

Senate Hearings

Before the Committee on Appropriations

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations

Fiscal Year 1987

99th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

H.R. 5234

PART 2—(Pages 1-1112)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM SERVICES
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS
NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION COMMISSION
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION
U.S. HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

STATEMENT OF ROBERT McC. ADAMS, SECRETARY

ACCOMPANIED BY:

ANN R. LEVEN, TREASURER

DEAN ANDERSON, UNDER SECRETARY

MARY RODRIGUEZ, ACTING DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PROGRAMMING
AND BUDGET

JOHN JAMESON, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

PREPARED STATEMENT

Senator McCLURE. We will now turn to the fiscal year 1987 budget request for the Smithsonian Institution.

The fiscal year 1987 budget request for the Smithsonian Institution totals \$215,240,000, an increase of \$15,257,000 above fiscal year 1986 appropriations to date.

And the amount provided for the current year, \$8,599,000, is sequestered.

Secretary Adams, we welcome you before this subcommittee. Your complete opening statement will be included in the record at this point. If you will introduce those at the table with you, we'll then proceed to questions.

[The statement follows:]

(829)

STATEMENT OF ROBERT McC. ADAMS

When I appeared for the first time before the Subcommittee a year ago I spoke of the strengths of the Smithsonian in defense of a budget request for Fiscal Year 1986 that, although nearly \$13 million above the FY 1985 level, was nonetheless carefully honed and deliberately focused. Designed to build on our strengths, the request embodied three important objectives of the priority of Institutional commitments: effective program operations; staffing and operation of two major new entities, the Museum Support Center and the Quadrangle; and improved research support.

Today I would share with you not only the Institution's aspirations for our FY 1987 request, but also the crucial importance of a regular appropriation. I do so in an atmosphere of extraordinary budgetary change and uncertainty, the implications of which are, no doubt, as disquieting to you as they are to me and my colleagues. Unchanged, however, are our objectives, which not only were unmet by the FY 1986 process, but were substantially diminished by it; a brief review of that process is illuminating.

A separate document submitted to the Subcommittee describes the details and the effects of the required Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions in FY 1986 across the five Smithsonian appropriation accounts, as well as some forty line items in the Salaries and Expenses Account. It is sufficient here to state that those reductions were the latest in a series of retrenchments that included the 0.6 percent base reduction in the Continuing Resolution and earlier reductions by the Subcommittee and its House counterpart. The net effect has been that as of March 1, 1986 the Smithsonian had sustained reductions totaling more than \$20,000,000 from the request that had gone to Congress slightly more than a year earlier.

In the Salaries and Expenses Account for Fiscal Year 1986 the reductions exceed \$16,000,000, leaving an amount that is just over \$5,000,000 more than was provided for Fiscal Year 1985. Certainly we are grateful for it, but would note that it is about \$1,700,000 less than we had requested solely for uncontrollable increases such as legislated pay increases, utility costs, and the like.

The prospects for further cuts can only be viewed as chilling, for that would be their effect on the lifeblood of the Smithsonian. Automatic, mindless, across-the-board reductions for Fiscal Year 1987 in the range of 8.4%, as the Congressional Budget Office recently has suggested, against our already tattered FY 1986 base, would eliminate another \$16,000,000.

We have not yet explored the details of a 1987 reduction, but we remain dedicated to the principle that the Institution must preserve its core functions for research and for the care and conservation of the national collections and the structures that house them. At the same time, we also have important responsibilities for broad public and outreach services. It is likely that we would have to reduce hours of operation, perhaps to the point of closing museums one or two days a week; possibly eliminate whole programs; and generally furlough or otherwise reduce our staff. While staff costs constitute approximately 65 percent of our current budget and may seem an easy target, it is important to remember that the collections are of little value to the Nation unless they are housed, cared for, conserved, studied, documented, managed, exhibited, interpreted, and guarded by the people who are the Institution's most important resource.

A century and a half ago, on July 1, 1836, the Nation pledged its faith to the execution of the will of James Smithson for "...the purpose of founding and endowing at Washington, under the name of the Smithsonian Institution, an establishment for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men..." In a report that accompanied the legislation - and probably was written by John Quincy Adams - the House Committee stated that in accepting Mr. Smithson's bequest the Congress would

"...feel in all its power and plenitude the obligation of responding to the confidence reposed by him, with all the fidelity, disinterestedness and perseverance of exertion which may carry into effective execution the noble purpose..."

Mr. Chairman, that noble vision and the faith of the Nation have created and sustained a great Institution, but it is an Institution in need of sesquicentennial plenitude if it is to endure and continue to fulfill its noble purpose. I urge that the option of appropriating our budget request for Fiscal Year 1987 be pursued vigorously.

We recognize that in the present environment the Smithsonian request is anomalous. Its approval would, in effect, entail reappropriating the Fiscal Year 1986 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions and provide a modest increase. This increased funding would be mainly for inflation-related items, Museum Support Center and Quadrangle operations, commemorative events of a national nature, and research support, the same objectives and commitments we had a year ago. Although the total request is nearly \$24 million above the current FY 1986 base, it is less than \$4,000,000 -- only 1-1/2 percent -- above our original FY 1986 request to Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I need not deal at length with the burden of concern over national deficits under which we are all laboring, but would remind you that we exist solely for the "increase and diffusion of knowledge." Our principal focus is on the assembling, studying, and exhibiting of systematic national collections in many fields, and in any case on basic research whose contributions to the advancement of knowledge and human welfare take place over the long term and are in many cases unpredictable. To some, cutbacks or postponements in these activities might well seem simple. Given the relatively small magnitudes that are involved, some might even hope they would be unnoticeable.

I can assure you that they are neither simple or unnoticeable. It is impossible to make responsible and coherent plans to meet our fundamental purposes when we are faced with potentially significant but undefined reductions in the overall level of our operations. Nor is knowledge a commodity that can be turned on and off with a tap. It withers when its acquisition is interrupted -- through inversions of research priorities, the dispersal of teams of investigators, the deterioration of collections, and the non-circulation and wider use of information about them. As my colleague Daniel Boorstin stated just a few months ago, "Any willful cut in our resources of knowledge is an act of self-destruction."

In addition, I share the concern expressed by Frank Press in the March 21, 1986 issue of Science where he wrote:

"the scientific community, rather than think that the budgetary crisis was short-lived, must operate on the assumption that it will endure for years, perhaps to the end of the century. I think we must assume in our planning that past real growths in basic research budgets are now history and that future growth is likely to be almost flat or, in some areas, negative."

Applied to the Smithsonian, with uncontrollable increases in its costs as a result of new facilities coming on-line, rising utilities bills, and the like, negative growth would clearly be our lot if Press' projection is at all accurate.

Mr. Chairman, our FY 1987 budget has been carefully crafted and, we believe, is fully justified. Nevertheless, if the Smithsonian cannot be excluded from the process of scaling-back activities, I invite your consideration of an alternative way of managing the Smithsonian budget in the event of further Gramm-Rudman-Hollings-mandated reductions.

As you know, we have for many years presented our operating budget to you by line item, with each museum or other program described in substantial detail. This procedure has served us both well, and I have the impression that today it leaves you virtually as familiar as we are with the scope and range of our activities. The presentation of the FY 1987 budget follows this format.

Potentially, however, there is a grave disadvantage to this procedure because of the inflexibilities placed upon me as a manager by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings requirement that uniform percentage cuts be taken at the program-

project-activity level. To be sure, the legislation allows for reprogramming with this Subcommittee and the equivalent body in the House. But my basic point is that we will need to act quickly, decisively, and perhaps, even courageously to comprehensively re-configure the Smithsonian's program at a significantly reduced scale. I do not see how this difficult and time-critical exercise can be imaginatively and efficiently carried out in a process of negotiation that must proceed independently from each of the forty or so separate line items in our present budget and with both Houses of Congress.

As you report on our budget, may I suggest that you consider making provision for aggregating a number of line items in order to increase the flexibility that we will need to accommodate a second round of Gramm-Rudman cuts? One possible framework might be the seven functional categories, which correspond reasonably well to the internal organization scheme that the Smithsonian is putting into place: Museums, Research, Public Service, Directorate of International Activities, Special Programs, Administration, and Facilities Services.

Another possibility would involve even a higher level of aggregation: the appropriation of the entire Salaries and Expenses account as a lump sum. From your viewpoint this may seem excessively risky, perhaps even an abdication of the responsibilities of Congressional oversight. However, I think this potential drawback might be overcome with appropriate arrangements for timely interim reporting, and, of course, with a final accounting for your review at the following budgetary hearing. But in any case, the choice of the specific mode of aggregation rests with your Subcommittee. Needless to say, my staff is prepared to work with you closely in developing a strategy along these lines in anticipation of the FY 1987 appropriation.

FY 1987 Budget Request

The FY 1987 budget request before you, developed with the full participation of bureau and program directors throughout the Institution, represents the funding required to move ahead with our most important programs and initiatives. It includes \$190.1 million for Salaries and Expenses, \$12.8 million for Restoration & Renovation of Buildings, \$4.9 million for Zoo construction, \$4.0 million for Quadrangle construction, and \$3.5 million for construction of a laboratory and conference center at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama. No funding is requested for the Special Foreign Currency Program for FY 1987.

Quadrangle

Our FY 1987 budget request provides critical funding for completing construction and developing programs for the Quadrangle complex. The final increment of funding for Quadrangle construction will provide for the construction of the public and staff facilities that will connect the Quadrangle building and the Freer Gallery of Art, as well as additional funding for equipment, construction management, and contingency costs. The Institution expects to take beneficial occupancy of the third level next month and the staff areas of the upper two floors about a month later. Work on exhibition space and the garden will continue into late summer.

In the Salaries and Expenses request, increases totaling \$4.2 million are sought to provide the staffing and program support essential to meet the scheduled public opening of the Quadrangle complex in mid-1987 and full operation of the facilities, including annualization of partial year funding of positions approved in the FY 1986 budget for Quadrangle support. Of the total increase, a sum of \$934,000 is requested for the Sackler Gallery; \$638,000 for the National Museum of African Art; and \$ 2.0 million for security, building management, administration, facility maintenance and operating support. A further amount of \$632,000 is requested for Quadrangle-related programs and support for the International Center, SI Libraries, Office of Exhibits Central, Traveling Exhibition Service, and Office of Public Affairs. If approved, the total federal operating budget for activities in the Quadrangle will be \$11.6 million in FY 1987. Trust funded activities will amount to about \$25.5 million.

Our plans for the public opening of the museums and programs in the Quadrangle complex call for a series of events and activities during May and

June of 1987. There will be major inaugural exhibitions at the Sackler Gallery, the National Museum of African Art, and the International Center, along with a wide range of public events and other activities to mark the occasion, including three lectures series to coincide with the opening of the Sackler Gallery, the National Museum of African Art, and the International Center. At the Sackler Gallery, the collection of objects donated by Dr. Arthur M. Sackler will be displayed, with other major objects from his private collection on loan. The National Museum of African Art will present three important exhibitions: "African Art and the Cycle of Life," "African Textiles," and "African Art from the Permanent Collection." In the International Gallery, the exhibition "Generations: Birth Rituals and the Roots of Becoming" will provide a multi-disciplinary, multi-cultural investigation of the art and rituals associated with birth from ancient times to the present.

Research

The Smithsonian, by virtue of its staff, collections, data bases, and research facilities, is an unique international resource in basic research. Complementing industrial, Federal, and university research, the Smithsonian's long-term research activities provide critical continuity to the Nation's research efforts in a number of disciplines. Expanded support for research has been identified as a major priority for the Institution over the next several years. In the FY 1987 budget, an increase of \$1.0 million is requested to augment the Smithsonian's current research capabilities in tropical biology, astrophysics, and art. An amount of \$330,000 is requested for the National Museum of Natural History to study biological diversity in the arc surrounding the Amazon Basin. The Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory requests \$150,000 to initiate instrument development in the new field of submillimeter astronomy in order to maintain SAO's pioneering leadership in astrophysical research during the 1990s. A requested increase of \$345,000 for the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute will permit the expansion of its ongoing research in tropical forest biology. Increases totaling \$175,000 are requested for the National Museum of American Art, the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, the Archives of American Art, and the Cooper-Hewitt Museum to reinforce the research programs related to their collections.

The FY 1987 budget also provides for the upgrading of research facilities. A sum of \$3.5 million in construction funding is requested to build a laboratory and conference center at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama; an additional amount of \$4.0 million has been provided by a donation from the family of the late Earl S. Tupper. In addition, the Restoration and Renovation of Buildings request for FY 1987 includes funding for important support facilities at STRI. The Zoo Construction request provides funding for the renovation of the old hospital and research building at Rock Creek.

At the same time, the Institution will review its current research programs to insure that its base funding for research is dedicated to its highest priority research efforts. In this regard, the Smithsonian will close the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center's (SERC) Rockville, Maryland, site on November 22, 1986, following a series of internal and external reviews aimed at assessing the scientific direction of this program and the financial ability of the Institution to support these activities in a time of budgetary uncertainties. The closure of SERC (Rockville) will allow the Institution, once the necessary expenses of closedown have been met, to redirect the available resources (approximately \$2.4 million) to existing high priority research activities and newly emerging lines of investigations in the natural sciences occurring elsewhere in the Institution. Selected activities formerly carried out at SERC (Rockville), including collection of solar monitoring data, aspects of plant physiology, and a carbon-dating laboratory, will continue under new organizational arrangements.

The Smithsonian's Special Foreign Currency Program supports research conducted by United States institutions in excess currency countries. No further funding has been requested in FY 1987; funding provided in FY 1986 will be used to continue the program of grants to United States universities, museums, and other institutions of higher learning, primarily for research and advanced professional training in fields of traditional Smithsonian competence. Since the inception of the program in FY 1966, Special Foreign Currency grants have

been made to 247 United States institutions to support more than 850 individual projects. Publications resulting from program grants total more than 1,450 to date.

Bicentennial of the Constitution

The year 1987 will mark a very significant milestone in the history of the United States -- the 200th anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution. In order to observe this occasion appropriately and to commemorate not only the events of 1787 but also the events that have shaped the United States during the past 200 years, several Smithsonian museums and programs will present special exhibitions and public programs during 1987 and 1988. The National Museum of American History will mount a special exhibition, "The Japanese American Experience in World War II," as the centerpiece of an exposition on the Constitution as a living and unfolding document. The National Portrait Gallery will develop an exhibition on "Portraits of Distinguished Jurists," featuring a selection of the most historically enlightening portraits of individuals who have been pivotal interpreters and shapers of our legal institutions. The Office of Smithsonian Symposia and Seminars will sponsor a symposium on "Constitutional Roots, Rights and Responsibilities," in May 1987; and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education will support a three-part program to highlight the meaning of the 200th anniversary of the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights for elementary and high school students. An increase of \$376,000 is requested in FY 1987 for these exhibitions and public programs.

Columbus Quincentenary

Another significant international anniversary will be commemorated just a few short years from now -- the 500th anniversary of the landing of Christopher Columbus in the Americas. The Columbus Quincentenary will be a catalyst for the discussion, investigation, and reinterpretation of the cultural interactions that have occurred in the Western Hemisphere between Native Americans and Europeans from 1492 to the present. The Quincentenary celebration will offer an opportunity to encourage public and scholarly consideration of the significance of Columbus' voyage and to promote better understanding of the Americas as a geographical entity with shared historical roots and concern for future life in this hemisphere.

The Smithsonian will undertake a wide range of programs, exhibitions, and research projects related to the Columbus Quincentenary that synthesize disciplinary perspectives through the reexamination of the history and development of the "New World." The development of these Quincentenary programs will be coordinated throughout the Institution and will be presented in accordance with an Institutional theme entitled, "Quincentenary: The Americas 1492-1992--Exploration of the Past - Encounter with the Present - Discovery of the Future." For FY 1987, initial funding of \$245,000 for the planning and research of these programs is requested.

MSC Equipping & Move

The Museum Support Center, located in Suitland, Maryland, provides the Smithsonian with a state-of-the-art facility for the storage, conservation, and study of museum collections. The move of Smithsonian collections to the MSC, a move unprecedented in the museum community in terms of volume, characteristics, and variety of collections, is scheduled to continue through fiscal year 1991. As a result of the reevaluation undertaken last year to solve the problems that developed with the initial design for the collections storage equipment, the installation of equipment in the storage pods will continue in FY 1987 with the construction of new concrete decks and the purchase of premanufactured storage cabinets. A total of \$4.6 million, an increase of \$1.3 million over the FY 1986 base, is required to continue the purchase and installation of collections storage equipment for the Museum Support Center. In addition, funding of \$712,000 (an increase of \$150,000 over the FY 1986 base) will be needed in FY 1987 to continue preparation and transfer of the collections to the MSC.

Uncontrollable Costs

An amount of \$4.5 million is required for the increased costs of current staff, utilities, postage, communications, and space rental in FY 1987. In addition, a sum of \$1.6 million is requested to compensate for the effects of inflation in other nonsalary areas of expense.

Zoo Construction

For FY 1987, funding of \$4.9 million is requested for construction and improvements at the National Zoological Park. The Zoo's facilities include 163 acres in the Rock Creek Valley of Washington, D.C. and a 3,150-acre Conservation and Research Center located in Front Royal, Virginia. The FY 1987 Zoo Construction request will support the renovation of the old hospital and research building at Rock Creek into a modern research facility (\$2.5 million); the second phase of the renovation and improvement of Olmsted Walk (\$600,000); and renovation, repairs, and improvements at Rock Creek (\$1.4 million) and at the Conservation and Research Center (\$351,000).

Restoration and Renovation of Buildings

For FY 1987, funding of \$12.8 million is requested to continue the Institution's important long-term program to maintain, upgrade, and renovate its museum, research, and support facilities. The R&R request for FY 1987 reflects efforts to plan the orderly completion of a number of major initiatives begun in previous years to improve the condition of existing facilities and to provide creative solutions to future facilities' requirements. In addition, funds sought in this budget will continue a wide range of ongoing essential repair and improvement projects.

The R&R funding requested for FY 1987 includes \$2.9 million for repairs to building facades, roofs, and terraces; \$1.2 million for fire detection and suppression systems; and \$1.9 million for repair and improvements to utility systems. Other projects, totalling \$5.7 million, have been proposed as facilities improvements in support of programmatic objectives, the most notable of which include major renovation at the Freer Gallery of Art and construction of facilities in support of research at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama and the Whipple Observatory in Arizona. Finally, an amount of \$1.1 million is requested for general repairs and for improvements in safety and security of collections, staff, and the public; correction of hazardous conditions; and access for the disabled.

Future Planning

Mr. Chairman, as you will understand, long-range planning in times such as these is difficult at best. Our guidance from the Office of Management and Budget suggests that we can anticipate funding for future years only in terms of increases for inflation. We have, as you know, a number of construction projects in mind, virtually all of which have been deferred while we study the effects on delay or explore various alternative sources of funding.

Within whatever resources are available, we would hope to reinforce areas of traditional Smithsonian expertise such as systematics, tropical biology, and American cultural history, while also trying to develop means for sharing the richness of the Institution more widely here and abroad. We welcome the counsel and the support of the Subcommittee as we engage in these efforts and guide the Institution in these extraordinary times.

INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATES

Mr. ADAMS. Thank you, sir. I'm sorry. I didn't understand the——
 Senator McCLURE. Do you want to introduce those who are with you, and then we'll go to the questions?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; at the lefthand end of the table is the Treasurer of the Smithsonian, Ann R. Leven; Dean Anderson, the Under Secretary, is on my immediate left; Mary Rodriguez, the Acting Director of the Office of Programming and Budget, is on my right; and John Jameson, the Assistant Secretary for Administration, is at the far end on my right.
 Senator McCLURE. Thank you.

QUADRANGLE CONSTRUCTION

The budget requests \$4 million for the final phase of construction of the quadrangle. It is proposed, however, that this amount not be matched on an equal basis with trust funds. Only \$2,630,000 of trust funds would be used.

The specific language of the authorization bill does not require an equal match, but states that trust funds, when combined with the funds so appropriated, is sufficient to carry out the purposes of this act.

Last year, in an attempt to recoup the \$8 million which was rescinded from the quadrangle budget, the Smithsonian decided to request funds for security installation, furnishings, and moving costs in the "Construction" account.

Amounts so added to the construction costs were to be matched by an equal amount of non-Federal funds. This year, those costs are not proposed to be matched. And while contained in the construction costs are identified as salary and expense items.

What's the basis for not following through with our earlier understanding on cost sharing?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the answer is a complicated one and I'd like to divide it into several parts. Part of it has to do with the total of available funds that we now have secured on the private side of this effort.

Part of it has to do with the technicalities of what we feel might be done about the shortfall on the private side.

The situation arises from the nonpayment of one very substantial pledge from the Saudi Government. The pledge made initially was in the amount of \$5 million. We have received \$1 million of that amount. And whether we will be able to retain that \$1 million is a matter that's still very much in question.

This has to do with an agreement which was reached between the Smithsonian under my predecessor and the Saudi Government. And it's my judgment and the judgment of Regents at the Smithsonian that we cannot implement that agreement.

And the Saudi disinclination to pay the balance, and perhaps to request back—the inclination to request the return of the first million—is tied to the unwillingness of the Smithsonian to proceed with that agreement.



That's the general situation in which we find ourselves. There's a further judgment involved here that, with the construction so far along and with the termination of the major fundraising effort having occurred well back into the past, that it's very difficult to pick up and resume an effort on the private side, to secure that \$5 million from some other source.

This is the general background within which we find ourselves facing a shortfall on the private side of what was indeed to have been a matching effort.

EQUIPMENT AND FURNISHING NEEDS

I'd like to ask Mr. Jameson to pick up the story there with the various alternatives with which we feel we are confronted, and that, therefore, are properly the business of this committee.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Chairman, we're now working with a revised and lower total amount of about \$73.2 million which includes furnishings. This is down from the \$75 million that we testified before you last year.

Of that total, we have at present \$33.3 million of appropriated moneys and are seeking the remaining \$4 million in 1987 appropriations.

Our best estimate is that we will have approximately \$35.9 million of raised moneys, which will create an imbalance situation to the tune of approximately \$1.4 million.

We are getting and have gotten favorable estimates, however, on our equippings and furnishings account; with a few more weeks passage of time, it is possible that those numbers will in total come down a bit more which would reduce the imbalance.

It is too early to promise that. We have yet to finish the building and to fully equip it. And of course yet to cope with any possible claims that may arise. We'll certainly come back quickly and tell you if we're coming down.

I would note that one possible suggestion which I think will not meet entirely with your favor, but let me put it on the record at this point. If we had contracted for construction that had been as costly as the Government estimate, it's certainly very likely that we would have been unable to afford very many furnishings and equipment within the "Construction" account.

That would have required us to put a very substantial amount of money into our S&E budget, perhaps as much as \$6 million. We did not have to do that.

One possibility is that we could ask you to reduce the 1987 construction appropriation by \$1.4 million, and provide that to us in the 1987 S&E budget.

We then in turn would further adjust our obligation plan this year and make sure that in both 1986 and 1987, we had enough trust funds to fully match appropriations.

Of course, it would mean that there would be \$1.4 million in the 1987 S&E budget, which would be unmatched. But at least it would be

slightly out of the context of the construction appropriation. And that, in a political, if not financial, sense might be a little easier to cope with.

But that is our present best estimate of the situation we find ourselves in.

Senator McCLURE. I understand that situation. My concern, however, is that the representation was made to us last year and you're not following through on that representation. And that by itself is troubling enough, except you continue to make representations to us about other items which we would like to take at more than just face value as well.

If you change your mind on one item this year, how do we have any confidence you won't just change your mind on another item next year?

Mr. JAMESON. Well, we try not to do that, Mr. Chairman.

Senator McCLURE. Well, I try not to have you do it, too.

Mr. JAMESON. If this pledge had been fulfilled, we would of course have been well ahead of the game, because we have earned a significant amount of money on the trust funds.

Senator McCLURE. Well, I understand that. But, are we in every instance in which a pledge fails going to find you shifting funds like this to try to get back to appropriated funds?

Mr. JAMESON. Absolutely not.

Senator McCLURE. I notice, in this year, the authorization bill for the Cooper-Hewitt Museum is introduced, contained identical language on cost sharing as the quadrangle authorization. And a letter to Senator Mathias dated July 23, 1985, the Smithsonian stated that the bill would require, quote, "an equal amount" to be available from non-Federal sources.

If that is your interpretation of the Cooper-Hewitt bill, why doesn't that interpretation apply to the quadrangle construction?

You have in the past, when you had shortfalls, you used unrestricted trust funds to come up with the total request.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Chairman, we try very hard to live up to our commitment and our responsibilities. And I think, over the long term, we have about a pretty good track record on that.

I think we feel very badly about this situation with the quadrangle.

Senator McCLURE. Well why don't you use unrestricted trust funds in this instance?

Mr. JAMESON. In my view, Mr. Chairman, they are not available.

Senator McCLURE. What do you mean, they're not available? You don't have them?

QUADRANGLE FUNDRAISING

Mr. JAMESON. We don't have them, yes, sir. We are quite heavily committed to a plan of work and I don't know where we would find \$1.4 million in the unrestricted trust fund budget.

Senator McCLURE. What will happen with respect to the Cooper-Hewitt next year if they run across a shortfall in pledges?

Mr. ANDERSON. If I might, Mr. Chairman, I think, in most instances, a pledge is a legally enforceable promise to pay. In this instance, of

course, when you're dealing with a foreign government, matters of that sort are subject to a different sort of interpretation.

Senator McCLURE. Should we then go through your list of unrestricted trust fund pledges and try to determine which are legal obligations and how much we can depend on them?

Mr. ANDERSON. We have done that, sir.

Senator McCLURE. You haven't done it for us.

Let me just ask that question then. How many of your pledges now on the books are legally enforceable obligations?

Mr. ANDERSON. They have all been paid.

Senator McCLURE. They have all been paid? You have no outstanding pledges at all?

Mr. ANDERSON. The last large one came in in a check for \$3 million earlier this week.

Senator McCLURE. That's just for the quadrangle, or is this for all of your operations?

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, I'm speaking of the quadrangle.

Senator McCLURE. I'm speaking of all of your operations.

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't know the answer to that. Perhaps our Treasurer does.

Ms. LEVEN. At the present time, we have legally binding agreements from all granting agencies. These are audited on an annual basis. We checked every one when we finished the 1985 audit. We will do so again for 1986. There are none that have been determined to be uncollectible, as long as we fulfill the prescribed obligations.

Senator McCLURE. Is that true of all pledges—

Ms. LEVEN. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLURE [continuing]. To the unrestricted trust fund?

Ms. LEVEN. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLURE. Is there a sufficient amount of money available for the equal amount to be paid for the Cooper-Hewitt Museum?

Mr. ADAMS. The Cooper-Hewitt Museum at this point has no Federal authorization. At this point, we're engaged in the early stages of a fund-raising drive. Most of the contacts that have been made have been very preliminary contacts with potential donors.

And, really, we're only getting underway in an effort there that will extend over a period of years, so that it would be premature to talk about assessing which pledges were firm and which ones were not.

This is not a case where there's any expectation of the payment of Federal funds until the private funds are actually in hand. That's some years down the road, I might say.

QUADRANGLE OPERATING COSTS

Senator McCLURE. During hearings on the fiscal year 1984 budget, representatives of the Smithsonian stated that, when the quadrangle was fully operational, total operating expenses were anticipated to be \$27 million annually, and that the Federal share of these expenses would be 40 percent.

The total quadrangle budget for fiscal year 1987 is \$37.1 million, an increase of almost 40 percent over earlier estimates. And the building hasn't even opened yet.

What's the basis for these cost increases, particularly in view of the fact that inflation is less than one-half the rate existing when the projections were made and fuel costs have also declined dramatically?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think, even though I don't have those numbers in front of me, Mr. Chairman, that the grand total of \$37 million includes the normal budgets of the component parts of the Institution which are to become tenants in the quadrangle, including our National Associates Program.

Senator McCLURE. It's true, but——

Mr. ANDERSON. As their experience——

Senator McCLURE. But wasn't that true of the \$27 million estimate?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLURE. So that's not changed?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; but the success of the program, if I may term it that way, has continued unabated and, therefore, the budget of that program has gone up considerably in excess of inflation.

Senator McCLURE. Well, now I'm not sure that I understand. The success of the program means you're going to spend more money?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; at the same time as taking more in. It is a self-supporting program.

Senator McCLURE. Is it just when you speak of success of the program, you mean more participation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLURE. More involvement by more people and more groups?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir, and advertisers.

Senator McCLURE. That would, I would assume, that if it is driven by the success of the program which generates receipts, that the Federal share doesn't increase proportionately.

The Federal share of the operating expenses which were estimated to be 40 percent at \$27 million would remain the 40 percent of the \$27 million and not 40 percent of the \$37 million?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that's a safe assumption, setting aside matters of inflation and rates of pay.

Senator McCLURE. All right. But, inflation, rates of pay and fuel costs are less than they were during the period of time you made the estimate, in spite of the fact that the 40 percent of the \$27 million, or \$10.8 million, your request is for \$11.6 million, up about \$1 million, or up about 10 percent over what the estimates were 1 year ago.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLURE. Is that correct?

What is the justification for the increase?

Mr. ANDERSON. The detail of those figures is not before me, sir.

Senator McCLURE. Could you provide it for the record?

Mr. ANDERSON. Be happy to.
 Senator McCCLURE. All right. Thank you.
 [The information follows:]

CHANGE IN ESTIMATES FOR QUADRANGLE OPERATING COSTS

The summary of projected operating costs for the quadrangle is provided in a table included in the Institution's 5-year prospectus. The first quadrangle table (contained in the 5-year prospectus, fiscal year 1984-88, issued in January 1983) was based on a review of quadrangle program and operating plans conducted in the spring of 1982 and projected that quadrangle operating costs would total \$28.1 million in fiscal year 1987 (approximately \$10.1 million in Federal funding and \$18 million in trust funding). In the most recent 5-year prospectus for fiscal year 1987-91 (issued in March 1986), a revised table shows the estimated fiscal year 1987 operating costs for the quadrangle at \$37.1 million (consisting of \$11.6 million in Federal funds and \$25.5 million in trust funds).

The estimates contained in the two tables are not completely comparable, due to changes in how data for quadrangle resources have been presented. For example, in the January 1983 table, only the program increases for the International Center and the Traveling Exhibition Service are included; whereas, the March 1986 table includes all of the base funding for the Directorate of International Activities and SITES. A further change on the trust fund side results from the inclusion (in the March 1986 table) of the funding to purchase the Vever collection for the Sackler Gallery. In addition to the adjustments made because of the change in presentation of the quadrangle resources table during the past 3 years, the projections of the specific funding requirements for both quadrangle program operations and support services have been revised to reflect the refinement of the Institution's program planning process for the quadrangle, especially for the Sackler Gallery and the National Museum of African Art, since the initial review conducted in the spring of 1982.

The program planning for these two bureaus has evolved during the past few years, as the early conceptual design for the facilities of the two museums was transformed into detailed program blueprints. In addition, as the planning progressed, the new position of assistant director for the Sackler Gallery was established and a new director for the National Museum of African Art was hired, resulting in the reevaluation of current programs and the development of new program directions in the two bureaus. This process has been especially evident in the Sackler because it must establish the entire range of base programs for the new museum.

As a result of these two factors, the current quadrangle resources table shows an increase of \$1.5 million in Federal funding for fiscal year 1987 over the initial projections made in January 1983, representing an additional \$2.2 million in the estimates for quadrangle program operations funding, offset by decreases in the projections for support operations (\$92,000) and utilities (\$623,000). The percentage of Federal funding for quadrangle operating costs decreased from the initial projection of 36 percent in January 1983 to the most current estimate of 31.3 percent in March 1986, even though the actual level of Federal funding increased from \$10.1 to \$11.6 million.

QUADRANGLE OPERATING COSTS, FISCAL YEAR 1987

	Estimate March 1986 table ¹	Estimate January 1983 table ²	Difference
Program operations:			
Federal.....	\$7,822,000	\$5,610,000	\$2,212,000
Trust.....	25,455,000	18,040,000	7,415,000
Support operations (Federal).....	3,118,000	3,210,000	(92,000)
Utilities.....	687,000	1,310,000	(623,000)
Totals:			
Federal funding.....	11,627,000	10,130,000	1,497,000
(Percent).....	(31.3)	(36)	
Trust funding.....	25,455,000	18,040,000	7,415,000
(Percent).....	(68.7)	(64)	
Grand total.....	37,082,000	28,170,000	8,912,000

¹The March 1986 table includes Federal and trust base funding for the Directorate of International Activities and the Traveling Exhibition Service, and the purchase of the Vever collection for the Sackler Gallery.

²The January 1983 table did not include Federal and trust base funding for the Directorate of International Activities and the Traveling Exhibition Service.

QUADRANGLE STAFFING

Senator McCLURE. In testifying before the subcommittee on the fiscal year 1985 budget, Mr. Jameson stated that 34 current civil service positions would be reallocated to the quadrangle.

The tables contained in last year and this year's justification don't reflect such a reallocation.

When will this reallocation occur?

Mr. JAMESON. The reallocation will take place as soon as the quadrangle is occupied, beginning next month. These are the staff from the Museum of African Art, some horticultural positions.

Senator McCLURE. Well, if that is true that it takes place starting next month, shouldn't that be shown in your justification for 1987?

Mr. JAMESON. It certainly should be. And I assume that the base we are giving you for 1986 and 1985 includes the positions that these activities that are occupying in the quadrangle will bring with them, including ones that I mentioned, plus the Traveling Exhibition Service, maybe a couple of smaller ones.

Senator McCLURE. It's my understanding that those, the 34 would be reallocated and not new positions.

Mr. JAMESON. It would be currently on board staff, if I understand the question.

Senator McCLURE. But, look as we can, we can't find them.

Mr. JAMESON. Well, we certainly need to give them to you.

Senator McCLURE. Would you?

Mr. JAMESON. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLURE. Would you update your justification and help me find them?

Mr. JAMESON. You deserve to have it and we'll do it quickly.

Senator McCLURE. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

EXISTING POSITIONS REALLOCATED TO THE QUADRANGLE

A total of 41 full-time permanent Federal positions, representing the Federal staffing base on the bureaus to be located in the quadrangle, are to be reallocated to the quadrangle, as indicated below. These positions are reflected in the tables provided in the fiscal year 1987 budget justification and in the 5-year prospectus, fiscal year 1987-91 for each of the bureaus involved.

<i>Bureau</i>	<i>Federal positions</i>
National Museum of African Art.....	25
Traveling Exhibition Service.....	7
Directorate of International Activities.....	9
Total.....	41

OUT-YEAR OPERATING COSTS—QUADRANGLE

Senator McCLURE. In your letter of appeal to the conference dated October 31, 1985, concerning action on the fiscal year 1986 bill, you stated that, by 1990, Federal support for quadrangle operations was estimated at \$11.6 million.

That is precisely the amount contained in the fiscal year 1987 budget request, some 3 years ahead of schedule.

Should we assume that if the request is approved for fiscal year 1987, there will be an absolutely flat budget for the quadrangle for the next 3 years?

Mr. ANDERSON. Independent again of rates of pay and inflation, sir.

Senator McCLURE. You anticipate that. You surely anticipated that when you told us what it was going to be in 1990. You didn't just give us 1986 figures, or 1985 figures. You told us what it was going to be in 1990.

Mr. ANDERSON. There are some tables in the 5-year plan, sir, that are footnoted exclusive of inflation. I'm not sure if that might be one of them.

Senator McCLURE. But this is not a part of your 5-year plan.

Mr. ANDERSON. I'm sorry? I did not understand that.

Senator McCLURE. It was—go back and look at your letter of appeal addressed to the conference last October 31, in which you made a flat dollar prediction of what your 1990 operating costs would be.

Now that 1990 operating cost which you gave us last October is precisely what you now estimate for 1987, which would indicate that you have an absolutely flat budget expectation for the next 3 years.

And I'm asking is that correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. One intervening variable, of course, was advice from the Office of Management and Budget on the administration's view of what the quadrangle ought to be supported at, if I may mix my grammar.

Senator McCLURE. Did they increase your money?

Mr. ANDERSON. They have on occasions, yes, sir.

Senator McCLURE. Did they on this occasion?

Mr. ANDERSON. My recollection is fuzzy. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think it's clear we're in some disarray on this and we—

Senator McCLURE. Well, you know, I would really—

Mr. ADAMS. Without going back to look at the letter and inspecting these figures through detail, we can't answer you.

Senator McCLURE. If you do that, and we laugh because I would really love to have an opportunity to find a situation in which OMB actually forced more money on you. If this is one, it's indeed a red letter item.

Mr. ANDERSON. The amount of force required would be very small, sir.

Senator McCLURE. I understand that. But, if you will supply for the record an explanation of those two figures and what we may read into that.

[The information follows:]

PROJECTIONS FOR QUADRANGLE OPERATING COSTS, FISCAL YEAR 1987-90

In the letter of appeal to the conference committee on the fiscal year 1986 appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, dated October 31, 1985, the Institution stated: "By fiscal year 1990, the Federal funding projected for quadrangle support is approximately \$11.6 million, or about 33 percent of total operating support." The projection of Federal funding for quadrangle operating costs used in the appeal letter was taken from the quadrangle resources table contained in the Institution's 5 year prospectus, fiscal year 1986-90, issued in January 1985, which accompanied the submission of the Smithsonian's fiscal year 1986 budget request to Congress. At that time, the projected estimate for Federal funding for the quadrangle in fiscal year 1987 was \$10.7 million, with an anticipated increase of \$900,000 between fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1990.

The corresponding figures in the most recent 5 year prospectus for fiscal year 1987-91 (issued in March 1986) show projected Federal funding of \$11.6 million for fiscal year 1987 and \$13.8 million for fiscal year 1990 for the quadrangle—an increase of \$2.2 million between fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1990 (\$1.3 million over the level of additional funding projected during this period in the earlier estimates).

The change in the projection of fiscal year 1987 Federal funding for the quadrangle represents increases in program funding for the Sackler Gallery (\$541,000), the National Museum of African Art (\$378,000), and the Directorate of International Activities (\$326,000); as well as the adjustment necessitated by the inclusion of the base resources of the directorate in the quadrangle table (\$401,000). These increases are partially offset by a reduction in the program support estimated for the Traveling Exhibition Service (\$61,000) and reductions totaling \$665,000 in projected support services including security, quadrangle building management, and utilities.

The increase of \$2.2 million currently projected for fiscal year 1990 Federal funding for the quadrangle over the \$11.6 million level estimated in January 1985 represents increases in program funding for the Sackler Gallery (\$282,000), the National Museum of African Art (\$634,000), the Traveling Exhibition Service (\$169,000), and the Directorate of International Activities (\$597,000); as well as the adjustment necessitated by the inclusion of the base resources of the directorate in the quadrangle table (\$401,000). There is also currently projected a slight increase in the costs of support services and utilities over the January 1985 estimates.

The increases in the projected Federal funding for the quadrangle in fiscal year 1987 and fiscal year 1990 are primarily the result of changes in program planning that have occurred during the past year. For the Sackler Gallery, the planning process has had to respond to the constantly changing process of developing the full range of programs for the new museum, including expanded programs in publications and education. For

the National Museum of African Art, continued exhibition planning for the increased exhibition space in the quadrangle resulted in the determination that the museum would have to continue to make extensive use of large loaned exhibitions from other countries in the future, eliminating an earlier anticipated decrease in the use of these higher-cost shows. For SITES, the projections reflect its expanded responsibilities in the quadrangle, including its role in developing and installing exhibitions for the International Gallery. The emerging central role of the Directorate of International Activities in the development of Institution-wide programs for the Columbus Quincentenary, as well as its role in coordinating major international research programs such as biological diversity, is also responsible for the increased funding requirements during this period.

QUADRANGLE OPERATING COSTS

	Estimate March 1986 table	Estimate January 1985 table	Difference
Fiscal year 1990 operating costs.....	\$13,800,000	\$11,600,000	\$2,200,000
Fiscal year 1987 operating costs.....	11,600,000	10,700,000	900,000
Anticipated increase, fiscal year 1987-90.....	2,200,000	900,000	1,300,000

GROWTH IN STAFF AT SMITHSONIAN

Senator McCURE. Secretary Adams, your opening statement contains some harsh words concerning automatic, mindless, across-the-board reductions, and an observation that the 1986 budget process not only left unmet but also substantially diminished the Smithsonian's objectives.

The Office of Management and Budget recently released information on the civilian work force levels between 1981 and 1986. Government-wide employment has increased by less than 5 percent. During that same period, your staff has increased by almost 12 percent. And the request for fiscal year 1987 would provide a cumulative increase of 15 percent in staff levels, and almost 80 percent in the "Salaries and expenses" account, as compared to the fiscal year 1981 level.

Considering the fact that there were two major agencies under our jurisdiction—the Department of the Interior and the Department of Energy—have sustained staff reductions of 9 percent and 23 percent respectively, I have no doubt that there are at least two other Secretaries who would be glad to swap percentages with the Smithsonian.

Having said that, I'm not totally unsympathetic to your requests, that some discretion be allowed to the Smithsonian in the event that sequestration is required in fiscal year 1987.

We cannot, however, address only your situation, as we have heard similar problems in other cases. We would be pleased to receive any recommended changes in the general definition of program, project, and activity which your staff may wish to offer.

And I would invite you to submit to the record what you might suggest in that regard.

[The information follows:]

PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

Public Law 99-177, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, defines the term "program, project, and activity" as follows: "(1) any item specifically identified in tables or written materials set forth in the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1986 (H.R. 3011) and accompanying committee reports (H. Rept. 99-205 and S. Rept. 99-141), and the joint resolution providing continuing appropriations (H.J. Res. 465) and the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the committees of conference; (2) Government-owned or Government-operated facility, and (3) management units, such as national parks, national forests, fish hatcheries, wildlife refuges and the like, for which funds are provided in fiscal year 1986."

The Institution has no proposed changes to this definition, portions of which, primarily section (1), are applicable to its budget submission. While no changes are proposed to this line item manner of submission which allows a comprehensive review by the committees, it is proposed that overall tables or written material in the committees' reports be limited to the summary type of information such as that appearing on page 93 of the Senate report and page 98 of the House report on the fiscal year 1986 appropriation rather than the line-item detail such as appearing on pages 164-167 of the Senate report. Activity groups themselves, such as science, history, and art, et cetera, would then constitute the program for possible Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions and allow the Smithsonian additional flexibility in allocating such cuts. Depending upon the magnitude of such reductions and the Institution's priorities, some component line items might take greater or lesser cuts than the percentage applied to the overall program grouping.

LINE ITEM REDUCTIONS

Mr. ADAMS. Thank you very much. I suppose I owe you an apology for having been somewhat carried away by my own rhetoric with——
Senator McCURE. I enjoyed it.

Mr. ADAMS [continuing]. The word "mindless". [Laughter.]

I do think that the Smithsonian faces a particularly difficult problem with some 40 line items in its budget. And the prospect of having to negotiate with two committees having budgetary oversight within a very brief time with respect to across-the-board line item reductions of comparable percentages is mind boggling.

And facing that new problem, it, as I say, I may get carried away in my rhetoric, but I think we do face a new situation that makes me very appreciative of your willingness to look at some alternative way that aggregates these lines into a more workable pattern for us.

The increase in the size of the Smithsonian staff needs to be—it needs to be taken into account together with the increase in the Smithsonian facilities that are coming on line—the quadrangle, to which you've already made reference, is one example of a major new facility that will need staffing at many levels, partly at professional levels, but partly also for guards and maintenance people, and so on.

And those are programmatic increases that have gone through the budget process and I think one needs to take those into account before you talk about total percentages.

Senator McCURE. I understand that. And I get the same plea from the National Park Service, the Forest Service, Department of Defense, and any number of others who have increased activity levels and shrinking, or at least not growing, budgets.

I know that you noted Senator Garn's presence and departure, but he expects that I would ask these questions. I am certain I have the same interests, although not identical interests with his, in regard to the food services contracts, which we had a discussion in my office.

NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM RESTAURANT

After years of discussion and planning, the Smithsonian has recently reached a decision to modify current operations with respect to the provisions of food services on The Mall.

A major component of this is the decision to construct a new restaurant at the Air and Space Museum using available trust funds.

Why has the Smithsonian selected this approach rather than the option of a concessionaire-built facility?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the concern of the Smithsonian needs to be directed in part toward the assurance of the quality of service for the public in its facilities. Partly, of course, also, toward the assurance of whatever is the maximum level of support for the Smithsonian itself that can be reasonable derived from those facilities.

And the advantage of the Smithsonian making arrangements to provide the capital for the construction of new facilities is a greater degree of control over the quality of service, over the pricing of that service for the general public, a degree of control which, in our judgment, is in the best interests of the public as well as the Smithsonian.

By not requiring the concessionaire to provide the capital, we assure more vigorous competition among the many qualified providers of such service.

If you are insistent that the concessionaire provide that capital, you limit the field very considerably.

Senator McCLURE. Do the RFP's which are out now allow for alternatives, including funding by concessionaires?

Mr. ADAMS. They make no reference, as I understand it, to allowing for funding by concessionaires, but I would ask Ms. Leven.

Ms. LEVEN. No; they do not.

Senator McCLURE. There is a kind of a catchall, isn't there, in the RFP that allows them to, first, they submit the RFP as written. If they have other proposals they wish to make, they're welcome to do so?

Ms. LEVEN. Yes; you have read the amendment No. 1 to the south mall proposal, which does allow that.

Senator McCLURE. And if there is a concessionaire that wishes to make a proposal based upon concessionaire funding, they could do so under that proposal?

Ms. LEVEN. That's right.

Senator McCLURE. And I assume, I need to ask for the record, but I assume I know what the answer is, that if they do that, they will be considered and evaluated as an alternative to the direct response to the RFP?

Ms. LEVEN. We will read and review all materials submitted to us.

Senator McCLURE. And if, as a matter of fact, such a concessionaire-funded proposal was on balance, or after your evaluation judged to be superior, it would be entertained?

Ms. LEVEN. Obviously.

Senator McCLURE. Restaurants open and close with some regularity in this town. But, clearly, some locations present less risks than others.

How would you assess the risk of the Air and Space facility being other than profitable?

Mr. ADAMS. I would find it very difficult to imagine its being other than profitable. With an attendance on the order of 10 million people a year coming through, I think one could bank on profitability.

The question of how much profitability is a matter of considerable concern. But it's very hard for me to imagine a set of circumstances with that many potential customers in the building, with the restaurant we're planning on immediately next door to that building, it's very hard to see how it could lose.

Senator McCLURE. Two RFP's are on the street for food service operations with closing dates of late May and early June. After the closing dates, how long do you anticipate it will be before a selection is made?

Mr. ADAMS. I need to turn to Ms. Leven.

Ms. LEVEN. Our anticipation is that we will start all new contracts on October 1, 1986. And we will take the requisite amount of time to carefully evaluate all of the proposals that we get in response to our RFP's.

We would anticipate that, at least by the end of July, we would have an indication on the first contract, if not on all three.

We need to leave ourselves maximum flexibility on time to be sure.

Senator McCLURE. So you're aiming for—

Ms. LEVEN. October 1 start date.

Senator McCLURE [continuing]. An October 1 award date, or that's when the—

Ms. LEVEN [continuing]. The new contracts would begin—

Senator McCLURE [continuing]. When the new contracts would be effective.

So you think by July?

Ms. LEVEN. I think by the beginning of August, August 1, in order to give the new vendors, if there were to be new vendors, a full 2 months to get ready.

Senator McCLURE. Last year's RFP with respect to the Air and Space addition, resulted in the selection of one of the bidders. Yet, contract negotiations fell through, which brings us to where we are today.

Are the current RFP's more specific in terms of requirements to make you confident that you will actually be in a position to sign a mutually acceptable contract with one of the bidders?

Ms. LEVEN. Yes, sir; they are far more specific.

Senator McCLURE. Although this is an area outside of the direct jurisdiction of this subcommittee, we do have a certain amount of interest in the process, and there is certainly a relationship between that ill-de-

fined or impossible to define area of crossover between appropriated funds and nonappropriated funds—what you do in one area affects the other inevitably.

And what happens in this particular instance has a potential of affecting the appropriated funds.

As you proceed, will you please keep this subcommittee apprised of all of the developments?

Mr. ADAMS. We certainly will. I'd be delighted to do so.

BICENTENNIAL OF THE CONSTITUTION

Senator McCLURE. Increases of \$185,000 for American History, and \$85,000 for the National Portrait Gallery are requested for the Constitutional Bicentennial. With \$265,000 provided through congressional increases, American History will have a total of \$450,000 for this effort in fiscal year 1987.

What additional amounts do you anticipate requesting for the bicentennial in the next 2 years?

Mr. ADAMS. Either we can supply that for the record, or we can call upon Mr. Tom Freudenheim.

Senator McCLURE. Well, if you would prefer to supply it for the record, that's satisfactory.

Mr. ADAMS. Fine.

Senator McCLURE. Are any base resources being devoted to this activity?

Mr. ANDERSON. In the sense of staff expertise, the culmination of research projects that have been afoot for a number of years, yes, indeed, Mr. Chairman. With regard to the actual new cash needed to build an exhibit that embodies the findings, no.

Senator McCLURE. Will any trust funds be used to support the program?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir; our special exhibition fund, which is entirely trust funded, has already made one grant in partial support of the National Portrait Gallery proposal.

Senator McCLURE. As you submit the materials with respect to the anticipated request for the bicentennial funding for the next 2 years, could you include in that either base-funding amounts and/or trust fund amounts?

Mr. ANDERSON. We'd be happy to, sir.

[The information follows:]

Anticipated increases for the bicentennial of the Constitution

Fiscal year 1988:

To complete exhibition, "Portraits of Distinguished American Jurists".....	\$120,000
To hire a registrar's aid, GS-5 and a conservator, GS-9 for the period between 1988 and 1990 to provide registrarial and conservation support for all bicentennial exhibitions.....	70,000
Total.....	190,000

Fiscal year 1989: Continuation of registrarial and conservation support..... 70,000

Fiscal year 1990: Continuation of registrarial and conservation support..... 70,000

In fiscal year 1985, the Smithsonian Institution special exhibition fund provided \$18,500 in trust funds to begin the initial planning and research for the exhibition, "Portraits in America 1700-76." An additional request for \$311,000 is being considered for funding from the Institution's special exhibition fund in fiscal year 1986.

COLLECTIONS INVENTORY PROGRAM

Senator McCLURE. Congress provided an increase of \$500,000 in fiscal year 1979 to expedite inventory of Smithsonian collections.

At that time, the Smithsonian estimated that the process would be completed in the early 1980's. It is now projected that the special program will continue at a level in excess of \$1 million annually, at least through 1991.

What's the total amount which has been spent since 1979 through both this program and base resources of the museums for the Collections Management and Inventory [CM/I] Program?

Mr. ADAMS. Obviously, we don't have those numbers here at hand. We'll certainly provide them for the record.

Senator McCLURE. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

FUNDING HISTORY FOR COLLECTIONS MANAGEMENT

(Dollars in millions)

Bureau	Fiscal year 1979-86		Fiscal year 1987		Fiscal year 1988-91	
	Base ¹	CM/I Program ²	Base ¹	CM/I Program ²	Base ¹	CM/I Program ²
National Museum of Natural History.....	\$5.100	\$2.900	\$0.857	\$0.515	\$4.285	\$2.575
National Museum of American History.....	4.000	1.950	.741	.419	3.705	2.095
Cooper-Hewitt Museum.....	.440	.530	.070	.084	.350	.420
Archives of American Art.....		.061	.025	.065	.125	.325
Office of Information Resource Management and Office of Registrar.....		.400		.062		.310
Total.....	9.540	5.841	1.693	1.145	8.465	5.725

¹ Base funds within bureau.² Collections Management Inventory Program allocations or estimates.

INVENTORY PROCESS

Mr. ADAMS. Let me say that the complexities of that inventory process have been very considerable, and I'm not at all sure that an early estimate could have been accurate, as we've gotten into this process.

The Smithsonian, in a normal year, is adding 3 or 4 million new objects to its collections. We're talking about a moving target here in some respects; it's not a problem that—

Senator McCLURE. Well, it looks to me as though something that looked like that was presented to us as a special project somehow being converted into a permanent feature.

Mr. ADAMS. I would guess, sir—I wasn't here at the time—that it was already visible as a permanent feature, when it was presented as a special project.

Senator McCLURE. It may have been visible but it certainly wasn't presented to us that way. I would hope it was less visible than that perhaps in view of the way it was presented.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Chairman, a baseline inventory was complete by, as I recall, 1983. In other words, we completed a full inventory of objects in the collection, albeit in some cases, like objects were estimated in the aggregate.

The funds that are now in our base would be used to continue to refine the inventory, to break down some larger collections of objects, to make sure that paper records are in agreement with fiscal records and, as the Secretary said, to make sure we are keeping up adequately with the goings and comings of objects.

Senator McCLURE. Would you, when you provide the information, include what additional amounts are projected through 1991 for this work?

Mr. ADAMS. Be pleased to do so.

MUSEUM SUPPORT CENTER

Senator McCLURE. The Museum Support Center must rank as one of the most poorly planned operations of the Smithsonian. Changes continue to be made in the type of storage equipment to be installed; equipment costs continue to escalate.

And the actual transfer of the collections, which was to have been completed this year, will carry over to the next decade. Total move costs were initially estimated at \$1.8 million. To date, \$3.2 million has been appropriated, with an additional request of \$862,000 for fiscal year 1987.

What are the additional outyear costs associated with the move?

Mr. ANDERSON. Anticipating questions on the Museum Support Center, Mr. Chairman, some numbers have been pulled together. The original building cost \$29 million to construct. As I think this subcommittee knew, it was a shell.

The intent was to fill up the inside of the shell—four pods containing the collection storage equipment—with the steel system on which one could hang shelves, walkways, cabinets, lighting fixtures, the like.

It was a system designed by fully competent architects. It was reviewed by fully competent engineers from outside firms. Those were all vetted by the General Services Administration, which was our agent in these matters.

Our own on-board architects and engineers reviewed the same plans. Everybody felt fully confident that the building would proceed on schedule.

What happened, however, was that when the plans got out into the real world of manufacturing companies, it was discovered that there were no firms out there either willing or able—we're not sure which—to meet the fine-tuned specifications in question.

The problems were essentially three. The air-tightness of the cabinets to make sure that if one ever had an infestation of bugs, for example, you could kill the bugs without killing people, or that you could maintain a high enough concentration of the insecticide to make sure that the problem would get cured right there on the spot.

The second problem was paint. It turns out that insecticides are very much like paint remover. And a steel system that is not well-painted is a steel system that's going to rust, particularly in a controlled, high humidity situation, plus or minus, 50 percent humidity level.

And the third problem was basic stability of the system, spanning long spaces. And the decision, as this committee knows, was to dispense with the steel tinker-toy, if I may, approach and, instead, pour intermediate concrete floors.

That process is well under way. We're happy to report that the expenses of doing so are no greater than the expenses that had been anticipated with the steel system, as reported in our book last year, thanks to the extent to which we are able to reuse many of the storage units in the Museum of Natural History; because they no longer have to hang on a storage rack but can sit on a concrete floor the costs balance out very nicely.

Where we do still have a problem, however, is in the area of the storage component parts themselves, the actual cabinets, the actual shelves, which will now fit on these two intermediate concrete slabs.

The general contractor on the job, a company by the name of Davis, has had inordinate trouble working out an agreement with a subcontractor. In fact, several have been tried on for size, to supply the component parts at the price and by the schedule that the Smithsonian and the General Services Administration had agreed to, and to which Davis itself had agreed.

Given contracting law, relations between a general contractor and a subcontractor are really unto themselves. There's no way that we can particularly intervene on specific matters. The only lever available to us is the large one of default.

And we have been reluctant to take that step, because at that point, one can almost guarantee that the whole project would grind to a halt. One would be looking at a number of years worth of legal disputes back and forth—meanwhile, no collection objects being moved whatsoever.

MUSEUM SUPPORT CENTER MOVE

On the brighter side, about 22 percent of the objects which had been anticipated to be moved out to the support center have already been moved.

Pod No. 3, I think it is—I forget the designations of them—the wet pod, so-called, in which one has any number of pickled fish and other kinds of natural history specimens, has been filling up very nicely.

Many of the dry collections have been moved from their object storage spaces to object preparation spaces in the Museum of Natural History and from there to staging space at the Museum Support Center. To answer your question regarding the future year costs of the move, the estimated amount is \$2.6 million.

MUSEUM SUPPORT CENTER EQUIPMENT

So, even though there are problems remaining as between contractors and subcontractors, there is progress being made at the site.

Senator McCLURE. I am puzzled a little. First, I understand the uncertainties involved. And you started out by saying we selected perfectly competent engineers, estimators. They came up with perfectly incompetent results.

Is that what I read you to say? Or are you trying to say that the uncertainties are such that even the competent couldn't be competent?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that's a question that may well be debated in court before we're all through, Mr. Chairman.

Senator McCLURE. You know, I heard all the explanation and those are reasons. I'm not sure that they're justification.

Mr. ADAMS. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we may have been, in retrospect, dazzled by the prospect of state-of-the-art technology that would have offered long-term economies of operation and ease of access, and so on.

Senator McCLURE. But I assume those competent engineers were competent to evaluate that? And the competent architects were competent to design that?

Mr. ADAMS. But if you're dealing with proven technology, with examples that have functioned for some years, you have a degree of confidence that you don't have when you turn to some new design.

Senator McCLURE. There is some degree of error, which begins to look more like incompetence than it does a collection of marginal errors.

Mr. ANDERSON. It's clear, Mr. Chairman, this is a project about which a large number of people can feel no pride, people within the Smithsonian, within a number of firms in the private sector, within the General Services Administration.

Senator McCLURE. What price, pride?

I am sensitive to the difficulties of trying to hold people to contract. But you indicated, and I think correctly so, the difficulty between a contractor and a subcontractor is his problem. And I assume, under that contract, that is his problem, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLURE. So what you're really doing is making it the taxpayers' problem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, we're laboring mightily to minimize it, sir.

Senator McCLURE. On the scale of \$1 to \$1 trillion, this isn't a very large item. But in percentages, it certainly doesn't look very good. Even DOD does better than that.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the situation, the choices are not good in either direction on this. It isn't a matter of simply trying to transfer a burden to the taxpayer, but if we were to declare non-compliance in this situation, we would lose any forward motion on this project at all. And the completion of the contract as time went on by some other contractor would become more difficult and more expensive.

So that we're faced with bad choices, whichever course of action we follow.

Senator McCLURE. I understand that. Are you withholding the money from Davis Construction?

Mr. ANDERSON. The General Services Administration's procedures apply here, sir, not those of the Smithsonian Institution. In other words, I don't know the answer to your question.

Senator McCLURE. Can you supply it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

PAYMENT TO CONTRACTOR

According to the General Services Administration, in keeping with the terms of the contract, progress payments are being made to the contractor for work performed on the concrete deck portion of the Museum Support Center project. Payment also has been made for preliminary engineering work done on the storage cabinets but no payments have been made for the production of cabinets since no progress has been made on this part of the contract.

MUSEUM SUPPORT CENTER PROJECT

Senator McCLURE. I don't mean to beat on that particular one, but it's troubling. And I think it's troubling you. You've been candid in saying you don't take very great pride in that. I think that's obvious, that you should not.

But what do we do about it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Another problem I think attendant to the project, Mr. Chairman, and from which we have learned a lot is that it makes little sense in retrospect—and hindsight is always full of wisdom—it makes little sense to proceed along two parallel paths with two different sets of architects and engineers, one of which will provide a building for you and the other of which will fill it, down to a margin of a fraction of an inch, with equipment and storage facilities.

It should have been, in retrospect, a unified contract with a single set of standards, a single group of architects, engineers to be held accountable.

Senator McCLURE. Well, I note in the cost for collections storage equipment, which was originally estimated at \$11.6 million, was revised upward in fiscal year 1985 to a level of \$17.9 million, an increase of \$8.3 million or better than 40 percent; and is apparently being again adjusted upward to \$23.3 million, which will be better than double the original estimate.

In fiscal year 1985, the Smithsonian requested \$7.5 million to complete the acquisition of equipment for pods one, two, and four.

Just since our 1985 hearing, the equipment that was to cost \$7.5 million has now increased to \$10.1 million.

Mr. ANDERSON. I'm not following your numbers, sir.

Senator McCLURE. Well, in 1985, you estimated the equipment at that time—not the initial estimate at the 1985 hearing—the equipment estimate was \$7.5 million, and has now increased to \$10.1 million—just since the 1985 hearing.

And that's without the cost of the high bay storage, which is included in the 1985 estimate.

What is the estimated additional cost for the high bay storage?

Mr. ANDERSON. I admit to embarrassing confusion, sir. It's my understanding, my oral understanding from staff at the Smithsonian, that the numbers this year before your committee are no different from the numbers last year.

If you have found a \$3 million discrepancy, we need obviously to work to—

Senator McCLURE. It was the hearing in 1985, not last year. The hearing on the 1985 budget.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, in 1984.

Senator McCLURE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. If we may, sir, we will supply for the record a justification.

Senator McCLURE. If you would, please.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

[The information follows:]

CHANGES TO MUSEUM SUPPORT CENTER EQUIPMENT COSTS

Following the hearings for the fiscal year 1985 budget, supplementary information on the estimated cost of the initial move storage equipment was given to the committee by letter of August 7, 1984. This information, which reflected contract prices as well as adjustments for fees, contingencies, and escalation, indicated that the revised cost for the system (at that time the three-tiered rack system) was \$20.8 million. In addition, a total of \$1.5 million would be required for the high bay storage equipment, bringing the total cost for the initial move equipment, both high density and high bay, to \$22.3 million.

Congressional action reduced the fiscal year 1985 request of \$7.5 million for storage equipment to \$3.258 million and it was, therefore, necessary for the Institution to project a longer period of acquisition and installation for this equipment and to project, as well, an additional amount of \$0.5 million each year for fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987 to cover resulting escalation costs. The total projected estimate thus became \$23.3 million for the initial move storage system for all four pods at the MSC and this amount was explained in the Institution's budget request for fiscal year 1986 (p. 180).

This estimate was also reported to the committee on March 13, 1985, with an explanation of how the amount of \$23.3 million would be applied to the installation of a concrete deck and cabinet storage system rather than to the three-tier metal rack system. Because of the nature of the construction involved, completion of concrete decks in areas of the pods initially reserved for future collections growth was contemplated. In effect, the Institution would defer certain steps planned to take place under the initial move and accomplish now other steps originally planned to take place in future years. However, even with this change in the sequence of events, the work presently planned falls within the amount of \$23.3 million which the Institution hopes to have available through fiscal year 1987 from a combination of line item appropriations for MSC equipment and funding already reprogrammed by the Smithsonian from other sources.

The estimated cost of \$1.54 million for the high bay storage equipment was established by a consultant retained by the Institution in 1984. No additional costs, other than some possible inflation, are anticipated for this equipment.

GUARD STAFFING AT THE QUADRANGLE

Senator McCLURE. Funds are requested for the Office of Protection Services to provide a total of 69 guards for the quadrangle. How does this level of staffing compare to other Smithsonian museums?

Mr. JAMESON. It's comparable, Mr. Chairman. It's a result of a detailed study to determine the number of guards that need to be placed in exhibit areas, at doors of entry and in other locations.

It is a comparable figure in numbers to our other museums.

Senator McCLURE. What are the anticipated hours of operation for the quadrangle?

Mr. JAMESON. The quadrangle will operate like the rest of our buildings, Mr. Chairman. Some of the staff will arrive at 6 in the morning, which requires some guards to make sure doors are open. Public hours will be from 10 in the morning until 5:30 p.m. And there's no doubt that special events of one sort or another—conferences, lectures, films, other kinds of events—will extend until 10 or 11 in the evening.

So we're talking basically about very close to an 18-hour day.

Senator McCLURE. Similar to the pattern of operation for the other buildings?

Mr. JAMESON. Very much so, Mr. Chairman, yes.

Senator McCLURE. And it is correct to say, is it not, that the costs of providing guard services and the number of guards depends upon the number of hours?

Mr. JAMESON. Yes; many of those posts will be manned around the clock, 7 days a week, particularly the perimeter posts.

Senator McCLURE. Is the 1987 request based on extended summer hours for all of the museums?

Mr. JAMESON. If the moneys in our budget for fiscal year 1987 are provided, we'll have summer hours.

Senator McCLURE. I think I understood you to say yes.

Mr. JAMESON. Yes, sir. [Laughter.]

ZOO HOSPITAL

Senator McCLURE. When will the new hospital at the zoo be ready for occupancy?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the answer is within the year, Mr. Chairman, but I think also Dr. Challinor, the Assistant Secretary for Research, is in the room. Perhaps he could step forward.

Dr. CHALLINOR. I defer to the Director of the zoo.

Senator McCLURE. OK, we'll find the sergeant pretty soon.

Dr. ROBINSON. We just have completed the process of having the plans approved by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts. The contract will be let later this year and we expect within the margin of error for construction, effects of weather, the building will be occupied 6 to 9 months after that.

So it will be next calendar year.

Senator McCLURE. Sometime mid-summer next year or late summer?

Dr. ROBINSON. I hope before that, sir.

Senator McCLURE. All right.

Dr. ROBINSON. I'll be happy to—

Senator McCLURE. What are the requirements for equipment and what resources have been identified to meet these requirements for the zoo hospital?

Dr. ROBINSON. We are hoping to get a lot of the equipment similarly from within our present hospital, transferred to the new hospital. And we're hoping to bring surplus medical equipment from human hospitals, if possible, in view of the financial situation—we're also establishing a foundation to develop private money for such things, sources of equipment from the private sector.

Senator McCLURE. So you're still not certain what the funding requirement will be?

Dr. ROBINSON. We have no Federal request for that equipment at the moment.

Senator McCLURE. At what moment will we? [Laughter.]

Dr. ROBINSON. In view of the restrictions on budget now, including Federal requests we do not know.

Senator McCLURE. I wonder, Mr. Adams, if you could develop for the record an estimate of what the total equipping requirement will be and how much you expect to be able to get from non-Federal sources.

Mr. ADAMS. You're speaking of the whole or of the zoo?

Senator McCLURE. Of the zoo hospital. Yes.

[The information follows:]

ZOO HOSPITAL

When the new hospital is completed we will transfer most of the existing equipment from the old hospital. The existing equipment in our hospital has a book value (for inventory purposes) of approximately \$50,000.

The estimated cost of the additional equipment we would like to have in our new hospital totals approximately \$825,000. This includes both hospital and research equipment. We hope that outside funding can be found for the equipment and that no Federal funds will be required to equip the hospital.

Listed are the equipment items we plan to purchase for the new hospital.

Equipment transferring to new National Zoological Park Hospital¹

Anesthesia machine ²	\$1	X-ray cassettes (6).....	\$400
Surgery table—Large animal.....	2,500	Pressure washer ²	220
Surgery table—Small animal.....	1	Cavitron ²	280
Suction machine ²	1	Office furniture.....	
Electro surgical cautery.....	200	File cabinets, chairs, equipment.....	
Imed infusion pump.....	200	X-ray viewers.....	250
Dinamap blood pressure monitor.....	1,200	Safe, drug.....	1
Dinamap blood pressure printer..	1,400	Fireproof file cabinet.....	85
ECG ²	3,400	Typewriters (3).....	794
Animal holding cages bank of 4		Electric thermometer.....	361
(2).....	2	Hospital stretchers (2).....	800
Freestanding cages (3).....	1,100	Pistols (5) ²	72
Crash cart.....	100	Kodak M20 processor.....	5,000
Chart holder.....	1	Kodak M20 auto mixer.....	900
Dental cart.....	100	Washing machine (2) ²	2
Sartorius balance.....	641	Clothes dryer ²	61
X-ray machine.....	13,000	Revco freezer ultra cold ²	1
Ultrasonic cleaner.....	1	Autoclave ²	1
Cameras.....	1,200	Squeeze cage—Large.....	210
Slide cabinet.....	530	Squeeze cage—Small.....	105
Bone plating equipment and drill.....	1,200	Oxygen tanks.....	800
Table water blankets ²	4	Refrigerators (3).....	520
Surgical lights ²	10	Freezer—Upright.....	265
Doppler.....	62	Incubator and stand ²	900
Welch Allyn wall mounted unit..	225	Incubator—Table model.....	700
Laparoscope equipment: ²		Microscopes (3).....	2,000
Scopes.....	600	Scales—Platform and atlas.....	2
Insufflator.....	154	Centrifuge.....	365
Light source.....	154	Liquid nitrogen tanks.....	1,462
		Computer.....	4,426
		Gas sterilizer.....	220

¹Dollar amounts are taken from yearly supply inventory.

²Equipment that is very old, in fair to poor condition, and may not transfer well.

Equipment purchases for new National Zoological Park Hospital

Electrical thermometer (2).....	\$860	Conference table.....	
X-ray unit 500 ma.....	350,000	Welch Allyn ophthalmic otoscope:	
Dental X-ray unit.....	4,500	Wall mounted unit.....	\$800
Equipment carts (3).....	450	Blades and handles (multiple).....	500
Copy machine.....	8,000	X-ray cassettes and screens.....	2,500
Microwave.....	400	Shelving—Pharmacy.....	75,000
Laparoscope equipment:		Office furniture.....	
Light source.....	3,100	X-ray viewers.....	2,000
Scopes.....	5,000	Medium transfer cage.....	500
Insufflator.....	1,300	Intensive care cage.....	8,000
Trocars.....	800	Computer terminal and hard disk.....	3,000
Cables.....	200	Surgery table.....	2,000
Realtime ultrasound.....	25,000	Surgical lights.....	27,000
Oxygen regulators.....	400	Imed infusion pump.....	2,600
Suction regulators.....	400	Floor scrubber.....	500
Lead gloves (3 pr).....	600		
Lead gowns (3).....	700		
Furniture.....			

Equipment purchases for new National Zoological Park Hospital—Continued

Refrigerators (3).....	\$2,000	Shelving—Clean utility.....	\$25,000
Washers (2).....	800	Incubator—Infant and access.....	4,800
Dryers (2).....	800	Sterilizer—Amsco.....	34,000
Freezers—Regular (2).....	1,200	Dental cart with drills.....	4,500
Freezer—Revco.....	5,600	Cavitron.....	1,200
Scale—Atlas.....	600	Food prep tables.....	2,000
Flexible colonofiber scope and light source.....	19,000	Total.....	627,610

Research equipment to purchase for new National Zoological Park Hospital

Mettler PC-series electronic balance (PC 2200).....	\$2,250
Precision water bath—Model 15-474-30.....	1,100
Heavy duty cart—Model 11-926.....	300
Refrigerated centrifuge (ICE, Ctr 7R).....	7,000
Refrigerator-freezer, 14 cu ft, lab-line (2).....	3,200
Revco, ultra-low temperature freezer.....	7,000
Laboratory chairs.....	800
Thermix stirring hotplate—Model 610T.....	250
Fisher sonic dismembrator—Model 300.....	1,575
Automatic CO ₂ incubator (Napco).....	5,400
Laminar flow cabinet—Fisher 92-750-8.....	5,000
Vacuum pump (Gast).....	325
Laboratory oven.....	425
Fisher accumet pH meter—Model 810.....	900
Hoxan embryo freezing unit.....	13,000
Labconco laboratory steamwasher.....	3,000
Water purification system.....	7,000
MVE high capacity liquid nitrogen storage tank—A2600.....	7,000
Automatic filling unit for high capacity liquid nitrogen (MVE).....	1,300
LKB ria gamma counter.....	19,500
Spectrophotometer—Bausch & Lomb.....	6,200
Mettler electronic analytical balance.....	6,500
Leitz micromanipulator with inverted microscope.....	35,000
Wild stereomicroscopes—MSAPO (2).....	11,300
Microforge.....	4,900
Pipette beveler.....	2,200
Pipette puller.....	5,100
Electroejaculator.....	700
Zeiss universal light microscope equipped with fluorescence, differential- interference contrast; Normanski Optics long working distance objectives, photographic capability.....	31,000
Video camera and monitor for microscope.....	5,200
Total.....	194,425

AQUATIC HABITATS EXHIBIT

Senator McC^LURE. When is it anticipated that design will be completed on phase two of the aquatic exhibit facility?

Dr. ROBINSON. If I may answer that again, just before I left for Malaysia a few weeks ago, we chose the architect-engineering firm for that. I'm not sure what the time schedule is on the work.

Senator McC^LURE. Could you supply that for the record?

Dr. ROBINSON. We could supply that for the record.

Senator McC^LURE. All right. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

AQUATIC EXHIBITS

The design for phase two of the aquatic exhibits will be completed in late fiscal year 1987.

AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENTS

Senator McCLURE. For the Arts and Industries Building, an amount of \$300,000 is requested for design of extensive renovations to the Arts and Industries Building.

Projected future costs are in excess of \$24 million. Last year, the Smithsonian had discussions with the authorizing committees concerning which projects would require authorization.

Will a project of this scope require action by the authorizing committees based on your understanding of their interest?

Mr. ADAMS. You know, that's a very difficult question. One can view a project of this kind as a series of ad hoc changes which are made as opportunity comes and as budgets permit, and which furthermore are frequently revised downward as opportunities shrink.

Or one can project rather over-confidently in this climate a long-term plan and take it forward for authorization and then be forced to explain why you haven't been able to carry out that plan.

This is a case that seems to me to lie on the margins and I'm not trying to escape the oversights involved in the authorization process, but to deal with the lack of certainties, that can only be done over a lengthy period of time and in the face of uncertain budgetary climate.

Mr. ADAMS. I should say that there is no doubt that over a period of years into the future, the Arts and Industries Building is in need of very extension renovation. It is a building which—

Senator McCLURE. I don't question that. What I really am trying to grope with here is whether we are going to be faced with a series of related, yet unrelated, individual annual appropriations, without having the context of an overall project, which, if that is what we have in mind, undoubtedly, would fall within the purview of the expectation of the authorizing committee.

Mr. ADAMS. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, and I confess I am not really clear what the best way to proceed here is.

Senator McCLURE. I am not sure that I am either, but might I make a suggestion, and that is, that you try to develop, as best you can, a broad outline of what the needs are and how you hope to achieve meeting those needs and submit it to the authorizing committee for their comment.

Mr. ADAMS. That is a very good idea. We will do that.

Senator McCLURE. And maybe together, we can find an answer to how we should best proceed.

Mr. ADAMS. Fine.

Senator McCLURE. Well, thank you very much for your testimony. I appreciate it.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

There are a number of questions which we will ask to be answered in writing for the record.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing:]

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Quadrangle Support Costs

Question: Are all utility, ground maintenance and building maintenance costs for the Quadrangle fully charged to the Federal government? If so, why in view of the fact that substantial portions of space will be occupied by Trust funded activities?

Answer: As noted in the March 10, 1986, policy statement provided to the Committee, those trust funded auxiliary activities which occupy administrative space in Smithsonian buildings pay rent equivalent to the number of square feet they occupy times the square foot rate for space occupied by Smithsonian units at L'Enfant Plaza. The funds thus obtained are used by the Institution to help pay for space it rents at the Plaza thus reducing federal expenditure for that purpose. The trust-funded auxiliary activities that will be in the Quadrangle will pay approximately \$431,000 in rent in FY 1987 according to the above formula. Since that rent is based on a commercial figure, it includes services, such as normal security, maintenance, and utilities, and the activities are not separately charged for such services. Should overtime assistance be used, however, such as for guards or custodial staff, the auxiliary activities would be billed additionally.

Quadrangle Employment

Question: Based on the FY 1985 figures, we estimated that approximately 196 new positions would be requested for Quadrangle associated work. According to our calculations, with increases provided to date and those requested for fiscal year 1987, we would have provided 229 new positions. Is that about right?

Answer: A total of 223 new positions for Quadrangle-related support have been approved through FY 1986 and requested in FY 1987, as indicated in the following table:

New Quadrangle-related Positions (By Bureau and Fiscal Year)

<u>Bureau</u>	<u>FY 1985</u> <u>Approp.</u>	<u>FY 1986</u> <u>Approp.</u>	<u>FY 1987</u> <u>Request</u>	<u>Total</u>
Sackler Gallery	8	17	12	37
National Museum of African Art	7	14	10	31
Smithsonian Institution Libraries	1	-	2	3
Office of Exhibits Central	-	1	3	4
Traveling Exhibition Service	-	6	3	9
Directorate of International Act.	-	2	-	2
Office of Personnel Admin.	-	2	-	2
Office of Accounting and Financial Services	-	-	1	1
Office of Protection Services	-	33	36	69
Office of Plant Services	-	11	4	15
Office of Horticulture	-	2	4	6
Quadrangle Building Manager	-	25	19	44
Total:	16	113	94	223

Question: Does the FY 1987 request represent the total staffing requirements for the Quadrangle? If not, what additional positions will be proposed?

Answer: While the FY 1987 request represents the completion of most staffing requirements for Quadrangle-related support, it is anticipated that several additional positions will be sought to strengthen the program capabilities of the Sackler Gallery and the National Museum of African Art, and adequately staff the Office of Horticulture and the Quadrangle Building Manager. The need for these new positions will be reviewed as part of the formulation of the Smithsonian's Federal budget request for FY 1988 and following years. After the initiation of full public operation of the Quadrangle facility, each bureau will review its original projections of staffing requirements and may request adjustments in proposed future staffing necessary to achieve efficient program operations.

Question: A total of 68 guards are requested for the Quadrangle. Upon what schedule of operations is that based?

Answer: The guard schedule of operations for the Quadrangle is based on the planned staff occupancy of the building in FY 1986, with public opening in June 1987. From that time the building will be open to the public from 10:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. each day, with the exception of Christmas Day. Security for the Quadrangle will be provided 24-hours-a-day seven-days-a-week through three eight-hour reliefs of guards. There will be four supervisors to cover the three reliefs which will have 30 posts on the first relief and four posts each on the second and third reliefs. The first relief posts are for entrances, loading dock and galleries. The second and third reliefs are for inspections and tours.

Smithsonian Environmental Research Center--Rockville

Question: The Smithsonian has made plans to close the Rockville Branch of the Environmental Research Center effective this coming November. As we have received copies of hundreds of letters directed to the Smithsonian protesting this action, it is obvious that the decision is controversial.

Outside reviews of the scientific work performed at the facility were conducted in 1979 and in 1982. We have a copy of the earlier report which contained recommendations for improvement, a number of which were implemented clearly with a view toward continuation of the program. Further we understand that the 1982 study recommended that the entire facility be moved intact to the Edgewater location. Has there been another outside review since 1982 which has led to this redirection?

Answer: The final external review on whether the Institution should continue the operation of the Rockville laboratory at any cost or redirect its research goals in other directions in biology was made in January 1986. The consensus of the reviewers was that the Rockville resources should be redirected to other higher priority biological programs within the Institution, while retaining selective SERC-Rockville programs under new organizational arrangements.

Question: Is there a regular schedule for outside review of all Smithsonian research work?

Answer: There does not exist a regular schedule for outside review of all Smithsonian research. However, the Institution uses various techniques to evaluate research directions and priorities from the individual research level to the broader bureau programs. The most basic evaluation is the performance appraisal system, an annual review of progress dictated by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). Twice a year an individual researcher reviews his/her research progress with his/her supervisor, and the results of this are reviewed by the Bureau Director. In addition to this mechanism, science bureaus, and the larger art and humanities bureaus, review on a cycle set by grade level, the performance of their research staff. This process entails reviews of the individual's accomplishments during the period (at a maximum of seven years) by soliciting external evaluations via letter and/or performance committees. The results of these reviews are routinely evaluated by senior bureau and institutional managers.

On a larger scale, whole bureaus or their component departments as well as interbureau research programs are periodically reviewed by external visiting committees. For the larger scientific bureaus, these reviews occur on a 5-7 year cycle.

The nature of most research at the Institution also dictates publishing in referred journals, and the presentation of research results at meetings. In both forums, extensive critique are received both formally and informally. The Smithsonian Council, consisting of distinguished scholars meets annually at the Institution, and provides counsel on research directions as well. In addition, Smithsonian's own research granting programs as well as external grants and contracts are peer reviewed. The Smithsonian's Research Policy Committee also provides regular assessments of Smithsonian research progress.

Ultimately, the Secretary with both inside and outside advice sets the broad direction of Smithsonian research.

Question: Is there an Institution-wide rating system which, for example, compares scientific research with museum research or with art research?

Answer: Disciplinary differences make an Institution-wide comparison and evaluation of research impossible to achieve. However, in judging broad lines of research within specific fields of science, arts, or the humanities, similar criteria can be developed for useful comparative analysis. As mentioned in response to the prior question, evaluation of these research programs occurs on a cyclical basis and the Institution is moving towards broader conformity in this area.

Question: Based on the revised justification requested by the Committee, it is estimated that only \$300,000 would be saved in fiscal year 1987 if the facility were closed. About 40 employees would lose their jobs. Is there any compelling reason that the closure could not be delayed a few months in order to allow staff, particularly the scientific staff, more time to seek alternative employment? We have been told that it is already too late in the year for most to obtain academic appointments for next year.

Answer: The SERC-Rockville staff were told on February 14, 1986 that the facility would close in FY 1987 and on March 1 that the date would be November 22, 1986, giving them nine months to seek alternate employment. The Institution remains optimistic that most of the more than 35 technical and clerical staff will be able to find new positions in other bureaus of the Smithsonian before the closure date, under a priority placement program. Current plans call for 2 scientists to transfer their research from SERC-Rockville to SERC-Edgewater, accompanied by at least 3 technicians. One scientist and 3 technicians will be transferred to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research to continue the development of instruments for measuring solar radiation in collaboration with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. One scientist will continue his research at the University of Pittsburgh. At least 2 scientists are planning to retire and the remaining 6 scientists are negotiating with other institutions. The Smithsonian is certainly ready to be flexible in helping these individuals make future employment arrangements.

Prudent budgeting dictated that the estimates for the closing costs for SERC-Rockville include the maximum projected costs of severance pay and annual leave payoff. As a result of the priority placement program established to assist SERC-Rockville employees in seeking alternative employment within the Smithsonian and the ability of employees to find other positions, the savings realized from the closing of SERC-Rockville may be greater than the \$300,000 estimated in the revised justification provided to the Committee. If these additional savings materialize, the available funding would be used to further the Institution's scientific equipment replacement program, which has received Congressional support during the past three years.

Question: Are there requirements of other federal agencies for research that are currently being supplied by Rockville which would be terminated if the facility were to close?

Answer: The only requirement of other federal agencies for research now being done at SERC-Rockville is for the development of instruments for measuring solar radiation. This requirement will be sustained by a collaborative program between the Smithsonian and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Question: Did the Smithsonian contact the other Federal agencies interested in this research to determine if they would be willing to pick up some of the costs of the operation?

Answer: Three federal agencies are interested in aspects of SERC-Rockville research: the Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service laboratory at Beltsville, Maryland; the Department of Energy; and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. There have been close professional links between Rockville and Beltsville, but no formal approach was made to have the Department of Agriculture support this research due to their budget exigencies and their own decision to deemphasize such research over a decade ago. The Department of Energy is also interested in part of the SERC research and is supporting by contract some of the work done by one of the scientists who will be moving from Rockville to Edgewater. As indicated in the answer to the prior question, the development of a collaborative program with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on the measurement of solar radiation is being vigorously pursued.

Research in Tropical Biology

Question: Increases are requested for the Museum of Natural History and for the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute to launch two new research efforts at initial costs of \$330,000 for work in the area of biological diversity in South America and \$345,000 for the tropical forest initiative. Are any base funds being used to support these initiatives?

Answer: At the National Museum of Natural History (NMNH) there are no base funds specifically allocated to this program, which represents a major new thrust in the study of biological diversity in the arc of highlands surrounding the Amazon Basin in South America. About 40 of the Museum's scientists (about a third of the entire scientific staff) do research on plants and animals of this vast tropical region, but their work is not restricted to this region or coordinated as a program. Perhaps a half of their research time, on the average, concerns the study of biological diversity in this region of South America. To this can be added the half time of about an equivalent number of support staff. Further base support goes into maintaining the large plant and animal collections from this region, which are housed and curated by the NMNH. The requested increase will provide critically needed operation support for fieldwork, training and information exchange, so that the current work can be better integrated and focused.

The \$345,000 requested by the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI) for FY 1987 for the Tropical Forest Biology Initiative will provide an increased investment in forest biology research programs currently being undertaken on Barro Colorado Island. Base funds have supported the forest census project that serves as the foundation for this initiative. While base budget funds have provided a wealth of basic data on tropical forest biology, the new initiative will permit the expansion of that data base as well as the integration of the data base with applied studies, such as of forest regeneration. The requested increase will also permit the use of molecular techniques to elucidate unsolved problems about the origin and maintenance of biological diversity.

Question: What is the anticipated duration of these studies?

Answer: The threat posed by massive tropical destruction dictates an urgency to expand present activities at a more intensified rate. These two studies will enable the Smithsonian to conduct long-term research efforts in tropical biological diversity and the problems of the rapid alteration of the tropical environment caused by human pressure.

The Museum of Natural History's research will include the task of cataloging and studying the tropical fauna and flora of 20 to 30 million species. It is expected that thousands of new plant species, hundreds of new animal species and tens of thousands of new insect species will be discovered. Because of the scope of this undertaking, it is anticipated that these studies will continue for more than ten years, and may need to continue indefinitely.

The STRI initiative involves intensive censusing and monitoring activity over a long-term time frame in order to ensure that research data are not affected by short-term phenomena. A major strength of this research is that it couples systematic work with ecological studies of long duration. By its very nature, the collection and analysis of these data must continue on an ongoing basis indefinitely.

Question: Will amounts above those requested in fiscal year 1987 be required to continue the projects?

Answer: The requested increase for NMNH's research on tropical biology will provide a minimum start-up budget, greatly reduced from initial draft requests. Although it would be possible to conduct a useful program at this minimal level indefinitely, the Museum expects to request incremental increases in future years. The task of documenting millions of species is enormous, requiring major continuing investment.

It is anticipated that additional funding above the level requested for FY 1987 will not be required to continue STRI's tropical forest biology initiative. Because these studies, however, represent part of a national effort to understand tropical biological diversity and its effects on the ecosystem of North America, such as the impact of tropical deforestation on hemispheric climatic changes, it may be prudent to expand some of these programs in the future.

Question: For the past several years the Smithsonian has sought substantial increases for equipment purchases. No additional funds are requested this year. Have you determined that the existing base is sufficient?

Answer: The condition of research equipment at the Institution's science bureaus has been a source of concern for a number of years. Many pieces of research equipment have been outmoded by recent technological developments. The productivity of our staff, especially new members trained in the use of modern equipment, has been severely impaired by the condition of the equipment. In FY 1984, efforts began to address these problems by a systematic approach of reviewing inventoried equipment for 1) present research needs, 2) physical condition, and 3) state of the art capability. Previously, equipment needs, particularly major items, were addressed only on an ad hoc basis. The results of our systematic review dramatically outlined the poor state of the Institution's research equipment, and the need to develop a rigorous cyclical program for replacement and upgrading. Recognizing the age of the many pieces of equipment, the Institution perceived a need to move expeditiously in developing a cyclical schedule to enhance the current bureau base for equipment. The schedule was designed so that within five years of its inception at each bureau, present inventoried equipment would be replaced or upgraded. Following the initial five year "crash" program, it was envisioned that an appropriate level of funding would be retained in each bureau's base for the future replacement of equipment on a regular basis. Funding for this program will continue to have a high priority in future years.

It is important to stress that equipment alone cannot sustain the research enterprise of any institution. The objective of the Smithsonian's equipment program is to build a sound infrastructure for research which has to be continually supplemented with personnel, travel support, supplies, and materials. Only with all these requisite parts in place can the Institution move its scientific programs forward. The nature of research cannot afford a static approach,

thus equipment and program monies must go hand in hand. Therefore, the Institution anticipates continuing requests for equipment to develop a sufficient funding base, while seeking selective programmatic increases.

Automation

Question: Last year's budget sought additional funds for automation of history and art museums. The request was reduced by Congress and there is no request in the FY 1987 budget. What is the current position of the Smithsonian with respect to automation for history and art?

Answer: The application of automated systems to the Smithsonian's research, collections management, exhibition, public service and other programs has become an important factor in maintaining the Institution's leadership role in the museum and academic communities, both nationally and internationally. The development of the automated data processing capabilities throughout the Institution's museums and research bureaus, as well as the development of Institution-wide software systems, has been a budget priority since FY 1984.

In FY 1986, particular attention was devoted to providing adequate base levels of funding for automation at the Institution's museums, which traditionally had not been able to take full advantage of the applications of automated systems to their programs and many of which had no base funding available to establish the needed automated systems. Increases totaling \$213,000 were provided in FY 1986 to further automation efforts in these bureaus: the National Museum of American History (\$57,000); the National Museum of American Art (\$27,000); the National Portrait Gallery (\$20,000); the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden (\$22,000); the Center for Asian Art (\$17,000); the Archives of American Art (\$20,000); the Cooper-Hewitt Museum (\$25,000); and the National Museum of African Art (\$25,000). Funding for automation will continue to be a high priority for future years.

Hirshhorn Bequest

Question: An increase of \$40,000 is requested to research and catalogue the Hirshhorn bequest of some 6,000 objects. In fiscal year 1984 the Smithsonian requested and Congress provided a base increase of \$125,000 to research and catalogue the items in the bequest and to provide for collections storage. This year's justification, however, requests funds to "begin researching, photographing and cataloguing" the additions to the collection. It would appear that we have provided funds for this effort for the past three years, but that funds justified for such work have been used for other purposes and that now you are asking for additional support rather than using resources that have specifically been made available for this purpose.

Answer: In FY 1984, the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden requested an increase of \$200,000 "to support costs of an extended loan program to institutions throughout the country of works of art" from the Museum's collections as well as the works of art that the Museum would receive as part of the Hirshhorn bequest. Congress appropriated \$125,000 for this purpose. Although it was intended to use the majority of these funds in the first few years to prepare the bequest for exhibition both in Washington and elsewhere, the proposed loan program was not limited to the bequest but included the total holdings of the Hirshhorn. The Hirshhorn Museum expected to receive the works of art from the bequest in FY 1984, and \$38,000 of the funding appropriated in FY 1984 was used (a) for travel to examine the bequest; (b) to purchase equipment for producing labels and other educational text; and (c) for a registrar to catalogue works on paper. When it became clear that the bequest would not pass to the Museum in FY 1984, the balance of the funds was reprogrammed to meet budget shortages elsewhere in the Institution. In FY 1985, Congress reduced the Hirshhorn Museum's budget request by \$149,000, thus eliminating all funding available for this program.

The Hirshhorn Museum is requesting \$40,000 in FY 1987 to help finance the incorporation of 6,000 additional works of art into the collection; all but three of these objects have now arrived. We intend to display some of these works of art in the Museum and make loans available to other museums but the

extended loan program that was envisioned in FY 1984 has been eliminated from our current program.

Exhibition Bases for Smithsonian Museums

Question: According to the justification, an exhibition base of \$1,200,000 has been established for the Sackler Gallery. Please provide the exhibition bases for the other history and art museums.

Answer: For FY 1986, the Federal exhibition bases for the other history and art museums are as follows:

Museum	FTE	\$
National Museum of African Art	7	\$1,174,000
National Museum of American Art	21	643,420
National Museum of American History	40	2,175,000
National Portrait Gallery	13	395,000
Cooper-Hewitt Museum	6	188,914
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden	7	268,500
Anacostia Neighborhood Museum	6	290,000

In comparing the exhibition base established for the Sackler Gallery with the exhibition bases of the other museums presented above, it is important to note that the Sackler Gallery will present changing exhibitions from its permanent collection, as well as objects from Asian Art collections throughout the world. Many of the collections to be displayed will include three-dimensional objects that require environmentally-controlled and security-protected installations. Precautionary measures for these objects, such as display cases with built-in humidification or dehumidification features and electronic security devices, add considerably to the exhibit production costs. The three-dimensional nature and delicacy of the objects also require custom-fabricated mounts or armatures to hold an object discretely and securely so that it can be more easily seen and appreciated by the public. In addition, transportation and insurance costs will be higher for those objects borrowed from art collections throughout the world. Because of these factors, the cost of installing exhibitions in the Sackler Gallery will far exceed those of an art museum where most of the works on display are paintings which are hung on walls and where security is provided primarily by guard staff.

Sackler Gallery

Question: The fiscal year 1986 request for the exhibition work was \$1,105,000. What is the source of the remaining \$95,000 that is now counted in the base?

Answer: The FY 1986 exhibition base for the Sackler Gallery (\$1.2 million) includes \$95,000 (received in FY 1985 to hire an exhibit specialist and to construct a case prototype) and \$1,153,000, received in FY 1986 for exhibition expenses (\$1,105,000) and to hire a woodcrafter, carpenter, painter's assistant and exhibition designer in the latter part of FY 1986 (\$48,000).

Question: For the record, please provide separate object class breakdown's for the Freer Gallery and the Sackler Gallery for fiscal years 1985 through 1987.

Answer: The tables below provides the object class breakdowns for the Freer Gallery and Sackler Gallery for fiscal years 1985 through 1987. The FY 1985 data represents the final year-end actual totals; the FY 1986 data represents the current allocation for each Gallery; and the FY 1987 data corresponds to the FY 1987 budget request to Congress.

FY 1985 Actual Costs

<u>Object Classification</u>	<u>Freer Gallery</u>	<u>Sackler Gallery</u>	<u>Total</u>
11 Personnel Compensation	743.4	125.6	869.0
12 Personnel Benefits	84.5	19.2	103.7
21 Travel	0.0	6.8	6.8
22 Transportation of Things	0.5	1.0	1.5
23 Rent, Communications & Utilities	57.9	5.2	63.1
24 Printing & Reproduction	41.2	1.6	42.8
25 Other Services	57.4	41.0	98.4
26 Supplies & Materials	73.4	32.6	106.0
31 Equipment	85.8	61.6	147.4
Collections Acquisition	109.8	0.0	109.8
TOTAL	<u>1,253.9</u>	<u>294.6</u>	<u>1,548.5</u>

FY 1986 Allocation

<u>Object Classification</u>	<u>Freer Gallery</u>	<u>Sackler Gallery</u>	<u>Total</u>
11 Personnel Compensation	770.9	395.0	1,165.9
12 Personnel Benefits	96.3	49.0	145.3
21 Travel	0.0	17.0	17.0
22 Transportation of Things	0.0	0.0	0.0
23 Rent, Communications & Utilities	0.0	0.0	0.0
24 Printing & Reproduction	66.0	9.0	75.0
25 Other Services	25.1	813.0	838.1
26 Supplies & Materials	25.5	324.5	350.0
31 Equipment	22.4	228.5	250.9
Collections Acquisition	100.0	0.0	100.0
TOTAL	<u>1,106.2</u>	<u>1,836.0</u>	<u>2,942.2</u>

FY 1987 Congressional Budget Request

<u>Object Classification</u>	<u>Freer Gallery</u>	<u>Sackler Gallery</u>	<u>Total</u>
11 Personnel Compensation	755	832	1,587
12 Personnel Benefits	95	104	199
21 Travel	0	24	24
22 Transportation of Things	0	0	0
23 Rent, Communications & Utilities	30	38	68
24 Printing & Reproduction	72	183	255
25 Other Services	31	611	642
26 Supplies & Materials	57	911	968
31 Equipment	40	219	259
Collections Acquisition	104	0	104
TOTAL	<u>1,184</u>	<u>2,922</u>	<u>4,106</u>

Museum of African Art

Question: The fiscal year 1987 request for the Museum of African Art totals \$3,342,000 and 55 positions, an increase of almost 100 percent in staff and an increase of 181 percent in funding compared to the fiscal year 1985 level. Are you convinced that the quality of staff can be maintained in view of such rapid expansion?

Answer: Yes. Of these positions, four are professional research positions related to curatorial and educational programs and great care is being exercised to ensure that those hired have the highest qualifications. The remaining posi-

tions include occupations such as: art handlers, clerical, exhibition support and design-related staff. These positions will also be filled with experienced, well-qualified applicants.

Question: What are the additional costs for fiscal year 1988 of annualizing the positions requested in fiscal year 1987?

Answer: The additional cost in fiscal year 1988 of annualizing the positions requested in fiscal year 1987 will be 1 workyear and \$24,000, as shown below:

Costs to Annualize FY 1987 Positions

Position Title	# of Pos.	FY 1987 Budget		In FY 1988		Full Year Costs	
		FTE	\$(000s)	FTE	\$(000s)	FTE	\$(000s)
Carpenter	1	1.00	24	0.00	0	1.00	24
Packer	1	1.00	19	0.00	0	1.00	19
Computer Asst.	1	0.25	7	0.75	18	1.00	25
Graphic Production Asst.	1	1.00	20	0.00	0	1.00	20
Exhibition Design Asst.	1	1.00	25	0.00	0	1.00	25
Art Handler	1	1.00	19	0.00	0	1.00	19
Painter	1	1.00	22	0.00	0	1.00	22
Asst. Curator	1	1.00	25	0.00	0	1.00	25
Secretary	1	1.00	20	0.00	0	1.00	20
Education Specialist	1	0.75	19	0.25	6	1.00	25
Total	10	9.00	200	1.00	24	10.00	224

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum

Question: What is the current annual lease cost of the Carver Theater?

Answer: The annual lease cost of the Carver Theater and its adjacent lot is \$35,500, which has been paid from the base funding of the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum.

Question: Please provide a detailed explanation as to the proposed use of these rental funds once the new museum is completed.

Answer: It is anticipated that the leases of the Carver Theater and its adjacent lot will be terminated on March 1, 1987. In FY 1987, the resulting partial-year savings (approximately \$21,000) will be used to equip and furnish the new museum facility at Fort Stanton Park. In FY 1988 and following years, the full-year savings (\$35,500) will be used to enhance the research and exhibition capabilities of the Museum, including the purchase of exhibition production supplies and materials (\$14,000); additional support for exhibition design, photographic, and audio-visual services (\$11,500); and funding for contractual services for research and research travel for Museum staff (\$10,000).

Museum Support Center Equipment

Question: The justification also contains an estimate of an additional \$16 to \$17 million in outyear costs to complete equipping of the MSC. Please provide a detailed explanation of these costs and indicate the inflation factor that is being used.

Answer: The estimated costs for completion of the storage equipment system for the MSC include: cabinets for the growth areas of the concrete decked portions in storage pods 2 and 4; a continuation of the self-supporting three level shelving storage system and the necessary utilities for Pod 3 growth areas for

"wet" collections; and the required utilities and shelving storage and material handling components to enable the Institution to store collections in the high-bay area of Pod 4.

The total of the estimated costs for these three segments of the storage equipment, including an inflation factor of 3% per year is \$16,881,000 if purchased on the basis of the funds requested in the Five Year Prospectus from FY 1988-FY 1991. These estimated costs were based on the final procurement costs for the initial portion of Pod 3 shelving and on the prices most recently provided for the storage cabinets for Pods 1, 2 and 4 by the contractor for the existing storage system contract. These estimated costs may vary by (1) actual bids received at the time of procurement; (2) the inflation rate in effect at the time of the bid for the city of the bidder; and (3) any change in the present schedule; the Institution is reviewing the appropriate schedule of procurement of the storage equipment system to fill the pods.

Question: What is your estimate of the costs incurred during this process in switching contractors and switching plans?

Answer: According to the General Services Administration (GSA), the general contractor's change of subcontractor for the design and production of the storage cabinets has not caused any change in the costs for the equipment, since the general contractor is obligated to perform under the contract at prices not to exceed those established in the change order for the concrete deck and cabinet system. Also according to the GSA, by using some existing storage cabinets worth about \$1.3 million to offset the cost of cabinets originally planned to be procured under the contract, there has been no change in the net cost of the storage system as a result of the shift from racks to concrete decks.

Question: What is the current status of the proposed contract for the acquisition of storage cabinets for the MSC?

Answer: Over the past several months, the GSA's prime contractor, Davis Corporation, has continued efforts to locate a subcontractor for storage cabinets for the Museum Support Center. Meetings held with prospective subcontractors, Smithsonian, GSA, and the A/E firm of Metcalf/KCF have led Davis Corporation to Jamestown Metal, Inc. in New York which manufactures metal case work and equipment for hospitals, scientific laboratories and kitchens. After inspecting sample cabinets, drawers and shelves, project participants concluded that this firm has the capacity as well as the capability to produce the needed storage equipment on a reasonable time schedule and according to specifications. Although the alleged cost to manufacture the storage cabinets exceeds the amount in the contract, in response to GSA's directive, the General Contractor provided a plan of action on June 10 to complete the project. GSA accepted this plan in principle but disallowed any cost increases. The contractor has indicated he may pursue a claim to recover the alleged cost increase, as well as possible other claims as yet undefined by the contractor.

The Institution has retained a consultant to provide an independent assessment of the anticipated time and cost for the completion of this project.

Quadrangle Security Staffing

Question: Funds are requested for the Office of Protection Services to provide a total of 68 guards for the Quadrangle. What are the full-year costs of the additional positions requested in fiscal year 1987?

Answer: The full year costs of the positions requested in FY 1987 for the Office of Protection Services is 36 workyears and \$589,000. An amount of 14.5 workyears and \$222,000 will be required in FY 1988 to annualize the partial-year funding requested for FY 1987.

Space Rental Paid by Trust-funded Activities

Question: According to the justification, "rent" paid by Trust funded activities is used to offset commercial space rental by the institution. For the record, please list the square feet occupied by the various trust activities and the "rent" paid for fiscal years 1983 through 1987.

Answer: The square footage occupied by the various Trust activities occupying Mall space and the rent paid for fiscal years 1983 through 1987 is shown on the table below.

Rental Costs and Square Footage Occupied
by Trust Funded Activities
FY 1983 - FY 1987 Est.

Trust Funded Activity	FY 1983		FY 1984		FY 1985		FY 1986		FY 1987	
	Cost	Square Ft.								
SI Magazine	\$110,200	6,000	\$133,500	6,000	\$126,000	6,000	\$140,900	6,000	\$153,100	6,000
Nat'l Assoc.	57,000	3,000	66,800	3,000	63,000	3,000	92,200	6,700 /2	171,000	6,700
Res. Assoc.	95,000	5,000	111,200	5,000	105,000	5,000	148,000	10,200 /2	260,300	10,200
Bus.Mgt.Ofc.	17,100	900	20,000	900	18,900	900	21,200	900	23,000	900
Concessions	6,600	360	8,000	360	7,600	560	13,200	560	14,300	560
Parking Ofc.	4,600	240	5,400	240	5,000	240	6,900	420 /3	10,800	420
TOTAL	290,700	15,500	344,900/1	15,500	325,500/1	15,700	422,400	24,780	632,500	24,780

/1 Auxiliary activities that occupy space on the Mall are charged a per-square-foot cost based on the projected cost of space at L'Enfant Plaza. Initial rent projection for FY 1984, which anticipated the same drastic increase as experienced in the two preceding years, substantially exceeded the actual per-square-foot cost of L'Enfant space. This resulted in a higher rental payment by the auxiliary activities in FY 1984 than in FY 1985.

/2 Reflects additional space acquired with the move of the National Associate and Resident Associate programs to new facilities in the Quadrangle during FY 1986. The FY 1986 rental cost is estimated on partial-year use of the new facilities.

/3 Represents additional space acquired with the move of the Parking Office to a new location in the Smithsonian Institution Building during FY 1986. The FY 1986 rental cost is estimated on partial-year use of the new location.

Smithsonian Horticultural Costs

Question: It is proposed that six positions and over \$200,000 annually be provided to maintain the Quadrangle gardens. Please provide information on horticultural expenditures at other Smithsonian museums for comparison.

Answer: The Office of Horticulture provides horticultural services to all of the Smithsonian's museums and support facilities through its Ground Management Division and its greenhouse - nursery complex located at the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home (36 workyears and \$1,056,000). Information on actual horticultural expenditures at individual museums is difficult to calculate because supplies, materials and equipment are purchased centrally to be used as needed in the different facilities and staff members with specialized knowledge may provide support for several museums.

In addition, comparison between current horticultural services for the other Smithsonian facilities and the services required for the Quadrangle must take into consideration the unique nature of the Quadrangle gardens, designed as three distinctly different types of gardens -- a central Victorian style garden flanked by Oriental and Persian gardens -- planted on top of the roof of the facility. The lack of a natural watertable, combined with the large size, intense development and demanding requirements of the plantings in the Enid A. Haupt Garden, sets it apart from other horticultural sites maintained by the Institution. Significant elements of the garden will include a large embroidery parterre garden; rare specimen trees, shrubs and plants requiring continual monitoring, grooming, and horticultural management; an extensive system of walkways and ornamental fountains to be cleaned daily; Victorian

lampposts fitted with hanging baskets requiring regular maintenance; and the restoration, installation, and upkeep of a major collection of antique garden furnishings. In addition, the Office will be responsible for the care and regular rotation of hundreds of interior plants in the entrance pavillions, reception areas, and museum galleries throughout the Quadrangle complex.

Building Management Costs of Smithsonian Museums

Question: A total of 44 positions are proposed for the Quadrangle building management division. Please provide information on the building management of other museums for the purposes of comparison.

Answer: Information on building management of other museums is provided in the table below:

<u>Museum</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>\$</u>
National Air and Space Museum	83	1,840,000
National Museum of African Art	2	50,000
National Museum of American History	53	1,019,000
National Museum of Natural History	60	1,104,400
Cooper-Hewitt Museum	9	448,135
Hirshhorn Museum	24	587,500
Anacostia Neighborhood Museum	1	29,000
National Museum of American Art; National Portrait Gallery; Renwick Gallery; and Barney House (AA/PG Bldg. Mgmt. <u>1</u>)	37	896,000

1 The AA/PG building management staff is responsible for maintenance and service to the American Art/Portrait Gallery Building (248,780 sq. ft.) which houses the National Museum of American Art, the National Portrait Gallery, and the Archives of American Art; the Renwick Gallery (21,317 sq. ft.); and the Barney Studio House (2,594 sq. ft.).

In comparing the Quadrangle Building Management unit with information on building management of other museums, it is important to note that the building management unit of the Quadrangle will provide a wide variety of support services to all of the organizations to be located in the Quadrangle, including the Sackler Gallery of Art, the National Museum of African Art, the International Center and related activities, the Traveling Exhibition Service, and the National Associate and Resident Associate programs.

Arts & Industries Building

Question: Has a location been found for construction of a facility to house the central computer?

Answer: At the time of the submission of the FY 1987 budget to Congress, it was anticipated that the computer facility would be relocated to another building. However, as the result of studying possible alternative locations for the facility, it was determined that none of these other locations could meet all of the following criteria: the amount of space required for the computer facility (approximately 6,600 square feet); the configuration of space suitable for the requirements of the technical center and related office space; a central location convenient to the major computer users on the Mall; and the ability to complete the relocation of the facility prior to the start of the exterior renovation work above the old computer facility. It was, therefore, decided that the best course of action was to keep the computer facility in its present location.

During the exterior renovation of the Arts and Industries building, however, the portion of the roof above the computer facility will have to be removed. In order to allow this work to proceed while the computer facility continues to operate, a contained environmental control structure will be built within the computer facility to maintain the strict environmental controls required by central computer operations. At the same time, the exterior work will necessitate the removal of the HVAC equipment for the computer facility that had been installed on the roof; the new HVAC system will be designed to operate independently of the system for the rest of the building, ensuring greater control of the environmental conditions within the computer facility. The funding requested in FY 1987 will be used to ensure the proper environmental conditions for the computer facility during the renovation of the building and to provide the permanent HVAC system dedicated to the computer facility.

Question: Please provide detailed information on renovation plans for the A&I building including a description of any activities to be relocated or which would receive significantly enhanced space. Include a description of the work done since fiscal year 1984 and the associated costs.

Answer: The Smithsonian is currently reviewing the recently completed space study of the A & I Building. Until decisions have been made about the future use of the building, detailed information on renovations cannot be developed. It is anticipated, however, that a major component of the renovation will be the replacement of the outmoded HVAC system to provide better overall climatic conditions and more efficient operation. Fire protection improvements will also be made as part of the renovation project.

Work accomplished at the A & I Building from FY 1984 to date has primarily been associated with the exterior repair and renovation program, including roof replacement, installation of new windows and sashes, brick and masonry restoration, and gutter and downspout replacement. Other work has been accomplished during the period related to the safety and operation of the building, such as asbestos removal, fire protection, HVAC and electrical repairs, and minor alterations. From October 1, 1983 through April 30, 1986 R & R appropriations in the amount of \$6,234,313 have been expended for work at the A & I building. Of the total, \$6,092,724 was for exterior work and \$141,589 for other work.

Freer Gallery Renovation

Question: Does the amount requested for the Freer renovation include equipment and furnishing costs?

Answer: The \$2,500,000 requested includes the cost of finished space with mechanical and electrical equipment. The cost of furnishings was not included in the estimate.

Effects of the FY 1986 Deficit Control Act on R&R Projects

Question: Which projects requested in the FY 1986 budget were deferred due to the Deficit Control Act reductions?

Answer: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act required reductions in the Restoration and Renovation account totalling \$473,000. Funding for four R & R projects was reduced as a result: 1) space moves related to the exterior renovation of the Arts and Industries Building (a reduction of \$150,000); 2) interior relocations in conjunction with the Arts and Industries Building master space plan (a reduction of \$150,000); 3) the STRI master plan (a reduction of \$73,000); and 4) the replacement of windows in the Smithsonian Institution Building (a reduction of \$100,000).

STRI Construction

Question: Has the STRI project been authorized?

Answer: Legislation to authorize construction of facilities at STRI has been approved by the House and is currently pending in the Senate. H.R. 1483, a bill to authorize construction of facilities at STRI and the Fred Lawrence Whipple Observatory, was approved by the House of Representatives on October 7, 1985. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration held hearings on bill S. 581, the companion measure in the Senate, on July 24, 1985 and reported the bill out of Committee on November 19, 1985. The bill is presently awaiting floor action.

Question: Are the full costs of furnishings and equipment included in the estimate?

Answer: The projected cost of the Tupper Research and Conference Center includes the cost of furnishings and built-in and other equipment necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Center. It does not, however, include money for portable laboratory equipment, much of which will be transferred from the facility it will replace.

Smithsonian Educational Programs

Question: How is the Smithsonian Institution fulfilling its mandate to "diffuse knowledge" and information? What are the individual bureaus/museums, not auxiliaries such as Resident Associates or National Associates, offering in the form of special education programs and events -- seminars, lectures, symposia? What kinds of events is the Smithsonian offering that are geared to the general public and what dollar amount is spent on organizing and publicizing these events? How many personnel does the Smithsonian have who deal directly with public programs (and this figure should not include such personnel as public relations officers -- just those staff whose job descriptions deal specifically with public programs.)

Answer: Education programs of the Institution offer enormous variety in content and form, ranging from in-depth, scholarly symposia to activities for fun and enjoyment and reach all ages from young children to senior citizens. They include lectures and workshops; special programs and performances related to museum exhibitions; guided tours by trained docents; and radio, television, and motion picture programs. These programs, sponsored by the individual museums and by centralized offices including Elementary and Secondary Education, Symposia and Seminars, and Fellowships and Grants, are highlighted in a monthly Smithsonian calendar of events published by the Office of Public Affairs and in brochures published by the individual museums which are distributed widely to the media and interested individuals and organizations, including both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Most of these events are presented free of charge to the public.

Funding for these programs is provided by each museum and office and may vary from program to program and from year to year. Especially noteworthy education programs include HERPlab, BIRDlab, and ZOOlab at the National Zoo; the "Wings and Things" open house at the Garber Facility of the Air and Space Museum; the "Discovery Room" at the Museum of Natural History and "Discovery Corners" at the Museum of American History; "conversations with artists" at the Museum of American Art; "Portraits in Motion" at the National Portrait Gallery; and "The Lunch Box Forum" at the Anacostia Neighborhood Museum. The Visitor Information and Associates' Reception Center provides a range of centralized information and assistance programs to the general public, including the staffing of information desks in ten museums seven-days-a-week, and works with the individual museums in developing better visitor services support for their education program. Additional material relating to the specific education programs at the individual museums has been submitted to the Committee.

In addition to the base funding of each museum and program devoted to these educational programs, the Institution requests additional funding, as appropriate, to provide special educational programs and events to commemorate significant historical anniversaries. For FY 1987, program increases for the Offices of Elementary and Secondary Education and Symposia and Seminars are

requested for educational programs to commemorate the Bicentennial of the signing of the U.S. Constitution. During the next six years, the Smithsonian will develop a wide range of public and scholarly programs and activities to commemorate the Quincentenary of the voyage of Christopher Columbus to the New World.

Question: Is the Smithsonian Institution's federally mandated directive being reflected in its programming budget allocations -- is there adequate staffing to produce the necessary and proper education and programming events? Does each exhibition, or quarterly budget provide for programming events? What would you say is the percentage of each bureau's budget for programming, publications, curatorial, acquisitions, conservation, museum maintenance, personnel.

Answer: For each major event at the Smithsonian the respective museum Director and staff, along with assistance from various Smithsonian support and program units, determine the kind of ancillary activities that are appropriate and affordable. No set percentage of a bureau's budget is used for these activities but, in fact, would vary from year to year depending on the major event planned and the selected programs and activities associated with it. Since units receive allocations annually and scheduled events vary from year to year, the unit is unable to allocate a standard percentage of its budget specifically for ancillary programs. Additionally, the fiscal climate may have a bearing on programmatic planning. For example, as a consequence of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings reductions for FY 1986, bureaus experienced a tremendous effect in the "other objects of expense" portion of their budgets--greatly affecting ancillary activities.

Question: What is the Smithsonian doing in terms of educational programs for pre-school, elementary and secondary students? What portion of the Smithsonian's budget that is appropriated by Congress is used to serve school children? What are you doing to reach a broad national audience?

Answer: All of the museums have educational programs that include such activities as tours for elementary and secondary school groups, art workshops, publications series for school children, free lectures, seminars, and films and teacher workshops. The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE) is the office that provides pan-institutional programming for elementary and secondary schools. These programs include workshops and seminars for teachers, publications and audio-visual materials for teachers and students, and a summer intern program for high school students. The intern programs gives high school students an opportunity to work behind the scenes with curators and museum professionals. OESE also provides curriculum kits for fifth and sixth graders and high school students which teach students creative thinking skills, what museums are and how to develop a classroom museum, and how to use primary and secondary research materials. A full description of this program is provided on Page 174 of the Smithsonian's FY 1987 Congressional Budget Justification.

Question: The recent recommendation made by the Bureaus' Directors to the Secretary submits three items as priority commitments for the Smithsonian -- research, conservation of holdings and acquisitions. The roles of outreach, educational programs and fundraising are relegated to a supportive position. Please explain these recommendations.

Answer: A large number of individuals and groups have been and continue to be involved in thinking about actions that might be necessary should further budget reductions be required. In commenting on overall philosophy that might be adopted by the Institution to guide decisions, the Council of Bureau Directors agreed that the essential core of the Smithsonian's program work encompasses preservation, collections and collecting, and research. While recognizing their importance, lower budget priority might be given to outreach and educational activities. Other sectors of the Institution argue vigorously for attentiveness to balance. This healthy dialogue will continue and form the basis for action should difficult budget decisions be necessary. Fundraising is a supportive, not programmatic, activity.

National Museum of American Art

Question: Remembering the success of two regional shows held at the National Museum of American Art during the past six years -- ones from Idaho and Appalachia -- what is on the exhibition calendar at that museum, and other museums, for similar regional shows? The Taos/Santa Fe exhibition is not really a regional show since the artists represented in that exhibition were from the East and only settled in Taos/Santa Fe.

Answer: There are no regional shows currently on the exhibition calendar for the National Museum of American Art; however, the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service plans to circulate four regional shows:

The Santa Fe Trail Series: Photographs by Joan Myers: Santa Fe photographer, Joan Myers documents traces of this great 19th-Century wagon trade route between Franklin, Missouri and Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Newcomb Pottery: An Enterprise for Southern Women, 1895-1940: Explores the ceramics and crafts produced at Newcomb College, Tulane University in New Orleans, one of the important centers of the Arts and Crafts Movement in America and the only major art pottery in the South.

Anasazi World: A photo-panel exhibition exploring the relationship between Anasazi (Ancient Ones) and modern day Pueblo Indian communities of the American Southwest and presents new archaeological findings from Anasazi sites.

Hawaiian Quilts: An exhibition of 22 quilts exploring this continuing folk art tradition. The beautiful craftsmanship of these painstakingly handstitched textiles is augmented by descriptions of the motifs, explanations of the pattern names and symbols, and comments by the quiltmakers.

Question: The National Museum of American Art has been soundly criticized by the Washington Post in recent months. On one occasion, the Museum provided personnel to move a piece of art in a private residence. What are you doing to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not going to fund these types of activities? While the Post only represents one reviewer's opinion, such criticisms as NMAA being the "Smithsonian's dullest museum" and "NMAA, whose curatorial policies mystify the viewer, has baffled us again" are troubling. Is NMAA moving away from serving the general public to only providing services to the elite -- the researchers, the academicians and art scholars? How many people visited the NMAA last year as opposed to its sister museum, the National Portrait Gallery? What are NMAA and the Museum of American History doing to serve the general public's taste and to bring American art to the American people?

Answer: Since the appearance of the two Washington Post articles referred to above, the same Post reviewer has written three other articles which glow in their praise of the following NMAA exhibitions and their curatorial direction: "Art in New Mexico" was extolled and "kudos" offered to its curators (Post, March 8); "Frank Lloyd Wright and the Johnson Wax Building" at the Renwick was lauded as "exemplary" (Post, April 26); and the "1986 Members Exhibitions of the Washington Print Club" was described as "a treat" and its NMAA curator as a "skillful connoisseur" (Post, May 21). The NMAA is definitely not moving away from its role of serving a broad and diverse public. The mandated Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cut of \$187,000 in the Museum's FY 1986 budget did, however, necessitate the elimination of one exhibition and the reduction in scope and programs for others. NMAA does not perceive its mission simply as "serving the general public's taste," but rather as exploring new directions, juxtaposing different historical contexts and stimulating new appreciation of American art. One of NMAA's primary means of bringing American art to the American public is by touring its exhibitions throughout the United States. Not only will "Art in New Mexico" travel to three other locations, but eighty-one of the Museum's very finest works are currently on tour to five major American cities as "Treasures of the NMAA," with all costs underwritten by a generous corporate sponsor. Additionally, exhibitions of Anni Albers' textiles and graphics, of contemporary photography, of 19th century Afro-American painting,

and of modern design in the service of advertising have been circulated nationwide by the NMAA during the past year.

Separate attendance figures for NMAA and NPG are not kept because visitors are encouraged to move freely between the two museums on all three levels of the building housing them; nor is it possible to ascertain a visitor's ultimate destination in the building merely by the door he chooses to enter. The sculpture was moved in a nonfederal vehicle on a lunch hour for a patron whose continued donations of artworks to NMAA the Museum wishes to encourage; this courtesy was nevertheless the rare exception, rather than the rule.

While working in the context of a larger systematic program of historical research and exhibition of the Museum's collections, The National Museum of American History is concerned with its relevance to the general public's interests and tastes. Examples of this are quickly seen in the permanent exhibition, "A Nation of Nations" -- a tribute to the contributions of America's diverse ethnic makeup; as well as in temporary exhibitions such as "M*A*S*H" and "Hollywood," which have had tremendous popular appeal. Upcoming exhibitions include one on computer technology which will feature devices able to interact with the public, both to provide information and survey public opinion. NMAH also devotes several spaces to changing exhibitions, that address a variety of subjects with unusual public appeal, such as a planned exhibition of quilts. Special mention must also be made of the Museum's extensive educational activities and programs of performing arts which are in direct response to public interest. Overall, NMAH hopes to serve public taste by weaving the theme of the ordinary man and his relationship to technology and society throughout the Museum's exhibitions. This can be seen in the titles of such exhibitions as, "Everyday Life In the 18th Century" and "We the People." NMAH brings art to the American public in such diverse forms as ceramics and glassware, fine furniture, folk art, costumes, textiles and needlework, costume jewelry, and, in general, through the aesthetic appreciation of the myriad objects that make up the Museum's collections. In addition, NMAH brings the performing arts to the public through exhibitions such as "A Nation of Nations," "M*A*S*H," and "Hollywood," as well as through its varied and exciting performing arts program of activities, mentioned above.

Renwick Gallery

Question: The Renwick Gallery has some of the best exhibition space in Washington and it has a wonderful location. Does the Smithsonian feel the Renwick is being utilized to its greatest potential? If not, what can be done to enhance this gallery so that it better meets the needs of the public? Does the Smithsonian intend for the Renwick to remain under the auspices of the NMAA, to make it independent or to be used at the Secretary's discretion? What are the long range exhibition plans at the Renwick?

Answer: The Renwick has a distinguished reputation as an exhibition center for American crafts, design and decorative arts. Recently the Smithsonian's Assistant Secretary for Museums has appointed an advisory committee of four distinguished outside individuals to examine the role of crafts at the Smithsonian. Although the specific use of the Renwick building is a separate issue, the future direction of crafts at the Smithsonian is a broader concern which should be resolved first. In the meantime, the Renwick's current programs will continue under the auspices of The National Museum of American Art.

Fundraising at the Smithsonian

Question: What are the plans for fundraising? What proposals or actions has the Office of Membership and Development taken, or is taking, in this period of belt-tightening? What is the project figure for the next five years?

Answer: Fundraising at the Smithsonian is being decentralized to increase the reach of individual museums and offices to prospective donors individual, corporate and foundation. The Office of Membership and Development will provide research, record-keeping and coordination for museum or office-initiated projects and will continue to be responsible for all pan-Institutional projects. The newly formed Development Committee will establish project priorities, oversee development practices generally and arbitrate any conflicts which may arise.

When this new system is entirely in place and functioning smoothly, it can be expected that the income from restricted gifts for museum and office support will exceed recent levels of \$6 - \$8 million annually.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.

Question: Since the promotion of research is one of the Smithsonian's stated top priorities, why does the Smithsonian want to close the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center facility at Rockville (SERC-Rockville), an internationally recognized laboratory that is highly regarded by the scientific community? Outside reviews were conducted in 1979 and 1982. The 1979 review state, "Clearly, it (SERC-Rockville) is one of the best (laboratories) in the country." The 1982 review concluded that the science at SERC-Rockville was of sufficient quality and importance that the Smithsonian should move the laboratory intact to the Edgewater location and build a new facility at Edgewater for the entire SERC.

Answer: Following the 1982 external review of SERC, the Smithsonian undertook a feasibility study to construct a new facility on Smithsonian property at Edgewater, Maryland. Over an 11-month period, engineers and architects explored possible sites for such a new laboratory. The study showed that a new entrance road, a bridge, and a completely new waste treatment system would be needed in addition to the new laboratory building. As the Edgewater tract is a nature reserve, there were additional constraints on where a new laboratory could be built. The cost to construct this facility was estimated to be \$21,000,000 in addition to the costs incurred for design and construction contract documents by the architect/engineers, construction management costs, and construction cost escalation. The Smithsonian Institution made the administrative decision not to go ahead with requests for authorization and appropriation for this facility as other new construction had higher priority. The decision to close SERC-Rockville was an administrative decision made on the basis of redirecting research activities into other areas of higher priority to the Institution.

Question: Has the Smithsonian carefully considered the impact that its decision to close the SERC-Rockville laboratory will have on the scientific community? SERC-Rockville is unique, not just among Federal laboratories but also when compared to any other laboratory in the world, both in the breadth of its plant photobiological research and also as a laboratory where long-term projects can be pursued that would be difficult to fund at universities. At a time of increasing interest in experimental plant science, does it make sense for the Smithsonian to eliminate nearly one-third of its plant scientists and virtually all of its laboratory-oriented experimental plant science?

Answer: The impact of closing the Rockville facility was indeed considered very carefully and two long-term (10 years or more) projects were transferred to SERC-Edgewater and one to NOAA, at their Rockville headquarters. The Smithsonian does not intend to eliminate all its long-term plant science research but rather redirect the assets of SERC-Rockville to other bureaus of the Institution where plant science will continue to be conducted. During the remainder of the FY 1986, and into FY 1987, the Institution will carefully scrutinize its existing biological research activities and review the various external options such as collaborative programs with universities, and internal options for redirecting SERC-Rockville monies in FY 1988. The results of these processes which will be aimed at strengthening our biological program with available resources will be communicated promptly to the Congress in the FY 1988 Budget Request.

Question: Is it proper for the Smithsonian to close a productive laboratory that was started 57 years ago without first conducting a thorough outside review? Despite the favorable conclusions of the 1979 and 1982 reviews, we feel it would be appropriate to appoint a committee of top experts in the field to conduct a new review before taking the drastic step of closing the facility.

Answer: The decision to close the SERC facility at Rockville followed a series of external and internal reviews from 1979 to 1986 to assess the scientific direction of the research program at Rockville, and its place and future

direction within the broader framework of the Institution's overall biological program. The reviews generally upheld the scientific quality of the research being done, but pointed out that the laboratory was relatively isolated in the context of the broader biological sciences and could be best served by integration into other existing research settings. The reviews urged that such long-term data collecting as solar and CO₂ monitoring, including research on CO₂ effects on marsh grasses, be continued by the Smithsonian and the Institution proposes to do so by transferring the programs to other of our facilities.

Question: Why has the Smithsonian decided to close the SERC-Rockville laboratory in late 1986 when the Smithsonian holds a lease on the building until January 31, 1990 at an extremely favorable rate of \$3.50/sq. ft., and could probably extend the lease for at least an additional five years at an estimated rate of \$10/sq. ft.?

Answer: The decision to close SERC-Rockville was based on the Institution's determination that this action would strengthen its research capabilities by redirecting existing funds into other high priority areas of Smithsonian research competence. The fact that the facility is leased by the Institution while playing a contributing role in the decision-making process, was not a major criterion in this decision.

Question: Does it make sense for the Smithsonian to close SERC-Rockville (without first conducting a careful outside review) when it has made considerable financial commitment to the laboratory in recent years? Following the recommendation of the 1982 review that SERC-Rockville move intact to the Edgewater location, the Smithsonian spent well over \$100,000 (it may have been closer to \$300,000) on a feasibility study of the Edgewater site by the Cooper-Lecky/Urban & Graham Joint Venture. Just this past year a greenhouse costing more than \$500,000 was completed, and in 1985 alone more than \$300,000 was spent on specialized research equipment.

Answer: The feasibility study to move the SERC-Rockville laboratory to Edgewater was conducted in February 1984, prior to the most recent of the Institution's reviews of the scientific directions of its research programs, which resulted in the decision to close the facility. The greenhouse, planned for more than a decade, will be moved to another Smithsonian facility when the Rockville building is vacated. The specialized equipment recently purchased at Rockville will move with the professional staff when they relocate or be transferred to other Smithsonian laboratories for use by other researchers.

Question: For the past several years the Smithsonian has sought substantial increases for equipment purchases. No additional funds are requested this year. Have you determined that the existing base is sufficient?

Answer: The condition of research equipment at the Institution's science bureaus has been a source of concern for a number of years. Many pieces of research equipment have been outmoded by recent technological developments. The productivity of our staff, especially new members trained in the use of modern equipment, has been severely impaired by the condition of the equipment. In FY 1984, efforts began to address these problems by a systematic approach of reviewing inventoried equipment for 1) present research needs, 2) physical condition, and 3) state of the art capability. Previously, equipment needs, particularly major items, were addressed only on an ad hoc basis. The results of our systematic review dramatically outlined the poor state of the Institution's research equipment, and the need to develop a rigorous cyclical program for replacement and upgrading. Recognizing the age of the many pieces of equipment, the Institution perceived a need to move expeditiously in developing a cyclical schedule to enhance the current bureau base for equipment. The schedule was designed so that within five years of its inception at each bureau, present inventoried equipment would be replaced or upgraded. Following the initial five year "crash" program, it was envisioned that an appropriate level of funding would be retained in each bureau's base for the future replacement of equipment

on a regular basis. Funding for this program will continue to have a high priority in future years.

It is important to stress that equipment alone cannot sustain the research enterprise of any institution. The objective of the Smithsonian's equipment program is to build a sound infrastructure for research which has to be continually supplemented with personnel, travel support, supplies, and materials. Only with all these requisite parts in place can the Institution move its scientific programs forward. The nature of research cannot afford a static approach, thus equipment and program monies must go hand in hand. Therefore, the Institution anticipates continuing requests for equipment to develop a sufficient funding base, while seeking selective programmatic increases.

Question: Why is the Smithsonian unwilling to transfer any of the research positions to other units within the Institution? There is space that could be made available to members of the SERC-Rockville staff at both the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center at Edgewater and at the Dept. of Botany of the Museum of Natural History (at the Museum Support Center in Silver Hill). The scientific staff at SERC-Rockville constitutes a valuable resource with many types of expertise that would prove very valuable to other scientists at the Smithsonian.

Answer: The Smithsonian has transferred two research programs to SERC-Edgewater and one to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research as a means to carry on high priority programs from SERC -Rockville under new scientific and administrative direction. As the Institution explores new directions for its biological programs, consideration will be given as appropriate to the existing Rockville scientific staff.

Question: Why did the Smithsonian decide to move up the closing date to November 22, 1986? When we were first informed of the closing on February 2, 14, 1986, we were told the laboratory would close sometime in 1987, most likely in the second half of the fiscal year. The announcement on March 24, 1986 that the laboratory would close on November 14, 1986 came as a shock. It is already too late for most academic jobs starting in the fall of 1986. The new closing date of November 14, 1986 means that the scientific staff will not be able to afford to wait for academic jobs starting in the fall of 1987. Therefore, we would urge that the very least the Smithsonian agree to delay the closing date by 6-12 months to give the scientific staff a realistic chance to compete for academic positions.

Answer: The SERC-Rockville staff were told on February 14, 1986 that the facility would close in FY 1987 and on March 1 that the date would be November 22, 1986, giving them nine months to seek alternate employment. The Institution remains optimistic that most of the more than 35 technical and clerical staff will be able to find new positions in other bureaus of the Smithsonian before the closure date, under a priority placement program. Current plans call for 2 scientists to transfer their research from SERC-Rockville to SERC-Edgewater, accompanied by at least 3 technicians. One scientist and 3 technicians will be transferred to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Research to continue the development of instruments for measuring solar radiation in collaboration with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. One scientist will continue his research at the University of Pittsburgh. At least 2 scientists are planning to retire and the remaining 6 scientists are negotiating with other institutions. The Smithsonian is certainly ready to be flexible in helping these individuals make future employment arrangements.

Question: Has the Smithsonian carefully considered the possible damage to its reputation within the scientific community that would develop if SERC-Rockville is closed on November 22, 1986 and as a result some or all of the senior scientific staff are forced to leave scientific research? Articles have recently appeared in both Nature and Science about the decision to close SERC-Rockville and criticism has been expressed concerning the Smithsonian's decision to move the closing date up to November 1986. Closing SERC-Rockville this fall may save money in the short run, but if, as a result, the Smithsonian

gains a reputation as an unreliable place to work, it may be more difficult for the Smithsonian to attract good scientists in the future and this damage to its reputation may carry a substantial cost. If, on the other hand, the Smithsonian attempts to find a new home for SERC-Rockville during the next few years, criticism within the scientific community may be significantly diminished.

Answer: The Institution carefully considered all the consequences of closing the SERC-Rockville laboratory and reached what it considered to be a sound and justifiable decision. It recognizes fully the personal hardships that might follow the closure and is fully prepared to ameliorate them whenever possible. The Institution has set up a specific priority placement program in order to further assist SERC-Rockville employees in seeking alternative employment within the Smithsonian.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JAKE GARN

Smithsonian Restaurant Facilities

Question: Why does the Smithsonian insist on using inside financing for restaurant facilities instead of private capital as encouraged by the Reagan administration?

Answer: As indicated in Dean Anderson's letter to Senator McClure dated May 7, 1986, economic analysis indicates that the Institution stands to gain significant additional concessions revenue by financing the Air & Space restaurant itself. When comparing previous funding proposals by an outside vendor with the current RFP's now "on the street", the Institution could net more than \$50,000,000 in additional concession fees even after paying for the new facility.

Question: Has the restaurant been designed and priced? How much will it cost to build? Have bids been obtained?

Answer: The Institution's architects are in the process of finalizing the detailed plans for the design owned by the Smithsonian which has approval from the Fine Arts Commission. When these plans are completed, construction bids will be sought.

Question: Under current RFP proposal, what will happen if you receive a 25% bid that doesn't work out and how can you even turn down a bid of that magnitude from a reasonably qualified bidder.

Answer: The RFP is also specific as to the term of the contract - four years with two three-year options to renew. Thus, if a chosen vendor does not perform appropriately, that contractor can be terminated at the end of the first four-year period, or sooner if performance warrants termination for cause.

Question: Is the employee discount in your public restaurants disclosed in the RFP so that bidders can make allowances for it?

Answer: Yes. Page 22 of the Proposed Concessions Agreement that accompanies the RFP details employee discounts in public facilities as follows: "...all persons possessing an official discount of thirty percent (30%) on the purchase price of all food and nonalcoholic beverages sold by the Contractor in the public facilities ..."

Question: How much of a factor is quality of operations in the bid process?

Answer: As noted above, the evaluation criteria are set forth in the RFP. Three of the five criteria deal specifically with quality of operations. Note particularly page 24 of the South Side RFP delivered to Senator McClure on May 7th.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator McCLURE. The subcommittee will stand in recess until May 15 at 2 p.m., at which time we will review the fiscal year 1987 budget request for the Fossil Energy Program.

Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 3:30 p.m., Thursday, May 8, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p.m., Thursday, May 15.]





SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES



3 9088 01624 6134