending cap on the NPS

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Volunteer Program would allow parks like Cuyahoga Valley to continue to grow their volunteer program, engaging more people in meaningful service experiences and getting more work done to preserve and protect the parks' natural and cultural resources.

Question 8: The Park Service is billions behind on projects needed just to maintain existing national parks. What kinds of plans does the Park Service have to address this shortfall?

Answer: The NPS is taking a number of steps to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog. Recently, the NPS issued a new policy requiring that 55% of recreational fees collected be spent on deferred maintenance projects, targeting highest priority asset. A number of NPS partners have recently made donations for historic structure restoration and trail rebuilding, reducing deferred maintenance on these critical facilities. We are also working to expand our leasing program by transferring the responsibility for routine and deferred maintenance to lessees for facilities that are unneeded for park operations. We are also engaging youth to accomplish deferred maintenance work while learning skills and developing an understanding of history and nature.

To focus the limited resources available toward our most important assets, the NPS developed and implemented the Capital Investment Strategy (CIS) for Line Item Construction, Repair/Rehabilitation, and Recreation Fee funded Facility Maintenance projects. The (CIS) evaluates four elements of a project: Financial Sustainability, Visitor Use, Resource Protection and Health and Safety and creates a numeric project ranking pool of high priority projects.

However, as helpful and useful as all of these approaches are to reducing the deferred maintenance backlog problem, the problem will not be solved without significant additional federal investment in park roads, bridges, utility systems, and visitor facilities.

Question 9: What are the largest maintenance projects on this list?

Please see the attached spreadsheet with examples of NPS's largest non-transportation projects. Included in the spreadsheet is a list of the NPS's transportation projects valued at less than \$4 million per project that do not have identified funding sources at this time. The transportation maintenance backlog is approximately the same value as the non-transportation backlog.

Question 10: Are major maintenance projects regularly completed?

Yes. Major maintenance projects are completed on an ongoing basis throughout the NPS.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Question 11: Our national infrastructure is aging, and I imagine that many of our park facilities are as well. Is this backlog expected to grow? What is the Park Service doing to limit this growth?

Yes, the NPS backlog will continue to grow as long as there remains a gap between the funding required to maintain the NPS facilities and the funds available to complete this maintenance. To lessen the impact of this growth, the NPS has developed and implemented a Capital Investment Strategy (CIS) to focus the limited maintenance funding on our highest priority assets.

Questions from Senator Angus King, Jr.

Question 1: What is the percentage of user fees vs. the percentage of appropriations? Given that percentage, are current user fees adequate in your opinion? Is there any plan to pursue more advanced technologies to collect park fees (such as requiring credit/debit card readers at each park entry station)?

Answer: In FY 2015, recreation fees were 9.53 percent of the amount of the NPS Operation of the National Park System and Construction appropriations. In the fall of 2014, the National Park Service conducted a nationwide review of entrance fees. As a result, implementation of a consistent pricing model by park type and grouping is continuing with some fee rates adjusted to better reflect the best balance between adequate resource supports for visitor needs at these parks while still keeping parks within reach of American families as an affordable recreational experience.

Additionally, the NPS is committed to the pursuit of advanced technologies for both methods of payment and entry passes. The NPS already employs credit/debit card readers at all parks with connectivity, and the NPS recently deployed 185 new credit card terminals capable of reading chip cards in 86 parks. The new terminals support Google Wallet and Apple Pay transactions. Four parks are currently piloting Apple Pay and other near-field communication enabled payments; once the pilot is complete a memo providing instructions on processing Apple Pay transactions will be sent to all parks with the new equipment.

The NPS also plans to pilot mobile entry passes at five parks across the country in the coming months, including Acadia National Park. The NPS released a Request for Information (RFI) in October of this year to seek information from the industry on what is currently available in the form of Electronic Entrance Passes. Over 20 companies responded to the RFI and the NPS is currently working with a number of the vendors in pursuit of additional information and plans to pilot electronic pass sales and use at pilot parks in the coming months.

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Question 2: In your opinion, what concession contract changes are necessary to make management more efficient?

Answer: The 1998 concessions act mandates a one-size-fits-all contract model and a rigid bidding process that does not allow the NPS to use industry standard contract models or negotiate contracts. To address this issue, the NPS needs the flexibility to employ a variety of contract types rather than a single type to contract for the wide variety of commercial services offered to visitors. Management contracts, for example, are widely used to manage lodging properties in the private sector, but the NPS has no ability to use this type of contract under the 1998 law. Freedom to negotiate some terms of the contract, which the current law does not provide, should result in more mutually beneficial contracts and better services for visitors.

In addition, the 1998 law provides only one financing avenue for capital improvements – leasehold surrender interest (LSI). Under current concessions law, LSI is the method used to compensate concessioners for improvements they make to the facilities associated with a concession contract. Concessioners generally are paid the value of this LSI when that contract ends. Due to the statutory formula that adjusts LSI value by the change in CPI, the value of LSI tends to grow rather than depreciate over the life of a contract, leading to large balances at the end of a contract. The NPS can increase the amount of investment in concession-assigned facilities if it has additional tools at its disposal. The Administration's legislative proposal, S. 2257, authorizes a revolving fund as well as management contracts that would allow for investment without the need to incur LSI.

Question 3: Is there a plan to award longer contracts to concessioners, such as 20-year contracts which would help promote more private investment? If so, what are the details of this plan?

Answer: Prior to the 1998 concessions act, NPS awarded concession contracts for terms as long as 30 years, and concessioners had the right to continue operating well past the 30 year term if they wanted to remain. This perpetual right to operate gave little incentive to improve performance or offer new services. Congress recognized this and resolved it in the 1998 act by requiring NPS to award contracts generally for a period of 10 years or less. Congress provided that NPS can award contracts for periods up to 20 years when the terms and conditions of the contract warrant a longer contract period. The NPS does award contracts with terms longer than 10 years when necessary to attract competition or when justified based on the required investment. For example, the recently awarded contracts at Grand Canyon and Yosemite National Parks are for 15 years.

Question 4: Is the Park Service taking steps to make sure criteria used to award concession contracts include strong consideration for past performance evaluations, quality of service and administration, and the locality of concessioner as it relates to the impact of the local community? If so, how is it taking these steps?

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

Answer: The Service is currently implementing updates to the service quality evaluation process including new standards and evaluation methods that consider current industry practice and recognize superior performance. Some of these changes were informed by discussions with the concessions community which explored ways to enhance concessioner incentive and recognition practices while still providing a competitive environment in accordance with the 1998 Act. The Service intends to continue this dialog. In addition, we now require submission of past operating evaluations when concessioners compete for new contracts. We are working to balance an incumbent concessioner's experience against a company without prior experience operating in a national park.

Questions from Senator Ron Wyden

Questions: As many of you know, access to outdoor recreation has been a priority of mine for many years. Not only do I support protections for some of the Nation's most pristine natural areas for generations of public access and enjoyment, I think it's clear that the outdoor recreation economy has become a sustainable economic engine in many parts of the country, including my home state of Oregon.

The recreation economy generates billions – and I'm not just talking about revenue from gift shops and sales of outdoor equipment – I'm talking about the tourism dollars generated in rural communities, at mom and pop diners, and even at local gas stations from folks driving to national parks, forests, and historic sites across the country to experience these wonders first hand.

I was in Oregon this summer touring Oregon's Seven Wonders – including the unmatched Crater Lake National Park – discussing all the ways Congress can support the recreation economy and ensure that our special places are taken care of for our kids and their kids to enjoy. One of the things I heard on this tour was the importance of maintaining safe and functioning infrastructure, like trails, bathroom facilities, and campgrounds, for the benefit of the visitors. But of course, funding remains a concern during a time where the maintenance backlog in our parks is over \$11 billion.

Q. How will the increased funding and authority in this Centennial bill help to improve visitor services and increase access to our National Parks?

Answer: Increases in funding resulting from the centennial bill will be used to address a variety of park needs, many of which will improve visitor services. Examples include addressing deferred maintenance, modernizing facilities and infrastructure, developing mobile interpretation and education apps, and developing new exhibits for visitor centers. New authorities, such as contracting flexibilities provided by the visitor service management authority provisions, will

U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
December 8, 2015 Hearing: S. 2257
Questions for the Record Submitted to the Honorable Jonathan Jarvis

attract new companies to business opportunities in parks. More competition in commercial visitor service opportunities improves services for visitors.

I've heard from many outdoor recreation communities about the need to streamline recreation permitting and cut the red tape to make accessing the outdoors easier and more fun. Q. What are the Park Services goals for improving the visitor experience when it comes to the commercial permitting process for outfitters and guides and ease of public access to permits and informational materials – like through an app or centralized website – and will this Centennial bill help you achieve these goals? How?

Answer: The Park Service continually looks for ways to improve our permitting processes for commercial services. Over the years we have streamlined and standardized permitting guidance. In addition, many park units now use Pay.gov to pay for their commercial use authorizations (CUAs). We recognize that there are more opportunities to improve the permitting process. Towards that end, we are exploring the possibility of creating a national CUA to eliminate the need for multiple CUAs. We are also exploring the possibility of developing one website to provide information about CUAs including Service-wide information and links to each individual park.

The NPS does not see a need to change or modify our existing authorities at this time - any needed improvements can be accomplished through changes in administrative processes. Consequently, S. 2257 does not address modifications to existing CUA authorities.

Examples of Large Planned NPS Line Item Construction Projects
(dollars in thousands)

Park	Project	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 President's Request
Dry Tortugas National Park	Stabilize Bastions 1, 2 and 3 at Fort Jefferson	6,618	
Vanderbilt Mansion NHS	Rehab Mansion Foundation and Support Walls	5,275	
Yellowstone National Park	Rehabilitation Mammoth Hotel	8,668	16,126
Golden Gate NRA	Stabilize & Repair Exterior Walls of the Cellhouse, Alcatraz	9,954	
Glacier National Park	Correct Health & Safety Hazards at Many Glacier Hotel	7,156	
Yosemite National Park	Rehabilitate El Portal Sanitary Sewer	4,886	13,929
Grand Teton NP	Replace Water & Wastewater Systems at Moose	13,948	
Cape Hatteras NS	Rehabilitate Wright Brothers Visitor Center	6,824	
Gateway National Recreation Area	Replace Electrical Infrastructure for Safety on Floyd Bennett Field		9,144
Mount Ranier National Park	Rehabilitate Paradise Inn Annex and Connection Snow Bridge		13,211
National Mall and Memorial Parks	Replace Washington Monument Screening Facility		9,456
Jewel Cave National Monument	Upgrade Structures for Safe Cave Tours		6,797
Grand Canyon National Park	Replace North Rim Potable Water Distribution System		10,458

National Park Service		26-Jan-15		Unfunded Transportation Projects (*\$4M+)		
By NPS Region & Park - Alphabetical Order						
	State and Cong. District	Brief Description	Low Cost Estimate	High Cost Estimate	Average Estimate	
Alaska Region						
Denali National Park and Preserve	AK-1	Denali Park Road Resurfacing	\$ 7,800,000	\$ 7,800,000	\$ 7,800,000	
Denali National Park and Preserve	AK-1	Toklat River Bridge & Causeway Replacement	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 15,000,000	\$ 15,000,000	
Kenai Fjords National Park	AK-1	Exit Glacier Road Reconstruction	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 4,200,000	\$ 4,200,000	
Intermountain Region						
Arches National Park	UT-3	Main Entrance Road Rehabilitation	\$ 28,000,000	\$ 28,000,000	\$ 28,000,000	
Yellowstone National Park Road Reconstruction	WY-1/ MT-1/ ID-2	Road Reconstruction Multiple Segments throughout Yellowstone National Park	\$ 850,000,000	\$ 1,250,000,000	\$ 1,050,000,000	
Midwest Region						
Isle Royale National Park	MI-1	Replacement of MV-Ranger III Ship - Isle Royale National Park	\$ 25,000,000	\$ 35,000,000	\$ 30,000,000	
National Capital Region						
George Washington Memorial Parkway	VA-8 & 10/ DC-1	Arlington Memorial Bridge Repair & Construction	\$ 232,775,000	\$ 232,775,000	\$ 232,775,000	
National Capital Parks East	DC-1	Complete the Anacostia Riverwalk Trail	\$ 100,000,000	\$ 120,000,000	\$ 110,000,000	
Northeast Region						
Colonial National Historic Park	VA-1	Parkway Reconstruction	\$ 270,000,000	\$ 300,000,000	\$ 285,000,000	
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area	PA-10 & 17/ NJ-5	Delaware Water Gap - Road Reconstruction	\$ 92,000,000	\$ 92,000,000	\$ 92,000,000	
Manassas National Battlefield Park	VA-10	Manassas National Battlefield Park Bypass	\$ 183,000,000	\$ 183,000,000	\$ 183,000,000	
Multiple Northeast Parks - multiple projects & locations	Multiple	Northeast Region Multi Modal Access	\$ 58,000,000	\$ 94,000,000	\$ 76,000,000	
Multiple Northeast Parks - over 35 parks	Multiple	Northeast Region Road Safety Improvement Program	\$ 27,500,000	\$ 27,500,000	\$ 27,500,000	
Pacific West Region						
Mount Rainier National Park	WA-3 & 8	Rehabilitate Roadways to Maintain Visitor Access to East Side of Mount Rainier	\$ 84,900,000	\$ 84,900,000	\$ 84,900,000	
Lake Mead National Recreation Area	NV-3 & 4/ AZ-4	Lake Mead - Stabilize Eroding Channel at Las Vegas Wash	\$ 22,300,000	\$ 84,000,000	\$ 53,150,000	
Southeast Region						
Everglades National Park	FL-25 & 26	The Tamiami Trail Modifications: Next Steps Project	\$ 285,000,000	\$ 285,000,000	\$ 285,000,000	
Great Smoky Mountains National Park	NC-11/ TN 2&3	The Foothills Parkway: Completing The "Missing Link"	\$ 29,000,000	\$ 29,000,000	\$ 29,000,000	
Natchez National Historical Park	AL-5/ MI-2, 3 & 6/ TN-4 & 7	Natchez Trace Trails	\$ 102,000,000	\$ 102,000,000	\$ 102,000,000	
Total			\$ 2,416,475,000	\$ 2,974,175,000	\$ 2,695,325,000	

*Estimates include preliminary engineering, construction engineering, construction, and administrative costs.

NOTE: This listing identifies large and complex projects from across the country. NPS Transportation website can provide additional information. Hot link: http://www.nps.gov/transportation/transportation_needs_beyond_core_program.html. Please note one possible means to fund these projects are include in the recently passed "Fix America's Surface Transportation Act" or FAST Act, which included the "Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Transportation Project Program." The new program would enable the NPS to compete for grants to address these large transportation infrastructure projects. The new program is authorized at \$100 million per year. However, the program is subject to annual United States Department of Transportation appropriations and not funded from the Surface Transportation Trust Fund.



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Washington, DC 20240

FEB - 1 2016

The Honorable John Barrasso
Chairman
Senate Committee on Indian Affairs
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Chairman Barrasso:

Enclosed are responses prepared by the Assistant Secretary- Indian Affairs in response to questions received following the May 13, 2015, hearing before your Committee regarding "Bureau of Indian Education: Examining Organizational Challenges in Transforming Educational Opportunities for Indian Children."

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this material to the Committee.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Salotti
Legislative Counsel
Office of Congressional
and Legislative Affairs

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Jon Tester
Vice Chairman

Questions for the Record
Dr. Charles Roessel
United States Senate Committee on Indian Affairs
Oversight Hearing
“Bureau of Indian Education: Examining Organizational Challenges in Transforming
Educational Opportunities for Indian Children.”
May 13, 2015

Submitted by Senator Mike Crapo

1. Funding:

The Department of the Interior has requested lower funding for the Indian School Equalization Program (ISEP) to provide funds for the Education Turnaround Pilot Program. These funds are used for Student Improvement Grants, which are temporary programs and do not provide long term funding to selected schools.

How can real educational reforms be achieved when funding for student improvement relies on temporary arrangements?

RESPONSE: On December 18, 2016, Public Law 114-113, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, was enacted. . The FY 2016 budget request included funding proposals for investments in education that will yield long-term benefits, and those proposals were funded under the enacted Consolidated Appropriations Act These benefits include focusing on improving instruction, improving teachers through national board certification, bringing Internet connectivity into all Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools, increased funding for tribal grant support costs, and assisting tribes with the development of tribal education departments. The increased funding for operations and maintenance will assist the BIE in improving conditions of BIE facilities.

2. Funding:

ISEP funding has steadily decreased over the past 3 years and BIE schools have to look toward short-term grants and pilot programs to provide basic educational services for their students.

How will the BIE provide Native students with world-class education when schools barely have the resources to hire teachers or provide modern learning environments?

RESPONSE: The funding for school operations has gradually increased since the sequestration of Fiscal Year 2013. In FY 2013, school operations was funded at \$493,700,867, in FY 2014 it was funded at \$518,318,000, and in FY 2015 it was funded at \$536,897,000. However, the FY 2015 base funding for school operations, the Indian School Equalization Program (ISEP), at \$386,565,000 is still lower than the FY 2012 funding at \$390,706,867 due to the FY 2013 sequestration and the FY 2014 adjustment for the Education Turnaround Pilot Program. The FY 2016 budget of \$391,837,000 restores ISEP funding to an amount greater than the pre-sequestration FY 2012 funding.

3. Organization and Structure:

The proposed organizational model as outlined by the BIE takes the agency from a "direct provider of education" and makes it into an "innovative organization that will serve as a capacity-builder and service-provider." The reorganization activity seems counter to this mission statement.

For example, the Shoshone-Bannock Tribe was one of around 25 schools under one Associate Deputy Director. Under the reorganization, that same person has responsibility for approximately 90 schools. How does this reorganization actually further the goal of providing world-class education, and how does the reorganization work to provide better communication and coordination with BIE schools when more schools are overseen by the same number of personnel?

RESPONSE: The Department of the Interior's (Department's) proposed Education Resource Centers scales up a best practice. Previously, when Director Roessel was the Associate Deputy Director for Navajo Schools, as a part of a Navajo pilot project for BIE-operated Navajo schools, he clarified roles and responsibilities within the field to enable specialization and avoid the "jack of all trades" approach. In addition, he restructured six separate Education Line Offices into one school district, established school improvement teams (made up of school improvement specialists) and established school clusters organized around strengths and weaknesses.

As a result, the percentage of BIE-operated Navajo schools that made "adequate yearly progress" (AYP) increased from 29 percent to 55 percent. Because this approach improved outcomes for students attending BIE operated Navajo schools, the Department seeks to apply this approach to the entire BIE school system. A key part of the restructuring will be clarifying the roles of everyone involved in delivering a world-class education to students. The proposed changes will result in better support to each tribe so it is better able to address student outcomes. These changes in the field will be supported by clearer central accountability through the Chief Academic Officer and the Chief Performance Officer who will be dedicated to the improvement of educational performance and operations.

4. Reorganization:

Regarding the overall structural reforms, I have heard concerns that tribes in Idaho and in neighboring states have been assigned to an Associate Deputy Director based out of Minneapolis, Minnesota. Previously, Idaho tribes had agency resources closer to home at an office in Montana.

How does moving resources further away from tribes the agency serves help BIE students?

RESPONSE: We considered two major factors in planning the 15 Education Resource Centers (ERCs): (1) proximity to schools served, and (2) needs of the schools. Proximity was based on the school's distance to the ERCs, the number of students per school, and the number of schools per

ERC. At that time, school needs included their adequate yearly progress¹ (AYP status, special education, and other student data, and distance from other schools and the number of tribes per ERC. The reorganization supports a ratio of ERC staff to BIE-funded schools as follows: (1) Associate Deputy Director (ADD)-Bureau Operated Schools; one Full Time Employee (FTE) to one school; (2) ADD Tribally Controlled Schools: one FTE to one school; and (3) ADD Navajo Schools: one FTE to three schools. The reorganization will locate several ERCs in new locations closer to schools to more effectively serve all BIE students. The ERCs will be staffed by employees who are currently in Albuquerque. The focus of reform is looking at the total BIE structure being closer to the schools and not just a line office with no services.

Submitted by Senator Tom Udall

1. I understand that the Navajo Nation is interested in being a Tribal Education Agency for the entire Nation. Wouldn't this result in some of the Navajo autonomous school boards losing their autonomy?

RESPONSE: The United States has a government-to-government relationship with the Navajo Nation and a deep respect for principles of tribal self-governance. In Part B of Title XI of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.), the various legislative and technical amendments since 1978, and the annual appropriations process, Congress has repeatedly stated that it is the policy of the United States to fulfill the Federal Government's unique and continuing trust relationship with, and responsibility to, the Indian people for the education of Indian children and for the operation and financial support of the Bureau of Indian Affairs-funded school system to work in full cooperation with tribes. Tribal nations and the United States share the same goal: to provide education of the highest quality and provide for the basic elementary and secondary educational needs of Indian children, including meeting the unique educational and cultural needs of those children.

The tribally operated schools on the Navajo Reservation operate as autonomous schools only by authorization of the Navajo Nation. The Navajo Nation has the authority, under existing tribal legislation, to withdraw the authorization, and through the tribal authority provided through Part B of Title XI of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2001 et seq.), as amended. The Navajo Nation, in its interactions with individual schools, must consider the well-being of all its students and community members, particularly when the autonomous school boards are not providing the sound governance required for a school to be a success, and are not providing the high-quality academic programs and services that students need to be successful in the 21st century.

The enactment and implementation of Title V of Public Law 100-297 in 1988 was an important milestone in the tribal control of Bureau-funded schools. But the success of the schools controlled by tribal organizations has been limited and has not met the full expectations of both Public Law 93-638, the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, which allows a tribe to perform federal functions under contract to the Federal Government and receive funding for that role, and Public Law 100-297, the Tribally Controlled Grant Schools Act, which allows a tribe to take over the responsibilities for the operation of a school under what is called a P.L. 100-297

¹The term, adequate yearly progress was deleted by P.L. 114-95, the Every Student Succeeds Act, signed into law, December 10, 2015.

grant. Many tribes have limited input in the operation and control of their schools after they approve a tribal organization, independent of the tribe, to operate a school. One outcome is that tribal organizations have not coordinated well with neighboring schools on standards, procedures, policies, curricula, and instructional programs. Lack of coordination produces inequities and has a negative impact on students who may move between schools during the academic year.

We defer to the Navajo Nation on the organization of education on the Navajo Reservation. That said, we seek to provide options to tribal nations to improve education. The desire of the Navajo Nation, as well as other tribes, to function as a Tribal Education Department is an important step in the Navajo Nation assuming greater control of the 66 Bureau-funded schools on or near the Navajo Reservation. The Navajo Nation is exploring various options to strengthen oversight, governance, and control of its schools. Although the final decision has not been made by the Navajo Nation on the oversight, governance, and control of its schools, the Bureau is comfortable with, and will support, the Navajo Nation's decision based on the stated policy of the Education Amendments of 1978, as amended.

The Bureau believes that greater coordination in the operation of its schools will strengthen the capacity of tribes to operate education programs and high-performing schools. It will also improve student performance, improve the quality of the instructional program, and develop an education system with uniform standards, policies, and procedures that better meet the needs of students and tribal communities. Tribal control of schools will allow tribes to implement innovative programs and curricula for their students, including an emphasis on their history, language, and culture. As a result, tribal communities are likely to be more invested in their schools.

a. How will BIE manage this conflict as you make decisions on how to move forward with the proposed reorganization?

RESPONSE: The future of Navajo education is a matter for the Navajo Nation to decide. The United States has not had a good historical record when it has used paternalistic approaches directed by federal entities, whether Congress or the Executive Branch. The question of how the Navajo Nation will operate its school system should be debated within the Navajo Nation. The BIE's role is to support whatever decision is made by the tribal government, provided that it is consistent with the law. The BIE Director and his senior managers hosted a tribal consultation session on April 27, 2015, which was open to the public, and have had formal and informal meetings, seven stakeholder conference calls, and eight webinars to provide information to the Navajo Nation, tribal and education department leaders, community members, and both tribally operated and BIE school board members and school staff. These activities were to collect information and input on the restructuring of BIE, including the feasibility of tribes operating all of the Bureau-funded schools on their reservations, and the strengthening of tribal departments of education. Through these efforts, the BIE has sought to become more supportive of educational endeavors on the Navajo Reservation.

In addition, BIE has provided the Navajo Nation \$400,000 through a feasibility grant and a "Sovereignty in Indian Education" (SIE) Enhancement initiative. These funds allowed the Navajo Nation to hold numerous listening sessions with school boards, school staff, and community members to determine the feasibility of operating the Navajo Bureau-funded schools, and other considerations to strengthen the Navajo Nation Department of Education and update tribal

education codes, policies, and procedures.

b. Do you have an opinion from the Department's Solicitor's office on the authority of the BIE to enter into its current restructuring? Is there any conflict between PL-297 and the proposed changes to increase tribal authority?

RESPONSE: The answer to the first question is "yes." The Department's Office of the Solicitor has reviewed the restructuring proposal and opined that the Tribally Controlled Schools Act does not prevent the restructuring. The Act envisions tribal governments as authorizing bodies and informed partners in the management of tribally controlled schools when not directly operating tribal schools themselves. The answer to the second question is "no."

The Solicitor's office has been actively involved with BIE's restructuring planning and implementation process, and with BIE's outreach to tribes to discuss the restructuring of the Bureau, including the transformation of the BIE from a direct service provider and school operator to a technical assistance provider to tribally operated schools.

2. I have great respect for the tradition of Tribal Consultation, and its importance for respecting tribal sovereignty. I understand you are using a range of tools to garner reaction from tribes for the BIE reorganization plan.

a. What changes have you made to the proposed reorganization plan based on consultation received from tribal leaders?

RESPONSE: Both the development and implementation of the BIE reorganization have evolved as tribal consultation has proceeded. In response to concerns in the Great Plains, for example, the reorganization was modified to establish an Education Resource Center (ERC) in Kyle, South Dakota and create an Education Program Administrator at Pine Ridge to oversee Cheyenne Eagle Butte, Flandreau, and Pine Ridge schools. In several areas, a smaller-scale support center was included as part of the proposed reorganization plan. An additional change came following input from the tribes in Oklahoma during the tribal consultation sessions in April and May of 2014.

In addition, during the tribal consultations, we heard that most of the tribal nations in Oklahoma are interested in programs supporting Native youth attending public schools (there are only three BIE-funded schools in that state). Because of this concern, we have proposed to transform the only regional office in Oklahoma to a national "Johnson O'Malley (JOM) Center." The new JOM Center will provide support and technical assistance to all tribes receiving JOM funds.

b. My constituents tell me they want to hear more about how the BIE expects this new reorganization "to be better able to provide more resources and support to Indian students at the local level." How will you be doing that?

RESPONSE: Our reorganization is designed with the best interests of the student and the success of their schools in mind. The 15 Education Resource Centers (ERCs) will address a key recommendation of the Blueprint for Reform to provide improved technical assistance and more comprehensive services to schools. The ERCs will be geographically positioned close to schools and staffed with School Solutions Teams to provide customized support to meet the unique needs

of each school. Instead of issuing mandates to schools, these teams will ensure that principals and teachers have the resources and support they need to operate high achieving schools. The ERCs will leverage expertise from other parts of the organization, including school operations, to offer a variety of technical skill supports in the field. With support from BIE Education Program Enhancement funds, the ERCs will assist schools in their improvement efforts by making available to schools data-supported "best practice" models in professional development, curriculum development, instruction, intervention strategies, school leadership, and tribal education support.

c. I understand that part of the proposed restructuring will be the closing of line offices. How have all tribes been notified of these closures?

RESPONSE: The BIE is transforming the current 22 Education Line Offices reporting to the Associate Deputy Directors into 15 Education Resource Centers (ERCs), four facility support centers, three technical support centers, and one National Johnson O'Malley Center. The ERCs address a key recommendation of the Blueprint for Reform to provide improved technical assistance and more comprehensive services to schools. The ERCs will be geographically positioned close to schools and staffed with School Solutions Teams to provide customized support to meet the unique needs of each school. Instead of issuing mandates to schools, these teams will ensure that principals and teachers possess the resources and support they need to operate high achieving schools. The ERCs will leverage expertise from other parts of the organization, including school operations, to offer a variety of technical skill supports in the field. With support from BIE Education Program Enhancement funds, the ERCs will assist schools in their improvement efforts by making available to schools data-supported "best practice" models in professional development, curriculum development, instruction, intervention strategies, school leadership, and tribal education support. Information on the transformation is shared during Tribal Consultation meetings, during monthly stakeholder calls, through webinars in partnership with the National Indian Education Association and the National Congress of American Indians, and through individual meetings with tribal leaders, tribal councils and tribal community members. Information on these consultation sessions can be found at the following link on the bie.edu website: <http://www.bie.edu/cs/groups/xbie/documents/document/idc1-031687.pdf>.

3. Understandably, tribes are concerned about the financial impact of operating schools previously run by the BIE.

a. Currently, what are the per pupil costs at BIE operated and BIE grant schools, and what is the breakdown of contributing factors for those costs?

RESPONSE: The BIE does not have access to cost information from all schools. However, most BIE-appropriated and Department of Education funds received by the BIE are distributed to BIE-funded schools by formulas based on student count variables or characteristics of each school. For School Year 2015-2016, the average Indian School Equalization Program (ISEP) funding was \$9,280 per student; the average BIE-appropriated dollars per student, including ISEP, was \$15,386; and the average for all funds was \$20,153. The \$20,153 per student was not adjusted for the funding generated by the residential students.

b. When tribes agree to take control of their schools now run by BIE, how can they compensate for the lack of resources and staff, insufficient infrastructure

(buildings, technology, and broadband) and needed wraparound services to achieve academic excellence?

RESPONSE: Since most BIE-appropriated and Department of Education funds received by the BIE are distributed to BIE-funded schools by formulas based on student count variables or characteristics of each individual school, individual schools would receive the same dollar amount per program regardless of whether they were BIE-operated or tribally operated. In either case, the school determines the number and type of staff needed based on available funds. When a school transfers from BIE-operated to tribally operated, the school receives the same dollar amount for facilities, operations, and maintenance, and has the same eligibility for facilities repair funds. However, a school gains more flexibility and will be more accountable to the community, giving the school the opportunity to better serve the community.

BIE funds the broadcast and Internet broadband for all of its schools from funds appropriated for Education Information Technology (IT) services, and the broadband at individual schools expands as school needs change and funds become available. The funding increase provided in FY 2016 will increase the broadband and hardware to better meet the needs for 21st century schools, especially in remote locations where broadband access benefits are not available to the local community except at BIE-funded schools.

The BIE will continue to work with other Federal, State, and private agencies to establish wraparound services at all BIE-funded schools. BIE continues to work with the Indian Health Service to increase the availability of health care services at or near BIE-funded schools.

c. What resources will BIE make available to them, and will it be sufficient and sustainable?

RESPONSE: BIE routinely provides technical assistance as tribes seek to convert to tribal control. Moreover, the BIE Sovereignty in Indian Education (SIE) Enhancement Initiative and the Tribal Education Department (TED) grants provide funding to build the capacity of Tribal Education Departments. On August 5, 2014, the BIE awarded \$1 million to five tribes under the SIE: Gila River Indian Community, Navajo Nation, Tohono O'odham Nation, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, and the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians. In November 2015, the BIE awarded ten tribes under the TED Grant: Pueblo of Acoma, Santa Clara Pueblo, Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, Rosebud Sioux Tribe, Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians, Muscogee Creek Nation Tribe, and Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe. These funds are intended to support tribes to build the capacity of their educational departments. The Oglala Sioux Tribe opted not to accept the SIE awards and were provided a full year to resubmit a new budget narrative. Unfortunately, the Tribe never resubmitted and funds were reallocated to fund technical assistance programs for Education Line Offices being contracted by five tribes. . These grants were announced for second-year funding in August 2015.

In addition to providing grants to tribes, the BIE is taking the necessary steps to ensure that employees are trained in how to provide technical assistance. BIE is working across the agency to ensure that BIE will be a capacity-builder and service-provider to tribes. Monthly BIE calls provide an opportunity for updates with stakeholders and offer an open forum for questions and

answers. There are also BIE training webinars announced by newsletter and mass emails through standard BIE communications protocols.

4. What is the risk of New Mexico staff losing their jobs if they are not able to relocate or retrain for the new roles?

RESPONSE: Employees are the lifeblood of any institution. It is BIE's intention to work with current employees to ensure that they have a place within the new BIE. Every effort will be made to ensure a smooth transition. The BIE has sought to provide all BIE staff with webinars on developing resumes and a walkthrough of how to apply for positions on USA Jobs, which are specific to job announcements. In addition, job announcements are shared across the BIE, and managers are encouraged to share the job listings with staff. New positions are being advertised and individuals are encouraged to submit applications for these positions. Training and professional development go hand in hand in the BIE and employees will be provided necessary training through webinars.

a. If fully implemented, is it true that Albuquerque would be at risk for losing 35 jobs?

RESPONSE: No. Currently, the Albuquerque Regional Office supports a staffing level of 44 positions and includes the following functions: (1) Associate Deputy Director West; (2) Albuquerque Education Line Office; (3) Division of Performance and Accountability; and (4) School Operations staff.

Under the proposed reorganization, the Albuquerque regional office will undergo several changes, but it will continue to support 44 positions, covering a variety of important functions:

1. An Office of the Associate Deputy Director for BIE-Operated Schools and an Education Resource Center (ERC) reporting to the Associate Deputy Director;
2. An Office of the Associate Deputy Director for Tribally Controlled Schools (3 positions) and an ERC reporting to the ADD; and
3. Staff supporting the Division of School Operations.

The most significant change will be within the Division of Performance and Accountability (DPA), for which the following changes are proposed:

1. The reassignment of the Associate Deputy Director for DPA to Washington, DC;
2. The reassignment of a majority of the DPA staff to ERCs around the country; and
3. The reassignment of DPA's data unit to Washington, DC.

b. What is the potential economic impact to New Mexico of fully implementing the proposed BIE reorganization plan?

RESPONSE: The number of federal jobs will remain the same and we anticipate that Indian education in New Mexico will improve. This will produce a more successful workforce in the State. While we cannot quantify with certainty the overall economic impact, we believe that it will

be positive.

5. Thank you for your assistance with getting the Pine Hill Elementary School (Bldg. 803) prepared for occupancy. I understand that significant problems on the campus remain, including connecting all of the buildings to the fire alarm system and fencing the campus to protect it from uninvited guests.

a. Do I have your commitment that BIE will continue to work with the Pine Hill schools to address the security and life safety features needed to create the appropriate learning environment for the students and staff?

RESPONSE: The Bureau of Indian Affairs Southwest Region Facilities Manager confirmed that building 803 and the campus-wide fire alarm system are complete. Yes, we are committed to working with the Ramah community in addressing other identified security and life-safety issues.

Submitted by Senator Al Franken

From 2007 to 2012, the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe operated its Pine Grove School as a charter school, but then outside assistance for the school ended. Without Pine Grove, children in the Band's Lake Lena community must be bused to the Band's Nay Ah Shing School 80 miles away or lose access to culturally appropriate education.

Last year's appropriations bill included language allowing BIE to waive the prohibition on funding satellite schools in limited circumstances. The Band has requested such a waiver so it can reopen Pine Grove as a satellite of the BIE-supported Nay Ah Shing School. And the Band would like to see this waiver approved in time for about two dozen kids in Lake Lena to start classes at Pine Grove in the 2015-2016 school year.

Can you assure me that BIE will review the Mille Lacs Band's waiver request in a timely manner?

RESPONSE: The BIE director traveled to meet with Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Indians Chief Executive Melanie Benjamin and agreed to the new satellite school. The BIE has worked with Pine Grove to identify students who are eligible for the Indian School Equalization Program (ISEP) funding but, as of this writing, the students listed by Pine Grove do not meet the ISEP eligibility requirements and are not eligible for ISEP funds. The BIE continues to work with Pine Grove to identify eligible students who will generate funds for Nay Ah Shing to provide education services to the Pine Grove students.



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, DC 20240

FEB 26 2016

The Hon. Doug Lamborn
Chairman
Committee on Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Enclosed are responses prepared by the Bureau of Land Management to the questions for the record submitted following the May 20, 2015, hearing on H.R. 2295, the National Energy Security Corridors Act.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this material to the Committee.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Salotti
Legislative Counsel
Office of Congressional and
Legislative Affairs

Enclosure

cc: The Honorable Alan Lowenthal, Ranking Member
Committee on Natural Resources,
Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources

Committee on Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources
1334 Longworth House Office Building
Wednesday, May 20, 2015
10:00 AM

Hearing on the *"National Energy Security Corridors Act"*

Questions from Rep. Lamborn for Tim Spisak, Senior Advisor for Minerals and Realty Management, Bureau of Land Management

- **As you mentioned in your testimony, "since designation of the west-wide energy corridors in 2009, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has participated in the approval of nine major pipeline expansion projects totaling nearly 2,000 miles of new oil and gas pipeline with nearly 1,050 of those miles crossing Federal lands. In the next 18 months, the BLM is expected to complete review and disposition of three more major pipeline projects totaling nearly 1,000 additional miles with nearly 450 of those miles across Federal lands." In order for the Subcommittee to better understand current pipeline infrastructure, could you please provide the following:**
- 1. The total number of miles of all pipelines crossing federal lands. Please provide a breakdown of miles of pipeline by each agency (BLM, NPS, USFS, etc.).**

Response:

For pipelines, the BLM acts as the authorizing agency when either 1) the BLM administers the Federal land involved, or 2) the surface of all Federal lands involved in a proposed project is administered by two or more Federal agencies. The table below shows the miles of pipelines authorized by the BLM. The figures include all pipelines authorized by the BLM, supporting a wide variety of commodities such as oil, gas, carbon dioxide, water, and sewer. The data were collected from the BLM's bureau-wide case recordation system, LR2000, and ALIS, an Alaska-specific database system. The figures represent the agency's best available estimate. The table also notes the relevant surface management agency in each case.

Pipeline Authorizations Issued by the BLM (Miles of Pipeline Crossing Federal Lands by Agency)	
AGENCY	TOTAL MILES
Bureau of Land Management	359,703
U.S. Forest Service	3,740
Bureau of Reclamation	3,573
Federal Energy Regulatory Committee	2,300
Military/Department of Defense	358
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	97

Bureau of Indian Affairs	84
National Park Service	44
Other	81
TOTAL	369,980

Pipeline Authorizations Issued by the BLM (Miles of Pipeline Crossing Federal Lands by Agency)		
BLM State Office/Pipeline Location	Surface Managing Agency	Miles of Pipeline
BLM-AK	Bureau of Land Management	378
	Kenai National Wildlife Refuge	38
	Chugach National Forest	15
BLM-AZ	Bureau of Land Management	1,565
	Bureau of Reclamation	1
	Coconino National Forest	16
	Kaibab National Forest	13
	Kofa National Wildlife Refuge	50
	Prescott National Forest	57
	Tonto National Forest	7
BLM-CA	Angeles National Forest	10
	Bureau of Land Management	1,740
	Department of the Air Force	35
	Department of the Army	1
	Department of the Navy	17
	Intl Bdy. Comm.-US & Mexico	1
	Inyo National Forest	2
	Los Padres National Forest	11
	Modoc National Forest	60
	National Park Service (non- specific)	1
	San Bernardino National Forest	2,250
Shasta National Forest	41	
BLM-CO	Arapaho National Wildlife Refuge	1
	Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest	813
	Bureau of Land Management	17,387
	Bureau of Reclamation	1
	Comanche National Grassland	3
	Dinosaur National Monument	3
	Forest Service (non-specific)	19
	Gunnison-GM-UNC National Forest	24

Pipeline Authorizations Issued by the BLM (Miles of Pipeline Crossing Federal Lands by Agency)		
BLM State Office/Pipeline Location	Surface Managing Agency	Miles of Pipeline
	National Park Service (non-specific)	2
	Pike-San Isabel National Forest	1
	Rocky Mountain National Park	16
	Rocky Mountain Region - FS	6
	Routt National Forest	27
	San Juan National Forest	14
	White River National Forest	35
BLM-ES/LA	Bureau of Land Management	15
BLM-ES/IN	Bureau of Land Management	945
	Bureau of Reclamation	6
	Department of Energy	13
	Department of the Air Force	1
	Kaniksu National Forest	7
	Nez Perce Reservation	1
	Sawtooth National Forest	2
BLM-MT	Bureau of Land Management	901
	Bureau of Reclamation	6
	Darby Ranger District	1
	Dillon Ranger District	1
	Flathead Reservaton	1
	Hungry Horse Ranger District	3
	Jefferson Ranger District	7
	Thompson Falls Ranger District	4
	Upper Missouri Region	5
	Wisdom Ranger District	1
BLM-MT/ND	Bureau of Land Management	537
	Corps of Engineers	249
BLM-MT/SD	Bureau of Land Management	3
BLM-NM	Bitter Lake National Wildlife Refuge	5
	Bureau of Land Management	150,730
	Bureau of Reclamation	187
	Carson National Forest	46
	Cibola National Forest	9
	Corps of Engineers	2
	Department of Defense	12
	Department of the Army	10
	Federal Energy Regulatory Committee	2,300

Pipeline Authorizations Issued by the BLM (Miles of Pipeline Crossing Federal Lands by Agency)		
BLM State Office/Pipeline Location	Surface Managing Agency	Miles of Pipeline
	Fish & Wildlife Service (non-specific)	1
	Forest Service (non-specific)	1
	U.S. Geological Survey	4
	Gila National Forest	4
	Intl. Body Comm.-US & Mexico	62
	Lincoln National Forest	2
	National Aero & Space ADM	1
	Rio Grande Project	4
	Santa Ana Pueblo	2
	Santa Fe National Forest	3
	White Sands Missile Range	12
	Zia Pueblo	4
BLM-NM/OK	Bureau of Land Management	3
BLM-NM/TX	Bureau of Land Management	1
BLM-NV	Bureau of Land Management	8,718
	Bureau of Reclamation	9
	Department of the Air Force	6
	Humboldt National Forest	3
	Lake Mead National Recreation Area	4
	Pyramid Lake Reservation	2
	Stillwater National Wildlife Refuge	2
	Toiyabe National Forest	4
BLM-OR	Bureau of Land Management	298
	Crooked River National Grassland	1
	Deschutes National Forest	23
	Mount Hood National Forest	8
	Wallowa National Forest	6
	Whitman National Forest	8
	Winema National Forest	8
BLM-OR/WA	Bureau of Land Management	15
	Okanogan National Forest	5
	Wenatchee National Forest	18
BLM-UT	Arches National Park	11
	Ashley National Forest	4
	Bureau of Land Management	78,360
	Cache National Forest	5

Pipeline Authorizations Issued by the BLM (Miles of Pipeline Crossing Federal Lands by Agency)		
BLM State Office/Pipeline Location	Surface Managing Agency	Miles of Pipeline
	Capitol Reef National Park	3
	Department of Defense	5
	Department of the Army	8
	Dinosaur National Monument	2
	Dixie National Forest	28
	Fishlake National Forest	6
	Kanosh Band	1
	Manti-Lasal National Forest	14
	Navajo Reservation	2
	Uinta National Forest	12
	Wasatch National Forest	17
BLM-WY	Ashley National Forest	16
	Black Hills National Forest	1
	Bridger National Forest	9
	Bureau of Land Management	98,107
	Bureau of Reclamation	9
	Fossil Butte National Monument	2
	Medicine Bow National Forest	14
	Shoshone National Forest	5
	Bureau of Reclamation Upper Colorado Region	3,354
	Wasatch National Forest	1
	Wind River Reservation	71
Total Miles		369,980

2. **The total acreage of all pipeline right-of-ways on all federal lands under the purview of your agency. Also, please breakdown that information by state.**

Response:

- The table below lists the acreage information based on the available data in the BLM's LR2000 and ALIS databases. The figures represent the agency's best available estimate.
- In some instances, ancillary facilities (e.g. pump stations, compressor stations, maintenance facilities, roads, power lines, wireless telecommunication facilities, etc.) are included as part of the pipeline authorization and are reflected in the acreage figures below, in other cases they are not.

Total BLM Acreage of Pipeline Rights-of-Way by State

BLM State Office	Total Acres	BLM State Office	Total Acres
Alaska	2,551	New Mexico	270,126
Arizona	50,777	Nevada	36,587
California	77,163	Oregon	27,196
Colorado	172,203	Utah	335,422
Eastern States	4,292	Wyoming	131,790
Idaho	50,507		
Montana	32,391	TOTAL	1,191,005

3. A map illustrating all pipelines that cross federal lands.

Response:

- Attached as Appendix 1 are maps prepared by BLM State Offices that identify pipelines with a diameter of 12" or larger that cross BLM-managed lands by state. Maps of Alaska, Arizona, California (Northern), California (Southern), Colorado, Eastern States, Idaho, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming are attached. A map of Montana is not provided as the BLM Montana State Office does not have GIS data for pipelines available.
 - These maps have been prepared as a general overview. Although the BLM has some Geographic Information System (GIS) capabilities related to oil and gas pipeline information, the agency does not maintain official geospatial data identifying pipelines. Therefore, it is important to note that although BLM strives to maintain the GIS system to the greatest extent available to each office, locations of the linear features shown are approximate.
- **The U.S. Department of the Interior has the authority to issue permits and right-of-ways (ROW) for the construction of natural gas pipelines across federal land, except for National Park Service land. Under the Mineral Leasing Act (MLA), the BLM has the responsibility of reviewing those ROW applications and must render a decision on the project.**

4. What is the average timeframe to process a ROW application from submission to approval or rejection?

Response:

The table below includes the average processing times for ROW applications. Processing timeframes largely depend on: 1) the completeness of an application (applicant dependent); 2) the scope/scale of project; 3) the presence of any environmental or cultural resource issues; 4) the adequacy of cost recovery funds; and 4) the number, types and timing of other Federal/tribal/State/local permits required.

It should be noted that the figures reflect the total elapsed time to process the application and do not capture slowdowns or stops in the application process, which inevitably occur because of any of the following: 1) lack of cost recovery funding from project proponents; 2) project financing challenges independent of the BLM; 3) litigation; 4) other (e.g., State, local, other Federal) permitting requirements depending on the route of a pipeline; 5) delays in receiving necessary information from the project proponent or their contractors; and 6) pauses in project processing requested by the applicant.

BLM's Average Time to Process Rights-of-Way				
BLM State Office	FY	Average Time to Reject/Deny	Average Time to Withdraw application	Average Time to Grant ROW
Arizona	2005	21	83	292
	2006	53	97	382
	2007	235	232	395
	2008	88	414	257
	2009	46	115	292
	2010	27	107	452
	2011	15	35	310
	2012	26	61	237
	2013	--	17	261
	2014	--	15	160
California	2005	56	133	218
	2006	49	100	296
	2007	159	199	274
	2008	177	150	226
	2009	98	71	279
	2010	90	133	239
	2011	34	82	249
	2012	29	131	156
	2013	50	22	207
	2014	19	19	153
Colorado	2005	24	57	130
	2006	49	42	191
	2007	8	31	213
	2008	15	52	214
	2009	20	69	229
	2010	31	40	267
	2011	3	57	222
	2012	13	65	218
	2013	9	14	199
	2014	4	8	158
Eastern States	2005	--	--	215
	2009	--	--	119
	2010	--	--	27

BLM's Average Time to Process Rights-of-Way				
BLM State Office	FY	Average Time to Reject/Deny	Average Time to Withdraw application	Average Time to Grant ROW
	2011	27	--	--
	2012	--	--	--
	2013	--	--	145
Idaho	2005	36	76	177
	2006	76	123	250
	2007	48	73	302
	2008	18	100	324
	2009	16	55	281
	2010	88	22	264
	2011	11	107	215
	2012	15	81	219
	2013	6	47	198
	2014	4	20	122
Montana	2005	--	53	153
	2006	1	8	121
	2007	2	58	172
	2008	3	20	153
	2009	--	0	147
	2010	--	19	110
	2011	6	9	157
	2012	0	29	131
	2013	--	11	113
	2014	--	3	92
New Mexico	2005	4	43	181
	2006	1	83	198
	2007	4	72	175
	2008	13	70	167
	2009	8	39	182
	2010	2	28	156
	2011	2	23	139
	2012	--	17	150
	2013	1	23	153
	2014	1	16	184
Nevada	2005	47	73	243
	2006	16	65	231
	2007	64	121	172
	2008	28	225	203
	2009	38	106	261
	2010	13	82	300
	2011	3	78	266

BLM's Average Time to Process Rights-of-Way				
BLM State Office	FY	Average Time to Reject/Deny	Average Time to Withdraw application	Average Time to Grant ROW
	2012	6	40	181
	2013	15	21	219
	2014	9	65	91
Oregon	2005	3	37	232
	2006	0	68	228
	2007	17	53	244
	2008	26	135	308
	2009	39	97	326
	2010	7	45	289
	2011	9	32	213
	2012	--	29	194
	2013	--	29	193
	2014	1	17	141
Utah	2005	56	87	304
	2006	124	49	309
	2007	71	69	299
	2008	57	86	242
	2009	32	140	297
	2010	19	72	259
	2011	33	66	211
	2012	9	37	215
	2013	2	24	182
	2014	1	12	112
Wyoming	2005	18	119	134
	2006	26	102	144
	2007	27	101	185
	2008	35	161	153
	2009	32	142	179
	2010	25	93	206
	2011	13	115	207
	2012	12	74	198
	2013	3	17	165
	2014	2	9	119

Note: Alaska data from the Alaska Lands Information System (ALIS) is unavailable. This information exists within the hard-copy administrative case files for each ROW at the individual BLM offices.

5. How many ROW applications were received by the BLM in each of the past ten fiscal years? Of those applications how many were approved? How many of those

applications were denied? What was the reason for their denial? Please breakdown based on type of ROW (ex. renewable, natural gas, electricity transmission).

Response:

- The table below shows the total number of ROW applications received by the BLM from Fiscal Year 2005 to 2014.
- Reasons for denial/rejection of specific applications are not readily available and would require manual review of thousands of individual case files. Typical reasons for denial include, but are not limited to: 1) the project is inconsistent with the land use plan; 2) the project could feasibly be located on non-public lands, and relocating to those non-public lands would result in fewer environmental or cultural resource impacts; or 3) the project is not in the public interest. Additionally, all ROWs for Alaska are combined due to substantial challenges in parsing out the data in the ALIS digital land record system.

Total BLM Right-of-Way Applications Received (FY 2005-2014)					
FY	Type of ROW	Total Received	Rejected	Withdrawn	Approved
2005	Air Space	1	0	0	1
	Fiber Optic Facilities	41	1	3	37
	Interstate Energy Facilities	1	1	0	0
	Non-Energy Facilities	1361	52	138	1202
	Nonexclusive	2	0	1	1
	Oil & Gas Facilities	1437	25	152	1276
	Other Energy Facilities	484	14	30	444
	Public Purposes	1	0	0	1
	Solar Energy Facilities	1	0	0	1
	Stone, Specialty	2	0	0	2
	Timber	1	0	0	1
	U.S. Rights Unknown	1	0	0	1
	Water	5	0	1	4
	Wind Energy Facilities	52	5	18	39
	Zeolites, Phillipsite	1	0	1	0
	Alaska (all ROWs)	29	7	0	19
	Not coded in database	23	1	6	16
2005 Total		3443	106	350	3045
2006	Carbon Dioxide	1	0	0	1
	Fiber Optic Facilities	32	1	3	28
	Interstate Energy Facilities	3	0	0	3
	Non-Energy Facilities	1470	61	142	1296
	Nonexclusive	3	0	1	2
	Oil & Gas Facilities	1760	49	189	1536
	Other Energy Facilities	616	35	38	545
Solar Energy Facilities	5	3	3	0	

Total BLM Right-of-Way Applications Received (FY 2005-2014)

FY	Type of ROW	Total Received	Rejected	Withdrawn	Approved
	Subject to Existing R/W-Esmt.	1	0	0	1
	Timber	1	0	1	0
	Water	4	1	0	3
	Wind Energy Facilities	70	7	14	60
	Alaska (all ROWs)	15	4	0	9
	Not coded in database	22	2	1	21
2006	Total	4003	163	392	3505
2007	Exclusive	1	0	0	1
	Fiber Optic Facilities	42	3	1	39
	Interstate Energy Facilities	4	0	2	3
	Non-Energy Facilities	1325	71	133	1145
	Nonexclusive	5	0	0	8
	Oil & Gas Facilities	1530	21	206	1315
	Other Energy Facilities	582	12	40	532
	Public Purposes	1	0	1	0
	Solar Energy Facilities	95	39	47	13
	Storage and Stockpile	1	0	0	1
	Timber	1	0	1	0
	Water	6	0	2	4
	Wind Energy Facilities	126	22	29	80
	Alaska (all ROWs)	26	10	0	11
	Not coded in database	5	1	0	4
2007	Total	3750	179	462	3156
2008	All Material Resources	1	0	0	1
	Fiber Optic Facilities	64	1	4	61
	Interstate Energy Facilities	5	0	3	2
	Non-Energy Facilities	1138	83	140	931
	Oil & Gas	2	0	0	2
	Oil & Gas Facilities	1135	7	162	978
	Other Energy Facilities	539	12	51	483
	Solar Energy Facilities	143	47	90	8
	Water	2	0	1	1
	Wind Energy Facilities	135	29	66	42
	Alaska (all ROWs)	27	4	0	11
	Not coded in database	10	0	5	5
2008	Total	3201	183	522	2525
2009	Carbon Dioxide	1	0	0	1
	Clay, Bentonite	1	0	0	1
	Fiber Optic Facilities	67	0	6	62
	Interstate Energy Facilities	3	0	1	2
	Non-Energy Facilities	888	30	87	783
	Nonexclusive	6	0	0	6

Total BLM Right-of-Way Applications Received (FY 2005-2014)

FY	Type of ROW	Total Received	Rejected	Withdrawn	Approved
	Oil & Gas Facilities	820	25	118	681
	Other Energy Facilities	569	14	37	523
	Recreation Purposes	1	0	1	0
	Solar Energy Facilities	40	20	18	3
	Storage and Stockpile	2	0	1	1
	To be Defined				
	U.S. Rights Unknown	1	0	0	1
	Water	2	0	2	0
	Wind Energy Facilities	86	12	43	32
	Alaska (all ROWs)	41	9	0	25
	Not coded in database	8	0	3	5
2009	Total	2536	110	317	2126
2010	Ditches or Canals	1	0	0	1
	Enclosures and Exclosures	1	0	0	1
	Fiber Optic Facilities	45	1	2	42
	Future Interest	1	0	1	0
	Historic Purposes	1	0	0	1
	Interstate Energy Facilities	5	0	1	4
	Non-Energy Facilities	916	41	93	800
	Nonexclusive	5	0	0	5
	Oil & Gas Facilities	717	1	64	653
	Other Energy Facilities	552	7	36	514
	Solar Energy Facilities	28	7	18	3
	Water	1	0	0	1
	Wind Energy Facilities	100	26	38	39
	Alaska (all ROWs)	50	15	0	17
	Not coded in database	9	2	1	6
2010	Total	2432	100	254	2087
2011	Carbon Dioxide	1	0	0	1
	Fiber Optic Facilities	65	0	5	62
	Interstate Energy Facilities	1	0	0	1
	Non-Energy Facilities	772	22	80	688
	Nonexclusive	2	0	0	2
	Oil & Gas Facilities	697	2	74	621
	Other Energy Facilities	596	9	48	541
	Sanitary Landfills	1	1	0	1
	Soil/Other, Fill	1	1	0	0
	Solar Energy Facilities	18	5	6	8
	Water	2	0	0	3
	Wind Energy Facilities	67	6	27	37
	Alaska (all ROWs)	61	23	0	28
	Not coded in database	14	1	2	16

Total BLM Right-of-Way Applications Received (FY 2005-2014)

FY	Type of ROW	Total Received	Rejected	Withdrawn	Approved
2011	Total	2298	70	242	2009
2012	All Surface Rights U.S.	1	0	1	1
	Exclusive	1	0	0	2
	Fiber Optic Facilities	61	1	3	59
	Filming	3	0	2	1
	Interstate Energy Facilities	2	0	0	2
	Natural Gas	1	0	1	0
	Non-Energy Facilities	841	20	90	741
	Nonexclusive	2	0	0	2
	Oil & Gas Facilities	639	6	77	556
	Other Energy Facilities	596	4	46	548
	Solar Energy Facilities	9	2	0	9
	Storage and Stockpile	1	1	0	0
	Subject to Existing R/W-Esmt.	1	0	0	2
	Subject to Existing Federal R/W	1	0	0	2
	Water	2	0	1	1
	Wind Energy Facilities	39	7	19	15
	Zeolites, Phillipsite	1	0	0	1
	Alaska (all ROWs)	44	14	0	23
	Not coded in database	17	1	6	14
2012	Total	2262	56	246	1979
2013	Fiber Optic Facilities	57	1	6	53
	Filming	1	0	1	0
	Natural Gas	2	0	1	1
	Non-Energy Facilities	777	19	63	704
	Nonexclusive	2	0	0	2
	Oil & Gas	1	0	0	1
	Oil & Gas Facilities	788	4	70	721
	Other Energy Facilities	534	5	31	503
	Solar Energy Facilities	3	1	1	1
	Subject to Existing Federal R/W	1	0	0	1
	Water	1	0	0	1
	Wind Energy Facilities	8	0	5	4
	Alaska (all ROWs)	29	7	0	13
	Not coded in database	17	3	2	18
2013	Total	2221	40	180	2023
2014	Civil Rights Reserved	1	0	0	1
	Ditches or Canals	1	0	0	1
	Fiber Optic Facilities	37	0	6	31
	Historic Purposes	2	0	0	2
	Non-Energy Facilities	658	16	44	604

Total BLM Right-of-Way Applications Received (FY 2005-2014)					
FY	Type of ROW	Total Received	Rejected	Withdrawn	Approved
	None				
	Nonexclusive	3	0	0	3
	Oil & Gas Facilities	608	1	59	551
	Other				
	Other Energy Facilities	354	5	67	283
	Recreation Purposes	2	0	0	2
	Solar Energy Facilities	1	0	0	1
	Water	5	0	0	5
	Wind Energy Facilities	2	0	0	2
	Alaska (all ROWs)	48	2	0	19
	Not coded in database	20	3	2	17
2014	Total	1742	27	178	1522

6. Please provide in detail a breakdown of all rentals and cost recovery fees and any other revenue collected from ROWs over the past ten fiscal years. Please breakdown that information based on type of ROW.

Response:

- The table below reports the total cost recovery fees collected by the BLM for rights of way. The information is grouped by state and right of way type. Cost recovery funds consist of "application processing fees," which cover BLM personnel costs to process applications up to the point of a decision. If a ROW is approved, "monitoring fees" are received to cover BLM personnel costs to monitor construction and operation activities. The BLM does not keep data on the mix of rentals and other fees that makes up the totals in each category.

BLM Cost Recovery Totals by Fiscal Year (FY 2005-2014)		
BLM State Office/State	Right-of-Way Type	10-Year Cost Recovery Total (in dollars)
BLM-AZ	Fiber Optic Facilities	65,220
	Interstate Energy Facilities	280,326
	Non-Energy Facilities	872,698
	Oil & Gas Facilities	86,322
	Other Energy Facilities	2,420,717
	Solar Energy Facilities	4,368,779
	Wind Energy Facilities	860,771
	Not coded in database	1,089
	TOTAL	8,955,923
BLM-CA	Apiaries	2,900
	Fiber Optic Facilities	672,402
	Filming	1,084

BLM Cost Recovery Totals by Fiscal Year (FY 2005-2014)		
BLM State Office/State	Right-of-Way Type	10-Year Cost Recovery Total (in dollars)
	Interstate Energy Facilities	986,501
	Non-Energy Facilities	4,565,778
	Oil & Gas Facilities	755,351
	Other Energy Facilities	7,870,878
	Solar Energy Facilities	17,842,977
	Storage and Stockpile	109
	Subject to Existing Federal R/W	1,108
	Water	26,960
	Wind Energy Facilities	8,765,761
	Not coded in database	223,724
BLM-CA	TOTAL	41,715,534
BLM-CO	Fiber Optic Facilities	41,131
	Non-Energy Facilities	662,892
	Oil & Gas Facilities	1,627,149
	Other Energy Facilities	1,307,664
	Solar Energy Facilities	50,000
	Water	1,774
	Wind Energy Facilities	25,526
BLM-CO	TOTAL	3,716,136
BLM-ES/AL	Other Energy Facilities	386
BLM-ES/IL	Other Energy Facilities	4,842
BLM-ES/LA	Oil & Gas Facilities	496
	Other Energy Facilities	104
	Not coded in database	222
BLM-ES/NJ	Interstate Energy Facilities	47,419
BLM-ES/PA	Interstate Energy Facilities	94,838
BLM-ES	TOTAL	148,307
BLM-ID	Fiber Optic Facilities	56,847
	Non-Energy Facilities	553,316
	Oil & Gas Facilities	35,353
	Other Energy Facilities	646,155
	Wind Energy Facilities	2,014,021
BLM-ID	TOTAL	3,305,692
BLM-MT	Fiber Optic Facilities	95,857
	Interstate Energy Facilities	1,401,306
	Natural Gas	784
	Non-Energy Facilities	349,692
	Oil & Gas Facilities	1,163,425
	Other Energy Facilities	169,925
	Water	1,499
	Wind Energy Facilities	81,494
BLM-MT/ND	Fiber Optic Facilities	4,082

BLM Cost Recovery Totals by Fiscal Year (FY 2005-2014)		
BLM State Office/State	Right-of-Way Type	10-Year Cost Recovery Total (in dollars)
	Interstate Energy Facilities	350,000
	Non-Energy Facilities	3,348
	Oil & Gas Facilities	935,620
	Other Energy Facilities	19,592
BLM-MT/SD	Fiber Optic Facilities	2,684
	Non-Energy Facilities	114,266
	Oil & Gas Facilities	416
	Other Energy Facilities	2,942
	Wind Energy Facilities	8,112
BLM-MT	TOTAL	4,705,045
BLM-NM	Fiber Optic Facilities	108,761
	Missing Doc/Illegible Data	686
	Non-Energy Facilities	2,105,366
	Oil & Gas Facilities	8,100,136
	Other Energy Facilities	6,853,029
	Solar Energy Facilities	100,000
	U.S. Rights Unknown	325
	Water	1,139
	Wind Energy Facilities	45,682
	Zeolites, Phillipsite	1,149
	Not coded in database	1,566
BLM-NM/TX	Non-Energy Facilities	224
BLM-NM	TOTAL	17,318,062
BLM-NV	All Surface Rights U.S.	2,178
	Fiber Optic Facilities	436,650
	Filming	460
	Interstate Energy Facilities	4,624
	Non-Energy Facilities	4,838,037
	Nonexclusive	2,316
	Oil & Gas Facilities	2,847,540
	Other Energy Facilities	15,470,480
	Solar Energy Facilities	6,370,722
	Water	4,697
	Wind Energy Facilities	2,912,438
	Not coded in database	227,623
BLM-NV	TOTAL	33,117,764
BLM-OR	Ditches or Canals	1,168
	Fiber Optic Facilities	57,958
	Filming	460
	Non-Energy Facilities	3,139,795
	Nonexclusive	18,217
	Occupancy, Commercial	343

BLM Cost Recovery Totals by Fiscal Year (FY 2005-2014)		
BLM State Office/State	Right-of-Way Type	10-Year Cost Recovery Total (in dollars)
	Oil & Gas Facilities	357,605
	Other Energy Facilities	4,548,913
	Water	907
	Wind Energy Facilities	476,590
	Not coded in database	11,395
BLM-OR/WA	Fiber Optic Facilities	7,530
	Non-Energy Facilities	25,094
	Oil & Gas Facilities	5,381
	Other Energy Facilities	537,084
	Wind Energy Facilities	14,410
	Not coded in database	734
BLM-OR	TOTAL	9,203,584
BLM-UT	Fiber Optic Facilities	72,396
	Filming	115
	Interstate Energy Facilities	200,000
	Non-Energy Facilities	2,437,997
	Oil & Gas Facilities	2,720,634
	Other Energy Facilities	2,409,632
	Water	200
	Wind Energy Facilities	843,676
	Not coded in database	765
BLM-UT	TOTAL	8,685,415
BLM-WY/NE	Non-Energy Facilities	107
BLM-WY	Carbon Dioxide	199,710
	Clay, Bentonite	109
	Fiber Optic Facilities	68,086
	Interstate Energy Facilities	7,238,993
	Non-Energy Facilities	2,299,956
	Oil & Gas Facilities	5,413,464
	Other Energy Facilities	1,131,191
	Storage and Stockpile	208
	U.S. Rights Unknown	495
	Water	480
	Wind Energy Facilities	2,415,298
	Not coded in database	425
BLM-WY	TOTAL	18,768,521



United States Department of the Interior

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
Washington, DC 20240

FEB 26 2016



The Honorable Tom McClintock
Chairman
Subcommittee on Federal Lands
Committee on Natural Resources
United States House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Chairman McClintock:

Enclosed are responses to follow-up questions from the legislative hearing on December 2, 2015, on a discussion draft of H.R. _____, the "*National Park Service Centennial Act*." These responses were prepared by the National Park Service.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond to you on these matters.

Sincerely,

Christopher P. Salotti
Legislative Counsel
Office of Congressional and
Legislative Affairs

cc: The Honorable Niki Tsongas
Ranking Minority Member
Subcommittee on Federal Lands

Enclosure

**Committee on Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Federal Lands
1324 Longworth House Office Building
Wednesday, December 2, 2015
10:00 A.M.**

Legislative hearing on:

A discussion draft of the "National Park Service Centennial Act"

Questions from Chairman McClintock for Director Jonathan Jarvis

1. Could you please provide the Committee with the National Park Service's justification for banning bottled water in certain National Parks?

Answer: The National Park Service has not banned bottled water in national parks. NPS Policy Memorandum (PM) 11-03, Disposable Plastic Water Bottle Recycling and Reduction was published in December 2011. The policy has a four-pronged approach of encouraging water bottle recycling, reduction of disposable water bottle use, education regarding disposable waste bottles, and elimination of disposable water bottles sales within parks where appropriate.

The policy includes an option for individual parks to eliminate sales, on a park-by-park basis, following extensive review and approval by the regional director. As part of this review, parks are required to evaluate the economic impacts of eliminating disposable water bottle sales on park concessioners as well as potential public health impacts on park visitors. Parks must show that they can avoid or mitigate any negative impacts prior to the regional director approving the elimination of sales. The policy is intended to reduce the environmental and cost impacts of disposable water bottles on parks.

National parks spend significant amounts of money on the management of solid waste, including disposable plastic water bottles. Reduction of waste is a highly successful approach for the National Park Service, as it contributes to reducing the overall costs for parks to provide sanitary trash collection and disposal services, reducing our environmental footprint, and reducing the greenhouse gas emissions associated with trash collection and disposal.

Visitors to all national parks continue to have access to unlimited drinking water and carry bottled water in the containers of their choice, either refillable or disposable. Parks have also added water bottle refilling stations to make use of refillable water bottles more convenient, and will have available for purchase affordable, refillable water bottles that can be refilled at no cost.

2. Please provide the Committee information about how the \$900 million in 2010 was used. Why was this 35% increase in a single year's budget not reflected in the construction fund? Where did this money go?

Answer: The National Park Service (NPS) received \$750 million in supplemental, one-time American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding in FY 2009, as well as increases to its annual budget in FY 2009 and 2010.

With the funding received under ARRA, projects were selected, using merit-based criteria. The NPS selected projects that addressed high-priority restoration and preservation needs, addressed deferred maintenance, and enhanced critical facilities. This included a quantifiable improvement to the condition of NPS facilities and a reduction of over \$500 million in deferred maintenance. NPS ARRA projects also improved the energy efficiency of facilities and equipment, expanded the use of renewable energy in parks, and encouraged the participation of young adults in their national parks. The NPS completed over 780 projects at 260 park units in 48 states and the District of Columbia with ARRA funds. ARRA grants were also awarded to 20 historically black colleges and universities for 21 historic preservation projects within the parameters of the Historic Preservation Fund.

The increases to its annual budget in FY 2009 and 2010 supported a wide variety of NPS programs, including over \$14 million for LWCF State Conservation Grants, nearly \$9 million for grants from the Historic Preservation Fund to States and Tribes, and \$3 million for grants to Japanese American Confinement Sites. The additional funding also included more than \$100 million in targeted park base increases to address high-priority needs at units across the national park system, including \$3.3 million to support drug eradication efforts on park lands, \$11.9 million to enhance law enforcement and icon security provided by the United States Park Police, and over \$44 million to support maintenance and repair of facilities.

Between FY 2010 and FY 2015, the discretionary appropriations for NPS fell by \$138.6 million. Additionally, the NPS has either fully or partially absorbed its fixed costs in each fiscal year, reducing the operational flexibility and capacity of its parks and programs.

**Committee on Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Federal Lands
1324 Longworth House Office Building
Wednesday, December 2, 2015
10:00 A.M.**

Legislative hearing on:

A discussion draft of the "National Park Service Centennial Act"

Questions from Representative Lummis for Director Jonathan Jarvis

1. Could you please provide the Committee with a complete list of projects that the NPS was able to fund using the \$10 million from the Centennial Challenge Fund? How were each of those projects matched with outside funding?

Answer: See attached chart.

**Committee on Natural Resources
Subcommittee on Federal Lands
1324 Longworth House Office Building
Wednesday, December 2, 2015
10:00 A.M.**

Legislative hearing on:

A discussion draft of the "National Park Service Centennial Act"

Questions from Rep. Dan Newhouse for Director Jonathan Jarvis

1. Whenever the cost of access to publicly owned lands or facilities is increased, I believe it is essential that it comes with commensurate increases in the quality of the user's experience. How will the additional revenues raised by this proposal improve the visitor's experience at national parks?

Answer: The additional revenues from lodging fees and the increase to the price of the senior pass will fund the NPS Second Century Fund. The Second Century Fund is a challenge program designed to match nonfederal donations to federal funds on at least a 1-to-1 basis for projects and programs that improve the visitor experience and preserve our natural and cultural resources. The fund will include projects similar in nature to the types of projects that have been funded under the smaller Centennial Challenge program, which have included youth education programs, trail rehabilitation, overlook restoration, campground enhancements, exhibit replacement, accessibility improvements, and other projects that enhance the experience of park visitors.

2. As you know, visitation at National Parks has declined by about 50% among youth over the past decade. How do you see this bill's provisions being used to reverse that troubling trend and help younger Americans appreciate our rich natural heritage?

Answer: The goal of the National Park Service Centennial is to connect with and create the next generation of park visitors, supporters, and advocates. Outreach efforts are therefore aimed at reaching younger audiences. We are accomplishing this through several Centennial programs including the "Find Your Park" campaign, the "Every Kid in a Park" initiative, and a multitude of other efforts that the NPS and our partners are engaged in.

The proposed legislation will add to our Centennial effort by establishing, clarifying, and expanding a number of key existing NPS authorities to allow us to better serve the American people. Among the ten titles are many that would support youth engagement and education of our cultural and natural heritage.

The Centennial Declaration would recognize that the NPS has responsibility not only for administering the units of the National Park System, but for programs that provide financial and technical assistance to states, communities, and individuals to protect our national heritage. Many of these programs aid youth in local communities by building trails and playgrounds or supporting outdoor educational programs.

The National Park Centennial Challenge Fund would provide a Federal match for signature partnership projects that will help prepare the national parks for another century of conservation, preservation, and enjoyment. Many of the challenge projects funded in FY 2015 directly engaged youth through environmental or historic preservation project rehabilitation. Programs developed to engage youth are one of the priority considerations for future selections.

Finally, the proposed legislation would clarify that interpretation and education are key functions of the National Park Service and it would encourage the use of current technologies and the development of educational programs that reach diverse groups. As the keeper of our nation's historic places and critical ecosystems, the NPS is an important educational resource, promoting historical and scientific literacy and civic engagement skills. Through interpretation and education the NPS will continue to invite youth to connect with National Parks and their local communities.

3. Americans can already make donations if they wish to the National Park Service and the individual parks it operates. How does the proposed National Park Foundation Endowment improve the Park Service's ability to develop and utilize private support?

Answer: Although Americans currently have the ability to make direct donations to the National Park Service and individual parks, it is our experience that donors are often reluctant to make a gift directly to a government agency, whether at the national or park level. However, they are drawn to supporting our nonprofit partners, such as the National Park Foundation, whose primary mission is to enrich our national parks and its programs through private support. The Congressionally chartered Foundation has the staff, expertise, and time to work with them to structure and steward their gift and explore the tax implications. The nonprofit partner is also able to combine their donation with other gifts for greater impact.

We believe in the coming years that the majority of private philanthropic support will come from individual bequests and planned gifts. Baby boomers – the richest generation in American history – are currently working on their wills and planned giving. The proposed endowment would allow the National Park Foundation to create incentives for donors to have their gift matched or leveraged for maximum benefit to the parks. The Foundation could also seed new and more ambitious projects to benefit groupings of parks or parks with similar meanings and introduce new audiences to park philanthropy.

FY 2015 Centennial Challenge Projects

State	Unit Name	Project Title	Federal Share ¹	Partner Match	Partner
ME	Acadia National Park	Restore Hiking Trails with Acadia Youth Conservation Corps	\$30,000	\$30,000	Friends of Acadia
ME	Acadia National Park	Rehabilitate Deer Brook Trail	\$50,000	\$50,000	Friends of Acadia
ME	Acadia National Park	Restore Carriage Road Vistas	\$85,000	\$85,000	Friends of Acadia
MD	Antietam National Battlefield	Restore Otto House Landscape	\$10,000	\$10,000	Save Historic Antietam Foundation
MD	Antietam National Battlefield	Remove Nonhistoric Trees from Antietam National Cemetery	\$10,000	\$10,000	Western Maryland Interpretative Association
WI	Apostle Islands National Lakeshore	Raise Sunken Walks at Raspberry Light Station Cultural Landscape	\$3,499	\$3,500	National Parks of Lake Superior Foundation
multi	Servicewide	Connecting Kids to Parks: Meeting the Centennial Challenge	\$450,000	\$450,000	National Park Trust
TX	Big Bend National Park	Replace and Renovate Fossil Bone Exhibit	\$300,000	\$515,000	Friends Big Bend National Park
KY,TN	Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area	Improve Access and Protect Appaloosa Field	\$5,090	\$5,090	Knoxville Arabian Horse Club
KY,TN	Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area	Reconstruct Stream Crossing and Correct Park's Legislative Access Road to Protect Aquatic Species	\$10,048	\$10,048	Back Country Horsemen
FL	Biscayne National Park	Conservation and Recovery of the Endangered Schaus Swallowtail Butterfly	\$18,211	\$18,212	Disney Worldwide Conservation Fund
FL	Biscayne National Park	Commemorate African American Conservation Hero	\$15,000	\$15,000	South Florida National Parks Trust, City of Homestead
RI	Blackstone River Valley National Historical Park	Conduct New National Park Jr. Ranger and Outreach Program	\$8,000	\$9,000	Blackstone, Inc.
NC,VA	Blue Ridge Parkway	Replace Amenities at Price Park Campground and Picnic Area	\$22,000	\$22,000	Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation
NC,VA	Blue Ridge Parkway	Rehabilitate Abbott Lake Trail for Accessibility	\$30,764	\$30,769	Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation
NC,VA	Blue Ridge Parkway	Repair and Restore Historic Polly Woods Ordinary	\$48,597	\$48,597	Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation
NC,VA	Blue Ridge Parkway	Rehabilitate Paved Walkways in Price Park Campground	\$56,368	\$61,067	Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation
NC,VA	Blue Ridge Parkway	Repair and Restore Historic Johnson Farm Structures	\$87,934	\$87,936	Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation
NC,VA	Blue Ridge Parkway	Rehabilitate Mt. Pisgah Amphitheater	\$107,001	\$107,001	Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation
AR	Buffalo National River	Develop Explorers for Health Program	\$23,512	\$25,000	Buffalo National River Partners
AR	Buffalo National River	Launch Toney Bend Environmental Education Center	\$30,000	\$30,000	Arkansas State University
MA	Cape Cod National Seashore	Rehabilitate Trails with SCA Youth Engagement	\$20,000	\$20,000	Eastern National

FY 2015 Centennial Challenge Projects

State	Unit Name	Project Title	Federal Share ¹	Partner Match	Partner
MA	Cape Cod National Seashore	Paint and Repair the Captain Penniman House to Preserve its Historic Integrity	\$85,000	\$115,000	Friends of Cape Cod
DC,MD,W V	Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park	Implement Educational School Based Programming at Great Falls, Maryland	\$74,999	\$75,000	C+O Canal Trust
DC,MD,W V	Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park	Repair Marsden Tract Footbridge	\$75,000	\$75,000	C+O Canal Trust
OH	Cuyahoga Valley National Park	Install East Rim Off Road Single Track Bike and Hike Trail	\$183,404	\$198,687	Conservancy for Cuyahoga Valley National Park
NJ,PA	Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area	Reconnect Native American Youth to the Delaware River Valley	\$22,146	\$22,146	TCF, PEEC, Delaware Nation, Delaware Tribe, Stockbridge-Munsee Nation
WY	Devils Tower National Monument	Re-Purpose Climbing Kiosk In To Visitor Contact Station	\$15,352	\$16,468	Devils Tower Natural History Association
FL	Dry Tortugas National Park	Re-Establish Loggerhead Key Lighthouse Light	\$26,400	\$30,000	Florida Lighthouse Association
FL	Dry Tortugas National Park	Assessment and Interpretation of sea turtle nesting and hatching at Index Beach	\$12,000	\$14,000	South Florida National Parks Trust
FL	Everglades National Park	Replace Aids to Navigation	\$50,960	\$50,960	Everglades Association, South Florida National Parks Trust, NPCA
FL	Everglades National Park	Assess Florida Bay benthic habitat as Florida Bay has experienced sponge and seagrass die-offs that warrant restoration or	\$34,320	\$35,000	South Florida National Parks Trust
FL	Everglades National Park	Replace Shark Valley Canal Viewing Platform	\$8,823	\$9,196	Everglades Association
FL	Everglades National Park	Introduce Diverse Miami Youth to Everglades National park through In-Park Educational Programs	\$78,172	\$99,475	South Florida National Parks Trust, NPF
NY	Federal Hall National Memorial	Improve Signage and Temporary Exhibits	\$90,000	\$110,000	Eastern National
CO	Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument	Trails4Teens: Engaging Teens Through Work and Recreation on FLFO Trail System	\$13,000	\$13,000	National Park Foundation
CO	Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument	Establish Interdisciplinary Youth Conservation Corps Crew	\$26,000	\$26,000	National Park Foundation
GA	Fort Pulaski National Monument	Complete Deferred Preservation Maintenance on Cockspur Island Lighthouse	\$25,000	\$25,000	Friends of Cockspur Lighthouse
NJ,NY	Gateway National Recreation Area	Enhance Habitat of the Gardens and Big John's Pond	\$300,000	\$300,000	The Nature Conservancy
DC,MD,V A	George Washington Memorial Parkway	Arlington House Summer Gardening Youth Internship	\$4,000	\$4,000	Save Historic Arlington House
PA	Gettysburg National Military Park	Rehabilitate Cemetery Ridge	\$600,000	\$700,000	Gettysburg Foundation
MT	Glacier National Park	Engage Youth Through the Rehabilitation of the Highline Trail	\$18,000	\$20,000	Glacier National Park Conservancy
MT	Glacier National Park	Reconstruct Historic Missing Double Helix Stairway at Many Glacier Hotel	\$121,650	\$121,650	Dorcy Estate
CA	Golden Gate National Recreation Area	Mobile Interpretive Application to Engage New Audiences, particularly Youth	\$44,400	\$44,400	Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy

FY 2015 Centennial Challenge Projects

State	Unit Name	Project Title	Federal Share ¹	Partner Match	Partner
CA	Golden Gate National Recreation Area	Concrete Preservation Institute Youth Stewardship Program	\$100,000	\$100,000	Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy
NY	Governor's Island National Monument	Connect New York Harbor Coastal Defense Story for diverse visitors	\$30,000	\$30,000	Eastern National
AZ	Grand Canyon National Park	Rehabilitate Clear Creek trail	\$30,000	\$30,000	Grand Canyon Association
AZ	Grand Canyon National Park	Rehabilitate Greenway trail	\$285,000	\$285,000	Grand Canyon Association
AZ	Grand Canyon National Park	Rehabilitate Wilderness trail	\$207,000	\$207,000	Grand Canyon Association
WY	Grand Teton National Park	Preserve the Iconic T.A. Moulton and Reed Moulton Barns in the Mormon Row Historic District	\$23,000	\$23,000	Grand Teton National Park Foundation
WY	Grand Teton National Park	Continue Preservation Efforts at the Mormon Row Historic District	\$21,000	\$21,000	Grand Teton National Park Foundation
WY	Grand Teton National Park	Rehabilitate Historic CCC Retaining Wall and Trail	\$51,375	\$51,375	Grand Teton National Park Foundation
WY	Grand Teton National Park	Replace Hidden Falls and Inspiration Point Bridges on Jenny Lake Trail	\$52,354	\$52,354	Grand Teton National Park Foundation
NC,TN	Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Preserving our Past Through Restoration of Historic Mills	\$14,040	\$21,400	Friends of Great Smoky Mountain National Park, Great Smoky Mountain Association
NC,TN	Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Engage and mentor youth in wildlife management using modern technology	\$26,460	\$96,744	Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Friends of GRSM, Great Smoky Mountains Association, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Tallassee Fund, and Seven Islands Foundation
NC,TN	Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Collaborate with partners to protect hemlock forests on a regional scale	\$49,961	\$60,000	Friends of Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Great Smoky Mountains Association, Tallhassee Fund
NC,TN	Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Collaborate with partners to protect and restore waterways to increase recreational fisheries	\$50,406	\$106,833	Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, The Nature Conservancy
NC,TN	Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Create Work Opportunities for the Next Generation through Youth Partnerships (SCA/ACE)	\$68,400	\$163,082	Friends of Great Smoky Mountain National Park
NC,TN	Great Smoky Mountains National Park	Mentor Youth (SCA/ACE) Stewardship through Alum Cave Trail Restoration Project	\$75,000	\$156,480	Friends of Great Smoky Mountain National Park
NC	Guilford Courthouse National Military Park	Rehabilitate Outdated Interpretive Media at Colonial Heritage Center	\$239,379	\$239,379	Guilford Battleground Company
HI	Hawaii Volcanoes National Park	Engaging Youths and Partners to Protect HAVO's Flagship Species and Special Habitats	\$38,780	\$40,000	Hawai'i Pacific Park Association
PA	Independence NHP	Repair Audiovisual Displays at the President's House Site	\$50,000	\$50,000	Friends of Independence
multi	Intermountain Regional Office	Increase Distance Learning Capability in Eight Intermountain Region Parks - Big Bend NP, Devils Tower NM, Glacier NP, Organ Pipe Cactus NM, Padre Island NS, Timpanogos Cave NM, White Sands NM, Zion NP	\$30,000	\$30,000	National Park Foundation

FY 2015 Centennial Challenge Projects

State	Unit Name	Project Title	Federal Share ¹	Partner Match	Partner
MI	Isle Royale National Park	Ballast Water Treatment for Freshwater Ships	\$111,000	\$120,000	American Steamship Company
MO	Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	Engage Youth of Ferguson	\$7,400	\$7,400	Jefferson National Parks Association
CA	Joshua Tree National Park	Repair Deteriorated Perimeter Fencing, Signage and Retaining Wall at Keys Ranch	\$11,723	\$11,760	Joshua Tree National Park Association
AK	Kenai Fjords National Park	Create Community Mural for Centennial Celebration	\$10,000	\$10,000	Alaska Geographic, Seward Mural Society
MI	Keweenaw National Historical Park	Establish Youth Stewardship Work Crew to Assist Heritage Sites and Partners	\$20,000	\$20,000	Keweenaw NHP Advisory Commission, National Parks of Lake Superior Foundation, and Isle Royale Keweenaw Parks Association
CA	Lava Beds National Monument	Capturing Vanishing Cave Resources for Future Generations	\$20,000	\$20,000	Fund for Parks
CA	Lava Beds National Monument	The Celebration of the Century! Youth Engaging Youth at LABE and TULE	\$30,000	\$30,000	Lava Beds Natural History Association
MA	Longfellow House-Washington's Headquarters	Engage Youth to Restore Longfellow Garden Features	\$12,000	\$12,000	Friends of Longfellow House
MA	Lowell National Historical Park	Develop Interactive Components to River Transformed Exhibit	\$17,000	\$17,000	University of Massachusetts Lowell, Tsongas Industrial History Center
TX	Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park	Improve Walking Surfaces for Accessibility at Johnson Cemetery	\$10,391	\$10,455	Friends of Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park
KY	Mammoth Cave National Park	Implement CAVEservation Summer Camps at Mammoth Cave National Park	\$26,753	\$26,753	Friends of Mammoth Cave National Park
VT	Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park	Youth Volunteer Trails Network for Sustainable Maintenance and Healthy Parks	\$41,080	\$45,940	Woodstock Foundation and Woodstock Trails Partnership
MN	Mississippi National River & Recreation Area	Redesign and Construct the Mississippi River Visitor Center Exhibits	\$100,000	\$100,000	National Park Foundation
WA	Mount Rainier National Park	Engage and Connect Youth and Volunteers with Mount Rainier and Paradise Area Trails	\$20,000	\$20,000	Washington's National Park Fund and Washington Conservation Corps
WA	Mount Rainier National Park	Repair and Upgrade Trinka Memorial Greenhouse	\$20,000	\$20,000	Washington's National Park Fund
CA	Muir Woods National Monument	Replace Redwood Creek Trail and Ben Johnson Trail Bridges	\$30,000	\$32,000	Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy
DC	National Mall and Memorial Parks	Replace paved surfaces at Monroe (James) Park	\$79,000	\$79,000	Golden Triangle BID
DC	National Mall and Memorial Parks	Install Display Fountain Circulation System and Rehabilitate Landscape at George Mason Memorial	\$470,080	\$470,080	Trust for the National Mall
NY	National Parks of New York Harbor	Produce an NPNH Centennial Mobile App for All Visitors	\$50,000	\$110,000	Eastern National
WA	North Cascades National Park	Repair the Sahale Arm Trail	\$18,300	\$18,305	Washington's National Park Fund
WA	Olympic National Park	Take Care of This Land: Connecting Tribal Youth to Olympic National Park	\$15,000	\$15,000	NatureBridge and Lower Elwha Klallam Tribe

FY 2015 Centennial Challenge Projects

State	Unit Name	Project Title	Federal Share ¹	Partner Match	Partner
IL	Pullman NM	Create Interpretive Materials for Newly Established Park	\$50,000	\$50,000	National Park Foundation
VA	Richmond National Battlefield Park	Develop, Fabricate, and Install Signs on Cold Harbor Battlefield	\$10,396	\$15,000	Eastern National
AZ	Saguaro National Park	Create and Support the Next Generation Ranger Corps	\$20,000	\$25,000	Friends of Saguaro National Park
CA	Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area	Construct Accessible Trail and Trailhead Improvements at Cheeseboro Canyon	\$590,000	\$710,000	National Park Foundation and private donor
TN	Shiloh National Military Park	Replace Cannon Carriages on Shiloh Battlefield	\$37,000	\$37,000	Eastern National
AK	Sitka National Historical Park	Preserve and Digitize the E.W. Merrill Glass Plate Negative Collection	\$102,710	\$119,805	The Merrill Project
MI	Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore	Assess Trails for Needed ADA Accessibility Improvements	\$6,185	\$6,251	Friends of Sleeping Bear Dunes
MI	Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore	Refurbish Faust Log Cabin Windows	\$10,383	\$15,383	Preserve Historic Sleeping Bear, SEEDS YCC
MI	Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore	Improve Parking Lot, Install Vault Toilet, and Enhance Signage at Voice and N. Bar Lake Roads	\$31,014	\$39,000	Traverse Area Recreational Trails, Inc.
PA	Steamtown National Historic Site	Restore Steam Locomotive Boston	\$60,000	\$60,000	Lackawanna and Wyoming Valley Railway Historical Society
AZ	Sunset Crater National Monument	Bring Arizona Conservation Corps to Sunset Crater Volcano	\$22,065	\$22,066	National Park Foundation
FL	Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve	Replace Broward House Dock	\$3,000	\$5,000	Timucuan Trails & Parks Foundation
CA	Tule Lake Unit of WWII Valor in the Pacific NM	Gather WWII Japanese American Incarceration Oral Histories	\$24,748	\$25,000	University of Maryland College of Information Studies
PA	Valley Forge National Historical Park	Provide Lighting for the New Event and Education Space project	\$28,000	\$28,000	The Encampment Store
MN	Voyageurs National Park	Improve Cruiser Lake Hiking Trail	\$20,000	\$20,000	Voyageurs National Park Association
MN	Voyageurs National Park	Restore Wetlands Invaded by Non-native Cattail	\$20,000	\$20,000	Voyageurs National Park Association, Friends of Voyageurs National Park
AZ	Walnut Canyon National Monument	Bring Arizona Conservation Corps to Walnut Canyon	\$22,065	\$22,065	National Park Foundation
AK	Western Arctic National Parklands	Facilitating Alaskan Youth to Find Their Park	\$43,000	\$43,000	Alaska Geographic
CA	Whiskeytown National Recreation Area	Engaging Youth Trail Crews to Address Deferred Maintenance	\$15,000	\$15,000	Friends of Whiskeytown
VA	Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts	Purchase Two Wheelchair Lift Visitor Services Cart	\$12,600	\$12,600	Wolf Trap Foundation
VA	Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts	Replace Roof on Encore Circle	\$10,000	\$15,000	Wolf Trap Foundation
VA	Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts	Replace Signage Parkwide	\$40,000	\$46,400	Wolf Trap Foundation

FY 2015 Centennial Challenge Projects

State	Unit Name	Project Title	Federal Share ¹	Partner Match	Partner
AZ	Wupatki National Monument	Bring Arizona Conservation Corps to Wupatki	\$22,065	\$22,065	National Park Foundation
ID,MT,WY	Yellowstone National Park	Enhance Cutthroat Trout by Reducing Nonnative Trout in Yellowstone Lake	\$500,000	\$600,000	Yellowstone Park Foundation
ID,MT,WY	Yellowstone National Park	Rehabilitate the Gardiner Gateway / Roosevelt Arch	\$500,000	\$1,000,000	Yellowstone Park Foundation
CA	Yosemite National Park	Return Endangered Sierra Nevada Bighorn Sheep to Yosemite's Wilderness	\$106,756	\$106,756	The Yosemite Conservancy
CA	Yosemite National Park	Perform Deferred Maintenance on Trails	\$308,600	\$382,968	The Yosemite Conservancy and California Conservation Corps
CA	Yosemite National Park	Rehabilitate and Restore the Mariposa Grove of Giant Sequoias	\$1,194,737	\$1,836,257	The Yosemite Conservancy
UT	Zion National Park	Support Youth Programming at Zion NP, Cedar Breaks NM, and Pipe Spring NM	\$87,030	\$100,384	Zion National Park Foundation, Zion Natural History Association
			\$9,788,886	\$12,107,542	

¹ Due to changes in partner match, there is currently \$211,114 in unallocated funds. The NPS plans to apply these funds to ongoing FY 2015 project changes and/or projects submitted for consideration in FY 2016.