

February 18, 1981

To: Jim  
From: Deb  
Re: Pinelands

(1) F.Y.I.: The Subcommittee on Public Lands and National Parks will hold oversight hearings on the F.Y.'82 budget requests for the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service, Department of the Interior on Monday February 23, 1981.

The Natural Resources Defense Council will be testifying on the Pinelands. The other New Jersey groups which will testify are not known as of yet.

Members will testify at a hearing scheduled for May 4, 1981.

*get me scheduled.*

As you requested, I am inviting the groups to stop by our offices following the hearing.

(2) F.Y.I.: Fred Mohrmann, Appropriations staffer, indicated that due to the controversy over the Pinelands, it will be somewhat easier to justify funding cutbacks for the program.



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
WASHINGTON OFFICE**

*From the desk of*

Date ...5/18..... To .....

TO: CONGRESSMAN FLORIO

FR: DOROTHY W. DUGGER

Attached is a copy of testimony delivered by David Kinsey of the NJ D-ept. of Environmental Protection on behalf of the Governor and The Pinelands Commission in opposition to proposed amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The amendment would have opened the Fund to operations and maintenance costs for National Parks and other federally managed lands.

We opposed the precedent of "raiding" dedicated funds to accomplish budgetary restraints. The potential negative impact on the Pinelands was used as an example.

cc: Commissioner English  
Terrence Moore

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, my name is Terrence D. Moore. I am the Executive Director of the New Jersey Pinelands Commission, and I am also representing Governor Brendan Byrne. I wish to speak in opposition to the proposed amendment to Paragraph 3, Subsection 7A of the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund derives its major funding from offshore oil leases. This arrangement, I believe, is built upon the very logical premise that those who deplete one natural resource - oil - should contribute to the preservation of an equally important resource - the natural and recreational estate of this Nation. It is an equitable arrangement which meets first the well documented, legitimate need of this country to find additional energy resources. Secondly, it meets the need, also well documented, and equally as legitimate, to acquire land for the enjoyment of those who exist today, and for those who will follow tomorrow, my children and yours.

The proposed amendment would allow the Land and Water Conservation Fund to be diverted from its original purpose of conserving a larger amount of our heritage - this precious, but dwindling land which is rapidly becoming our most unique resource - to be used as a "better management fund."

I happen to agree with Secretary of the Interior Watt that we need to learn better how to manage the Federal property - represented by our National Parks, Forests, Wildlife Refuges and other lands administered by the Bureau

of Land Management. I fail to see, however, how newer buildings, improved sewage treatment facilities, more "hook-ups" for recreational vehicles, and more attractive gift shops will accomplish that task. It seems that this amendment goes beyond the desire that we all share for having better management of these lands. It seems, indeed, that all that we will accomplish is having newer facilities to manage in the same manner that we managed the old. I would prefer to have more land, and better land management.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a dedicated fund to increase the Nation's land supply for the enjoyment of its citizens. It was not intended to be, nor should it be, subject to the vagaries of changing economic philosophies, or frequently changing administrations. It should not be directed to cover a gap created by a budget cut in financing such activities through the general treasury.

Should this amendment pass, the precedent for raiding dedicated funds will be established. Do we next, perhaps, cover additional areas subject to OMB's desires by raiding other dedicated resources? Do we next, perhaps, call for better management of our highways by diverting the Highway Trust Fund? I hope not.

It may appear unusual that a representative of the State of New Jersey appears before this committee to oppose this amendment. We do not, after all, have extensive federal lands within our borders. There are two reasons why I am here today. The first, of course, is that as an urbanized State, we understand all too clearly, the need to conserve the remaining land resources of

this nation. Secondly, we have within our boundaries the Country's first National Reserve - the New Jersey Pinelands. It is a unique experiment that tests the ability of a state in partnership with the federal government to couple both regulatory and acquisition policies to preserve and protect unique natural areas. The reserve concept relies heavily on land use regulation as the preservation mechanism. However, the legislation authorizing this experiment as enacted by Congress recognized that purchase of some lands was critical to their preservation and protection. The funding for the relatively small acquisition component of this program is derived from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund and represents the primary Federal role in the Federal/State Partnership established by Sec. 502 of the Omnibus Parks and Recreation Act of 1978: The National Pinelands Reserve.

It is ironic that this new approach to preserving our critical resources which was designed to meet the realities of dwindling public funds for acquisition is now threatened by the very situation it was designed to accommodate. New Jersey is attempting to protect its resources through management but we must be able to complement that effort with critical acquisitions. As responsible public servants, we in New Jersey cannot ignore our responsibility to protect this resource, including the trillion gallons of potable water which face contamination as a result of increasing pressure for development of the overlying lands. We are fearful that without continued acquisition of critical lands, we will not be able to fulfill our role as responsible managers, of either our public lands or our public responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of this Committee, let me conclude by calling upon you to continue to provide for the expansion of our Nation's estate through the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Those who follow us will not remember that we were better managers. They will, however, thank us dearly, as we do those who came before us, for setting aside some of this dwindling earth for their enjoyment. We can better manage this amendment by not enacting it.

Thank you.