

OAGB File Copy
(Do not remove)

S. HRG. 102-1010, Pt. 1

Senate Hearings

Before the Committee on Appropriations

SI p. 377

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations

Fiscal Year 1993

102^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

H.R. 5503

PART 1 (Pages 1-1405)

- DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
- DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
- DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
- DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
- SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1992

**U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.**

The subcommittee met at 10:05 a.m., in room SD-116, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Harry Reid presiding.
Present: Senators Reid, Stevens, Garn, and Domenici.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

STATEMENT BY ROBERT McC. ADAMS, SECRETARY

ACCOMPANIED BY:

ALAN FERN, ACTING UNDER SECRETARY

ALICE G. BURNETTE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INSTITUTIONAL INITIATIVES

JAMES C. EARLY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EDUCATION AND PUBLIC SERVICE

TOM L. FREUDENHEIM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

ROBERT S. HOFFMANN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR THE SCIENCES

THOMAS E. LOVEJOY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NANCY D. SUTTENFIELD, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

CLAUDINE BROWN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ARTS AND HUMANITIES

JOHN F. JAMESON, SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE SECRETARY

MICHAEL H. ROBINSON, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

RICHARD L. SIEGLE, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF FACILITIES SERVICES

FRANK H. TALBOT, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

L. CAROLE WHARTON, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF PLANNING AND BUDGET

PETER POWERS, GENERAL COUNSEL

BUDGET REQUEST

Senator REID. The subcommittee will come to order. This morning we will be reviewing the fiscal year 1993 budget request for the Smithsonian Institution. Testifying in support of the Smithsonian

is the Secretary, Mr. Robert Adams. The Smithsonian fiscal year 1993 budget request is \$364,700,000, which is an increase of about 10 percent above the 1992 enacted level.

This increase includes almost \$30 million for salaries and expenses, \$801,000 for the repair and restoration of buildings and \$2,245,000 for new construction. In addition, the Smithsonian is requesting an employment level of 4,910 full-time equivalents, which is an increase of 161 FTE's over the fiscal year 1992 program.

Mr. Secretary, would you come forward?

Let me express on behalf of our subcommittee our sorrow on the death of Mrs. Carmen Turner. She was without question a woman of enormous intelligence and talent. I worked with her when she was with the Metro when I was on the D.C. Subcommittee. Her personal and professional contributions to this city and to the Smithsonian Institution will be a lasting tribute to a remarkable woman and her career. Her courage and her commitment are an inspiration.

To Mrs. Turner's family and to her colleagues, we offer our condolences. She'll be missed.

We have your prepared statement, which will be made part of the record. If you would proceed to introduce your associates and summarize your statement, we will proceed to the subcommittee's questions.

INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATES

Secretary ADAMS. On the right is Ms. Nancy Suttentfield, Assistant Secretary for Finance and Administration. On my left is Alan Fern, whose regular position is Director of the National Portrait Gallery, but who is serving on an interim acting basis as the Under Secretary as well.

There are a number of my other colleagues who are here whom you may want to call on for specific responses.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for inviting a brief oral comment at the beginning of this meeting. I am pleased to present once again the budget request for the Smithsonian. In the time I have before you this morning, I would like to focus on some concerns that I know have been on your minds and the minds of many of our constituents during the past year.

I take very seriously the concerns that have been raised, particularly those about the Smithsonian management, and would like to address them by discussing with you my strategy for management, our priorities and some thoughts on our future.

The management principles that guide our decisionmaking must be and are dynamic in nature and directed toward satisfying three requirements: serving the Smithsonian's primary purpose as a public institution, making the best and proper use of the resources it seeks and receives from Congress and its many other benefactors, and maintaining accountability to those who have entrusted to us uniquely important responsibilities.

The Smithsonian was created in its present form by the act of August 10, 1846, to carry out the trust obligation assumed by the

United States in the act of July 1, 1836, when it accepted the bequest of James Smithson. During the 146 years since then the Smithsonian has grown to encompass a wide array of museums and research bureaus, each of which typically has its own purposes that reflect the Institution's founding mandate.

Given the range of these purposes, I view my managerial role as Secretary to be primarily one of articulating and implementing the broad goals and policies established by the Board of Regents of the Institution. Beyond that, the Smithsonian's fundamental research and educational objectives are best served if authority for day-to-day management of programs and operations is delegated to the most appropriate and practical level closest to the work at hand.

This guiding principle serves to enable and to empower the highly qualified individuals who manage various parts of the Institution.

My basic philosophy has been to hire such people for senior management positions, delegate authority to them, and hold them accountable for results. Although this offers managers considerable freedom and flexibility, it does not relieve them of the obligation to comply with all appropriate laws, policies, and regulations.

Smithsonian administrative practices do not permit the Institution to opt in and out of the federal system for its own convenience, or to evade the oversight of the Congress. Those practices demand compliance with Federal appropriations statutes, personnel procedures, procurement, retirement, health and safety codes, travel regulations, and so forth.

In addition, many of our trust fund operations also follow Federal guidelines. We have, as well, strong internal, financial and management audit programs that follow OMB and GAO guidelines to monitor compliance and to evaluate the cost effectiveness for our activities.

Furthermore, the Smithsonian has, for many years, engaged the services of an independent audit firm to audit annually our financial statements, to review our management procedures, and to assure that any irregularities or weakness in our systems are detected and brought to the attention of senior management staff.

ACCOUNTABILITY OF SMITHSONIAN OFFICIALS

While I hold each Assistant Secretary, and in turn, each Bureau Director, accountable, ultimately I am accountable to the Board of Regents, at whose pleasure I serve, if an action or decision by a Smithsonian official is called into question. I recognize, too, that as Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, created by Congress to carry out the bequest of James Smithson, I am, as well, accountable to the Congress and to the public.

This management system for the most part has served the Smithsonian and its constituency well over the years, as our achievements can attest. But in our 146 years, it certainly has not always been perfect. No system of management ever is. We have made missteps, but I believe we have learned from them and applied those lessons in order not to repeat our errors.

As a recent example, the Smithsonian has strengthened its policies on collecting biological specimens and has learned a number of other valuable lessons as a result of our relationship with U.S. Fish

and Wildlife scientist Richard Mitchell. Procedures are now in place to guard against this type of situation. And our goal is to put this matter behind us and move forward.

SMITHSONIAN CORE RESPONSIBILITIES

As the official ultimately responsible for implementing Institutional direction, I have stressed certain areas of emphasis, which not only assure that we address our core responsibilities, but also represent priorities around which there is strong consensus, because they have been developed by painstaking management assessments at various levels of review.

Our core responsibilities, which we recognize are a major concern of the subcommittee, are the care and conservation of collections entrusted to us; sustaining research on collections and in areas of traditional and unique institutional strengths; and informative exhibitions that educate the public about our collections and our research.

The four priority areas I have established to assure proper attention to these core responsibilities emphasize the following: maintaining our collections, physical plant, and operating infrastructures; serving progressively wider and more culturally diverse audiences; contributing our unique scientific expertise to understand the causes and effects of global environmental change; and helping to address the daunting educational needs and challenges that confront the Nation.

For each of the last 3 years we have given highest priority in our internal planning, priority-setting, and budget deliberations to the first of these areas of emphasis—sustaining current programs and caring for our facilities, while placing less emphasis on initiatives in other areas. However, the guidance with our allowances in the present budget has tilted the balance more and more in favor of the others.

To illustrate, our fiscal 1993 request to OMB devoted 75 percent of the increase beyond uncontrollables to items of infrastructure, which encompass our core responsibilities, and 25 percent of the proposed increase to programs in global change, cultural pluralism, and education. Our allowance, which was 32 percent of the increase we sought and is now the request before you, earmarked 75 percent of the increase for programs in those three areas and 25 percent to our highest priority, taking care of what we have.

Thus, while our internal priorities are entirely consistent with those expressed by the subcommittee, external factors beyond our control limit our latitude to assign funding accordingly.

PREPARED STATEMENT

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would note that like every other organization, whether public, private, or nonprofit, we face the challenge of maintaining vitality when needs outstrip resources. While I believe we have laid the groundwork for addressing that challenge through our planning and priority-setting processes, hard choices will be required. Certainly we will keep the subcommittee informed as we confront those choices and seek its guidance.

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss this with you. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT MCC. ADAMS

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before the Subcommittee once again and to present the Smithsonian Institution's budget request for fiscal year 1993. This request totals \$364.7 million to support the array of activities pursued in order to fulfill the Institutional mission "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge."

Before getting into the details of our request, I would like to express for myself and my colleagues gathered here today our gratitude for the efforts you and the Subcommittee have made in difficult circumstances to assist us in fulfilling that mission. We are grateful, as well, for the goodwill with which you and the staff have greeted our requests for guidance between these meetings each year.

Smithsonian activities over the past year that reflect the fruits of your efforts on our behalf include, among others, the establishment at the National Museum of American History of a resident jazz orchestra that performs a repertory based on accurate transcriptions and original manuscripts of this uniquely American music. In March that Museum opened a new First Ladies Hall, where many of the gowns, which are among the icons in the Smithsonian collections, form the centerpiece of a major exhibition that looks at the various roles, images, and achievements of the women who have served as first ladies to our Nation's presidents.

Events commemorating the Columbus Quincentenary were launched in September, 1991 with the "Symposium of the Americas" and followed in October with the opening of the extraordinary exhibition, "Seeds of Change," at the National Museum of Natural History. In June of this year, the Festival of American Folklife will feature the State of New Mexico during a two-week program on the Mall, while, at the same time, another new exhibition at the Museum of American History, "American Encounters," will explore the interactions of the diverse cultures in New Mexico's Rio Grande Valley across nearly five hundred years.

On March 29th, under the football stadium at the University of Arizona in Tucson, casting began for the 6.5 meter mirror for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory's Mount Hopkins telescope. The mirror blank is now cooling, and by the end of June it will have done so sufficiently for us to make an initial assessment of the success of this effort. Additional steps, such as polishing, which will require almost a year, are necessary before we can know for certain whether or not we have the largest single optical mirror ever produced in the United States. SAO also is engaged in tasks related to its award by NASA of a contract to develop and operate the worldwide science support center for the Advanced X-ray Astrophysics Facility, an orbiting X-ray telescope that is scheduled for launch by NASA in 1998.

With respect to the National Museum of the American Indian, I am happy to report that we now have funds in hand from the City and State of New York and have issued a solicitation for construction of the George Gustav Heye Center at the old U.S. Custom House in lower Manhattan. The Heye Center is now expected to open early in 1994. However, "Pathways of Tradition," a temporary exhibition that will be held in the Rotunda of the Custom House, will open to the public on November 15th of this year.

While the support of the Subcommittee is reflected in each of these activities, another factor—the interrelationship, and, indeed, the complementarity, of Federal funds and Trust funds—also is reflected in them. The prudent and accountable use of funds from these different, but nonetheless public, sources affords a synergy that both complements and energizes our ability to provide a rich range of services and public programs, while also enabling us to pursue certain research initiatives such as those that often require long spans of time for their realization.

Through its support the Congress gives us valuable leverage as we seek to raise additional sums from other sources. As an example, the funding provided by the Subcommittee for the new Amazonia exhibit at the Zoo has enabled us to raise other amounts for critical research in biological diversity. A further example is the core of Federal funds that, together with certain restricted Trust funds, were used to stimulate the interest of donors in completing the acquisition by the National Museum of American Art of its handsome portrait of Mrs. George Watson by John Singleton Copley.

Two current projects illustrate on a large scale how Federal support generates non-Federal resources and how together they can offer programs and services not possible by either alone. Later this year we plan to move the philatelic collection of the National Museum of American History into the new National Postal Museum, which will operate as a branch of the American History Museum. Located in the historic City Post Office building, now undergoing renovation, the Postal Museum

will be supported by existing Federal base funding for the collection, which will be supplemented by funding from the Postal Service, gifts and grants from individuals, foundations, and corporations, and revenue-producing activities. The Postal Museum is expected to open to the public in the summer of 1993.

The membership program of the National Campaign for the National Museum of the American Indian, launched with Federal and Trust funds in March 1991, is designed to help support the campaign to raise non-Federal construction funds for the Museum's building on the Mall. The program anticipated a membership of 85,000 over a five-year period and projected raising \$500,000 through special appeals in that same time. As of April 20, 1992, almost 44,000 people have been recruited and more than \$1.3 million in gross membership revenue have been received, including \$72,680 raised in special appeals, even though the major campaign elements are just now getting underway.

While nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of the Institution's net operating funds in fiscal year 1991 came from direct Federal appropriations, the partnership of Federal and Trust funds works to meet the total needs of the Smithsonian. Thus, a shortfall on either side means that certain programs and projects have to be deferred, curtailed, or canceled.

At the Smithsonian the term "Trust funds" applies broadly to all monies that the institution has, receives, or generates which are not direct Federal appropriations. Trust fund sources begin, of course, with the bequest of James Smithson, and include income from that bequest and others, together with gifts and grants from individuals, corporations, and foundations; government grants and contracts; membership programs; and gross receipts from activities such as the magazine, museum shops, concessions, product licensing, and mail order.

Each source of funds carries with it certain requirements related to its use. Most of the Institution's Trust funds are restricted in their application by the funding source, such as government grants and contracts and gifts that have been made for specific purposes. Only a modest amount—some 11 percent of all Trust funds in fiscal year 1991—is available for discretionary purposes. Proposals for the use of these discretionary funds are carefully considered; those approved are applied to research, collections management, exhibits, and other public programs.

The Smithsonian has increased its development activities and taken several additional steps to enhance external sources of support. Among the former are a new initiative by the Smithsonian National Board to create a special fund for support of institutional programs, as well as recognition of the financial contributions of corporations in an appropriate manner on credit panels and in publications. The latter includes opportunities that enable us to share knowledge of our collections through the reproduction of objects in them, while earning royalties from the sale of those reproductions. In all instances, the Institution maintains rigorous control over the substance, quality, and integrity of the product, be it a silver reproduction or the ideas in an exhibition, and over the use and association of its name.

Trust fund availability is highly dependent upon a number of factors outside of our control: the state of the economy; interest rates; donor interest and competition; museum visitation; and raises in postal rates. Although our business activities generated increasing amounts of unrestricted trust funds over most of the past two decades, that trend has been reversed in the last few years because of significant declines in the national economy.

I would note here that, although a single quarter is not necessarily a new trend, our visitation from the first of January to the end of March increased by 18.7 percent over the same months in 1991 and by 9.5 percent over the same period in 1990. For the National Museum of Natural History the increases were 30 percent and 16.8 percent respectively. While it is too early to tell precisely, we hope that these greater numbers of visitors will continue and will result in improved activity in our museum shops and restaurants.

We are acutely aware of the special requirements for stewardship and public accountability that the availability of both Federal appropriations and Trust funds impose on us, and would assure the Subcommittee of our diligence in fulfilling those requirements. Our budget documents describe in substantial detail by program activity our planned uses of all funds. Every Federal dollar expended, whether for personnel, contracting, procurement, travel, or other purposes is obligated in accordance with Federal law and regulation. Indeed, as a matter of practice and full accountability, many of our Trust fund expenditures also follow Federal guidelines, particularly in matters of contracting and procurement. While the Institution, as a Trust instrumentality of the United States, has been held to be exempt from certain laws applicable to Government agencies, no such exemptions have been claimed or sought with respect to the expenditure of Federal funds.

In addition to an annual audit of the Trust funds of the Institution, we have taken the unusual step of also having an annual audit of our Federal funds by an outside public accounting firm in order to assure compliance with standards established by the General Accounting Office. This practice has been in place for more than ten years, and reflects the degree of attentiveness shared by the Board of Regents and the staff for thoroughness and consistency in the management of the financial resources of the Smithsonian Institution.

Turning now to our request, I would observe that, while it is the largest in our history, it embodies virtually no major new initiatives. It will, nonetheless, allow us to continue to offer to the American people and the peoples of the world an important selection of exhibitions and other educational activities and to sustain promising research pursuits. The request also will enable the Institution to continue modest efforts in global change research and cultural pluralism. However, most critical to the long-term well-being of the Institution are those items related to our infrastructure, or the support services, collections, and facilities that constitute the heart of the Smithsonian and provide the ordered base from which its research and public programs go forward.

The fiscal year 1993 request of \$364.7 million is \$32.9 million or 9.9 percent above our fiscal year 1992 level of \$331.8 million. Included in it are \$311 million for salaries and expenses; \$24.4 million for the repair and restoration of Smithsonian facilities; \$7.9 million for Zoo construction and repairs; and \$21.4 million for other construction.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Smithsonian's request of \$311 million for Salaries and Expenses includes small, but significant, increases in funding to continue addressing the backlog of deficiencies in the Institution's program and operating infrastructure (\$3.4 million). This critical increment reflects the Institution's highest priority, and the first of its Areas of Emphasis—Stewardship of the Public Trust—as outlined in "Choosing the Future," our five-year planning document. In addition, we seek small increases in funding in order to expand programmatic support in three areas that reflect important public imperatives and other areas of institutional emphasis: global change research (\$4.2 million); cultural pluralism (\$5.9 million, including \$5.2 million related to the National Museum of the American Indian and \$270,000 related to planning for the proposed National African American Museum); and education (\$300,000).

The majority of the fiscal year 1993 Salaries and Expenses increase, however, represents resources required to keep existing people and programs in place. Approximately 62 percent of the net increase (\$18.6 million) is required to cover the increased costs of "uncontrollable" items such as the costs of legislated pay raises, utilities, space rental, and inflation. Coupled with the \$3.4 million request for critical infrastructure needs, the bulk of the requested increase for fiscal year 1993 in Salaries and Expenses is clearly dedicated to maintaining our basic resources.

STEWARDSHIP OF THE PUBLIC TRUST

To support our infrastructure requirements, the Institution is requesting funding of \$3.4 million which would be applied to financial management improvements (\$1.4 million); development of two telescopes for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (\$666,000); implementation of health and safety programs throughout the Institution (\$500,000); facilities maintenance (\$350,000); improved personnel operations (\$300,000); and the conservation of the Institution's library and archival collections (\$200,000).

UNDERSTANDING THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT: GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH

Within the community of Federal entities engaged in global change research, only the Smithsonian has the capacity to address basic biological questions such as change in ecosystems and biological diversity. For fiscal year 1993, the Institution is requesting increases totaling \$4.2 million to continue activities in this area in order to enhance understanding of world-wide environmental change. The request includes funds for research at the National Museum of Natural History (\$1 million); the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (\$889,000); the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (\$768,000); the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (\$550,000); the National Zoological Park (\$500,000); the International Environmental Science Program (\$300,000); and the National Air and Space Museum (\$186,000).

The Smithsonian's Global Change Research Program draws upon the unique resources of the Institution and works cooperatively with the U.S. Global Change Re-

search Program that is supported by the Committee on Earth and Environmental Sciences of the Federal Coordinating Committee on Science, Engineering, and Technology. The information generated as a result of proposed initiatives in global change research will build upon the data already in the Smithsonian's possession and will be broadly available to policy-makers and members of the scientific community.

An example of specialized global change research at the Smithsonian is the Forest Canopy Biology Program. A place of great biological diversity and a sensitive indicator of global biospheric and climate change, the forest canopy sustains numerous plant and animal species, is the dominant site of energy and gas exchange in the atmosphere, and plays an essential role in the control of climate. Despite its proximity to us, we know little about it.

Our researchers are working in both temperate and tropical zone forests to unlock the secrets of the canopy, the ecophysiology of canopy leaves, the ecology of communities of canopy plants, insects, and other animals, and the exchange of gases and energy. At the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC) on the Chesapeake Bay, the cooperative initiative planned for fiscal year 1993 will go forward using an existing tower to monitor changes in the forest canopy, while at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI) in Panama the studies will utilize commercial construction cranes.

The use of towers and cranes in this emerging chapter of global change research requires additional personnel and resources. In the fiscal year 1993 budget request, \$389,000 and seven workyears are requested for canopy research at SERC, and four workyears and \$320,000 are requested for the companion program at STRI. The research program is cost-effective because it is fundamentally comparative, yielding information not only about two very important sites in the temperate and tropical regions, but also about the general response of canopies under different climates.

EXEMPLIFYING THE NATION'S PLURALISM

One of the important activities supported in the fiscal year 1993 request is the Smithsonian's commitment to mirror in all its programs and operations the many cultures of our Nation's heritage. Foremost in this effort is the National Museum of the American Indian. The Smithsonian requests an increase of \$5.2 million for operating requirements and for project planning for the Mall museum, as well as for furnishing and equipping the Heye Center at the Custom House in New York.

Another element of our requested increase is \$270,000 for initial planning for and staffing of the National African American Museum. Currently pending before both houses of Congress is legislation to authorize such a Museum. Upon enactment, we would expect to begin the search for a director and appoint a Board of Trustees with whose guidance and counsel we will be able to plan effectively for the Museum's program, space, and operational requirements.

The remaining components of the Institution's request related to cultural pluralism are increases to train, recruit, retain, and promote a diverse work force. In addition, and to complement these efforts, existing bureaus and programs are concentrating more effort on collecting and interpreting multicultural materials.

BRINGING SYNERGY TO CONTEMPORARY EDUCATION

The Smithsonian's requested increase of \$300,000 for education activities in fiscal year 1993 will strengthen institutional programs and is consonant with the President's Educational Goals for the Year 2000. We have chosen precollege initiatives as our top priority in coordination with the goals established by the Committee for Education and Human Resources of the Federal Coordinating Committee for Engineering, Science, and Technology.

Precollege initiatives are translated into concrete educational projects through two mechanisms. First, they take the form of lectures, tours, and classes, as well as curriculum materials, offered by the education departments of our museums. Second, through the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, the central policy-setting unit for our education programs, the Smithsonian creates models for sharing Institution-based research, collections, and learning with schools and school systems nationally. In doing so, the Institution addresses national audiences and needs in collaboration with local institutions, rather than by imposing predetermined solutions. Part of the requested increase will enable the Smithsonian to establish an 800 phone number and computer service through which teachers can talk to experts on our educational resources. This electronic information system—providing one-stop shopping to the entire Smithsonian for teachers throughout the Nation—will build upon offerings currently available to schools across the country through the Institution's resource guides.

REPAIR AND RESTORATION

The Smithsonian's commitment to a planned maintenance and renovation program for its facilities continues to be among the highest priorities in our fiscal year 1993 request and is another aspect of our stewardship. These repairs are essential to ensure smooth, safe, and efficient functioning of building equipment and systems; long-term preservation of our buildings, a number of which are National Historic Landmarks; and compliance with safety and health codes and standards.

In the repair and restoration account, approximately 43 percent of the requested \$24.4 million in fiscal year 1993 funding will allow us to continue to modify our aging facilities as part of the Major Capital Renewal Program. This ongoing process began in fiscal year 1989 and includes the planned replacement of major building systems. The remaining 57 percent of repair and restoration funds will support several categories of routine maintenance and repair projects, including facade, roof and terrace repairs; fire detection and suppression projects; and advanced planning and inspection.

As the Subcommittee is aware, the backlog is not static. Added to it each year are items not previously included, as well as those that result from increased costs and deterioration or damage caused by delays in addressing them. While we have estimated that reducing the backlog to a manageable level would require funding of \$35 million annually for eight to ten years, reductions in recent years now make it clear that a level of \$39 million annually over the next decade will be needed to bring the backlog of repairs under control.

NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS

In the Zoo construction and improvements account, the Institution seeks a total of \$7.9 million. Of that amount, \$2.1 million would be used to design and begin construction of a cluster of new habitat exhibits as part of the Zoo's Aquatic Trail. Another \$1.3 million will aid the design and initial site preparation for three new exhibits, each representing distinct ecological and geographic areas: American Grasslands, African Grasslands, and Asian Tropical Forests. To upgrade and extend the roadway system at the Zoo's Conservation and Research Center at Front Royal, Virginia we seek \$1.2 million. The fiscal year 1993 request also includes funding for major repair and renovation of the Zoo's existing facilities at Rock Creek Park (\$2.35 million) and at Front Royal (\$950,000).

CONSTRUCTION

The Smithsonian's fiscal year 1993 construction request of \$21.4 million is dominated by two priorities, the first of which is the completion of the East Court In-Fill at the National Museum of Natural History. The amount sought for this project is \$13.5 million. The addition will provide space to relocate employees during renovation of the Museum's heating, cooling, and ventilating systems. Later, it will provide permanent space for ongoing Museum programs.

Our second priority is to move forward with the varied components of the National Museum of the American Indian. We seek \$1 million for the planning and design of its Suitland Collection Storage facility to house the extensive collection of Native American artifacts from the Heye Foundation Collection. In this facility, adjacent to the Smithsonian's Museum Support Center, the collection will be near the Native American collections of the National Museum of Natural History, thus achieving efficiencies by consolidating resources for conservation, preservation, and collections-related research.

Other major construction projects proposed for funding in fiscal year 1993 include planning and designing an extension of the National Air and Space Museum at Washington Dulles International Airport (\$1 million); performing a construction study for a new Collections Research Center in Suitland (\$500,000); and planning for the proposed National African American Museum (\$200,000). The Institution also requests \$4.45 million for minor construction, alterations, and modifications in existing buildings, and \$750,000 for planning future construction projects.

The representation of our longer-term needs in "Choosing the Future" results from the adoption in 1977 of a series of recommendations, designed to improve the Institution's accountability to Congress, one of which stated that:

"The Regents and the Secretary should establish a 5-year forward planning process for the Institution covering all activities. Such a process should establish the general direction of the Smithsonian program efforts and identify areas for priority and emphasis, but permit flexibility enough to take advantage of ad hoc opportunities. It will be a useful management tool, will provide a basis for periodic oversight hearings by the authorizing committee, and will communicate to those committees

and the appropriations committees important information about the forward plans of the institution."

We recognize that our capital program for the decade ahead is more ambitious than the Federal budgetary environment can absorb, and that its realization is entirely dependent on the authorization, as well as the availability, of funding. Nonetheless, it has seemed important to share this sense of direction with you. As we continue to justify our needs and refine our estimates, we also will refine our priorities and explore alternative financing options, including enhanced public/private partnerships for individual projects in order to reduce their impact on the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, I would again thank you for your time and for your consideration of our needs. We appreciate the efforts of the Subcommittee in helping us fulfill our many roles at a time when there is little flexibility in the structure of the Federal budget. Our request has attempted to respect the constraints that the current economic climate imposes, while observing our obligations for the collections and facilities with which we have been entrusted and for carrying out our historic mandate. The modest levels of increase will, as I have outlined, go primarily toward meeting uncontrollable cost increases and investing in our infrastructure; we would hope to work closely with the Subcommittee to assure that these most fundamental objectives are secured.

I would thank you, as well, for your support of what I think the Smithsonian does best: bringing the stories of science, history, and culture to our many audiences, while continuing to explore the frontiers of knowledge. All of us at the Smithsonian are indebted to the Subcommittee for making possible rewarding journeys along the paths of knowledge and of public service.

I would be glad to respond to any questions you and other Members of the Subcommittee might have on our fiscal year 1993 budget request and on any other Smithsonian matters.

CONCERNS OVER POSSIBLE POLITICAL AGENDA

Senator REID. So my colleagues know, we're going to ask questions on a rotational basis.

I think it's fair to say that for most of 1991 and thus far in 1992 the Smithsonian has found itself at the center of a great deal of controversy. There are some, including respected members of this subcommittee, who have expressed alarm at the Smithsonian's apparent preoccupation with pursuing a political agenda.

My interpretation of this concern is that the Smithsonian is increasingly perceived as being more concerned with becoming conversant in what is politically correct than in effectively managing its collections, that the Smithsonian seems more intent on moralizing rather than simply preserving and exhibiting this Nation's heritage.

Some have even suggested that the Smithsonian has veered so far off its traditional course that the Institution seems no longer content to simply act as a catalyst for the increase and diffusion of knowledge, but seems more inclined to promote a particular point of view.

This concerns the subcommittee because it ultimately affects not only the cost of operating the Smithsonian, but the substance of the Institution's exhibits and programming.

Would you care to comment on those concerns?

Secretary ADAMS. I'd be delighted to, Mr. Chairman.

I would state flatly at the outset that I don't think that the Smithsonian ever has pursued or should pursue what is sometimes called a politically correct agenda. I don't think that has been in our minds. I don't think it should be in our minds.

I think we do strive both to expand our audiences and to broadly represent the cultural diversity that is a characteristic feature of

this country. Others obviously may disagree, but my own position is that the Smithsonian has an obligation, carefully and deliberately, to try to expand, what should we call it, the envelope of convention, to stress the development of tolerance as a feature that should characterize the interactions within the American public and among all the groups that compose it.

I think there's a positive relationship between tolerating and recognizing diversity on the one hand and encouraging creativity on the other. And I think we're very much committed to the latter.

It's only a continuing display of creativity which will keep the Smithsonian exciting and interesting for members of the public.

I would accept as a personal article of conviction, and I believe it's one that the Institution as a whole would also hold, the importance of maintaining the motto "e pluribus unum," which recently has been brought forward in a very persuasive way by historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and others, while nevertheless encouraging ethnic and racial groups in this country to make their rightful and distinctive places within this larger whole.

I guess if I were to try to summarize my response to what you put forward as a position or as a sense of criticism that's in the air that you're aware of, I would say that the Smithsonian is not and should not be a Federal equivalent of Disneyland, in which everything is perfect and changeless and familiar.

We're here for another purpose. And I think we need to remain consistent in our pursuit of our purpose.

Senator REID. From what I heard in your oral statement to the committee, it's my understanding that certain requests to OMB—in fact, infrastructure was some 75 percent of your requested increase, and it came out just the opposite. Infrastructure dropped to 25 percent and the other programs were 75 percent. When you submitted it to OMB, it was just the opposite.

Secretary ADAMS. The point is, in the request that we submitted, it was not possible to meet that in full. Of that aggregate request, 75 percent represented infrastructure and 25 percent represented the programs; as it went forward to Congress, it is reversed.

I think new programs are always more interesting and exciting. But it's certainly not our intention to have this happen.

EXHIBITIONS BASED ON SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Senator REID. The New York Times carried an article in its February 4 edition regarding the Smithsonian's "Etiquette of the Undercaste" exhibit on the homeless. I haven't personally visited this exhibit. The Times description, though, said, "To enter, all the museum visitor has to do is lie on a morgue drawer." The article contains several quotes from you, including your description of the homeless exhibit as "an example of art imitating life" and how "museums must relate to the problems of the contemporary world, as opposed to the past, when museums were storehouses of idealized images, and museums are no longer that."

Are we likely to see the Smithsonian, then, in its exhibits, experimental or otherwise, allow the museum visitors to experience what it's like to die from AIDS, be victimized by spousal abuse, or suffer the indignity and harassment of discrimination?

Are we likely to see exhibits that allow the museum visitor to experience what it's like to live in a family that because of increasing concerns for the environment, lost its source of income because they're coal miners in West Virginia, or loggers in the Pacific Northwest, maybe even miners in Nevada?

Secretary ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would take it for granted that the task of the Smithsonian is to consistently maintain a very wide array of exhibits in which small experimental changes, exemplified by the "Undercaste" exhibit, ought to be a part.

But I certainly think it would be a terrible mistake to allow that kind of highly experimental exhibit to become characteristic of the whole.

Let me point out that it was an experiment that was open to a total of 7,000 visitors. That's 0.2 percent of the audience of the Smithsonian during the period of time that exhibit was here. I think it was an attempt to see what the impact would be of oral material accompanying the presentation that was much more immediate than any which was put on in the course of an ordinary exhibit.

But beyond the technical questions which I've been touching on, which I think make this a useful experiment, let me say with regard to the subject matter that I think it was a matter of conscience and, frankly, patriotism and institutional responsibility to touch on what the "Today Show" recently called America's staggering social problem, to try to disturb our complacency to a degree.

There was no agenda as to what should be done about this. There was no political program that came out of this.

But it was an attempt to see how we can sometimes, in a modest way, use the museum context to bring people closer to a reality which is otherwise very difficult to get your arms around.

I'm not at all sorry we did it. In fact, I'm proud that we did it. But that isn't to say that I agree with everything that was said in there. And I do regret that we did not edit out some of the strong language that appeared in the tape of that program. It wasn't stronger than one can hear in an R-rated movie in any main street in America, but it nevertheless didn't need to be there for the purpose we were pursuing. And I think that's an example of the kind of mistake that we need to learn from and correct in the future.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Senator REID. In March of this year, the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia ruled that you, the Smithsonian, were a Federal agency and subject to the requirements of the Freedom of Information Act. Eighty-five percent of your budget is provided by Federal appropriation and even on that day the Smithsonian was represented before the court by the U.S. attorney.

It's my understanding that the Smithsonian is appealing the District Court's decision. Is it the Institution's position now that it's not an agency of the Federal Government?

Secretary ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, if there is an appeal of that decision, and I don't know that that matter is yet determined, that would be an appeal put forward by the Department of Justice, not by the Smithsonian.

It is the position of the Smithsonian at this point—and, of course, that's always subject to further determination by the legislative process and perhaps by the judicial process—it is the position of the Smithsonian that it is a trust entity of the United States rather than an agency of the Federal Government and that it does not have governmental powers.

If that were not so, then, indeed, the question could probably be raised whether the whole manner of governance of the Smithsonian is constitutional. It includes representatives of both Houses of Congress, of the executive branch, and of the judicial branch on its Board of Regents.

All that would, indeed, be called into question if it is recognized duly and after appeal as a Federal agency.

Senator REID. If there is not an appeal filed, then that decision would stand? Would that affect the Smithsonian's operation on a day-to-day basis?

Secretary ADAMS. As I understand, this is a complicated legal matter and we may want to hear from the General Counsel of the Smithsonian, Mr. Peter Powers.

Let me state my own understanding which is that the issue of freedom of information applies in this case to two documents, which may not be necessarily available on other grounds to the plaintiff in the case. If they are not, then the decision rests there without the possibility of appeal because the matter becomes moot, if you see what I mean.

But I'd rather you hear from our general counsel. I'm beyond my own depth here.

Senator REID. What is the bearing of this decision?

Mr. POWERS. I should point out first that for 25 years we have used the Freedom of Information Act as a guideline in responding to requests from the public for information.

Senator REID. I don't care about that. My question is, Is the decision of the district court one where it made a finding that the Smithsonian was an agency of the Federal Government?

Mr. POWERS. It was called an authority of the Government of the United States. That's the phrase under the coverage definition in the Freedom of Information Act.

Senator REID. I am right, then, when I say that the decision of the Federal District Court of the District of Columbia made a determination that the Smithsonian was in fact an agency of the Federal Government.

Mr. POWERS. It made that ruling from the bench, very briefly mentioning some of the things that you talked about. A few weeks ago additional briefs were filed on the merits. As the Secretary said, there are only two or three documents.

Senator REID. But you see, I don't care about the Freedom of Information Act. What I'm concerned about is whether the court decided that the Smithsonian was an agency of the Federal Government.

Mr. POWERS. It decided that, yes, sir.

Senator REID. My question to you, Mr. Adams is, Does that change the way that you will run the Smithsonian?

Secretary ADAMS. I don't believe so. I believe we are already consistent with the basic rules of the Federal Government. If it would

have an effect, at the moment I'm not aware of what that effect would be.

Senator REID. Mr. Stevens, you're recognized for 10 minutes.

SALARIES OF SMITHSONIAN MANAGEMENT

Senator STEVENS. First I have some questions, Mr. Adams, that I'd like to have you and your staff just answer for the record. I have some others that I will be pleased to have a dialog on.

I'd like to know how many employees of the Smithsonian have salaries in excess of the Federal Government's pay schedules. Specifically, I'm interested in your salary, the General Counsel, the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretaries, and all Museum Directors.

Would you give us that for the record, please?

Secretary ADAMS. Certainly.

Senator STEVENS. And any others that are in excess of the Government pay schedule.

Secretary ADAMS. I might say here that I believe the count of those in excess of Government pay scale is 21. We will give you the details.

[The information follows:]

SALARIES IN EXCESS OF FEDERAL PAY SCHEDULES

Currently, 21 members of the Smithsonian staff (all Trust Fund employees) earn more than the Federal Pay Cap of \$112,000. The following lists the current members of the senior staff and their current salaries:

<i>Position title</i>	<i>Base pay</i>
Secretary	\$180,000
General Counsel	115,000
Assistant Secretary for Museums	130,000
Assistant Secretary for Research	130,000
Assistant Secretary for External Affairs	115,000
Assistant Secretary for Institutional Initiatives	115,000
Director, NMAH	125,000
Director, National Zoological Park	125,000
Director, NASM	125,000
Director, Cooper-Hewitt Museum	115,000
Director, NMNH	127,995
Director, Freer/Sackler Gallery	120,000
Director, HMSG	138,200
Director, NMAA	125,000
Assistant Secretary for Finance and Administration	130,000
Director, Museum of the American Indian	127,995
Publisher, Smithsonian Institution Magazine	112,848
Editor, Smithsonian Institution Magazine	112,848
Associate Publisher, advertisement	112,848
Associate Publisher, circulation	112,848
Associate Publisher, administration	112,848

SMITHSONIAN PROGRAM OFFICES THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Senator STEVENS. I have limited time so I'll put these in the record, if I may.

Second I'd like to have the number of program offices that you've established throughout the United States, not only how many that exist, but the employees in each and what is the annual cost and whether those costs are paid by the Federal funds, or in part by the trust funds.

In other words, what is the funding of those?

Secretary ADAMS. We will furnish that for the record.
[The information follows:]

PROGRAM OFFICES IN THE UNITED STATES OUTSIDE OF IMMEDIATE
WASHINGTON, DC, AREA

[Dollars in thousands]

Office and location	1991 operations				
	Number of employees		Costs		
	Civil Service	Trust	Federal	Trust	GGC ¹
Archives of American Art:					
New York, NY	3	6	\$141	\$156
Boston, MA	1	2	68	54
Detroit, MI		2		82
San Francisco, CA	1	1.5	73	24
Los Angeles, CA		2		51
Cooper Hewitt Museum, New York, NY	28	19	1,786	2,996	\$30
National Museum of the American Indian, New York, NY	49		1,678	
National Museum of Natural History Field Station, Ft. Pierce, FL	1	5	85	517
National Zoological Park, Front Royal, VA	48	3	1,904	757
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory Headquarters, Cambridge, MA	81	264	6,211	² 6,873	7,405
SAO Field Station:					
Tucson, AZ	21	4.5	1,125		72
Harvard, MA		4	132		60
Hilo, HI4	22	
Huntsville, AL		3			238
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center, Edgewater, MD	34	2	2,478	679	559
Smithsonian Magazine, New York, NY		54		5,968

¹ Government grants and contracts.

² Includes overhead on grants and contracts and cost centers.

REPRODUCTIONS OF SMITHSONIAN QUILTS

Senator STEVENS. Let me go to some controversial items. My attention was called to the fact that we have had this dispute over the Smithsonian's contract with a Chinese company to reproduce historic quilts in China and to sell them in the United States at prices which are comparable to those made in the United States.

Is the Smithsonian bound by the Buy America laws that apply to other Federal agencies?

Secretary ADAMS. I'm afraid that I don't have an answer to that. Maybe our general counsel can answer that.

Mr. POWERS. When we use Federal funds, Senator, we abide by those principles. But in the trust fund operations, we do not. I don't think I can answer more clearly than that.

Senator STEVENS. Do you put into the trust fund the moneys you acquire from selling items that are sold at the Smithsonian?

Mr. POWERS. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. So they're not subject to control. The moneys that you earn, so to speak, when people come to the Smithsonian, which we believe is a Federal entity, are then not subject to Federal laws in terms of Buy America. Is that your position?

Mr. POWERS. I believe that's correct.

Senator STEVENS. I'd like to have an extended answer in the record on that. I don't know of any other Federal agency that avoids the impact of Federal laws by virtue of creating a separate one.

Even the Department of Defense, with its appropriated funds that are earned in commissaries and PX's are subject to the laws of the United States.

And I would like to know on what basis you believe that you are able to avoid the Buy America laws and the licensing laws? It's my understanding that this was a contract of the Smithsonian and an entity in the People's Republic to reproduce quilts, which the public believes are made in America. They are traditional American hand-quilted quilts.

Secretary ADAMS. This is not a contract with anyone in the People's Republic. It is a contract with an American firm, American Pacific. They, in turn—

Senator STEVENS. It's Western Pacific doing business in China. But they are made in China.

Secretary ADAMS. They are indeed. And they carry a label to that effect.

Senator STEVENS. I am told they do now after Senator Hollings objected.

[The information follows:]

THE BUY AMERICAN ACT

The "Buy American Act," 41 U.S.C. § 10a-10d, requires that American made articles be preferred in government contracts as follows:

§ 10a. *American materials required for public use*

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and *unless* the head of the Federal agency concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the *cost to be unreasonable*, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, shall be acquired for public use. *This section shall not apply with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, or if articles, materials, or supplies of the class or kind to be used or the articles, materials, or supplies from which they are manufactured are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality.* (Italic supplied.)

In order to determine whether the acquisition of domestic items would be "unreasonable" in cost, the Federal Procurement Regulations implementing the Act provide that a 6 percent surcharge, or a 12 percent surcharge in labor surplus areas, will be applied to merchandise of foreign origin for purposes of evaluation of bids subject to the Act.

Section 10c of the Act defines the Federal agencies whose procurements are covered by the Act as follows:

"(c) The term 'Federal agency' has the meaning given such term by section 472 of Title 40, which includes the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force."

Section 472 of Title 40 provides:

"(b) The term 'Federal agency' means any *executive agency* or any *establishment in the legislative or judicial branch* of the Government (except the Senate, the House of Representatives, and the Architect of the Capitol and any activities under his direction." (Italic supplied.)

In 1846, Congress chartered the Smithsonian for the sole purpose of carrying out the trust responsibilities of the United States under the will of James Smithson: "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." In providing for the administration of the trust by the Board of Regents with members from the three branches of government and from the private sector, it would appear that Congress did not intend to make the Smithsonian an agency or instrumentality in the executive, leg-

islative, or judicial branch. There is no evidence that the increasing support given the Smithsonian by the Congress for nearly 146 years has ever been intended to transform the Institution from a non-government trust instrumentality of the United States into a Government agency. Nevertheless, the requirements of the "Buy American Act" have always been included in all Smithsonian procurement contracts which obligate appropriated funds.

With regard to procurements utilizing non-appropriated trust funds, the Smithsonian has recently implemented a policy whereby the requirements of the Buy American Act will be followed in all trust fund procurements with the exception of the auxiliary (business) activities procurements. An internal review is underway to develop a merchandising policy that will improve the percentage of American products purchased for resale. Since merchandise bought for resale by the Smithsonian is reflective of museum collections that have international components, such as the collections of the National Museum of Natural History, National Museum of African Art, and Freer and Sackler Galleries of Art (primarily near and far eastern art), some proportion of this merchandise will of necessity always come from foreign sources.

PRODUCTION OF IMAX FILMS

Senator STEVENS. Second, I have asked some questions about the exclusive contract that the Smithsonian has with a Canadian theater owner. I really haven't gotten successful answers yet.

It also involves—my interest is also in the fact that we now have a majority of the products sold by the Smithsonian are foreign-made. The books are printed in Japan, the quilts are made in China, the films are made in Canada.

I know my friend sitting beside me here is a member. Is your Board familiar with that fact, that in administering the Smithsonian you are evading the laws of the United States by virtue of taking moneys that you've earned from the sale of items and thereby going out of the country?

Secretary ADAMS. You speak of these films, for example, as being made in Canada, Senator Stevens.

In fact, it is NASA that is involved in the making of many of these films. The IMAX Corp. I believe is a Canadian corporation. But the films have been made in good part in the United States, in fact, mainly in the United States.

Senator STEVENS. Is the money earned by those films considered to be trust funds too?

Secretary ADAMS. There is a contract which goes back many years between the Lockheed Corp., the Smithsonian, and the IMAX Corp., which provided the funds with which those films were made.

Those films could not have been made without the money being put forward. There are IMAX theaters in a number of museums and other cultural institutions around the country. Those films are distributed through the IMAX Corp.

There is a conversation that's going on almost as we speak between the IMAX Corp. and another corporation called IWERKS, which seeks to make prints from the original films for distribution in a different format. I believe those conversations are going to be successful.

I don't think that the enormous popular impact of the IMAX films would have been possible without the technology that was patented by a Canadian corporation. They held the rights to it.

It permits a format that is enormously impressive, as anyone who has visited the Air and Space Museum theater will know.

Senator STEVENS. I understand that, but I'm getting at the money side of it. We're supposed to be interested in the money that Federal agencies use. I understand you sold licenses to reprinters of many of the federally owned Smithsonian items. These are reproductions. When those licensees sell those items, you have a royalty or some kind of an agreement.

Secretary ADAMS. Yes.

Senator STEVENS. Once again, these fees go to a trust fund. They're not returned to the United States and not subject to the control of this committee, is that correct?

Secretary ADAMS. They're subject to control in the sense that our budget is fully provided for your scrutiny and contains all those items.

POSTAL RATES FOR SMITHSONIAN MAIL

Senator STEVENS. Let me go on. I am very limited in time and I have to go to another committee. I would like to know—the Smithsonian publications are sent through the mail and are subsidized, right, as an agency of the Federal Government. The Smithsonian benefits by revenue for appropriations. And I've now been asked by other newspapers, magazines, advertisers, if you're not a Federal entity, on what basis do you justify the use of subsidized rates in the postal service?

Mr. POWERS. May I say something about that? The Smithsonian as a nonprofit organization, not as a government entity, sends its magazines and other things under the regular nonprofit rates. Those rates are controlled in large part by the Congress and the subsidy that's voted each year for that type of mail.

Senator STEVENS. You use no mail that says you're a Federal agency?

Mr. POWERS. The indicia mail that we use for regular correspondence and so forth is paid for at first-class rates. The indicia mail is only free to Congress.

Senator STEVENS. We pay first-class rates, too, Congress does. But do you use the Federal indicia on your mail?

Mr. POWERS. We do and a great deal of it is provided by statute, Mr. Senator.

Senator STEVENS. I just want it on the record that you do.

Mr. POWERS. It's not subsidized.

Senator STEVENS. It all is subsidized slightly.

Mr. POWERS. We have a new system coming in that's going to change that.

SMITHSONIAN POLICIES ON ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY

Senator STEVENS. The Washington Post reported that you had been offered one of the Noriega ranches in Panama. Have you agreed to accept that yet?

Secretary ADAMS. I'm not aware that it's been offered. The Department of Defense is vacating a lot of premises that it holds in Panama and there have been informal conversations between our Tropical Research Institute located in Panama and the Department of Defense about the possibility of some of that land coming to the Tropical Research Institute.

None of that is beyond the level of informal conversations in Panama.

Senator STEVENS. In one of those program offices I asked you about, isn't one of them in Panama?

Secretary ADAMS. It's the Tropical Research Institute. It is located in Panama. But there has been no formal action taken.

And obviously, in view of the present budgetary exigencies we're going to be very careful about accepting that.

Senator STEVENS. That gets me into the subject—I hope you will be and I hope that Congress will direct you not to enter into the acquisition of any additional real property that will be supported by taxpayers' moneys, unless that acquisition is first approved by the Congress of the United States.

I'm informed that there are a series of additional properties that you are thinking about acquiring.

One is a 48,500 acre cattle ranch in Kenya. Again, this information is from the Louisville Courier. The Louisville Courier has reported that you have accepted control of this Kenya ranch, a portion of this Kenya ranch, which is to be still maintained by the owner.

Secretary ADAMS. Could I briefly respond, Senator?

Senator STEVENS. Let me make sure that what I'm putting in the record is correct. This is an international partnership to study wildlife on a working cattle ranch of somewhat less than 50,000 acres in Kenya, owned by an alumnus of the University of Princeton, who donated a portion of that land for use by this trust. And it will not be supported with Federal funds.

Is that correct?

Secretary ADAMS. Mr. Stevens, we and Princeton University, the National Museums of Kenya, and the Kenyan Wildlife Service have together formed a research consortium to carry on research on this ranch, which is maintained by a private trust. We have not acquired the land that belongs to this ranch. The ranch will continue. It happens to be a place in which you have not only a large working cattle operation, but you also have wildlife and the native habitat. And they coexist in a way that makes it a very interesting research site.

Senator STEVENS. Again, Mr. Adams, I am limited. I've got another committee to go to and the chairman's going to knock me down in a minute here. Will you support that project in Africa with Federal moneys?

Secretary ADAMS. I believe there is one position in the fiscal year 1993 request for a research director.

Senator STEVENS. That was not my question. Will you support that trust with Federal money?

Secretary ADAMS. I believe there is one—

Senator STEVENS. I'm not saying are you. Will you in the future use Federal moneys to support that trust without the approval of Congress?

Secretary ADAMS. No; we will not.

NATIONAL POSTAL MUSEUM

Senator STEVENS. Thank you. I happen to be embarrassed by this last one. I might well have some other questions perhaps for

the record, but because I am now one of the trustees of this new postal museum—as a matter of fact it was my suggestion to former Postmaster General Bill Bolger that we try to work out arrangements with the Smithsonian for the museum. I understand that it's been started now even before we have congressional authorization for its operation, is that correct?

Secretary ADAMS. There is no congressional authorization. But let me fill you in more completely on this. We have kept the Rules Committee, as well as this Appropriations subcommittee, regularly informed. We've discussed this with them. We've provided our internal memoranda dealing with all this.

It involves no additional appropriation for either capital expense or operations.

There was every opportunity for either the Rules Committee or one of the Appropriations Committees to say to us that they thought that there needed to be an authorization on this. But since it involved no additional cost from the appropriated side of our budget, authorization was not requested.

Senator STEVENS. Is that because you're using nonappropriated funds again, just trust funds, to support the postal museum?

Secretary ADAMS. No.

Senator STEVENS. Where are the moneys coming from?

Secretary ADAMS. We already have a section of the National Museum of American History that's devoted to—it's called the National Philatelic Collection—we're moving that staff and its facilities to the new facilities that have been constructed by the Postal Service, not by us.

And the additional expense incurred in establishing this new facility will entirely be provided by the Postal Service, not by the Smithsonian. There is no increase that we anticipate in the cost of establishing this new facility to the appropriated or to the trust side of the Smithsonian budget.

Senator STEVENS. I should think that would have been better done. As one of the trustees, I intend to do it with specific authorization of Congress so we're sure of it. I think the trouble is, I keep in mind the Cooper-Hewitt situation that I lived through in the 1970's, where you acquire a facility and suddenly it becomes an item supported by Federal funds, although they were not involved in the beginning and there were no guidelines involved. But suddenly it becomes an item on the budget.

I predict that the Postal Service is not going to forever put the burden on the rate payers of the Postal Service to run a function of the Smithsonian, if it really truly is a function of the Smithsonian. But I intend to pursue that, Mr. Chairman, in another committee.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF SMITHSONIAN PROGRAMS

But I do think one of the things we've got to do is we've got to get an understanding from the Smithsonian that you will not use trust funds, whether they're acquired by donation or by earnings of the Smithsonian to acquire Federal property or undertake new functions without the approval of Congress. That's where this budget's running away.

We do not have the authority over many of these things. We're suddenly in them, totally in them, in terms of expenditures.

I could put a whole list here. We've gone through it many times, Mr. Adams. But I believe our job is to try and see to it that this Smithsonian is going to be preserved into the future. I am one of the great believers in the Smithsonian as it used to be. But as a fact of the matter, the problem right now is that we have no control, Mr. Chairman, over the financing of the Smithsonian.

Whereas these new functions are started with these funds that any other agency would have to put directly into the Treasury of the United States, but the Smithsonian puts them in the trust fund, which originally was created for donations to be received, not for earnings of the Smithsonian.

As a consequence, we have, then, a whole series of items which, after they're added into and formalized, they then become a burden on the taxpayers. And I seriously question that.

My last question is, how many homes do we maintain for employees of the Smithsonian?

Secretary ADAMS. I believe the Secretary's residence is the only one. I'm not sure.

Senator STEVENS. Is that maintained with Federal funds?

Secretary ADAMS. No; with trust funds.

Senator STEVENS. Earnings from the Smithsonian or donated funds?

Secretary ADAMS. I suspect it's with earnings that come out of the Smithsonian's endowment.

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

Secretary ADAMS. Mr. Stevens, I share your concern about the proper oversight functions Congress should be exercising. I'd be pleased to work with you.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator REID. Senator Garn.

OBSERVATIONS FROM SENATOR GARN

Senator GARN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Rather than some questions, maybe I'll use my time for a few observations because I think it is fair to say there is no stronger supporter in this body than I.

Second, I should make it very clear that I may have somewhat of a conflict of interest considering I've served on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian for more than a decade.

So I have had an opportunity to see both sides of this debate. And what appears to be absolutely clear on the one hand, in some of my colleagues' minds is not quite that clear when you see the other side of it.

Just to use an example, the IMAX situation, there are no competitors for IMAX. And it certainly wasn't filmed in Canada. It was filmed by my colleagues, the astronauts, in space. And there was a Canadian astronaut at one time, but he was not on that particular flight, either "The Dream is Alive" or "The Blue Planet."

So, although I certainly would encourage the Smithsonian—and I think there have been some areas where much more effort could have been made to Buy American, IMAX is not a good example of

that situation because there was no other technology that could do that.

As one who has looked at the Earth from space, as good as IMAX is, it doesn't duplicate what it really looks like. That is impossible to do. But it does a lot better job than any other film format that has been used.

As one who used various types of photographic devices to take photos of the Earth, IMAX was the best one that can be found. So at least that example is not a very good one.

I would say, however, Mr. Secretary, something that I just said as recently as 3 or 4 weeks ago in the Audit and Review Committee, which I serve on, one of my biggest frustrations that I emphasized there and again today, to avoid congressional criticism I think that you have to move a great deal faster on the reports of the auditor.

That's the comment that I made, Mr. Chairman, that I get somewhat frustrated by sitting on that committee. In each meeting that I go back to, many of the reports—unchanged comments by Coopers & Lybrand—are the same ones for the year before and the year before that.

So from a practical matter, the Smithsonian can do itself a great service by not having that repetition of complaints. I have to, as a Regent and a Member of Congress, say, "why not?" That one was the same one that was on the report 3 years ago.

So as supportive as I am of the Smithsonian, there are certainly some areas where I think the administration could dramatically be improved. And then Members of Congress wouldn't have so many things to complain about. That's a point I make as both a Regent and a Member of Congress.

EDITORIALIZING IN SMITHSONIAN EXHIBITIONS

In regard to the chairman's comments, I must say maybe I have an old-fashioned concept of what museums should be, and I certainly wouldn't term it politically correct. I would put it in the frame of reference that I think the Smithsonian is tending to editorialize a great deal more than they used to. Whether I agree or disagree with the particular editorial isn't the point.

It's almost the way I feel about newspapers. What they say on their editorial page, I couldn't care less no matter how much I disagree. But I do resent the editorializing within the news stories, where as a reader I'd like to read the news story and make up my own mind. And on the editorial page if they want to say that was their interpretation—but I see it more and more in the news magazines. I read Time and Newsweek and I say, that isn't a news story. That is the feeling of that writer.

I really do think you ought to try and stay away from editorializing in those exhibits. I'm not talking about presenting the facts, both sides, all sides of the facts.

To give you a specific example, it has nothing to do with politically correct. I don't particularly like the World War I exhibit. I don't know whether the Smithsonian ought to be unromanticizing the Red Baron. Maybe he deserves to be. I don't know.

But in talking about whether they were really as romantic as they used to be, they really sneaked around early in the morning

and late at night, well, as a military pilot, if I can get my guy sneaking in instead of getting killed, I'm going to do it. That's the reality of war.

So I just make that comment trying to be helpful. Maybe the Smithsonian shouldn't try to editorialize quite as much and present facts on both sides. Maybe the Red Baron was sneaky and maybe he didn't deserve all his kills and so on.

Secretary ADAMS. Senator Garn, can I respond briefly? I think what we're dealing with here is a broad and long-term shift in the nature of scholarship, to be honest with you, in which people were much more content, people who became professionals and then curators in the museums, were much more content a generation or two ago to "present the facts" or put the pictures on the wall and not have any text accompanying them at all. The pictures or the exhibits told their own story.

I think there's much more of a sense these days that every bit that we think we know is contingent on where we're coming from. That argument has become a much more important part of scholarship. And when this is a climate of opinion, which is what I think it is, it's very hard to know how to move back in the direction you're describing. This is pervasive. The whole community on whom the Smithsonian draws for its curators and others who prepare these exhibitions—I'm not disagreeing with you, but I don't quite know how to—

Senator GARN. I understand what you're saying. I'm not sure that it is helpful to the museum to say that all these great historians and so on are there to present in mirror image their opinions. I live in an opinionmaking body every day of my life and I have for the last 25 years and that's expected. That's why I would say, looking at the "Homeless" exhibit, no matter how strongly and how proud you are that you did it, is it really helpful to the Smithsonian on an issue that, believe me, is debated up here every day? It isn't a hidden issue.

I was mayor of Salt Lake City 20 years ago and I dealt with the problem of the homeless at that time. Today it's grown. But it's such a complex issue that I don't know in that form you can properly present any viewpoint, because one of the things that isn't often discussed, having followed the issue of the homeless when it really got started as a mayor with direct responsibility for it, and being a member of the Senate Banking Committee, the Housing Committee for the last 18 years, one of the major problems is we deinstitutionalize people with mental disease.

And so in many cases you can build all the homes that everybody says are necessary. But you still wouldn't solve the homeless problem until you do something about mental health care in this country.

We used to keep a lot of people who are homeless, we institutionalized them. They made a decision for better or worse to put them out on the streets. At least 50 percent of our homeless problem in Salt Lake City is mental illness, not homeless problems. People that have money have children where you're taken care of. I don't want to get into all that debate. I'm just suggesting that it is a debate that goes on daily.

Senator REID. Would the Senator yield?

Senator GARN. Yes.

FEDERAL FUNDING OF PROGRAMS WITH EDITORIAL COMMENT

Senator REID. Senator Garn, I'm not taking sides in this, but this is a feeling that's developing in Congress as to whether or not the Federal Government or any government should be involved in paying for editorial comments.

That's what George Will is writing about. When he's talking about the National Endowment for the Arts, Public Television, whether or not the Federal Government should be involved, that's a debate that we have. Whether that's a problem, I think in my opinion, during this day and age, you're only creating problems for yourself by creating a homeless exhibition. No matter how scholarly it might be, there are some people here in Congress, on the House side and the Senate side, who feel that I guess as Friday said in "Dragnet", "just the facts."

Secretary ADAMS. Mr. Reid, I would encourage you to have a look at today's Washington Post, which has a very interesting reply from Sharon Rockefeller.

Senator REID. I read that.

Secretary ADAMS. I don't offer an opinion on that either.

Senator REID. But the point is, that's the point I'm making. I apologize for the interpretation. That's what the debate's all about. I guess you as director of the Smithsonian whether you want to create more fodder for that debate or not.

Secretary ADAMS. We offered no prescription. That was an attempt to have people see what homelessness was like if you were in the middle of it, rather than to offer any suggestion as to what might be done. I completely agree with you and the assessment of Senator Garn that one needs to take into account the problems of substance abuse and the release of the mentally ill.

And in the end, the problems of homelessness are not likely to be solved, as I said, in the government.

Senator GARN. Our point and my point is to be helpful. I've been in public office for 25 years and I see everything becoming more partisan, more political. There's not as much comity in the Senate—I said comity, not comedy. [Laughter.]

Senator REID. There is a lot less comedy.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF SMITHSONIAN DECISIONS

Senator GARN. That's true. My point is we are a political body and that is expected whether we like it or not. I just don't know whether it's useful for everybody to join the battle or helpful in a remarkable institution with so many forms to debate these issues.

And I understand your scholars, how strongly they feel. When I first came to the Smithsonian, I thought there was no hope for the Air and Space Museum. Most of the people down there, if something hadn't been buried for 3,000 years, they weren't interested in it. [Laughter.]

Senator GARN. I found out that there are some modern thinkers down there. But I'm trying to be helpful.

The other side of that coin, Mr. Chairman, what the Smithsonian puts up with, I can't remember the exact time, but back in the days

when Republicans were still in control and I was on the Rules Committee with Mac Mathias, the Board of Regents made a decision to extend the Air and Space Museum to Dulles so that we could improve Silver Hill. Nobody can be very proud to work out at Silver Hill, it is not an adequate facility with all of the undisplayed items, like the Enola Gay and many terrific aircraft. So I knew there might be political problems.

So I went to Mac Mathias and I said, Mr. Chairman, you're a Senator from Maryland. Is Maryland BWI interested in this? He checked with everybody in the Maryland government, came back and said no. I had passed a bill at least three times that I'm aware of to implement that. The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian over and over again, despite Congress reopening the whole debate, has reaffirmed their decision continually that Dulles was the most logical place to go.

It still has not even been started. And we'll hear some day all the criticism of why the extension of the Air and Space Museum costs so much more than originally talked about. It should have been finished by now. It should have been available to the public years ago.

So the other side of the coin is ridiculous mismanagement and interference by Congress. The latest one, after we had it resolved for a third time—I can't even remember how many times we've had it resolved—was Denver wanted it. Now if there is a more ludicrous proposal than to say let's split up the curators and all these people and have some of them in Washington and some of them in Denver working on these aircraft and telling the public when they come by, well, if you want to see the rest of the collection, go to Denver. Why not Las Vegas or Salt Lake? I mean, I put in a bid for Salt Lake. We've got plenty of room at Salt Lake International Airport.

So I want to make the point that while I have some criticisms I'm able to voice as a member of the Board of Regents, I think the other side of the coin needs to be looked at. Congress plays with the Smithsonian for their own political gains as well. And these games have a multimillion dollar cost.

Some sense will be imposed when we finally get around to authorizing the facility I feel badly that I won't be here to see it happen after 18½ years of trying to get an extension for the Air and Space Museum that hasn't happened because of that political interference. I guess what I'm suggesting is that there needs to be improvement on both sides of this issue. Having served on both sides, I can see the problems in each area.

So Congress is not clean either. Sometimes we sit there as the Regents and think, how can we outguess Congress? How do we get around this game player or that game player? I don't know how many more studies we can have, objective, outside financed studies on where the Air and Space Museum extension should go.

OVERCOMING SETBACKS

Secretary ADAMS. Senator Garn, if I could offer a comment on that, it seems to me that I think there's some hope that there will, in fact, ultimately be an extension of the Air and Space Museum. If you look at the length of time it took for the original Air and

Space Museum to work its way through the legislative process—I believe it was first introduced in 1950 and I do believe construction started in 1970 or 1971, somewhere along in there.

But the larger point I have to make is in the sense that the justification for the somewhat independent mode of governance of the Smithsonian that involves a Board of Regents that represents the three branches of government and also private citizens is that it can retain over a long term the very important objective of properly embodying, for all time, America's achievements in air and space, the fact that we led the world to a totally new set of horizons and can hold that as an objective for various administrations until it finally happens.

And that capacity to have a strategy and to work at it and to suffer setbacks but to remain committed to that strategy is something that I think the Smithsonian is all about. And I think in the end, it will lead to what we're both very much in favor of, but it may take a lot more time.

Senator GARN. I agree. And I guess my final comment would be that knowing the nature of Congress, you need to do the very best job you can on audits in correcting some of the problems so you don't give us so many handles to grab onto up here. So when you come up and you say, you're wrong, gentlemen. We've done this and this and this.

My final request would be, if I'm still alive, would you please invite me to cut the ribbon when we dedicate the extension of the Air and Space Museum, I think I at least deserve that for a decade and a half of effort.

Secretary ADAMS. We'll regard that as a commitment. [Laughter.]

Senator GARN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN GLOBAL CHANGE RESEARCH

Senator REID. Before you leave, Senator Garn, in my work on this committee, one of the problems I had, one of the things that the public, if they knew, would be more upset than they are, is we have all these individual agencies doing the same thing. For example, we have, I know about \$10 million that you want for climate change research. There is a subcommittee that I have been involved in—I'm sorry, hearing—that I have been involved in. They also don't want it.

BLM wants to do theirs, the Forest Service wants to do theirs, the Geological Survey wants to do theirs and on and on. And I think we need to get the Federal Government so that we have a program for looking at global climate change rather than 25 different groups doing just a little bit.

Secretary ADAMS. Can I comment on that, Mr. Reid?

Senator REID. Please.

Secretary ADAMS. I think that the structure that the executive branch has established called FCCSET, the Federal Coordinating Committee for Science, Engineering and Technology, if I have the right description, has been put in place precisely for that purpose.

One of its important committee activities is to bring together into a common budgetary framework the work that's going on in the U.S. Geological Survey, and in fact the work of the Smithsonian, the Forest Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. There is a

device in place that does this and I think it's doing this very effectively, particularly in the field of global change.

To take the specific issue of the work that we do under this program, it differs completely from what the Forest Service does. The Forest Service concerns are properly, primarily with coniferous forests, which provide of course the lumber, which is an important industry for the United States, and with the problem of forest regeneration in order to maintain and preserve it. Ours are with long-term ecosystems, particularly in the tropics, because that's where the Smithsonian's strength is.

So there really are important differences between these programs. And there is a mechanism in place, put in place by this administration that I think is functioning, particularly in the global change area.

Senator REID. But you see the problem that I have, I have no doubt that you have some specialties that the Forest Service doesn't have. But couldn't we have one staff doing everything rather than have duplications of staff and equipment?

Secretary ADAMS. Perhaps so. But the traditional strength of the Smithsonian rests in its collections. Its natural history collections are unparalleled. They make possible the kind of expertise in the Smithsonian and the study of ecosystems, which don't exist and couldn't exist, let's say, in the Forest Service.

We have, on the other hand, no real capacity, no expertise in the field of forest management. In a sense there are historic trajectories in these different agencies that really lead them in different directions. I don't know how you can put them all together in one super agency.

Senator REID. I hope you're right. I hope that these different programs that we have, there's some coordination.

Secretary ADAMS. I'm not saying that it's all it should be. Understand me, I'm not familiar with all the details, but I'm familiar with the general structure. And I think its intent, at least, was to meet precisely the concerns that you're speaking of.

MITCHELL CASE

Senator REID. This *Mitchell* case, it's my understanding that the Smithsonian advanced some \$300,000 from appropriated funds for a legal defense of this man.

Secretary ADAMS. In the end, it was slightly less than \$300,000.

Senator REID. Now it's found not to be justified, is that right?

Secretary ADAMS. It was found not to be justified to advance appropriated funds for this purpose. I don't think it has ever been a determination that it was improper to advance trust funds for this purpose.

Senator REID. As I recall, didn't he shoot some game that was endangered or something like that over in China?

Secretary ADAMS. This was an allegation at one time. I believe that's not seriously maintained any longer since the hunters, the sports hunters who, in fact, did shoot these specimens were able to have the specimens returned to them. If they were endangered species, I can't believe that this would have happened.

There was never any charge that Richard Mitchell was himself a hunter of the species in question, which are a subspecies of the

Argali sheep, another subspecies of which is unquestionably endangered.

Senator REID. This matter we've been through with Dr. Mitchell. Have we learned anything for the future regarding the indemnification policy and future management of detailees?

Secretary ADAMS. I think we've learned a great deal. First of all, we've tightened up on the implementation of our indemnification resolution. This will now come directly to the Secretary. And the Secretary will not take any such steps without consulting with the Executive Committee of the Board of Regents. This was never done in the present case. And I think that means that we will consider more carefully a point that our inspector general made at a late stage of the proceedings, namely, that it's a matter of judgment as to when and as to what extent we apply that indemnification resolution rather than as a matter of obligation.

I must admit my initial sense was that we were obliged to do this. And I now can see that that sense of obligation carried us to the point where we committed trust resources of the Institution to an extent that is really not justifiable in view of the enormous financial pressures that the Institution suffers from. I don't think the principle was incorrectly applied in this case. But I think we allowed it to get entirely out of hand. And I have to take personal responsibility for not having stepped in sooner.

Senator REID. Robert Hoffmann, the Assistant Secretary for the Sciences, is under investigation by a Federal agency. Is this true? The question is if so, how does the Smithsonian intend to treat his legal fees or legal expenses?

Secretary ADAMS. We have been treating his legal fees, which so far have not been large, under the same indemnification resolution. That investigation, I would point out, has been continued for 4 years without an indictment, either of Dr. Mitchell or of Dr. Hoffmann.

Senator REID. What's the background of this? What's the allegation?

Secretary ADAMS. In the absence of an indictment, we are unable to tell you what the allegations are.

Senator REID. What is it?

Secretary ADAMS. It is presumably connected with that hunting, the same incident. But obviously it's not proper—

Senator REID. How much money has been advanced, either from trust funds or otherwise?

Mr. POWERS. About \$17,000. He's signed an undertaking to pay it if he's not entitled to it at the end.

Senator REID. He has obviously had either a cheaper lawyer or obviously not as much trouble.

Senator GARN. There aren't any cheap lawyers. [Laughter.]

Senator REID. This one must be—this is \$600,000 or something compared to \$17,000?

Secretary ADAMS. This is, I think, a margin of a larger case rather than a central issue in its own right. Obviously the Department of Justice doesn't share its strategy with us and I don't expect it to do so.

SMITHSONIAN POLICIES ON COLLECTION OF SPECIMENS

Mr. POWERS. Could I say something about that, Mr. Chairman? The documents which were requested from us indicate that there's a question in someone's mind about the importation of certain collections—not endangered collections—from China a year before the other incident. The letters show that Dr. Hoffmann thought he had all the permits that were necessary from the regional authorities and was given this piece of paper in Chinese. When he got back, he discovered with the specimens having been brought in that the Chinese, when translated said, yes, you have your local permit but you must also get a national permit from Beijing before exporting the specimens.

Then he asked them to correct that, the Chinese authorities, and they said, no, we can't. That's where it's left.

It's our view that there is perhaps a technical violation of the Lacey Act but one which is thoroughly excusable under the act and that's all we know about it.

Secretary ADAMS. May I continue because you asked me earlier as to what steps we are taking to correct the problem that we have here. We have also tightened up on our collecting policies to make clear that we will need to be much more sensitive than we have traditionally been, and I might say that the museums have traditionally been, in having any association, direct or indirect, with sports hunters in the acquisitions of collections. I must say that we still are not in a position to follow these animals around until they drop dead. But we clearly need to behave in a more circumspect way than we have in that respect. That's accounted for in the collecting policies that we have.

The additional area where we've tightened up is to try to bring into better order the fairly large number of individuals who are research associates of the Smithsonian and who constitute a very important extension or arm of our activities going far beyond what our own staff would be able to do, many of them on a voluntary association basis, others, as is the case of Dr. Mitchell, on a detail agreement of some kind with the agency or university from which they come.

All that, I think, has been brought into better order. And the application of the indemnification resolution to the volunteers among them has now been expressly excluded. So we have taken a number of steps that I think are responsive to that problem.

Senator REID. We have a number of questions we're going to submit to you in writing as we normally do.

FISCAL YEAR 1993 BUDGET REQUEST

Senator REID. We've gone into some detail on the *Mitchell* case. One of the things I wanted to touch on is in your written statement, you indicate that your budget request for next year is the largest in the Smithsonian's history. Your total request is 10 percent above last year for salaries and expenses. I'm sorry, your total request for 1993 is 10 percent over the fiscal year 1992 enacted level. And your salaries and expenses are 11 percent above current level.

I would note, however, that your original request to OMB talked about a 23-percent increase for salaries and expenses and a 315-percent increase for new construction above the current level. While the conference on fiscal year 1993 budget resolution has not yet completed its work, we know that with regard to the budget agreement, if we were to simply hold all agencies to their 1992 spending levels, we would still exceed our cap by \$1½ billion. If we were simply to allow for inflation in 1993, we would exceed the domestic discretionary cap by \$6½ billion.

I should add the full Appropriations Committee will be meeting later this week to mark up the President's proposed revisions for 1992. Given the budgetary situation facing us, how would you have us treat your 1993 request for the Smithsonian?

Secretary ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I'm aware as you are of the grave difficulties that confront the Congress in this budgetary year. We make the best case we can for the increase that has been approved in the President's budget. We recognize that your problems are such that any increase above the very modest cap that you've got will require cuts in someone else's budget and that you may not be able to do it.

Senator REID. We tried, for example, during a mark-up of the budget resolution, to take some of the money from Defense and put it into these programs, but failed on a number of different occasions. Those of us that voted for that now must go along with the budget resolution, which is going to, for example, probably for you, limit your 1993 fiscal year 1992 minus 2 percent. If that's the case, what are we going to cut?

Secretary ADAMS. Even if we were to have a flat budget, a budget that was exactly the same—

Senator REID. We're talking about minus 2 percent.

Secretary ADAMS. I understand. But I can't make the calculation instantly—I had made it in my own head for a flat budget. Given the uncontrollables that are in our budget—rent increases and mandatory salary increases and Federal retirement and so on—we would be down approximately \$18 million in available funds. If it's an additional 2 percent, obviously it would still be more serious.

There is no way that we can make cuts of that magnitude purely on the basis of a hiring freeze or attrition or something or other of that kind. We would need to take a hard look at parts of the operation that were of lesser priority and that we'd have to cut off. That is indeed something going on all over the Federal Government. And I offer no special justification for the Smithsonian being treated differently. We will have to respond in the same way that every other recipient of Federal funds responds. It will not be easy.

Senator REID. Especially in light of how we've treated the Smithsonian over the past 10 years. Appropriations for the total Smithsonian program increased \$186½ million or 128 percent. So it's something that we need to be aware of.

During last year's budget hearing, I asked the Smithsonian to assess in time for this year the state of its core responsibilities in collections' management, research and public education, and the adequacy of resources to support these functions. This is something we're attempting to do off the legislative program. With our huge

backlog we've done a great deal toward allowing additional manpower resources in that sense to work to get out of that bind.

In a document dated April 24 of this year, the Smithsonian has provided what it describes as a first cut at undertaking the assessment I requested. The report concludes that despite the Smithsonian's efforts, the current and projected budgets inadequately fund the underlying supporting structures and services required to maintain its collections, research and public programs. And based on a funding crosscut we asked you to provide, it appears that barely 21 percent of the Smithsonian's requested increase for salaries and expenses are targeted for these core responsibilities. That means more than three-quarters is not. Would you provide a more detailed funding plan to address these critical needs?

Secretary ADAMS. Yes, we will indeed.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—Above mentioned material to be submitted at future date and retained in subcommittee files.]

SMITHSONIAN FISCAL YEAR 1993 BUDGET PRIORITIES

Mr. FERN. I'd like to go back to something the Secretary said earlier, which is that this also has to do with the swap in the OMB priorities. So we did ask for more infrastructure support, which we'll give you, but those amounts were not allowed to be requested.

Senator REID. You've said in your prepared testimony that your request embodies virtually no new initiatives. But your request does include \$200,000 for planning and designing of the new National African-American Museum, \$500,000 for planning and design for a new collections research center, and \$1 million for a planning and design of an extension to the Air and Space Museum, and on and on with other things, including you spending \$20,000 of the trust funds to purchase a new field station in Panama. Tell the subcommittee whether each of the projects that I've just identified is authorized, and what the anticipated mortgage is going to be, along the lines that Senator Stevens spoke earlier.

Secretary ADAMS. Let me say with regard to both the Air and Space Museum that we were talking about and also the African-American Museum, those authorizations are before the Congress but they have not been acted on. And unless they are acted on, the question is whether the expenditure is an appropriate one.

Senator REID. Congress has appropriated \$37.3 million since 1981 for the purchase and installation of collection storage equipment at the Museum Support Center. Storage equipment now occupies 40 percent of the space in the Museum's Support Center. And of the 8,435 new storage cabinets installed, only 16 percent have been filled. Given the amount of unused space and storage capacity that also exists at the Museum Support Center, why are you requesting one-half million more for a whole new collections research facility adjacent to the existing center?

Ms. SUTTENFIELD. I can give a partial answer and perhaps Tom Freudenheim can elaborate further. But the difficulty has been that while we have proceeded to procure the storage equipment, we have not been successful in getting the additional staff that will do the preparatory work to move the collections. In many cases, the collections are contaminated with asbestos and require special care.

We have made a request to place better balance between the staffing to carry out the move and to fill those storage devices.

Senator REID. The Smithsonian's requesting, as we mentioned earlier, \$10.6 million for global warming and climate change research, this is an increase of 68 percent over last year. For the record, this request is 1,666 percent above the amount appropriated to the Smithsonian for global climate change research in 1990. The President's total budget request for 1993 includes \$1.3 billion for global change research, a 24-percent increase. The Smithsonian budget request for global change research includes the largest single increase of any Federal agency. How do you justify this?

Secretary ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, this outcome is one that went through what I described as the FCCSET process. In other words, in the weighing of programs of all of the Federal agencies and all of the other recipients of Federal funds, it was deemed that the Smithsonian had a contribution to make that was not being adequately funded. And those funds came out of that process. That can be questioned perhaps, but we do have a body of expertise in the long-term monitoring of climate, and in particular, with regard to the tropics. This seemed to represent an important part of the problem, where research wasn't going on and none was scheduled. That's all I can say.

LAND ACQUISITION AT THE SMITHSONIAN ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER

Senator REID. The Smithsonian, once again, is including an increase of one-half million dollars for the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center for the purchase of watershed land at the SERC site in the Chesapeake Bay region. Why do you insist on using appropriated funds for Smithsonian land acquisition, which is properly the responsibility of Federal land acquisition agencies?

Secretary ADAMS. I'm afraid I don't have that.

Mr. FERN. I think we'll have to look into that.

Senator REID. We go through this every year.

Secretary ADAMS. Let me say that this requires an authorization and that authorization has not been obtained. Presumably that question would be asked in the authorizing process.

Senator REID. I'd also like to know how much of this Chesapeake Bay purchase, which is one-half million dollars, just a small amount of the purchase, which is intended to be around \$12 million—

Secretary ADAMS. Over a period of many years, yes.

Senator REID. How much of the total acquisition cost is the Smithsonian proposing to fund with Federal appropriations?

Secretary ADAMS. Would you like that for the entire history of that acquisition?

Senator REID. Yes.

[The information follows:]

SERC LAND ACQUISITION

SERC has never used federal funds for land acquisition. The Smithsonian is now requesting federal cost sharing for future land acquisition and protection, but this request is contingent upon obtaining appropriate authorizing legislation, which has

been subject to hearings in both the House and the Senate. Federal cost sharing will allow the Institution to protect an important site for environmental research which contributes to not only the Smithsonian's mission, but also that of the larger U.S. and international efforts in global change. The specialized, basic research purpose for which these lands are required makes it more efficient for the Smithsonian to continue in its historic role of land acquisition and management. These lands are used for intensive, long-term ecological research on air/land/water interactions in the Chesapeake Bay region. The detailed, specialized, basic research conducted at the site by Smithsonian staff is much different than the mandate given to such agencies as the Fish and Wildlife Service or Bureau of Land Management and thus makes it more efficient for the Smithsonian to manage the land locally. The management of these lands by Smithsonian will build upon the close relations that have been established with local landowners and leasers over the years. This relationship is important in order to attain the land use patterns necessary for the research program.

Between 1963 and the present, the Smithsonian has purchased in fee or protected with covenants 2,584 acres with a net overall cost of \$1,920,200. All of the purchases were made using non-Federal dollars. No federal funds were used. We anticipate future costs for acquiring additional acreage to be between \$8 to \$12 million (in fiscal year 1992 dollars) spread over a ten-year period. The fiscal year 1992 request of \$500,000 will allow for the costs to be shared equally between federal and non-Federal funds, assuming enactment of an appropriate authorization. Therefore, the overall costs for past and future acquisitions and protective easements are anticipated to be approximately four to six million federal dollars and six to eight million non-Federal dollars.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEFICIENCIES

Senator REID. The Smithsonian requested \$32.9 million, as was indicated, for infrastructure development. What are we missing by not having these infrastructure items?

Ms. SUTTENFIELD. Infrastructure categories embrace a wide variety of operating support systems, including such things as research equipment.

As we all know, research equipment over time has to be replaced. It encompasses supplies and in some cases staff to take care of the collections to preserve them properly. It encompasses information systems, both hardware and software. It includes the necessary staff to maintain our buildings. So to the extent that we don't have resources to maintain optimal programs, a certain amount of work is not taking place or is not taking place as effectively as might otherwise be the case.

Mr. FERN. And there are repair items, replacement of heating, air-conditioning, roof repairs, there is an asbestos removal issue that seems to come along every time we open space in one of the older buildings. And that is a considerable issue and that is an infrastructure issue because this is part of maintaining and upgrading a structure.

And then the reconfiguration of exhibition spaces as you change—not new exhibitions—but just change the existing exhibitions in the various museums.

FISCAL YEAR 1993 BUDGET REQUEST FOR EDUCATION

Senator REID. Senator Domenici, we will be with you in just a second here. The Smithsonian requested \$3 million from OMB for education programs in 1993. The Smithsonian request to Congress for education programs is \$300,000. Tell us what education programs did OMB eliminate? How about supplying that to us?

Secretary ADAMS. We'll supply that to you.

[The information follows:]

SMITHSONIAN EDUCATION PROGRAMS NOT INCLUDED IN OMB PASSBACK

Funding totaling 40 work-years and \$3.0 million for education programs was requested as part of the fiscal year 1993 request to OMB. An amount of \$300,000 was allowed and is included in the fiscal year 1993 budget to Congress. The following list provides information on these programs not allowed in the OMB passback:

Program	FTE	Amount
National Science Resources Center: National Science Education Clearinghouse—To distribute up-to-date information about effective science curriculum resources to teachers and science educators throughout the country	3	265
Anacostia Museum; Education Specialists—To expand visitor population of school and community groups. The request to OMB sought 2 work-years and \$100,000 for this program. The request to Congress represents a reduction of 1 work-year and \$50,000 from the level requested from OMB	1	50
SI Environmental Education Training Programs: A joint effort to support training of nationals in developing countries in the conservation of biological diversity. Increases related to this Smithsonian-wide initiative were requested by the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (1 work-year and \$50,000), the National Zoological Park (3 work-years and \$200,000), the National Museum of Natural History (2 work-years and \$125,000), the Office of Environmental Awareness (2 work-years and \$150,000), and the SmithsonianMan and the Biosphere Program (2 work-years and \$125,000)	10	650
Cooper-Hewitt Museum: Conversion of CHM trust employees—To stabilize education/exhibition programs through conversion of positions; to provide free education programs to children and the public	3	115
Assistant Secretary for Education and Public Service: Special Assistant—To manage the Smithsonian-wide educational outreach program which supports Institutional objectives in education, cultural diversity and public service	1	70
Office of Fellowships and Grants: Fellowship/Internship Coordinator—To hire a Fellowship/Internship Coordinator and to develop a guide on research opportunities at the Smithsonian. The request to OMB sought 1 work-year and \$66,000 for this program. The request to Congress represents a reduction of 1 work-year and \$58,000 from the level requested from OMB	1	58
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory: Science Education—To develop and conduct workshops training teachers to train other teachers in using modern educational materials to teach science in the Nation's schools. The request to OMB sought 1 work-year and \$86,000 for this program. This request had been supported by the interagency Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering, and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Education and Human Resources (CEHR) as part of its recommendations for the fiscal year 1993 Federal budget. The request to Congress represents a reduction of \$14,000 from the level requested from OMB	14	
Office of Folklife Programs: Summer Folklife Institute and Education Program—To develop educational and curricula materials in concert with OFP curators, researchers, and outside educators. The request to OMB sought 1 work-year and \$65,000 for this program. The request to Congress represents a reduction of \$15,000 from the level requested from OMB	15	
National Portrait Gallery: Senior Citizens Outreach Program—To maintain and expand the Gallery's adult outreach programs, especially for senior citizens	1	26
Freer Gallery of Art: Education Activity and Related Literature—To establish an education program on Asian arts and cultures	1	80
Assistant Secretary for Museums: Establish Museum Career Information Center—To establish a Museum Career Information Center that will provide information concerning disciplines throughout the museum world	1	100
SI Office of Wider Audience Development: Administrative Support—To provide staff support for Federally-mandated observances of ethnic and women's heritage; to provide staff education on issues of cultural pluralism; and to promote wider audience development	1	41
National Museum of Natural History: Intern Program—To coordinate intern program for undergraduate students in the fields of natural history, comparative biology, and systematics	1	126
National Museum of African Art: Publications—To develop collection-based educational publications that will be made available free of charge	50	
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute: Academic and Education Programs—To expand educational mission to include programs for primary and secondary school students and to establish a training program for professionals in tropical biology and conservation	3	182
National Air and Space Museum: Science Demonstrations, Teacher, Curriculum Material—To increase educational outreach efforts at the local community level through live science demonstrations and availability of school curriculum packages on aviation and space. This request had been supported by the interagency Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering, and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Education and Human Resources (CEHR) as part of its recommendations for the fiscal year 1993 Federal budget	1	162

Program	FTE	Amount
National Museum of American Art: Education Programs—To target education programs for multiple audience levels and national constituencies through new technologies and wide dissemination of films, videos, teacher workbooks, and course materials on American art	2	200
National Museum of American History: Education Programs—To address heightened public demand for more live interpretations of NMAH exhibits and educational materials relating to exhibit themes	3	150
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden: Educational Material—To increase accessibility of the collections to new audiences, including teachers, junior high and high school students, and minorities		130
National Museum of African Art: Education Specialist—To develop and disseminate elementary and secondary school curriculum materials devoted to African art, history and cultures	1	42
Cooper-Hewitt Museum: Education Department Critical Base Operations—To support base operation of the museum's educational department		100
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory: Public Information Display—To support the development of interactive software; to purchase computer, monitor and display station cartrel; and to publish astronomical photos study guides in both Spanish and English to serve the diverse audiences of southern Arizona at the Fred L. Whipple Observatory		20
Office of Museum Programs: Smithsonian Staff Training—To provide training that would strengthen technical and professional skills of SI staff in areas such as exhibition planning, educational program management, and collections management. The request to OMB sought 1 work-year and \$50,000 for this program. In the request to Congress, this program was combined with the related request for the Intern Development Program, resulting in a net reduction of 1 work-year and \$45,000 from the level requested from OMB for the two programs combined	1	45
Visitor Information and Associates Reception Center: Printing and Reproduction—To develop and print informational materials about the Smithsonian		15
Total	35	2,706

TRIBUTE TO UNDER SECRETARY TURNER

Senator REID. Senator Domenici.

Senator DOMENICI. First I apologize for being late. I understand that this has been a rather fun hearing for you thus far.

Secretary ADAMS. I think that oversight hearings are a very important part of what Congress is here to do. We are here to respond as best we can. I'm delighted to share in that process, even though at times it's difficult.

Senator DOMENICI. I really expected you to say something very funny. [Laughter.]

Senator REID. That's the first time he's laughed all morning. [Laughter.]

Senator DOMENICI. First, I wanted to note for the record, Mr. Chairman, my great sadness at the passing of Carmen Turner.

Senator REID. We mentioned that and talked about it. We recognized that she was a very fine person.

Senator DOMENICI. I'll tell you, Mr. Chairman, I met this lady that I didn't know much about when I was first elected to the U.S. Senate, maybe a year into it. I sat by this marvelous lady on a plane out in Albuquerque and I was a brand new senator. I was a gabber then because I was a brand new senator.

Senator REID. We notice you're real quiet now.

Senator DOMENICI. At any rate, we talked about everything under the Sun. About 10 years later I met her in my office, and she recalled that meeting, and she's been a friend ever since. I know the Smithsonian will miss her greatly and, frankly, I know we need more fine people like her.

AMERICAN ENCOUNTERS EXHIBITION

Having said that, on a positive note, before I talk about this policy problem, I want to commend you and the Smithsonian for the "American Encounters" exhibit, which is going to take place as part of the 500th anniversary of the landing of Christopher Columbus in the New World. It's going to focus on the Rio Grande Valley as it goes through New Mexico and the several cultures coexisting there.

I think our State legislature has shown some real courage in appropriating almost as much as the Federal Government is going to spend on this important exhibit. New Mexico doesn't have very much money—and it has appropriated \$1 million to match the \$1.2 million from the Smithsonian for this "American Encounters" exhibit. New Mexico is also going to put up another \$200,000 for the annual folklife festival this year. I think it's going to be exciting. Thus far, from what I've seen, I have no current inclination to be critical of the way these exhibits are being put together and the messages they will convey.

Senator REID. When will that be available to the public and where will it be available?

Secretary ADAMS. It will open in June. It will be part of the Folklife Festival on the Mall and it will open in the Museum of American History at about the same time. It's a long-term exhibit.

Senator DOMENICI. I look forward to joining you there.

FEDERAL BUDGETARY SITUATION

Let me just speak in a general sense about your budget and what's going on in America. Frankly, it is rather startling that we are running a budget deficit of almost \$1 billion a day. It used to be if we talked about a few million dollars, we got frightened, but \$1 billion a day? I think there are a lot of people thinking that the deficit is just going to disappear, but it isn't.

If we leave things alone, the deficit is going to come down to about \$188 billion, but it's going right back through the roof, and it will be \$400 billion or more in 10 years. Literally, within our lifetimes, assuming normal longevity, the deficit of the United States could hit one-half trillion dollars annually.

We've got to fix that major problem because if the Smithsonian exists to let our people know about the past and to help them with the future, I assure you there will be very little future if we have those kind of deficits for another decade. We will have economic stagnation, I can promise you. We will have permanent recessions. That will be America's legacy. That's when America will be bankrupt, when it has permanent recessions.

So I'm worried because we've gotten into a malaise that a few hundred million dollars doesn't count. And some are even beginning to say, well, that's all going to get fixed one of these days, and \$1 billion doesn't count. In fact, I will confess, Mr. Chairman, that I find myself now and then saying, oh, hell, why should we worry about \$50 million when the deficit is \$385 billion?

But I think we have reached the point where hardly anything is going to be immune from some kind of significant restraint. And, frankly, we have spoken about restraint, but we haven't seen anything like the States have experienced. There are States in the Union cutting everything 10 percent.

The only reason we aren't is because we don't have any cap on our debt. We are a giant milk cow and spend wherever we want; we just think it will go on forever. Everybody looks at the national government, and we have no limit on our debt. So our debt is only so good as our credit is and that's the limit. And it's pretty good so we can borrow plenty.

So I think it might very well be the rule that a lot of line-item programs don't grow very much. And I don't hear you—and when I spoke to you in preparation for this hearing, I didn't hear you—leading a revolution against such a thing. You just want to know as fast and as quickly as you can what your budget will be, is that correct?

Secretary ADAMS. That's correct.

Senator DOMENICI. The most important thing is that we don't stall it off until the end of the year and then you have to adjust everything in 1 month. I personally don't see how your funding can grow in real terms. It might even come out negative in real terms. That would be rather dramatic.

Senator REID. We talked about that.

Senator DOMENICI. You have, and I assume that you've spoken in the record about the kinds of disruptions that it's going to cause. But you will do it, but the sooner you know, the better you can do it.

Secretary ADAMS. That certainly is the case.

Senator DOMENICI. I wonder if you've said anything about new programs versus making sure we don't let what we're doing well fall apart.

Secretary ADAMS. We have discussed that and made the point that in the process by which budgets are developed, there was a reversal of the emphasis we gave to our infrastructure compared to new programs when it went through the Office of Management and Budget. But the problem is always—and it's as true for the Congress as it is for the Smithsonian or the Office of Management and Budget—new programs are more exciting and seem to offer the possibilities of greater public interest or something and maintaining what you've got is very, very difficult to develop that level of enthusiasm. So we're acutely aware of this and we've agreed to provide information for the record.

INCREASE IN SMITHSONIAN VISITATION

Mr. FERN. Could I add a word about the issue of staying flat or decreasing? Please note that we do have an increase in visitation, talking about the Institution as a whole, open to over 25 million people a year. This is more than 1 million over 2 years ago, and it continues to increase.

Secretary ADAMS. It's the highest in 4 years. I think it's a very good sign that the country may be coming out of a recession when you begin to get visitation at 20 percent above where it was last year.

Mr. FERN. We're not just talking about either infrastructure things or new things. We're talking about doing what we've always done with a larger number of visitors, Americans and visitors from abroad as well.

SMITHSONIAN BUDGETARY SITUATION

Secretary ADAMS. The problem that we face is that in a sense, with two sides to our budget, the trust side and the Federal side, the concern has long been in the Institution to try to compensate on the trust side for what may be coming on the Federal side. When we're in a recession, of course, that's very difficult to do. So we're looking for some positive turn to the economy. It's something that we count on.

That also leads us into various forms of commercialization which then lead to some of the criticisms we've already discussed on this point.

Senator DOMENICI. I don't want my question about new initiatives versus maintenance to imply that I'm against new things, or that I think you need to do new things because people aren't interested in what you've already got. Neither of the above do I believe. I just think we have to have some balance. I also think the Smithsonian Institution is one of the finest institutions of which we can be a part. I wouldn't put it high on the list of what we ought to cut, but I don't get a chance to look at all the programs and say which ones we do prefer. We get a little allocation in this subcommittee and then we divvy it up among the programs that are

here, not the programs that are all over the Government. So we'll do our best.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator REID. Even with the increase we had last year, we're still not up to the levels of 1988, right?

Secretary ADAMS. The levels on the trust side of the budget, you mean?

Senator REID. I'm talking about the visitors.

Secretary ADAMS. The records that are available to me at the moment go back to 1989. I don't know what it was in 1988.

Senator REID. In 1988 it was almost 32 million.

Secretary ADAMS. We're not up to that.

Mr. FERN. But we're coming back.

Senator DOMENICI. Does it fall that much during a recession?

Secretary ADAMS. It certainly did. It's obviously also related to major new ventures, major new exhibitions that we had that really pulled people in. It did fall that much, yes.

Senator DOMENICI. Thank you.

DECLINE IN TRUST FUND INCOME

Senator REID. The one thing that we haven't talked about is the fall-off of trust fund moneys. We've talked about the fall-off of what may be appropriated moneys. Tell us about the fall-off of trust fund moneys.

Secretary ADAMS. Perhaps we ought to develop this also in a written answer because—

Senator REID. Is it significant, though?

Secretary ADAMS. Yes; very significant.

Senator REID. Ten percent?

Secretary ADAMS. Twenty-five percent.

Senator REID. Amazing.

Secretary ADAMS. That's where we really have taken a big bite that has been taken out of us in that respect.

Senator REID. We also need with the numbers what your strategy is to make up for this, if we can.

[The information follows:]

SMITHSONIAN TRUST FUND RESOURCES

Starting in fiscal year 1991, the weak economy along with decreased visitor attendance led to decreased revenues from the Smithsonian's investments, membership programs, museum shops, food service concessions, and mail order operations. For fiscal year 1992, the initial general unrestricted Trust deficit was estimated at \$11.8 million. Because this level of deficit was unacceptable, the Institution formulated a plan that involved identifying additional revenues and implementing budgetary reductions to both administrative and programmatic Trust fund budgets, including the special program awards. The Institution also implemented a hiring freeze on all Trust funded positions. These steps left a projected deficit of approximately \$3.7 million or only 30 percent of the initial estimate, which will be absorbed into the Institution's accumulated general unrestricted fund balance. However, since the Smithsonian's reserves are limited, the Institution intends to formulate a balanced general unrestricted Trust budget for fiscal year 1993 through a series of permanent base reductions.

Examples of the impact the fiscal year 1992 cuts have had on the public and the Institution's staff, programs, and administration are outlined below.

Scholarly Studies Program.—Funding for the Scholarly Studies Program has been cut by one third from its fiscal year 1989 budgeted level. This has resulted in funding far fewer proposals than recommended by the program's review committee. This

clearly results in a significant drop in the quantity of research produced by scholars, many of whom rely on this program as their major potential source of funding.

Fellowship Programs.—The centralized and bureau fellowship programs will be able to fund only two out of every three fellows selected. In fiscal year 1992, 75 fellows will come to the Institution instead of 110. Fellows infuse new ideas and concepts into ongoing research and are very important as a link in fostering national and international ties with other scholarly institutions. In addition, the Office of Museum Programs had to eliminate Smithsonian contributions to medical insurance for interns. While this does not impact OMP's ability to recruit interns overall, it eliminates insurance as an option for interns with limited financial resources.

Special Exhibition Fund Program.—Reductions to this program will reduce the quantity and quality of Smithsonian exhibitions sponsored for fiscal year 1992. Many of the planned exhibitions were geared toward attracting wider audiences. Reduced funding will curtail some of the Smithsonian's cultural diversity efforts.

Educational Outreach Program.—Trust budget cuts have reduced funding for this program by approximately 26 percent. This has severely limited the Institution's efforts to bring its educational endeavors to ever widening and diverse audiences outside the confines of the Mall.

Visitor Information and Associates' Reception Center (VIARC).—Staff, public and associate services have been impacted by the reductions. This has resulted in a cut-back of public telephone information services; reduction of available funding for volunteer appreciation events; elimination of participation in tour and travel industry organizations and marketplaces; elimination of key public information materials; and lower quality publications. The impact to staffing resulted in vacant positions remaining unfilled and reduced staff on duty on holidays and Sundays.

Hirshhorn Museum.—All but one of the five concerts planned as part of the 20th Century Consort Program for fiscal year 1992 have been eliminated due to a reduction in funding. This program attracts a repeat local audience that may now be lost.

National Museum of American History.—Performances sponsored by the Chamber Music Program will not include Smithsonian Chamber Orchestra concerts this year. The Chamber Orchestra usually gives three to four concerts a year.

Public Affairs.—The Institution's monthly Washington Post calendar advertisement has been reduced to one-half page. This has severely limited advertising for free Smithsonian events, reducing the number of events listed from 50 or 60 to 13. The Institution has had to discontinue its practice of providing reprints of the calendar to community groups. Only limited quantities of English and foreign language "Welcome" brochures will be reprinted.

Elementary and Secondary Education.—The Office had to cancel Smithsonian Opportunities for Learning, an outreach effort directed toward local teenagers, especially minority teenagers. Six students will not be able to participate in the Smithsonian's national high school internship program. The Regional Workshop Program has had to reduce the number of communities it can serve.

Administration.—There have been various reductions to administrative offices, including reduced funding for nonpersonnel operating expenses and the elimination of selected vacant positions.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator REID. We appreciate your testimony today, Mr. Secretary. We'll have additional questions we will submit to you in writing. Senator Stevens said he had some additional questions. I ask that you reply to our questions within the next 2 weeks. And I ask that you not only submit the answers to the committee, but also to individual members who showed up here.

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

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Reorganization

Question 1: One of the more enduring aspects of the legacy that Carmen Turner leaves behind at the Smithsonian is her reorganization plan which she continued to work on until her death. What is the status of the implementation of the reorganization plan and what operational benefits are you likely to experience?

Answer: The report on the organizational review has three principal components: roles of senior management officials, organizational structure, and delivery of administrative services. Consistent with the management philosophy articulated in the report and the need to hold Assistant Secretaries accountable for the efficient and effective management of their program bureaus and support offices, each has prepared new position descriptions and performance criteria to be used to monitor the success of their operations. These documents are being reviewed by the Acting Under Secretary with the goal of having them in effect in June. Changes to Assistant Secretary titles and reporting assignments to them were effective on March 25. Purposes of these changes are to define the Institution more clearly, to bring together and eliminate artificial barriers between entities, and to eliminate dual reporting relationships to certain Assistant Secretaries which have complicated management and reporting responsibilities.

The report recommends that the Offices of Conference Services and Special Events be combined and the Resident and National Associate Programs be merged. Over the course of the summer, information will be assembled and issues identified with the expectation that actions can be taken in the fall. With regard to recommendations on the delivery of administrative and financial services, negotiations are under way with the Private Sector Council to conduct a review with an estimated completion date in October. Simultaneously, delegations of authority for the performance of certain functions by bureaus and offices are being examined. Objectives of these actions are to simplify and speed-up the delivery of services.

Question 2: The reorganization plan, as originally submitted to the Committee, included references to Phase II which is to be implemented during FY 1993. What will Phase II include and when is it likely to be implemented?

Answer: Implementation of Phase II is to begin in January 1993 and will be complete in that year. Actions include the completion of the merger of the Associates Programs, implementation of service delivery recommendations stemming from the Private Sector Council Study, delegations of authority for the performance of certain services, and the possible establishment of a small office of Strategic Planning and Analysis. Another phase II action includes strengthening of the Office of Equal Employment and Minority Affairs to enable it to implement a Smithsonian-wide cultural diversity program and take charge of all aspects of accessibility for disabled persons. Phase II will also investigate some closer association of program support offices, such as exhibits central, museum programs, and photographic services, which would improve internal and external services. Longer range, merger of the Associates may allow it to relate better to other education, development, membership, and business activities.

Question 3: On page 75 of the minutes of the Board of Regents' February 3, 1992 meeting, you are recorded as expressing some surprise regarding the existence of the reprogramming

guidelines of this Subcommittee which explicitly require agencies within this Subcommittee's jurisdiction to seek the Subcommittee's approval for any reorganization plans regardless of budget impact. You describe this requirement as an "apparently new requirement." Are you aware that the Subcommittee's reprogramming guidelines have been in place since 1987?

Answer: The Institution is aware that the Subcommittee's reprogramming guidelines have been in place since 1987. The Institution follows the reprogramming guidelines as part of its regular budget execution responsibilities and has sought approval for various reprogrammings over the years. Since the changes proposed through the new reorganization plan were developed primarily as changes in reporting relationships, with minimal effect of the distribution of funding between budget line-items and no effect on programmatic allocations, the Institution mistakenly believed that these changes did not fall into a category that was covered by the reprogramming guidelines. Upon review of the guidelines, the Institution complied with the requirements and provided the impact of the changes to both the House and Senate Subcommittees for their consideration.

Question 4: Will you keep the Subcommittee informed as you proceed on the remaining portions of the reorganization plan?

Answer: Yes, we will keep the Subcommittee informed as we proceed.

Question 5: I commend you, Secretary Adams, for your attempts to grapple with what is a very difficult and important set of issues. I was struck with what you wrote in what I felt was a thoughtful piece regarding the Smithsonian's "Cultural Agenda" which appears on pages 82-86 of the minutes of the Regents' February 3, 1992 meeting. At the risk of taking things out of context, I would like to read a few passages and ask you to comment if you would.

"Ours is a heavy responsibility for the National Collections - in study, in storage, and on exhibition. Those collections embody and speak for the past, not only in the millions of individual elements they contain but in the systems of knowledge that have been erected around them over the course of generations to make them intelligible. At some admitted risk of never quite managing to keep up with all the latest cutting edges, the stream of ongoing museum scholarship must carry, and to some extent be constrained by, that weight of tradition. But there is also an opposing consideration, always to be balanced against the constraining hand of tradition. This is a time of incredibly rapid change in the world. Much of that change is positive, reaching out to new horizons of human potential, basic freedoms of association and expression, scientific knowledge, and intercultural understanding. But much also is deeply marred by economic uncertainties, by grave social fragmentation, and by a sense that there are approaching, ominously interacting crises in many aspects of our lives."

Are you suggesting that the Smithsonian cannot allow itself, as an institution, to be satisfied with its role as curator of the National Collections but must also provide social and, perhaps, political commentary and/or advocacy?

Answer: There is a fine and difficult line to be drawn here. We cannot do justice to the richness and significance of the national collections, or to the Smithsonian's chartered responsibility to devote itself to "the increase and diffusion of

knowledge," by merely displaying small portions of our collections without explanation or commentary. At the same time, we would risk damaging the credibility and support for the Smithsonian on the part of the American people if we were to create the impression that the Institution is primarily concerned with airing the mere opinions of its staff and provoking controversy.

These opposing considerations suggest a general course of action. To begin with, we need to maintain and stress the great diversity of the Smithsonian's programs, while remaining duly attentive to where the greatest concentrations of our audiences' interests lie. Secondly, we need to direct our accompanying commentaries -- usually labels -- primarily toward elucidating the objects that are the main focus of museum exhibits. To meet the canons of responsible scholarship, commentaries will not infrequently deal with what is not known as well as what is known; with prevailing and plausible alternative interpretations of the exhibited materials; and with their interrelations and larger significance. There will occasionally be controversy. Museums are probably not doing their jobs if they do not have some effect in "expanding the envelope" of tolerance for the unfamiliar. But the success of the Institution in its larger role demands that advocacy and personal bias be excluded, and that the introduction of controversial elements be carefully and deliberately controlled.

Question 6: You also state that, "Given the severity of the challenges this country faces, it would be irresponsible for a public institution like this one to allow itself to become a bastion of exclusivity." I unquestionably agree. But you go on to say:

"It is a position that I have personally reached only with numerous qualifications and reversals along the way, but now hold with considerable conviction, that perhaps the central challenge before museums today is to find ways to address themselves to the increasing diversity, and at the same time the growing interdependence and vulnerability, of social life everywhere. Museums need to see themselves increasingly, and to be publicly recognized, as important institutional means by which every group in our very pluralistic society can define itself and represent its place within complex, dynamic circumstances that seem to hold all of the risks as well as the promises of our American heritage."

While I agree with you on the need for the Smithsonian, and museums generally, to accurately reflect the diversity of our pluralistic society, I must admit I have questions regarding the notion that these institutions should become the vehicle or means by which every group can define itself and represent its place in society. In doing so, don't these institutions run the considerable risk of advocacy which, by definition, involves promotion and, ultimately, exclusivity?

Answer: This is a good question, and the answer again involves treading a fine and difficult line. On the one hand, we have a responsibility to reach out to the widest possible audiences, to draw them into the cultural and learning experiences that the Smithsonian can provide. Encouraging the sense that groups will find themselves fairly and sympathetically represented here, in ways that draw upon their own knowledge, is an essential step toward this end. On the other hand, we cannot allow the Smithsonian to become a discordant collection of group-generated myths and stereotypes. All that can be said is that we should not shrink back from this challenge because it is difficult, and that, as the Smithsonian magazine column to which you refer concludes, "ours is also a responsibility to hold high the corresponding vision of E pluribus unum."

Etiquette of the Undercaste Exhibit

Question 7: The New York Times carried an article in its February 4, 1992 edition regarding the Smithsonian's "Etiquette of the Undercaste" exhibit on the homeless. While I have not personally visited this particular exhibit, I am struck by the Times' description: "To enter, all the museum visitor has to do is lie on a morgue drawer." The article contains several quotes from you, Mr. Secretary, including your description of the homeless exhibit as an example of art imitating life and of "how museums must relate to the problems of the contemporary world" as opposed to the past when museums were "storehouses of idealized images, and museums are no longer that."

Are we likely to see Smithsonian exhibits, experimental or otherwise, that allow the museum visitor to experience what it's like to die from AIDS, or be victimized by spousal or child abuse or, perhaps, suffer the indignity and humiliation of sexual harassment and/or discrimination? Are we likely to see exhibits that allow the museum visitor to experience what it's like to live in a family that has, because of increasing concerns for the environment, lost its source of income because they are loggers in the Pacific northwest or coal miners in West Virginia or hard-rock miners in Nevada or oil field workers in Alaska? If not, why not?

Answer: The Experimental Gallery provides space for exhibit makers to create, innovate, explore, and experiment with the exhibition development process, audience and access, exhibition context, and technique and style.

Experimental Gallery exhibitions are reviewed throughout the year by a peer review panel and are selected based on the following criteria:

1. Innovative or experimental methods to increase audience access, diversity, understanding or participation in the exhibition
2. Innovative and creative techniques and styles (including interpretive strategies, exhibition design, and program design) which can lend themselves to non-traditional installations in museums and/other settings
3. New ways for audiences and museum professionals to explore the exhibition development process, including the team approach to exhibition development
4. Innovative treatment of context or exploration of issues

Criteria for selection of either extant shows or residency-developed exhibitions is developed by the Advisory Committee. The Committee may, from time to time, elect to focus on a particular cultural group or issue of special relevance. Once selected by the Committee, potential applications are submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Arts and Humanities and his deputy.

Since the selection process is not driven by subject matter, it is likely that the Experimental Gallery could host exhibitions on a variety of topics as long as the exhibition is experimental in the aforementioned areas. Other Smithsonian exhibitions emanate from the Institution's research and collections. Areas which might be considered for exhibitions include art history, social and political history, the social sciences and a wide variety of scientific disciplines.

Question 8: Mr. Secretary, would you elaborate on a point you made in your opening statement regarding the distribution of the funding increase that the Smithsonian requested in its FY 1993 budget submission to OMB? If I understood you correctly, 75

percent of your FY 1993 submission to OMB was targeted for infrastructure related costs and 25 percent would have applied to new initiatives. When OMB passed back the Smithsonian's FY 1993 request these percentages had been revised -- 25 percent for infrastructure and 75 percent for new initiatives. Is that correct?

Answer: This shift in the relative percentages between increased funding for infrastructure requirements and new initiatives did occur between the Institution' FY 1993 budget request to the Office of Management and Budget and the budget request to Congress. The Institution's request to OMB for infrastructure requirements equaled \$32.9 million of the total increase of \$43.8 million (excluding uncontrollable increases), or 75 percent. The Institution's request for infrastructure in the Congressional request equaled \$3.4 million, or 25 percent of the total increase of \$13.8 million (excluding uncontrollables).

While the Institution is extremely appreciative of OMB's support for the funding for global change research, cultural pluralism (including the National Museum of the American Indian), and education, the strict limitations on OMB's ability to support all of the Institution's priorities, including its infrastructure requirements, had the unfortunate result of producing this shift in the proportion of increases associated with infrastructure requirements and new initiatives.

Question 9: For FY 1993, if the Smithsonian is limited to its FY 1992 funding level minus 2 percent, what adjustments would you make to your FY 1993 budget request?

Answer: The possibility of having to operate in FY 1993 at a level equal to two percent below the FY 1992 appropriations level (or approximately \$325.2 million) was briefly discussed at the Smithsonian's FY 1993 Senate appropriations hearing. The Institution has begun to assess the impact of such a proposed reduction to its FY 1993 budget. Because of the complexity and the serious consequences, including the possible elimination of many jobs, of implementing any decisions resulting from a reduction of this magnitude (representing an 11 percent decrease from the request to Congress), the Institution has not had sufficient time to identify and analyze alternative options, or to make final decisions on what specific changes in the FY 1993 budget request would be necessary to respond to this proposed reduction.

In general, however, there would necessarily be a very severe underfunding of base operating requirements and a significant reduction in funding for all of the Institution's capital accounts. Since approximately 60 percent of the requested FY 1993 increases for the Salaries and Expenses account is required to support uncontrollable costs such as the legislated pay raise, the Federal Employee Retirement System (FERS), and utilities, the Institution's first priority would be to cover these essential costs. Beyond satisfying the uncontrollables, the Institution would address the Institution's most important infrastructure and program priorities; fund the most essential repair and restoration projects throughout the Institution; and continue critical construction projects.

Question 10: Over the last 10 years (FY 1982-FY 1992), the appropriations for the total Smithsonian program have increased \$186.6 million or 128 percent. Appropriations for that period have averaged 9.3 percent. Over the last 14 years (FY 1978-FY 1992), your total program has increased \$227.3 million or 218 percent and again averaging 9.3 percent. The Smithsonian salaries and expenses has also increased dramatically: over the last 10 years salaries

and expenses increased 114 percent; over the last 14 years, 201 percent averaging 8.1 percent for the entire period.

Would you provide for the record an analysis of the increases in your annual appropriations for the period FY 1982-FY 1992? Such analysis should include an identification, by fiscal year, of the major cost components to the increase over the previous fiscal year, i.e construction or opening of new facilities, Congressional add-ons, new program initiatives, facilities maintenance and/or renovation etc.

Answer: The following table presents an analysis of the increases in the Smithsonian's annual appropriations for the period FY 1982 - FY 1992 by account and major cost component.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION -- TEN YEAR GROWTH SUMMARY, FY 1982 - FY 1992

Budget Component	FY 1982	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992
SALARIES & EXPENSES											
Prior Year Appropriation	117,685	128,470	144,366	155,263	162,415	169,384	183,920	201,432	211,240	225,479	272,879
Uncontrollable Increases:											
Salary and Related Personnel Costs	7,501	5,966	6,336	5,247	6,924	1,916	13,004	1,924	8,094	12,636	13,837
Utilities, Communications & Postage and Rent	2,160	949	(956)	579	1,604	1,856	(237)	301	(308)	4,341	(1)
Program Increases /1	1,652	1,700	1,500	1,450	4,350	3,311	4,745	7,583	9,527	16,875	12,963
Program Increases /1	4,845	6,281	4,017	(3,315)	(8,679)	7,213			(3,074)	(1,363)	(3,378)
Restoration of Prior Year Across-the-Board Cuts /2	(5,353)										
Pass Through Grants to JFK Center	1,000			(300)	(336)	(348)					
TOTAL, SALARIES AND EXPENSES	128,470	144,366	155,263	162,415	169,384	183,920	201,432	211,240	225,479	272,879	281,183
REPAIR & RESTORATION											
	7,680	8,450	9,000	13,475	10,536	12,975	19,254	20,735	26,468	31,191	23,599
CONSTRUCTION											
Quadrangle	960	36,500	(8,000)	0	3,805	3,315	1,315	2,700	1,930	1,542	
Tropical Research Institute						2,780		3,185	1,620	7,391	2,370
Whipple Observatory Base Camp									1,492	1,678	1,678
National Museum of the American Indian									4,040	3,987	4,493
Natural History Service Light Bldg.								2,020	750	995	4,741
Minor Construction Alt. & Mod.											
Construction Planning											
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	960	36,500	(8,000)	0	3,805	6,095	1,315	8,655	8,320	15,407	19,156
ZOO CONSTRUCTION											
	1,104	1,550	3,500	4,851	5,281	2,500	8,150	5,305	6,423	6,636	7,899
SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM											
	4,320	2,000	7,040	8,820	2,378						
TOTAL, SMITHSONIAN (all accounts)	142,534	192,866	166,803	189,561	191,384	205,490	230,151	245,935	266,690	326,113	331,837

NOTES:

/1 The totals for S&E Program Increases presented above include the following funding related to the construction and opening of new facilities:

	FY 1982	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992
S&E Program Increases related to New Facilities	1,753	2,205	1,460	327	4,273	3,342	2,411	862	6,569	9,888	7,717

/2 Because the FY 1986 and FY 1991 Gramm-Rudman-Hollings across-the-board reductions were in effect only for that fiscal year, the FY 1987 and FY 1992 budget formulation processes were not affected by the cuts, effectively "restoring" the reductions in the next fiscal year.

Question 11: On page 24 of your FY 1993 budget justification, you are requesting \$1.5 million to offset the "inflation-related erosion of the Institution's purchasing power that has occurred over the last year." Isn't inflation normally included as part of your annual base adjustment?

Answer: Funding to compensate for the effects of inflation in "other objects of expense" is one of the uncontrollable increases in the Institution's FY 1993 budget request. The justification for this increase is presented as part of the "Uncontrollable" section of the budget (on page 24); the funding for this increase is distributed throughout the budget line-items and reflected in their total.

Question 12: How does the \$1.5 million requested for inflation differ from the \$1.3 million increase requested on page 16 for object class 31?

Answer: There is no relation between the inflation request of \$1.5 million and the \$1.3 million increase for equipment presented in the "Report of Appropriation by Objects of Expense" table on page 16. The increase of \$1.3 million for equipment represents the sum of components of the various individual program increases throughout the budget that is earmarked for pieces of equipment and major equipment systems and does not include any inflationary allowances. The funding requested under inflation is used by each Smithsonian unit to offset the inflationary pressures that affect all objects of expense covered in the base budget. For convenience, the \$1.5 million request for inflation is reflected in the "Objects of Expense" table as part of the increase for other services, but may be used by the individual units in any object class.

Question 13: The Smithsonian's FY 1993 budget request proposes to add 161 new FTEs, this is in addition to 103 FTEs that were created as a result of the FY 1992 appropriations. The Smithsonian still has a vacancy rate of almost 5 percent in its staff positions. Given the number of positions that still remain vacant at the Smithsonian, why do we need to add 161 FTEs?

Answer: The long-standing problem of personnel vacancies throughout the Institution has been caused by the cumulative erosion of base resources that had previously been used to pay the personnel costs of on-board employees, and is not directly related to the need for new positions. As indicated in the table below, the requests for new positions are related to the specific staffing needs that are components of the individual program increases for infrastructure requirements and national imperatives. The funding requested for these positions reflects full funding, including the costs of the Federal Employee Retirement System (FERS) and the costs of health insurance, which have been two major factors in the base erosion problems.

Summary of New Positions
Requested in the FY 1993 Budget

<u>Bureau</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Number of FTE's</u>
Assistant Secretary for Research	Scientific Diving Program	1
Smithsonian Astrophys. Observatory	Global Change Research Education	4 1
	Submillimeter Telescope Array Staffing	7
	Global Change Research - Canopy Biology	4
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute	Global Change Research - Forest Dynamics	2
	Global Change Research - Tropical Paleocology	3
	Global Change Research - Canopy Biology	7
National Zoological Park	Global Change Research	5
Smithsonian Institution Archives	Archives Processing Team	4
Internat'l Environmnt'l Science Program	Global Change Research at SERC	4
	East African Savanna Ecosystem Studies	1
Assistant Secretary for Museums	African American Programming on the Mall	3
Office of Museum Programs	Intern Development Program and SI Staff Training	1
National Museum of Natural History	Global Change Research - Earth History Program	3
	Global Change Research - Biodiversity Program	3
	Global Change Research - Human Ecological History	1
	Cultural Identity and Diversity in Africa	1
	Facilities Planning and Coordination	6
	Global Change Research	2
National Air and Space Museum	Global Change Research	2
National Museum of American History	Asbestos Removal	3
National Museum of the American Indian	Custom House Program	9
	Maintenance for the New York Facilities	5
	Security for the New York Facilities	12
	New York Program Support	3
	National Campaign Office	2
	Planning and Coordination	13
	Repatriation	9
	Technology for the Education Program	3
Design and Construction Mgmt	2	

<u>Bureau</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Number of FTE's</u>
NMAA/NPG Bldg Mgmt	Safety Specialist	1
Archives of American Art	Archives Collections Processing and Conservation	1
Anacostia Museum	Education	1
Museum Support Ctr.	MSC Move and Asbestos Contamination	10
Ofc. of Folklife Pgms.	Cultural Conservation Research Education Program	1 1
Ofc. of Elementary and Secondary Education	Clearinghouse on Pre-college Education'l Pgms & Publications	1
Assistant Secretary for Finance & Admin.	Financial Mgmt. Improvements	2
Ofc. of Human Resources	Operations Division Staffing	6
Office of Equal Opportunity	Professional Development Pgm.	6
Ofc. of Information Resource Mgmt.	Central Computing Center and SIRIS Staffing	<u>7</u>
		161
	<u>New Initiatives</u>	

Question 14: You state in your prepared testimony on page 4 that the Smithsonian's FY 1993 request "embodies virtually no new initiatives." Your FY 1993 request does, however, include \$200,000 for planning and design of the new National African American Museum, \$500,000 for planning and design for a new Collections Research Center, \$1,000,000 for planning and design of an extension to the Air and Space Museum, \$50,000 to establish and begin staffing the new Mpala research station in Kenya, East Africa, and the new National Postal Museum which will house the American History Museum's philatelic collection which will be supported by the Smithsonian and supplemented by contributions from the Postal Service and the private sector. In addition, I understand that the Smithsonian will spend \$20,000 of its Trust funds in FY 1992 to purchase a new field station in Bocas del Toro, Panama, that you have personally expressed an interest in building a \$10 million physics branch in Arlington, Texas, and that the Smithsonian will soon be the recipient of one of five of the Noriega ranches seized in Panama.

Would you please tell the Subcommittee whether each of the projects that I have just identified is authorized, what the anticipated "mortgage" is likely to be (i.e. projected out-year costs including construction, operations and staffing), and exactly how each of these projects ranks on the Smithsonian's priority list?

Answer: With respect to Smithsonian construction, the Air and Space Museum extension is ranked third on the Smithsonian's priority list of major construction projects (following the NMNH East Court Building and the facilities for the National Museum of the American Indian). The National African American Museum and the Collection Research Center also are priorities on the Institution's list of construction planning projects. Information on other projects is as follows.

National African American Museum - The National African American Museum is not yet authorized. Construction, operations, and staffing costs have yet to be determined. The purpose of the requested \$200,000 is for planning that will begin developing preliminary cost data of this nature.

Collections Research Center - The Collections Research Center is not authorized. The preliminary estimated design and construction cost is \$197 million for the first three phases of this new facilities complex at Suitland in the Institution's long range plan through FY 2001. These are very preliminary estimates and will be refined during the master planning process, currently underway. Operating and staffing costs are also being developed during the master planning process. More specific cost estimates for the first building will be developed in conjunction with the detailed planning to be completed using funding requested in FY 1993.

Air and Space Museum Extension - The Air and Space Museum extension is not yet authorized. The preliminary estimated cost is \$9 million for design and \$153 million for construction. The contribution from state and private sources is expected to be \$1 million for design and the equivalent of \$54 million for construction. Once the extension is authorized, the Institution plans to pursue alternative funding strategies to meet the total estimate of \$162 million. Estimates of other one-time costs include artifact move (\$4.7 million) and start-up costs (\$0.5 million); those for annual costs include staff (\$2.3 million), museum operations (\$1.5 million), and facilities management (\$5.7 million).

Mpala Research Station - In 1990, the Board of Regents authorized the Smithsonian Institution to enter into a consortium with Princeton University, and with the National Museum of Kenya and the Kenyan Wildlife Service, to establish and jointly operate a research center in north central Kenya. The Institution anticipates that the research center's activities will be largely financed through gifts and grants. Recent indications are that preliminary fundraising may be successful. However, a modest amount of \$50,000 for salary support is necessary. It is critical that the directorship have the security of a Federal position in order to guarantee the continuity of research and management programs to provide independence from the year-to-year vagaries of fund raising, and to develop appropriate proposals for private support.

National Postal Museum - The National Postal Museum was authorized by the Smithsonian's Board of Regents. It will be supported by existing base funding and contributions from the U.S. Postal Service, which is providing construction funding of \$9,000,000, as well as start-up costs of \$6,000,000. Of the annual operating budget, \$2,000,000 will be from the U.S. Postal Service in addition to the \$538,000 that the Smithsonian currently spends on the philatelic collection.

Bocas del Toro Field Station - This purchase from Trust funds was approved by the Board of Regents at its February 1992 meeting. The new field station consists of a small house built on a 160 square meter lot (less than 1/25th of an acre). The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute will spend about \$10,000 in Trust funds for the repair of the house so that it can be used as a base for field work in the Bocas del Toro. A part-time caretaker, periodic repairs, and maintenance by STRI's facilities management are all that are presently needed to sustain this field station. STRI anticipates annual maintenance and operating expenses to be less than \$2,000, and expects to maintain this minimal level of operation for three to five years, after which its research needs at this location will be reevaluated.

Proposal from Arlington, Texas, for a Museum of the Physical Sciences - Earlier this year, the City of Arlington, Texas, made a proposal to the Smithsonian to develop a Museum of the Physical Sciences as a not-for-profit institution. Drawing on the work of a civic committee, the idea stemmed from the development nearby of the Federally-funded particle accelerator, the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC). The proposal envisioned a Museum that would be independently managed and self-supporting, but that would include the Smithsonian Institution as part of its name. It was discussed at the Regents meeting on May 11, 1992. The Regents expressed the view that geographic dispersal of Smithsonian activities, and use of its name, should only be undertaken as a matter of deliberate, carefully developed policy that was consistent with Smithsonian priorities. The Regents also recognized that the establishment of new facilities for which the Institution might bear responsibility also would be dependent upon the prior authorization of Congress. As a result, the proposal was rejected.

Noriega Ranches - The Smithsonian does not expect to receive any Noriega ranches. The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute had made it clear to the Government of Panama that it does not have any use for such lands. (The Washington Post article was incorrect.)

Question 15: Regarding the National Postal Museum, you state in your testimony that the Smithsonian will help support the new museum through "existing Federal base funding from the existing collection" to be supplemented by funds from the Postal Service and private sources. I understand that the Postal Commission was not exactly enthusiastic about this museum and has only committed the Postal Service for 15 years. Who will be responsible for operating, maintaining, and staffing this facility at year 16?

Answer: The "Operating Agreement" between the Smithsonian and the Postal Service remains in effect until May 14, 2022. Under the terms of the agreement, the Postal Service is committed to support this museum for 30 years. After the 15th year, however, and upon giving at least two years advance notice, the Postal Service may reduce its annual contribution to the base operating budget by not more than 50-percent of its contribution in the immediate preceding fiscal year, effective in and after 2008. The Postal Service may exercise this option only once. Even if the Postal Service does not elect to exercise this option, through endowments and on-going fundraising, the museum hopes Postal Service support will not be required beyond that point. If the Postal Service exercises its option, it will reimburse the Smithsonian for all reasonable and necessary operations, in an amount to exceed \$1.45 million. In addition, the Smithsonian may strive to operate the museum for the full term of the agreement without reducing its level of activities or space in the former Washington City Post Office Building.

Museum Support Center

Question 16: Congress has appropriated \$37.3 million since 1981 for the purchase and installation of collections storage equipment at the Museum Support Center. Storage equipment now occupies 47 percent of the 203,000 square feet of floor space in the Museum Support Center. Of the 8,435 new storage cabinets installed, only 16 percent have been filled. Given the amount of unused space and storage capacity that already exists at the Museum Support Center, why are you requesting \$500,000 to begin the planning and design for a whole new Collections Research Center facility adjacent to the existing Center?

Answer: The Museum Support Center, planned as the first in a series of collection storage/research facilities for Smithsonian

museums, was primarily intended to house Natural History collections/research activities. All of the storage capacity of the MSC, when fully utilized, will be devoted to the space requirements of the National Museum of Natural History and a small portion of the space requirements of the National Museum of American History. Despite the problems that had earlier occurred in the procurement of collections storage equipment for the MSC and that have as yet prevented it from being fully utilized, the currently unused space and storage capacity at the MSC is not "free" space that can be used to satisfy the space requirements of other Smithsonian bureaus.

The planned facilities of the new Collections Research Center complex are urgently needed to ensure the continued preservation of the collections and the vitality of the collection-based research and collections management programs of these other museums, including the National Museum of American History, the Hirshhorn Museum, the National Museum of American Art, the National Portrait Gallery, the National Museum of African Art, the Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, and the Anacostia Museum. Future phases will also serve to meet future collections storage and research space requirements for the National Museum of Natural History, following the full utilization of the MSC.

The Institution has documented these immediate and long-term needs for additional space to house and study these growing collections, as well as important archival and library collections that are currently inadequately housed and conserved. Based on the initial phase of the Suitland Master Plan, the Institution will require approximately 2.8 million square feet of new collections management, conservation, and research support space over the next two decades (even after the full utilization of the Museum Support Center).

This space problem is exacerbated by the age and the poor condition of the present storage buildings at Suitland. Among these structures are temporary metal buildings that provide approximately 115,000 square feet of storage space for the National Museum of American History. Most of these buildings have a remaining life expectancy of less than ten to 15 years. Since half of NMAH's collections, excluding stamps and coins, reside there, it is essential to have facilities ready in the next decade to replace these existing buildings and to ensure that the National Collections have proper housing. Moreover, other Smithsonian museums, archives, and libraries are also experiencing serious shortages of appropriate collections storage space. Space in museum buildings is severely overcrowded, and several museums and bureaus have moved collections into leased space in off-site locations to avoid damage and deterioration of artifacts from excessive compression. Unfortunately, many of these locations and most of the existing Suitland buildings do not provide the adequate environmental conditions necessary for long-term preservation of collections.

A study completed in 1990 determined that buildable land is available at Suitland to accommodate these identified space requirements, as well as to provide three to five million additional square feet of space for growth of the National Collections and support services well into the next century. The Smithsonian plans to sequence construction of a new Collections Research Center complex at Suitland over the next ten to 20 years. The final phase of the Suitland Master Plan, initiated in 1991, will determine the appropriate placement of structures, roads, infrastructure, and landscaping that will form an integrated complex of buildings and services to support management of and research in the National Collections. The location of the collections storage and research/study facilities of the individual

bureaus, as well as a construction-phasing plan and an environmental analysis, are also part of the Master Plan study.

For FY 1993, the Institution requests \$500,000 to carry the planning process into the next phase. This planning will develop more specific program and facility requirements, refine estimates and schedules for construction, identify and analyze logistical issues, and establish operating-cost estimates for the initial structure or structures on the site. The FY 1993 request is essential to ensure that the Institution can carry out the detailed level of planning which must precede a future request for authorization and funding of construction for these critically-needed facilities for the long-term preservation of Smithsonian collections.

Question 17: How many additional square feet of storage are planned for the new Collections Research Center and what is the total projected cost to construct, staff and equip the new Center?

Answer: The preliminary estimated design and construction cost (including equipment) is \$197 million for the first three phases of new facilities for the Collections Research Center complex at Suitland, Maryland. This funding would provide approximately 1 million square feet of space encompassed in multiple buildings to be constructed as part of the Suitland Master Plan. These are very preliminary estimates and will be refined during the master planning process, currently underway. Staffing costs are also being developed during the master planning process.

Question 18: Your FY 1993 budget request also includes \$1,000,000 for the planning and design for new collections research and storage facility at the Suitland site for artifacts related to the National Museum of the American Indian. What is the total projected cost to construct, staff, and equip this facility?

Answer: The initial project budget estimate for construction and equipping for the Suitland facility was \$44 million. The Museum has hired Venturi, Scott, Brown and Associates, Inc., to complete the architectural programming for Suitland and the Mall facilities which will be completed early this summer. At that time, a more refined estimate should be available. The process of determining the total number of staff at both Suitland and the Mall is currently being developed during master planning and is expected to be completed by the fall of 1992.

Biodiversity

Question 19: The Smithsonian FY 1993 budget request includes an increase of \$3,134,000 and 14 FTEs for the National Museum of Natural History including \$1,039,000 and 7 FTEs for its Global Change program. A part of that proposed program is to study biodiversity and the regeneration of tropical ecosystems throughout the world. This would require the establishment of field stations in Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Guyana, and Peru. How would these field stations be staffed and what are the out-year costs to operate and maintain these stations?

Answer: The field stations mentioned are not new ones, but ones which have been in operation for several years; they were approved with Federal support in 1985 (Belize), 1987 (Bolivia, Peru, and Guyana), and 1991 (Brazil). They are managed from Washington by program staff using the on-site logistics support of local scientific and educational organizations and contracted in-country managers and workers. No permanent Federal staff are

stationed overseas at these field stations; they are used exclusively for field research. The outyear increases for maintaining the field stations are not expected to exceed normal inflationary factors.

Education

Question 20: The Smithsonian requested \$3.0 million from OMB for education programs in FY 1993. The Smithsonian request to Congress for education programs in FY 1993 is \$300,000. What education programs did OMB eliminate in its pass-back to the Smithsonian?

Answer: The following annotated list of Smithsonian Education requests is arranged in the order of priority as originally submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (totaling 40 workyears and \$3,006,000). Prioritization of items was decided through joint deliberation of the Assistant Secretaries and approved by the Secretary. After the OMB passback of \$300,000, the Assistant Secretaries reordered the original list of Educational requests to reflect the priority in Education which either: (1) serve pan-Institutional goals of promoting more effective alignment of staff and budget resources to improve and/or expand dissemination of education products and services to pre-collegiate, undergraduate/graduate and continuing education constituencies; or (2) reflect extreme need of a particular bureau or program to stabilize or upgrade its educational activities.

Prior.	Program	FTE	\$000s
1	<u>National Science Resources Center</u> National Science Education Clearinghouse - To distribute up-to-date information about effective science curriculum resources to teachers and science educators throughout the country.	3	265
* 2	<u>Anacostia Museum</u> Education Specialists - To expand visitor population of school and community groups. The request to Congress seeks 1 workyear and \$50,000 for this program, representing a reduction of 1 workyear and \$50,000 from the level requested from OMB.	2	100
3	<u>SI Environmental Education Training Programs</u> A joint effort to support training of nationals in developing countries in the conservation of biological diversity. Increases related to this Smithsonian-wide initiative were requested by the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (1 workyear and \$50,000), the National Zoological Park (3 workyears and \$200,000), the National Museum of Natural History (2 workyears and \$125,000), the Office of Environmental Awareness (2 workyears and \$150,000), and the Smithsonian/Man and the Biosphere Program (2 workyears and \$125,000).	10	650
4	<u>Cooper-Hewitt Museum</u> Conversion of CHM trust employees - To stabilize education/exhibition programs through conversion of positions; to provide free education programs to children and the public.	3	115
5	<u>Asst. Secretary for Education & Public Service</u> Special Assistant - To manage the Smithsonian-wide educational outreach program which supports Institution objectives in education, cultural diversity and public service.	1	70

Prior.	Program	FTE	\$000s
* 6	<u>Office of Fellowships and Grants</u> Fellowship/Internship Coordinator - To hire a Fellowship/Internship Coordinator and to develop a guide on research opportunities at the Smithsonian. The request to Congress seeks \$8,000 for this program, representing a reduction of 1 workyear and \$58,000 from the level requested from OMB.	1	66
* 7	<u>Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory</u> Science Education - To develop and conduct workshops training teachers to train other teachers in using modern educational materials to teach science in the Nation's schools. This request had been supported by the interagency Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering, and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Education and Human Resources (CEHR) as part of its recommendations for the FY 1993 Federal budget. The request to Congress seeks 1 workyear and \$72,000 for this program, representing a reduction of \$14,000 from the level requested from OMB.	1	86
* 8	<u>Office of Folklife Programs</u> Summer Folklore Institute & Education Program - To develop educational and curricular materials in concert with OFP curators, researchers, and outside educators. The request to Congress seeks 1 workyear and \$50,000 for this program, representing a reduction of \$15,000 from the level requested from OMB.	1	65
9	<u>National Portrait Gallery</u> Senior Citizens Outreach Program - to maintain and expand the Gallery's adult outreach programs, especially for senior citizens.	1	26
* 10	<u>Office of Museum Programs</u> Intern Development Program - To implement a Smithsonian-wide intern development program. In the request to Congress, this program was combined with the related request for SI Staff Training, resulting in a net reduction of 1 workyear and \$45,000 from the level requested from OMB for the two programs combined.	1	45
11	<u>Freer Gallery of Art</u> Education Activity & Related Literature - To establish an education program on Asian arts and cultures.	1	80
12	<u>Assistant Secretary for Museums</u> Establish Museum Career Information Center - To establish a Museum Career information Center that will provide information concerning disciplines throughout the museum world.	1	100
13	<u>SI Office of Wider Audience Development</u> Administrative Support - To provide staff support for Federally-mandated observances of ethnic and women's heritage; to provide staff education on issues of cultural pluralism; and to promote wider audience development.	1	41
14	<u>National Museum of Natural History</u> Intern Program - To coordinate intern program for undergraduate students in the fields of natural history, comparative biology, and systematics.	1	126
15	<u>National Museum of African Art</u> Publications - To develop collection-based educational publications that will be made available free of charge.	0	50
* 16	<u>Office of Elementary and Secondary Education</u> Pre-college Education Programs and Publications - To establish a centralized national computerized clearinghouse of information about Smithsonian programs and materials for schools.	1	70

<u>Prior. Program</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>\$000s</u>
17 <u>Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute</u> Academic & Education Programs - To expand educational mission to include programs for primary and secondary school students and to establish a training program for professionals in tropical biology and conservation.	3	182
18 <u>National Air and Space Museum</u> Science Demonstrations, Teacher, Curriculum Material - To increase educational outreach efforts at the local community level through live science demonstrations and availability of school curriculum packages on aviation and space. This request had been supported by the interagency Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering, and Technology (FCCSET) Committee on Education and Human Resources (CEHR) as part of its recommendations for the FY 1993 Federal budget.	1	162
19 <u>National Museum of American Art</u> Education Programs - To target education programs for multiple audience levels and national constituencies through new technologies and wide dissemination of films, videos, teacher workbooks, and course materials on American art.	2	200
20 <u>National Museum of American History</u> Education Programs - To address heightened public demand for more live interpretations of NMAH exhibits and educational materials relating to exhibit themes.	1	150
21 <u>Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden</u> Educational Material - To increase accessibility of the collections to new audiences, including teachers, junior high and high school students, and minorities.	0	130
22 <u>National Museum of African Art</u> Education Specialist - To develop and disseminate elementary and secondary school curriculum materials devoted to African art, history and cultures.	1	42
23 <u>Cooper-Hewitt Museum</u> Education Dept. Critical Base Operations - To support base operation of the museum's educational department.	0	100
24 <u>Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory</u> Public Information Display - To support the development of interactive software; to purchase computer, monitor and display station carrel; and to publish astronomical photos study guides in both Spanish and English to serve the diverse audiences of southern Arizona at the Fred L. Whipple Observatory.	0	20
* 25 <u>Office of Museum Programs</u> Smithsonian Staff Training - To provide training that would strengthen technical and professional skills of SI staff in areas such as exhibition planning, educational program management, and collections management. In the request to Congress, this program was combined with the related request for the Intern Development Program, resulting in a net reduction of 1 workyear and \$45,000 from the level requested from OMB for the two programs combined.	1	50
26 <u>Visitor Info. & Associates Reception Ctr.</u> Printing and Reproduction - To develop and print informational materials about the Smithsonian.	0	15
TOTAL	40	3,006

Note: An asterisk (*) indicates that the increase has been either partially or completely included in the FY 1993 request to Congress.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DON NICKLES

General Budget

The Smithsonian Institution's FY 1993 budget request of \$364,700,000 is an increase of \$32,863,000 (+10%) above the FY 1992 enacted level of \$331,837,000. Salaries and expenses (\$311,000,000) are increased \$29,817,000 (+11%) above the FY 1992 level of \$281,183,000. The Smithsonian's construction account (\$21,400,000) is \$2,244,000 (+12%) above the FY 1991 level of \$19,156,000. Construction and improvements for the National Zoological Park are approximately requested at the same level as the FY 1992 appropriation of \$7,900,000. The repair and restoration on buildings is proposed at a \$24,400,000 funding level which is \$801,000 (+3%) above the FY 1992 level of \$23,599,000.

Global Change Research

Question 21: The FY 1993 request for global change research is \$10.6 million, which is an increase of \$4.3 million (+68%) above the FY 1992 enacted level of \$6.3 million. In addition another \$8.0 million is requested which contributes to the Smithsonian's global change research (reference to "Our Changing Planet: The FY 1993 U.S. Global Change Research Program - A Report by the Committee on Earth and Environmental Sciences").

For FY 1993 a total of \$1,372.4 million with another \$1,390.6 million for other supporting activities is requested by the President for global change research.

Mr. Adams, considering the magnitude and involvement of this program, please explain why your prepared statement reads that "only the Smithsonian has the capacity to address basic biological questions such as change in ecosystems and biological diversity." What makes the Smithsonian so unique?

Answer: Throughout the century and a half of its existence, the Smithsonian Institution's scholars have focused much of their attention on the causes, magnitudes and effects of changes in the Earth's environments. In recent years, Smithsonian scientists have been particularly concerned with understanding and interpreting the nature of environmental change as it has affected the Earth and its inhabitants in the past, and as it continues to affect the world today. Recognizing the importance accorded by Smithsonian scientists to such studies, the Secretary several years ago made Global Change Research an "Area of Emphasis" for the Institution.

The Smithsonian can make significant contributions in the area of Global Change research in several ways. First and foremost, Smithsonian researchers are looking at the effects of environmental change, both natural and human-induced, on critical ecosystems - particularly those which may exert a major influence on the Earth's climate or are particularly threatened, such as tropical rainforests. Second, they are trying to understand major periods of global environmental change in the past, to provide a longer time baseline than the current brief era for evaluating the effects of such changes. Third, they are studying the processes which cause natural changes in climate and the environment - such processes as global volcanism, solar variability, atmospheric chemistry, and changes in oceanic circulation - so as to distinguish better between natural and human-induced environmental changes.

The Smithsonian Institution has unique capabilities and experience in studying these topics. Its studies of critically important terrestrial and marine ecosystems are based on a fundamental understanding of the composition, behavior and dynamics

of these communities, and unequalled expertise in long-term monitoring - especially in the tropical systems which have been targeted by the scientific community as crucial to understanding the behavior of the Earth system. To the task of unravelling and interpreting past global change, the Institution brings the experience and skill of teamwork by paleontologists, geologists, biologists and anthropologists working together, and the historical evidence locked in the treasure trove of Smithsonian museum collections. To the understanding of fundamental Earth processes, Smithsonian researchers contribute an interdisciplinary approach which utilizes vast files of global data, and the insights accumulated by decades of experience in Earth system studies.

Finally, the Institution is extremely well-positioned to carry out studies of human interactions with the environment, from the emergence of humankind to the present day. The Institution's combination of anthropological, biological and physical-science expertise is focussed on efforts to understand, predict, and mitigate the effects on human populations of global and regional environmental changes. In fact, the Smithsonian research focus on effects of environmental changes on the Earth's ecosystems will be of enormous benefit to policy makers and planners now and in the future.

Question 22: Why do you make such a statement when agencies such as the Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Bureau of Land Management have ecosystem and biological diversity responsibilities?

Answer: The Smithsonian is the only research entity which is engaged in long-term monitoring of global environmental changes and their effects on biological diversity, in precisely those critical areas of the globe which are most threatened by such changes. The programs for which we are requesting additional funding in FY 1993 are very specifically targeted at some of the highest-priority ecosystems identified by the U. S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP): the Amazonian and other tropical rain forests, coral reefs, the fragile Arctic tundra, coastal estuaries, and regions undergoing desertification. Our programs also uniquely address priority problems in atmospheric chemistry, greenhouse gas production and destruction, and the geologic record of past global climate changes. Because of the indispensable role played by the Smithsonian in the study of global change, the interagency Committee on Earth and Environmental Sciences strongly urged us to participate in the U.S. Global Change Research Program, and we are included in the USGCRP budget crosscut.

Question 23: Why does the Smithsonian have the largest percentage increase of all of the agencies in the global change research program? Why is your program proposed for such a significant increase?

Answer: For historical reasons, the Smithsonian's base Federal budget for global change research as of FY 1992 was very small compared to that of the other agencies in the U.S. Global Change Research Program - less than \$6.3 million - although the Institution has maintained widespread and effective, though small-scale, programs in critical areas. The increases requested for FY 1993 are again very modest in terms of the work proposed and the accomplishments to date, but they represent a sizable percentage increase because the base was so small. The requested FY 1993 increases are comparatively large since we are providing answers to critical questions about the effects of global change on terrestrial and marine ecosystems - answers which no other group of researchers, either inside or outside government, has the experience to provide. These results are deemed essential by

planners and policymakers, as established by numerous high-level science planning and review bodies, such as the National Academy of Sciences. The requested increases are the minimum necessary to ensure the long-term viability which is essential to success in global change research.

Question 24: Please provide for the record the number of additional FTE's by program area that would be required if the requested funding level were approved by Congress?

Answer: Following is a breakdown of the requested additional FTE's by program area that would be required if the requested funding level for Global Change research were approved by Congress:

<u>Bureau/Program</u>	<u>Additional Workyears Requested for FY 1993</u>
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory	4
Smithsonian Tropical Research Inst.	9
Internat'l Forest Dynamic Project (2 FTEs)	
Paleoecology Program (3 FTEs)	
Canopy Biology Program (4 FTEs)	
Smithsonian Environmental Research Ctr.	7
National Zoological Park	5
Internat'l Environmental Science Pgm.	5
IESP/Global Change Research at SERC (4 FTEs)	
East African Savanna Ecosystem Studies (1 FTE)	
National Museum of Natural History	7
Earth History Program (3 FTEs)	
Biodiversity Program (3 FTEs)	
Human Ecological History (1 FTE)	
National Air and Space Museum	<u>2</u>

39

Question 25: How would the Institution's temperate and tropical zone forest research relate to the research that the Forest Service and other agencies are involved in? What coordination efforts occur? Are memorandums of understanding in place?

Answer: The Global Change research projects conducted by the Smithsonian differ substantially from those within the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The Forest Service focuses its research on temperate forests, primarily coniferous forests, with the goals of developing management strategies to achieve reforestation of deforested land and preservation of existing forests. With its management orientation, the USFS uses its research for purposes of applied training in the areas of reclamation of degraded lands, effects of forest fires, and forest management, with less emphasis on basic research.

In contrast, the Smithsonian's global change program emphasizes basic research. At the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI), for example, researchers are studying the long-term dynamics and ecological processes of primary or old secondary forests. The program at STRI aims to acquire a basic understanding of how intact tropical forests work as ecological systems interacting with indigenous people. Among the areas of basic research are plant physiology, canopy biology, and plant-animal interactions. Other scientific research into global change at the Smithsonian includes research into atmospheric composition; desertification in Africa; ecosystem composition and functions in coral reefs; interactions between global carbon dioxide and temperature changes in the past, and their influence on communities of organisms living then; and means of conserving and reintroducing selected endangered species, among others.

Global Change research at the Smithsonian complements, rather than duplicates, research performed by Federal agencies. This is ensured by the coordination of projects through the Subcommittee on Earth and Environmental Sciences of the Federal Coordinating Council on Science, Engineering, and Technology (FCCSET). A very high degree of coordination between the Smithsonian and agencies involved in the U.S. Global Change Research Program is assured by the intensive review process of the Committee on Earth and Environmental Sciences (CEES), which is based on formal agreements regarding division of responsibilities for different problem areas. In addition the National Academy of Sciences, through its Committee on Global Change Research (soon to be a Board of the National Research Council), provides high-level review from the entire scientific community.

Environmental Research Center and Land Acquisition

Question 26: The Smithsonian Institution is proposing an initial request of \$500,000 for land acquisition in the Rhode River tidal river system in the Chesapeake Bay region. The Smithsonian Environmental Research Center plans to use a combination of outright purchases, easements, and protective covenants to protect a series of key land parcels on the upper watershed. The Institution proposes to acquire about 500 acres of the lower watershed and 3,000 acres of the upper watershed.

What is the status of the authorizing legislation allowing the Institution to purchase this land with federal funds?

Answer: The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration held a hearing on S.1598, the authorizing legislation, on February 26th.

House Report 102-456, Part 1, on the companion bill in the House, H.R.2757, was filed by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation on April 17, 1992. The Committee amended the bill to authorize appropriations for Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994 only. On November 13, 1991, the Committee on House Administration, to which the measure also had been referred, ordered it reported, amended to authorize funding to begin in Fiscal Year 1993 instead of 1992. The Committee on House Administration has agreed to support the version reported by the Public Works committee.

Question 27: Has the Smithsonian purchased land in the past with Federal funding? Under what authorization were the lands acquired?

Answer: No current land holdings at the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center in Edgewater, Maryland have been purchased with Federal funding.

Question 28: How many acres would be purchased with the \$500,000?

Answer: Approximately 120 acres would be purchased with the \$500,000 requested Federal funding and matching trust funds.

Question 29: How many acres would be purchased in future years? What would the estimated cost be?

Answer: About 1,900 acres need protection. Much of this additional land may be protected with easements, but the Institution's current estimate is that it will be necessary to purchase about 1,000 acres. The cost of acquisition would be between \$8 to \$12 million (FY 1992 dollars) to be shared equally between Federal and non-Federal funds.

Question 30: Why should the Smithsonian manage this property rather than one of the land managing agencies - such as the Fish and Wildlife Service?

Answer: These lands are used for intensive, long-term ecological research on air/land/water interactions in the Chesapeake Bay region. The detailed, specialized, basic research conducted at the site by Smithsonian staff differs from the mandate given to the Fish and Wildlife Service and thus makes it more efficient for the Smithsonian to manage the land locally. The management of these lands by Smithsonian will build upon the close relations that have been established with local landowners and leasers over the years. This relationship is important in order to attain the land use patterns necessary for the research program.

Exhibit - "Etiquette of the Undercaste"

Question 31: The exhibit, Etiquette of the Undercaste, recently visited (February 14 - April 15) at the Experimental Gallery which is located in the Arts and Industries building. The exhibit was intended to allow visitors to experience the environment of homelessness. Entry to the exhibit was made by requiring visitor to lie down on a morgue drawer, symbolizing dying. The visitor was then to be reborn into a new life of homelessness, first as a child, then as an adult.

A newspaper article describing the homeless exhibit stated that no Federal dollars would be used for the exhibition. How was the exhibit funded? Why was this method chosen?

Answer: The exhibition, "Etiquette of the Undercaste," designed and produced by Antenna Theater, attempts to re-create the realities of the plight of homeless people through authentic taped interviews and theatrical staging. It is an interactive maze in which the visitor becomes the actor.

"Etiquette of the Undercaste" was an opportunity to experiment with ways to enhance museum education through the visitor's personal experience. It compelled the visitor to active rather than passive participation. The exhibition created a physical format which provides personal interaction through its sculptural use of space and audio. The script for the exhibition is a collage of real life interviews, narration, sound effects, and music that serve as the primary interpretive strategy for the exhibition's content and message.

All exhibitions presented in the Experimental Gallery are supported by nonappropriated Trust funds. "Etiquette of the Undercaste" was supported by funds from the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Freed Foundation. These foundations provided grants to the Experimental Gallery because they felt that it was important to provide museum visitors with alternative means of understanding current social issues. By allowing exhibit makers to address issues which are usually only presented by the news media, the Experimental Gallery hoped to encourage visitors to look at subjects differently, and to become more informed about contemporary national and global concerns.

Question 32: How much has been spent on the Experimental Gallery to date - from trust funds and from appropriated funds?

Answer: The Experimental Gallery is a special initiative which is funded with nonappropriated funds. To date, the Institution has spent \$647,322.41 in nonappropriated Trust funds on the Experimental Gallery. These funds have supported the costs of

an eighteen month planning process; renovation and equipment for the exhibition area; and ongoing operational costs for hosting exhibitions which include shipping, insurance, installation and deinstallation, public programs, printing and exhibit rental costs. The Experimental Gallery does not provide funding for the development, nor pre-development research for the exhibitions presented. Trust fund support is from foundation grants as well as from the Institution's Special Exhibition Fund and the Educational Outreach Fund.

Initial planning funds (FY 1989 - FY 1990):

Rockefeller Foundation	\$150,000
The Morris and Gwendolyn Cafritz Foundation	58,000
SI Special Exhibition Fund	<u>150,000</u>
Subtotal	\$358,000

Current funds (FY 1991 - 1992):

Rockefeller Foundation	75,000
Pew Charitable Trusts*	600,000
American Psychological Association*	150,000
Nathan Cummings Foundation	50,000
Elizabeth Freed Foundation	15,000
SI Women's Committee	3,000
SI Educational Outreach Fund	4,500
SI Special Exhibition Fund	<u>100,000</u>
Subtotal	997,500

TOTAL \$1,355,500

* Reflects total grant received for a three year grant commitment

Question 33: What is the projected total cost of the Experimental Gallery?

Answer: To date, we have raised \$1,355,500 to support the Experimental Gallery.

Question 34: Will the Experimental Gallery be continued after FY 1992?

Answer: The Experimental Gallery is a three-year initiative, which began its exhibition program in February 1991. Funding has already been raised to carry the program past FY 1992, although no exhibits have been booked beyond "Kids Bridge" which opens in calendar year 1993. The Institution will be evaluating the Gallery's future over this period.

Question 35: What exhibits have appeared in the Gallery? Which exhibits were supported by trust funds?

Answer: A list of exhibitions to date is included. All exhibitions were supported by nonappropriated Trust funds dollars, as indicated in the above funding information. The Experimental Gallery does not develop its own exhibitions, but provides space for other exhibit makers to create, innovate, explore, and experiment with the exhibition development process, audience and access, exhibition context, and technique and style.

Experimental Gallery Exhibition Schedule

Casitas: An Urban Cultural Alternative

Developed by the Bronx Council on the Arts (Bronx, NY)

Exhibition Dates: February 1, 1991 - June 30, 1991

Exhibition description:

This exhibition depicted casitas, a Caribbean architectural form and the uses of this form by the Puerto-Rican community in Puerto Rico and in the Bronx. Constructed by Latinos from the community, these small houses are used by the community for social gatherings and special occasions.

The Casitas exhibit had English and Spanish labels. It was designed to attract the local Latino community which comprise less than two percent of the Institution's audience. Public programs designed for children (grades K - 5) and adults included instrument-making, mask making (vejigantes), Puerto-Rican traditional cooking and musical forms (salsa and Merenque).

In the exhibit, the curator and the object makers of casita builders worked as a team to tell the story of casitas and what they mean, how they are used and where they originated.

"Casitas" was an artist's installation about a folk art phenomenon in New York. Betti-Sue Hertz developed the larger installation/exhibition after having tested a smaller version in a group exhibition prior to submitting her application. The exhibition attempted an abstraction of the role, function and appearance of casitas rather than a folklife recreation.

Project Face to Face

Developed by Project Face to Face (San Francisco, CA)

Exhibition Dates: February 1, 1991 - April 1, 1991

Exhibition description:

Project Face to Face targeted local teenagers and college students. It was an exhibition of life masks of people from all walks of life with AIDS. This hands-on exhibition used tape recorded life stories of men and women, professionals and indigent. It was designed to demonstrate to adolescents and young adults that they are not immortal and that anyone can get AIDS. Important development issues for adolescents and young adults included: sexual roles, death and religion, independence and dependence, and punishment and consequences.

We celebrated Project Face to Face for its creative solution to the issue of accessibility. This exhibit was easily mounted in many types of spaces, from small informal settings to museums. In delivering a message to the public, it used tapes recorded simply and honestly to tell a story about mortality and AIDS. The goal of this exhibition was to instill compassion in visitors for people living with the HIV virus. Based on the visitor comments, the exhibition achieved this goal and the techniques used might be applicable to any subject area where compassion is an intended outcome.

Principles of Flight

Developed by the National Air and Space Museum

Exhibition Dates: February 1, 1991 - May 30, 1991

Exhibition description

The Air and Space Museum is developing its first hands-on interactive exhibit gallery to help audiences understand how planes fly. Their try-out included a series of exhibition components in the Experimental Gallery which allowed visitors to manipulate and touch objects to demonstrate how gravity works; how wind current works with wing structures to allow for take-off and landing; and

other principles of understanding flight. Each one of the try-outs allowed audiences to comment on whether the exhibition components increased the understanding of flight.

In preparation for its upcoming gallery, "Principles of Flight", the National Air and Space Museum (NASM) used this exhibition opportunity to test the durability of interactive exhibitions in high museum visitorship. They experimented with noise control and on the reliability of its mechanics. Since the try-out here, NASM has continued to experiment with these components and with exhibition text, including the name of the new gallery.

Brazil/New York Oxygen Share

Developed by Jonas dos Santos (Philadelphia, PA)
Exhibition Dates: April 17, 1991 - July 7, 1991

Exhibition description:

This exhibition was an artists' installation of images and colors derived from Amazonian aesthetics and symbols. It had minimal exhibition text to encourage visitors to learn and empathize with the beauty of the rain forest visually rather than literally. Dos Santos interpreted these images as an outsider of the culture. Public programs for the exhibition were to include performance pieces developed around the same theme by the artist.

The environment and energy conservation have had a significant impact on our daily lives. Though scientists and scholars have attempted to shape our understanding, behaviors and attitudes about waste and environmental issues, it is sometimes difficult to relate to the destruction of environments on other continents such as the Amazonian Rain Forest in Brazil. Brazil Via New York/Oxygen Share allowed the artist to tell his story about the need for urgent attention and care for the Rain Forest through objects, images and emotions.

Crossroads/Footprints/Dreamkeeper

Developed by the State University of New York College at Fredonia (Fredonia, NY)
Exhibition Dates: June 3, 1991 - July 7, 1991

Exhibition description:

The series of three channel video/audio installations was to have explored African/Diaspora symbolic language. The purpose in developing the exhibition was to interpret a body of symbols expressing qualities, relationships, phenomena and activities which have persisted during the diaspora. These symbols connect the mundane tangible world to the unseen worlds, lives and forces.

The actual exhibition shown was different from the exhibition materials selected by the committee. Rather, the exhibition showed works in progress around the same theme. These works included video images of men and women in traditional dress from Burkina Faso, in the nude and with various movements, accompanied by music and human sounds. Visitors were asked if they understood and liked the message and imagery of the presentation. Many people responded favorably to the exhibition, but very few grasped the key meaning of the installation.

World Wall: A Vision of the Future Without Fear

Developed by the Social and Public Art Resource Center (SPARC) (Venice, CA)
Exhibition Dates: July 12, 1991 - September 3, 1991

Exhibition description:

This exhibition contained six murals by Chicana artist, Judith Baca, based on the theme "Visions of the Future Without Fear". This world tour was designed to include contemporary murals by artists from Finland and Russia. In the "Great Wall", Baca's mile long mural in California, she worked with teams of artists and youth to depict the history of inter-racial struggle among youths who frequented the site.

The Good, the Bad and The Cuddly: Human Attitudes Toward Animals
Developed by the National Zoological Park

Exhibition Dates: September 15, 1991 - November 3, 1991

Exhibition description:

The Zoo developed an exhibition, in conjunction with the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibitions Service (SITES), to examine the ways in which non-traditional zoo-going audiences perceive animals. This hands-on exhibit targeted children and adults who do not ordinarily go to zoos and included opportunities to look at common every day interactions with animals. In this exhibition try-out, the Zoo installed component mock-ups and interviewed children and adults to incorporate their interests and experiences in the exhibit content. They worked with family groups from different ethnic and cultural groups in Washington to explore how culture affects the subject area.

This exhibition try-out helped the National Zoological Park to better serve its audiences as this exhibition travels around the country through SITES. Audience participation helped shape the exhibition design and educational programs and audience development. Additionally, this exhibition try-out changed staff perceptions of non-zoo-going and zoo-going audiences.

Finding Your Way: A Historical and Interactive Approach to Navigating

Developed by the Exploratorium (San Francisco, CA)

Exhibition Dates: November 11, 1991 - January 31, 1992

Exhibition description:

This prototype for an exhibit presents the ideas and apparatus of navigation at the personal, technological and historical level. The curator tested low-tech interactive exhibition components for a cross-cultural exploration into the ways people get from one place to another. This exhibition included experimentation with use of navigation instruments to plot direction, as well as physical activities that necessitated the participant acting on directions. This exhibition had implications for the smallest child who must find his/her way to and from school to airline pilots and space navigators.

The Exploratorium has a reputation for being one of the finest interactive physical and natural science museums in the world. This museum has mastered the creation of hands-on interactive exhibit components which can be simply made with inexpensive, easily replaced materials.

Powers of Ten

Developed by Awad Astronomical Models, Inc. (New York, NY)

Exhibition Dates: November 23, 1991 - January 24, 1992

Exhibition description:

The purpose of this exhibition was to increase public understanding of astronomy; specifically, the sizes of, locations of and distances between celestial objects in the universe. With this scale model of the universe, the exhibitors hoped to achieve a number of goals:

- increasing the awareness of the Earth's position in the solar system;
- explaining the mathematical concept of the "Power of Ten";
- creating a basic understanding of the vastness of space within the universe;
- giving museum visitors a visual experience of the Universe that goes beyond the two dimensionality of books and video, into the actual three dimensional form of the real physical universe.

While at the Experimental Gallery, the exhibitors tested the effectiveness of the exhibition text in creating a broader understanding of the basic principles involved in the understanding of elements of astronomical science. This is the third prototype of this exhibition, consisting of vertical wall modules, arranged in linear fashion. The modules, as well as the exhibition text, were tested and re-arranged if necessary according to the data collected from visitor evaluation. Currently (May, 1992), the exhibition is at the Maryland Science Center.

Etiquette of the Undercaste

Developed by Antenna Theater (Sausalito, CA)

Exhibition Dates: February 14, 1992 - April 15, 1992

Exhibition description:

Antenna Theater has created an installation exhibition which uses space, angles, and audio interpretation to help people better understand the process of poverty and homelessness. Each segment of the exhibition recreates an abstraction of the realities of the homeless including soup kitchens, park benches, cheap hotels and prison. Visitors were given a tape recorder and headphones which cued them on how to proceed through the space. Because only one visitor at a time could enter the exhibit space, access to children of certain ages, who were not accompanied by an adult, was restricted.

This exhibition really challenged the notion of exhibit design and access for museum audiences. It provided a model for audiences, in their role as active participants in the exhibition experience. With the assistance of a MacIntosh computer, Antennae Theater created this design to manipulate the visitor in to gaining a greater understanding about living with limited choices.

Understanding Ourselves and Each Other Association

Developed by the American Psychological Association
(Washington, D. C.)

Exhibition Dates: May 18, 1992 - September 8, 1992

Exhibition description:

"Understanding Ourselves and Each Other: Psychology's Search" has a hands-on, participatory format which introduces research on basic psychological processes underlying everyday thoughts,

feelings, and actions. Each unit of this 4000 square foot exhibit is designed to encourage children and adults to interact with the many facets of psychology as a science.

Participants may explore the ways in which the mind works in the play space, an interactive, hands-on section of the exhibit which allows adults and children to play together. The exhibition features 10 - 15 discovery boxes which contain guided activities for children to explore memory and forgetting, problem solving, prejudice, counting and measuring, facial expressions, anatomy and physiology.

This exhibition was selected because it uses high tech equipment such as computers and video discs with low tech exhibition components such as the play space and the discovery boxes. It provides an opportunity for our audiences to learn more about the science of psychology while learning about themselves.

Kids Bridge

Developed by The Children's Museum (Boston, MA)

Exhibition dates: September 28, 1992 - March 1, 1993

Exhibition description:

Kids Bridge is a hands-on interactive exhibition from the Boston Children's Museum which allows children to explore issues about race, ethnicity, identity and racism. The Experimental Gallery will partner with SITES to develop a traveling version of the exhibition, which will be tested in its first venue as a traveling show at the Experimental Gallery. Activities include places for children to draw their portraits and display their work; play with toys and games from many cultures and to go on a scavenger hunt in different ethnic neighborhoods for special toys, games and clothing. Local children will be asked to help in the construction of the exhibition by using doll house furniture and dolls in constructing rooms for special ethnic celebrations (Kwanzaa, Passover, Dia de las Muertos, etc.). The exhibition also includes an interactive video disc program which allows children to explore what happens when they or their peers are the victims of racism.

The Children's Museum has developed an exhibition which allows children to address sensitive, difficult social issues. It uses hands-on exhibition components which allow children and parents to learn about how families are different and similar to each other, as well as what happens when people become victims and practitioners of racism.

Legal Fee Payment

Question 36: There have been a series of Washington Post articles regarding the payment of legal fees which were incurred by a Smithsonian scientist who has been investigated for the past 3 years because of his activities involving big-game hunters.

I understand that the Smithsonian has agreed to pay a portion of the legal fees. Is that correct?

Answer: Yes. In June 1988 the Smithsonian agreed to pay the legal fees incurred by the scientist as a result of these continuing investigations, as they related to his Smithsonian responsibilities.

Question 37: What is the total cost that you have decided to pay? What is the total bill?

Answer: The total bill to the Smithsonian for legal fees incurred from June 1988 to April 1991 (when the agreement was terminated) is \$418,000. As of December 1991, the Smithsonian had an outstanding obligation under this agreement of \$134,000. An audit of these remaining charges is presently being carried out. At the end of December 1991, \$67,000 of this amount was paid subject to refund of any amount disallowed as a result of the audit. The remaining \$67,000 has not yet been paid.

Question 38: Why did the Smithsonian decide to pay the legal fees?

Answer: The Revised Indemnification Resolution, which was adopted by the Board of Regents in 1982, provides for the payment of legal expenses of Smithsonian employees arising from the performance of their official duties. It was determined in June 1988, and reaffirmed thereafter, that this case met the criteria set forth in the Revised Indemnification Resolution. The resolution is as follows:

REVISED INDEMNIFICATION RESOLUTION

Every person who is or was a member of the Board of Regents or an officer or employee of the Smithsonian, or of any other corporation or entity in which he served as such as part of his official Smithsonian duties, may in accordance with the second paragraph of this Resolution be indemnified by the Smithsonian against any and all liability and reasonable expense that may be incurred by him in connection with or resulting from any claim, action, suit or proceeding (whether brought by or in the right of the Smithsonian or such other corporation or entity or otherwise), civil or criminal, administrative or investigative, or in connection with an appeal relating thereto, in which he may be involved, as a party or otherwise, by reason of his being or having been a member of the Board of Regents or an officer or employee of the Smithsonian or such other corporation or entity, or by reason of any action taken or not taken in his capacity as such member of the Board of Regents or officer or employee, whether or not he continues to be such at the time such liability or expense shall have been incurred, provided such person acted, in good faith, in what he reasonably believed to be the best interests of the Smithsonian or such other corporation or entity, as the case may be, and, in addition, in any criminal action or proceeding, had no reasonable cause to believe that his conduct was unlawful. As used in this Resolution, the terms "liability" and "expense" shall include, but shall not be limited to, counsel fees and disbursements and amounts of judgments, fines or penalties against, and amounts paid in settlement by a member of the Board of Regents or officer or employee. The termination of any claim, action, suit or proceeding, civil or criminal, by judgment, settlement (whether with or without court approval), conviction or upon a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, or its equivalent, shall not create a presumption that a member of the Board of Regents or officer or employee did not meet the standards of conduct set forth in this paragraph.

Every person referred to in the first paragraph of this Resolution who has been successful, on the merits or otherwise, with respect to any claim, action, suit or proceeding of the character described in such first paragraph shall be entitled to indemnification as of

right. Except as provided in the preceding sentence, any indemnification under such first paragraph may be made by the Board or by a committee of the Board in its discretion, but only if either (i) the Board or such committee, acting by a quorum consisting of persons who were not parties to (or who have been wholly successful with respect to) such claim, action, suit or proceeding, shall have found that the member of the Board of Regents or officer or employee has met the applicable standards of conduct set forth in such first paragraph or (ii) if there be no such disinterested quorum, independent legal counsel shall have delivered to the Smithsonian written advice to the effect that in their judgment such applicable standard has been met.

Expenses incurred with respect to any claim, action, suit or proceeding of the character described in the first paragraph of this Resolution may be advanced by the Smithsonian prior to the final disposition thereof upon receipt of an undertaking (which need not be secured) by or on behalf of the member of the Board of Regents or officer or employee to repay such amount unless it shall ultimately be determined that he is entitled to indemnification by the Smithsonian.

The rights of indemnification provided in this Resolution shall be in addition to any other rights to which any such member of the Board of Regents or officer or employee may otherwise be entitled by contract, vote of the Board or otherwise or as a matter of law; and in the event of any such person's death, such right shall extend to his heirs and legal representatives.

The provisions of this Resolution shall apply to members of Regents Committees and Smithsonian advisory bodies and to Regents Emeritus. The right of indemnification for official service with outside organizations shall be limited to service as a member of the Board of such organization.

Question 39: What funding source is being used to pay the legal fees?

Answer: Since the scientist was an employee paid from appropriated funds, the amount of \$284,000 of the legal fees for his defense was originally paid from appropriated funds. In deference to the recommendations of the House Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration at its hearing on March 4, 1992, and the views of the General Accounting Office, this amount has been repaid to the U.S. Treasury from the non-appropriated trust funds of the Smithsonian. The payment of \$67,000 in December 1991 was made with trust funds.

Question 40: What is the status of the investigation?

Answer: After four years of investigations, no specific charges have, as yet, been formally stated.

Question 41: Do you anticipate that the Smithsonian will pay any additional legal fees associated with this case?

Answer: The second paragraph of the Revised Indemnification Resolution, reprinted above, provides that:

"Every person referred to in the first paragraph of this Resolution who has been successful, on the merits or otherwise,

with respect to any claim, action, suit, or proceeding of the character described in such first paragraph shall be entitled to indemnification as of right."

The review and determination of any such claim to indemnification as of right at the end of the proceeding will be made by the Board of Regents, applying the criteria set forth in the first paragraph of the Resolution. It is possible that such a claim will be made in this case.

Repair and Restoration of Buildings

Question 42: The Smithsonian is requesting \$24.4 million for Repair and Restoration of Buildings in FY 1993. Your budget justification points out that the current backlog of unfunded projects is \$221 million. Mr. Adams, in reading your prepared statement I find that "\$39.0 million annually over the next decade will be needed to bring the backlog of repairs under control."

Why was your request to OMB for only \$36.5 million rather than \$39.0 million?

Answer: The Institution requested \$36.5 million for the Repair and Restoration of Buildings program in the FY 1993 budget presented to the Office of Management and Budget. At the time, August 1991, the request for FY 1992 pending before Congress totalled \$31.6 million. If funding had been received at that level, and OMB subsequently allowed the requested level for FY 1993, the Institution projected that future funding of \$35 million annually would have been sufficient to bring the backlog down to a manageable level within the next ten years. However, the FY 1992 appropriation was reduced to \$24.4 million, and the OMB allowance assumed a no-growth level based on the FY 1992 appropriation.

Because of the FY 1992 reduction, the January 1992 backlog total has climbed from the 1991 level of \$216 million to \$221 million. The Smithsonian is in effect pushing a greater "bow wave" of work forward. The staff now estimates that the Institution will need a consistently higher level of funding (\$39 million compared to previous estimates of \$35 million) for the next ten years to provide a comparable level of resources to bring the backlog down to a manageable level.

Question 43: What will be foregone at the \$24.4 million level that would have been accomplished at the Smithsonian's requested level of \$36.5 million?

Answer: The following repair projects that would have been accomplished at the Smithsonian's requested level of \$36.5 million will be forgone at the \$24.4 million level.

- Repairing an elevator to improve safety and reliability at the American Indian Research Branch in New York City.
- Patching of miscellaneous holes in fire walls at the American History building.
- Repairing miscellaneous facade and terrace problems at the American History building, including installing handicap ramps and curb cuts, resetting heaving granite curbs, replacing ice melting equipment, repairing the fountain.
- Improving sanitation at the American History loading dock by studying alternative locations for the trash compactor.
- Preventing further deterioration of finishes and restoring surfaces in the Rotunda of the Natural History building.

- Improving security at the Natural History building by further separating public and staff areas, which includes new security doors, card reader systems, electric locks, and surveillance cameras.
- Expanding the women's rest room, constructing a unisex rest room for the handicapped, and restoring the men's rest room in the north lobby of the Natural History building.
- Installing conduit for communication cabling in the Smithsonian Institution building.
- Repairing copper roof valleys, skylight leaks, and windows in the Arts and Industries building.
- Repainting of the garage level at the Air and Space building, including scraping and painting of corroding metal areas.
- Improving security at the Air and Space building by installing a system to detect elevator movement when the building is closed.
- Repointing and sealing of masonry, replacing substandard partitions, and repainting the attic area in the Freer Gallery.
- Replacing deteriorated, unsafe metal storage sheds at the Environmental Research Center in Edgewater, Maryland.
- Replacing boilers that have reached their useful life span at the Environmental Research Center.
- Improving safety and access by paving a portion of roadway between the Mt. Hopkins gate and the ridge observatory complex at the Whipple Observatory in Arizona
- Providing a weather tight exhibition area by repairing leaking metal work in the Conservatory at the Cooper-Hewitt Museum in New York City.
- Repairing and widening of roads around the Museum Support Center in Suitland, Maryland
- Improving safety by providing a better means of egress from the upper levels of the "pods" at the Museum Support Center.
- Installing lightning protection at the Air and Space building, American Art and Portrait Gallery, and the American History building.
- Repairing miscellaneous grounds, sidewalks and parking lot problems; accessibility problems; and asbestos problems throughout the Smithsonian's facilities.

Air and Space Museum Extension

Question 44: The FY 1993 President's Budget requests \$1.0 million to begin detailed planning and design of the Air and Space Museum Extension. In FY 1990, the Smithsonian selected a site at Washington Dulles International Airport for the Extension. In FY 1991, the Board of Regents concurred in a recommendation to reduce the original scope of the Extension. A total of \$162 million is the estimated cost of the facility as it is now envisioned.

What is the current status of the pending authorizing legislation for the Extension (page 236 of budget justification)? Does this legislation specify site location?

Answer: S.289, authorizing planning for an extension at Washington Dulles International Airport and the appropriation of \$9 million, was reported by the Senate Rules and Administration Committee on October 4, 1991. It is currently pending on the Senate calendar.

The Extension concept was reviewed by the House Public Works Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds on June 26, 1991. The Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration, to which the bill was referred upon introduction, held a hearing June 30th on H.R.2756, the companion to S.289, which specifically identifies Washington Dulles International Airport as the location of the Extension.

On October 23rd the Subcommittee ordered reported H.R.3281, the National Air and Space Museum Expansion Site Selection Act. The bill, which the Institution opposes, establishes a Site Selection Advisory Panel whose members are to include four citizens, two of whom must reside and work west of the Mississippi River, appointed by the leadership of the Senate and the House acting jointly; four Members of Congress, appointed individually by the leadership of the House and Senate; and one representative of the Smithsonian.

The panel is to obtain proposals for expansion sites in a nationwide competition and develop and promulgate criteria for site evaluation. However, it may address the Extension's proximity to the Mall only in terms of administrative and curatorial advantages. The panel is to complete its work within 12 months of enactment and to terminate within 30 days of the Regents' consideration of the panel's recommendation and selection of a site. The full Committee on House Administration has taken no action on either bill.

Question 45: There have been other thoughts as to the location of the facility. While I would love to have the National Air and Space Museum Extension located in my own State of Oklahoma, do you believe these are realistic considerations? Why?

Answer: The National Air and Space Museum Extension is needed to replace the Museum's current storage facilities at the Garber Facility in Suitland, Maryland and to provide adequate support services for the Museum on the National Mall, the most visited museum in the world. NASM needs exhibition preparation shops and airplane and spacecraft restoration shops that are adequately housed and within a one-hour travel time from the Mall museum. At the moment these facilities are in 1940's and 1950's vintage temporary shelters with no temperature or humidity control, often leaky roofs, and openings through which birds and insects can enter to nest in the stored artifacts. The Museum needs improved storage facilities to house artifacts that are not currently on exhibition at the Museum on the Mall or out on loan to another museum elsewhere in the country.

In addition, the NASM Extension is essential to enable the Smithsonian to house, under adequate cover, airplanes and spacecraft too large to move from an airport into the Museum in downtown Washington or into any other facility outside of an airport site. The airport in question must have runways long enough to land the largest airplanes now in existence and in particular the Shuttle Enterprise on the back of a Boeing 747--the only way the Shuttle can be transported.

Given the requirement for support to the Mall Museum, the National Air and Space Museum extension must be as close to the Mall as is practical. Therefore, the suggestions of locating the extension in another area of the country, such as in Oklahoma, are not based on realistic considerations.

Question 46: I would note along these same lines in the February 1992 Proceedings of the Board of Regents Meeting comments were included regarding how the Cooper-Hewitt Museum (in New York City) is disadvantaged by its distance from central services.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of having the facility located away from the National Air and Space Museum?

Answer: The components of the completed Extension as envisioned consist of exhibition hangars to house the greater part of the national collection of air and spacecraft, including the largest aircrafts; a Study Collection Facility for dense housing of the rest of the collection; a Restoration and Exhibits Production Hangar and an Archival Resource and Research Center; an Exhibit Gallery to house the B-29 Enola Gay; a theater/ auditorium; facilities for meetings, visitor services and education support; and related office and building services space.

Moving the storage, exhibition preparation shops and artifact restoration shops to a remote site will threaten the ability of the current museum to survive. The Mall Museum's exhibits are continuously serviced for maintenance; exhibitions are rotated frequently and require a resident staff; and restorations of aircraft need to be carried out in proximity to curators who also are in charge of the collections.

While locating some parts of the Smithsonian at various sites across the country may be highly desirable, the separation of exhibition from supporting services space or the division of collections and support of a popular and complex museum will dilute the overall impact of and accessibility to its collections. Furthermore, separation will escalate operating costs and lead to duplication in construction and other expenditures. The greater the distance, the greater the cost.

National Museum of the American Indian

Question 47: Secretary Adams, the National Museum of the American Indian is identified in "Choosing the Future" (the 5-year prospectus for FY 1992-1996) for a FY 1993 need of \$6.4 million for the Mall Museum building. The \$6.4 million amount, which was requested by the Smithsonian, was denied by OMB.

For what was the \$6.4 million intended?

Answer: The \$6.4 million, which was in the Smithsonian's initial FY 1993 request to OMB, was for design of the Mall Museum building of the National Museum of the American Indian.

Question 48: What will the consequences be, if the \$6.4 million is not provided for FY 1993?

Answer: The Institution's FY 1992 appropriation included \$970,000 included to initiate design of the Mall Museum building. The Smithsonian's FY 1993 request to the Office of Management and Budget sought \$6,350,000, the remainder of the funds required for design. However, OMB decided to defer the additional Mall Museum design funding until FY 1994. As a result, although the Smithsonian is ready to advertise for design services for the Mall Museum facility, and has committed the \$970,000 for those services, a design contract may not be executed this year because without the prospect of additional funds for design in FY 1993, awarding a contract now could create detrimental interruptions in the design process. As only a modest amount of work could be done with funds available, completion would have to await funding in more distant fiscal years.

The delay in funding not only will delay design, the initiation of construction, and the opening of the Mall Museum by one year, but also will have a significant and negative impact on the NMAI National Campaign fund-raising efforts which are currently underway. At the present time, the National Campaign is faced with the extremely difficult task of trying to raise funds solely on the basis of a vision for a national institution that will give all Americans the opportunity to learn about the historical traditions and contemporary cultures of Native Americans. Sustaining that vision without concept renderings of the Museum on the Mall, and extending the public expectation for its opening beyond the year 2000, will place extraordinary burdens on the Campaign and impede its success.

Question 49: What is the minimum level of funding needed which would allow planning and design activities to get underway in FY 1993? What could be done with this amount of funding?

Answer: The Smithsonian's Office of Design and Construction has indicated that if \$2 million were available in FY 1993, the Smithsonian would be able to proceed with the selection process for a designer and award a design contract later this year. Utilizing the results of the Mall Museum architectural programming study that will be completed this Fall, the designer could proceed in FY 1993 with the development of concepts and preliminary design work, which would be completed when the balance of funding (\$4,350,000), expected to be requested in Fiscal Year 1994, becomes available.

Oklahoma Indian Cultural Center

Question 50: As you may be aware Mr. Secretary, Oklahoma's Indian tribes, numbering more than 40, are currently working to develop an Indian Cultural Center to be located in Oklahoma City. The proposed Center will highlight each tribe's history and culture, including the stories of their removal to Indian Territory, which is now the State of Oklahoma. These stories have not adequately been told; the proposed cultural center would allow the tribes a unique opportunity to educate the American public about the rich history and culture of the American Indian.

As you know, tribes now living in Oklahoma originally roamed and lived in every State in the lower forty-eight. Their cultures represent and reflect those native lands from which they were removed. Considering the National Museum of the American Indian and considering the national significance and importance of an Indian Cultural Center representing the removed tribes, what role would the Smithsonian Institution be willing to play in assisting in the establishment of the Oklahoma Indian Cultural Center?

Answer: Collections in both the National Museum of the American Indian and the National Museum of Natural History contain significant resources which, assuming appropriate conditions, could be loaned to the Oklahoma Indian Cultural Center once a facility is established.

In addition, Section 10 of P.L. 101-185, the National Museum of the American Indian Act, encourages the Smithsonian to give priority to Indian organizations in entering into agreements with museums and other educational and cultural organizations to lend artifacts; sponsor traveling exhibitions; and provide training and technical assistance. Within that authority, as well as the Institution's traditional role in working with other museums and cultural institutions, the Smithsonian would be glad to explore ways in which it might assist the Oklahoma Center.

Question 51: Last year President Bush signed into law authorization language (Public Law 102-196) which allows \$200,000 to be spent to carry out a study regarding the feasibility of the Oklahoma Indian Cultural Center. While the language directs the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the study, what assistance and expertise would the Smithsonian be willing to lend in determining the feasibility and in selecting potential sites for the Center?

Answer: If the Secretary of the Interior requested the assistance of the Smithsonian with respect to the study, the Institution would be glad to explore appropriate ways in which it might be helpful. However, the Institution is not in any position to determine the feasibility of entities beyond its purview, nor can it determine sites for such an initiative, decisions which must flow not only from considerations of project feasibility, but also local interests.

Field Station at Bocas Del Toro

Question 52: Consideration is being given to establishing a field station at Bocas Del, Panama, for the Tropical Research Institute. Purchase and renovation expenses for 160 acres with a house would be covered by restricted trust funds (\$20,000).

Although this is described as a small research unit, it still would require staffing, maintenance, and program support. Where will future funding come from?

Answer: In the past, field researchers had used the R.V. Benjamin research vessel as a "mobile" base for this location, but the expanded research program planned for the new research vessel (replacing the R.V. Benjamin) will preclude its use for this purpose, and therefore a land-based field station is now needed. The Bocas del Toro field station is less than 1/25th of an acre and contains a small house. The small house is adjacent to ANCON facilities (Panama's equivalent to the Nature Conservancy), which includes boats and a dock that STRI will use. The house will be used only as a base for field work in the Bocas del Toro. A part-time caretaker, periodic repairs and maintenance by STRI's facilities management are all that are presently needed to sustain this field station. STRI anticipates annual maintenance and operating expenses to be less than \$2,000. STRI expects to maintain this minimal level of operation for about three to five years, after which it will reevaluate its research needs in the area.

Question 53: Have commitments and use of trust funds, as in this example, contributed to the infrastructure and maintenance backlog shortages, which the Smithsonian faces today? Explain.

Answer: The purchase of a small house as a field station at Bocas del Toro will have a negligible effect on STRI's infrastructure and maintenance backlog shortages. The field station will allow research to continue in Bocas del Toro, a critical area in the marine and paleoecological research programs, after the loss of use of the research vessel, R. V. Benjamin, which was previously used as a mobile field camp for the ongoing studies in the Bocas del Toro region. STRI does not have a serious backlog of maintenance. The infrastructure backlog at STRI is related to long-standing deficiencies associated with current ongoing programs and has no relation to the purchase of the house.

Question 54: What is the status of this project?

Answer: The house has been purchased and is now being prepared for use in field work.

Question 55: What is meant by "restricted" trust funds?

Answer: Restricted Trust funds include gifts, grants, and endowments from individuals, foundations, organizations, and corporations that specify the use of the donation or bequest. Generally, these funds provide support for a particular exhibit or research project. Regarding the funds used for the Field Station at Bocas del Toro, the only restriction was that they be used to "support programs of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute."

Long Range Facilities Planning

Question 56: Mr. Adams, for the past several years this Committee has expressed its concern about the Smithsonian's ability to set priorities. I am told that in June 1991 a team was established to propose a new planning process for facilities expansion.

What is the status of this team? What progress has been made since it was established last June?

Answer: In November 1991, as a result of the team's work last summer, the Secretary and his management team established a Capital Program Planning Board to bring greater focus and discipline to the way in which future facilities expansion projects are brought to the Secretary's attention and ultimately to the Regents and to Congress. The Board centralizes decision making for all Smithsonian capital construction or acquisition projects, regardless of funding sources. The new Board, composed of five senior management officials including the Acting Under Secretary as chair, has begun deliberation of the currently defined capital program in light of the Institution's overall goals and priorities and economic realities.

Question 57: A major concern that has been expressed numerous times is the Smithsonian's seeming ability to use trust funds to begin projects and programs which later require support from shrinking federal funds.

How will the Capital Program Planning Board address this concern and take the deficit reduction efforts into consideration?

Answer: Although there have been no recent examples of any substantive activities begun with Trust funds that later require Federal funds, one of the reasons behind formation of the Capital Program Planning Board was the recognition that in the previous Institutional planning environment decisions often were made without full consideration of the interrelationship among projects funded from different sources. Nor did the planning process include sufficient assessment of the impact of new facilities on the Institution's program and operating infrastructure. Under the new planning process, the Capital Program Planning Board will approve all capital expansion projects only after considering of the complete range of operational implications and identification of necessary funding for operations and repair. The extra step in the approval process should bring more order to the Institution's capital program and will prevent premature commitment to projects for which continuing operating support is not available.

Decisions by the Board also will take economic realities into account before committing the Institution to long-term expenditures. Although the long-range capital development program is likely to be more ambitious than the capacity of near-term funding sources to complete, the Institution believes that it is important to continue to express accurately the full range of capital needs to support current programs and new initiatives. In

an era of shrinking resources, Institutional efforts towards meeting its facilities needs will focus on three fronts: seeking and creating opportunities for funding from the private sector; building more flexibility into the scheduling of priorities; and a careful paring and/or delaying of activities.

Question 58: A summary of the major elements and advantages/disadvantages of the new facilities planning process lists as disadvantage of the process that "the Board must adopt a global view of the Institution, its mission and goals, and be willing to make and communicate decisions about the pursuit of individual projects, or potential improvements in the planning process will be lost."

Why is this considered to be a disadvantage?

Answer: The statement is listed as a disadvantage only to emphasize that if the Board does not base its decisions regarding individual capital projects on a thorough assessment of the full range of needs and priorities that best serve the overall direction of the Institution, the new planning process will merely perpetuate problems experienced with the old way of making decisions. Similarly, if the Board merely acts as a "rubber stamp" to avoid making unpopular decisions, projects would essentially be pursued on an ad hoc basis, with planning resources wasted on development of visions that do not match program priorities or meet the highest and best use of the Institution's resources.

Question 59: What is meant by global view? Does this mean that Institution would looking at global construction opportunities?

Answer: The term global view is used to convey the Board's responsibility to consider the Institution's overall mission and long-term goals both when approving individual projects that often represent only one bureau's goals and defining priorities for facilities expansion. It is not meant to imply that the Institution will seek world-wide opportunities for construction.

Museum Support Center

Question 60: Two new collections/research centers at Suitland, MD, are being proposed for funding in the FY 1993 budget request. One facility is to house and study the Heye Foundation Collection (Indian artifacts which are currently stored in New York). The \$1.0 million request is to be used to complete design of a \$44.0 million storage facility. Completion date is targeted for FY 1997.

Another \$.5 million is requested for planning another collections/research center to ensure preservation of future collections and related research. Construction of this center would occur over the next 10 to 20 years.

Page 238 of your budget justification states that storage space in Mall museums is severely overcrowded and several museums and bureaus have moved collections into leased space in off-Mall locations.

I am told that the present Suitland Museum Support Center, which opened in 1983, is still not fully utilized. How much of the Suitland facility is currently occupied?

Answer: Currently, storage equipment has been installed in approximately 47 percent (or 203,000 sq. ft.) of the total

potential 432,000 square feet of floor space distributed among the four storage "pods" as follows:

- Pod 1 - approximately 85 percent of the floor space
- Pod 2 - approximately 40 percent of the floor space
- Pod 3 - approximately 29 percent of the floor space
- Pod 4 - approximately 38 percent of the floor space

From the Fall of 1990 through April 1, 1992, approximately 1,375 of the 8,435 new cabinets in Pods 1, 2 and 4 (16 percent) have been filled with collections. In Pod 3, collections are currently stored in 100 percent of the installed "wet" collections storage system and large storage tanks (which occupy a total of 29 percent of the floor space in the pod).

In addition, storage equipment is presently being designed/procured/installed to: (1) bring the Pod 1 total to 100 percent, (2) bring the Pod 2 total to 60 percent, and (3) bring the Pod 4 total to 88 percent. Storage equipment to furnish the remaining vacant areas in Pods 2 and 4 will continue to be procured as funds are available.

Finally, even though the collections storage space at the MSC is not completely occupied, the remaining space currently unoccupied is totally committed to those collections identified to move there from the National Museum of Natural History (NMNH) and the National Museum of American History (NMAH). Both NMNH and NMAH are working to move these collections to the MSC as quickly as possible with the MSC Move resources currently available.

Question 61: What is preventing the Museum Support Center from being fully occupied?

Answer: There are two major factors that are preventing the storage areas at the Museum Support Center from being fully occupied: (1) the lack of sufficient funding to support the expanded level of MSC move activity necessary to ensure the relocation of collections to the MSC in a timely manner; and (2) the lack of sufficient funding to complete the procurement of the remaining collections storage equipment for the MSC over the next several years. Based upon current funding availability, completion of the purchase of all collections storage equipment and the relocation of collections to the Museum Support Center will not be possible until after the year 2000.

Funding Requirements for the MSC Move - The Institution projects that at the current FY 1992 base of funding for the MSC move (\$619,000), it will take at least nine more years to complete the relocation of collections as part of the "Initial Move" to the Museum Support Center.¹ With the additional funding requested for

¹From the beginning of planning for the relocation of museum collections to the Museum Support Center, the Smithsonian has divided the move into two phases: (1) the "Initial Move" phase, during which two-thirds of the storage space would be filled at the time of the initial occupancy period; and (2) the "Growth Move" phase, during which the remaining one-third of the storage space would be filled as these collections grow. The "Initial Move" represents the systematic transfer of millions of objects from the National Museum of Natural History and a small portion of the National Museum of American History collections to the MSC over a multi-year period during the initial occupancy of the storage space. No estimate has been made of the additional funding required to support the continuing "Growth Move" activities, following the completion of the "Initial Move."

FY 1993, resulting in an expanded base level of \$871,000, it will take at least seven more years to accomplish the "Initial Move." In fact, the Institution estimates that it would require a minimum of an additional \$1 million to \$1.3 million and 36 workyears (over the FY 1993 request level) annually for a three-year period to support the expanded move activity and to prevent further delay in achieving the planned utilization of the Museum Support Center as expeditiously as possible.

Once "Growth" storage equipment is procured and installed at MSC, the funds for moving the collections to occupy this "Growth" space will be requested in order to fully utilize MSC.

Funding Requirements for MSC Collections Storage Equipment - Storage equipment to furnish the remaining vacant areas in Pods 2 and 4 will continue to be procured with the current funding base for MSC equipment (\$2.8 million) as funds are available. The collections designated to fill this equipment are now stored in compressed and other substandard spaces both on the Mall and in other storage locations. The new MSC equipment is being filled as fast as possible with the funds appropriated to the MSC Move. With additional funding for the Move, this equipment could be filled more quickly.

An increase in the level of funding for MSC equipment will be necessary to procure the storage equipment for the "Growth" areas and for the replacement of old storage cabinets in Pods 1, 2, and 4 in a timely manner. The Institution currently estimates that it will cost a total of at least \$24 million to procure the balance of the storage cabinets to fully equip Pods 1, 2, and 4, depending on the number of shelves and drawers needed to store the collections.

The procurement of the balance of the "wet" collections storage system to store specimens preserved in alcohol in Pod 3 will pose a special problem. Because of the integrated structure of the "wet" storage system, installation of new storage equipment, mechanical ducts, electrical components, sprinkler pipes, catwalks and other construction elements will cause considerable disruption to collections currently stored in this pod. Furthermore, the necessity for this new equipment to span over the existing large storage tanks on the floor makes the job even more difficult structurally. In order to minimize the disruption in Pod 3, the installation of the balance of the "wet" storage equipment must all occur at one time.

Accordingly, the Institution will not be able to procure storage equipment for the remainder of Pod 3 (71 percent) until sufficient funds, estimated at between \$7.3 million and \$9.5 million (in 1992 dollars), are available to both design and equip the remainder of this pod at one time. Following the completion of the "wet" collections storage system, additional collections of specimens stored in alcohol would be moved from the Museum of Natural History into Pod 3.

Question 62: Why are collections going into leased space rather than at the Museum Support Center? Are the collections in appropriate environmental conditions? Is it more economical to store collections in leased space?

Answer: The Smithsonian has resorted to storing collections in leased space because it does not have sufficient space in its own facilities, including the Museum Support Center (MSC), to house all of the National Collections. Moreover, even though the collections storage space at the MSC is not completely occupied, the remaining space currently unoccupied is totally committed to those collections identified to move there from the National Museum

of Natural History (NMNH) and the National Museum of American History (NMAH). While many of these collections are still in their original locations, both NMNH and NMAH are working to move these collections to the MSC as quickly as possible with the MSC Move resources currently available.

If other collections now in leased space were moved to the MSC, there would be a significant displacement of Natural History collections already scheduled to be moved. As a result, collections housed in the attics and other locations in the Natural History Building would have to remain where they are, and would then be in the way of the Major Capital Renewal Project. The current plan for implementing this major renovation of the building systems depends on the availability of these spaces for use as "swing" space, to provide temporary space for collections displaced during construction in other parts of the building. In addition, the mechanical systems serving the attics, as well as staff offices on the third floor, are located in the attics and must be replaced during the course of the Project. In the process, asbestos insulation must also be removed for life safety. This work cannot be undertaken with collections in place. Thus, if the collections are not moved to the MSC, the Major Capital Renewal Project cannot be implemented, and this could risk major failure of building equipment and systems. Failure to move collections from the Natural History Building would also further exacerbate the overall crowding of space at the Natural History Building and prevent it from addressing some of its current human safety hazards.

Other considerations that prevent the use of the MSC for other collections involve the size and nature of the different collections. While the MSC space was designed mostly for the storage of small objects in cabinets, many of the Smithsonian collections now stored in leased space are large objects which would not fit into the storage areas at MSC. In addition, Pod 3 was specially designed to store collections preserved in alcohol, a flammable liquid. It is illegal to store large amounts of combustible materials in the same area as these fluid collections. In addition, the fluid from these collections evaporates and could be absorbed by other collections stored nearby. This evaporated fluid can have deleterious effects on other types of collection objects. As a result, it is not possible to store most other types of Smithsonian collections in this Pod.

The facilities in which the Smithsonian currently leases space to house collections provide a range of environmental conditions from good to poor. For example, most of the space acquired for the Museum of American History collections at the Fullerton Industrial Park in Newington, Virginia, has been renovated to provide adequate climatic controls. The remaining space at that facility will be renovated using Alterations and Modifications funding requested in FY 1993 in the Construction account. On the other hand, space at the leased facility on North Capitol Street does not provide appropriate environmental conditions for the collections of the National Museum of American Art, the Hirshhorn Museum, the Archives of American Art, the Smithsonian Institution Archives, and the Smithsonian Institution Libraries. For the most part, the collections at this facility do not require strict climate control, but some deterioration may occur.

Use of leased space for the storage of museum collections is not an economical solution, particularly for the long term. In addition to direct costs of leasing, the Institution must make at least some minor renovations to the space to meet security, fire protection and life safety codes. These expenditures will eventually be lost when the Institution vacates the leased space.

While the Smithsonian has had to resort to storing collections in leased space as an urgently-needed short-term solution to its space

requirements, the Institution believes that the construction of an expanded Collections Research Center complex at Suitland, Maryland, is essential to provide the most efficient and economical long-term solution for its collections storage space requirements. As a result, the Institution's FY 1993 Construction request includes \$500,000 to continue to plan for the facilities required to provide appropriate environmental conditions for the Institution's collections well into the next century.

Question 63: A funding level of \$5.8 million is requested for the Museum Support Center. The Smithsonian's request to OMB was for \$12.6. For what purposes was the additional \$6.8 million requested?

Answer: The additional \$6.726 million had been requested from the Office of Management and Budget to: (1) support the expanded MSC Move activity anticipated for FY 1993 (36 workyears and \$1.245 million); (2) provide an expanded base level of funding for MSC collections storage equipment to allow the Smithsonian to procure and install the balance of the "wet" collections storage equipment in Pod 3 and/or the balance of the collections storage cabinets for Pods 2 and 4 (\$5.025 million); and (3) fund two critical MSC operating requirements -- the replacement of the 11-year-old computer which supports the MSC move and the addition of a safety coordinator (1 workyear and \$456,000). The most critical of these unfunded needs for FY 1993 is the expanded support for the Move. The second most critical need is the replacement of the computer.

Expanded Support for the MSC Move - As previously indicated above, with the current FY 1992 base of \$619,000, the Smithsonian projects that it will take at least nine more years to complete the relocation of collections as part of the "Initial Move" to the Museum Support Center. The Institution's FY 1993 request to OMB sought an increase of 46 workyears and \$1.475 million (representing an additional 36 workyears and \$1.245 million over the level requested from Congress) to support the expanded move activity required to achieve the full utilization of the MSC as expeditiously as possible.

This additional funding would allow the Institution to hire museum specialists, technicians, conservators, and administrative support staff required for the Move for FY 1993 and the following years. The specialists and technicians are needed to inspect, clean, decontaminate, invoice, stabilize, pack, transport, unpack, and place collections into permanent storage equipment at MSC. The conservators are needed to develop stabilization requirements for collections prior to their relocation, develop handling and packaging procedures, and train the Move staff to use these procedures. The administrative support staff are needed to continue the planning, coordinate the logistics, monitor the progress of the Move against the proposed schedule and revise the schedule as necessary, and procure the necessary supplies and equipment. The increase would also allow the Institution to supplement staff expertise by contracting some specialized work, such as asbestos decontamination, to outside individuals or firms, and to purchase archival supplies for permanent storage.

MSC Collections Storage Equipment - The Institution's FY 1993 request to OMB sought an increase of \$5.025 million for the procurement of MSC collections storage equipment. This additional funding would allow the Institution to accelerate its efforts to complete the two remaining unfunded storage equipment requirements for the MSC: (1) the design, purchase, and installation of the balance of the "wet" collections storage equipment for Pod 3; and (2) the purchase and installation of the balance of the collections storage cabinets for Pods 2 and 4.

As previously indicated above, the Institution estimates that the procurement of the balance of the "wet" collections storage equipment will cost between \$7.3 million and \$9.5 million (in 1992 dollars). Because of the integrated structure of the "wet" collections storage system and the significant disruption that will occur to collections already stored in Pod 3, the installation of all of this equipment must occur at one time. Therefore, the total funding required for all of the balance of the Pod 3 storage system must be available prior the initiation of its procurement.

In addition, the Institution projects that the procurement of the balance of the storage cabinets for Pods 2 and 4 will cost at least \$24 million. Although these cabinets can be purchased as needed in future years, there is an incentive to purchase as many as possible in FY 1993 and FY 1994 under a current contract for a set price--good through FY 1994--including a ceiling for annual escalation costs above the base price.

MSC Operations - The Institution's FY 1993 request to OMB sought an increase of 1 workyear and \$456,000 to support two critical operating requirements at the Museum Support Center: replacement of the MSC computer and the hiring of a safety coordinator.

Replacement of the MSC Computer: MSC provides both basic and specialized computer services to its occupants and to the rest of the Institution. MSC's computer provides computer programs that support research, conservation, collections management, and administrative functions. The computer runs the Move Information System, Tracking and Inventory Control (MISTIC) program, which controls and documents the move of collections to MSC. It also supports a variety of other collections information systems for collections management and accountability, as well as research programs for scientists, conservation data bases for conservators, and accounting and management control programs for administrators. It also provides integrated electronic mail services, including direct access to local and international network systems.

The increase of \$385,000 requested from OMB would have allowed the Institution to replace this computer, which will be more than 11 years old in 1993 and by all standards will have exceeded its normal lifespan. Replacement is the most cost-effective and efficient solution to the problems of increased maintenance costs, small capacity (by current standards), and inability to support newer, expanded applications. Moreover, the growing demand of users for new programs and communications systems, including connection to the international network, requires a newer, more powerful computer.

MSC Facility Safety Program: The MSC manages a facility safety program to ensure compliance with all Federal, state, and local government regulations and provide a safe and healthy working environment. It manages the disposal of all potentially hazardous waste that results from normal facility maintenance, conservation, and research activities. The program coordinates the use and disposal of alcohol, solvents, oil, cleaning agents, and other chemicals. It conducts inspections to make sure all electrical and mechanical equipment, including x-ray and other radiographic technology, is used properly and is in good working order. It monitors air flow and exhaust systems to record internal air quality standards. The program sets standards for documenting safety-related conditions to provide accountability for all activities.

Because of the increasing complexity of the regulations and the new, sophisticated techniques for collections-related research and conservation, MSC needs the assistance of a specially-trained

individual to manage this facility safety program. The increase of 1 workyear and \$71,000 requested from OMB would have allowed the Institution to hire a safety coordinator to manage the safety program and to purchase needed safety equipment and supplies.

Question 64: Please explain how the Museum Support Center move impacts the Natural History Building's capital renewal project. What time schedule must be met for the Natural History building project to proceed on schedule? What funding would be required?

Answer: Collections scheduled to relocate to the Museum Support Center are stored in all three of the Natural History Building's attics as well as in other locations around the building. The move of the collections from the attics and other locations before the Major Capital Renewal Project work begins is critical for several reasons. (1) The mechanical systems serving the attics as well as the staff offices on the Third Floor of the Main Building are located in the attics and must be replaced. Each attic is insulated with asbestos and the awkward placement of structural components and severely crowded conditions make the renovation work impossible unless the collections are removed before the renovation work begins. If renovation were attempted while the collections remained in place, damage to stored artifacts by workmen would be inevitable. (2) The attics are scheduled to be used as "swing" space for the relocation of collections which are to remain in the Natural History Building during this renovation project, but which must be temporarily removed from their permanent location during the renovation work. (3) The scheduled move of collections slated for MSC currently stored in NHB locations other than the attics is important because otherwise they will be in the way of the construction work and could potentially be damaged.

In order for the Natural History Building's Major Capital Renewal Project to remain on schedule, all three Natural History Building attics must be vacated, and asbestos removal and attic renovation completed in two of the three attics by the Spring of 1995.

The amount of funding required for the MSC Move in order to keep the Major Capital Renewal Project on schedule is an increase of 46 workyears and \$1.475 million in FY 1993 (making a total of 56 workyears and \$1.9 million) and an additional increase of \$300,000 in FY 1994 (making a total of 56 workyears and \$2.2 million). This funding level would have to be maintained in FY 1995, but would then gradually decrease over the next few years. Further, there is significant concern that the MSC computer that controls the Move will soon fail. As indicated previously, the computer is vital to documenting the move of collections from the National Museum of Natural History to the MSC. A minimum of \$200,000 (in 1992 dollars) is needed to replace it at the earliest possible opportunity.

Finally, each year that the Institution must continue without sufficient resources to quickly occupy MSC and to prevent delay in the Major Capital Renewal Project exacerbates the current situation. Already, the failure to secure the required level of funding in FY 1991, FY 1992 or FY 1993 has resulted in the Institution now being far behind the original schedule for both the Move and the Major Capital Renewal Project.

National Postal Museum

Question 65: The March 1992 Newsletter to the Regents explains that the 72,000-square-foot National Postal Museum continues on schedule. Staff occupancy is targeted for July 1992. Exhibits are expected to open in July 1993.

Where will this museum to be located?

Answer: The National Postal Museum will be located in the former City Post Office building, situated at Massachusetts Avenue and North Capitol Street and adjacent to Union Station. The Museum will occupy space on two floors of the building.

Question 66: Where is the Smithsonian's philatelic collection housed currently? How much space will be freed up by moving the collection to the new Postal Service museum?

Answer: The nation's philatelic collection, consisting of over 16 million objects, is currently housed at the National Museum of American History. Several of the collection's historic postal vehicles, such as the nation's first Highway Post Office buses, acquired by the Smithsonian in 1968, are housed at Silver Hill.

Moving the philatelic collection to the new National Postal Museum will free up about 8,630 square feet at the National Museum of American History. Of this area, public exhibition space equals 4,500 square feet and storage spaces amount to 2,362 square feet. Offices represent an additional 904 square feet, and the philatelic library is housed in the remaining area, which includes 864 square feet.

Question 67: Explain the U.S. Postal Services versus the Smithsonian responsibilities of the new facility and exhibits. Is the Smithsonian providing funding for the new facility and exhibits? For what and how long? Will Smithsonian employees be located at the facility?

Answer: Under terms of the "Operating Agreement" between the Postal Service and the Smithsonian, the Postal Service owns the building in which the Museum is housed and is providing sufficient space for it. The Museum will be operated and managed by the Smithsonian, which holds the collection in trust.

The Smithsonian is not providing construction funding, nor is it furnishing exhibits funding. A construction budget of \$9.2 million was approved and provided by the Postal Service. The build-out commenced in December 1990 and is slated for completion in the summer of 1992.

In addition, the Postal Service will provide a "start-up" budget of \$6 million, which covers expenses associated with the project from November 1990 to October 1992. It includes \$4.5 million in exhibits-related costs, as well as other costs associated with the creation of the Museum prior to occupancy of the building. The Smithsonian is not required to support additional expenses incurred in establishing the new facility for the National Postal Museum.

The Smithsonian will continue to provide its current level of direct Federal funding for the National Philatelic Collections (approximately \$538,000) appropriated to it as part of the National Museum of American History (NMAH), as well as additional indirect support from NMAH for administrative and program services. The Institution anticipates that funding will be requested in future fiscal years to cover normal increases such as requirements for necessary pay and inflation, and programmatic increases to care for the collections consistent with the level of support that the National Philatelic Collections would require even without the establishment of the National Postal Museum. The Postal Service will provide the remaining operating funding for the National Postal Museum.

The staff currently consists of 14 people. Ultimately, it is envisioned that 71 people will work in the Museum as employees of the Smithsonian. Of the total staff, which will be housed entirely in the new Museum facility, 35 positions are expected to be security-related. Only ten of the total staff will be Federally-funded. These positions are those currently allocated to the National Philatelic Collection.

Question 68: Has the Smithsonian considered loaning or giving their collections to the Postal Service? If not, why?

Answer: In 1911 the Postal Service transferred its entire postal history collection to the Smithsonian. Since that time, periodically the Smithsonian has loaned small numbers of objects to the Postal Service for limited use in temporary philatelic exhibitions. The Postal Service does not have the expertise or facilities to manage and operate a national museum. The mission of the Postal Service is to bind the Nation together through the personal, educational, literary and business correspondence of the people, and the Postal Service conducts, through its issuance of commemorative and other postage stamps and postal stationery, a philatelic program dedicated to displaying the cultural and historic heritage of the United States. The Smithsonian's mission is to increase and diffuse knowledge, and the Smithsonian's collections include a postal history and philatelic division whose mission is, in part, to preserve and display publicly that collection. No consideration has been given to relinquishing the Smithsonian's trust responsibility for the Nation's postal history and philatelic collection.

Question 69: Is the Smithsonian anticipating that it will be providing museum services for other agencies such as it is for the U.S. Postal Service?

Answer: This Smithsonian is not providing museums services to the U.S. Postal Service but rather the Postal Service is providing some of the funding for the Institution to expand its philatelic collection into a newly created museum. The Postal Service is providing space and funding for the museum and its collections. The Smithsonian is not entertaining a similar arrangement with any other agency.

Columbus Quincentenary Programs

Question 70: At the Committee's FY 1991 hearing for the Smithsonian, you were asked when we could expect to see a decrease in the Columbus Quincentenary programs. The reply was that a decrease in funding request would be seen in FY 1993. The FY 1993 request is for \$1.7 million which is a decrease of \$.2 million below the FY 1992 level of \$1.9 million. The decrease is in the Office of Folklife Programs.

Why is the Office of Folklife Programs the only activity which reflects a reduction?

Answer: The FY 1993 request reflects two reductions associated with the Columbus Quincentenary programs for the Office of Folklife Programs and the Smithsonian Institution Press. The decrease in the Office of Folklife Programs (-\$198,000) represents the offsetting reduction related to the FY 1992 one-time support for the New Mexico Program at the 1992 Festival of American Folklife. The decrease in the Smithsonian Institution Press (-\$15,000) represents the completion of funding for the publication of the three-volume series of the Columbian Consequences. Offsetting reductions associated with other Quincentenary programs are anticipated to be made in FY 1994 and thereafter following the

completion of those programs. Currently it is anticipated that the Institution will seek retention of a portion of Quincentenary funding in FY 1994 and following years to support the "Institute of the Americas" which will serve as a permanent Quincentenary presence.

Question 71: How many FTE's are associated with the Columbus Quincentenary programs?

Answer: There are 14.5 FTE's associated with the Columbus Quincentenary programs.

Question 72: Is it anticipated that the funding level for FY 1994 be lower than \$1.7 million? Explain.

Answer: The Smithsonian currently is reviewing the projected funding needs for each Quincentenary activity for FY 1994; it is anticipated that the levels required in FY 1994 will be less than those in FY 1993 as individual Quincentenary activities are completed. Plans have been received from each unit that received funding for Quincentenary activities and a revised spending plan will be developed for FY 1994, based on this review. The Institution may seek retention of a portion of the Quincentenary funding in FY 1994 and following years to support the "Institute of the Americas," which will serve as a permanent Quincentenary presence.

Question 73: When will this program be absorbed by the Smithsonian museums and offices and no longer be a special initiative?

Answer: Some of the Smithsonian's special programs for the Quincentenary will end in FY 1993, some will end in FY 1994, and some are proposed to be retained as permanent programs.

As stated in the FY 1987 budget submission to Congress, the Smithsonian's Quincentenary Program has a "two-fold objective: the presentation of a complex of thematically integrated programs for the Quincentennial observance itself, and the formation of a solid base of knowledge for the future in order that the commemoration will have a public and scholarly impact beyond the 1992 anniversary." The Institution anticipates that its FY 1994 budget request will propose the retention of at least a portion of the Quincentenary funds for the support of the "Institute of the Americas" which will be a permanent Quincentenary presence devoted to the study of issues of importance to the Americas. It is hoped that, in addition to its scholarly pursuits, the Institute will address the aspirations of the U.S. Hispanic population.

FY 1992 Operating Deficit

Question 74: An April 6 article in the Washington Post pointed out that the Smithsonian had an over-expenditure of about \$750,000 from the trust funds. Your most recent Newsletter to the Regents identifies a \$756,000 first quarter deficit for FY 1992, bringing the current year operating deficit to \$4.426 million. The Newsletter also states that FY 1993 estimates will call for trust fund cuts in excess of \$10.4 million.

Is the \$750,000 deficit cited in the Washington Post the same as the first quarter deficit cited in the Newsletter? If not, explain.

Answer: The two \$750,000 amounts are different. The \$756,000 referred to in the Regents' March 1992 Newsletter was an increase

in the fiscal year 1992 general unrestricted trust fund deficit as a result of revised projections of income and expense based on first quarter actual results. The \$750,000 referred to in the Washington Post article, "Smithsonian's Spending Problem", was an estimated total for specific programs or projects where expenditures exceeded approved budgets. The majority of these overexpenditures occurred in other than the general unrestricted category (primarily restricted and special purpose funds). These deficits are temporary since bureaus and offices are expected to resolve these deficits through reprogramming from other sources of trust funds before year-end. Efforts are underway to review and resolve each of these situations.

Question 75: Does the current year operating deficit of \$4.426 million mean that at the end of FY 1992 the Smithsonian will over-spend by \$4.4 million?

Answer: Prior to the start of fiscal year 1992, the Smithsonian faced a projected budget deficit of almost \$11 million in its general unrestricted trust funds. Budget cuts and revenue enhancements were identified to reduce that deficit to \$3.8 million in the initial budget for the year (that figure rose slightly to \$4.4 million in recent projections). The Institution felt that making cuts to reduce the full deficit would be too detrimental to its programs in the short run. The Institution maintains a balance sufficient to cover short term fluctuations. Currently plans are under way to bring the budget back into balance for fiscal year 1993. In summary this is not overspending, but a planned/budgeted one-year deficit covered by an accumulated prior year balance maintained as a contingency for a situation such as this when the economic recession causes a shortfall in projected income. Also note that the projected operating deficit is based on revenue projections which could change by year-end.

Question 76: How will the deficit be resolved? Will priorities within the Smithsonian change and appropriated funds be used to fund programs and projects which trust funds were targets to fund?

Answer: As mentioned above, the deficit will be covered by an accumulated general unrestricted Trust fund balance between now and the end of the fiscal year. The Institution will continue to look for opportunities to reduce the amount of the deficit. A significant portion of the Trust budget reductions have been taken against programs that are not generally supported with appropriated funds such as fellowships, special exhibitions, and educational outreach award programs. The Institution has not shifted these programs or their expenses to Federally-appropriated funds.

Question 77: What are the FY 1993 trust projections? Is the Smithsonian anticipating a deficit? How will the projected year-end balance affect the FY 1993 Federally financed programs?

Answer: The initial projection for FY 1993 reflected a deficit of \$10.4 million in the Institution's general unrestricted Trust funds. Based upon a conservation re-estimate of Trust revenues and specific budget reductions identified by each Assistant Secretary, the current projection for FY 1993 shows a deficit of \$2 million. Prior to the start of the fiscal year, the Institution will identify additional adjustments to balance the budget. Trust funding shortfalls have created a conservative fiscal environment at the Institution, but they should not have a direct impact on Federally-financed programs.

Question 78: Are the programs and projects which are supported by the Institution's trust fund completely independent of programs and projects which are supported by Federally appropriated funds? Explain.

Answer: As with any organization, all sources of funding contribute to supporting the mission. The Smithsonian, every bureau and office, and every major program is the sum of all of its parts. Although trust funds generally supplement programs supported with Federal appropriations, there is a significant degree of complementarity between Federal and trust funds. There are not two separate Institutions. Within many organizational units at the Smithsonian there are both Federal and trust staff. If either Federal or trust funds were taken away, each organizational unit would be significantly compromised if not crippled in carrying out its responsibilities. For example, the Smithsonian has one accounting system which supports both its Federal and trust operations. Both Federal and trust resources support the accounting office. If either Federal or trust funds were withdrawn, the Institution would not be able to meet its legal, financial and management responsibilities for either Federal or trust operations.

Similarly, without a trust fellowship program or a trust funded internal grant program to support a special research project, a Federal scientist could well determine that the environment at the Smithsonian was not as rewarding as it should be and seek employment elsewhere. If the Institution does not maintain its facilities adequately (primarily with Federal support), visitors might not want to come to our museums, and trust income will suffer as a consequence (lower sales in restaurants and shops).

Question 79: Are specific bequests and gifts to the Institution ever turned down because they are not in line with the mission and priorities of the Smithsonian or if it is anticipated that future Federal funds may not be available to support the project? Explain.

Answer: The Smithsonian has had minimal problems with the issue of receiving bequests or gifts that did not support the mission and priorities of the Institution. Many bequests are unrestricted and can be utilized as the Smithsonian determines. Other bequests for specific purposes have tended to be sufficiently broad that there have not been difficulties in using the funds for purposes consistent with the Smithsonian mission and its programs. It is also the case that most gifts are received in response to the Institution's identified needs, which have already been determined in accordance with the Smithsonian's mission, programs, and priorities.

Inflation Request

Question 80: The FY 1993 President's Budget includes \$1.5 million "to offset the inflation-related erosion of the Institution's purchasing power that has occurred over the past year." The base calculation also includes an inflation adjustment.

How is this \$1.5 million request different from the inflation adjustment included in the Smithsonian's FY 1993 base?

Answer: Funding to compensate for the effects of inflation in "other objects of expense" is one of the uncontrollable increases in the Institution's FY 1993 budget request. The justification for this increase is presented as part of the "Uncontrollable" section of the budget (on page 24); the funding for this increase is distributed throughout the budget line-items and reflected in their total. This uncontrollable request serves as the "base adjustment" for inflation.

Question 81: What makes the Smithsonian unique from other agencies with its request?

Answer: The Institution believes that the need for additional funding to compensate for the effects of inflation as an uncontrollable cost is wide-spread throughout Federal programs and is not aware of any unique treatment that it has received regarding inflation.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR J. BENNETT JOHNSTON

Research on Wetlands

Question 82: Earlier this year a major new Fish and Wildlife Service facility was opened in Lafayette, Louisiana to undertake research on wetlands, and it is my hope that this will become the cornerstone for coordinating Federal research on this disappearing resource which is critically important to my home state, Louisiana.

As one of the premier research institutions in the United States, it seems to me that the Smithsonian Institution would bring considerable expertise, and different expertise, to research in this area particularly in the area of small invertebrates which are the very basis of the food chain in these areas.

What is the Smithsonian doing in this area and how are your efforts coordinated with those of the Fish and Wildlife Service?

Answer: The Smithsonian has a long history of involvement in basic research on invertebrates, and its studies frequently provide the basis for further work on management applications needed by several Federal and State land management agencies.

The National Museum of Natural History (NMNH) has had cooperative agreements in effect with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) since before the turn of the century, and currently houses its Biological Survey unit. A group of FWS biologists has worked within the Natural History Building through the years, using the Museum's collections and library and undertaking joint field and laboratory research programs. These collaborative efforts have been very effective in combining the Smithsonian's expertise in basic taxonomy and classification of organisms with FWS's more applied focus on wildlife problems in relation to land use. No joint work is currently being undertaken in Louisiana.

In addition to its continuing basic studies of invertebrate biology, the National Museum of Natural History has programs directly involved in the study of wetlands and coastal ecosystems. The Caribbean Coral Reef Ecosystems Project, an important component of the Museum's Biodiversity Programs, has published several hundred papers dealing with the complex interactions of mangrove and coral reef ecosystems. The Museum's program at the Smithsonian Marine Station in Fort Pierce, Florida, has produced 300 publications on coastal and estuarine research, including ecosystems of coral and algal reef systems in the Florida Keys, and lagoonal seagrass beds, mangrove communities, offshore benthic communities, and cold water coral reefs on the central east coast of Florida. The Nile Delta project has provided critically important understanding of the geological and sedimentary processes involved in delta formation of major river systems.

The Smithsonian Environmental Research Center in Edgewater, Maryland, has conducted extensive research on ecological processes of coastal ecosystems associated with the Chesapeake Bay and other similar ecosystems. The Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama is also involved in various coastal, marine, and wetland

studies. This research provides a comparison of tropical and temperate ecosystems.

Question 83: What could you do to fill in the gaps of the research efforts of the Fish and Wildlife Service on wetlands and what resources would be required for you to establish a presence in Lafayette?

Answer: The National Museum of Natural History has the expertise to provide baseline studies of Gulf Coastal and wetland ecosystems that would allow the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and State agencies to focus their efforts on critical applied problems in the region. It also has the ability to conduct detailed inventories of not only the better known organisms, such as the vertebrates and the vascular plants, but also poorly known organisms such as invertebrates (e.g., mollusks, crabs, worms, insects), algae and other groups that traditionally have not been the focus of the Fish and Wildlife Service. These poorly known organisms are basic to the ecosystems that support the birds, mammals, and fish. The Museum's working relationships with FWS scientists are such that it could easily collaborate and share facilities to begin necessary studies until more permanent arrangements could be made. Sharing the excellent Fish and Wildlife Service facilities in Lafayette, Louisiana would allow the Smithsonian to focus its resources on personnel and operating expenses in a very cost-effective manner. The Smithsonian contribution would complement the FWS efforts also by establishing and curating a reference and voucher collection of the plants and animals being studied.

However, current base funding for the National Museum of Natural History is not able to support these efforts. Additional funding will be needed to enable the Museum to effectively supplement the Fish and Wildlife Service's research efforts on wetlands. An additional 8 workyears and \$950,000 would be needed to establish a presence of professional biologists and technical and clerical support to begin such cooperative studies at the new Fish and Wildlife Service facility in Lafayette, Louisiana.

Biodiversity

Question 84: The Smithsonian has undertaken considerable efforts internationally in the general area of biodiversity.

What are you doing domestically, particularly as this relates to wetlands?

Answer: The Smithsonian has traditionally focused on both domestic and international problems in an effort to better understand the natural world and mankind's place in it. Smithsonian scientists have also developed a tradition of working collaboratively with university colleagues throughout the country and abroad to contribute to solving biodiversity questions. The Marine Systems Laboratory of the National Museum of Natural History has constructed detailed functional models of both the Everglades and Chesapeake Bay ecosystems. At the Smithsonian Marine Station in Fort Pierce, Florida, Museum scientists have worked on marine biodiversity for 20 years, also conducting a variety of research programs related to the functioning of ecosystems of estuarine seagrass beds and mudflats, mangroves, and offshore shallow and deep-water benthic communities. Other pertinent domestic biodiversity research includes a study of fresh water snails in groundwater seeps in the Southwest.

Question 85: Do you have any high priority unfunded needs in this area, and if so, what are these?

Answer: For three years, the National Museum of Natural History has been developing plans for increased efforts in the rapidly changing shallow marine and wetland areas at Fort Pierce, Florida, and for a comparative program of work at Lafayette, Louisiana. A high priority unfunded need for the NMNH, therefore, is to stabilize and enhance the Fort Pierce effort and establish other stations to form a network of permanent research sites in critical coastal wetland regions. The Museum has prepared a detailed proposal in conjunction with the University of Southwestern Louisiana for a program that would address these and other important research needs in a systematic, long-term fashion. This would allow the Museum to gather the data needed to approach critical land-use problems ranging from general sedimentation models of the Mississippi basin, through food-chain relationships of southeastern wetlands, to the functioning and comparison of coastal and off-shore ecosystems of the Gulf Coast regions and the southeastern Atlantic Coast. These plans have been informally discussed with officials of the University of Southwestern Louisiana and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The strengthening of the existing Fort Pierce program and the enhancement of these studies by the addition of a comparative effort on shallow marine and wetland areas in Lafayette, Louisiana, would require \$1.9 million in the first year--\$950,000 and 8 workyears at Fort Pierce, Florida and \$950,000 and 8 workyears at Lafayette, Louisiana.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JAKE GARN

Question 86: Your budget summary for Congress indicates that you are requesting \$364.7 million. That is \$32.9 million over the FY 1992 appropriations of \$331.8 million. That is almost a 10% increase. With an inflation rate of about 4%, how is that justified? What are the major areas of increase? Why?

Answer: The Smithsonian believes that the magnitude of the FY 1993 increase is justified by the nature of the important high priority needs for which funding is requested. Both the operating budget requirements (in the Salaries and Expenses appropriation) and the capital budget requirements (in the Construction, Zoo Construction, and Repair and Restoration appropriations) support programmatic and facilities commitments necessary to carry out the Institution's long-standing and recent responsibilities. By allowing almost a 10 percent increase in the FY 1993 passback, the Office of Management and Budget indicated its concurrence in funding these commitments.

Secondly, the impact of rising uncontrollable costs on the FY 1993 request has been significant. In the Salaries and Expenses request, an increase of \$18.624 million (approximately 57 percent of the total S&E increase) is required to cover increases in uncontrollable items, such as legislated pay raises, utilities and inflation.

Finally, the additional funding requested for FY 1993 has been targeted for specific high-priority program areas, while other priorities were not able to be funded even at the FY 1993 request level. For example, the increase in capital budget requirements is critical to continue to make progress in ongoing major construction projects, including the East Court Building of the National Museum of Natural History. However, even though the Construction account increased by 12 percent to support these projects, there has been virtually no increase in either the Zoo Construction or Repair and Restoration accounts over the FY 1992 level.

The major areas of increase in the Smithsonian's FY 1993 budget request reinforce the priorities in Choosing the Future, the Institution's five-year prospectus: (1) Stewardship of the Public Trust; (2) Understanding the Global Environment and Our Place in the Universe; (3) Exemplifying the Nation's Pluralism; and (4) Bring Synergism to Contemporary Public Education. Of the total increase of \$32.9 million, \$22.3 million represents resources that the Institution needs to reinforce its programmatic, operational, and facilities infrastructure--an investment in its foundations--to ensure its Stewardship of the Public Trust. Only \$10.6 million represents resources for new program initiatives and facilities in the areas of Global Change Research (\$4.2 million), Cultural Pluralism (\$6.1 million), and Education (\$300,000).

Question 87: Would you explain briefly the major provisions of Under Secretary Turner's reorganization plan?

Answer: Major provisions of the organizational review include actions to establish greater accountability at the Assistant Secretary level, to define their areas of responsibility more clearly, and to eliminate dual reporting relationships to certain Assistant Secretaries. Key activities, including Government Relations and Public Affairs, will report to the Under Secretary. The Resident and National Associates Programs will be merged. And a variety of actions, including detailed study of the central administrative and financial units and possible delegations of authority to bureaus and offices to perform certain functions, previously handled centrally, are aimed at improving the delivery of services.

Question 88: Granted that it is desirable to delegate authority, what kind of controls do you maintain to insure that the authority is being properly exercised?

Answer: Prior to any delegations, it would have to be determined that the receiving organization units have the staff capability, training, and knowledge to handle additional authority and responsibility. Periodically, thereafter, there would be reviews and audits to determine if delegations are being carried out responsibly.

Question 89: In my opening statement, I indicated that I believe there has been some lack of objectivity in certain displays. Can you outline any specific steps you have taken to insure future objectivity? I am not suggesting "political correctness" imposed from within or without, just an objective demonstration of the facts.

Answer: A major element in the Smithsonian's greatness is the vast range of subject matter covered by its museums, in both their permanent and temporary exhibitions. A widely divergent array of scholars work on these exhibitions, and the Smithsonian is proud of the fact that no single unified point of view is ever ascertainable across the whole Institution. Nevertheless, the Institution is aware that there are occasional exhibitions which cause concern to some visitors. In an effort to understand better the meaning of these situations, both for their audience and for their staffs, Smithsonian museums are trying to improve the ways in which exhibition concepts and scripts are reviewed in advance of their presentation. The Institution is also continuing to present exhibitions with multiple points of view.

Question 90: Since I am also a member of the Smithsonian Audit and Review Committee, and since how audit reports are handled reflects on the stewardship of the Institution, I am interested in

your progress in meeting the recommendations of that report. Could you give us a brief update?

Answer: The Smithsonian has established a formalized tracking and follow-up system covering the audit recommendations both in Coopers & Lybrand's "Report to Management" and in reports of the Smithsonian's Inspector General. Each assistant secretary has been asked by the Under Secretary to provide a detailed plan of action with timelines to the Office of Financial and Management Analysis by June 5, 1992. The Office of Financial and Management Analysis will maintain a list of outstanding recommendations, which it will update each quarter with the current status. This report will be provided to senior management so that proper oversight is given to meeting audit requirements. Of the fifteen items contained in the "Report to Management," one has been completed, several are currently being addressed, and implementation plans are being developed for the remainder. In addition, accountabilities are being strengthened at each management level and across the Institution to assure that appropriate attention is given to audit recommendations.

Question 91: I understand that SI has paid back all the Federal funds used to pay the legal fees of Mr. Mitchell. Since trust funds seem to have been used to repay the federal funds, can you tell us is there is underway or contemplated, any efforts to replace the trust funds? What are they?

Answer: Since 1982 the Smithsonian has maintained in force a Directors and Officers liability insurance policy to offset the costs of providing legal representation to its employees under the Revised Indemnification Resolution adopted by the Board of Regents in 1982. The Smithsonian has asserted a claim under this policy, which is currently under negotiation with the insurance company.

Question 92: My understanding is that all potential charges have been dropped against the colleagues of Mr. Mitchell. Is there any specific efforts underway to also clear Mr. Mitchell? If so, what are they? If now, why not?

Answer: The Smithsonian does not itself represent Mr. Mitchell, but his present counsel, Sidley and Austin, is responsible for defending him and is dealing directly with the Federal authorities involved. It is understood, although never formally stated by the Federal authorities, that the potential charges which were dropped against Mr. Mitchell's colleagues are no longer being considered in the proceedings against Mr. Mitchell.

Question 93: You mentioned that OMB had almost exactly reversed you request to apply 75% of the increase beyond uncontrollables to your first priority of infrastructure and 25% to new programs. What have you done to negotiate your desires with OMB? Are you asking the Congress to help you achieve your priorities?

Answer: This shift in the relative percentages between increased funding for infrastructure requirements and new initiatives occurred between the Institution's FY 1993 budget request to the Office of Management and Budget and the budget request to Congress. The Institution's request to OMB for infrastructure requirements equaled \$32.9 million of the total increase of \$43.8 million (excluding uncontrollable increases), or 75 percent. The Institution's request for infrastructure in the Congressional request equaled \$3.4 million, or 25 percent of the total increase of \$13.8 million (excluding uncontrollables).

While the Institution is extremely appreciative of OMB's support of funding for global change research, cultural pluralism (including the National Museum of the American Indian), and education, the strict limitations on OMB's ability to support all of the Institution's priorities, including its infrastructure requirements, had the unfortunate result of producing this shift in proportion of increases associated with infrastructure requirements and new initiatives.

Because of the critical importance of addressing these infrastructure requirements, the Institution requested reconsideration of this situation as part of its appeal responding to the FY 1993 OMB passback in December, 1991. However, the appeal was not successful.

The Congress may be assured that the Institution is committed to addressing these critical infrastructure deficiencies and will continue to make them a top budget priority within the context imposed by current Federal budgetary constraints.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator REID. I thank you very much. The subcommittee will stand in recess until 9:30 a.m. Tuesday, May 12, when we will receive testimony from the Department of Energy.

[Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., Tuesday, April 28, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Tuesday, May 12.]

ISBN 0-16-040038-4



90000

9 780160 400384

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES



3 9088 01641 0151