



## Professional Report Series Number 9

### ***IT'S NOT A MATTER OF MONEY – IT'S A MATTER OF PRIORITIES***

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **Abstract**

Recently, in Tucson, Arizona, Dwight Pitcaithley, PhD, former National Park Service Chief Historian and now Professor of History, New Mexico State University, gave a keynote address at a National Park Service Conference for Comprehensive Resource Stewardship. His candid exposure of the National Park Service's flaws when it comes to federal budgets is also tempered by optimism that things can change for the better in the future if the National Park Service can demonstrate its capacity for leadership. This *Professional Report* is further complemented by an in-depth National Park Service budget analysis of the last 16 years, completed by former Deputy Director Deny Galvin. Taking special interest in the dynamics of different political administrations relative to their support of the National Park Service, Mr. Galvin has produced an in-depth budget analysis annually since 1993. This analysis is exceptionally candid and objective, free of the ideological camouflage often associated with Presidential budgets. When combined, these two reports offer a compelling perspective on the budget of the National Park Service. The historical reflections by Dr. Pitcaithley on the "culture of organizational poverty" long experienced by the National Park Service, coupled with the factual analysis of numbers, percentages and budget comparisons of different political administrations by Deny Galvin, provide a window into the depth of the problem while still offering hope for a solution.

#### **The Coalition**

The Coalition of National Park Service Retirees (CNPSR) is an organization comprised of nearly 700 former National Park Service employees who, collectively, have served almost 20,000 years within the agency in every capacity and at all grades, including a substantial number of former Directors and Deputy Directors, former regional Directors or Deputy Regional Directors, former Associate or Assistant Directors at the national or regional office level, former Division Chiefs at the national or regional office level, and former Superintendents or Assistant Superintendents. In our personal lives, we come from the broad spectrum of political affiliations. As park managers, rangers and employees in the National Park Service's many disciplines, however, we devoted our professional lives to a common goal – maintaining and protecting our national parks for the benefit of all Americans, both living and those yet to be born. We remain committed to that goal. This paper is one of a series on critical issues facing the National Park Service as it enters its second century. A complete listing of all current or planned papers appears at the end of this report.

#### **The Authors**

Dwight Pitcaithley, PhD, is the former National Park Service Chief Historian (Ret) and now Professor of History, New Mexico State University. His position as historian has enabled a contextual view on the National Park Service budget and is a much different perspective than normally encountered. Deny Galvin, Deputy Director of the National Park Service (Ret) served with the highest distinction over a long and varied career. He earned the deep respect of the employees of the National Park

Service and different political administrations in the Department of Interior, as well as the special friendship of park advocates and adversaries alike. With the permission and encouragement of both authors the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees has combined their respective works believing both authors have accurately represented the professional views of this organization.

## Professional Report Series – Number 9

### ***IT'S NOT A MATTER OF MONEY – IT'S A MATTER OF PRIORITIES***

*“A case can be made that the National Park Service has managed itself for so long in an environment of declining funding and increased political interference that it doesn’t know how to envision a different future. Most or you, perhaps all of you, have developed your National Park Service careers within a pronounced **culture of organizational poverty**.” - Dwight Pitcaithley, PhD.*

Recently, in Tucson, Arizona, Dwight Pitcaithley, PhD, former National Park Service Chief Historian and now Professor of History, New Mexico State University, gave a keynote address at a National Park Service Conference for Comprehensive Resource Stewardship. Dr. Pitcaithley’s stirring address before several hundred National Park Service scientists, cultural and natural resource specialists received the only standing ovation of the three-day conference. This special recognition was in response to the candid exposure of the National Park Service’s flaws when it comes to federal budgets and also the optimism that things can change for the better in the future if the National Park Service can demonstrate its capacity for leadership.

Dr. Pitcaithley also received widespread acclaim for a provocative and thoughtful article on the same subject which appeared in the George Wright Forum in 2007. The Coalition of National Park Service Retirees believes both the article and the speech accurately represent the professional views of this organization and, with the permission of Dr. Pitcaithley, provide an edited excerpt of the address made in Tucson and present it as a formal *Professional Report* of this organization.

This *Professional Report* is further complemented by an in-depth National Park Service budget analysis of the last 16 years, completed by former Deputy Director Deny Galvin. Mr. Galvin served with the highest distinction over a long and varied career. He earned the deep respect of the employees of the National Park Service and different political administrations in the Department of Interior, as well as the special friendship of park advocates and adversaries alike. Mr. Galvin is still very much involved with National Park Service issues and very influential as an advocate for the agency and the System of Parks it serves.

Taking special interest in the dynamics of different political administrations relative to their support of the National Park Service, Mr. Galvin has produced an in-depth budget analysis annually since 1993. This analysis is exceptionally candid and objective, free of the ideological camouflage often associated with Presidential budgets. Further, Mr. Galvin understands how the money arrived, where it was allocated, and how the magic of political manipulation can re-interpret the numbers. Mr. Galvin, a member of the Coalition, provided this 16-year analysis so that the organization might thoughtfully and accurately use the information on behalf of the National Park Service as circumstances warrant.

When combined, these two reports offer a compelling perspective on the budget of the National Park Service. The historical reflections by Dr. Pitcaithley on the “culture of organizational poverty” long experienced by the National Park Service, coupled with the factual analysis of numbers, percentages and budget comparisons of different political administrations by Deny Galvin, provide a window into the depth of the problem while still offering hope for a solution.

The Coalition of National Park Service Retirees is grateful to both authors for allowing us to use their work and present it as a comprehensive *Professional Paper* on the matter of budgets and priorities representing the informed opinion of this organization.

## **“CONNECTIONS BETWEEN NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND THE FUTURE OF THE NPS”**

By Dwight Pitcaithley, PhD

We are, as you know, approaching the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the National Park Service. Celebrations, if they are to be at all useful, should provide for a time of reflection, introspection and critical analysis that results in a refined vision for the future. This is, of course, not always the case. The 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Civil War, for example, encouraged none of the above. We can hope that history's judgment of the Centennial of the National Park Service will be favorable, but that remains to be seen.

The Centennial should offer all of us, employees and public alike, an opportunity to think deeply and expansively about what kind of Service we want for the second century. The Centennial should be a time to have a wide-ranging conversation about what we want the National Park Service to look like for its next century. How can or should the agency adapt to the changing social and political environment within which it operates? How can it position itself as a leading educational organization in the fields of environmental science and history? In short, how can it serve society (the taxpayers) better?

The Service and the System are different today from the agency and small collection of parks managed by Stephen T. Mather and Horace Albright almost 100 years ago. We are closing in on 400 parks that now have to be managed through a multiplicity of laws and regulations un-envisioned by Mather and Albright. Our society is different as well, more complex, more diverse, more awed by electronic wizardry than by natural beauty or important stories from the past.

The Park Service faces, and will face, increased competition from myriad known and unknown sources. If it wants to become **relevant** within American society, it will have to broaden its message and its appeal. If it wants to fix what is broken within it, the Service will have to be more open about the problems it faces.

The face we present to the public, however, is always uplifting and optimistic and inspirational and never, never, never suggests that the National Park Service is facing major problems on multiple fronts.

A case can be made that the National Park Service has managed itself for so long in an environment of declining funding and increasing political interference that it doesn't know how to envision a different future. Most of you, perhaps all of you, have developed your National Park Service careers within a pronounced **culture of organizational poverty**. The last time the National Park Service witnessed a major infusion of funds was during the Bicentennial of the United States. For many of the years that followed, the budget of the agency did not even match inflation. We have become so used to a parsimonious Congress we cannot envision a different reality.

The **Centennial of the National Park Service** might be a time to consider what adequate funding for this agency should be. It might be a time to ask Congress for adequate funding. That would require, however, the leadership of the agency to step up and formulate a budget that emphasized the reality of the **three-legged stool** upon which management responsibility sits.

It seems to me that any informed observer of the agency will see that the **core mission of the National Park Service** rests upon its responsibilities in three areas: preservation, research, and education; a three-legged stool, if you will, or an equilateral triangle with each point having a symbiotic relationship with the other two. They work in concert with each other....or should in the best of possible worlds. But we live in a real world, don't we, an environment where each of the points must compete with the others for table scraps.

*Did you know that the National Park Service has a maintenance backlog for its facilities and historic structures that totals \$8 billion dollars?*

*Did you know that the National Park Service receives only two-thirds of the money it needs to professionally manage your parks?*

Envision a National Park Service where each of these important/ critical/ fundamental responsibilities are fully funded and work in complete professional partnership with the other two - **Preservation** and **Research** and **Education** working together as the **core mission** of the National Park Service.

Envision a Park Service that does not carry a \$5 to 8 billion dollar maintenance backlog.

Envision a Park Service that does not manage its parks with an average of 68% of the funds it needs to meet all the demands Congress requires.

If we envisioned an optimum budget for the National Park Service, what would that budget be? In an article in the *George Wright Forum* (see [www.georgewright.org](http://www.georgewright.org)) last year I suggested that the optimum operating budget for the National Park Service would be between 5 and 6 billion dollars! Not an unreasonable figure, I observed, to manage and preserve properly:

20,000 buildings,  
1,000 campgrounds,  
1,600 wastewater systems,  
1,300 water systems,  
115,000,000 natural and cultural objects,  
67,000 archeological sites, and  
26,000 historic structures.  
Not to mention the natural resources in every park you manage.

Not an unreasonable figure to ensure that no visitor center has interpretive exhibits that have been in place for 40 years, or even 30 years.

Not an unreasonable figure if our educational programs are to keep pace with ongoing science and research.

Not an unreasonable figure if the agency were to develop continuing educational opportunities for its employees as the Department of Defense does.

Not an unreasonable figure if the National Park Service were to embrace, **seriously embrace**, and professionally design its preservation, research, and education programs.

The chronic under funding of the National Park Service is not now and has not been for the past 50 years a matter of money — it is a matter of priorities! Five billion dollars amounts to 0.002% of the president's 2008 proposed budget.

Let's put the \$2.4 billion current budget into perspective.

Let's compare it to Department of Defense's \$550 billion budget.

One B-2 bomber costs \$2 billion. Do you really think the American people would notice if this country's military-industrial complex held one less bomber than it does today and that those funds were transferred to the National Park Service?

The President and Congress took less than ten minutes to determine that the economy needed an economic stimulus package totaling \$150 billion. Do you think anyone would have complained if it were \$148 billion? And the resulting \$2 billion savings were given to the National Park Service?

We hang on to our Fee Demo program as though it were a lifeline; this entrance fee program that generates \$150 million annually. No small figure, I grant you, but a figure that should be simply added annually by Congress to the Service's operating budget.

Perspective: The **Osprey aircraft** developed by the United States Marine Corps cost \$110 million each! They are currently being sent to Iraq even though military analysts believe they don't work as designed. Here's the punch line: several branches of the military are planning to purchase 400 of these flawed aircraft! 400 times \$110 million equals \$44 billion!

**It's not a matter of money; it's a matter of priorities** and the National Park Service over the years has not developed a constituency that will lobby on its behalf. The **National Parks Conservation Association** is simply not enough and clearly no match for other park interest groups. If you doubt that in any way consider the recent successful effort by the **National Rifle Association** to change decades-long NPS policy on guns in parks. A **goofy idea** by any measurement, but one that went unopposed except by a handful of editors.

In the world I envision for the National Park Service, the forty congressmen who endorsed the proposal would have been instantly balanced by forty congressmen and women who opposed it – delegates in Congress who had been cultivated over the years to support various pieces of legislation that benefit the national parks and, through the parks, the American public. Where are those Congressmen and women? Why don't we do that? The Department of Defense passes up no opportunity and spares no expense in cultivating Congressional representatives to support its programs. Why doesn't the National Park Service do the same?

We have become complacent as our society has changed. We assume the American public views the parks and the Park Service the same way we do. We see and understand how the National Park Service has changed and evolved over the past fifty years; many Americans, intelligent Americans, see the parks unchanged over the same period. The National Geographic picture books published during the 1950s and 1960s on the National Park Service remain the central and guiding vision of the national parks for most of the public. Yellowstone and Yosemite and Crater Lake and the Grand Canyon are what the public thinks of when it thinks of the National Park Service. When Ken Burns envisions the National Park Service he, too, thinks of those large, traditional national parks. His multi-evening romp through the National Park Service, due out next year, will not include the interesting and edgy historic parks that have been added over the past thirty years. Topeka and Selma and Manzanar and Women's Rights will be side notes to his story if they appear at all. The blame for not promoting the richness and the diversity of this incredible collection of parks rests with us. We claim to be a system, but conduct ourselves otherwise. For example, how many of your parks prominently display the *Map & Guide* of the National Park System? All of you sell it to the public, but how many of you have framed the map and prominently display it for your visitors? What easier way is there to encourage the visiting public to think of our parks as a system rather than a nice place to have a picnic?

**WHAT IS TO BE DONE? WE NEED TO:**

***BE MORE INTROSPECTIVE***

***THINK BIGGER THOUGHTS***

***THINK OUTSIDE THE BOX***

***ENVISION A FUTURE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE UNFETTERED BY THE PATTERNS OF YESTERDAY***

**WE NEED TO WORK AT BECOMING RELEVANT TO A LARGER, A MUCH LARGER, PERCENTAGE OF TAX-PAYING AMERICANS.**

As frustrated as I become at times over the future of the National Park Service, I remain hopeful that the agency will achieve a kind of renaissance during its centennial. But to do so, it must expand, greatly expand, its vision of itself.

Our vision is fundamentally inward, isn't it? We promote ourselves, to the degree we do, to strengthen the condition of our parks as though that were a goal in itself. The recent *Education Program Business Plan* (2006) carries this subtitle: "Helping People Enjoy, Care About, and Care for National Parks." That's fine, I suppose, but rather self serving. We need to help visitors enjoy the parks, it says, so they will care more for the parks. The education programs in the parks are all about parks...not our society.

Both the *Vail Agenda* and the Advisory Board's *Rethinking the National Parks for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, however, argued for a much broader purpose for education in the National Park System. They envision educational systems in parks that encourage the visiting public to be better stewards of the land, to increasingly think in sustainable terms, to envision solutions to local and global environmental problems. The desired action they envision is not within park boundaries, but outside park boundaries; parks are exemplars, in their view, of environmental stewardship that will encourage increased environmental stewardship in backyards and city parks and public places where we live, not just visit.

These reports envision **historic parks** where educational programs promote a better understanding of our nation's history which will in turn lead to better citizenship.

*The study of our nation's history, formal and informal, is an essential part of our civic education. In a democratic society such as ours, it is important to understand the journey of liberty and justice, together with the economic, social, religious, and other forces that barred or opened the ways for our ancestors, and the distances yet to be covered....Our nation's history is our civic glue. Without it, our national character is diminished.*

The Advisory Board's report concludes with a challenge to the National Park Service....a challenge we should all be aware of....a challenge that has been largely forgotten (or perhaps purposefully ignored) only seven years after it was laid down. In the twenty-first century, it pronounces, the National Park Service has a responsibility to proclaim anew the meaning and value of parks, to expand learning and research and share the resulting knowledge broadly.

*As a people, our quality of life—our very health and well-being—depends in the most basic way on the protection of nature, the accessibility of open space and recreation opportunities, and the preservation of landmarks that illustrate our historic continuity. By caring for the parks and conveying the park ethic, we care for ourselves and act on behalf of the future. The **larger purpose** of this mission is to build a citizenry that is committed to conserving its heritage and its home on earth.*

When we conserve natural parks, those parks become exemplars for better environmental stewardship outside parks. By preserving historic places and sharing the stories inherent in those places, we become better citizens.

We preserve these places not as a means in itself. **We preserve these places because they have stories to tell and we have thing to learn from those stories!**

How can we embrace this **larger purpose** of building a citizenry that is committed to conserving its heritage and its home on earth?

When it wants to, the National Park Service can be quite effective in designing programs and gaining Congressional approval for them. Witness Mission 66 and the Natural Resource Challenge. Although quite different, both were Park Service initiatives; both were funded by Congress; both resulted in a strengthened Service and System.

The employees of the National Park Service are inventive and creative when encouraged to be so. **Discovery 2000**, the last large gathering of NPS personnel, was remarkable for its creative presenting of critical ideas and the degree to which it encouraged creative thinking on the part of its attendees. Prose and poetry were abundant in St. Louis.

Parks can and should be forums for contemporary issues through lectures, symposia, and discussion and book groups. There are endless opportunities for parks to become relevant to local and national audiences; endless opportunities to share and explore science and research-based management and interpretive issues. We can play a much larger role in the civic and environmental affairs of our society. We will be effective in that endeavor, however, only if we extend our view beyond park boundaries.

Anti-intellectualism in American society is on the rise and we are certain to encounter it if we challenge traditional views of our parks or promote thinking about our parks and their values that rub up against, or challenge, assumed truths. Susan Jacoby has explored this uncomfortable side of American life in her recent book titled, *The Age of American Unreason* (Pantheon, 2008).

*Memory loss has made us bad stewards of our intellectual inheritance, and the dissipation of our cultural storehouse gives rise in turn to new cycles of forgetting. Anti-rationalism and anti-intellectualism flourish in a mix that includes addiction to infotainment, every form of superstition and credulity, and an educational system that does a poor job of teaching not only the basic skills but the logic underlying those skills.*

You are obligated to manage your parks and resources through research and with intelligence in an environment that combines anti-rationalism with apathy and, sometimes, entrenched ignorance. Roger Kennedy termed it “militant ignorance.” Yet **there is a role in this democratic society of ours for leadership**. There is a role for the National Park Service as an exemplary steward of “our intellectual inheritance.” With the problems this nation faces and will face in the coming years throughout your careers, there is the opportunity - even necessity - for the National Park Service to rise to that **larger purpose** envisioned by the Advisory Board’s report - to build a citizenry that is committed to conserving its heritage and its home on earth.

The choice, to me, is clear. The National Park Service can continue on the path it is on of becoming increasingly irrelevant to a larger percentage of American citizens; believing itself unworthy of funding from Congress that will allow it to manage effectively the resources under its care; on a path that narrowly defines its role in American society.

**OR,**

The National Park Service can, during its Centennial, re-envision itself and its mission; it can proclaim anew the **larger purpose** of parks and the inherent values within those parks that strengthen our democratic traditions; it can assume a leadership position throughout the country and, indeed, the world, in the areas of resource stewardship and heritage education.

I am hopeful that this beloved agency of ours **will** expand its horizons, **will** re-think its role in our society, and **will** rise above itself and become an intrinsic part of hope for the future of our human community.

I am hopeful that we, collectively, can solve the environmental problems that confront us and that the National Park Service will be a major player in that effort.

I am hopeful that we can achieve a more enlightened understanding of ourselves, of our past, and of our relationships to one another.

I am hopeful that the National Park Service:

will become a major facilitator of the conversations we must have if we are to improve our “home on earth”;

will become a major player in this nation’s educational system; and

will become a respected exemplar of resource research and stewardship.

Wallace Stegner once wrote that the national parks were “the best idea we ever had.” Let’s hope he was right.

---

## **AN ANALYSIS OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE BUDGET TRENDS 1993 TO 2009**

By Deny Galvin, Deputy Director, NPS Retired

### **NATIONAL PARK SERVICE TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR**

(Source National Park Service Budget Justifications 2009 Page Overview 71 and prior year Budget Justifications, dollars in thousands.)

Year	Appropriation	%annual change	Administration
1993	1,386,283		Clinton
1994	1,451,637	+04.7	Clinton
1995	1,373,153	-05.4	Clinton
1996	1,361,050	-00.9	Clinton
1997	1,593,337	+17.1	Clinton
1998	1,667,474	+04.7	Clinton
1999	1,791,005	+07.4	Clinton
2000	1,849,491	+03.3	Clinton
2001	2,292,122	+23.9	Clinton
2002	2,379,772	+03.8	Bush
		-05.8	

2003	2,241,930		Bush
		+01.1	
2004	2,266,852		Bush
		+04.2	
2005	2,361,616		Bush
		-04.4	
2006	2,257,944		Bush
		+01.4	
2007	2,289,959 (actual)		Bush
		+04.3	
2008	2,390,488 (estimate)		Bush
		+00.6	
2009	2,404,342 (estimate)		Bush

**Eight year Clinton record:**

**Cumulative increase +65.3%**  
**Average annual increase +06.5%**

**Eight year Bush record:**

**Cumulative increase +04.9%**  
**Average annual increase +00.6%**

**OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM APPROPRIATIONS 1993 TO 2009**

(Source National Park Service Budget Justifications 2009, page ONPS-2, and prior year Justifications, dollars in thousands.)

Year	Appropriation	%annual change	Administration
1993	983,995		Clinton
		+07.9	
1994	1,061,823		Clinton
		+01.9	
1995	1,082,409		Clinton
		-00.1	
1996	1,081,772		Clinton
		+06.7	
1997	1,154,669		Clinton
		+07.9	
1998	1,246,344		Clinton
		+05.5	
1999	1,315,077		Clinton
		+03.7	
2000	1,364,190		Clinton
		+08.1	
2001(1)	1,474,049		Clinton
	(80,976)	+06.9	
2002	1,576,678		Bush
	(90,480)	+04.1	
2003	1,642,251		Bush
	(77,921)	+03.4	
2004	1,697,515		Bush
	(77,887)	+04.2	
2005	1,768,812		Bush
	(80,076)	+01.7	
2006	1,798,804		Bush
	(80,213)	+02.8	

2007	1,848,421 (enacted) (85,213)	+06.6	Bush
2008	1,970,581 (enacted) (86,747)	+08.2	Bush
2009	2,131,529 (estimate) (94,390)		Bush

**Eight year Clinton record:**

**Cumulative increase +49.8%**

**Average annual increase +05.2%**

**Eight year Bush record:**

**Cumulative increase +44.6%**

**Average annual increase +04.7%**

**Since 2001 most of the growth in operations has come from reductions in other National Park Service appropriations. The increase in total appropriations since 2001 is \$112,220. The increase in Operations for the same period is \$657,480. The difference, \$545,260, has come at the expense of other National Park Service appropriations.** (All dollars in thousands.)

NOTE: Prior to 2001 the U.S. Park Police were included in the Operations budget. They have been a separate appropriation since then. To make the comparisons valid they have been added to the operations number. The numbers in parentheses are the USPP appropriation.

**APPROPRIATIONS WITHIN THE NPS TOTAL COMPARING LAST CLINTON YEAR (2001) WITH CURRENT BUSH REQUEST (2009)**

(Source 2009 Budget Justifications, page overview 50, and prior justifications, dollars in thousands.)

	2001	2009	Change (\$,%)
Operations	1,474,049 [1]	2,131,529 [1]	+657,040 (+44.6)
Park Police	(80,976)	(94,390)	(+13,414) (+16.6)
National Recreation	59,827	45,488	-14,329 (-24.0)
Urban Parks	29,934	0	-29,934 (-100.0)
Historic Preservation	94,239	66,142	-28,097 (-29.8)
Land Acquisition and (State Assistance)	266,161 (90,301)	20,832 (0)	-245,329 (-92.2)
Construction	397,912	172,459	-225,453 (-56.7)

**All appropriations except Operations and the Park Police have been reduced.**

[1] Total includes Park Police

**THE SUM OF PARK BUDGETS AS PART OF THE OPERATIONS ACCOUNT**

Park base funding (source page ONPS-191 et seq; dollars in millions.)

		Annual % change	Cumulative % change	% of total operations
2001	919			62.3
		04.2	04.2	
2002	958			60.6
		02.5	06.8	
2003	982			59.8
		00.5	07.4	
2004	987			58.1
		06.1	13.9	
2005	1047			59.2
		00.6	14.6	
2006	1053			58.5
		01.8	16.6	
2007	1072			60.6
		11.0	29.4	
2008	1190			57.9
		04.4	35.2	
2009	1243			58.3

Eight year average annual % change in park base funding = +03.8

**Park base budgets have declined as a percentage of the Operations account. The rate of growth is lower than the Operations appropriation.**

**A BREAKDOWN OF THE OPERATIONS APPROPRIATION INTO SUB ACTIVITY**

Source National Park Service Budget Justifications 2009, page ONPS 2 (dollars in thousands).

	2001 actual	2009 request	change (%)
Park Management			
Resource Stewardship	286,957	410,421	123,464 (43.0)
Visitor Services	287,011	432,936	145,929 (50.8)
Facility Operations	458,311	712,184	253,783 (55.4)
Park Support	259,673	333,453	73,870 (28.5)
External Administrative Costs	99,408	148,055	48,647 (48.9)
U. S. Park Police	80,967	94,930	13,963 (17.2)

The emphasis on backlog is shown in the relative growth of the Facilities Operations and Maintenance sub activity. There has been considerable growth in External Costs. These are payments made to the Department of Interior, the General Services Administration, and the Department of Labor.

### CHASING THE BACKLOG NUMBERS

Cyclic Maintenance, Repair Rehabilitation, and Construction (Source 2009 Budget Justifications pp. ONPS-194, CONST-2 and prior year justifications – dollars in thousands).

	Cyclic	Historic Cyclic	Repair/rehab	Line Item Const.	Total	NEW
2001	24.1	10.4	55.5	245.0	335.0	0.0
2002	21.9	10.4	72.6	296.9	401.8	+66.8
2003	46.9	10.4	90.3	214.2	361.8	+26.8
2004	54.9	10.2	94.4	241.3	400.8	+65.8
2005	52.8	10.0	95.1	233.1	391.0	+56.0
2006	51.1	9.9	96.2	214.9	72.1	+37.1
2007	61.1	9.9	86.2	180.6	37.8	+02.8
2008	65.1	14.7	99.6	122.6	302.0	-33.0
2009	81.3	19.7	99.6	90.2	290.8	-44.2
TOTAL NEW FUNDS					+178.1	

Using the 2001 numbers as a base, the NEW funds budgeted for backlog projects are not more than 178.1 million dollars, or about 22 million dollars annually. **It would take 220 years to total 4.4 billion dollars, the current non-roads backlog. The 2008 and 2009 budgets are less than the 2001 base.**

#### SUMMARY

- The budget of the National Park Service (2009 request) is only slightly more than it was in 2001 (+04.9 %). Except for Operations and the Park Police, all other Appropriations have been reduced or eliminated.
- Funds have been redirected to the Operations appropriation from all other NPS appropriations. Despite this emphasis, the Operations account has grown at 4.7 % per year, a rate below the eight comparable Clinton years (5.2% per year).
- Park budgets, as a part of Operations, have grown more slowly (3.8% per year). As a result, park budgets are a smaller part of Operations than they were in 2001 (58.3 % vs. 62.3%).
- The emphasis on the backlog has diverted an additional \$178 million (approximate) to this purpose over the past eight years. At this rate it would take 220 years to total \$4.4 billion, the current non-roads backlog. The 2008 and 2009 budgets for this purpose are less than the 2001 base.

## **This Series Of Papers**

The imminent arrival of the centennial of the National Park Service's birth, which will occur in 2016, has led to reflection on its past, evaluation of its successes and failures, and discussion of its future goals and priorities – both within the agency and among its many friends and supporters.

As an organization containing more professional experience and knowledge than any comparable entity anywhere in the country, we believe that we are uniquely placed to offer our professional perspectives on the array of issues that are and will be discussed over coming months and years.

This series of papers offers our professional evaluation of the key issues that the agency is now facing or will be dealing with in coming years. Current papers in the series, either completed or in development, include the following. Others may be added:

- Report 1        *America's Crown Jewels: The National Park System* – A paper on the philosophic and legislative foundation of the NPS and an evaluation of the need for more effective national engagement in protecting parks.
  
- Report 2        *The National Parks Centennial Commission* – An evaluation of the commission and recommendations on how it should work, what its goals should be, and what issues it should focus on.
  
- Report 3        *The National Park Centennial Institute* – A paper that explores the need and concept for a formalized academic institute to study a wide variety of park-related issues in order to inform and educate agency staff and political leaders and better manage our parks in a new century.
  
- Report 4        *Competitive Sourcing, Privatization, and Philanthropy in our National Parks* – A paper on these key issues and the bearing they have on the agency and its efforts to attain its goals.
  
- Report 5        *The Future of Entrance Fees and Their Connection to Visitation* – An examination of the problem of over reliance on entrance and user fees and the potential fees have to “price publics out of their parks.”
  
- Report 6        *Reasserting International Environmental and Park Leadership* – This paper looks at the reasons why the NPS has lost its standing as an international leader in parks and what needs to be done to become a more effective member of the international parks community.
  
- Report 7        *A Renaissance of Park Interpretation and Education Reaffirms the Mission of the National Park Service* – A paper that looks at the present dire straits of the NPS interpretive and education program and calls for a “renaissance” and a renewal of excellence in our on-site and off-site educational programs.
  
- Report 8        *Toward A Second Century Of Excellence For The National Park System* – This paper presents a ten-point vision of the attributes that the National Park Service needs to have by the time its centennial arrives on August 25, 2016. It also outlines qualities that must be sought and fostered in its leaders for it to retain its integrity, serve the public and meet its goals, and identifies core values that underlie “principled leadership.”
  
- Report 9        *It Is Not A Matter Of Money – It Is A Matter of Priorities* – This paper exposes the budgetary quagmire the National Park Service finds itself in and discusses ways

out of the situation. It also presents a 15 year review and analysis of NPS budgets and compares the Clinton and Bush administration's budgets.

- Report 10      *The Renewal of the Park Ranger Profession* – A review of the present state of the park ranger profession, which is increasingly called upon to specialize in the narrow niche of law enforcement, and how it might be reformed to better serve the agency in the future.
- Report 11      *Global Climate Change Creates New Park Environments and New Organizational Challenges for Park Science Programs* – This paper looks at the coming changes to our national and global ecosystems and impacts upon society and where our national parks can serve as effective barometers of global change.
- Report 12      *Reassessing the Development Footprint in our Parks* – This paper looks at the planning, development and construction process in the parks, examining the lessons learned from the first century of park development and how they need to be reconsidered for the second century.