

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM D. SHADDOX, ACTING ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING H.R. 783, TO MODIFY THE BOUNDARY OF MESA VERDE NATIONAL PARK, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

JULY 19, 2007

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Department of the Interior's views on H.R. 783, a bill to modify the boundary of Mesa Verde National Park.

The Department supports H.R. 783. On March 20, 2007, the Department testified in support of S. 126, an identical bill as introduced, before the Senate Subcommittee on National Parks.

H.R. 783 would adjust the boundary of Mesa Verde National Park (park) by adding to the park a total of approximately 360 acres, located near the park entrance. This land includes 324 acres currently owned by the Henneman family and 38 acres owned by the Mesa Verde Foundation. The Secretary is authorized to acquire the land by donation, purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated funds, or by exchange.

We estimate that \$45,000 would be required for closing and survey costs for the Henneman property. Acquisition is estimated to cost approximately \$1.5 million. At this time, operational costs are estimated to be minimal and are not expected to exceed approximately \$20,000 per year. This acquisition would have to compete with other Park Service priorities for funds.

Mesa Verde was authorized as our nation's tenth national park in 1906 and currently includes 52,122 acres. The resources preserved at Mesa Verde include more than 4,000 known archeological sites, three million objects in the park's collections, and natural resources that provided a rich environment and supported the lives of the Ancestral Puebloans who lived there for more than 700 years.

The Henneman and Mesa Verde Foundation properties are adjacent to the current park boundary and in full view from the entrance road into the park. The property forms the foreground of the view of Point Lookout, the promontory which Congress added to the park in 1931. In addition to its strategic position at the park's entrance, the Henneman property possesses Ancestral Puebloan sites, a several-hundred-year-old pinyon-juniper forest, a major wildlife corridor and important winter habitat, and the largest recorded population of the globally imperiled Gray's Townsend daisy, a few of which are found within the current park boundary.

The Hennemans approached Mesa Verde National Park in 2002 with their desire to protect their property through its inclusion in the park. Currently, the Henneman property could be developed and is zoned for subdivision into 10-acre lots and the Hennemans have received written offers from a developer interested in constructing a high-end RV park and convention center on the property. Rather than selling for development, the Hennemans have entered into a contract to sell their property to The Conservation Fund by November 15, 2007, contingent upon passage of this boundary legislation and the availability of funds to acquire the property.

The Mesa Verde Foundation has been working with the park to provide a visitor information center adjacent to the collections facility being designed by the National Park Service for construction. The facility will be located in part on the Foundation property. The Foundation intends to donate their 38-acre parcel to the park, but cannot do so until the land has been included within the park boundary.

We understand that the Hennemans have discussed their desire to include their property in the park with the Montezuma County Commissioners. The commissioners' position was neutral, stating that this is a landowner-initiated project, and it is the right of the landowner to exercise their property rights as they desire. They have also talked with their neighbors about the proposal and no opposition has been voiced.

We recommend one amendment to correct the map reference in the bill. In section 3, paragraph 1 strike "entitled '2006 Proposed Mesa Verde National Park Boundary Adjustment'." and insert "entitled 'Mesa Verde National Park Proposed Boundary Adjustment' numbered 307/80,180, and dated March 1, 2007."

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

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM D. SHADDOX, ACTING ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES, AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND PUBLIC LANDS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES REGARDING H.R. 1266, THE BUTTERFIELD OVERLAND TRAIL STUDY ACT.

July 19, 2007

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you to provide the Department of the Interior's views on H.R. 1266, a bill to authorize a resource study along the "Ox Bow Route" of the Butterfield Overland Trail.

The Department supports enactment of H.R. 1266 with amendments that are described later in this statement. However, we believe that priority should be given to the 37 previously authorized studies for potential units of the National Park System, potential new National Heritage Areas, and potential additions to the National Trails System and National Wild and Scenic River System that have not yet been transmitted to the Congress.

H.R. 1266 authorizes a resource study to examine the Ox Bow Route of the Butterfield Overland Trail to evaluate a range of options to preserve the trail's history, interpret the stories associated with it, and protect resources key to its future appreciation by the public. One alternative may be to add the trail to the National Trails System, which would require subsequent Congressional action. The bill outlines a variety of study objectives as well as requirements designed to protect private property rights of landowners along the route.

The Butterfield Overland Mail Route was the scene of biweekly stage coach and mail service between St. Louis, Missouri, and Memphis, Tennessee, to San Francisco, California between 1858 and 1861. Like the Pony Express farther north, this business venture, closely tied to U.S. Government mail contracts, ceased functioning at the outbreak of the Civil War. The two eastern ends of the Ox Bow Route joined at Fort Smith, Arkansas, crossed Texas to El Paso, came through Fort Yuma (in what is now Arizona), and proceeded up the California coast to San Francisco. This 2,812 mile route took 22 to 25 days to complete by four-horse coach, costing passengers \$200 for the full one-way fare. Started by John Butterfield in 1858, the business was taken over by Wells, Fargo and Company in 1860 before ceasing operations a year later. It employed over 800 men, had 139 relay stations or frontier forts, used 1,800 head of stock, and required the use of 250 Concord Overland stagecoaches. In its heyday, the Butterfield Overland Stage Company was the largest overland stage company with the most relay stations and frontier forts then operating in the United States.

When the category of “national historic trail” was first added to the National Trails System in 1978, the Department of the Interior developed a file of potential historic trails, including the Butterfield Overland Mail Route. Never developed into a study document, this file lists 39 trail-related resources across Texas, including 17 towns and cities and a variety of state and national park areas. To our knowledge, there has not been a Federal study that fully examined trail-related sites or remnant trail segments in all eight of the states crossed by the Ox Bow Route.

H.R. 1266 would enable the study team to look at all feasible alternatives for preserving and interpreting resources associated with the Ox Bow Route. These alternatives could potentially

include a national historic trail, a national heritage corridor, a multi-state scenic byway, or other options. However, if one of the alternatives is a recommendation for addition to the National Trails System, we believe that part of the feasibility study should meet all the study requirements of the National Trails System Act as outlined in 16 USC 1244(b). We suggest amending the bill to specify this requirement. We also recommend clarifying some of the provisions in Section 2(b), which lists the study objectives, and making a technical amendment to Section 3. We would be happy to work with the bill's sponsor and the committee on these amendments.

We estimate the cost of this study to range from \$200,000 to \$400,000, based on similar types of studies conducted in recent years.

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

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM D. SHADDOX, ACTING ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, PARK PLANNING, FACILITIES AND LANDS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, CONCERNING H.R. 1674, TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO STUDY THE SUITABILITY AND FEASIBILITY OF DESIGNATING THE SITE OF THE BATTLE OF CAMDEN IN SOUTH CAROLINA, AS A UNIT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

JULY 19, 2007

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Department of the Interior on H.R. 1674, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating two sites near Camden, South Carolina as a unit or units of the National Park System.

The Department supports H.R. 1674 with a technical amendment, described later in this testimony. While we support the authorization of this study, we also believe that any funding requested should be directed first toward completing the 37 previously authorized studies.

H.R. 1674 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating both Historic Camden, a National Park System affiliated area within the City of Camden, and the nearby site of the Battle of Camden as a unit or units of the National Park System. The study would be conducted in accordance with the criteria contained in Public Law 91-383 and would be transmitted to Congress within 3 years after funds are made available.

The Battle of Camden was a key battle in the southern campaign of the American Revolutionary War. In 1777, the British suffered a decisive defeat at Saratoga, New York. With few prospects

for success in the northern colonies, they turned their attention to the south. The British government was spurred by loyalist representatives in London, who argued that many of the southern colonists would come over to their side if the British were to take control of the southern colonies. In late 1778, the British took Savannah, Georgia and by early 1779, the entire Georgia coastal plain was under British control. In May, 1780, the British took Charleston, South Carolina and the southern Continental Army retreated to North Carolina.

On August 16, 1780, the reconstituted Continental Army, under the leadership of General Horatio Gates, hero of Saratoga, marched on the British position at Camden, South Carolina. Though Gates' force of more than 3,000 men outnumbered the British force of approximately 2,000, the well-trained British right flank overran the untrained militia that made up Gates' left flank. More than 1,000 colonial soldiers were killed, wounded or taken prisoner and the British captured many of the colonists' supplies and artillery. The battle decisively ended American hopes of a quick victory in the south. Gates was replaced by General Nathaniel Greene, whose brilliant campaign of attrition led to the eventual defeat of the British at Yorktown.

The Camden Battlefield is approximately six miles north of the City of Camden and slightly west of U.S. Highway 821/601. In 1961, the Secretary of the Interior designated 1,229 acres of the battlefield as a National Historic Landmark. In 2002, the Palmetto Conservation Foundation purchased 310 acres within the landmark boundary. The remainder of the property within the boundary is owned by Bowater Timber LLC, a private timber company.

Between September 20, 2002 and April 30, 2003, the National Park Service (NPS), conducted a reconnaissance study of the Camden battlefield at the request of former Senator Hollings in order to determine whether a Special Resources Study was warranted. The investigation found that Camden Battlefield appears to have strong potential to meet established criteria for addition to the National Park System and should be considered for additional study.

The reconnaissance study also examined nearby Historic Camden, a National Park System affiliated area within the City of Camden, to determine whether it should be included in a Special Resource Study. Historic Camden is one of the oldest towns in South Carolina and some of its features illustrate life during the colonial and Revolutionary War periods. In 1971, the historic town site was listed as an historic district on the National Register of Historic Places. The town site was also the subject of a 1980 Special Resource Study authorized by Public Law 95-629. The 1980 study concluded that Historic Camden had lost much of its historic integrity and that several non-historic features intruded upon the site of the colonial town. In 1982, Congress authorized the Secretary to provide assistance to Camden, but did not designate it as a unit of the National Park System.

In the 22 years between the 1980 study and the 2002 reconnaissance, both the board of Historic Camden and the City of Camden have done an admirable job addressing many of the items that made the area unsuitable for designation as a unit of the National Park System. The city has purchased property within the boundaries of the colonial town and relocated power lines that intruded on the historic scene. The Kershaw House, a colonial building that served as headquarters for British General Cornwallis during the Battle of Camden, has been restored.

Nonetheless, the National Park Service reconnaissance study concluded that the town site alone was unlikely to be suitable or feasible for designation as a unit of the National Park System.

However, the reconnaissance study recommended including the town site in a Special Resource Study that focused on the battlefield.

We recommend amending both the short title of the bill on page 1, line 5, and the text on page 4, line 12 by inserting “special resource” before “study” to use the term for the proposed study that is normally used for such studies.

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