

# Senate Hearings

*Before the Committee on Appropriations*

---

## Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations

*Fiscal Year 1996*

104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

H.R. 1977

**PART 1 (Pages 1-1145)**

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS  
NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES  
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

p. 515



# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1995

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

The subcommittee met at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-116, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Slade Gorton (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Gorton, Stevens, and Cochran.

Also present: Senator Inouye.

## SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

STATEMENT OF I. MICHAEL HEYMAN, SECRETARY

ACCOMPANIED BY:

CONSTANCE B. NEWMAN, UNDER SECRETARY

ROBERT S. HOFFMANN, PROVOST

NANCY D. SUTTENFIELD, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

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

ROBERT P. DILLMAN, ACTING DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF FACILITIES SERVICES

MICHAEL H. ROBINSON, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

MAXINE SINGER, CHAIR, COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

## BUDGET REQUEST

Senator GORTON. It is 9:30 a.m.; we will get started. This is a hearing of the Subcommittee of the Interior and Related Agencies, with respect to the Smithsonian Institution.

We have the budget figures in front of us, of course, and a series of questions. But I want to let you, Secretary Heyman, start this out with whatever introductions you would like to make, and set forth into the opening statement as you would like to communicate with us all.

## INTRODUCTION OF ASSOCIATES

Mr. HEYMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Gorton.

Let me introduce most principally Connie Newman, who is the Under Secretary, sitting to my right, and Bob Hoffmann, who is sitting to my left.

Then there are others from our staff who are here and can answer questions: Carole Wharton, who is the Director of the Office of Planning, Management and Budget, and Nancy Suttentfield, who is the Assistant Secretary for Finance and Administration, Robert Dillman, who is the Acting Director for the Office of Facilities Services, and Michael Robinson, who is the Director of the National Zoological Park.

I would also like to introduce Maxine Singer, who is the chair of the Commission that has been looking at the future of the Smithsonian, and has been doing yeoman's work for us.

#### SUMMARY STATEMENT OF MICHAEL HEYMAN

I would like to start out talking briefly about the Smithsonian in general. Really, this probably is just a reminder to many, but the Smithsonian started in 1846 as a trust instrumentality of the United States.

As you know, it is run by a Board of Regents. It has eight members from the three branches of Government, three each from the Senate and from the House, the Chief Justice, and the Vice President.

And then it has nine citizen regents; whose nominations are confirmed by the Congress, or must be confirmed by the Congress for them to serve.

The Board chooses the Secretary; it is a rather unique organization. It is much like that of a State university. It has provided a due measure of independence for the Institution, while simultaneously providing very close relationships with the Federal Government.

Its original charter is very broad, as laid down by James Smithson, the original donor, creating an institution devoted to the increase and diffusion of knowledge. The Board of Regents has taken both of these missions seriously.

Thus, increase of knowledge has occurred through a lot of quite exemplary research, especially in astronomy and astrophysics, in biology, in art, in history, and in technology, and diffusion has largely been through museum exhibitions, associate programs, and publications.

We have art museums and galleries, including American arts and crafts, African art, American portraits, contemporary art, and oriental art. We also have important museums devoted to air and space, American history, natural history, and the American Indian.

It is really an enormous undertaking. That whole complex provides opportunities to many visitors, over 28 million a year. This figure reflects, obviously, repeats of local people, but it also reflects visitors from all over the United States and elsewhere.

We had an economic impact study done for the Smithsonian by an independent expert from George Washington University.

By doing some polling, it was estimated that nonbusiness visitors to Washington spend nearly 60 percent of their daytime hours at the Smithsonian during their time here. So it has a big impact on visitors in the metropolitan area itself.

The heart of both of our enterprises, research and diffusion, depends on the scope and maintenance of our collections: paintings, sculptures, graphics, industrial machines, airplanes, space vehicles,

systematic groupings of flora and fauna—that is probably the best collection of specimens of that type in the world—and cultural objects and the like.

We are a somewhat unique Federal entity, because we rely for 28 percent of our operating expenditures on funds not appropriated to us.

We receive income from our endowment—our endowment is about \$400 million—from various enterprises such as shops, magazines, product licensing, and from fundraising primarily to support research and exhibitions.

We well recognize the need to increase these funds in the future. As I said in my installation speech 6 months ago, and I have reiterated often, we have to push this proportion up, and we have to do more with fundraising than we have, although we have had a very good start. This quarter, for instance, we raised something like \$33 million.

Senator GORTON. Has your income from those other sources, as a share of what you spent, increased over a 10-, 20-, or 30-year period, or decreased?

Mr. HEYMAN. It has decreased. It has decreased for two reasons: One, that Federal appropriations have been ample, at least in the past, and, two, it has decreased recently, primarily because the Smithsonian magazine is not netting nearly as much as it did before.

The readership has stayed constant, but we have not increased price enough in relationship to the cost, because both printing and paper costs have gone up, and advertising rates have gone down, although not the sum of advertising that we have.

Senator GORTON. OK. Go ahead.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Mr. HEYMAN. The lion's share of our Federal appropriation is for salaries and expenses. In fiscal year 1994, that was about 88 percent of our Federal appropriation. Of course, that fluctuates in relation to appropriations for construction.

In the recent rescission action, the House took \$32 million out of our fiscal year 1995 appropriation. That represents a good portion of the construction budget, and 8.6 percent of our whole 1995 appropriation.

The funds deleted related to requests in our submission for 1996 which are before you. If the past action presages the future, the House will zero out two major activities, which I think will be very unwise. I hope that the Senate will act otherwise. I want to talk about those a little bit.

First are the planned local facilities of the National Museum of the American Indian. I believe that the Congress, as well as the Smithsonian, is under at least a moral obligation, if not a legal obligation, to proceed with planned construction, and I will tell you why.

The museum facilities are largely a creature of congressional initiative. The main objective of its creation was the preservation and provision of public access to an extraordinary collection of over 1 million American Indian artifacts, which were collected in the late 19th and early 20th centuries by a man named Gustav Heye.

This is reputed to be the best collection in the world, and it is being housed presently in the Bronx in New York, under quite awful conditions. We have photographs here that perhaps we will share with you later, if you wish, that show you how this is being presently housed.

The Heye collection was under the jurisdiction of the Heye Foundation in New York. For various reasons, that foundation came on hard times, and the Smithsonian was approached to take over the collection.

Multiple parties were involved, including the attorney general of the State of New York—who resisted moving the collections elsewhere—the trustees of the Heye Foundation, representatives from American Indian communities, political leaders, such as Senator Inouye, and, of course, the Smithsonian.

I think it is fair to say that—you were there and I was not at the time—but I think it is fair to say that the Board of Regents was reluctant to undertake the financial responsibilities entailed unless Congress passed appropriate legislation directing the Smithsonian to establish the museum and promising to support it.

As the result of all of this, agreements were struck, and statutes passed, and judicial decrees rendered, mainly in 1989.

We agreed with the Heye Foundation and the other stakeholders to accept the collection and house it in a museum on The Mall, a branch in New York, and a state-of-the-art collection and conservation facility, to which the Heye collection could be moved and preserved and taken out of danger. But our agreement was conditioned on the passage of relevant legislation.

The relevant legislation was passed in 1989, and it comprises 20 U.S.C., section 80(q), some 20 pages of provisions, which, among other matters, directs the Regents to construct the three facilities in question with a net square footage of no less than 400,000 square feet, creates a board of trustees under the Regents made up largely of American Indians, and provides that The Mall museum will be financed no more than two-thirds by Federal appropriations.

The idea was that the Smithsonian would raise the balance. In addition, there was a New York court decree confirming the arrangement and permitting the collection to be moved, in view of the guarantees in the statute.

A variety of events have occurred since 1989. First, the branch museum in New York was established in the refurbished custom-house in Lower Manhattan. It was financed by the Federal Government, the State of New York, and New York City, in accordance with the directions of the Federal statute.

Second, the Smithsonian has organized a major fundraising campaign for the National Museum of the American Indian. It has already raised in cash and pledges over \$26 million toward the goal of \$35.5 million to be applied to The Mall museum, one-third of its projected cost.

It has enrolled over 72,000 members of the museum, who hopefully will continue annual support. The total campaign goal is \$60 million, with some \$25 million to go to an endowment, the income of which is to support outreach activities in the Indian communities around the country.

The basis of this campaign has been the plan that is contained in the Federal statute: a Mall museum, a branch in New York, and a state-of-the-art collection and conservation facility adequate to house the Heye collection, independent of other collections of the Smithsonian Institution.

It is in light of the foregoing that we view the rescission action and the potential desertion of the two museums of the American Indian facilities with such alarm.

If this occurs, we will have broken our collective promise to the American Indian community. And we will have undermined the confidence we have so carefully nurtured in the donor community, to which we must turn increasingly, as I indicated, for support as Federal funding becomes less available.

This is a very large priority for me—the fundraising campaigns that have been undertaken and we shall extend—and it was something in my last job, an administrative job at the University of California, where we had quite a successful fundraising activity. I think we can do the same in enlarging that which the Smithsonian does.

I want to turn very briefly to the second major activity, which involves the Air and Space Museum extension at Dulles. You know that we have run out of space to exhibit planes, space vehicles, and other objects in the existing museum. Also, very large objects, like the Enola Gay, cannot fit into the present museum.

In addition, we need expansion of facilities for storage and restoration presently located in Suitland. The plan that was accepted by Congress is to create a substantial extension at the Dulles Airport.

Reality, however, indicated that the Federal Government cannot fund the \$160 million or so that will be needed to create that extension.

At least two other sources are necessary. One source is the Commonwealth of Virginia, which aggressively supported the extension's location in Virginia. The Commonwealth has promised infrastructure investments for roads and the like, about \$40 million worth.

My understanding is that the money is there, and the question is: Will it go in priority order to this undertaking? My understanding is it will, if we move.

The second source is the issuance of \$100 million in bonds, bonds which, of course, we are going to have to repay out of the proceeds of the development, and an interest-free loan to finance a study to determine the best ways to attract private sector involvement.

The Federal investment in this undertaking was authorized at \$8 million. That is for planning and design. The House rescinded the first \$4 million, which was contained in the 1995 appropriation. The budget request for this year is \$2 million, and there was to be \$2 million again next year.

This arrangement builds upon the shared funding formula, the same kind of a formula that was used for the American Indian Museum, but it goes much further in seeking to leverage a very large non-Federal investment with a relatively smaller Federal one.

## PREPARED STATEMENT

I urge that even if there is a rescission and the rescission is not restored, the appropriation of \$2 million requested in the 1996 budget be approved, because that will let us accompany the study of ways to attract private investment with enough preliminary design to make the inquiries realistic.

Senator, that is the statement I wish to make. There is more contained in the one that has been filed with the committee.

I stand ready to answer any questions you might have.

[The statement follows.]

## PREPARED STATEMENT OF I. MICHAEL HEYMAN

Good morning Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am pleased to appear before the committee today for the first time since assuming my role as Secretary in September of last year. I entered the office of Secretary with great enthusiasm for this extraordinary Institution and I can honestly say that my first five months have been more than challenging.

The Smithsonian is a unique and dynamic institution which belongs to the citizens of the United States. Each secretarial era reflects unique circumstances and poses its own opportunities and problems. When I was selected for the position of Secretary, I began to explore in detail the opportunities and problems facing the Institution and how I could best address these issues during my tenure. I identified four areas where I believe I should focus my energies in the coming years. To address these issues, I first implemented a reorganization which included the creation of a provost to oversee all programmatic areas. This will allow me to more actively and effectively manage the Institution as a whole and ensure a greater level of oversight and accountability over the diverse components which make up the Smithsonian.

The greatest challenge presently facing the Institution, along with the rest of the Federal establishment, is the constraint on resources. In the past, the Smithsonian could count on increased resources from Congress and the Executive Branch in discharging its mission. Those times are past and if the Institution is to continue as one of the world's premier cultural and scientific institutions, it must begin to rely more heavily on private support from individuals and corporations. A systematic effort to increase private support started very well under my predecessor and I intend to accelerate this initiative as quickly and effectively as possible.

This new era also demands from public, as well as private, organizations increased fiscal accountability. We must use our resources efficiently and intelligently both to husband them and to underscore our credibility to those who provide them—the government and our donors. I believe that frugality also has a positive side. For example, it will require us to agree more specifically than in the past on the dimensions of our mission.

Second, we must take a hard look at the role of the Smithsonian as the nation's museum and at the goals of our exhibitions and public programming. As you are all too well aware, we have suffered through the long controversy surrounding the National Air and Space Museum's proposed exhibition which included a portion of the Enola Gay. There were mistakes made in the development of this exhibition which, in the end, made its presentation doomed to failure. This, and a small number of exhibitions over the past few years, have raised important questions concerning the Institution's responsibilities in presenting historical and analytical treatments to the public. Even before I made my decision to replace the original Enola Gay exhibition with a scaled-down display, I announced that we would undertake an assessment and review of the processes and criteria used in determining what subjects to cover and how they are to be addressed. I expect this review to be completed later this year and that it might well call for the establishment of guidelines to be used across the Institution regarding exhibitions and public programs. I will gladly report back to the committee with the results of this review and on those steps I plan to take in response to it.

Third, I am committed to developing, across the Institution, the ability to make our collections and information available to the public through technology. With the great advances in information technology during the past decade, we now have the opportunity to take our collections, via electronic media, to virtually every city and town in the nation, and ultimately, to almost every household. I have made this a priority of my tenure.

Within a few months the Smithsonian will go on-line on the Internet with a full and constantly updated information service with "home-pages" for our museums and research centers. This will become a Smithsonian without walls, bringing our vast resources home to Americans and offering a perennial field trip for students, young and old. This reach should increase considerably in the near future as the private sector merges means of communication and provides access to "ordinary" homes throughout the country.

I am told that one day soon emerging technologies will allow on-line visitors to look at 3-D images and, in essence, to "hold" an item in their hands, turning it through all its dimensions. We have already made plans to open a trial 3-D digitizing lab at the National Zoo to test the possibilities for the entire Smithsonian. I am excited by what this technology can mean to us in extending the reach of our historic mission—the "increase and diffusion of knowledge." At the heart of the information revolution is something far more than an advance in technology; it is the fulfilling of one central promise of democracy: to make knowledge available to as many citizens as possible, and to allow that access to be shaped by their needs. I see it as James Smithson's mandate reborn for a new century and a new generation of Americans.

On-line exhibitions can do things we cannot do through conventional means. Take, for example, the major exhibition *Ocean Planet*, which will open at the Museum of Natural History in April before going off on a national tour. I am sure that no one who actually visits the exhibition will easily forget the experience. It is state of the art in the presentation of important questions regarding the health of the Earth's oceans. Noteworthy, however, is that this is the first exhibition that we are developing in parallel form on-lined in collaboration with scientists from NASA. That prototype will be available over the Internet. The on-line version will feature an interactive floor plan of the exhibit and will incorporate all of its elements. Its "resource room" will provide an interactive bulletin board and instantaneous connections to many sources of oceanographic information available on the Internet. It will feature a variety of special programs, including discussion sessions, demonstrations, curricula for elementary and high school courses, and meet-the-curators opportunities in real time.

New information technologies will also greatly enhance the benefits of our research programs. For instance, we are putting in digital form systematic collections of biological information in the National Museum of Natural History which can be shared among scientific researchers worldwide. Access to this information and these collections will not require a special trip to Washington in order to undertake or continue research activities.

Hence, greater access to our-collections through advanced technologies will make a trip to the Smithsonian as easy as turning on a personal computer. The potential benefits of this electronic outreach to the American public are inestimable.

Finally, we must continue to take care of the most important asset of the Institution—the national collections. Numbering more than 140 million objects, the collections are the foundation for all that the Institution does. From its myriad research programs to the hundreds of exhibitions and public programs we present to the public each year, the collections are what distinguishes the Smithsonian from other educational and cultural institutions. The primary target of increases in our request for this fiscal year is in the management and conservation of the collections. It would be impossible, however, for me to discuss these priorities without first commenting on the recent action taken by the other chamber on fiscal year 1995 rescissions and which is likely to be considered by the Senate.

The rescissions of fiscal year 1995 Smithsonian funds recently approved by the House Appropriations Committee cut right to the heart of our ability to care for the collections. The effect of these rescissions, and their impact on our fiscal year 1996 request, is to allow the collections of the National Museum of the American Indian and the National Air and Space Museum to continue to deteriorate with the potential for permanent damage or loss. In both instances, the need for new storage and conservation space is clearly demonstrable. I would like to discuss each case in some detail.

With regard to the NMAI Suitland collections center, this component is critical to both the preservation of the collection and the success of The Mall Museum. The Smithsonian, after many years of discussion and negotiation, and with the guidance and ultimate direction of Congress, agreed to accept the transfer of the Heye collection—the single largest and most important collection of Native American artifacts in the world—and to take the necessary steps to preserve it. Upon Congressional authorization the Smithsonian entered into a legally binding agreement with the Heye Foundation and the State and City of New York for the construction of three facilities which would comprise the NMAI. One of these facilities, the Suitland Col-

lections Center, would replace the antiquated and wholly substandard Bronx storage facility at which the Heye collection is now housed. Specifically, the legislation authorizing the Suitland facility prohibits any of the Heye collection from being commingled with any existing Smithsonian collections. This is a key provision of the agreement. It is the Smithsonian's obligation to care for this collection. Without the construction of an acceptable facility, we fail to meet this obligation.

Another component of the NMAI legislation is The Mall Museum. As spelled out in the legislation, this facility is a public/private partnership. The Smithsonian is responsible for raising one-third of the costs of this museum from private sources. I am pleased to report that we have already raised \$26.7 million towards the \$36.7 million goal. The pledges—ranging from the 71,000 members of the NMAI national campaign who contribute a minimum of \$20 a year to the \$10 million gift from the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation of Connecticut—have been secured with the expectation that the planning, design and construction of the Museum would proceed in accordance with the legislation. The proposed rescission of fiscal year 1995 planning and design money for this component will result in a delay or possible termination of The Mall Museum and will be viewed by donors and supporters as a broken commitment on the part of Congress and the Federal government. Sadly, one of the best examples of public/private partnership will be seen as a failure at precisely the time we need to demonstrate its potential as a future resource to the Institution.

Finally, the proposed rescission of fiscal year 1995 planning and design money for the NASM extension at Dulles will have two immediate results: placing the collections in jeopardy as they continue to be housed in substandard facilities at our Garber facility; and the likelihood that the significant commitment from the Commonwealth of Virginia which includes infrastructure improvements to the site (estimated at \$30–40 million), a \$3 million dollar interest free loan and the issuance of up to \$100 million in bonding authority, will lapse or be withdrawn. As we have stated on the record, with the exception of the initial planning and design money which totals \$8 million, the funding for the construction of this extension would derive from non-Federal sources. This would seem to be a wise investment on the part of the Federal government in which \$8 million of Federal funds could leverage more than \$100 million of non-Federal funds.

I felt the need to discuss these three projects in some detail as our request for fiscal year 1996 includes funding for all three. It would be a great setback for the Institution if these projects did not move forward and a real impediment to our being able to properly care for the collections.

I am fully aware of the difficult situation which faces this committee specifically, and Congress as a whole. Reductions in the Federal budget now, and in the near future, are a reality. Making decisions about what programs and activities the Federal government should or should not support are difficult indeed.

On this, the eve of the Institution's 150th anniversary, I would like to remind the members of the committee that the Smithsonian Institution was created by Act of Congress and has evolved into a unique and revered institution which represents the best of America and its people. The Smithsonian is the mirror in which we, as Americans, see our history and culture from the past, in the present, and towards the future. I would venture that the vast majority of Americans believe the Federal funds which support the Institution are a worthy and rewarding expenditure of resources that provides direct benefits to all citizens.

I thank you and I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have regarding our fiscal year 1996 request or any other topic.

---

#### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF I. MICHAEL HEYMAN

I. Michael Heyman, a law professor and former chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, and most recently counselor to the Secretary of the Interior and Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, is the tenth secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. As the Smithsonian's chief executive officer, he heads a complex of 17 museums and galleries and the National Zoological Park, as well as scientific and cultural research facilities in 10 states and the Republic of Panama.

Secretary Heyman assumed the Smithsonian position on September 19, 1994. He began his career at the University of California at Berkeley in 1959 as an acting professor of law and became a full professor in 1961. He was named professor of law and city and regional planning in 1966. His distinguished teaching career has included service as a visiting professor of law at Yale (1963–1964) and at Stanford (1971–1972).

Heyman became vice chancellor of Berkeley in 1974 and served as chancellor from 1980 to 1990. A strong leader and active fund raiser, he strengthened the university's biosciences departments and successfully promoted ethnic diversification of the undergraduate student body while maintaining high academic standards. The university maintains several large museums, including the University Art Museum, the Lowie Museum of Anthropology, and the Lawrence Hall of Science, and Heyman actively participated in their supervision while chancellor. After stepping down as chancellor in 1990, he was named Selvin professor of law and professor of city planning at Berkeley.

Most recently, Heyman has been counselor to Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt as well as deputy assistant secretary for policy at Interior (1993-1994). He is a member of the state bars of California and New York.

Born on May 30, 1930, in New York City, Heyman attended P.S. 9, Junior High 118, the Bronx High School of Science (one year) and Horace Mann High School, where he played football. He was educated at Dartmouth College, earning a bachelor's degree in government in 1951.

After a year in Washington as legislative assistant to Sen. Irving M. Ives of New York, he served as an officer in the United States Marine Corps, as a first lieutenant on active duty from 1951 to 1953, and as a Captain in the reserves from 1953 to 1958. Heyman received his Doctor of Laws in 1956 from Yale University Law School, where he was editor of the Yale Law Journal. He was an associate with the firm of Carter, Ledyard and Milburn in New York City from 1956 to 1957, and was chief law clerk to Chief Justice Earl Warren from 1958 to 1959.

Heyman's expertise goes well beyond the legal field. His interests include civil rights, constitutional law, land planning, metropolitan government, housing, environmental law and management, public-land law, and affirmative action, and he is the author of many journal articles and papers on these subjects.

Over the years, Heyman has served on or chaired numerous boards and commissions, including almost four years as a member of the Smithsonian's Board of Regents (1990-1994). He has dedicated more than a decade of service to his alma mater Dartmouth as a member of its board of trustees from 1982 to 1993 and as chairman of the board from 1991 to 1993. Heyman also has been a member of the board of trustees of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law since 1977.

He was the secretary for the California Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1962-1967), and chairman of the City of Berkeley Human Relations and Welfare Commission (1966-1968). He was counsel to the Task Force on Demonstration and Protest of the President's Commission on Violence (1968-1969). He served on the board of directors of the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (1985-1993) and the board of directors of the American Council on Education (1984-1985). He chaired the executive committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in 1986.

He was Division I Subcommittee Chairman of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Presidents Commission (1986-1988) and chairman of the Bay Vision 2020 Commission (1989-1993).

Heyman has served as a consultant to the Virgin Islands Planning Office (1975-1976), the Government of American Samoa (1973-1974), the County of Kauai, Hawaii (1972-1973), the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (1970-1975), and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (1968-1970). He advised the University of Hawaii on the creation of a law school (1971-1972); analyzed the land-planning systems of the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service and the National Park Service (1967-1969); and prepared a report for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare on race and education at Berkeley (1964-1965).

He was awarded The Koret Israel Prize in 1989 and was made a Chevalier de la Legion D'Honneur by the French government in 1985. He has received honorary degrees from the State University of New York (1990), The University of Maryland (1986), The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (1984), and the University of the Pacific (1981).

Heyman is married to Therese Thau Heyman, senior curator on leave from the Oakland Museum in California. Their son, James, is a physicist and teacher.

---

#### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CONSTANCE BERRY NEWMAN

Constance Berry Newman became Under Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in July, 1992. She was Director of the Office of Personnel Management from June, 1989 to June, 1992. For more than 20 years' she managed public and private organizations. Among her major management positions were: Assistant Secretary of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Director of VISTA,

and President of the Newman & Hermanson Company. She was also Commissioner and Vice-Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

From 1987 to 1988, Ms. Newman worked for the Government of Lesotho as a Co-operative Housing Foundation consultant to advise the Ministry of Interior regarding the establishment of a housing corporation to receive World Bank funding.

During her public career which began in 1961, Ms. Newman worked both as a career public servant and a political appointee with four Presidential appointments, three of which were confirmed by the Senate.

Ms. Newman was a Woodrow Wilson Visiting Fellow from 1977 to 1985 and a member of the Adjunct Faculty at the Kennedy School, Harvard University from 1979 to 1982. She has received an Honorary Doctor of Laws from her Alma Mater, Bates College, Amherst College and Central State University. In addition to receiving an A.B. from Bates College, she received a Bachelor of Science in Law degree from the University of Minnesota Law School. In 1985, she received the Secretary of Defense Medal for Outstanding Public Service. At present she serves on the Board of Trustees of The Brookings Institution, the National Academy of Public Administration, and is a member of the Board of Governors of the Center for Creative Leadership. In addition, Ms. Newman is Vice-Chairman of the National Research Council's Board of Testing and Assessment.

---

#### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ROBERT S. HOFFMANN

Dr. Robert S. Hoffmann, came to the Smithsonian Institution as director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of Natural History in 1986. He became Assistant Secretary for Research on January 1, 1988, and acting Provost of the Smithsonian on October 1, 1994.

Hoffmann is a world authority on the evolution of Holarctic mammals, specializing in the Arctic and mountainous regions of the world, as well as the mammals of the USSR, China, and Central Asia. He is co-author or editor of 10 books and more than 230 scientific papers. His research has included a study of Pleistocene mammals and reflects a broad morphological knowledge of fossil and modern mammals, as well as a grounding in the newer techniques of biochemical systematics and molecular evolution.

Before coming to the Smithsonian, Hoffmann was Summerfield Distinguished Professor of Systematics and Ecology at the University of Kansas. He also served as associate dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for three years (1978-1980 and 1981-1982) and as acting dean for one year (1980-1981). Prior to 1981, Hoffmann served as chairman of the Department of Systematics and Ecology (1969-1972) and as acting chairman of the Division of Biological Sciences (1976-1977). During these years at the University of Kansas, Hoffmann also served as curator of mammals at the university's Museum of Natural History.

Hoffmann was born in Evanston, Illinois, in March, 1929. He received a bachelor's degree in zoology from Utah State University, Logan, in 1950, and earned a master's degree and a doctorate in zoology from the University of California, Berkeley, in 1954 and 1955, respectively. Following his graduate work, Hoffmann spent 13 years at the University of Montana in Missoula as an instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and full professor in the Department of Zoology. In 1988 he was awarded an honorary Doctor of Science from his alma mater, Utah State University.

Hoffmann served on the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Joint Commission on Science Policy of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) from 1974 to 1982 and on the NAS Advisory Committee on the USSR and Eastern Europe from 1970 to 1975. He has traveled extensively throughout the world and conducted fieldwork in Alaska, Canada, the U.S.S.R. and China, including Tibet. Hoffmann speaks and reads Russian.

Hoffmann is past president and first vice president of the American Society of Mammalogists (ASM). He served on that society's board of directors for 25 years, and was chairman of the ASM Committee on International Relations for 8 years. He served a term as president of the Society of Systematic Zoology, and has served on numerous other advisory committees and organizations. He is a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Honorary Member of the All-Union Theriological Society (U.S.S.R.) and of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, and a member of the American Association for Quaternary Research, the Ecological Society of America, and numerous other organizations.

Hoffmann is married to Sally Monson Hoffmann, an independent arts consultant and former education officer with the Spencer Art Museum of the University of Kansas. The Hoffmann's have three grown sons and a daughter.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF NANCY D. SUTTENFIELD

Nancy D. Sutzenfield was appointed Assistant Secretary for Finance and Administration of the Smithsonian Institution in 1990. In this capacity, she serves as the Chief Financial Officer and oversees the Institution's various financial, administrative, and facilities services functions. Prior to her appointment, Ms. Sutzenfield served briefly in 1990 as the Institution's Acting Under Secretary. From 1986 to 1990, she also served as the Director of the Smithsonian's Office of Planning and Budget.

Before joining the Smithsonian Institution, from 1973 to 1986 Ms. Sutzenfield held a series of public finance and management positions for agencies of the Commonwealth of Virginia. In her last state government position, she served as Budget Manager for Education at the Virginia Department of Planning and Budget, where she had lead responsibility for policy/program analyses and budget formulation for 17 institutions of higher education, 23 community colleges, three teaching hospitals, 140 local school divisions, and several museums and cultural agencies.

Ms. Sutzenfield received a B.S. degree in mathematics from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, and a M.A. degree in economics from Virginia Commonwealth University.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF L. CAROLE WHARTON

L. Carole Wharton joined the Smithsonian Institution in December 1991 as Director of the Office of Planning and Budget. Since late 1993, she has been the Director of the Office of Planning, Management and Budget. Prior to coming to the Smithsonian, she held various administrative and faculty positions at both public and private colleges and universities. Her major administrative assignments have included the Chief Planning Officer at Drexel University in Philadelphia; Director of Capital Planning, University of Maryland; Assistant Dean of Academic Development, St. Mary's College of Maryland; Dean of Students, Webster College, Washington, D.C. In addition, she was Assistant Professor of English at Columbus College, Columbus, Georgia.

She holds a B.A. in English and history from Emory and Henry College; an M.A. in English from Florida State University; and an Ed.D. in Higher Education Administration with supporting fields in Adult Education and Arts Management from The George Washington University in Washington, D.C., where she was a U.S. Office of Education Fellow.

She has been active in national planning organizations and has written articles on the subject of planning and resource allocation. She has served as national program chair for, and as a board member of, the Society of College and University Planning, and is currently on the editorial board of the journal, *Planning for Higher Education*.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ROBERT P. DILLMAN, P.E.

Mr. Dillman has about thirty years of experience in all aspects of facilities management from design and construction of new facilities to operation and maintenance of existing. His experience was gained working many different places in the United States, as well as in Europe, Africa, Central America, Southeast Asia and Antarctica.

He is a registered professional engineer with degrees in civil engineering and nuclear engineering from the University of Pennsylvania and the Pennsylvania State University respectively. He is also a graduate of the Harvard Business School.

He was selected Director of Design and Construction at the Smithsonian in 1990, and in December 1994 was named Acting Director of Facilities Services, following the resignation of Richard L. Siegle.

As Acting Director of Facilities Services for the Smithsonian Institution, he is responsible for the planning, design, construction, maintenance, security, safety, architectural history and historic preservation of the facilities which protect the Nation's collections and which are historic monumental structures themselves.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MICHAEL H. ROBINSON

Michael H. Robinson, Director of the Smithsonian Institution's National Zoological Park, is an animal behaviorist and a tropical biologist. Immediately prior to his appointment to the National Zoo in May 1984, Dr. Robinson served as Acting Director

and Deputy Director of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama, which institution he joined in 1966 as a tropical biologist. He received his Doctor of Philosophy from Oxford University after being awarded his Bachelor of Science, Summa Cum Laude, from the University of Wales. His scientific interests include predator-prey inter-actions, evolution of adaptations, tropical biology, courtship and mating behavior, and freshwater biology. He is the author of more than 130 scientific papers and articles including a book on the courtship and mating behavior of spiders.

Senator GORTON. Senator Stevens, I will defer to you to ask any questions or make any comments, if you would like.

Senator STEVENS. No; I do not have any questions this morning, Senator. Thank you very much.

Senator GORTON. OK.

Senator Inouye.

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

Senator INOUE. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for granting me this opportunity. I am really not a member of this subcommittee, but I feel so close to this project, as you are well aware, that I wanted to say a few words on behalf of it.

First, I would like you to forgive me because my voice is not up to par. I am under medication right now. I have a common ailment that I presume some of you have, an inner ear infection that causes vertigo and all that nonsense. So I am under medication to keep me level. [Laughter.]

So at this moment, I am level, and I hope I can remain that way throughout this.

#### NATIVE AMERICAN MONUMENTS IN WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. Chairman, when I became chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee about 7 or 8 years ago, I must confess that I knew very little about native Americans.

But I have been a citizen of this city now for nearly 35 years. In addition to that, I spent 2 years in law school in this town.

One thing that has always fascinated me is all of the statues throughout the city. Believe it or not, there are over 300 statues in this little city. And of all the statues, there is not a single one of a native American.

One would think that there should be one of Sequoia, or Tecumseh, or maybe Crazy Horse, or Sitting Bull. There are none, and I thought to myself, now, that is really strange that we honor everyone but the first citizen of this land.

And then it occurred to me that when one considers all of the stereotyping that you find in this land, that it was not quite fair to the young Indian child going through life not knowing about himself.

So this idea of a museum came about, someplace where the young Indian child can go and see what his ancestors have done. And maybe the non-Indian can do the same thing and see what the Indians have done. But there is no museum to speak of.

#### STORAGE CONDITIONS OF THE HEYE COLLECTION

Then one day I was called by a dear friend of mine, and he said: "Why not go to the Bronx? There is a warehouse there."

So I went to the Bronx and what I saw there was just unbelievable, nearly 1 million Indian artifacts. But then when I left the place, I felt nauseated; to think that here was a collection, priceless, on the verge of deterioration.

The rooms were not properly dehumidified. They were not insect proof. If you can imagine a room this size, with hundreds of buffalo robes—any one of them would be a prime exhibit in any museum, but hundreds of them. But they were hanging up like some dry cleaning plant, with plastic covers.

And there was a rifle that President Grant had presented to Sitting Bull. It was laying on top of a file cabinet. And that is the way it was.

So I thought it was an obscenity to have something like this, and thus began this movement.

And as the Secretary pointed out, it involved not just the New York delegation, but the New York City government, the State government. A memorandum of understanding was filed. We had to go to court.

From the standpoint of moneys, because that is our prime concern here, the Federal Government has already invested over \$90 million; \$90 million have been appropriated, and the Smithsonian, from your trust fund, you have already spent about \$1.5 million.

And a slight correction, sir, of the \$35 million that the law said you must raise from private sources, we have already raised, or received pledges exceeding \$32 million. We are ahead of schedule, in other words.

Some have suggested, "Well, you can always build a museum and put the items in either New York or in The Mall museum."

I am not a curator. What little I know about museums is the experience I had from this enterprise. Most museums will display no more than 5 or 10 percent of their collection, unless you want to make it look like Wal-Mart.

#### PROPOSED SUITLAND FACILITY TO HOUSE HEYE COLLECTION

So this museum, I suppose, would exhibit about 10 percent of the collection at any one time. You need someplace to store the remaining 90 percent. This is where the Suitland facility comes in.

Without the Suitland facility, this whole enterprise would just collapse. We have no place to put the collection. This would be the central facility for planning and staging all of these exhibits that would go countrywide.

And so if there is a step that is absolutely essential in the development of this museum, I would say Suitland is the one. And to stop at this point would mean not any savings, because I can see a few law suits down the line. I would hate to have the United States dragged into court.

There is another little tiny legal matter, because it has been said that, "Well, why not return the collection?"

When all of this was concluded, the law was passed, and the Smithsonian was directed to fulfill its responsibilities under the act, and New York State signed on the dotted line, and the city of New York did the same thing, the board of the trustees of the Heye Foundation met and said, "We are finished," and they dissolved—the Heye Foundation is no longer in existence.

There is really no legal repository to which this collection can be returned.

So Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of the law and the money, and equally as important, if not more important, from the standpoint of a long-held obligation, which I feel we have with the first Americans, we should support this museum. We should not rescind these moneys.

I thank you very much for your indulgence.

Senator GORTON. Well, you have proven once again how dedicated you are to this, and not at all incidentally, how responsible you are for the progress which has taken place so far.

We are going to look around and see if there is not a way we can get at least some of this back.

Senator INOUE. I am certain we can do that, because among the many coauthors of the measure, the chairman of the subcommittee is one, and he always stands for his bill.

Senator GORTON. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate it.

Senator INOUE. May I be excused?

Senator GORTON. Yes.

Senator COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, may I just ask unanimous consent to put in a statement for the record? I wish I could stay for the balance of this hearing.

Senator GORTON. First, the statement will be included, and second, I will defer to you now if you have a question or two.

Senator COCHRAN. Well, I do not. My only question is how we can go to all these meetings we are supposed to go to?

Senator GORTON. If my memory serves me correctly, you are supposed to be presiding in one right now.

Senator COCHRAN. I am supposed to be presiding. Yes.

Senator GORTON. That is on my schedule, too, today.

Senator COCHRAN. I wish I could stay here to listen to Secretary Heyman, and Constance, and all the others who are here.

Mr. HEYMAN. The loyalty of my Regent. [Laughter.]

Senator GORTON. The statement will be included in the record.

#### PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator GORTON. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

#### PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

Mr. Chairman, although I must preside at another hearing at 10 o'clock, I wanted to stop by to welcome Secretary Heyman, and the other witnesses who are here to discuss the budget request of the Smithsonian Institution. As a recently appointed Smithsonian Regent, I am especially interested in the testimony of these witnesses.

The Smithsonian is an independent trust instrumentality of the United States that is dedicated to the high goal of the "increase and diffusion of knowledge." As we Americans proudly note, it is the largest Institution of its kind, and nearly 29 million people annually visit its 16 museums and galleries and National Zoo. The arts, history, technology, and science are represented in its exhibits through the conduct of research, publication of studies, and participation in cooperative international programs of scholarly exchange.

As we move toward the Smithsonian's sesquicentennial in 1996, I am sure we all want to pay careful attention to the work of this very important national Institution and support its service to the Nation and to the world.

## NATIONAL AIR AND SPACE MUSEUM EXTENSION

Senator GORTON. Let me start by asking about the last question that you raised concerning the \$4 million rescission for air and space, and the desire to keep going ahead with \$2 million. I take it that none of that \$4 million has been expended?

Mr. HEYMAN. No, No; none of it has been expended.

Senator GORTON. What was your time line, and the breakdown of the use for the \$8 million that you expected over a 3-year period?

Mr. HEYMAN. I am going to defer to the Under Secretary.

Ms. NEWMAN. The first amount, the \$3.9 million, was to be used to plan and design the first number of buildings, the hangar with the mezzanine, a building for the public amenities, additional storage space. In other words, we already have a master plan for that whole area.

There were two other major activities that needed to go on. One was the determination of our sources of funds, whether or not you could raise funds, what kind of business activities, what kind of membership program. In order to do that, we were borrowing up to \$3 million, the initial amount was \$500,000, to conduct those studies.

At the same time, we needed to go beyond the master plan and plan and design the individual buildings. The idea was that the first building would be the hangar with the mezzanine that would be available to the public.

Now, what I should do is also ask the man who has been involved in developing the master plan, Bob Dillman. He wants to put a little more detail behind that.

Mr. DILLMAN. We are working on the final pieces of the master plan, and then we will move into the design of the individual buildings. So we are approaching a time where we will start using that \$4 million for design of the actual structures.

The reason that we need the \$2 million in 1996 to carry forward is once we get the design started, to keep it moving forward.

Senator GORTON. Well, I guess my real question is: If the \$4 million rescission went through, but you got \$2 million for fiscal year 1996, you would be using that, Mr. Secretary, for something else other than this preliminary design; you would change the order of the way in which you are spending the money?

Ms. NEWMAN. What we talked about doing is to then break up the project and say that we would then build, first, the hangar with the mezzanine, so that we would—rather than attempt to move in the way of the original schedule, that we would break it out in order to respond to our commitment to Virginia, that the first buildings would be those that the public would have access to.

So the first buildings would be the hangar with the mezzanine and the public amenities.

Senator GORTON. Would \$2 million be sufficient to do the design work?

Ms. NEWMAN. \$2 million would be sufficient, we believe, to design the first building and to begin the second design on the second building.

Senator GORTON. And it would not matter whether that was \$2 million less of a rescission for this year, or a new appropriation of \$2 million for next year.

Ms. NEWMAN. Correct.

#### CONSTRUCTION COST OF THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Senator GORTON. On the Indian museum, Mr. Secretary, refresh my memory as to what you believe the total construction cost of those two facilities to be, spread out over how long a period of time?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, the resources and collection center in Suitland is \$44 million. Some \$6 million has already been expended from prior appropriations. So the design for that is complete.

And we have done some of the site work already with regard to its construction. So the new money that is necessary is approximately \$44 million, and it was planned to be one-half in 1995 and one-half in 1996.

Senator GORTON. And that would be entirely Federal funding?

Mr. HEYMAN. That would be entirely Federal. Then The Mall museum is estimated at \$110 million, one-third of which we would raise the money for—a good portion of that money has been raised or pledged already.

Senator GORTON. Are the two buildings absolutely interdependent? If you had a certain amount, if you had half as much money available over the next 3 or 4 years, would you build one of them and ignore the other?

Mr. HEYMAN. Very frankly, I would like to get done with the one in Suitland. I think that is the highest priority, because we simply have got to move that collection out of the circumstance it is presently in. If we were to delay anything, I would prefer to delay The Mall museum.

Senator GORTON. Even though it is The Mall museum that you are getting outside money—

#### CURRENT STORAGE CONDITIONS OF HEYE COLLECTION

Mr. HEYMAN. That is right. But I still would, just because I think that we are really in jeopardy. Bob Dillman has some pictures here that give you some of the flavor of what it looks like up in New York.

Mr. HOFFMANN. I think you have copies of this. As you can see, the objects are extremely crowded. They are on open shelving, so they are exposed to dust and pollution. They are so crowded, in fact, that it is extremely risky even to try to move an object, because any moving tends to—

Senator GORTON. Would the Suitland facility be sufficient to store everything that is up here in these places in New York, and more?

Mr. HOFFMANN. That is right.

Mr. HEYMAN. Probably some more, but—

Mr. HOFFMANN. Some more, not very much. The Heye Foundation collection is a single collection, and we do not contemplate major additions to it, as it stands.

What we are hoping for is a sort of storage—these are the same kinds of objects you see here, pottery. And you can see that we have shelving that can be closed up, so that the objects are enclosed, protected from dust and contaminants.

They are spaced so that they can be easily retrieved or put back in the collections. This is the sort of situation that we hope to achieve for this very important collection.

Senator GORTON. Does the Heye collection fairly represent all of the varying Indian cultures and civilizations in the United States?

Mr. HEYMAN. It is pretty comprehensive. About 70 percent of it is Indians who lived in what is now the United States or in portions of Canada. About 30 percent is Central American and South American. It represents a very large proportion of Indian roots in the United States.

#### FISCAL YEAR 1996 PRIORITIES

Senator GORTON. Now, on to your request of appropriations for next year: In nominal dollars, the budget that has been submitted to us increases your appropriations by approximately 10 percent over fiscal year 1995.

This subcommittee is more likely than not to be faced with a total amount of money for all of its various responsibilities that, at best, will be equal to the number of nominal dollars that we have for the current year, and very likely be fewer.

I guess I have a double question. How do we justify cutting the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Endowment for the Arts even more in order to provide a 10-percent increase for the Smithsonian Institution?

And assuming that you got precisely the same number of nominal dollars for next year that you are getting for this year, what would that require you to cut out?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, we are prepared, really, to go through this whole thing and prioritize as best we can. It is a little hard for me to do it right here, but we are prepared to do that.

Senator GORTON. All right. I will want you to do that. You recognize the problems that this subcommittee faces, in connection with all of our areas of responsibilities.

Mr. HEYMAN. Yes; I do recognize it.

#### MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR BACKLOG

Senator GORTON. Something that is related to that, and related to your construction budget, is your backlog for the maintenance of the facilities that you already have.

I heard yours and, obviously, the eloquent justification of Senator Inouye, for these new facilities. But how do we balance our desire for new facilities against our obvious requirement of keeping those we have in pristine condition?

Mr. HEYMAN. It is hard. It really is hard, given the budget cap, and we really have to try to think through where we would suggest that we hold back.

I must say that on the R&R budget, we have gone many years with a budget that is inadequate. And we did do an analysis this year, which was persuasive at least to OMB, which gave us a \$10 million increase, not the \$20 million that we thought would be the best, but the \$10 million increase, which we think will go a long way to meeting the problems that we have.

In this exercise that we obviously have to go through, we are going to have to balance and make suggestions to you, and see the extent to which we think it justified in what are our priorities with respect to lessening that sum.

There is no doubt about the fact that we have problems, and we have some very noticeable ones that we simply have to address rapidly in order to preserve collections, not the least being that we have to put a new roof on the Museum of American Art and the National Portrait Gallery. That is about a \$5 million item.

And we simply have to do that, because we have been patching and trying our very best to stop leaks. But it is like my house in California; apparently, you really have to replace the whole roof if you are going to really stop those leaks. So we have some real problems that we have to face in that reordering.

#### POLITICAL CORRECTNESS AT THE SMITHSONIAN

Senator GORTON. Now I want you to speak to the record in such detail as you will about the controversy over the Enola Gay exhibits, and beyond the Enola Gay exhibit, the clear perception across the country that the Smithsonian Institution, in many of its exhibits, is infected with an overwhelming political correctness virus, which somehow requires that you denigrate American history, whether it is our expansion into the West, or World War II, or the like.

You did not arrive in this position until most of what was going to take place had taken place. You have taken actions with which I can say on the record, as I have to you personally, I agreed under the circumstances.

But the people of the United States and the Congress are still faced with the proposition that the Smithsonian Institution gives the perception of wishing to downgrade our history, denigrate our triumph in World War II, treat the United States as an aggressor nation.

This, to put it mildly, differs rather profoundly from the attitude of national museums of other nations in the Western world.

What, if anything, is going to happen to keep this kind of very bad publicity, bad actions from recurring in the future—actions which, I have to say very bluntly, are likely to be reflected in future budgets of the Smithsonian?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, as you know, and certain staff knows, I have been concerned with this kind of a problem. And I have addressed it a couple of times in public speeches that I have made, both in the installation speech, a speech I made at the Press Club recently, and some others.

My concern is taking action which is a proper kind of a response for a new secretary.

We have put together a good group of people, who are talking through and trying to put together guidelines with respect to exhi-

bitions, and to give us a much more uniform review process of exhibitions, so that we know, or at least I know, what is coming up on the platter and what the contents of the exhibition are.

So I think that what is happening in a way is that we are firming up the administrative and management relationship between the central administration and each of the museums.

The museums, of course, historically, have been really quite independent. And in many ways I would like them to continue to be, with the directors of the museum essentially responsible.

But I would like us all to be dealing within some framework of guidelines. I would like us all to have somewhat similar processes of review. And I would like early warning systems for the central administration, I think we can accomplish that.

Senator GORTON. It is, of course, the Smithsonian that takes the criticism when one of its elements involves itself.

Mr. HEYMAN. I have noted that. [Laughter.]

And consequently, I have a responsibility. I have no doubts about that.

Senator GORTON. Is that what your new provost is partly for?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, in a way, yes. But, in a way, what I really have wanted is the ability—first of all, the ability to have somebody who is really accountable for the whole of the program rather than it being spread out, and various responsibilities falling between jobs.

But the second is to get some tradeoffs between arts and humanities on the one hand and sciences on the other, which were difficult in the past, because of separate assistant secretaries being in charge of those activities. But yes, in a way, accountability is a purpose of that reorganization.

But I did want to say something in advance of that, which is that I have not only been trying to think of management, I have been going around and seeing a bunch of exhibits, and going through museums slowly.

It is a vast place. The kinds of problems that have been noted, especially in some of the press, really are basically history exhibitions.

I think it is very noteworthy to realize that we also learn from past experience. And I guess the first of the notable exhibitions that come within your description, Senator, was West as America in the Museum of American Art.

That happened 4 or 5 years ago, and the people at the Museum of American Art really took the criticism that was rendered and have acted in accordance with that criticism.

So that is one thing I wanted to say, which is that there is a learning curve, and there is education that goes on within us.

The second thing I wanted to say was that if you look around the Smithsonian here in Washington at the moment, there are about 150 exhibitions, and then countless other objects that are not in exhibition format.

And there are about five that fit within what we are talking about in terms of controversial, in that sense. So in terms of scope, what always happens is that a group of things is fastened upon and the rest of the Institution is characterized by that.

Senator GORTON. V-J Day was a pretty big day.

Mr. HEYMAN. I understand. I understand that. By the way, I really do find, in a way, the Enola Gay exhibition and the problems that were raised by it extraordinary—in the sense that they so infuriated so many people. We just have not had anything like that, and I hope to God we never have anything like that again, in terms of response.

And I might just say about the Enola Gay exhibition itself—and I do not want to get into long descriptions of process, and all the rest—the original script, and the notoriety that it got, really kind of poisoned the atmosphere, because the eventual script that everybody came up with—through a collective activity of veterans groups making criticisms, and curators acting, and changes being made—if that had been the original script, that would be the show that would be going up in the Air and Space Museum now.

So in a way there was a corrective process. But unfortunately, it was the corrective process that gave us a terrible black eye, and we cannot afford to do that. We simply cannot afford to have replications of that kind of attack on us.

#### EMERGING EXHIBITION GUIDELINES

Now, as far as other exhibitions are concerned, as I say, I have been looking at them, and I have been getting educated. There is one over in the American History Museum, for instance, that the provost and I have spent, what, 7 or 8 hours with curators, with outside people who have come in who were critical of it, making suggestions, and slowly changes are being made in that existing exhibition.

We are all learning quite a lot about the kind of problems that are raised, together.

I am not inclined to think that we should only show objects; although, obviously, we should show a lot of objects, because they have meaning in themselves, and they do not really need a lot of interpretation or context.

But I think we ought to do contextual things. I think, for instance, where we used to show the First Ladies' gowns, for instance, simply alone, and then after we had to take that down in order to clean the gowns and preserve them from the light, we replaced that with a more interpretative exhibition, which tells you a lot about each of those First Ladies, and what they did, and how they aided their spouse in office, and the like. I think it is really a much deeper and better kind of an experience.

But when we do those kind of things—and I hope our guidelines, as they emerge, are going to do this—we have to make very sure that, especially in controversial areas, we are really balanced.

We should be more of a forum, and not pitching a line. I feel very sensitive to our not preaching and our not conceiving of a particular interpretation, but rather in the really controversial areas, being a forum for a number of interpretations where we are in neutral, and where we absolutely are sure that there is balance of presentation. So I think that is one of the guidelines I am looking forward to.

I think we should be very explicit about what we are doing. I think one of the things that trouble some is that they feel that in

some way there are unstated subtitles; there are things that are supposed to be extracted, but they are not talked about.

I think being very, very explicit and trying to define what the objectives of a particular exhibition are, and how one gets there, is a very good discipline for making sure that we are balanced.

And then there are some things that maybe are just not right for exhibitions. Often I have thought, with respect to the morality and the reasons and all the argument that surrounded the use of atomic weapons, I am not sure that that is the kind of thing you meaningfully can address on a wall, that that is the kind of thing that you address with a lot of words in books, and in a lot of conversation back and forth, that is very interactive.

It is a different way, but I am just not sure. I think some of the undertakings we have made in the past are probably not very appropriate for wallboard exhibitions.

As a matter of fact, the more signs you see, the more plaques you see, the more labels you see, written large, probably the more you see of that, the less that whole subject is really appropriate for education through exhibition. So we have a lot to do, in terms of thinking this through.

And, of course, there is very lively debate in the museum community, in general—this is not just the Smithsonian, but around the country—with regard to what exhibition policy ought to be.

But this is the direction we are going in, and I take it really quite seriously, and I take it as my responsibility to ensure that this is going to occur.

#### REDUCING SMITHSONIAN WORK FORCE

Senator GORTON. Another subject. At some point during the current fiscal year, as I understand it, you will have reduced your full-time equivalents by something more than 200 individuals. What impact is that going to have on the way in which you operate your museums?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, I am going to let the Under Secretary talk about this, because she is the one who, before I arrived, really orchestrated that.

Ms. NEWMAN. We tried very hard to go about this in a systematic way by, first, in 1993, coming back for approval to reprogram, based on restructuring, which came about through a process of back and forth with the museums and with the research institutes.

At that time, we reduced the work force by 41 people. That was based on the organizations saying that they could continue to carry out their mission, yet lose those personnel.

The second round was using the Federal buyout authority, which was very helpful to us, because we did not want to run a formal reduction in force.

I will not go into all the reasons that we do not want to do that, except to say that given the formula process and the way in which it is so mechanical, you lose, as an organization, the ability to influence the outcome, and you lose often some of the people that you have brought in who are cutting-edge people.

Frankly, in a previous life, I would have tried to have changed that, but for a lot of reasons, I was not able to do that.

But anyhow, moving on, we used the buyout authority. We did not limit it. We made it available to anybody who was interested, and through that process, 209 people took the buyout.

Now, that has been more problematic for us, because in some organizations we lost key people, and we lost the position. But we were able to make determinations within the Institution to move resources and positions back into those organizations.

We had requests back for about 63 to fill in behind. I mean everybody had a sad story, as you might imagine. And we ended up, we were only able to fill, I think, 6 of the 63.

People had an opportunity to make their arguments, and we looked at our resources and found that six of those positions were critical to the operation. Now, we are going to go through another process. We have to come up with another 29 positions in this year.

But I guess I would end by saying to you, up to this time, we have tried to do it in a way in which the managers of the programs have had an opportunity to make their arguments, and we have tried to do it in a way that is not mechanical and destructive of the mission.

But it is tough. It is tough for everybody. But so far, they will not agree if you ask them, but I believe they have had their say.

Senator GORTON. And you do not believe that your ability to undertake your many missions, whether they are displays, or research, or preservation, have been seriously undermined?

Ms. NEWMAN. It is more difficult, but we have taken existing resources and moved them into those areas where we, in fact, felt that the mission would not be able to be carried out by the reduction of personnel.

But it is difficult, and I will tell you that we lost people in some of the critical trade areas for building exhibitions. We lost large numbers of people in our Office of Exhibits Central.

The second part of that problem is there is not a new generation of people coming along with those skills. We lost a large number of people in our building maintenance area. We lost some people in our general counsel's office.

So we are finding areas where there are serious difficulties, and we are having to move from other areas, which are not as high priority.

But yes, it has had an impact and we would certainly hope that we are not forced into a position that we have to move faster than we are now moving, because that would, in fact, have a serious impact on our mission.

Years ago you would have said in this organization and many others, there is fat there somewhere. I would say to you that we are down to the bone really throughout the Institution.

#### UNOBLIGATED BALANCES IN THE REPAIR AND RESTORATION ACCOUNT

Senator GORTON. OK. Thank you. You talked about new roofs. My notes here say that as of 2 months ago you had over \$33 million in unobligated balances for repairs and renovation. What are they for and when are they going to be obligated?

Mr. DILLMAN. I think in the last few months that a lot of those obligations have been made, Senator.

Senator GORTON. It was probably fortunate. [Laughter.]

Mr. DILLMAN. Yes, sir; we have designs in place for repairs that far exceed the dollars we have available. One of the other things that we have to do is, because we are repairing very old, historic monumental structures, we must maintain a certain amount of contingency dollars available to us, because when we open up a wall, we frequently find things that we did not expect, or if we go above a ceiling we find things we did not expect.

And that normally runs us about 20 percent of the cost of a repair contract, for those things we find, and we have no way of predicting until we tear into it and do that repair.

For example, when we talked about doing the repair of the roof at the Museum of American Art and National Portrait Gallery, since it has been patched for years, there are many things under that roof that we just do not know what is there, until we start tearing it off.

So a certain amount of the dollars that you talked about, that \$30 million, are there to cover changes that occurred to us during our repair contracts.

Senator GORTON. These contracts are done by the private sector on a bid basis, correct?

Mr. DILLMAN. Yes, sir; they are.

Senator GORTON. But how do you deal then with all of these unexpected contingencies?

Mr. DILLMAN. When we do a design, we prepare a set of plans and specifications, which is typical in our business for any of the agencies.

We prepare a set of plans and specifications. We negotiate with a construction contractor, based on those plans and specifications, for a price to provide what is shown, what is detailed in those drawings and on those specifications.

But those are based on what we can see and what we know from our past experience with a particular system or with a particular part of the structure.

And we invariably find things. We find asbestos when we go in to tear out that we did not know was there, or we assume might be there, but were not sure. And so we price it as though it is not there.

If we expect or think there is a high potential for asbestos, for example, we will unit price it. We will agree with the contractor that for so many dollars a cubic foot, he will remove it and dispose of it for us.

But then we get in and we have to measure what the cubic feet are, and we will use those contingency funds then to pay for that.

At any one time we will have \$50 million to \$70 million worth of repair contracts underway, so 20 percent of that is a fair chunk of dollars that we have to have available to us to keep those repairs moving forward.

The other thing I would say to you is, for example, in the Museum of Natural History, where we have about 100 million dollars' worth of heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning required to be done in order to bring the systems to current day requirements and codes, we have that full packet designed at about a 25-percent level.

And we have 25 million dollars' worth of that 100 percent designed, and this year's budget request is only \$7 million for that. So by some miracle, if another \$16 million to \$20 million came to us, we could obligate that within a year.

We have many designs ready to go for repairs which are badly needed on the museums. It is just a matter of not having the cash at hand to do it.

#### OPERATING COSTS OF NEW FACILITIES

Senator GORTON. Let me go back both to the Indian Museum and the new Air and Space facility. Assuming that each one of these is completed, by how much is that going to increase the necessary personnel and future maintenance and operation expenses?

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, it will increase things, obviously. There is in this budget right now, provision for an increase in staff mainly in staff, for the Suitland facility, of about 30 FTE's. So, clearly, there is going to be an increase. I don't have with me a quantification of all of it, but there are increases in costs.

Senator GORTON. I think it will be valuable for us to know as soon as possible, let us say 5 or 6 years down the road, whenever your present construction plans would have all of these completed, how much larger, in numbers and in percentage, the permanent staff be, and the permanent maintenance and operation costs.

Mr. HEYMAN. OK. We will work those out.

#### NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Senator GORTON. Well, I am not sure that I have any specific questions on it, but due to all of the time that it has been in the news, does the Director of the zoo want to add anything to our testimony here today, to tell me what your plans are?

Mr. ROBINSON. Do you mean about the recent fatality?

Senator GORTON. Well, that is just what brought you into the news recently. Obviously, I do not think you can prevent something like that from taking place. I have no criticisms of the way in which you run the zoo.

It just reminds us all that you are there, and I would like to know something about your future plans.

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; on that particular issue, of course, you are absolutely right, it was an unpreventable event. I spent a lot of sleepless nights worrying about whether there was any way we were remiss. The D.C. Medical Examiner came up with the verdict that it was not an intentional act, and could not have been prevented.

We are moving ahead in a lot of the development of the zoo, and we are very pleased with the support we have had in the past from the Congress in creating exhibits that bring us into the most modern form of humane exhibition of animals.

We are very pleased that we are giving an educational message, which has greatly improved and reaches 3 million people, at least, a year.

We are very happy, indeed, with the state of the whole situation. But the one thing that really is crucial is that throughout the

world, zoos and similar institutions are being vigorously attacked by animal welfare organizations.

I feel that that necessitates the continuance of our progress in creating admirable exhibits, where the animals and plants are properly looked after. And the message they convey is not mitigated by any sense that the animals might be oppressed or in inappropriate—

Senator GORTON. There is no question about that. Does that same movement lead to any security problems?

Mr. ROBINSON. So far it has not. In Europe, there have been major problems in that direction. The animal liberation front has released animals from zoos, with disastrous effects for the animals that they have released.

They have not achieved freedom, as a consequence; at best, they have achieved a state of extreme stress. If you release wolves into downtown Birmingham—Birmingham, England, that is—it is not the ideal habitat, by any means. [Laughter.]

There is no ready supply of food, other than peoples' dogs and cats. [Laughter.]

So far we have our own security force, and that was one of the things that Mrs. Newman restored when two of our officers retired under the buyout plan.

That is an illustration of the kind of effects that this nonrandom retirement can have on a bureau. It is one of those processes where you do not choose people who retire, they choose to retire, and they can leave you very embarrassed—by people in inappropriate areas, like security, retiring.

We would love to carry on with our modernization and affecting so many people coming to Washington with a positive image of what the world of animals and plant life is about.

Senator GORTON. Thank you. I want to thank all of you. Secretary Heyman, you have taken this position over at a particularly stressful time.

Mr. HEYMAN. I expected a serene job, but much has changed since September.

Senator GORTON. It is obvious, and it ought to be able to go without saying, but it does not, that you now preside over one of the great American assets, even in these difficult times. We will do what we can to see to it that that aspect continues to prosper and to grow.

Mr. HEYMAN. Well, I am really very pleased with that sentiment, Senator. I could give you a long speech about how relatively small organizations find it hard to cut back, rather than big ones, but you have heard that from others, I am sure.

But I must say that having had 35 years at the University of California at Berkeley, and 10 years as chancellor, I have some sense of quality in education and in research, and I am astounded at, at least, selective parts of us.

I am astounded, for instance, at the quality of the Smithsonian astronomical observatory, its joint program in astrophysics at Harvard, the telescopes in Arizona, the new array that is going up in Mauna Kea. That is one thing we just have to preserve somehow.

We have to finish that. And there are \$650,000 of new money in here which is the finish of that project, but that submillimeter

array will be taking waves at a length that is going to permit looking through dust clouds, and presumably being able to see the birth of stars. It is just extraordinarily exciting.

The quality of the work that is being done there matches the quality of the work that is being done at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, which is probably the best tropical biology laboratory and research undertaking in the world.

People flock there from other universities around the world, and they pay their way when they come. But it really is an extraordinary facility.

I hope that there will be a stability of relationship with the Panamanian Government as the United States leaves the Canal Zone. There is a worry there, but not a serious one.

I was down there recently with the Director. We went and talked to the President of Panama, and if the Government stays stable, we will be fine, because we are——

Senator GORTON. That is a big—— [Laughter.]

Mr. HEYMAN. But in any event, it is a wonderful place. Obviously, I have responsibilities of the sort that I just indicated, and I will followup on those assiduously.

But I agree with you, it is really one of the great assets for the United States. So it is up to all of us really to preserve it and enhance it. Thank you very much.

#### ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator GORTON. There may be additional questions from other members of the committee. We have a series of questions we can submit to you in writing about particular projects and the like.

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

## ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

## Priorities

Question 1. Mr. Heyman, you are in the unenviable position of taking up the reins of an institution at a time when fairly abundant financial resources, which encouraged an expansive set of plans, no longer exist. What thoughts do you have about maintaining the quality and vibrancy of this national institution within the smaller and more fiscally severe framework within which we will all have to work?

Answer. At the outset let me assure the Committee that I am absolutely committed not only to maintaining the quality and vibrancy of the Smithsonian, but also to extending its resources to new audiences. To do this in the severely constrained fiscal environment in which we must operate requires building on processes initiated by my predecessor to restructure programs and to take further steps such as those I did right after I took office to streamline institutional management by reducing its layers and consolidating administrative functions.

In addition, we must thoroughly examine key functions and policies such as collections acquisition and deaccessioning with respect to their centrality to the mission of the Institution and their costs. The Institution must also seek collaborative relationships with other educational and cultural organizations as candidates for the long-term use and storage of collections that may no longer be central to the Smithsonian and as potential partners for shared exhibition and administrative functions.

Finally, the Institution must generate additional sources of income. Three avenues for doing so include:

- developing partnerships that use modest amounts of Federal funds to stimulate additional resources in the private sector and with units of state and local government
- invigorating the Institution's fund-raising capacity in order to create a broader base of individual donors
- accelerating the Institution's business activities to produce not only higher levels of income, but also distinctive products and improved public services.

Question 2. Does this budget request and the priorities it outlines reflect your own stamp on the Institution, or your predecessor's? Will it be in the next fiscal cycle that the Smithsonian's budget will more fully speak to your own priorities or are you comfortable with the status quo?

Answer. Prior to my becoming Secretary I was a Regent of the Smithsonian. The pending request, which was approved by the Regents, reflects institutional priorities that were developed on a "ground up" basis in an environment that offered limited funds for new programs.

I place a very high priority on the funding requested for electronic communications because they offer the Smithsonian an incomparable opportunity to fulfill its founder's global mandate for the diffusion of knowledge. The Institution is uniquely positioned to provide data, images, and programming across the country and around the world, but it must first accelerate modernization of its information technology infrastructure. It also is important, I believe, to complete the submillimeter array, and to continue development of the National Museum of the American Indian.

The Smithsonian's budget request for FY 1997 will reflect a planning process that I am initiating, as well as further internal restructuring and management streamlining and continued emphasis on public access to institutional resources through the new technologies.

Question 3. A number of the Smithsonian's facilities are in urgent need of repair and renovation. The backlog for major capital renewal is estimated at \$250 million. With collections potentially endangered and the threat of closure to the public where significant portions of buildings are deemed unsafe, is it responsible to lay the groundwork for expansion prior to investing in current maintenance requirements? Are the Smithsonian's responsibilities for safeguarding current collections taking a back seat to other program initiatives?

Answer. The Institution carefully balances program initiatives, the need to repair and renew existing buildings, the need to provide new space essential to the long term preservation of the collections that it holds in trust, and fulfillment of legal mandates. The high priority placed on maintaining the Institution's most valuable assets -- facilities and collections -- and on meeting legal responsibilities is reflected in annual budget requests and in the Smithsonian's long-range plans.

The projects in the major construction program all meet one or more of these criteria. The National Air and Space Museum Extension, the American Indian Cultural Resources Center, and the Suitland Collections Center are components of the Institution's plan to provide adequate and appropriate space in which to house, care for, and study the collections. The Natural History East Court building will help alleviate long-term space needs. It also relates directly to the Smithsonian's ability to complete urgently-needed renewal of the Museum's HVAC systems in the short term. The Cultural Resources Center and the Mall museum building of the National Museum of the American Indian also will satisfy legislative mandates, as well as legal responsibilities accepted by the Government when the Heye Foundation collections were transferred to the Institution.

The funding requests for Repair and Restoration (R&R) and Construction further reflect institutional balancing: if more were requested for R&R, it would be at the expense of funding for essential space in which to care properly for existing collections. Similarly, these needs are balanced against the Smithsonian's operational requirements that appear in the S&E account. The increase requested for R&R exceeds that for S&E and underscores the Institution's determination to accelerate the pace at which Smithsonian facilities, the core infrastructure for achieving its program goals, are renewed.

## Research vs. Collections

Question 4. The Smithsonian is frequently referred to as the "Nation's Attic." Behind it is the notion that you are the keeper of the nation's cultural treasures and artifacts, which indeed you are.

How do you respond to critics who see this as your sole mission and believe the Institution is overstepping its bounds by assuming a leading role in specific research activities?

Answer. The Smithsonian has a long tradition of being more than just a repository for collections. Some of its earliest work involved studies of the universe, research in evolutionary biology, and efforts related to understanding both temperate and tropical areas. The Institution's leadership role in specific research areas has developed from its unique collections, landholdings, and astronomical instruments.

Question 5. What can the Smithsonian Institution bring to its research efforts that is unique and could not be accomplished by another government agency or universities that receive federal grants?

Answer. The Smithsonian's research efforts focus on issues uniquely suited to the Institution by virtue of the combination of its collections, landholdings and unique instrumentation not duplicated by other federal agencies or universities. Further, the Smithsonian is interested in long-term questions (i.e. how ecosystems function over long periods of time) that can only be performed by an institution devoted to fundamental research with a permanent staff engaged in multi-disciplinary investigations. The Institution's research is often coordinated with other federal agencies and universities to ensure that it does not duplicate other on-going research programs or to ensure that it fills a unique niche which other institutions cannot. In particular, the national collections in areas of art, history, and natural science support research that would be impossible to carry out elsewhere.

Question 6. How does the Smithsonian coordinate its scientific endeavors with others to ensure that duplication is not occurring?

Answer. The Smithsonian employs a number of mechanisms for ensuring that duplication is not occurring. At the federal level, the Institution participates in the deliberations of the National Science and Technology Council and coordinates its efforts with the other science activities of government. Outside of the government, the Institution relies on tracking trends in the various disciplines where it conducts research by monitoring appropriate journals, attending national meetings, participating in research consortia, and by widely consulting experts in the field. In addition, the Institution relies heavily on peer review of its research in the sciences and is given feedback on the particular niche it fills in the disciplines represented at the Institution.

## FY 1996 Reductions

Question 7. If the Smithsonian were forced to operate in FY 1996 at the FY 1995 appropriated level, where would the impact be felt most significantly? What programs would be impacted most severely? How would you absorb this erosion to your base? Would you take across the board cuts or would you target programs selectively? Which programs would you try to maintain at current level funding and which ones would be reduced? Please discuss.

Answer. The impact would be felt Institution-wide with major impact on the developmental programs at the National Museum of the American Indian and the submillimeter telescope array at the Astrophysical Observatory. Mandatory costs for pay would be absorbed by each Smithsonian unit. Museums, research centers, and offices would also be forced to absorb across-the-board reductions made for utilities and rent shortfalls. Where feasible, the Institution would look to reduce selected programs, although no final decisions on which programs to reduce have been made at this time. The Institution, under the leadership of its new Secretary, is in the beginning of a process to review its mission and reorganize and restructure to maintain core programs. Specific areas being considered for cost savings include:

- Closing of museum galleries or reducing public hours in order to reduce security costs
- Reductions to the on-going development of the National Museum of the American Indian
- Curtailment or elimination of research projects throughout the Institution
- Reduction or deferral of critical collections management activities
- Reduction of the Traveling Exhibition Service's outreach programs

## Repair and Restoration

Question 8. The Smithsonian's request for this account in FY 1996 is \$34,000,000, an increase of \$10,046,000 over the FY 1995 appropriated level of \$23,954,000. In 1987, repair and renovation needs were estimated at \$216 million. As of April 1994, the Smithsonian estimated its total unfunded facilities renewal requirements at \$250 million.

The total federal appropriation for repair and renovation (not including NZP needs) from FY 1988 through FY 1995 has been \$193,394,000. The federal government has made a significant investment to help the Institution meet its obligations in this area. Why does it appear that this support has had little or no impact on the repair and restoration program? Please outline for the Subcommittee what has been accomplished within appropriated funds during the past eight years.

Answer. The amount of federal investment from FY 1988 through FY 1995 has been significant. However, given the age, nature, location, and historical status of many of Smithsonian buildings and spaces, the investment has not been enough to keep facilities at a normally acceptable level. Facilities deficiencies are accumulating at a rate of \$32 - \$35 million a year - a rate greater than the annual appropriation. The biggest contributor to the annual increase in deficiencies is the normal aging of building systems and components. Most of the Institution's older buildings were last renovated in the 1960s. Several were newly constructed about the same time, and several more were built in the 1970s. Building systems have an average life expectancy of 20 - 30 years, and the pace of deterioration accelerates dramatically as they pass the 30-year mark. New regulations on hazardous materials (such as PCBs and asbestos containing materials), and accessibility requirements have also contributed to the growth of facilities deficiencies.

Without adequate funding levels, the Smithsonian has been unable to accomplish systematic renewal of the older building systems. Some renewal work has been done -- notably at American History and the Freer Gallery. Work has also begun at the Natural History Building. Most of the funds provided in the Repair and Restoration account, however, has been necessarily focussed on making repairs "just in time" to keep buildings operational, and on meeting code requirements. A listing of the most significant projects completed in the last eight years follows.

- ceiling repairs and replacement at the Air and Space Museum Building
- attic repairs and renovations at the American Art and Portrait Gallery Building
- repair and renovation of galleries and support spaces at the Freer Gallery
- repairs to all Smithsonian parking lots and sidewalks in the Mall area
- repairs and safety improvements to the access road at Whipple Observatory
- phased facade repair and window replacement at the Smithsonian Institution Building
- roof repair and replacement at the Air and Space Museum, Renwick Gallery, Cooper-Hewitt Museum, and Hirshhorn Museum buildings
- exterior wall, roof, and skylight repairs to most buildings at the Paul E. Garber Facility in Suitland, Maryland
- window repairs at the Hirshhorn building

- energy improvements at the Renwick Gallery
- plaza repair and replacement at the Air and Space Museum, American History Museum, and Hirshhorn Museum buildings
- repair and installation of handrails in the Natural History Building
- major mechanical and electrical repairs to the Ancon building at the Tropical Research Institute in Panama
- mechanical equipment controls upgrades for all the Mall museum buildings
- electrical repairs to most buildings at the Paul E. Garber Facility in Suitland, Maryland
- electrical switchgear replacement at the American History Building
- major phased fire protection improvements and upgrades at the Air and Space Museum, Arts and Industries and Smithsonian Institution buildings
- emergency power upgrade for all the Smithsonian Mall museum buildings
- removal of significant amounts of asbestos containing materials throughout the Institution
- underground storage tank removal throughout the Institution
- removal and replacement of electrical transformers containing PCBs throughout the Institution
- elevator repairs and safety upgrades throughout the Institution
- security lighting for the Institution's Mall buildings and the American Art and Portrait Gallery building
- phased major repair and renovation of the heating, ventilating, and air conditioning systems and energy improvements at the American History, Air and Space Museum, and Anacostia Museum buildings
- chiller plant relocation, window replacement, and new mechanical equipment penthouse structures at the National Museum of Natural History
- cooling tower renovation at the Museum Support Center in Suitland, Maryland

Question 9. Given the grave condition of several of your facilities and the peril in which collections are placed as a consequence, has the Smithsonian been a conscientious steward in executing its responsibilities to safeguard our national treasures? Why were conditions not attended to prior to the accumulation of an identified \$200 million backlog? Why was there not a more timely evaluation that might have averted the structural crises now facing the Smithsonian?

Answer. The Smithsonian has been a conscientious steward in executing its responsibilities to safeguard our national treasures. For the past several years, the Smithsonian has been articulate in portraying the conditions of its buildings and the need for funds. We first reported the existence of a \$200 million plus backlog of repairs in 1987. The Smithsonian staff conducts regular building inspection. From these inspections and other investigative work the staff develops a five-year repair and restoration plan. This five year plan is the basis for annual appropriation requests.

While the Smithsonian's needs have been reflected in its annual budget requests, the full requests have been cut back at the executive and legislative levels. The Institution has effectively and efficiently used the funds that have been made available.

Question 10. Have structural needs and maintenance of facilities taken a back seat to an expanding construction schedule that has gone from an appropriation of \$3.805 million in FY 1986 to a requested funding level of \$38.7 million in FY 1996? Please comment.

Answer. The repair and maintenance of facilities has not taken a back seat to construction priorities. The Institution carefully balances the need to repair and renew existing buildings with the need to provide new space essential to the long-term preservation of existing collections and the fulfillment of legal mandates. The high priority placed on maintaining the Institution's most valuable assets -- facilities and collections -- and on meeting legal responsibilities is reflected in the annual budget requests and in the Smithsonian's long-range plans. The projects now in the major construction program meet one or more of these criteria.

The Air and Space Extension and the American Indian Cultural Resources are key components of the Institution's plan to provide adequate and appropriate space in which to house, care for, and study the collections. The Natural History East Court Building will help alleviate space needs in the long-range, and will directly impact the Smithsonian's ability to complete urgent renewal of the National Museum of Natural History in the short term. The American Indian Cultural Resources Center and the Mall Museum will satisfy legislative mandates, as well as legal responsibilities accepted by the government when the collections were transferred to the Institution. Several of these new facilities will also contribute to the Institution's ability to present exhibitions and other programs directly to the public, made available.

Question 11. According to your request, funding repair and renovation in the years ahead at the current appropriated level of \$24 million will not halt the

continuing decline of the buildings for which you are custodian. A minimum annual appropriation of \$40 million is necessary to halt the decline, an increase of approximately \$16 million over FY 1995. Are there areas where the Smithsonian can reduce its programs or plans in order to help provide the additional funds necessary?

Answer. As indicated in the answer to Question 3, the Smithsonian engages in a continuing process of carefully balancing Institutional needs related to program initiatives, to the repair and renewal of existing facilities, and to the provision of new space for the long-term preservation of its collections and the fulfillment of legal mandates. The Smithsonian's annual budget requests and its long-range plans reflect Institutional judgment on that balance and on the priority placed on maintaining the Institution's most valuable assets -- facilities and collections -- while also meeting legal obligations and utilizing the collections for public benefit. Diverting funds from existing accounts to that for repair and renovation would be at the expense either of Construction funding for essential new space in which to care properly for the collections or of the Smithsonian's already constrained operational requirements appearing in the S&E account.

Question 12. As of January 1995, the Smithsonian had a \$33,730,000 unobligated balance for repair and restoration (R&R). How much has been obligated since that time?

Answer. The amount of \$2.9 million has been obligated through February. An additional \$14 million is currently committed and expected to be obligated during FY 1995. The remaining \$16.8 million is needed to complete various projects now underway, cover testing, inspection and necessary contractual changes, as well as security and Office of Plant Services support and project management for R&R projects.

Question 13. The Subcommittee recognizes that because of the nature of activities in this category, dollars cannot always be allocated on a precise timeline. However, given the dire needs cited by the Smithsonian, is the Institution moving as expeditiously as possible in order correct hazardous conditions and potentially disastrous consequences?

Answer. The Institution moves as expeditiously as possible to correct hazardous conditions and potentially disastrous consequences. Projects are prioritized with immediate attention given those where safety of visitors, staff or collections are in immediate danger. Unfortunately, the backlog continues to grow, creating more situations that must be responded to on an emergency basis.

Question 14. The National Gallery of Art recently received a grant from the Department of Energy's Federal Energy Efficiency Fund to assist them with replacement of their building automation systems. Has the Smithsonian investigated the possibility of similar assistance from grant programs that may be

available to help meet the Institution's needs? If so, please explain. If not, why not?

Answer. The Smithsonian has received grants from DOE's Federal Energy Efficiency Fund to assist in lighting retrofit projects at the Museum Support Center. PEPCO rebates are also expected upon completion. Investigation of other alternative funding sources continues.

Applications for grant assistance are pending or in development for the following projects:

- Smithsonian Institution Support Center lighting retrofit (\$65,000)
- National Air and Space Museum lighting retrofit (\$45,000)
- Paul E. Garber Facility lighting retrofit (\$200,000)
- National Museum of Natural History lighting retrofit (approximate cost \$950,000)
- Hirshhorn lighting retrofit (to be developed)
- American Art & Portrait Gallery lighting retrofit (to be developed)

The Smithsonian is also exploring potential incremental funding from the Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) for necessary major capital renewal. High efficiency replacement glazing for the skylights and window walls at the National Air and Space Museum, and energy efficient cooling equipment to reduce electrical loads are two candidates for FEMP funding.

Question 15. Is it realistic in this budget climate to hope that \$50 million a year, almost double your current funding level, will be available beginning in FY 1997 through the year 2000 and beyond to provide repair and renovation (R&R) funds?

Answer. The Institution is aware of the economic implications of its request for R&R funding. However, the Institution would be acting irresponsibly not to alert the Congress to the true need and the potential impact of continued funding at a lower level.

Question 16. The Museum Support Center is a relatively new facility and yet on the charts that display the conditions of Smithsonian facilities (p.105-107), it falls below the level of excellent. Why? Were there needs that were not anticipated or met in the planning and construction of this facility? Please explain.

Answer. As the chart on page 102 of the Institution's budget request illustrates, overall building conditions begin to decline at the end of the first ten years of service. The Museum Support Center was completed twelve years ago (in 1983), and thus is already past the period when it can be considered "excellent." The charts on pages 105-107 reflect a projection of an additional five years of deterioration, when the MSC will be 17 years old. The facility's position on the charts reflects only the normal aging process.

## Office of Design and Construction

Question 17. The Smithsonian has requested increases of 15 positions and \$1.5 million for staff and support costs to administer the repair and renovation program. This would raise the appropriation for this division from the currently funded level of \$3.77 million to \$5.438 million in FY 1996. The request includes 9 positions and \$1 million to administer the program at the currently funded level of \$24 million, and 6 positions and \$500,000 to meet demands of the FY 1996 program at the proposed increased level of \$34 million.

What is not being addressed within the repair and renovation program as currently funded at \$24 million because of insufficient staff to execute this office's responsibilities? What would be accomplished with the 9 requested positions that cannot be accomplished within the current level of staffing?

Answer. The Office of Design and Construction (ODC) cannot currently complete a number of activities related to planning, design and management of R&R projects in a timely manner because of staff shortages. Projects which are ready to be bid are often delayed because construction management staff are not available to oversee contractor activities and perform inspections of work in place. Lack of staff to prepare cost estimates and job specifications also causes delays in preparing projects for bid. These delays result in additional costs to the Government, for example, through change orders. Some specific kinds of work, such as efforts to make all Smithsonian facilities fully accessible and in conformance with new laws and regulations governing seismic safety, are slowed due to lack of specialized staff to evaluate the problem areas and plan solutions.

The nine requested positions would allow ODC to develop and manage more design and construction activities and to properly consider and implement new laws and regulations governing seismic safety, accessibility, historic preservation, energy conservation, and the environment. The additional staff will make more efficient and effective use of limited R&R resources to reduce the accumulation of facilities deficiencies.

Question 18. From FY 1993 through FY 1995, the appropriation for the repair and renovation program has been approximately \$24 million. By the requested increase of 9 staff positions to administer this program appropriately at the current level, should we assume that the funding over the past three years has exceeded what existing staff could implement?

Answer. As described in the answer to the previous question, the Office of Design and Construction has in fact been spread thin and stretched to accomplish the current volume of work. To counter this problem, R&R funds have occasionally been used for contract and temporary staff to assist in management of R&R projects, but this is an expensive and inefficient solution to a long-term need.

Question 19. The budget request for FY 1995 did not contain a request for an increase in staff, but your request for repair and renovation funds was \$25.3 million, over a million more than the final Congressional appropriation.

How does the Smithsonian explain its current staffing request in light of the above. Please explain.

Answer. The Institution intended to use a portion of the FY 1995 requested increase in R&R funding for additional contract and temporary staff to assist in the management of R&R projects. As stated in the answer to question 18, the Institution has determined this method inefficient. An increase in permanent ODC staff would be more cost effective.

Question 20. Looking ahead to FY 1997 and beyond, when according to the budget estimate the request for repair and renovation funds will escalate to \$50 million, do you envision further staff increases for this office? Please explain.

Answer. Yes, the Office of Design and Construction may require a staff increase when the R&R program escalates to \$50 million.

Question 21. If Congress is able to fund fully your request for the Office of Design and Construction, what will be accomplished in FY 1996 that otherwise would be left undone, if held to the current funding level?

Answer. Work will be accomplished more efficiently and effectively with permanent ODC staff than with contractors and temporary employees. Projects will be designed, bid and constructed in a more timely manner, allowing the Institution to complete more work in less time, at significant savings. The nine new positions will dramatically improve management of construction activities and ensure that designs appropriately incorporate laws and regulations governing seismic safety, accessibility, and historic preservation.

#### National Museum of the American Indian Salaries and Expenses

Question 22. Within the Salaries and Expenses account, an increase of 30 positions and \$4.285 million is requested for the NMAI. For the record, please prioritize the 7 distinct request for federal assistance. Are there requests that could be deferred? Are there functions that would be enhanced by an increase in staff and dollars, but are nonetheless operational and can be maintained at current funding levels? Please explain.

Answer. The following lists the FY 1996 requests in order of priority:

1. Custom House Security and Health Support (10 Positions and \$854,000)
2. Facilities Support Personnel (3 Positions and \$137,000)  
This request includes funding to hire 2 Engineers and 1 Groundskeeper.

3. **Community Services (4 Positions and \$253,000)**  
NMAI has placed an emphasis on the establishment of a "Community Services" component in order to provide outreach and support to tribal museum efforts and to work more closely with the people representing the living culture of the Museum. The Museum has identified a minimum staffing need of 4 additional FTE's to launch this effort. This program will focus on such activities as training and internship and expanding the accessibility of NMAI's extensive collections and resources to its constituencies.
4. **Public Programs (6 Positions and \$232,000)**  
NMAI has identified the need for 5 additional FTE's to work with the large numbers of the public who are visiting the GGHC. This does not represent an expansion of a program, but is an effort to stabilize and enhance the programmatic authenticity of NMAI "on the floor" educational efforts through the use of an interpretive staff. At the present time NMAI uses interpreters as a part of the exhibit experience, and they are employed on contract. This method has proven to have inherent quality control and training problems which NMAI intends to correct by making this function a fully recognized part of its program with permanent staff. The request for an additional position in the area of exhibits for GGHC will assist in the normal changeover of exhibits at the Custom House.
5. **Cultural Resources (4 Positions and \$480,000)**  
NMAI's request includes 4 additional FTE's to enhance its research efforts pertaining to the collection, the repatriation program and support of exhibits activities. Additional program funds in the amount of \$288,000 will allow for expanded research activities with tribal communities, enhancement of the conservation of the collection and support for the digital imaging of objects and photos in the collections. All of these efforts will improve accessibility to the collection.
6. **Administrative Support (3 Positions and \$878,000)**  
Without this staffing, NMAI cannot respond in a timely and cost effective manner to the myriad of support needs inherent in the planning and implementation of programs for the care and protection of the collection of the Collections Resources Center (CRC). Planning and procurement of equipment, furnishings, technology support, etc. for the construction and occupancy of the Mall museum will also be affected. Program funding in the amount of \$735,000 is directly related to the phase out of the Audubon Terrace facility, the operations at the George Gustav Heye Center

(GGHC) and the Research Branch at the Bronx. Of this amount \$485,000 can be deferred.

7. Cultural Resources Center Equipment (\$1.451 million)  
An amount of \$1.451 million will begin to equip the CRC in support of traditional care and access to the collection. This support item will require long lead time for procurement and installation and will need to be closely coordinated with the building construction contract. In addition, the resources requested will provide funding for installation of a universal communication system. The system will provide efficient communication within the Suitland facility, communication with other NMAI sites, and automated access to the collections and research information. This request can be deferred.

Question 23: To date, construction costs for the three facilities have totalled \$42.7 million in federal appropriations. What are the total costs that have been appropriated to date through the Salaries and Expenses account for NMAI activities?

Answer: The Salaries and Expenses appropriations to-date for the National Museum of the American Indian are as follows:

NMAI Salaries and Expenses Appropriation History  
(\$000)

	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995
NMAI Appropriation	4,000	10,168	10,772	12,365	11,502	13,241

Question 24. What are estimated operational costs and FTE levels for both the Cultural Resources Center and the Mall facilities, when completed? Where do we stand at present?

Answer. The Cultural Resources Center in Suitland, Maryland is scheduled to open in FY 1997. The facility will be fully functional when the move of the NMAI collection and staff from the Bronx is completed in 2002. The projected annual cost of operations for this facility when fully functional in FY 1995 dollars is \$12.329 million supporting 76 FTEs. The projected operating cost of the Mall museum is \$19.392 million and 159 FTEs and includes staff and funding from current D.C. operations. The following chart outlines the National Museum for the American Indian's anticipated operating requirements for FY 1995 through FY 2001.

## National Museum of the American Indian Operating Costs

Facility	FY 1995		FY 1996		FY 1997		FY 1998		FY 1999		FY 2000		FY 2001	
	FTE	\$000												
Mall	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	131	--	3,833	159	10,302
Custom House	61	6,270	67	6,816	78	9,411	78	9,834	78	8,989	78	9,046	78	9,057
Suitland	--	--	--	137	10	3,990	18	6,124	42	7,977	57	9,386	67	10,276
Bronx	43	3,775	46	4,380	54	5,369	54	5,369	31	3,704	19	2,613	9	2,051
DC	48	5,292	56	6,048	77	7,079	81	7,441	95	8,170	105	9,483	--	--

Note: Operating costs include salaries/benefits for NMAI staff, direct (NMAI) and indirect (other SI offices) support costs. SI offices providing NMAI support include: Office of Protection Services, Office of Plant Services, (including Utilities), and SI Libraries at the Suitland facility.

Move costs and one-time start-up costs such as furnishings, computer equipment, and conservation-related equipment, are as follows:

## National Museum of the American Indian Move and One-Time Start-up Costs.

	FY 1996 \$000	FY 1997 \$000	FY 1998 \$000	FY 1999 \$000	FY 2000 \$000	FY 2001 \$000
One Time	1,826	5,496	1,837	7,200	12,500	3,500
Move	0	1,065	2,169	2,129	2,129	2,129

Question 25. What are the current operational costs and FTE level for the Custom House? Are the operational costs shared by the State and City of New York, as the construction costs were, or is that a full federal responsibility?

Answer. The NMAI's current Federal operating base for the Custom House facility is 61 FTEs and \$6.270 million. The operating costs are not shared by the State and City of New York.

Question 26. An additional \$735,000 has been requested to cover operations functions of the Washington, D.C. and New York facilities. Please break out the costs between the two offices. What was the federal contribution to the NMAI campaign development effort in FY 1995?

Answer. Funding requested for the Washington, D.C. facilities (\$415,000), includes increased rent costs for existing space; and travel between New York and Washington. In addition, funding for the George Gustav Heye Center (GGHC), N.Y.C. (\$320,000) includes upgrade of phone systems, cleaning/consumable supplies and maintenance contracts based on additional staff and projected public attendance which has exceeded original estimates and workstations for new staff. The federal contribution to the NMAI campaign development in FY 1995 is \$905,000.

Question 27. An increase of \$1.451 million is requested to begin to equip the Cultural Resources Center. It is anticipated that this funding will be kept in the base to continue the purchase of critical communications and collections storage equipment for the Suitland facility. Additional funding will be required in FY 1997 and future years in order to complete the relocation of the collection from New York. Please outline the plans and estimated future costs for this equipment. Is there current base funding that the \$1.451 million will be added to or is this an initial request? How many years is it calculated that this amount will need to remain in the base?

Answer: The requested funding will complete the purchase and installation of communications technology equipment by FY 1997 to coordinate with the anticipated construction completion of the Cultural Resources Center (CRC) in September 1997. The total estimated cost of \$2.015 million is phased between FY 1996 and FY 1997. An amount of \$5.44 million for the purchase and installation of compact collections storage equipment for CRC will be phased over a six year period between FY 1996 and 2001. This is in addition to a request under the Major Construction Program account for \$2.11 million, which will cover the installation of floor tracks and initial allotment of compact collections storage equipment. The \$1.451 million requested in FY 1996 is an initial request that will need to remain in the NMAI base through 2001.

Question 28. Four positions and an increase of \$253,000 is requested to establish a community services program. Where will this staff of four be located?

Answer. The four staff members will initially be located in existing offices in L'Enfant Plaza. When the Mall facility is completed, NMAI will relocate the program there permanently.

Question 29. Six positions and an increase of \$232,000 for public programs and exhibitions at the Heye Center is requested. How much of this increase will be used to accommodate the current program? How much will be used for expanded activities? Are volunteers used for these kinds of activities? How many individuals are employed by the Heye Center for these two functions now?

Answer. This does not represent an expansion of a program, but is an effort to stabilize and enhance the programmatic authenticity of NMAI "on the floor" educational efforts through the use of an interpretative staff. At the present time NMAI uses interpreters as a part of the exhibit experience, and they are employed on contract. This method has proven to have inherent quality control and training problems which NMAI intends to correct by making this function a fully recognized part of its program with permanent staff. The request for an additional position in the area of exhibits for GGHC will assist in the normal changeover of exhibits at the Custom House. NMAI currently has a roster of 100 individuals who volunteer for staffing the information and

membership booths. The Heye Center currently has 27 positions funded for these two functions.

Question 30. Of the requested increase of 4 positions and \$480,000 for cultural resources, \$288,000 is proposed for curatorial staff to expand its research activities with more field research in tribal communities, enhance the conservation of the collection through specialized treatments by contract conservators, and support on-going digital imaging of objects and photos in the collection. How much of the current budget is dedicated to these activities?

Answer. NMAI has dedicated \$178,000 of its FY 1995 funding to cultural resources activities. This funding includes:

Research Activities	\$25,000
Collections Conservation	\$63,000
Digital Imaging	\$90,000

Question 31. Ten positions and an \$854,000 increase have been requested in FY 1996 for Custom House security and health program support. This program increase will provide funding for 8 Smithsonian security officers and contract security officers, an occupational health nurse and an emergency medical technician. How much of the total \$854,000 increase is for security? What is the current level of security staffing at the Custom House?

Answer. Of the \$854,000 requested, \$654,000 is for security in New York, and \$200,000 is for health services.

There are 60 security personnel presently assigned to the staff at the Custom House. However, some staff and funding were temporarily diverted from the other NMAI facilities in order to open the building to the public this past fall. Contract officers are being used at the other NMAI sites (the Research Branch and Audubon Terrace), but this is not an acceptable solution for the long term because of the increased risk of security incidents. The requested funds will allow the Office of Protection Services (OPS) to replace those contract officers with proprietary officers and to hire to the full level of staffing necessary to secure all NMAI facilities in New York. Although the Audubon Terrace facility will close in the next year, these funds will allow OPS to provide security until the Smithsonian no longer has responsibility for the building. Finally, a portion of the funds will also allow necessary routine modernization and upgrades of radios and alarm systems at the Custom House and the Research Branch integral to the year-to-year operations of those systems.

The health services portion of the FY 1996 request will fund two positions and related support costs. The requested funding will support the full range of health services mandated by OSHA (physician services, hearing conservation, blood-borne pathogens, flu shots, and worker's compensation reports). The Custom House will be the central point in New York for all Smithsonian occupational health support.

Question 32. As of January 1995, an unobligated balance of approximately \$10 million included funding for security officers at the Custom House. Why do you include a request in your FY 1996 budget, when resources are available currently for unmet needs? How much of the total unobligated balance is targeted for the Office of Protection Services at the Custom House? Please explain.

Answer. The funds available to the NMAI in FY 1995 are budgeted for NMAI salaries and expenses (approximately 70% of the annual appropriation) and programmatic support. In FY 1995, an amount of \$200,000 of NMAI funding will be used to supplement the Office of Protection Services at the Custom House.

As of February 28, 1995, NMAI's unobligated balance was \$9.2 million. This funding is budgeted for specific uses in FY 1995 shown below and will result in no carryover funds in FY 1996.

(\$ in millions)

Salaries and Benefits	7.0
Travel	.3
Rent/Communication	.5
Other Services	1.1
Supplies	.2
Equipment	<u>.1</u>
Total	\$9.2

Question 33. The National Museum of the American Indian has funding requests for FY 1996 within a number of accounts. Please provide the Subcommittee with the total amount requested within each separate account for the NMAI in FY 1996.

Answer. The following summarizes FY 1996 funding for the National Museum of the American Indian by accounts:

Salaries and Expenses	\$16,125,000
Construction	
Cultural Resources Center	21,500,000
Mall Museum Building	3,000,000
Repair and Restoration	485,000

NMAI Construction

Question 34. To date, the Smithsonian has received \$42,699,000 in construction appropriations for all three facilities. The FY 1996 request is \$24.5 million, an increase of \$1.5 million over the FY 1995 appropriated level

of \$23 million. \$21.5 million is proposed for construction of the Suitland facility; \$3 million for planning/design of the Mall facility.

Design of the Cultural Resources Center (CRC) has been completed and construction is anticipated to begin in late 1995. \$22.956 million was appropriated in FY 1995 for construction (\$2.994 for the Mall facility and \$19.962 for CRC); \$21.5 million is requested in FY 1996 to fund the remaining construction costs and purchase a portion of the furnishings and equipment for the building. Another \$1 million from the Salaries and Expenses account will also be used for equipment. How much of the \$21.5 million requested through the construction account will be designated for equipment?

Answer. Of the \$21.5 million in the Construction request for FY 1996, \$3.94 million is for equipping the NMAI's Cultural Resource Center. Of this amount, \$2,110,000 is for the initial purchase of collections storage equipment, \$820,000 is for furnishings and equipment, \$780,000 is for security systems equipment, and \$230,000 is for signage.

Question 35. In the budget, it states that over the next several years, the remainder of CRC storage collection equipping requirements will be met through the NMAI salaries and expenses account. What are the estimated total costs of these requirements and over what period of time?

Answer. NMAI plans to phase the purchase and installation of collections storage equipment over a six-year period with the initial phase to begin during construction. Total projected costs in 1995 dollars for the collections storage equipment is \$7.55 million. Of this amount, \$2.11 million is included in the Construction account to install tracks in the floor and to purchase the initial allotment of compact collections storage units. The remaining \$5.44 million will be included in NMAI's Salaries and Expenses Account to continue the phased purchase of compact collections storage units between FY 1996 through FY 2001.

Question 36. Storage for the Heye Collection is now located in the Bronx. How much does it cost to operate the Bronx facility? Once the CRC is completed, what is the estimated timetable for removal of the collection from the Bronx to the Suitland facility? When is it estimated that the Bronx facility will be closed down and how much will be saved annually from the closure of this facility? Is the Bronx facility rented space? Please explain.

Answer. The Bronx facility's operational cost for FY 1995 is \$3.775 million; the cost at peak operation beginning in FY 1997 with the collections relocation phase is estimated to be \$5.369 million. The move of the collection from the Bronx is projected to take five to seven years. If the CRC is completed on schedule and opens in the fall of 1997, NMAI will begin moving collections in the spring of 1998 and complete the move by the end of 2002.

The Bronx facility is owned by the Smithsonian Institution. It was transferred by the agreement granting the Heye Foundation collection to SI.

Question 37. \$3 million is requested for completing the design of the Mall facility. Another \$3.7 million in non-appropriated funds will also be used. Total prior federal funding for design totals \$6.3 million. Where in the design process are we now?

Answer. Three concept alternatives will be ready by September 1995.

Question 38. Construction on this facility is scheduled to begin in 1997, with its projected opening in 2001. Estimated construction costs total \$110 million, 2/3's of which will be paid for by federal appropriations. Another third will be obtained through fundraising. Where does the fundraising effort stand now?

Answer. As of May 31, 1995, \$27,886,733 has been raised in cash and pledges toward the construction fund goal of \$36.7 million. Overall, the National Campaign for the National Museum of the American Indian has raised a total of \$32,824,899.

#### Air and Space Museum Extension

Question 39. Congress has authorized \$8 million for planning and design of the Air and Space Museum Extension. \$4 million was appropriated in FY 1995. \$2 million is requested in FY 1996 and a final \$2 million will be requested in FY 1997 to complete the federal commitment. Construction costs are to be met independent of any federal appropriation.

The Commonwealth of Virginia has affirmed its support for the Air and Space Museum Extension with a \$3 million interest-free loan, provision of infrastructure at the site (estimated at approximately \$25-40 million), and a \$100 million bond for construction. Last year at a hearing held by the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, the Director of the Air and Space Museum discussed finding "additional income streams" to pay off this bond. In the ensuing year, have some of these potential income streams been identified? Please explain.

Answer. Potential revenue streams at the Extension include both traditional and non-traditional business ventures. The Museum is currently looking into the feasibility of two types of non-traditional ventures that might be income generating and thereby permit a portion of the construction costs to be financed through a bond issue.

Both non-traditional ventures would entail using a portion of the 185 acre site for activities which complement the museum. One venture is a permanent aerospace trade fair which would provide exhibition space for military and commercial aerospace products. The other venture is an aerospace/futuristic entertainment complex which could provide additional activities for families visiting the museum. Efforts are underway to analyze the feasibility of these two ventures and to determine whether the income generated through these and more traditional means (e.g. parking fees, restaurant and gift shop purchases, and theater admission charges) would permit financing an appreciable portion of the

costs of construction. The Institution is also beginning preliminary discussions with representatives of the Airport Authority and the Commonwealth to ensure that these ventures would be acceptable to them.

Question 40. The Garber facility in Suitland, Maryland now serves to provide storage for the Air and Space Museum. How much does it cost to operate the Garber facility annually? Is this funded through the Museum's salaries and expenses account? If not, how?

Answer. Annual operating costs for Garber total \$3,028,000, the majority of which is funded through the Museum's salaries and expenses account. Total operating costs include security and plant services which are provided by central Smithsonian offices. These services total \$380,000 and are funded through the respective offices' salaries and expenses accounts.

Question 41. Are there repairs needed at the Garber facility in order to protect existing collections? If so, what are they and what is the cost estimate? Will these repairs need to be made in order to adequately protect the collections at the Garber facility while the extension is built?

Answer. The Suitland Hill Facility includes 28 older buildings. Garber occupies 18 of them. In 1992 a study was made of the entire facility to identify what was needed to bring the condition of the buildings up to minimum, but adequate, storage for collections still housed in them. Needed repairs include all types of maintenance--architectural, civil, structural, mechanical, electrical, fire protection and abatement of asbestos. The estimated costs of these repairs (in 1992 dollars) was approximately \$23 million for the work plus design and miscellaneous services needed to support the work.

Question 42. If the Air and Space Museum extension is not built, what is the estimated cost of upgrading the Garber facility to an adequate level? If the Garber facility is demolished once the extension is operational, what are the Institution's plans for that land?

Answer. If the Extension is not built, the work described in the previous answer will be required. If the NASM vacates the Suitland Hill Facility, the Smithsonian will have a continuous need for storage and shops at this site. A long range Master Plan has been developed by the Office of Design and Construction providing for the construction of modern facilities as the existing structures (which have exceeded their economic life) are demolished. In the current economic climate, however, it is unlikely that the SI will be able to proceed with this plan in the near future. The upgraded facilities now on the site will be critically needed until the new storage complex can be constructed.

## National Museum of Natural History

Question 43. A contract award for construction of the East Court of the National Museum of Natural History is not scheduled to be made until early summer of 1995. What is a realistic estimate of when the building will be completed and ready for occupancy?

Answer. The East Court of the National Museum of Natural History should be completed and ready for occupancy in fourth quarter of FY 1997.

Question 44. The FY 1996 budget includes a requested increase of 9 positions and \$283,000 for East Court facility management. Without this additional support, the East Court cannot open to the public. If, as you state in the budget, portions of the existing museum structure will need to be closed down for renovation and repair of the HVAC system, can the facilities management crew now operating in those areas contribute to the operation of the East Court in the short term? If not, why not? Is it possible to defer this request until FY 1997?

Answer. The facilities management crew now operating in the areas of the Natural History Building closed down for renovation and repair of the mechanical (HVAC) system will not be able to contribute to the operation of the East Court in the short term. The existing facilities management crew now operating is small in relationship to the needs of the large existing building. There has been no increase in facility management resources for the Natural History Building since decentralization of the Smithsonian's Building Management Department in 1975, despite significant growth in both public visitation and the scope of Museum programs during that time.

Museum staff have learned from recent experience with such projects that demands for cleaning are much greater in occupied areas adjacent to the construction projects. In addition, needs for post-construction clean-up and maintenance in areas to be re-occupied by staff or re-opened to the public also demand a significant work effort. In combination, these maintenance requirements will greatly exceed any savings in maintenance costs from the temporary closing of an area for construction.

The East Court Building is projected to open in late FY 1997. It takes up to 6 months to fill positions in the Institution after funding is in-hand. Once the new staff is on-board, they must be thoroughly trained to perform their jobs well. When the Contractor has substantially completed the building, he performs only "broom" cleaning, leaving the majority of the detail cleaning and other necessary maintenance activities to the facility staff to perform. As soon as the Contractor turns the building over to the Museum for beneficial occupancy, the new maintenance staff must be on-board, trained, and ready to intensively clean the facility. Occupancy by the staff and the public must be initiated immediately in order not to delay the Major Capital Renewal Project schedule.

Deferral of the request to FY 1997 will have serious implications for the efficient maintenance of East Court. The museum needs to hire staff no later than late FY 1996 so that they will be on-board and in training to enable them to be ready to immediately implement the necessary cleaning and other maintenance

required to prepare the East Court Building for occupancy. While a full-year salaries and all other costs in FY 1996 is not required, sufficient funding for a quarter of FY 1996 of \$66,000 to hire 9 staff members is required. In FY 1997, the 9 positions and full amount of \$283,000 will be needed to support the staff hired in late FY 1996.

Question 45. What other staffing requirements will be necessary when the East Court facility is completed?

Answer. There will be additional staff and support requirements necessary to maintain and provide security for the East Court facility when it is completed:

- The National Museum of Natural History will require additional resources to support operations beginning in FY 1997 including: (1) 3 salaries, and all other funding to support the facilities maintenance requirement and (2) additional one-time funding for a telephone system and other electronic communications costs.
- The Office of Protection Services will require 5 security officers and support costs to provide sufficient security for the East Court Building.
- The Office of Plant Services will require additional funding to pay estimated utilities costs and to hire 3 maintenance mechanics to run the mechanical equipment and provide routine repairs of the building.

Question 46. What is the status of plans to construct a West Court facility with private funds? By how much is it estimated that the federal appropriation for operations will be increased after construction of this building is completed?

Answer. Congress authorized the construction of the West Court Building, now known as the Discovery Center, on November 24, 1993. The design contract was awarded in May 1994 and the design will be completed by June 1995. It is anticipated that construction will start by late FY 1996 and be completed by late FY 1997 or early FY 1998. No federal appropriation will be required after construction of this building is completed. It is anticipated that the proceeds of the large format theater, the restaurants and the Museum sales shop will cover the operational costs of the West Court facility. Such costs have been anticipated in the business plan.

Question 47. Significant repair and renovation of the original facility of the National Museum of Natural History is planned. How much has been expended to date? What is the total estimated cost of the major capital renewal plan for this building? When will the work be completed?

Answer. About \$27 million has been expended so far on significant repairs and renovations of the National Museum of Natural History. An additional \$95 million will be required over a period of years to complete the renovation. The minimum amount of time required is seven years. However, based on current funding levels the time required may be 12 to 17 years.

#### Electronic Outreach/Public Access

Question 48. This priority program enhancement for collections information systems (CIS) and support totals \$2,166,000 for the following: 3 positions and \$665,000 for the National Museum of Natural History; 3 positions and \$724,000 for a collections information system linking the 6 Smithsonian Art Bureaus; and \$777,000 for CIS outreach at the National Museum of American History.

Is this funding requested to support a new initiative or to enhance and expedite ongoing projects? What is the total estimated cost of this outreach initiative and when do you anticipate that the Collections Information Systems will be on line and available to the public? When do you expect this multi-year effort to be completed?

Answer. For the National Museum of Natural History, current projections are that full implementation will take five years and will require an estimated \$2 million increase in base funding. Definitive cost estimates and scheduling for the full program cannot be established until requirements are fully defined and designs completed for each development phase. The phased buildup of system capabilities will enable the public to have increased levels of access at each stage of development. Functional capabilities for users will increase as will access to more complex data types such as image and sound.

The requested funding for the National Museum of American History is to expedite the museum's capability to make collections information available to the public in electronic forms and to upgrade the communications and computing environments that enable the delivery of this information. The overall program is planned for completion during 1999 to provide the visiting public with electronic access to collections information. Electronic images, video, audio and text will begin to be made available to the museum's visitors beginning in late FY 1995 and early FY 1996. A permanent base increase of \$777,000 is required.

The six art museums of the Smithsonian (Cooper-Hewitt, Freer-Sackler, Hirshhorn, National Museum of African Art, National Museum of American Art, National Portrait Gallery) have undertaken a collaborative effort (ARTCIS) to identify and implement a common Collections Information System (CIS) to answer the needs of all six museums. Total estimated cost is \$1.5 million in new funds to bring the six art museums to full implementation. Ongoing maintenance and equipment upgrades required to support the CIS will be covered in the museums' existing base. The ARTCIS goal is to have an automated Collections Information System fully operational in each art museum. This will form the infrastructure on which increased capability can be built for the public to access collections information including text, images and sound.

The activities associated with providing electronic access to the public is complicated, and the speed with which technology changes has major impacts on

what and how information is packaged. Initially, the information provided to the public will be limited due to the time it takes to place it in a suitable electronic form that has meaning to the public. As our understanding of this process evolves, we will be able to package and distribute more exciting and useful information. The CIS programs do not have an end in the traditional sense. As new or additional information becomes available and as the public's desire for information increases, the Smithsonian will continue to have requirements to maintain an up-to-date infrastructure to deliver the information as well as transforming the information itself into an electronic form. Several museums in the Smithsonian have recently implemented prototype public access components. Usage statistics demonstrate a strong public demand for electronic access to information about the National Collections.

Question 49. If only partial funding is available for this initiative, which of the three projects would take precedence over the other two?

Answer. The Institution believes that all of these initiatives are important to be completed so that the American public can have full access to collections information held by the Smithsonian. With partial funding, the Institution would reduce accordingly all the initiatives in order to continue progress.

Question 50. Does the \$1 million allocated within the base for Information Resources contribute to this effort as well? What has been accomplished to date through the Information Resources program?

Answer. The total FY 1995 base for this program is \$1.85 million of which \$375,200 has been allocated to the museums for collection information systems. The Institution recognizes that organizing and digitizing the collection is a necessary foundational step in efforts to establish digital repositories to facilitate public access. These systems are concentrating on the logistics of managing a collection of 140 million objects and are providing the structure within which the digital collection will reside. In addition, \$1.2 million has been committed to upgrading the Institution's network and \$100,000 has been allocated to upgrading the Institution's Internet access capability. The network upgrade, which is well into implementation, allows the Institution to begin moving digitized images within our own facilities and provides an enhanced gateway capability to the public for access to current and future services, particularly Internet-based products. The allocation to Internet access has provided upgraded computer equipment and software to greatly enhance the volume and quality of material provided through this network capability. In January of this year, the Institution opened its extensive library catalog to the public through Internet. On May 8, the Institution opened a comprehensive "World Wide Web" service on the Internet as a keynote feature of the Institution's electronic transformation. This visually stimulating product already contains fifteen to twenty hours of general information and electronic exhibits. The Institution believes that, in initial release, the product will set a new standard for the "Web". In the coming months, additional exhibits will be added.

## National Zoo

Question 51. What portion of the annual Zoo budget is dedicated to the Migratory Bird Center? What are the staffing requirements? Is the Center's effort in Latin America coordinated to take advantage of STRI's presence in the region?

Answer. Although included in the National Zoological Park's line-item for presentation purposes, operating funds for the Migratory Bird Center (SMBC) are maintained separately from the Zoo's budget. The FY 1995 appropriation for the SMBC was \$382,000 and 7 FTE's.

The SMBC conducts ornithological research in several Latin American countries, including Panama. All research conducted by SMBC in Panama (currently 4 primary projects spanning the entire country) is coordinated through STRI. One primary research project of the SMBC is supported as part of a multi-disciplinary research program ("Stability of tropical forests and tropical forest fauna on military installations of the Panama Canal area") funded by a grant from the Department of Defense Legacy Natural Resources Program, administered through STRI. In short, the SMBC takes full advantage of STRI's presence in Panama, and success of SMBC research there is highly dependent upon cooperation and coordination with STRI.

Question 52. The Zoo budget includes an increase of \$390,000 to fund five positions for staffing at the Amazonia Gallery and the first module of the aquatic trail. What is the current status of the aquatic trail? How many of the five requested positions would staff the Living in Water exhibit?

Answer. Living in Water, the first module of the Aquatic Trail, is in an advanced state of design. The planning has anticipated minimal increases in staffing and has a greatly reduced living animal component. The Amazonia Gallery was originally designed to have a substantial component of living plants and animals. These were eliminated or scaled down when new support staff requests in previous years were not approved. However, both the Gallery and Living in Water exhibits are designed to allow for restoration of living exhibits should staffing be approved. Of the five new positions requested, one is designated for the Living in Water exhibit.

Question 53. Last year, it was estimated that a construction contract would be awarded for the Grasslands Exhibit by September 1995. Is this still the timeline for this project? Will the Zoo be ready to obligate the \$1,700,000 requested for FY 1996 during that fiscal year? Can part of these funds be deferred to a future fiscal year?

Answer. The National Zoological Park is on schedule and anticipates that a construction contract will be awarded before the end of FY 1995. The \$1,700,000 requested for FY 1996 will provide funding to complete the first phase of this project. The Institution anticipates that the actual contract will be

awarded in FY 1996. In order to keep to the current construction schedule, the Zoo will require the full \$1,700,000 in FY 1996.

Question 54. As of last year, the estimated total cost for the Grasslands exhibit was \$8,750,000. Additional private funding in the amount of \$1,215,000 would be necessary for the inclusion of the farm exhibit. Have these estimates been altered in any way during the past year and, if so, how? What is the estimated completion date for the Grasslands exhibit?

Answer. The estimated cost of the Grasslands exhibit has not changed. The complete Grasslands exhibit complex is scheduled to open in August 1999.

Question 55. Masterplan projects at the Rock Creek Zoo have outyear construction and planning/design costs of \$42,239,900. Repair and renovation figures total another \$19,350,000. Do these statistics represent the Zoo's ideal funding requirements or are they intended to be a realistic assessment of needs through the year 2000 and beyond? Please explain.

Answer. These figures do not represent ideal or even optimum requirements to maintain progress in upgrading exhibits and satisfying urgent educational needs. However, the Institution does consider them to be minimally realistic.

#### Cooper-Hewitt

Question 56. An increase of two positions and \$69,000 has been requested for care of the Miller/Fox collection and resource facility and the Carnegie mansion. How many staff are currently fulfilling these responsibilities? Is the current maintenance staff meeting the minimal requirements of the Museum? If not, please explain.

Answer. The Facilities department consists of: 1 Facilities Manager; 1 Assistant Facilities Manager; 1 Woodcrafter; 1 Mason; 4 Maintenance Mechanics; 3 Custodians; and 1 Administrative Assistant.

The Facilities staff meets the minimal requirements of the Museum as it now exists. Once the renovation of the Fox/Miller Resources Facility is complete there will be an additional 10,000 square feet of usable space open to the public, which will require a higher level of maintenance attention than is currently afforded this space. At present the Fox House facility is maintained by custodians only on the first floor, the home of the Masters Degree Program in the History of Decorative Arts. With the completion of the renovation, the remaining five floors will require daily maintenance and custodial services. Also, in addition to their regular duties, the facilities staff also cares for the lawn and gardens, unloads delivery trucks and shovels snow.

## Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory

Question 57. What is the arrangement that the Smithsonian has with other governmental agencies such as NASA and NOAA to operate Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO) facilities? Approximately how much does it receive annually in financial assistance from other federal sources?

Answer. The Smithsonian has no arrangement with other governmental agencies to operate SAO's facilities and receives no financial assistance from other agencies to operate these facilities. SAO, however, does research and related activities for NASA, the Air Force, NSF, and other federal agencies via the mechanism of contracts and grants from these agencies. The expenses incurred are then reimbursed by the agencies. In FY 1994, these reimbursements amounted to approximately \$38 million (NASA), \$1.5 million (Air Force), and \$0.4 million (NSF). All other sources of reimbursement came to less than \$0.8 million.

Question 58. What does Harvard College offer as a part of the collaborative arrangement it has with the SAO in Cambridge?

Answer. As part of its collaborative arrangement with Harvard College Observatory (HCO), SAO has access without charge to all HCO's equipment and facilities, including its library, which has one of the best astronomical collections in the world. SAO is able to rent space from Harvard at rates significantly below those of the prevailing commercial market. SAO scientists have numerous collaborative arrangements with Harvard scientists that greatly enhance SAO's research capabilities. In addition, SAO scientists benefit substantially from the interaction with Harvard graduate students and faculty. SAO enjoys the advantage of the intense stimulation resulting from a close interaction with the staff of a major research university.

Question 59. Does the SAO anticipate holding its scientific instrumentation costs at the current appropriated level for the near future? If not, please explain.

Answer. SAO anticipates holding its scientific instrumentation costs at the current appropriated level.

## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BYRD

The FY 1996 budget proposed for the Smithsonian Institution is \$407,450,000 in appropriated funds, an increase of \$36,357,000 (or 9.8 percent) above the FY 1995 enacted level.

The proposed increases for FY 1996 include \$16 million for salaries and expenses, to cover fixed costs, as well as new facility and initiative expenses; \$9.5 million for construction associated with the National Museum of the American Indian, the Air and Space Museum extension, and the East Court at the Natural History Museum; approximately \$900,000 for construction at the National Zoo; and \$10 million for repair and restoration to enhance the level of effort directed towards attention to the protection of the Smithsonian's facilities and collections.

## Proposed Rescissions

Question 60. Mr. Heyman, the House of Representatives has recommended \$32 million in proposed rescissions in the Smithsonian's two construction accounts. By far, the largest portion of these rescissions affects the National Museum of the American Indian.

As I understand it, the agreements which provided for the transfer of the Heye collection to the Smithsonian required the construction of a storage facility for the collection. This facility is to be constructed in Suitland, MD. If the Suitland facility is not constructed, does this place the Smithsonian in violation of the terms of the agreement which brought the collection to the Institution? Would the Smithsonian be subject to legal action?

Answer. The terms under which the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, was transferred to the Smithsonian, are set forth in several documents. The parties entered into a Memorandum of Understanding on May 8, 1989, providing for the transfer subject to the enactment of legislation, which occurred on November 28, 1989. The legislation, in turn, was contingent on a decision by the New York Supreme Court granting the *cy pres* petition of the Museum of the American Indian. That decision was rendered by Justice Stecher on June 18, 1990. In that proceeding, brought by the Heye Foundation against the State and City of New York seeking permission to transfer the collection to the Smithsonian, Justice Stecher authorized the transfer subject to certain conditions. In paragraph 3(b), he held:

"If work on the facilities<sup>1</sup> of the National Museum of the American Indian (the "National Museum") does not begin within a reasonable period of time after the date on which Petitioner transfers to the Smithsonian title to its collection and other assets to the Smithsonian (the "Closing Date"), or if such work is not prosecuted with reasonable promptness, then the Attorney General as the Petitioner's assignee shall be able to rescind the Memorandum of Understanding and the Implementation Agreement and to recover the Petitioner's collection and other assets transferred to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Facilities, for these purposes, means the George Gustav Heye Center in New York, the Suitland facility, and the Mall facility.

Smithsonian pursuant thereto...The term "reasonable" shall be construed in the context of government projects of similar magnitude and complexity."

Pursuant to this language, if the Smithsonian fails to construct Suitland, the New York Attorney General could initiate a legal action against the Smithsonian for breach of contract, and seek rescission of the transfer and recovery of the collection.

Question 61. Was the Suitland facility authorized in the legislation which established the National Museum of the American Indian?

Answer. Yes. Section 7 of the National Museum of the American Indian Act (P.L. 101-185), entitled "Museum Facilities", provides in Section (c) that:

"The Board of Regents shall plan, design, and construct a facility for the conservation and storage of the collections of the National Museum at the Museum Support Center of the Smithsonian Institution."

Section 17 provides that there is authorized to be appropriated to the Board of Regents "such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year" to carry out this Act.

Question 62. If the \$21.9 million rescission for the cultural center is enacted, how will this affect the Smithsonian's plans for this facility? Would you "go back to the drawing board"?

Answer. The Smithsonian would not "go back to the drawing board," for the following reasons. Because on its legal agreement with the state and city of New York, which was ratified by Congress in the legislation establishing NMAI in 1989, the Smithsonian is required to improve the care of and access to the collections. Current designs, achieved at the expense of \$5 million, meet these requirements in the minimum way. None of the scenarios already reviewed for possible redesign would effect any measurable saving over the current design because most of the costs are associated with fire protection, security, climate control and collections equipment which are all basic to even a scaled-back facility. Rather, we would delay construction one year and attempt to request funding in FY 1997 to finish the project.

Question 63. What will be the effect of the proposed rescission of \$987,000 in funding for planning for the National Museum of the American Indian facility on the mall?

Answer. If the \$987,000 rescission for the Mall Museum is enacted, the Institution would either delay the project or use trust funds to continue the design process, as it was directed to do in FY 1994.

Question 64. How do these proposed rescissions affect your FY 1996 budget request?

Answer. If the House/Senate Conference Committee sustains these rescissions, it will be essential that the funding requested for FY 1996 be approved in order to meet Institutional commitments, keep the projects close to their current schedule, and, most significantly, contain their costs.

#### Overall Budget

Question 65: Secretary Heyman, as you know, the budgetary situation is not getting any better. In recent years, some parties, including this Subcommittee, have questioned the "vision" of the Smithsonian, not for its concept, but rather, for its lack of sensitivity to the realities of the Federal budget.

Mr. Heyman, you assumed responsibility as the Secretary for the Smithsonian Institution last September.

What do you see as the most significant challenge facing the Smithsonian Institution over the course of the next 5 to 10 years?

Answer: Becoming the truly national, indeed, international, Institution that it was intended to be is the most significant challenge facing the Smithsonian over the next five to ten years. Embedding itself in the hearts and minds of the people it touches by allowing them to find themselves within it - be it in the pursuit of scholarly interests, in the sharing of a common history, or in the connections of memory - is likely to reap benefits heretofore not contemplated either by the Institution or the nation to which it has been entrusted.

The National Mall would be an elegant but lifeless green space without the Smithsonian, the growth of which has been central to its shaping and to the significance of Washington as an international capital. As the examples of Bonn and Brasilia so amply illustrate, being a seat of government simply is not enough to invigorate a city, much less its culture.

Because of the Smithsonian, the Mall has become, in effect, the nation's front yard, bringing together a lively neighborhood of Americans and visitors from abroad for those largely informal, often entertaining, experiences which contribute so greatly to our education and our growth. Nonetheless, it is now time, and the tools are at hand, for the Smithsonian to break the bonds of the Mall and move as well into homes, schools, and communities across the country and around the world.

Becoming channel 143 in the era of multiple television stations, flooding educators with CD-ROMs, and beaming up to the Internet databases for the sake of data may be attractive tactics in that effort. Unless, however, they are part of a systematic strategy that understands the needs and nature of those it seeks to serve and validates means for doing so, they will be offensive and unused.

Developing and implementing an appropriate systematic strategy for meeting the challenge of wider service among a broader audience demands that the Institution re-organize itself, streamline its management, and examine the full spectrum of its activities. Resources will have to be redirected from programs that are no longer central to the Institutional mission to those that are, and new

sources of revenue beyond the Federal budget will have to be identified. In this process the Institution itself is likely to be redefined, becoming more entrepreneurial and more collaborative as it also becomes accessible to more people.

Question 66. Given what you have been able to learn thus far about the programs of the Smithsonian, and their various future goals, are these attainable at current budgetary levels? If so, what would be the effect on the current programs of the Institution?

Answer. There is a dramatic gap between the needs of the Institution that are reflected in its long-range construction program and the identification of resources with which to fund them. As a result, underlying functions and policies, such as those relating to collections, must be thoroughly examined and options for addressing their requirements must be explored. Until those processes have been completed and further decisions have been made, it is not possible to outline effects on current programs.

Question 67. And if not, what steps are you taking to bring your managers "back to earth" in terms of what they expect to be funded in the future?

Answer. Smithsonian managers are increasingly aware of the limits of the Federal budget. Because they cannot expect increases in the levels of Federal funding, they are being asked to look closely at the structures of their operations in order to identify opportunities for redirecting resources through streamlining management and consolidating functions within their units and across administrative boundaries. In addition, they are being encouraged to work on new fund-raising strategies in concert with the Institution's central development office and to think imaginatively about ways in which product development and communications could enhance their revenues.

Question 68. If funding for the Smithsonian Institution were reduced by 20 percent below the FY 1995 enacted level for the foreseeable future, what would be your long-term strategy for dealing with this scenario?

Answer. If such a reduction was mandated, the Institution would prefer to take it as a percentage and then make decisions about how to allocate it within its budget. Among the areas that could be affected by a reduction of that magnitude would be:

- drastically lowered staff levels through reductions in force, hiring freezes, and furloughs
- closing of museums, galleries, and the Zoo or reducing public hours in order to reduce security costs

- curtailment or elimination of research and exhibition projects throughout the Institution
- reduction or deferral of collections management activities
- drastic curtailment of employee travel, training, and overtime and of supplies and equipment purchases
- reduction of Traveling Exhibition Service outreach programs

Question 69. Under a -20 percent funding level, what would be the first priority you would propose to protect? Would the continued support and operation of the core facilities on the Mall and the National Zoo (and their attendant collections) receive a higher priority than research activities?

Answer. Reducing the enacted FY 1995 level of nearly \$314 million by 20% -- about \$63 million -- would leave the Institution with some \$251 million in operating funds. With a reduction of that magnitude nothing could be protected in the sense of maintaining current levels of activity because so much of the Institution's funding is tied up in salaries. People, large numbers of whom would be forced off the payroll, run the museums, galleries, and the Zoo. They perform research, manage collections, and create exhibitions, activities that are inter-related and inter-woven throughout the Smithsonian. Without necessary staff, those functions could not be sustained in the manner they are at present. All activities would have to be reduced and facilities to a substantial degree would have to be closed in order to provide a minimum level of care for the objects and living animals in the collections.

Question 70. To what extent does the proposed FY 1996 budget reflect your priorities for the Institution in the years to come?

Answer. As noted in my response to Question 2, before becoming Secretary I was a Regent of the Smithsonian. The Institution's FY 1996 budget request was approved by the Regents and reflects overall Smithsonian priorities that were developed on a "ground up" basis in an environment that offered limited funds for new programs.

I personally place a very high priority on funding for electronic communications, and believe that the higher level of funding requested for the repair and restoration of Institutional facilities is essential to any long-term prospect for the Smithsonian. It also important for the Institution to complete the submillimeter array being developed by the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory and to continue the development of the National Museum of the American Indian.

## Operational Costs of New Facilities

Question 71. The budget proposes an increase of \$2,550,000 and 26 positions for additional staffing and operational requirements associated with new facilities. Briefly, describe the various new projects that are coming "on-line" and why these additional staff are necessary?

Answer. A portion of this increase (\$1.05 million and 11 FTEs) is specifically for new projects that are coming on line. In essence, the Institution has new space that will not be fully functional without funds necessary to maintain that space. For example, the Amazonia exhibit at the National Zoo remains only partially utilized because funds are not available to hire qualified personnel to staff the exhibit. At the Tropical Research Institute, funds are necessary to maintain air conditioning systems, fire sprinkler and alarm systems, and elevator service. At Natural History, funds are necessary to clean and maintain the East Court; without them, facilities management requirements in portions of the Museum will go unmet.

Also included in this request is \$1.5 million and 15 positions to support the administration of the Institution's Repair and Restoration (R&R) appropriation. These funds are essential to support accessibility, historic preservation, and construction management at the current R&R funding level of \$24 million; funds are also necessary to conduct structural reviews, coordinate environmental issues, and support construction management associated with the FY 1996 program request at the increased level of \$34 million.

Question 72. More than half of the proposed increase appears to be allocated to the Office of Design and Construction. Are these funds to be provided in support of projects already underway, or for new projects?

Answer. The funds will support both ongoing and new projects in the R&R program.

Question 73. What if Congress is unable to provide any of this requested increase this year? How would you absorb the added responsibilities of these new facilities?

Answer. If Congress is unable to provide any of the requested increase this year, the repair and restoration program for existing buildings will suffer. The proposed staffing increases will support annual repair and restoration projects: nine positions at the \$24 million level and six additional positions at the \$34 million level. Without the needed staff, the Institution will continue to leverage assistance in managing the R&R program by contracting out design and construction management activities or by hiring temporary staff to perform these functions. This will reduce the funds available to do actual repair and renewal work.

Question 74. The budget states (p. 45) that "if start-up and operating funds for facility management are not added to the current NMNH base, the East Court building cannot be opened to the public and staff when construction is completed." When is construction scheduled to be completed at this facility?

Answer. The East Court of the National Museum of Natural History is scheduled to be completed and ready for occupancy in fourth quarter of FY 1997.

Question 75. Would you really not open this facility, or would you perhaps only open it partially by reallocating resources from the National Museum of Natural History?

Answer. The East Court Facility would be opened to the public and staff even if operating funds for facility management are not added to the current NMNH base. This new facility must be fully opened and occupied so as not to delay the implementation of the Major Capital Renewal Project. However, it would not be possible to open the building in its entirety immediately after the completion of construction. The current facility management staff is focused on keeping the public Museum presentable to our visitors. This priority means that the time devoted to staff and collections spaces is at a bare minimum. As stated in the answer to question 44, after the contractor completes his work, much cleaning and other preparation remains to be done by the NMNH facility management staff before the new building can be occupied. If existing staff must be stretched to accomplish this work, it would of necessity have to be phased over a much longer period of time to meet occupancy priorities. Once the building is completely opened, this same staff resource would continue to be stretched to maintain both the new and existing buildings. As a result, the maintenance of the entire building in its public Museum, staff and collections areas would suffer.

Question 76. If the approach of the Smithsonian is that new facilities will only be opened if additional dollars are forthcoming, and the prospects for providing such dollars in the future is limited at best, why should the Congress provide any funding for capital projects at the Smithsonian?

Answer. As noted in the response to Question 3, the projects in the Smithsonian's construction program meet key Institutional criteria: the need to provide new space essential to the long term preservation of the collections that it holds in trust and the fulfillment of legal mandates. The extension of the National Air and Space Museum, the Cultural Resources Center of the National Museum of the American Indian, and the Suitland Collections Center are components of the Institution's plan to provide adequate and appropriate space in which to house, care for, and study its collections. The Natural History East Court building will help alleviate long-term space needs. In the short term it also relates directly to the Smithsonian's ability to complete urgently-needed renewal of the HVAC systems in the National Museum of Natural History. The Cultural Resources Center and the Mall museum building of the National Museum of the American Indian also will satisfy legislative mandates, as well as legal

responsibilities accepted by the Government when the Heye Foundation collections were transferred to the Institution.

#### National Museum of the American Indian

Perhaps the largest new effort underway at the Smithsonian Institution is the National Museum of the American Indian. Because of the House proposed rescissions, the Congress will soon be engaging in a debate about the appropriateness of this undertaking.

Question 77. Mr. Heyman, if the Congress were to determine that it would not agree to construct all of the various components envisioned in the legislation establishing the Indian Museum, how would you proceed?

Answer. P.L.101-185, which authorized establishment of the National Museum of the American Indian within the Smithsonian Institution and authorized appropriations for construction of its three components, is related to a Memorandum of Understanding dated May 8, 1989, between the Institution and the Trustees of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation. That agreement provided for the transfer to the Smithsonian of the collection of the Heye Foundation, and for assignment of the rights of the Heye Foundation (which now does not exist) to the Attorney General of the State of New York.

The authorizing legislation, in turn, was contingent on approval by the Supreme Court of New York of the *cy pres* petition of the Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, against the City and State of New York for permission to transfer the collection to the Institution. In the decision granting that petition, which was rendered on June 18, 1990, the transfer of the collection was approved, subject to certain conditions such as that in paragraph 3(b):

"If work on the facilities [meaning the George Gustav Heye Center in New York, the Suitland facility, and the Mall museum] of the National Museum of the American Indian (the "National Museum") does not begin within a reasonable period of time after the date on which Petitioner transfers to the Smithsonian title to its collection and other assets to the Smithsonian (the "Closing Date"), or if such work is not prosecuted with reasonable promptness, then the Attorney General as the Petitioner's assignee shall be able to rescind the Memorandum of Understanding and the Implementation Agreement and to recover the Petitioner's collection and other assets transferred to the Smithsonian pursuant thereto...The term "reasonable" shall be construed in the context of government projects of similar magnitude and complexity."

Given this language and the fact that the Smithsonian cannot itself construct the remaining facilities, the absence of appropriations for them could lead the New York Attorney General to initiate legal action against the Institution for breach of contract and to seek rescission of the transfer and recovery of the collection.

Question 78. If such a determination were made, what portions, if any, of the planning and design to date for the Suitland facility and the Mall facility would be "salvageable" if Congress were to direct the construction of just one facility?

Answer. If Congress directed the construction of just one facility, about 50% percent of the planning (about \$0.8 million) would be salvageable. Although the space requirements developed would still be valid, the planning documents would have to be revised to combine functions, conduct a new environmental assessment, and conduct new site analyses. None of the design would be salvageable for either the Suitland facility or the Mall Museum (total \$7.07 million spent to date).

Question 79. What would happen to the integrity of the collection if the Suitland facility were downsized dramatically?

Answer. Dramatic downsizing of the Suitland facility would effectively confine the collections to their present substandard state of densely compacted storage which is especially damaging to fragile collections made of leather, feathers, cloth, and other delicate and unstable substances. Current plans permit a decompression ratio of 2 or 3 to 1 against a professionally recommended ratio of 5 or 7 to 1. Substantial reductions of storage space have already been made in developing the current design. Further reductions would not only fail to meet the requirement to improve care of collections but would also continue to limit their accessibility for education and research.

Question 80. What would be the cost savings if the mission of the NMAI were changed to involve primarily the protection of the collections, with some display/exhibit capacity, and the research and public programming functions were given a secondary role?

Answer. This question implies that the exhibition and education spaces at the Mall museum could be reduced in deference to collection protection. That result would violate legal agreements with New York City and State, subsequently ratified by Congress in NMAI's authorizing legislation, requiring a minimal total project of 400,000 square feet; controvert the public/private partnership requiring the Smithsonian to raise one-third of the \$110 million capital cost (\$37 million, of which more than \$27 million has already been secured), and dishonor the intent of the NMAI enabling legislation to relate the experience and contributions of the American Indian through a public facility on the National Mall. Negative financial consequences from these breaches would likely offset any cost savings from a shift of emphasis. Mere protection of the collections without providing spaces for research and collections support staff, and for access to the collections for research and active use, would also compromise existing agreements and statutes.

The information that resides in the collection is its most important aspect. Research continues to enhance that information, and much of that research is

conducted by Museum staff in conjunction with Indian people who visit the Museum's storage areas and identify the cultural context within which objects were made and the uses to which they were put. If the collection is considered merely as an assemblage of unique objects to be conserved in a static state, its education value is thwarted.

Question 81. A total of \$4,285,000 and 30 positions are requested for additional programming aspects of the NMAI. For the record, please provide a prioritization of the various components of this increase.

Answer. The following lists the FY 1996 requests in order of priority:

1. Custom House Security and Health Support (10 Positions and \$854,000)
2. Facilities Support Personnel (3 Positions and \$137,000)  
This request includes funding to hire 2 Engineers and 1 Groundskeeper.
3. Community Services (4 Positions and \$253,000)  
NMAI has placed an emphasis on the establishment of a "Community Services" component in order to provide outreach and support to tribal museum efforts and to work more closely with the people representing the living culture of the Museum. The Museum has identified a minimum staffing need of 4 additional FTE's to launch this effort. This program will focus on such activities as training and internship and expanding the accessibility of NMAI's extensive collections and resources to its constituencies.
4. Public Programs (6 Positions and \$232,000)  
NMAI has identified the need for 5 additional FTE's to work with the large numbers of the public who are visiting the GGHC. This does not represent an expansion of a program, but is an effort to stabilize and enhance the programmatic authenticity of NMAI "on the floor" educational efforts through the use of an interpretive staff. At the present time NMAI uses interpreters as a part of the exhibit experience, and they are employed on contract. This method has proven to have inherent quality control and training problems which NMAI intends to correct by making this function a fully recognized part of its program with permanent staff. The request for an additional position in the area of exhibits for GGHC will assist in the normal changeover of exhibits at the Custom House.
5. Cultural Resources (4 Positions and \$480,000)  
NMAI's request includes 4 additional FTE's to enhance its research efforts pertaining to the collection, the repatriation

program and support of exhibits activities. Additional program funds in the amount of \$288,000 will allow for expanded research activities with tribal communities, enhancement of the conservation of the collection and support for the digital imaging of objects and photos in the collections. All of these efforts will improve accessibility to the collection.

6. Administrative Support (3 Positions and \$878,000)  
Without this staffing, NMAI cannot respond in a timely and cost effective manner to the myriad of support needs inherent in the planning and implementation of programs for the care and protection of the collection of the Collections Resources Center (CRC). Planning and procurement of equipment, furnishings, technology support, etc. for the construction and occupancy of the Mall museum will also be affected. Program funding in the amount of \$735,000 is directly related to the phase out of the Audubon Terrace facility, the operations at the George Gustav Heye Center (GGHC) and the Research Branch at the Bronx.
  
7. Cultural Resources Center Equipment (\$1.451 million)  
An amount of \$1.451 million will begin to equip the CRC in support of traditional care and access to the collection. This support item will require long lead time for procurement and installation and will need to be closely coordinated with the building construction contract. In addition, the resources requested will provide funding for installation of a universal communication system. The system will provide efficient communication within the Suitland facility, communication with other NMAI sites, and automated access to the collections and research information.

Question 82. To what extent are volunteers being used at the Heye Center in New York to conduct educational tours for school groups?

Answer. Because of the knowledge base needed on guided tours of the exhibits, NMAI has contracted interpreters who have the degree of expertise essential to the desired museum experience. NMAI currently has 48 volunteers essential to the operation of the museum. These volunteers assist at the information and membership desks, but do not have the specialized expertise to conduct educational tours. There are 35 "active" volunteers: 30 who operate the information and membership desks accessible to the public and 5 student volunteers who support various NMAI departments. There are also 13 "on call" volunteers who are called when the museum is in need of extra support during special events or other programs.

## Enola Gay Exhibit

Question 83. Mr. Heyman, over the course of the last year or so, there has been considerable controversy surrounding the proposed exhibit to accompany the display of a portion of the restored fuselage of the Enola Gay at the Air and Space Museum. After numerous redrafts, after the January, 1995 Board of Regents meeting, you announced the decision to replace the contentious exhibit. You also announced several steps being taken under your leadership to deal with this particular issue, and how future controversial topics would be dealt with by the Smithsonian.

Please provide the Subcommittee with an update of actions the Smithsonian has taken regarding the forum at the University of Michigan and future public symposia regarding atomic weapons.

Answer. "Presenting History: Museums in a Democratic Society," a free, public symposium was held at the University of Michigan's Rackham Auditorium on April 19, co-sponsored by the Smithsonian Institution and the University of Michigan. It provided a forum for discussions on ways that museums can best handle controversial subjects, particularly when museums create exhibitions on subjects whose interpretation may generate controversy. The conference was organized in three sessions with panels comprised of the academic and museum communities as well as military and journalistic perspectives. The sessions were "Exhibiting Controversial Subjects," "The Enola Gay Exhibit: A Case Study in Controversy" and "Museums in a Democratic Society."

Through this public forum, the Smithsonian facilitated an understanding of factors and forces that contribute to a "controversial" exhibit and how the museum and the public can best respond to these forces. In addition, the symposium sought to clarify the role museums take in enhancing the public's understanding of the nation's history.

Regarding public symposia on the origins and use of atomic weapons, no such symposia are planned at this time.

Question 84. What is the status of the management review of the National Air and Space Museum? When do you anticipate receiving a report and possible recommendations?

Answer. The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) agreed to conduct an independent management review of the National Air and Space Museum, which began in early April and will be completed by the fall. The National Academy is a highly regarded, independent organization, established in 1967 to facilitate development of top quality management practices in both the public and private sector. NAPA has achieved wide respect for providing broad experience and credibility in addressing complex policy and management issues.

The Academy works through distinguished panels of experts who work with research teams comprised of permanent Academy professionals. A panel of six individuals has been chosen for the study with Mr. James E. Colvard, Senior Fellow, Center for Naval Analyses, agreeing to chair the panel. The Provost is

currently working with staff at the National Academy to initiate the interviews and research papers that will be the focus of the study. The first meeting of the panel will be in May. The scope of the study will focus primarily on policy and decision making, planning and operations, as well as mission and organizational structure. The NAPA Report, with conclusions and recommendations, is due in September and will be shared with the Regents.

#### Locality Pay

Question 85. As part of the FY 1996 request for the Smithsonian, an increase of \$1,620,000 is proposed to cover the costs of the locality pay increase which took effect in FY 1995.

What actions has the Smithsonian taken during FY 1995 to absorb the \$1.62 million additional cost for locality pay which was not included in the budget?

Answer. Smithsonian units were advised in their FY 1995 allocations that the unfunded locality pay requirements would have to be absorbed within their base. As a result, units have delayed or cancelled recruitment actions, reduced contractual funding, reduced supply and equipment purchases, and reduced or eliminated travel.

Question 86. Have any facilities had their hours reduced? Are vacant positions being left unfilled for longer periods of time?

Answer. No facilities have had their hours reduced. While no formal review of vacant positions has been made, it can be assumed that vacant positions are being left unfilled for longer periods of time due to the required absorption of the locality pay increase in FY 1995.

Question 87. What, in your view, has been the effect of these actions on the services provided to the Smithsonian's visitors?

Answer. In our view, the effect of these actions on the services provided to the Smithsonian's visitors has been negligible. One direct impact, however, has been the inability of the Institution to fully meet its printing needs for visitor brochures; there may be times when these brochures are unavailable to the public.

#### Public Outreach

Question 88. Throughout the budget, added emphasis appears to be applied to the concept of public outreach, and the stated desire to make the Smithsonian Institution more accessible to the American public. How do efforts in support of this objective contribute to cost reductions for the Smithsonian?

Answer. The purpose of the Smithsonian's efforts in this area is to make knowledge available to as many citizens as possible and to allow that access to be shaped by their needs.

A broad range of technologies to provide electronic access to the Institution's many audiences (the general public, students, teachers, scholars, museum professionals, etc.) is currently being evaluated. Appropriateness to mission and cost effectiveness are the primary decision criteria in devising an overall outreach strategy.

To the extent that these efforts replace, over the long term, the need to construct new and not-yet-planned museum facilities, the cost reductions are substantial. In the near term, the redirection of resources and base funding associated with collections and information systems will be a major source of their support. In addition, the Institution is exploring the prospect of partnerships in the private sector as means for developing support for electronic communications programming.

Question 89. How does the Smithsonian justify additional funding for public outreach efforts at a time when other costly needs have been identified to maintain the primary facilities of the Institution and the protection of existing collections?

Answer. The primary justification for increasing public access lies in the Institution's mandate for "...the diffusion of knowledge among men." Across the years the Smithsonian has sought to fulfill that mandate and respond to demand through means such as exhibitions on the Mall and traveling to communities throughout the Nation; the scholarly exchange of information; publications such as books, magazines, and recordings; and communications systems such as radio and television. New communications technologies have increased demand for Smithsonian resources, while also providing new ways for sharing those resources very widely.

The Institution carefully balances program initiatives, the need to repair and renew existing buildings, and the need to provide new space essential to the long term preservation of the collections that it holds in trust. The high priority placed on protecting and maintaining the Institution's most valuable assets -- facilities and collections -- is reflected in annual budget requests, not only for renovation and construction, but also for operating funds associated with the management of collections, their protection, and improvements in the Institution's internal information infrastructure.

The emphasis on public outreach and accessibility builds on Smithsonian traditions in these areas, reflects the continued balancing of its various needs, and takes advantage of related improvements in the management of its core activities in order to honor its most basic obligation.

Question 90. The budget proposes \$2.2 million in new funding for expanded electronic outreach and public access for the "collections and research information system". Is this funding proposed to initiate a new system, or to expand and enhance an existing data base?

Answer. As discussed in detail in the answer to question 48, the requested funding will expand and enhance the existing collections and research information systems and provide greater access to the system by the public.

Question 91. To what extent will electronic users contribute to the costs of managing this system?

Answer. In its present configuration, the systems would be accessed by the public and scholarly community through the Internet. Costs associated with accessing the Internet would be the responsibility of the user.

Question 92. What is the total estimated cost and duration of the collection and information system enhancement project?

Answer. The total estimated cost of the Institution's Collection Information System (CIS) enhancement projects as undertaken by the National Museum of Natural History, National Museum of American History and the six Smithsonian art museums is difficult to provide, as this is a continuing program which will be affected by evolving technology as well as the public's increasing demand for information. Permanent base increases of \$2 million for NMNH and \$777,000 for NMAH are requested. For the ARTCIS project, \$1.5 million in new funds will be required of which \$724,000 is requested for FY 1996. The projects underway will be developed in phases over the next 3-5 years.

#### Science Research

Question 93. Included in the core mission of the Smithsonian is the "increase and diffusion of knowledge". This has resulted in the Smithsonian being involved in a wide variety of scientific activities, including astronomy, zoology, tropical forestry, global climate change, and biodiversity, to name a few. How are the science and research activities of the Smithsonian Institution coordinated and prioritized in conjunction with the activities of the other members of the Federal "family"?

Answer. The Smithsonian is an active participant in the various government-wide science committees coordinated through the National Council of Science and Technology. Through this mechanism the Institution keeps abreast of other federal research initiatives. Most interagency committees of the National Council are now setting priorities between existing and proposed research initiatives.

Question 94. For example, the budget (p. 30), includes discussion of the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center and its role in collecting data regarding the effects of the Mount Pinatubo volcanic eruption on ultraviolet radiation. How is the Smithsonian's work regarding the effects of volcanoes coordinated with the U.S. Geological Survey?

Answer. The Smithsonian work is focused on the design, construction, and calibration of precision spectral radiometers and on the actual measurement of ultraviolet radiation at the Earth's surface. These measurements can then sometimes be related to events, such as Mount Pinatubo, which may cause changes in the amount of ozone in the atmosphere or changes in other factors, such as atmospheric aerosols, which also affect the transmission of solar ultraviolet light to the Earth. The Smithsonian program is coordinated with the NOAA Climate Monitoring and Diagnostics (CMDL) program and the USDA initiative on ultraviolet radiation in the U.S. Global Change Program. For example, CMDL operates a Smithsonian UV spectral radiometer at its observatory on top of the volcano Mauna Loa in Hawaii. USDA has the lead role in coordinating U.S. efforts for monitoring ultraviolet radiation on Earth. They have provided the Smithsonian some of the funding for the construction of its UV spectral radiometers. Smithsonian findings are published and made available to the U.S. Geological Survey.

Question 95: Similarly, how do the activities of the Smithsonian regarding global climate change fit in vis-a-vis the funding provided for such programs at the Department of Energy, Forest Service, and the Environmental Protection Agency?

Answer: The Smithsonian is a participant in the interagency subcommittee on Global Change (a subcommittee to the Committee on Environmental and Natural Resources). This assures that Smithsonian Global Change research at sites such as Chesapeake Bay, Panama, and Carrie Bow Cay in Belize are not duplicating other U.S. Global Change research. In some cases research grants are obtained from agencies such as DOE or EPA to support specific projects at these sites. The Smithsonian also participates in conferences and workshops of such research networks as the National Science Foundation's Long-Term Ecological Research Network and Land Margin Ecosystem Research Network and the international Man and the Biosphere network. Participation in these networks places Smithsonian research at specific sites for both a national and a global perspective.

Question 96: The narrative in the budget about the National Zoo describes its proposed transformation into a biological park in order to represent "... the whole of life on earth, plant and animal, in all its complexity and glory."

What are the cost implications of this transformation? What major new construction is contemplated under such a scenario?

Answer: There are no major cost implications in this transformation. It is one of interpretation and not of dedicated construction. Thus, whenever new exhibits are built or old ones refurbished, the Zoo will simply make the connections between plants, animals, human activity and science in general as part of the scenario. For example, in the Grasslands exhibit the Zoo emphasizes the connections between the natural Grasslands and the basis of U.S. agriculture and the dairy industry. No new construction is specifically required to implement the Biopark idea.

Question 97. How are the public education aspects of the programs at the National Zoo aided by the work of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute and the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center? How are each of these entities different?

Answer. The Amazonia gallery will be a major educational endeavor consisting of exhibits that have been developed in cooperation with Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI).

The Living in Water exhibit, a cooperative effort with the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center (SERC), will emphasize aspects of the biology of the animals and plants of Chesapeake Bay. The input from SERC and STRI to programs at the National Zoo differ in the ecosystems found in biological regions that are their areas of study. STRI's input relates to tropical regions; SERC's is north temperate.

Question 98. The budget proposes an operational increase of \$390,000 to allow the National Zoo to hire additional personnel to staff the Amazonia gallery and the first module of the aquatic trail. What are the total additional staffing needs for these two exhibits? Will this request staff the Amazonia gallery fully?

Answer. The Amazonia Gallery was originally designed to have a substantial component of living plants and animals. These were eliminated or scaled down when new support staff requests in previous years were denied. Living in Water, the first module of the Aquatics Trail, is in an advanced state of design. The planning has anticipated minimal increases in staffing and has a greatly reduced living animal component. However both the Gallery and Living in Water exhibits are designed to allow for the restoration of living exhibits should staffing be approved. The six FTE's requested would be allocated to the Gallery (5 FTE's) and Aquatic Trail (1 FTE). In their absence the exhibits will be museum type and non-living. Six FTE's would be sufficient for both exhibits while 5 FTE's would fully staff the gallery.

Question 99. What is the status of Phase II of the Amazonia gallery? Are there additional staffing requirements associated with this component?

Answer. The Amazonia Gallery Phase I exhibit construction contract has been awarded and construction will commence in May, 1995. Phase II will follow shortly after the completion of Phase I and will open in early 1996. Staffing requirements are explained in detail in answers to questions 52 and 98.

Question 100. In its rescission package, the House proposes to delete \$500,000 in funding for the aquatic trail. What effect will this rescission have on this project?

Answer. If \$500,000 is rescinded from the available funds for the Aquatic Trail, construction to upgrade the Zoo park area close to a major entrance and

parking lot would be slowed. Delays would occur to make the important changes in the utility, security and appearance of this area.

#### Submillimeter Telescope Array

Question 101. The budget proposes an increase of \$650,000 and 6 positions in the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory for salary and related costs associated with the submillimeter telescope array. The budget includes a statement that this array will be completed by FY 1998. Why is it necessary to begin staffing in FY 1996, two year before completion?

Answer. The positions requested for FY 1996 and for past fiscal years for the Submillimeter Telescope Array serve two purposes: first to provide staff for the construction of the array; and second, to provide staff for the array after it becomes operational. The six positions requested in FY 1996 are the last of 34 staff that will serve both purposes. The positions requested in FY 1996 are needed to prepare the site in Hawaii, while the remainder of the staff completes the construction and testing of the antennas and receivers in Massachusetts.

Question 102. What are the estimated outyear additional staffing requirements (and costs) associated with this project?

Answer. The six positions requested in FY 1996 will complete the staffing of the array. In addition to the salaries and benefits for the array staff, which will then all be in the SAO base, the operation of the array will require additional funding of approximately \$2.3 million per year, of which about \$250,000 will be in the base at the end of FY 1996, if the requested funds are provided. These total operating costs, with allowance for actual inflation, are within the budget developed when the project was proposed eleven years ago. The Institution plans to request the remainder of the operating funds for the array as additions to the SAO base in FY 1997 and FY 1998.

Question 103. Why is a field station in Hilo required? How will the functions at Hilo differ from the activities to be conducted at the project site on the summit of Mauna Kea?

Answer. The summit of Mauna Kea is too high an elevation (13,500) for humans to work for extended periods of time. The summit is also far from a population center (a drive of more than two hours). SAO plans to operate the array remotely most of the time and thus to avoid the higher costs associated with full time staffing at the summit. Nearly all the telescope control, most of the equipment repair, and most other logistic support will be provided from the base camp in Hilo. Similar approaches have been adopted for all other instruments located at extremely high altitudes.

## Construction Projects

Question 104. The budget includes \$1.7 million for the Grasslands exhibit at the National Zoo. What is the total estimated cost of this project?

Answer. The total estimated cost remains at \$9,965,000. This includes \$1,215,000 for the farm exhibit, which we expect to receive from private sources.

Question 105. What modifications can be made to the design for this project if it were to be constructed without additional appropriations?

Answer. If the Zoo received \$1.7 million and no more, it could build the Domestication area (without the Farm option) but would not be able to construct the African (Cheetah) Phase; this would be a critical shortfall because that area is in need of repair and renewal. Major construction funds have not focused in the area since 1965.

Modifications of this project could have a wide range of consequences. The continuing process of exhibit upgrading at the Zoo is a necessity for a number of reasons. The increasing scrutiny of exhibits by Animal Rights groups, which are increasingly active, is exerting public pressure on zoos throughout the country. Delaying the process of enhancing animal welfare and exhibit quality could subject us to public protests and media attention particularly embarrassing to a federally-funded flagship National facility. The Grasslands Exhibit will modernize an obsolete exhibit area close to two major visitor entrances and greatly enhance the visitor access and safety.

Question 106. When does the Smithsonian anticipate awarding the construction contract for Phase I of the Grasslands exhibit?

Answer. The construction contract will be awarded before the close of the fiscal year.

Question 107. The budget indicates (p. 118) that the Institution "...is currently considering a variety of capital expansion and improvement projects to provide needed facilities for existing programs and urgent new initiatives." Please provide a summary of the projects under discussion and a description of the urgent new initiatives.

Answer. The projects under discussion include possible consolidation of administrative space in an owned facility to reduce dependence on expensive long-term leased space and to free space in museums on the Mall for public use. The Institution also continues to develop alternative strategies for resolving the crisis in collections storage space.

Question 108. What existing programs would you do away with in order to accommodate "urgent new initiatives" if your budget is decreasing?

Answer. The Secretary has begun a strategic planning process that will address the questions of existing programs versus unfunded needs. The need to provide funding for urgent projects exists in every organization. The strategic planning process will incorporate such considerations. The schedule calls for completion of the strategic planning effort by the end of the fiscal year.

Question 109. The budget proposes that \$800,000 be allocated to cover escalated costs for two modules at the Environmental Research Center. Do you anticipate reprogramming the \$750,000 provided for this purpose in FY 1995? If so, for what purpose?

Answer. In its FY 1995 request to Congress for Minor Construction, Alterations and Modifications, the institution listed projects totalling \$5 million while the funding request itself was only \$3 million. Page 193 of the FY 1995 request contains the statement "the \$3 million request for FY 1995 accommodates all of the projects listed above. The Institution seeks the approval of the remaining projects listed below for the possible substitution and redirection of funds." The SERC laboratory modules are included in those projects listed below the line (see page 194 of the request).

While we had hoped that we might be able to redirect a portion of the \$3 million to complete the SERC laboratory modules in FY 1995, it now appears unlikely. The Institution is therefore requesting funding in FY 1996 for this project.

Question 110. If the funds provided in FY 1995 are to be used for the modules, why is the cost of the project expected to increase by over 100 percent?

Answer. As explained in the preceding answer, funds provided in FY 1995 will not be used to construct the laboratory modules. The \$800,000 requested in FY 1996 constitutes a small increase over the \$750,000 identified in the FY 1995 request. This increase represents the escalated cost of the original design, which was completed in April 1993.

#### Rental Space

Question 111. An increase of \$400,000 is proposed for additional archival storage space due to an anticipated depletion of existing storage space. Is this storage situation associated with existing collections, or are significant additional acquisitions anticipated? If the latter, what are the acquisitions and what is their importance?

Answer. The Smithsonian Institution Archives retains three categories of records: materials created or generated by the Institution itself, personal papers of significant individuals associated with the Institution, and records of related

organizations where Smithsonian staff invest a significant portion of their professional lives. The great bulk of the holdings (roughly 80%) falls into the first category. The rate of acquisition is approximately 1,000 feet of records per year.

The Archives is now completely full. New storage space is needed primarily for the continuation of transfer of records of the first category - archivally significant materials from the offices of the Smithsonian Institution - into secure and well-maintained storage. The Archives is required to preserve these records for the following purposes: for legal purposes of contracting, personnel, property transfer, etc.; to provide a basis for the Secretary's annual report to Congress as specified by the originating legislation; to provide a basis for the oversight of the activities of the Institution by the Secretary, the Regents, and the Congress; and to provide historical perspectives and a research resource for scholars, curators, administrators, and the general public.

Examples of future acquisitions include records of the National Air and Space Museum as well as file additions to Archives holdings from the Secretary's office, the national museums, central administration, and the Institution's multiple programs. These and other records trace the entire 150 year history of the Smithsonian and are irreplaceable sources of documentation and accountability for its actions, impact, and programs.

Question 112. If additional funding can not be provided for rental space, what steps would the Smithsonian take in order to protect its collections? Would you have to forego adding new acquisitions?

Answer. For the 20% of acquisitions that are personal papers or the records of related organizations, the Archives would be forced to cease or greatly reduce its rate of acquisition. These papers are of significant value to present day and future historians.

Of the remaining 80%, the Smithsonian is obliged to retain these records. A likely short-term solution would be to require offices throughout the Institution to hold their archival records for longer periods. This course would result in reducing further the Institution's already cramped office space while increasing the cost of records storage. Over a five-year period an estimated 2,254 file drawers of archival records will accumulate in office space. This situation poses grave threat to survival of historical documentation, since it forces "old files" to compete with staff and new files for highly valued space.

Long-term options include miniaturization of the Archives' holdings through microfilming or digitizing. While digitization in particular would carry the benefits of decreasing space requirements while increasing records accessibility, the start-up costs of digitizing the holdings of the Archives would be in the millions of dollars. Given budgetary constraints, the Smithsonian is unable to support this option, requesting instead support for additional storage sufficient to house acquisitions for the next ten years.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DOMENICI

National Atomic Museum Request or an Enola Gay Exhibit

Question 113a. A letter dated February 27, 1995 was forwarded to Secretary Heyman regarding a request from the President of the National Atomic Museum Foundation, Joel Carlson. On behalf of the Board of Trustees for this museum, Mr. Carlson indicated that they would appreciate the opportunity to house the Enola Gay either on a permanent or temporary basis at the Albuquerque location. In addition to the controversy surrounding the Enola Gay exhibit, the Smithsonian is planning to store - away from public view - the Enola Gay until the Smithsonian Annex is completed. The museum board believes the period of storage is the perfect opportunity to display the plane in New Mexico.

For over 25 years, Albuquerque, New Mexico, has been the home to the National Atomic Museum. The museum's displays include unclassified atomic technology, the explanation of the atomic theory of matter, examples of the development of the chain reaction, items from the Manhattan Project, and missiles representing every branch of the military. Last year, the museum attracted over 200,000 visitors. Eighty percent of these patrons came from areas other than the Albuquerque metropolitan area.

On March 14, I. Michael Heyman's response to the initial letter states that the Enola Gay is one of the premier artifacts in the Smithsonian's collection. The plane has been under restoration for more than a decade at a considerable cost. Additionally, Mr. Heyman believes that transporting the plane may cause damage. Therefore, the Smithsonian has declined the proposal to loan the Enola Gay to the National Atomic Museum.

Isn't it true that only the front fuselage of the Enola Gay will be placed in the scaled-down display opening this June?

Answer. The display of the Enola Gay currently planned to open in the spring of 1995 will include:

- The forward fuselage,
- Two engines,
- A Vertical Stabilizer, Rudder and Dorsal Fin,
- Two Propellers; one assembled, one disassembled,
- A Radar Unit, and
- Several other small items.

Question 113b. When will the plane be fully assembled, and how long will the Enola Gay be housed in a warehouse?

Answer. The aircraft will be fully assembled as soon as a suitable building for its display is available to the National Air and Space Museum in the greater Washington Metropolitan area.

Question 114. How many hours will it take to fully assemble the Enola Gay?

Answer. It will take approximately 6,250 man-hours, or six people working six months to fully assemble the aircraft. The staff involved should be trained restorers, who will be able to perform the assembly without the original jigs that were used at the World War II aircraft factories. Without these jigs, irreversible damage from excessive strains could result if the assembly was carried out by other than skilled technicians familiar with the aircraft. If the aircraft were loaned to another facility and assembled and disassembled there, before final return to the National Air and Space Museum and reassembled, the entire effort would add up to 15,000 man-hours, a 9,000 man-hour difference. The Museum does not have a sufficiently large restoration staff, nor adequate funds, to carry out such an extensive set of operations at a remote site.

Question 115. Would the museum be willing to loan to the National Atomic Museum portions of the Enola Gay - such as the front fuselage, tail section or any other portion of the plane - while the Dulles Annex is being prepared?

Answer. Loans to other institutions, of artifacts that are not on display at the National Air and Space Museum, can be arranged. The Museum has a loan package that outlines our loan program to all potential borrowers and is happy to send it out on request. It lists a set of criteria intended to provide proper care and security for borrowed artifacts. If those are met, a loan for a fixed number of years can be arranged, with the understanding that payment for most costs involved, including shipping and insurance, will be borne by the borrowing institution.

Question 116a. What is the Smithsonian's policy in sharing artifacts and/or exhibits with other institutions?

Answer. Lending objects for exhibition, research, and study is an integral part of the Smithsonian's mission to make museum collections accessible to the widest possible audience. In general, the Smithsonian lends objects for educational, non-profit purposes. Borrowing institutions must comply with both specified environmental requirements and safety and security precautions, and are prohibited from using Smithsonian collections for private pecuniary gain. Requests to borrow unique or especially important objects and specimens are considered in light of the nature of the object; the impact of its absence on the visiting public and research scholars; the condition of and the risk to the object; and security, environmental, and legal restrictions. Outgoing loans are authorized by a standard loan agreement, which generally specifies the collection items to be lent, the purpose, time period, conditions of the loan, insurance coverage, the responsibilities of each party, and options for renewal.

Question 116b. How often does the Institution loan artifacts to qualified institutions?

Answer. Annually, the Smithsonian initiates approximately 2,000 outgoing loan transactions, which includes anywhere from 125,000 to 225,000 objects and specimens. These figures reflect only outgoing loans initiated in a given year. In addition, active on-going loans total approximately 500,000 objects and specimens annually. Such loans require periodic review, monitoring, record-keeping, on-site inspection, condition reporting, and conservation by Smithsonian staff. Smithsonian collections have been lent to organizations in every state, as well as over fifty foreign countries.

Question 117. Would it be a fair assessment that the Smithsonian Institution is very capable of safely transporting artifacts to and from remote locations?

Answer. If an object or specimen, following review, is deemed appropriate for loan and able to withstand the rigors of travel, the Smithsonian possesses the staff, skill, and professional expertise to safely transport objects and specimens to and from remote locations. Conditions at proposed exhibition and/or study locations and transportation methods are evaluated during the review of each loan request to determine whether the safety of the objects or specimens might be adversely affected.

Question 118. What would be the financial cost of transporting such an artifact within the country?

Answer. The transportation costs (including packing, shipping, handling, and insurance) would be dependent upon the size, value, and handling requirements of the artifact and the specific destination.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator GORTON. I thank you very much. The subcommittee will stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 22, when we will receive testimony from the Fish and Wildlife Service.

[Whereupon, at 10:35 a.m., Wednesday, March 15, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 22.]





SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION LIBRARIES



3 9088 01619 8699