031/D-16

Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve Legislative History, 1920-1996

Tallgrass Historians L.C.

1998

PLEASE RETURN TO:

TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
DENVER SERVICE CENTER
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

SCANNED
11/1/01

United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MIDWEST REGION
1709 JACKSON STREET
OMAHA, NEBRASKA 68102-2571

IN REPLY REFER TO:

November 22, 2000

H1415(CRSP-CR)

Memorandum

To: Technical Information Center, Information and Production Services Division, Denver Service Center (DSC-PGT)

Through: Chief, Cultural Resources, Midwest Region

From: Architectural Historian Dena Sanford, Cultural Resources, Midwest Region

Subject: Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve Legislative History, 1920-1996

Attached for your information is a copy of the final *Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve Legislative History, 1920-1996*. The Legislative History was prepared in 1998 under contract with Tallgrass Historians L.C., Rebecca Conard, Principle Investigator.

This document was recently printed through the Government Printing Office. Additional copies have been provided to the Regional Director, the Midwest Regional Office library, Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, the Midwest Archeological Center, the Kansas State Historic Preservation Officer, the Assistant Director of the National Center for Cultural Resources Stewardship and Partnership Programs, the Cultural Resource Management Bibliography Cluster Coordinator, Harpers Ferry Center Library, the Natural Resources Library, the National Trust for Historic Preservation Library, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institution Libraries.

Attachment

Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve

Legislative History, 1920-1996

Prepared by:

Tallgrass Historians L.C.
931 Maiden Lane
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Rebecca Conard, Principle Investigator
Susan Hess, Research Assistant

Prepared for:

National Park Service, Midwest Support Office
Omaha, Nebraska
1998

Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve
Legislative History, 1920-1996

Introduction: Contrasting Images of the Prairie Landscape

During the nineteenth century, the midcontinental plains were alternately disparaged as an inhospitable desert and rhapsodized as a verdant garden, depending on the mindset of the viewer, the vantage point, and the motive for recording an observation. Ever since explorers Zebulon Pike and Stephen Long created the image of the Great American Desert that emblazoned early maps of the West, writers and artists have been recording contradictory human responses to the prairied landscapes of America.[1]

After traveling from the Atlantic seaboard to the Wabash River through "a thousand miles of gloomy forest," George Flower found the "beautiful and light expanses" of the eastern Illinois prairie "most enchanting." To Washington Irving, whose native habitat *was* the eastern forest, there was "something inexpressibly lonely in the solitude of the prairie." Charles Dickens found nothing in the American prairie landscape remotely pleasing or even interesting: "...its very flatness and extent, which left nothing to the imagination, tamed it down and cramped its interest." Walt Whitman's imagination, conversely, led him to wonder whether the prairies and plains, more than Yosemite, Niagara Falls, and Upper Yellowstone, were not truly "North America's characteristic landscape."

The vast majority of Euro-Americans who explored and settled the mid-continent, however, mainly saw economic potential inherent in the prairie. Louis Joliet, exploring the Upper Mississippi Valley in 1673, noted that "a settler would not there spend ten years in cutting down and burning the trees; on the very day of his arrival, he could put his plough into the ground."[2] Writing 250 years later, Herbert Quick compared the fertility of Iowa's tallgrass prairie to mother's milk: "Bird, flower, grass,

cloud, wind, and the immense expanse of sunny prairie, swelling up into undulations like a woman's breasts, turgid with milk for a human race."[3]

Artist George Catlin stands virtually alone among those who confronted the undomesticated prairies in suggesting that a portion of them be preserved, and his nineteenth-century appeal found an audience in the twentieth. As much ethnographer as artist, Catlin understood the impending fate of those American Indian cultures he rendered meticulously on canvas and of the vast grassland plains that sustained them. His attitude toward Native Americans was typically ethnocentric for the times. Nonetheless, he genuinely lamented the anticipated loss of dramatic "wilderness" that indigenous peoples inhabited and gave life to. As early as 1832, Catlin called for a government policy that would create a "nation's park, containing man and beast, in all the wild and freshness of their nature's beauty."[4]

A century passed before the loss of prairie landscape reached proportions that could no longer be ignored. By then, the economic value of the prairie was not only fully understood; it had been fully appropriated.

A Grassland Preservation Ethic Emerges: 1920-1956

By 1920, natural scientists located in the Midwest—especially at the University of Nebraska, the University of Iowa, Iowa State University (then College), and the University of Illinois—were seriously studying prairie flora, identifying prairie types, and increasingly alarmed at how little was left undisturbed. Sometime during the decade, Victor E. Shelford, of the University of Illinois, and the National Research Council's Committee of the Ecology of North American Grasslands began studying the prospects for a large grassland preserve in the Great Plains. They studied eleven sites and found four with sufficient floristic integrity to be considered true prairie. In 1930, Shelford, supported by the Ecological Society of America, proposed that one of these sites, a large area straddling Nebraska and

South Dakota, be incorporated into the national park system.[5] This proposal marked the beginning of continual efforts to establish a national prairie park in the United States.

The Great Depression and the Dust Bowl diverted attention from a national prairie park during the 1930s. Instead, New Deal land-use planners and agricultural economists tackled the more immediate, and interrelated, problems of soil erosion, soil exhaustion, agricultural overproduction, depressed agricultural market prices, and increasingly degraded farm life. Under the 1934 Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the federal government acquired 11.3 million acres of submarginal farmland. Of this, 2.64 million acres in the Great Plains were eventually designated as national grasslands and placed mostly under U.S. Forest Service management.[6] The National Park Service, meantime, rejected a proposed grassland park in Texas and remained more focused on acquiring parks with awe-inspiring topography, spectacular natural scenery, or unequivocal national historical importance. Only two Great Plains landscapes met the traditional test for parks during the 1930s and 1940s: Badlands National Monument in South Dakota, designated in 1939, and Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Park in North Dakota (1947), the latter of which comprises two island units surrounded by the Little Missouri National Grasslands in North Dakota.[7]

National grasslands, however, were intended to be land reclamation and demonstration areas, not substitutes for an authentic prairie park as first proposed in 1930. In cooperation with the NPS, the Ecological Society of America and the National Research Council's Committee on the Ecology of North American Grasslands continued to examine short-grass prairie sites for a grassland national park. Dr. John E. Weaver, an ecologist at the University of Nebraska, and other scientists investigated and reported on a variety of areas in Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Kansas, and the Dakotas. By 1940, these studies resulted in a new proposal for a Great Plains national monument located west of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in South Dakota and a smaller area in extreme northwest Nebraska.[8] World War II, however, intervened before this proposal could lead to any legislative action.

Following the war there was renewed interest in preserving grasslands. In a 1950 report to the National Resources Council, the Department of Agriculture, which had initiated acquisition of national grasslands in the 1930s, recommended the preservation of large expanses of six different types of grasslands in the West. In 1956, the Secretary of the Interior's Advisory Board formally recommended additional studies for the purpose of identifying and acquiring grasslands for inclusion in the national park system. This recommendation correlated with ongoing grassland studies commissioned by NPS and, more generally, with MISSION 66, an intensive ten-year development program (1956-1966) initiated during the administration of NPS Director Conrad Wirth.[9]

The Pottawatomie County Park Proposal: 1958-1963

During the nearly three decades between 1930 and 1958, the broad concept of a grasslands national park gradually narrowed in focus to a tallgrass prairie park, which was promoted as being "true" prairie. However, just as ambivalence over the meaning and value of America's grasslands was expressed by early observers, so did ambivalence and controversy mark the long endeavor to create a "true" or tallgrass prairie national park in a specific location. The first contested area was located in Pottawatomie County, Kansas.

Between 1954 and 1958, G.W. Tomanek and F.W. Albertson, professors at Fort Hays State College (now University), studied twenty-four areas in Colorado, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Wyoming, New Mexico, Montana, Texas, and Kansas. These studies were funded by the NPS and endorsed by the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments. The results of the Tomanek-Albertson investigations became the basis for NPS recommendations issued in 1958.[10] In the 1958 report, *Proposal for a True Prairie National Park*, the NPS called for a 34,000-acre park in Pottawatomie County, Kansas. In 1959, the Advisory Board recommended for inclusion in the park system a 34,000-acre site east of Tuttle Creek Reservoir, near Manhattan in Pottawatomie County, Kansas. This recommendation appeared to have initial local support, at least through the Manhattan

Area Park Development Association, founded in 1958 to promote both the Tuttle Creek Reservoir, an Army Corps of Engineers project, and the establishment of a grassland national park in Pottawatomie County.[11] The stage was thus set for the NPS to initiate legislative efforts for the purpose of establishing a prairie national park in a specific locale.

The next year, however, when NPS final recommendations began to take shape, key differences emerged. The 1960 *Reevaluation Study, True Prairie Grasslands*, was less specific than its predecessor, the 1958 *Proposal for a True Prairie National Park.* In the 1960 report, the NPS concluded that of the twenty-four sites surveyed, six met the criteria for preservation. These criteria stipulated that the area must be at least 30,000 acres; have the topography, drainage systems, vegetation, and wildlife species of a "typical" prairie ecosystem; be free of serious intrusions; and display sufficient scenic quality. A follow-up study subsequently reduced the number of "nationally significant" areas to four, all of them in the Flint Hills region of Kansas and Oklahoma. The four sites were designated Manhattan, Chase, Elk, and Osage according to city or county names where they respectively occurred. Of the four, the Manhattan study area (near the City of Manhattan, Kansas) was considered the most "feasible" for designation as a national park, inasmuch as the federal government already had a presence in the area. The Osage study area (located in Osage County, Oklahoma and parts of Cowley and Chautauqua counties, Kansas) was considered the most "suitable," based on natural qualities.[12]

Another 1960 NPS study, *Statement Analyzing Studies and Preliminary Plan for Proposed Prairie National Park,* called for a 57,000-acre site east of and abutting Tuttle Creek Reservoir. This recommendation not only increased the acreage, but, more importantly, eliminated a corridor of land separating the 34,000-acre site and Tuttle Creek Reservoir.[13] The two differing recommendations reflected the emergence of local desires to exploit the recreational potential of the new reservoir. In March of 1960 the Pottawatomie County Commission approved the proposed national park as long as

the boundaries were not extended to the shore of Tuttle Creek Reservoir. As a result, NPS officials decided to make two separate recommendations to Congress, one with a buffer zone between the park and the reservoir and one without. The NPS clearly favored the proposal without the buffer zone, but county commissioners were equally adamant that a mile-wide strip be established for economic development. The Kansas congressional delegation sided with the county commission.[14]

The final 1961 NPS planning report, *A Proposed Prairie National Park*, maintained the agency's preferred plan, despite local opposition. As envisioned in the final recommendations, visitors could drive through a 57,000-acre park along a road winding from the shores of the reservoir through restored prairie, stopping at viewing areas along the way. They could also hike trails on foot or ride horses on equestrian trails. Proposed amenities included campgrounds, picnic areas, and an interpretive center.[15]

As NPS recommendations were being finalized, legislation also was under discussion. As early as 1959, Rep. William Avery [R] apparently requested the assistance of the NPS in drafting a bill that would authorize the creation of a 34,000-acre park. Kansas senators Andrew F. Schoeppel [R] and Frank Carlson [R] joined Avery in supporting the creation of a park, but the three publicly announced that they would await completion of NPS studies before taking any legislative action.[16] The next year Rep. Avery and Sens. Schoeppel and Carlson introduced companion bills. Instead of a 34,000-acre park, the bills called for a 57,000-acre park, which accorded with NPS final recommendations, and the proposed boundary had been extended westward to the shores of Tuttle Creek Reservoir.[17]

Even at this early stage, area residents were dividing into proponents and opponents. Among proponents, Bill Colvin, a member of the Manhattan Area Park Development Association, was the most visible. Colvin, who was employed as editor of the *Manhattan Mercury*, began supporting the park idea in the newspaper. Not coincidentally, the *Manhattan Mercury* was owned by the family of Fred Seaton, who served as Secretary of the Interior from 1956 to 1961 under President Dwight D.

Eisenhower.[18] Developing multipurpose flood control reservoirs to serve a variety of outdoor recreational demands was a priority of the Eisenhower administration. The Kansas state park system was moving in this direction at the same time, so the idea of meshing a federal flood control project with a new national park was in line with the thinking of the times to meet growing demand for outdoor recreation.

Opposition began to form in part because of the Tuttle Creek flood control project. After a devastating flood in 1951, which took forty-one lives and the homes of 100,000 people in Manhattan, Topeka, and Kansas City, the Army Corps of Engineers found enough local and congressional support to move forward with the proposed Tuttle Creek Dam Project, first proposed in 1931. The need for a large flood control dam and reservoir had been a contested local issue since then; and, as the Tuttle Creek project moved to reality, passions rose higher among landowners and soil conservationists who opposed the "big dam" solution to flood control. Additionally, the Corps dragged its feet in constructing new roads, which had been promised so that nearby landowners would not be inconvenienced when the reservoir began to fill. As a result, by the late 1950s the Corps and the federal bureaucracy in general were considered "the enemy" to many citizens of Pottawatomie County.[19]

Before passions could cool, the proposed national prairie park became another target for those who felt as though the federal government had acted arrogantly in taking agricultural land to impound the waters of Tuttle Creek. The initial 34,000-acre concept of 1959 attempted to mitigate local controversy by stipulating a corridor of land to separate the flood control reservoir and the park. However, the corridor concept also conveniently allowed for considerable private recreational development, which generated local interest and support among business people. Proposed legislation in 1960, which promulgated an "ideal" park of 57,000 acres without the buffer zone, was thus politically risky from the outset. It did not entirely please proponents who wanted a corridor along the reservoir for private recreational development, and it confirmed the worst fears of opponents because it would

take more land. In 1961, when legislation was reintroduced in the 87th Congress, the odds against passage probably increased, inasmuch as these bills would have authorized the Secretary of the Interior to acquire up to 60,000 acres. A provision authorizing the federal government to take this many acres by eminent domain was a further irritant.[20]

Still, there was enough local support that the Avery and Schoeppel-Carlson bills might have passed with some amendments. Pottawatomie County commissioners, who generally supported the proposal, asked the NPS to consider restoring the corridor concept. NPS officials hedged by submitting two separate recommendations. Under the leadership of Dr. E. Raymond Hall, professor of ecology and director of the Museum of Natural History at the University of Kansas, proponents in northeast Kansas organized another group, the Prairie National Park Natural History Association.[21] This group requested that Governor John Anderson seek a substantial appropriation from the state legislature to assist the federal government with purchase of park lands.[22] Despite rising opposition, the state legislature approved a $100,000 appropriation in February 1962, contingent upon Congress passing legislation to establish the park.[23]

Opponents, who were slower to organize, eventually captured enough momentum to kill the congressional bills. A key episode in this turn of fortunes took place on December 4, 1961, when cattle rancher Carl Bellinger confronted Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall and NPS Director Conrad Wirth on grazing land that Bellinger was leasing in the Twin Mound area. Although first-hand accounts of the Twin Mound Incident vary in the details, Bellinger happened to be on the property when Udall's entourage, traveling in two helicopters, landed near Twin Mound to rendezvous with a tour guide. Instead, Bellinger met Udall as he deplaned and, wielding a gun, ordered him off the property. Caught off-guard, a stunned Udall returned to his helicopter. Reporters and photographers, however, were on hand to record the brief event, and the news traveled well beyond local headlines. Accordingly, Bellinger became something of a local legend for taking on the federal government. His "standoff" gave

rise to the first opposition group, the Twin Mound Ranchers, and more-or-less set the thematic tone for every legislative effort that followed.[24]

The Twin Mound Incident would have been sufficient buffeting, but it proved to be only a prelude to the opposition that greeted Udall and Wirth at public meetings later the same day. At the Pottawatomie County Commission chambers Bellinger was once again on hand to voice his opinion before a packed audience. Two other people presented signed statements of opposition. Ranchers and farmers, affronted because the NPS had not included them in the planning process, began coming together against the park on principle; and real estate developers wanted the corridor area restored so the shore of Tuttle Creek Reservoir could be developed with home sites.[25]

One day of news-making controversy, however, was not enough to stop the Pottawatomie County proposal entirely. New bills were introduced in 1963 by Congressman Avery and Senators James Pearson [R] and Frank Carlson. A key component of both bills was a provision that would establish an advisory committee to determine the proposed park boundary on the Tuttle Creek Reservoir side.[26] The strategy did not work. By this time, the Twin Mound Ranchers Association was organized for opposition and endorsed by the Kansas Livestock Association. In July 1963 the Twin Mound Ranchers staged a local public hearing to publicize its opposition, then sent a delegation to Washington, D.C. in August to attend hearings of the Senate Public Lands Subcommittee. Senator Pearson testified on behalf of Kansans who supported legislation, which officially included the governor and the state legislature. Anthony W. Smith, president and general counsel of the National Parks [and Conservation] Association, however, cautioned the senators not to allow "enlargement of the national park system... by riding roughshod over human property and lives." When subcommittee members from western states lined up with local opponents criticizing the park proposal, chances for a favorable report vanished. Pearson's bill died in committee, and the Pottawatomie County proposal faded away.[27]

Reconsidering the Kansas-Oklahoma Flint Hills Options: 1963-1970 Interlude

No new federal legislation was introduced during the remainder of the 1960s, but public interest continued and the prairie park idea remained a focus of study and discussion at the state level as well as within the NPS. In 1965, the NPS proposed a Prairie-Great Plains Tourway stretching 1400 miles north from Oklahoma to the North Dakota-Montana border. This proposal appears to have evolved from a number of sources: the 1962 report of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, the Great River Road program along the Mississippi River, and legislation passed by the 88th Congress authorizing the Lewis and Clark Tourway. The Prairie-Great Plains Tourway concept included three "national parkway" segments that were considered to be of greater national significance and would be treated similarly to the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways. Proposed as parkway segments were a 145-mile Great Prairie Parkway through the Flint Hills from Pawhuska, Oklahoma to Council Grove, Kansas; a 100-mile Sandhills National Parkway through central northern Nebraska; and a Sioux-Badlands National Parkway in South Dakota.[28]

Another NPS study reconsidered the remaining three options that had been presented in the 1960 *Reevaluation Study*: sites designated as Chase County, Kansas; Elk County, Kansas; and Osage County, Oklahoma. This study, requested by the National Parks Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, led to a 1965 report, *The Living Prairie,* which compared several aesthetic and land-management factors and then ranked the three areas in terms of desirability. The Oklahoma site, which extended into Chautauqua County, Kansas, was ranked highest. The Chase County and Elk County areas were ranked second and third respectively. All three sites, however, occurred along the proposed Prairie-Great Plains Tourway Route. *The Living Prairie* report also noted that Dr. Raymond Hall of the University of Kansas had been contacting philanthropic sources seeking support for land acquisition. No potential benefactors were named, but the idea of working with private entities to acquire land and then slowly phase out livestock use through regulated grazing leases was

clearly under discussion.[29] These studies helped to sustain interest in a prairie national park, but without political leadership the movement really was at a standstill. The only result was the marking of a north-south highway route through Kansas as the "Prairie Parkway."[30]

Walter Hickel, during his brief tenure as Secretary of the Interior (1969-1970) in the Nixon administration, signaled that he would support a new legislative effort. At a 1969 Republican fund-raising dinner in Salina, Hickel, a Kansas native, announced that he "encouraged... another bid for the creation of a prairie national park."[31] Several statewide groups now added their support to that of the Prairie National Park Natural History Association. Later that year, the Kansas Wildlife Federation, the Kansas Recreation and Park Association, and the Kansas State Teachers Association all passed resolutions urging the creation of a park in Kansas.[32]

The following year, after the Kansas legislature rejected a bill to establish a seven-member governor's commission to "work for the establishment of a Prairie National Park," Governor Robert Docking took the initiative and appointed a fifteen-member Governor's Prairie National Park Advisory Committee.[33] Bill Colvin of the *Manhattan Mercury* was named chair, and the governor's advisory committee immediately initiated discussions with members of the Kansas congressional delegation. Senators James Pearson [R] and Robert Dole [R] and Representatives Chester Mize [R] and Joe Skubitz [R] reportedly expressed initial interest. The advisory committee also contacted the NPS to discuss possible locations. Pottawatomie County was not among them, but Colvin made it clear that the committee was only considering areas in the eastern tallgrass region of the state.[34] A December 4, 1970 meeting of the committee confirmed this focus. Discussion centered on the recent passage of P.L. 91-462, which directed the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study of lands in Oklahoma and Kansas historically associated with Euro-American settlement in the Cherokee Strip. Rep. Skubitz, whose district included the Kansas portion of the feasibility study, introduced the bill that became P.L. 91-462, which carried a $30,000 appropriation. However, the governor's advisory committee did not

support Skubitz's bill. Instead, the committee voted to hold a joint meeting with the Kansas congressional delegation and ask for the introduction of legislation to create a prairie park entirely in Kansas. The committee purposely avoided recommending specific locations and size, hoping to avert renewed opposition.[35]

Kansas Flint Hills v. Cherokee Strip Proposals: 1971-1973

In 1971, two competing proposals entered the legislative hopper. In June of that year the Governor's advisory committee, backed by the Prairie National Park Natural History Association, other environmental groups, universities, newspapers, and an untold number of individuals, presented the Kansas congressional delegation with a formal request for legislation.[36] Rep. Larry Winn, Jr. [R] of Overland Park and Sen. James Pearson responded by introducing companion bills similar to the failed Pottawatomie County proposals of the early 1960s. That is, both bills called for a 60,000-acre prairie park. However, neither bill specified a location other than within the State of Kansas.[37] Even though the location was left unspecified, everyone understood the intent was to establish a prairie park somewhere in the Flint Hills of Kansas. Corresponding support for the Winn-Pearson bills came primarily from residents of northeast Kansas.[38] Also in 1971, Sen. Henry Bellmon of Oklahoma introduced a bill to expand the study authorized by P.L. 91-462 to include the Oklahoma Panhandle.[39] No action was taken on this bill.

The NPS withheld support from both bills, in part because of continuing local controversy and in part because the Cherokee Strip proposal taking legislative shape in Skubitz's office was for a historical park thematically linked to nineteenth-century cattle trails. Although the Cherokee Strip concept included 30,000 acres of grassland, NPS staff advised that it was not "true prairie" and worried that the proposal, should it gain momentum, would dilute support for a prairie park in the "choice area" of Osage County, Oklahoma.[40] Instead of supporting either proposal, the NPS suggested amending Pearson's bill to authorize another study, similar to the study authorized by P.L. 91-462.[41]

On the local level, supporters of the Flint Hills proposal held some hope that Skubitz would help advance the Winn bill through the National Parks Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which he was the ranking minority member.[42] However, by mid-1972, both the Winn and Pearson bills were still locked in subcommittee and hope for support from Skubitz had faded. Prairie park proponents located primarily in Winn's district in northeast Kansas thus formed a new lobbying group to shore up support. The People for Prairie Park League, as the group was known, had the backing of the Prairie National Park Natural History Association and a variety of other environmental groups that were organizing in the early 1970s.[43]

Photographer Patricia DuBose Duncan was a prominent figure in the People for Prairie Park League. She wrote articles, served as a local liaison to elected officials and national environmental organizations, and generally helped to coordinate local affairs. In a 1972 article, Duncan expressed concern that Rep. Skubitz shared "the same general philosophy" of cattlemen and other prairie park opponents.[44] It was a concern widely shared by park proponents in northeast Kansas.

Meantime, the Kansas Livestock Association took the lead in opposing the Winn-Pearson bills and proposed instead a 600 mile "prairie parkway" loop consisting of observation viewpoints along existing highways through the Flint Hills.[45] Clif Barron, a Cambridge rancher, is credited with originating the "prairie parkway" or "ribbon park" idea, but the concept is also traceable to the Prairie-Great Plains Tourway proposed by the NPS in 1965. The major difference was that Barron envisioned a scenic loop following county roads on both the east and west sides of the Flint Hills, not a single highway corridor.[46]

Hoping to unify agriculturists and environmentalists, various groups in Manhattan, Kansas, formed the Manhattan Citizens for the Tallgrass National Park. The Manhattan Citizens took the position that "range abuse by ranchers," perceived or real, was "not a valid point for having a park" and

proposed that some sort of landmark or museum commemorating the "ranching heritage" of Kansas be erected "in conjunction with the preservation of the natural ecosystem."[47]

The flurry of citizen organizing that took place in 1971 and 1972 succeeded in drawing the general lines of battle, agriculturists v. environmentalists, but it produced no evidence of strong support among Kansans in general either for or against a national prairie park. This was reason enough for other members of the Kansas congressional delegation to adopt a wait-and-see attitude, as they did. Moreover, national conservation and environmental organizations were not yet taking much interest in the proposition. As a result, the 1971 Winn-Pearson bills died in committee.

Rep. Skubitz captured the spotlight early in 1973 by calling attention to the NPS's study report on the proposed Cherokee Strip National Historic Park. The preliminary report, prepared in January, recommended combining Skubitz's proposed Cherokee Strip historic park with a tallgrass prairie segment. Before the preliminary report had even been approved internally, Skubitz requested that NPS Director Ronald Walker expand the study to include additional recreational areas, especially lakes and reservoirs, and related historic sites of local as well as national significance. He further requested that the director have prepared a legislative proposal "that would include the recommendations now in the Cherokee Strip Report with the most appropriate segments of tallgrass prairie, the combined total of which should not exceed 60,000 acres...."[48]

Skubitz lost no time in promoting his proposal as a "prairie park" that might appeal to both ranchers and environmentalists. Speaking at the annual meeting of the Kansas Recreation and Park Association, he made it clear that he did not support the concept of a large park focused solely or primarily on preserving an expanse of tallgrass prairie. Such a park, in his estimation, would not attract enough tourists to offset the loss of property tax revenue when land shifted to public ownership.[49] He also announced the formation of a Kansas Advisory Team to work with the NPS to develop the "integrated park system" he had in mind. Members of his advisory team represented a broad spectrum

of interests: Bill Colvin, chair of the Governor's Prairie National Park Advisory Committee; rancher Clif Barron; directors of the Kansas Park and Resources Authority, State Historical Society, and State Water Resources Board; the executive secretary of the Kansas Soil Conservation Committee; the director of the Kansas District Corps of Engineers; and a private citizen from Council Grove, located in the heart of the Flint Hills.[50]

Whatever the merits of the combined Cherokee Strip-Tallgrass Prairie proposal, it only succeeded in polarizing opposing sides. Environmentalists in northeast Kansas banded together in a new group, Save the Tallgrass Prairie, Inc. (STP), organized in January 1973. Two months later, STP announced that while it did not exactly oppose the Cherokee Strip Park concept, it was concerned that the tallgrass prairie segment meet the criteria established by earlier NPS studies and therefore recommended a separate national park on the eastern slopes of the Flint Hills in Kansas. This was quickly followed by legislative "guidelines" for a tallgrass prairie park at a specific location south of Emporia.[51]

Ranchers and landowners in the Flint Hills countered by organizing the Kansas Grassroots Association (KGA) in March 1973. The KGA was willing to support Clif Barron's scenic loop idea, but it withheld support for Skubitz's Cherokee Strip proposal and campaigned against STP. In May 1973, KGA chairman J. Manuel Hughes informed the NPS that the organization had "at least 6,000 signatures, gathered all over the State of Kansas" protesting a prairie park. Hughes went on to conclude that "except for a hard-core group in Kansas City and its environs, and in Lawrence[,] Kansas[,] at our state university, I believe we can safely say that the big majority of Kansans do not want such a park."[52]

As 1973 progressed, a host of organizations took positions for or against or somewhere in between. The Kansas Ornithological Society and the American Institute of Architects generally endorsed a tallgrass prairie park. The Wichita Branch of Friends of the Earth specifically supported a

30,000-60,000-acre natural park.[53] Skubitz appealed to the KGA to drop its opposition to a prairie park, but to no avail.[54]

Kansans Divide: The Winn Bills, 1973-1980

Throughout the 1970s, Congressman Winn continued to champion a national prairie park in Kansas, while Kansans became increasingly divided on the prospect. In 1973, Winn introduced another bill for a 60,000-acre park, after which the Special Committee on Environmental Protection of the Kansas House of Representatives called a public hearing to listen to what Kansans had to say.[55] At the August 30th hearing, the Kansas Livestock Association, the Kansas Farm Bureau, and the Kansas Association of Conservation Districts lined up with the KGA to oppose a large prairie park. The KGA also offered a counter suggestion that the federal government transfer land from the Fort Riley Military Reservation and around several Corps of Engineers reservoirs to the NPS for park purposes. The Kansas Association of Commerce and Industry, Kansas Association of Garden Clubs, and Kansas City Junior Leagues lined up with STP in favor of a large park. Speaking on behalf of the STP, Patricia Duncan announced that the group had identified a suitable 60,000-acre tract south of Emporia. Clif Barron and the Kansas Park and Recreation Authority endorsed the prairie parkway concept. And the Kansas Hotel and Motel Association went on record in favor of a large park developed similar to Disneyland.[56]

The Special Committee on Environmental Protection, which was charged with recommending a position that the Kansas Legislature could support to the congressional delegation, debated its options for two months trying to find consensus. When it finally reported back to the legislature in late October, it recommended a cautious position stating that "should the federal government choose to preserve [the natural] heritage" of the Flint Hills, "full consideration should be given to the possibility of utilizing the Ft. Riley federal enclave and other federal lands to accomplish these purposes." The committee also

recommended that the Kansas Legislature "reserve further consideration of a tall grass prairie park until after completion of a feasibility study by the U.S. Park Service."[57]

Larry Winn remained the sole member of the Kansas congressional delegation supporting a tallgrass prairie park. Despite lack of support from other members of the delegation, Winn continued the campaign. His determination did not spring from "extreme" environmentalism, though. Rather, he just believed that the Flint Hills "was some of the most beautiful land in the country" and that Kansans "ought to do something to put it into some kind of park or preserve."[58] After learning that the Department of the Army had virtually no land at Fort Riley that it was willing to give up, Winn suggested to park proponents that private entities begin buying land in the Flint Hills for eventual transfer to the NPS.[59]

As 1973 drew to a close, six members of the congressional delegation did come together to support yet another feasibility study by the NPS. Secretary of the Interior Rogers C.B. Morton agreed to another study at the request of Senators Pearson and Dole and Congressman Winn, joined by Rep. Garner E. Shriver [R], Rep. Keith G. Sebelius [R], and Rep. Bill Roy [D]. Congressman Joe Skubitz, still the ranking Republican member of the National Park Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, did not join in the request. In yielding to the request, Secretary Morton warned that any proposal for a prairie national park in Kansas "would remain dormant until Kansans ended their division and presented a united front...."[60]

Both sides continued posturing while Winn's bill remained stalled in committee. In the Kansas Legislature the issue headed toward polarization. To counter the proposed concurrent resolution sought by the Special Committee on Environmental Protection, Kansas State Senator Frank Gaines [D-Augusta] introduced a resolution early in 1974 requesting that Congress reject any bill to establish a tallgrass prairie park in the Flint Hills. In so doing, he defended ranchers in his Flint Hills district, who were "do[ing] a better job of keeping [the prairie] up than the federal government could."[61] Gaines's

proposed resolution directly opposed the recommendation of the Special Committee on Environmental Protection, which essentially requested that the state legislature adopt a wait-and-see approach until the NPS had finished a new feasibility study.

Save the Tallgrass Prairie, Inc. monitored developments in the state legislature. It also mobilized a petition drive among college students to press for passage of H.R. 8726, Winn's consolidated bill, which was referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In April 1974, a group of students, representing various colleges and universities in Kansas, staged a much-publicized caravan to Washington, D.C. where they presented signed petitions, reportedly bearing 18,000-25,000 signatures, to Rep. Winn. Douglas Wheeler, a deputy assistant secretary in the Department of the Interior, and Richard Curry, NPS associate director for legislation, were on hand for the presentation.[62] STP also attempted to generate stronger support among environmentalists by publicizing the threat that the energy crisis of the 1970s posed for the Flint Hills. Pointing to controversy surrounding the proposed Wolf Creek nuclear generating station, STP posited that a new electric power transmission corridor through the Flint Hills, which would be needed for this project, might be the first of many such corridors as private utility companies scrambled to meet projected energy consumption for the year 2000 and beyond. STP also "watched with alarm" as one Flint Hills rancher plowed up several thousand acres of land and planted it with fescue, a non-native species of grass.[63]

The Tallgrass Prairie Conference of 1974, held in Elmdale, Kansas, appeared to signal an easing of tensions between the two sides. Co-sponsored by STP, the Kansas Group of the Sierra Club, Burroughs Audubon Society, Citizens Environmental Council, and the Sierra Club Southern Plains Regional Conservation Committee, the two-day Elmdale Conference sounded a conciliatory note. Former Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, a keynote speaker, received a much friendlier reception this time. For the press, Udall defended a 60,000-acre tallgrass prairie park in the Flint Hills to "fill the last

gap in the nation's park system." He also noted that even though the park campaign was still alive, a "major obstacle" to passing legislation was a weak conservation movement in Kansas and lack of aggressive support from mainstream national conservation organizations.[64] Representatives of the Kansas Grassroots Association who attended the Elmdale Conference gave statements to the press maintaining their opposition but admitting that "things have been easing up on both sides when the two groups get together."[65] Even though both sides held their positions, the rhetoric began to soften. The event, which drew more than 300 people for a packed agenda of speakers, workshops, and field trips, appeared to lay the groundwork for negotiations leading to successful legislation.[66]

Any possible rapprochement was short-lived, however. In the spring of 1975 the Kansas Legislature passed, by substantial majorities in both houses, House Committee Resolution (HCR) 2013, authored by Rep. Robert Whittaker [R-Augusta]. HCR 2013, like the resolution introduced the previous year by Whittaker's counterpart in the Kansas Senate, Frank Gaines, requested that Congress reject any bill authorizing the establishment of a tallgrass prairie national park in the Flint Hills. The language amplified arguments routinely put forth by agricultural interests: the federal government already controlled "a vast amount of property in Kansas," a reference primarily to Fort Riley Military Reservation and several multipurpose reservoirs administered by the Corps of Engineers; a national park would remove too much land from the property tax rolls, seriously hampering school financing; and "the loss of vast grazing areas in the grasslands" would impair Kansas beef production in an "era of nationwide food shortages."[67]

The leadership of STP, which had been working the halls of the state capitol to defeat the measure, redoubled its efforts. The organization's media campaign had already succeeded in gaining a modest level of national attention through the pages of magazines and newspapers with large national circulations, such as *Smithsonian Magazine* and the *Wall Street Journal*. Now STP formed an honorary board of prominent men and women to help advance the cause. Chaired by Dr. Karl

Menninger, the board included Stewart Udall; philanthropist Katherine Ordway, then active in preserving prairies throughout the Midwest; David Brower, president of Friends of the Earth and past president of the Sierra Club; Charles Callison, executive vice president of the National Audubon Society; Loren Eiseley, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania and author of *The Immense Journey*; and several other influential people in environmental affairs.[68]

The park proposal finally had the endorsement of nationally recognized names. With a new level of support, Rep. Winn reintroduced legislation in July 1975. This time he picked up bi-partisan co-sponsors, twenty-one in all, but none of them was from Kansas. Even so, the co-sponsors, who included Rep. Morris Udall [D-Arizona], Claude Pepper [D-Florida], Larry Pressler [R-South Dakota], Shirley Pettis [R-California], and Bella Abzug [D-New York], reflected the political spectrum. STP backed them up with petitions bearing more than 34,000 signatures.[69]

It was still not enough to overcome the opposition. Despite a pledge of "total support" from Michael McCloskey, executive director of the national Sierra Club, at the 1975 Elmdale conference, Rep. Winn told the assembled proponents that they were facing "a virtually impossible mission."[70] Winn was "not even slightly optimistic" that his bill would pass. In an open letter to park proponents, he noted that the "action of the Kansas State Legislature in approving resolutions opposing the park dealt a virtual death blow to the proposal, which was already reeling under the impacts of Congressional delegation disunity." Winn also cited "an abundance of other park proposals before the Congress" and "growing opposition to big government and deficit spending" as additional obstacles.[71]

As 1975 came to a close, proponents and opponents were as divided as ever. Into this divide the NPS dropped the feasibility study that the Kansas congressional delegation, except Rep. Skubitz, had requested two years earlier. The 1975 preliminary environmental assessment contained an analysis of seven areas in the Flint Hills, all of them by now fairly familiar to residents of eastern Kansas and northeastern Oklahoma: Pottawatomie, Elk, Chase North, Chase South, Wabaunsee East, Wabaunsee

West, and Osage. The NPS advised that three areas met the criteria for "nationally significant" tallgrass prairie areas—Wabaunsee West, Chase South, and Osage—and recommended them for further study.[72] Considering the audience to whom the document was addressed, the NPS stressed that the purpose of the information was "to aid decisionmakers in determining whether—and if so how best—to preserve a segment of the tallgrass-prairie region," and further, that the "final decision" would be made by the "the Administration, the Congress, and the public...."[73]

To aid in that process, the NPS laid out four different land acquisition and management concepts in the 1975 assessment. All of them had been discussed before, and repeatedly, but the report presented them side-by-side as viable alternatives without advocating any as better or more desirable. One was the "traditional" park concept whereby the federal government would acquire a large area of land and administer it solely. Another was the Cherokee Strip concept, whereby NPS would acquire and preserve a "core" of "pure parkland." This would be surrounded by a zone where "compatible agricultural uses" would be allowed to continue but where "incompatible uses" would be prohibited. The third concept was to protect the prairie "landscape" by acquiring scenic easements or by other less-than-fee agreements. This was the Clif Barron concept. The fourth concept was simply the "no action" alternative required under the guidelines and regulations implementing the 1969 National Environmental Policy Act.[74]

Elsewhere in the 1975 assessment, NPS planners also slipped a fifth concept into the discussion: a Flint Hills Agricultural Reserve. Based on British national park constructs, the Flint Hills Agricultural Reserve idea envisioned regional management of privately owned land based on a "unified effort, beginning at county and state levels...." In promoting the regional management concept, the NPS stressed the distinctive cultural as well as natural history of the Flint Hills prairie landscape, ranking it as "truly unique" alongside "the beautiful New England townscapes, the stark Black Hills of South Dakota, and the majestic Quetico-Superior region of Minnesota and Ontario [Canada]."[75] For the first

time, a prairie park study seriously considered the archaeology, history, sociology, and economics of the Flint Hills region, and suggested a land-management concept that could recognize as well as perpetuate regional culture.

The stalemate that developed in 1973-1974 continued for the remainder of the decade, the only noticeable change being that the field of opponents and proponents widened. Agricultural opposition groups now had the backing of a majority of Kansas state legislators, and park advocates attracted increasing support from mainstream conservation organizations. Rep. Winn reintroduced legislation in 1977 and 1979; both bills would have significantly expanded the size of the proposed park. They met the same fate as his previous attempts. By now, the controversy seemed to have acquired a life of its own.

Save the Tallgrass Prairie, Inc. carried on as the chief park advocacy group. To keep up momentum, STP produced or supported several media events and public information efforts. Patricia Duncan's photographic exhibition "The Tallgrass Prairie: An American Landscape," sponsored by the Smithsonian, opened in Kansas City in August 1976 before it began a two-year tour around the nation. To maximize publicity, the Tallgrass Prairie Foundation, a tax-exempt educational arm of STP, hosted the opening. Friends of the Earth president David Brower gave the keynote address. The new foundation, incorporated June 1976, also distributed information to members of the press who covered the 1976 Republican National Convention, held in Kansas City.[76]

In addition to maintaining a library of films and slide shows for presentation at schools, community groups, and public gatherings, STP continued to establish new chapters throughout Kansas, publish a quarterly newsletter, and gather petition signatures, which now totaled about 40,000. In November 1976, STP gained national publicity when one of its leaders, attorney Larry Wagner, debated the prairie park issue with Bill House, former president of the American Cattlemen's Association, on PBS's *Robert MacNeil Report*. STP subsequently distributed the 30-minute debate on video cassette.[77]

STP also pressed for completion of the preliminary environmental assessment that had been issued by the NPS in October 1975.[78] Internal briefing documents prepared for Sen. James Pearson reveal that the assessment had been "halted mid-stream... as a result of the extreme anti-park pressure of Congressman Skubitz." As of early 1977 the unfinished study was "dormant due to a lack of funds" and the NPS predicted that "unless there was a significant influx of pro-park political pressure, either from Congress or the Administration," the study would remain in limbo.[79]

If there was encouraging news for park proponents in 1977 it was that Congressman Skubitz planned to retire after completing his current term and that two conservation-minded members of the House had assumed key committee positions. Morris Udall now chaired the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Phillip Burton [D-California] now chaired the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee under it. Additionally, in 1976 Congress had passed P.L. 94-565, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to make in-lieu payments to local governments to offset the loss of tax revenue from public lands within their jurisdictions. Passage of this law invalidated one of the strongest arguments against a prairie park.[80] Friends of the Earth also gave the prairie park proposal more attention, listing it among the organization's top four priorities for inclusion in President Carter's national parks program.[81]

Rep. Winn kept the park proposal before Congress by reintroducing legislation in September 1977. Winn's latest bill, H.R. 9120, differed substantially from its predecessors. First, the bill identified specific park boundaries that expanded the Chase South study area to incorporate additional lands from which oil and natural gas were being extracted, a total of 187,000 acres located south of Emporia. The site-specific bill was a result of discussions between STP and Sierra Club lobbyist Linda Billings, who encouraged the group to study the areas covered in the 1975 NPS preliminary environmental assessment and arrive at its own conclusions. (Billings also promoted a national tallgrass prairie park in the *Sierra Club Bulletin*.) STP subsequently appointed Dr. E. Raymond Hall; Dr. Lloyd

Hulbert, professor of ecology at Kansas State University; Dr. Dwight Platt, professor of biology at Bethel College in Newton, Kansas; and attorney Lawrence R. Wagner as the site-selection committee.[82] H.R. 9120 also stipulated that about 58 percent of the acreage would be designated as "park" and the remaining 42 percent as "preserve," where oil and natural gas production would be permitted to continue until the resources were exhausted. Additionally, the bill contained a provision that gave the Department of the Interior authority to allow ranching, farming, and cattle grazing to continue at its discretion. Winn's bill was backed by various environmental organizations, and a letter-writing campaign initiated by STP produced sixteen co-sponsors by November.[83]

Other key developments in 1977 included an announcement by Sen. James Pearson that he, too, would retire at the expiration of his term in 1978. STP urged him to introduce a companion bill in the Senate before he retired, but Pearson did not do so. The Department of the Interior, however, responding to shifts in administration politics, ranked the tallgrass prairie third on its priority list of nationally significant areas for possible inclusion in the national park system. Likewise, the Midwest Regional Advisory Committee to the NPS recommended that the agency advance its planning for a national prairie park.[84]

Throughout 1978 park advocates and opponents kept confronting one another. Representatives of the Kansas Grassroots Association challenged pro-park speakers at a prairie symposium held at Ottawa. Proponents and opponents debated at the Pittsburg Prairie Day. The Kansas Advisory Council on Environmental Education gave STP and KGA equal time for presentations at one of its meetings. KGA presented a slide show about cowboy lifestyles; STP countered with a slide show emphasizing that a tallgrass prairie park was a national concern.[85]

STP and the Tallgrass Prairie Foundation likewise continued their media and educational campaigns. The Foundation produced a scenic route map of the Flint Hills and sponsored a bus tour of the Chase South site. STP worked to get publicity out through mass circulation magazines, including

Time and *National Geographic*, and through children's publications such as *My Weekly Reader* and the National Wildlife Federation's *Ranger Rick* magazine. Patricia Duncan was interviewed by the CBS radio affiliate in Chicago, station WIND. She also published *Tallgrass Prairie: The Inland Sea* and donated a share of the profit to STP. All of these activities, plus the usual lobbying trips to Washington, D.C., were designed to keep up the pressure on Congress to hold hearings on H.R. 9120, which STP considered "its" bill.[86]

Rep. Winn introduced his last tallgrass prairie bill in 1979. H.R. 5592, co-sponsored by Morris Udall, was the result of deliberations initiated in November 1978 when STP and a loose coalition of mainstream conservation groups formed a working group for the purpose of crafting legislative guidelines. The NPS followed developments closely, but from a distance. Although Winn and Udall did not introduce their bill until October of 1979, the basic framework was in place by January. Working with STP to prepare draft legislation were the NPCA, the National Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, Friends of the Earth, the Wilderness Society, and the Izaak Walton League. The coalition's concept borrowed from the NPS's 1965 tourway-parkway proposal. It also echoed the "agricultural reserve" idea outlined in the 1975 preliminary environmental assessment whereby the federal government, instead of acquiring entire parks through purchase or condemnation, would enter into cooperative agreements with state and local governments as well as private citizens in order to preserve large areas of national concern.[87]

H.R. 5592 set out three "core-park units" in the Flint Hills—Wabaunsee, Chase South, and Osage—each surrounded by an intermediate prairie perimeter, or "preserve," with all three linked by interconnecting "parkways" to an outer perimeter "reserve" area. The whole conceivably could encompass as much as 3.5 million acres of the Flint Hills in Kansas and Oklahoma. A fifteen-member commission would oversee the "reserve" and "through cooperation would seek to integrate local governmental activity by land use planning into a positive force for the protection of prairie resources

not immediate to the park-core(s)." The "preserves" and "parkways" would be "controlled by conservation easements to restrict timbering, quarrying, subdivision, plowing of virgin prairie, etc." The core-park units would be acquired by the federal government, or by an intermediary for the federal government, "on a willing seller-willing buyer basis."[88]

In discussions with the NPS, STP spokespersons estimated that it would take a minimum of fifty years before the core areas (approximately 300,000 acres) could be acquired. Conceivably, acquisition could take as much as 150 years based on various alternatives to condemnation that environmentalists were now willing to extend to landowners, the most generous being the right to transfer land ownership through immediate family members for an unlimited number of generations. In return for such concessions, STP and its coalition partners felt they were entitled to ask for a truly vast (2.5-3.5 million acres) "reserve" area.[89]

Because the environmental coalition's legislative guidelines incorporated provisions that the NPS was not inclined to accept, based on its park land-acquisition criteria and its land-management philosophy, NPS Director William Whalen requested that the Midwest Regional Office (MWR) formulate a counter set of recommendations.[90] After reviewing information from various conservation organizations and additional fieldwork by staff, the MWR regional director issued a memorandum in April 1979 recommending that the proposed park consist of approximately 100,000 acres, "all of which would be acquired in fee" and "subject to eminent domain" in order to achieve this objective. Rejecting the complex reserve-preserve-core unit concept as too costly and too difficult to manage, the MWR gave the Chase South area preference over the Osage area. If necessary, the MWR advised, the NPS could consider a "buffer zone averaging no more than three miles in width" in order to maintain scenic values, but it did not feel that such a zone was essential. As for a parkway, the MWR "no longer favored" this element.[91]

The April 1979 memo explained what the MWR understood to be a "basic conflict" between its position and "that of the conservationists." Whereas the environmental coalition groups were "seeking to *preserve most of the remaining unplowed prairie* in the Flint Hills," the MWR felt that "the appropriate role of the Federal Government should be limited to preserving a *representative portion* of the remaining prairie" that was "easily accessible to visitors" and "returned to its historic character... as quickly as possible." The MWR also considered the conservationists' proposal to restrict the federal government's use of eminent domain to be "unrealistic." Based on prior experience, the MWR anticipated that park opponents would not cease their opposition once legislation was passed. Instead, they would initially refuse to sell their land and then after a period of time "seek de-authorization on the grounds that the Service is simply not going to be able to do the job." [92]

When Winn and Udall introduced H.R. 5592 on October 15, 1979, it was based on the complex "reserve-preserve-core park" concept, which the MWR had rejected as unfeasible.[93] The Winn-Udall bill proposed three "reserves" or "special conservation areas" connected by a "prairie national parkway" between Marysville, Kansas, and Pawhuska, Oklahoma. Proposed as "reserves" were 73,000 acres in Wabaunsee County, 150,000 acres in the Chase South area along the Kansas Turnpike, and 151,000 acres in the Osage area along the Kansas-Oklahoma border. The "reserve" designation was key to the whole concept. It permitted federal purchase of land and scenic conservation easements only on a willing seller-willing buyer basis. No condemnation under eminent domain would be allowed. If and when private land went on the market, the Department of the Interior would have the right of first refusal at the landowner's offering price. If the federal government refused the offer, the landowner was free to sell it on the open market. This meant that it might, and probably would, take a long time for the Department of the Interior to acquire large units of land, but when that happened the NPS would be free to designate such units either as parks or preserves.[94]

The reserve concept represented a major concession to landowners in the Flint Hills. Winn and Udall called this "a necessary new approach...which recognizes the contributions of these private landowners...." The National Audubon Society pointed out that the "reserve" concept was "much more compatible with the interests of established ranchers." Save the Tallgrass Prairie called it an "innovative approach to land protection... that recognizes the significant contribution of the Flint Hills ranchers" and a "balanced approach between beef production, the major industry in the area, and land preservation...."[95]

Early in 1979, park proponents were optimistic that a compromise solution had been found. Conservation groups had reached agreement among themselves, and they had consulted with farmers, ranchers, and landowners "seeking their reactions" before the bill was introduced. Rep. Phillip Burton, chair of the Interior and Insular Affairs Subcommittee on Parks, was poised to move the bill forward in the House. Even though Robert Whittaker, the premier voice of opposition in the Kansas Legislature, had won election to the U.S. House of Representatives and landed a spot on the House Interior Committee, Rep. Winn did not consider him a serious threat to the bill's passage.[96]

After October 15th, however, optimism faded quickly. Della Wrae Blythe, secretary of the Kansas Grassroots Association, dismissed the concept as a ruse: "Preserve, reserve or whatever it's called, it's a park. We oppose a national park in Kansas." Rep. Whittaker "declared all-out war" in a press statement charging that the Flint Hills would either become an "uninhabited no-man's land" or a "tourist trap complete with curio shops and hot dog stands" if H.R. 5592 passed.[97] The immediate reaction from KGA and Whittaker was not unanticipated by Winn, but lack of support from other members of the Kansas congressional delegation once again doomed his bill. By the end of October, Reps. Jim Jeffries [R] and Keith Sebelius [R] had joined Whittaker in opposing H.R. 5592.[98] Rep. Dan Glickman [D] stated that he did not oppose the bill entirely, but listed enough reservations that it was clear he would not support it.[99] Senators Bob Dole and Nancy Kassebaum [R], who was elected to

James Pearson's Senate vacated seat in 1978, also withheld support. They cited the proposed size, which had increased from 60,000 to 374,000 acres, and defended Flint Hills ranchers and farmers as "good stewards of the land." Dole and Kassebaum also expressed "serious reservations about the federal government accelerating...the trend from individual ownership," citing the Konza Prairie, purchased by the Nature Conservancy in 1977, and the Cimmaron National Grassland as examples.[100]

After Rep. Winn interviewed Secretary of the Interior James Watt on a radio-broadcast program in March of 1980, the *Wichita Eagle-Beacon* reported the "Prairie Park on Back Burner." Watt declared the Reagan administration to be "in the mainstream of the environmental movement" and stated that the Department of the Interior was asking Congress "for a moratorium on acquisitions." [101] Rep. Whittaker welcomed Watt's remarks and told the press that the Reagan administration's position "should take care of the issue for a while...."[102] Winn conceded that although he had not given up on a prairie park completely, there was no longer any reason to reintroduce legislation "when we know that for the next four years the administration won't approve it."[103] A post-mortem offered by the *Kansas City Times* cited as reasons for failure an unwarranted optimism among conservationists when Rep. Joe Skubitz retired from Congress in 1978, the inability of Kansas environmentalists to present a united front, Rep. Phillip Burton's reluctance to hold hearings on the bill as long as Senators Dole and Kassebaum opposed it, and, behind all this, entrenched opposition from Flint Hills ranchers and farmers.[104]

Winn, who remained in Congress until January 1985, summed up the legislative efforts of the 1970s in much the same way. He consulted with the various park advocate groups involved in the effort, during which they weighed Secretary Watt's remarks, Reagan's approach to the economy, and the critical lack of support from other members of the Kansas congressional delegation. After a decade of trying, he decided that introducing further legislation was futile, and advocate groups decided not to press him.[105]

The Osage Prairie National Preserve Proposal: 1980s Interlude

For the duration of the Reagan administration, a national prairie park in the Kansas Flint Hills remained a dormant issue. In the meantime, unforeseen developments opened up the possibility of creating a national prairie preserve in Osage County, Oklahoma. The prospect for a prairie preserve in Oklahoma sustained the momentum of conservation groups supporting a prairie park in the Flint Hills. It also presented an opportunity to rethink the planning process.

The locus of activity shifted to Osage County when trustees of the Barnard Ranch announced in the fall of 1983 that they would be willing to sell the 29,000-acre ranch to create a preserve. The Audubon Society, Save the Tallgrass Prairie, and The Nature Conservancy immediately supported the prospect. The Audubon Society went so far as to draft legislation, which Rep. Mickey Edwards [R], in whose district the ranch lay, was willing to introduce provided certain conditions were met, such as a 50,000-acre limit and no condemnation of private lands, and provided there was enough local support for it. Senator Don Nickles [R] expressed the same caveat and organized a local task force to help him figure out just what local residents and landowners might agree upon. The task force was led by rancher Lee Holcombe and comprised representatives of the Osage County Cattlemen's Association, the Osage County Commissioners, the Pawhuska Chamber of Commerce, the Oklahoma Wildlife Federation, and the Osage Indians.[106] The NPS, which had long favored the Osage area as a national prairie park, provided information gathered from previous studies. The task force also toured Chickasaw National Recreation Area, a 10,000-acre NPS unit in Oklahoma formerly called Platt National Park, and found that the nearby community of Sulphur was benefiting from tourist dollars.[107]

The combination of bringing diverse interests to the table in the early planning stages and the availability of a second ranch, owned by a willing seller, smoothed the way for the task force. By mid-1985, the task force recommended that legislation be drafted for a 50,000-acre "working park" as Lee Holcombe described it. What Holcombe meant by this is that the compromise worked out by the task

force would allow the Osage Indian Tribe, which owned oil and gas rights on part of the site, to continue collecting royalties, and that about 75 percent of the proposed acreage could still be leased for grazing.[108] The NPS recommended designation as a "preserve" which would allow oil and gas production to continue on lands that were being actively managed to maintain a viable tallgrass ecosystem.[109]

Despite a promising start, the Osage prairie preserve proposal dissolved in controversy after legislation was introduced in 1987.[110] At best, the bill represented a fragile compromise. One side consisted of the Osage Tribal Council, dominated by individuals who held mineral rights to the proposed park area, joined by cattlemen, farmers, and oil drillers. The other included the Tallgrass Prairie Preserve Association, based in Pawhuska, Oklahoma, which was backed by the Audubon Society, the Oklahoma Wildlife Federation, and other national conservation organizations.[111] When the Sierra Club launched a nationwide letter-writing campaign in 1988 seeking to increase the size of the proposed reserve, Rep. Edwards immediately withdrew his support. Other members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, who were not subject to the same degree of local pressure as was Edwards, did not throw in the towel as quickly. Without Edwards's support, however, the proposal stalled.[112]

The Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch Option: 1988-1990

As the Osage legislative effort ebbed, the tide turned and flowed back to the Flint Hills of Chase County. This time the focal point was the Z Bar Ranch, historically known as the Spring Hill Ranch, near Strong City. Established in 1878, the 10,894-acre ranch included a stunning complement of limestone buildings built in the 1880s, a one-room stone schoolhouse, approximately thirty miles of stone fences, and numerous outbuildings.[113]

In June 1988, the National Audubon Society secured an option to purchase the ranch from Boatman's National Bank of Kansas City, acting on behalf of the ranch trustees.[114] This event proved to be a critical turning point. It altered the balance of power between opposing sides just enough to set

in motion a complex process of negotiations that ultimately led to successful legislation. However, the process moved haltingly, and important concerns were left unresolved by the legislative compromise finally enacted in 1996. The news that the Audubon Society had an option to purchase the Z Bar was not made public until January 1989. In the meantime Ron Klataske, the West Central regional vice president, contacted Congressman Dan Glickman about developing legislation to establish the ranch as some type of NPS unit.[115] Klataske, a native Kansan with a farming and ranching background, had been involved in the tallgrass prairie park effort since the early 1970s and had long maintained the position that any land acquisition must be on a willing-seller basis with protections against federal use of eminent domain.[116]

Rep. Glickman had expressed interest in a new legislative effort and arranged for Klataske to meet with the Kansas congressional delegation early in December 1988. At this meeting, Klataske outlined a proposal for establishing the ranch as a tallgrass prairie monument, possibly in conjunction with a tallgrass prairie parkway, with land for the latter to be acquired on a willing-seller basis. Following the meeting, Klataske worked with Glickman's staff to develop his proposal into a discussion draft bill.[117] Events then began to move quickly. The City of Strong City learned about the Audubon Society's option when it approached the trustees about purchasing a few acres of the ranch adjacent to the city limits. At that point, Klataske had little choice but to go public with the information, so he called a meeting with local community leaders on January 5, 1989. To a gathering of about eighty people he presented three options that were under consideration: federal purchase with development, management and interpretation by the NPS; purchase and operation by the National Audubon Society; or purchase by the State of Kansas with operation through an appropriate state agency. Before proceeding with legislation, however, Klataske proposed that a "partnership" of local leaders, landowners, and conservation groups sit down together and work out a plan.[118]

Initial reaction up and down the Flint Hills was encouraging. A stream of favorable editorials appeared in newspapers. "Home on the Range" wrote the Emporia *Gazette*; "This Is the Time; This Is the Place" came from the *Wichita Eagle-Beacon*; "Prairie Park's Time Has Come" appeared in the *Topeka Capital-Journal*. The city councils of Strong City, Cottonwood Falls, Council Grove, and Emporia endorsed the national monument idea. So did the chambers of commerce of Strong City and Cottonwood Falls. Klataske also made it clear that he would work diligently to obtain local consensus before the Audubon Society would seek congressional action.[119]

By late February, however, resistance had begun to form once again, and local residents were drifting into different camps. Ranchers expressed their opposition at a "packed meeting" which was followed the next day by a meeting "packed with supporters." Community leaders and business owners welcomed the local economic boost that would come with tourism. Ranchers had no objection to the Audubon Society purchasing the property, but they were skeptical about federal involvement. Some ranchers were willing to accept a national monument in the park system if there were guarantees that no more land would be taken by eminent domain. Others just saw the proposal as an entering wedge, no matter what assurances were given. As a spokesman for the Kansas Livestock Association put it, "There is just a deep-seated philosophy in the Flint Hills that the government should not own land."[120]

While local residents began to take sides, the Flint Hills National Monument Committee began preparing a legislative proposal that might fly. Chaired by attorney Lee Fowler, the committee numbered more than thirty people, including owners of land adjoining the Z Bar and representatives from the communities of Strong City, Cottonwood Falls, Council Grove, and Emporia. "The purpose of the committee," according to Fowler, "was to identify local concerns because there were a lot of controversial issues at that time." The committee reviewed previous proposals for a tallgrass national park and visited a number of national monuments. The goal was to draft a legislative proposal that would alleviate fear among Flint Hills landowners that they would lose their farms and ranches. As

stated by Fowler, "We were trying to include provisions to help protect these people's property in any bills that came forward."[121]

After several meetings, the committee developed a proposal. When Fowler forwarded the draft bill to Rep. Glickman, he advised the congressman that "certain provisions" were considered by the committee to be "sacred." These provisions included "prohibiting the use of eminent domain" to acquire additional lands or scenic easements and "protection of the local tax base." To assure that local residents and communities would be permanently involved in the management of the proposed monument, the draft bill also contained a provision to establish a twenty-member advisory committee, explicitly directed to comprise two adjacent landowners and one non-rural resident of Chase County; one representative each from the governing bodies of Strong City, Cottonwood Falls, Council Grove, and Emporia; one representative each from the Kansas Wildlife and Parks Department and the Kansas State Historical Society; one representative each from the Kansas Audubon Council or the Kansas Wildlife Federation, the Kansas Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and the Kansas Livestock Association; three experts in range management and animal science from Kansas universities; a representative of the governor's office; and four members selected by the Secretary of the Interior.[122]

Even though the Flint Hills National Monument Committee had addressed every concern expressed by opponents, and newspapers throughout eastern Kansas endorsed the draft legislation heartily, the *Topeka Capital-Journal* nonetheless predicted that this was the beginning of "Range War in Chase County — 1980s Style...."[123] The prediction proved to be accurate. In late April, Congressman Glickman appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior to request, on behalf of the Kansas delegation, $50,000 to fund an NPS feasibility study. He cautiously noted that the delegation was "not yet committed to support the actual creation of...a monument," but they felt that there was "enough interest in Kansas to warrant a feasibility study."[124] Just a few days before he

spoke, however, the Kansas Grassroots Association notified his office that it had "recently reorganized to actively and consistently oppose" turning the Z Bar Ranch into a prairie national monument.[125]

Congress adjourned for the summer without appropriating funds for the feasibility study, but early in September the NPS notified Glickman that it would fund the study out of its own budget.[126] With the announcement that the NPS would spend its own money, tension in Chase County increased. The *Wichita Eagle* sent a reporter up to Strong City to gauge local reactions. The story ran in a Sunday edition with a photograph of five ranchers posed defiantly on the lawn of the Z Bar Ranch. Such a provocative photograph lent emphasis to information buried in the article reporting that the *Chase County Leader* had stopped printing letters to the editor because there was just too much local frustration over editorials that had appeared in newspapers throughout the state "in favor of the monument proposal without speaking to nearby ranchers." In other words, while many local residents were trying to maintain civility and calm in the face of serious community divisions, the media seemed to be playing up the controversy, making it much harder to find common ground. People from both sides who were willing to give statements to the press agreed on one thing: nothing had ever happened to split the community worse.[127]

Randall Baynes, Superintendent of Homestead National Monument of America, led the team assigned to the feasibility study. On March 23, 1990, when the study team traveled to Strong City for a day-long "open house" in order to give local residents a chance to ask questions and make comments, KGA representatives disrupted the proceedings. The local newspaper ran a headline story describing the grim details, which included day-long picketing, blocking access to the meeting room, and videotaping speakers who were perceived to be park supporters. A companion editorial chastised the KGA for "making the issue of the national monument personal and in the process wounding and hurting our community for a long time to come. Chase County has far more to fear from *that*," the editorial concluded, "than any national monument--or not."[128]

Randall Baynes reported the event in a long letter to Congressman Glickman. After detailing what had already been well-covered by the press, Baynes acknowledged that "despite repeated attempts, the Service has been unable to convince local citizens that there currently is neither a Congressional effort underway nor has legislation been introduced to establish a park in Chase County." He further noted that the divisive issue was having a "profound" negative effect on the communities of Strong City and Cottonwood Falls.[129]

The KGA made no attempt to disrupt a second meeting held in Cottonwood Falls on June 28, but the Chase County Board of Education unanimously rejected an NPS request to use air-conditioned school facilities. Nonetheless, about 100 supporters and opponents turned out to fill folding chairs set up in the un-air-conditioned municipal building. Baynes and his study team came prepared to maintain control of the meeting. They kept it short and responded only to questions written on cards handed out to those who attended.[130]

While the NPS finished its feasibility study, local adversaries tried to find an acceptable compromise. Directors of the Flint Hills Resource Conservation and Development organization negotiated a six-member committee composed of three representatives from the Flint Hills National Monument Committee and three from the KGA. The committee decided not to discuss its meetings publicly, but it was generally known that the central issue of debate was federal ownership of land.[131] Positions on that issue, moreover, had moved beyond compromise.

H.R. 2369: 1991

In April 1991 the NPS completed its study, and Dan Glickman announced that he would introduce legislation authorizing the NPS to acquire the Z Bar. His office compiled a list of conservation and environmental groups that could "activate their memberships" to support legislation and began to line up people who would testify favorably at committee and public hearings. The Kansas

Farm Bureau, the Kansas Livestock Association, and the Kansas Grassroots Association immediately announced that their opposition had not changed and would not change."[132]

Glickman's bill was in trouble before it was introduced. By late April, Glickman staffer Myrne Roe advised the congressman and the rest of the staff that the issue was "out of hand in Chase County. We may have every newspaper in the state and all environmental groups," she continued, "plus some eco devo folks for it, but it is not going to fly with the level of emotion of those against it primarily in that county." Based on incoming reports suggesting that the emotional pitch in Chase County could lead to violence, Roe suggested that the congressman "back off" for awhile, shore up support among the Kansas delegation, and let the media and environmental groups "put pressure on Chase to get with it."[133]

Congressman Glickman delayed introducing the bill until mid-May. In the meantime, it became clear that support from the Kansas delegation would not be unanimous. Reps. Jan Meyers [R] and Jim Slattery [D] who, along with Glickman, represented eastern Kansas districts, maintained their support. Rep. Dick Nichols [R], whose district included the proposed park area, remained undecided. Rep. Pat Roberts, whose district lay in western Kansas, had "strong reservations." Sen. Dole told the press that he did not have a position, a statement that was interpreted to mean Dole would not support the bill because Glickman had "upstaged the rest of the delegation" with his April announcement and because Glickman was then considering a bid for Dole's Senate seat in 1992. Sen. Nancy Kassebaum gave the press a non-committal statement expressing hope for an agreement that would satisfy both sides.[134] On May 16, 1991, Glickman finally introduced the prairie monument bill with only two other members of the Kansas delegation listed as co-sponsors: Jan Meyers and Jim Slattery. Nine other members of the House also signed on as co-sponsors.[135]

Hearings on H.R. 2369 were set for July 16 before the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. Before Glickman went to the hearing to give his own opening statement, his staff

presented him with a copy of testimony that Denis Galvin, Associate Director for Planning and Development of the NPS, would give *opposing* the bill, along with prepared arguments for him to use in response to Galvin's testimony. Opposition from the NPS was based on an assertion that the 11,000-acre ranch was "not large enough to ensure successful management" and that there had been no "determination of the degree of natural or cultural significance."[136]

The NPS's sudden shift altered the politics of the situation substantially, but the hearings went on as scheduled. Glickman tried to mitigate the damage as best he could by pointing out that the bill had been introduced because the NPS's own feasibility study concluded that the ranch *was* of "sufficient size and configuration to afford adequate resource protection and provide sites for visitor facilities with minimal intrusion of the landscape." The study furthermore stated explicitly that natural and cultural resources had been evaluated and were considered to be of "prime significance." For the record, Glickman let it be known that the feasibility study had been approved "by all levels of the NPS bureaucracy" and charged that this sudden and "total conversion of its position" was "one of the most unusual incidents to ever come out of the NPS."[137]

Originally, the subcommittee had planned only one hearing in Washington, D.C., but after the NPS came out in opposition to the bill, the subcommittee traveled to Emporia, Kansas, for a second hearing on August 23rd. Both hearings produced little new information and no new arguments, but they did allow opponents and proponents to restate their positions for the official record. Among those testifying in support of H.R. 2369 were Paul Pritchard, then-president of the National Parks and Conservation Association and chairman of the National Park Trust; Ron Klataske, West Central regional vice president of the National Audubon Society; attorney Lee Fowler representing the Flint Hills National Monument Committee, which drafted the bill; Dr. David Hartnett, associate professor of biology at Kansas State University; and Dr. Sid Stevenson, assistant professor of recreation and park management at Kansas State, who presented the results of a cost-benefit analysis he had recently

completed showing the "benefit" to be 1.57 times greater than the "cost" based on several economic factors.[138]

Among those speaking in opposition were Congressman Dick Nichols, who stated that his constituents opposed the creation of a prairie national monument by a "2 to 1 margin"; Chuck Magathan and Jim Mayo of the Kansas Grassroots Association; Paul Fleener, director of public affairs, and Doyle D. Rahjes, president, Kansas Farm Bureau; Mike Beam for the Kansas Livestock Association; James E. Link for the National Cattlemen's Association; Melinda Barrett, national legislative representative for Kansas Agri-Women; and Dr. Scott Irwin, professor of science and environmental education at Emporia State University.[139]

Cutting through some of the emotionally charged rhetoric, on both sides, was Rep. Pat Roberts, who did not explicitly state that he was opposed to H.R. 2369, but *did* articulate clearly and concisely the heart of the opposition's message. Roberts noted that the Z Bar Ranch (and, by extension, other areas in the Flint Hills) was "attractive to both environmentalists and recreationalists because of the stewardship that had been provided by the previous and current owners." This was a point on which both sides had long agreed, even if grudgingly. If, then, the "caring of the Z Bar and (similar) surrounding lands has been a way of life for the local residents, farmers, and ranchers," Roberts wondered, "[w]hy should the government come in and threaten this delicate balance?"[140]

Reducing the controversy to "agriculture v. environment," as many people had done, masked complex values and attitudes that park proponents outside Chase County often did not understand, appreciate, or acknowledge. Flint Hills ranchers who opposed the monument did not assume, as did many conservationists, that the National Park Service would be a better steward. Nor could they accept the proposition that hundreds of thousands of visitors annually, no matter how much money they pumped into the local economy, would be more in harmony with the prairie ecology than the cattle that grazed the hills. Granted, organized opponents all too often engaged in inflammatory anti-government

rhetoric. Nonetheless, as Roberts pointed out in his remarks to the subcommittee, ranchers who lived in Chase County were "justifiably fearful of 'outsiders' wanting to take this property and make changes that [would] dramatically change their land, their communities and eventually their lives and livelihoods."[141] Moreover, when park proponents and park planners talked about interpreting the cultural heritage of the Flint Hills, they implicitly thought in terms of Native Americans who were long gone and idealized images of nineteenth-century settlers who established ranches, farms, and small communities across the beautiful Flint Hills. The heritage envisioned for interpretive centers did not extend conceptually to the culture of their contentious descendants who placed high social and political values on private ownership of land.

Roberts closed his remarks by noting that "Kansans continue to wonder why the Z Bar was not simply purchased by the environmental groups fighting so hard for the federal government to purchase it."[142] This point was hard to refute in view of new developments. Early in July 1991 the Kansas Farm Bureau, the Kansas Grassroots Association, and an un-named individual approached Boatman's Bank about a private purchase of the Z Bar. Boatman's informed the group that the ranch was not on the market, and the prospective buyer was told to speak with Ron Klataske of the Audubon Society. Agricultural opponents of the prairie monument proposal were immediately suspicious that "someone" was "trying to control" the hearings in order "to assure a favorable outcome" for Glickman's bill.[143]

After the July 16 hearing, Klataske took immediate steps to avoid a "political standoff from evolving in the Kansas delegation." He spoke with Assistant Secretary–Fish and Wildlife and Parks Mike Hayden, a former governor of Kansas and a Republican, about Denis Galvin's statement of NPS opposition. Based on this discussion, Klataske relayed to Rep. Glickman as well as to Sens. Dole and Kassebaum that apparently whoever prepared the position statement "was not familiar with the 'New Area Feasibility Study' prepared by [NPS], was not familiar with the property, and evaluated the

proposed monument on the wrong basis." He urged Glickman to continue working the bill in the House, and all of them to provide leadership in order to avoid "another thirty years of unresolved conflict."[144]

The Kansas delegation did get together for a meeting after the July 16 hearing, during which they agreed to keep discussing options, including private ownership or some sort of public-private partnership.[145] Meanwhile, Chase County commissioners voted 2-1 to study the feasibility of purchasing the Z Bar for a county park and dude ranch. It was not a serious bid, but the move kept local residents stirred up because the two commissioners voting in favor of the measure said they would support county condemnation of the property.[146] Assistant Secretary of Interior Mike Hayden curiously stood by NPS opposition and publicly "denied that partisan politics had any role in the decision."[147] Controversy dragged on in the media, but as Glickman's bill moved closer to a vote the momentum for passage gained strength. All the mainstream conservation organizations backed it as did a host of statewide organizations. In September the House Interior Committee approved the bill, and the House of Representatives passed it in October.[148]

At about this point, the legislative effort began to assume a life of its own. After thirty years, the momentum had finally shifted in favor of preserving a small portion of the Flint Hills prairie for public access. However, Sen. Dole was unwilling to support the proposal contained in Glickman's bill. Sen. Kassebaum was philosophically supportive of some plan to establish a park or preserve, but in November she announced that she, too, would not introduce legislation authorizing the NPS to purchase and manage the Z Bar Ranch. After weighing various options, Kassebaum had decided that she "would support the creation of a private foundation to purchase the Z Bar...." A few days later, she announced that she "would bring together the state's various conservation and agriculture groups on December 9 to discuss the creation of a private foundation...."[149]

The "Kassebaum Commission": December 1991-January 1994

From late 1991 to early 1994, Sen. Kassebaum worked with a group of individuals who were selected to represent all the major concerns associated with establishing the Z Bar Ranch as the place where a portion of the prairie would be preserved. Kassebaum's November 1993 announcement followed private discussions with farm groups and a firm belief that if representatives from opposing sides could be brought together, rational minds would prevail to create a mutually acceptable proposal for preserving the Z Bar Ranch under private ownership.[150] Leaders of the Kansas Farm Bureau, the Kansas Livestock Association, and the Kansas Grassroots Association agreed to work with her to find or create a private entity to acquire the Z Bar. Realizing that the House bill had little chance of making it through the Senate without the support of Sens. Kassebaum or Dole, but that Sen. Kassebaum nonetheless was going to continue the search for a workable solution, all parties began to give a little ground.[151] After a two-hour, closed-door meeting that took place in December at Wichita State University, Kassebaum told the press she was "encouraged by reaction to her proposal," which was that a seven-member board be formed, representing agriculture, conservation, and local community interests, to "work together to preserve the property." Representatives from opposing sides of the issue were less sanguine about the prospects for working together, but they agreed to go along with the proposal for the time being.[152]

The proposal actually began to take shape when Kassebaum convened a meeting in January 1992 at the Z Bar Ranch. The group she assembled agreed to create a private foundation with a twelve-member board of trustees. The board would raise private funds to purchase the ranch and develop a plan for managing the land and interpreting its natural and cultural resources. The agreement mirrored all the stipulations that the Flint Hills Monument Committee had written into draft legislation except that the land would be privately owned. Membership in the board of trustees was structured so that the seven members of the Kansas congressional delegation appointed nine of the twelve trustees, with the

other three appointed by the governor, the city councils of Strong City and Cottonwood Falls (jointly), and the Chase County Board of Commissioners. The structure deliberately avoided recreating the old divisions.[153] By mid-April the board of trustees had been named, and everyone expected the new foundation, which did not have a name yet, to get down to work.[154] However, during the next few months the commission actually accomplished little more than "housekeeping details" and choosing stationery, according to trustee Lee Fowler. By the end of the year, the commission, which was now officially Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch, Inc., still had not begun to raise money or develop a management plan, and park proponents were impatient with the board's lack of progress and lack of visibility.[155]

Shortly after the 1992 presidential election, which brought Democrat Bill Clinton into the White House, Glickman announced that he would reintroduce his bill if the Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch board did not begin to make progress.[156] He reiterated his intent the following May after a meeting with Bruce Babbitt, the new Secretary of the Interior, who gave a statement to the press endorsing a tallgrass prairie park in the Flint Hills.[157] A few weeks later Sen. Kassebaum's aide, Mike Horak, reported to key board members on a critical meeting with Denis Galvin of the NPS. With a change in political administrations, the NPS was once again supportive of a prairie park concept. According to Galvin, the NPS "very much" wanted to have the Z Bar Ranch "affiliated" with the NPS and was willing to be "flexible" in working out the details of an "affiliate relationship." The only type of relationship that Galvin ruled out was one that would relegate the NPS "to merely run[ning] a visitors center and a few acres around the ranch building."[158]

Within two weeks, the board adopted a consent agreement with the NPS that provided for NPS to operate and manage the ranch with appropriate interpretive and educational programs focused on the natural history of the prairie and the cultural history of Native Americans and ranching in the Flint Hills region. Under terms of the agreement, the board committed to raising $5 million within two years in order to purchase the ranch.[159] Now that a management agreement and a fund-raising schedule were in

place, the Spring Hill Z Bar board approached Boatmen's Trust Company with a purchase proposal. Six months of negotiations followed, including a personal meeting between Sen. Kassebaum and the president of Boatmen's Bank. In the end, the bank stipulated a firm purchase price that was fifteen percent above the $3.9 million appraised fair market value. Officially, the board rejected Boatmen's asking price, but a disappointed Kassebaum concluded that the bank never intended to sell the ranch to Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch, Inc.[160] In a message to Kansans through the *Topeka Capital-Journal*, Kassebaum responded that it was "unfortunate, and deeply disappointing, that Boatmen's waited two years to make its own position clear."[161]

In retrospect, Fowler noted that "even though the Kassebaum Commission failed in its ultimate goal, it actually succeeded because it provided the metamorphosis from 'we can't do this,' to 'yes, we can.' What happened in the Kassebaum Commission that was extremely important was that everybody signed on board, including the Kansas Livestock Association and the Kansas Farm Bureau, [agreeing] that it was okay for a private nonprofit organization to own the property."[162] Kassebaum concurred with this assessment of the commission. "It accomplished bringing the diverse voices to the table, and they could be just as vehement on one side as the other." In the end, although Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch, Inc. did not get the property, "it put in motion the process that did enable [the preserve] to come to fruition."[163]

Convergence: 1994-1996

The ranch, moreover, was still for sale to the right buyer and under the right terms. Amid speculation that Kassebaum's group and Boatmen's might still work out a deal, the National Park Trust (NPT) entered the field of prospective buyers. As the Audubon Society's option began to run out, Ron Klataske approached the NPT and asked this group to become involved. The NPT, formed by the National Parks and Conservation Association in 1983 to function as a nonprofit land trust, thus began negotiating a separate deal with Boatman's Bank.[164] By late February 1994, negotiations were far

enough along that Paul Pritchard, chairman of the board, circulated a confidential memorandum requesting that board members and others privy to the negotiations divulge only limited information until an official announcement could be released.[165] The official announcement, which came a few days later on March 4th, revealed that the NPT had agreed to raise $4.7 million by the end of June in order to meet the bank's asking price. The NPT's plan was to keep the ranch in private ownership and enter into an "affiliate relationship" with the NPS to operate the ranch as a unit of the national park system. Sen. Kassebaum and Rep. Glickman issued companion press releases on the same day approving of the agreement.[166]

Secretary of the Interior Babbitt toured the ranch in April while the NPT and the NPCA worked out arrangements for purchasing the ranch. His trip, on which Gov. Joan Finney accompanied him, appeared to be for the purpose of gauging local reaction to the impending purchase. Babbitt issued a cautious statement to the press saying that he was "not ready to endorse any particular plan to incorporate the 11,000 acre ranch into [the national park] system." Gov. Finney also was "not yet prepared to endorse a course of action for the Z Bar." [167]

The NPT and NPCA completed the purchase early in June 1994, and a delegation from both organizations traveled to Strong City to celebrate with Chase Countians on the grounds surrounding the Z Bar's 1880s stone ranch buildings.[168] The following August, Sen. Kassebaum convened a crucial meeting of the Kansas delegation with Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt and Paul Pritchard to discuss "in very candid fashion" the National Park Service's land management role and what sort of federal ownership was necessary in order for the Department of the Interior to establish management authority. The feasibility of a partnership that would satisfy all interests was at stake in this meeting, and the intensity of discussion, as reported by those who were present, reflects as much. After the discussion "sort of went round and round," according to former Senator Kassebaum, Congressman (now Senator) Pat Roberts reportedly focused attention squarely on the point of how many acres the Department of the

Interior needed to own in order to support legislation. The meeting ended with no final answer to that question, but shortly thereafter, Secretary Babbitt notified Kassebaum's office that 180 acres was the minimum needed under federal ownership. [169]

With this agreement struck, the Kansas delegation introduced companion bills to create a Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve on the Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch, allowing the NPS to purchase a core area of 180 acres including the ranch buildings and the Fox Creek School. The "preserve" designation was one that allowed the National Park Service greater land management flexibility to carry out the proposed public-private partnership. Glickman's House bill was co-sponsored by Reps. Jan Meyers, Jim Slattery, and Pat Roberts. Kassebaum's Senate bill was co-sponsored by Sen. Bob Dole. H.R. 5000 and S. 2412, introduced during the second session of the 103rd Congress, marked the first time the full Kansas congressional delegation had ever supported legislation to create a prairie park in Kansas.[170]

The campaign was not quite over, however. The Kansas Farm Bureau immediately objected to the provision authorizing federal purchase of the 180-acre ranch headquarters area on the basis that it would "open the door to future land acquisitions."[171] Glickman had hoped for a speedy passage through both houses, but the Farm Bureau mounted one last effort, pressing the Kansas delegation to drop the provision authorizing NPS acquisition of 180 acres. This time, however, there would be no entering wedge to split the Congressional delegation. Still, by late September neither the House nor the Senate had scheduled hearings, and the 103rd Congress was about to adjourn. The November elections brought another setback when Republicans captured control of Congress. This political shift directly affected the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve legislative effort because conservative Republican Todd Tiahrt managed an upset victory to win Dan Glickman's seat in the House, and Republican Sam Brownback replaced Democrat Jim Slattery, who retired from the House. It was not immediately clear whether either or both of the freshmen congressmen would support legislation in the 104th Congress.[172]

Meanwhile, the NPT and the NPCA kept moving forward.[173] Having depleted cash reserves and taken on a conventional bank mortgage in order to pay the purchase price, the organizations had a major fund-raising effort in front of them. That effort lightened early in 1995 when Texas multi-millionaire Edward Bass contributed $1 million to the park effort and paid $2 million, in advance, for a 35-year grazing lease on the Z Bar Ranch.[174]

The agreement between Bass and the NPT seemed to smooth the way for Sen. Kassebaum to reintroduce legislation. So did the hiring of Barbara Zurhellen as NPT's on-site person at the ranch. Zurhellen, whose official title was Director of Interpretation, was charged with the task of building trust and credibility in the local community. Her "mission" was "to humanize the project, because it was controversial, because there was a lot of mistrust and skepticism." She did this by becoming "very involved in the community," starting an open house program that gave many local residents their first opportunity to set foot in the ranch buildings, developing a volunteer program, and generally being "a good neighbor."[175]

The bill that finally passed into law was the product of intense cooperation between Mike Horak, Kassebaum's communications director; Laura Loomis, legislative representative for the NPCA; and Linda Potter, legislative affairs specialist for the NPS.[176] Senate Bill 695, introduced in April, was co-sponsored by Sen. Dole. Reps. Pat Roberts and Jan Meyers introduced a companion bill, H.R. 1449 in the House. The bills limited the NPS to ownership of 180 acres, to be acquired by donation, with no further expansion permitted.[177] The Farm Bureau kept up its lobbying effort in order to remove the provision allowing the NPS to own 180 acres, but Sen. Dole, whom they continued to hope would become an opposition leader, quietly maintained his support for the bill without getting involved in actual negotiations. In addition, Dan Glickman, recently confirmed as Secretary of Agriculture, did what he could to solidify Democratic support.[178]

Once again, however, the bill was stalled, this time mired in congressional debate over scores of park and land bills. Early in March 1996, Kassebaum succeeded in attaching the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve bill to a parks package bill that included sixty park measures. The package bill, which passed the House, got bogged down in the Senate with partisan controversy over a provision to set aside two million acres in Utah as wilderness but, in return, open up another twenty million acres of federal land to ranching, mining, and other development. After the Senate failed to break a Democratic filibuster on the comprehensive parks bill, led by Sen. Bill Bradley, Kassebaum announced she would push the Z Bar bill separately.[179]

Intense negotiations and lobbying by many groups forced the Senate to work out partisan differences in order to keep the comprehensive parks bill alive. Finally, in early May, the Senate unanimously approved a negotiated bill. It then went to a House-Senate conference committee where it faced further opposition from the Clinton administration, which demanded that dozens of "pork barrel" provisions be removed. The Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve was not among them. In late September, the House finally passed a scaled-back version, which then went back to the Senate. After a year of back-and-forth partisan negotiations, political pressure from constituents in a presidential election year forced Congress to pass legislation. The Senate voted unanimously on October 4, one month before the general election, to approve the massive parks bill, which affected a total of 113 sites in 41 states.[180] President Clinton signed the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act into law at a highly publicized Oval Office ceremony on November 12, 1996.[181]

Throughout the negotiations, the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve provisions remained intact. Officially, the preserve is authorized under Subtitle A of Title X, Miscellaneous, of P.L. 104-333. It permits the NPS to acquire not more than 180 acres by donation and to manage the preserve in conjunction with the property owner, central provisions reflecting the compromises that led to successful legislation. Title X of P.L. 104-333 also established a thirteen-member Tallgrass Prairie

National Preserve Advisory Committee to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. The committee's mandated composition also reflects the diversity of concerns and interests involved in reaching compromise. Its members must include three representatives of the NPT; three representatives of local landowners, cattle ranchers or other agricultural interests; three representatives of conservation or historic preservation interests; one person each recommended by the Chase County Commission, Strong City and Cottonwood Falls officials, and the Governor of Kansas, and one range management specialist representing Kansas institutions of higher education. As mandated by law and chartered in September 1997, the committee's role is to advise the NPS on matters "concerning the development, management, and interpretation of the Preserve, including timely advice during the preparation of the general management plan for the Preserve."[182]

Conclusion

Without exception, everyone who was involved in the legislative effort credits Sen. Nancy Kassebaum as the key to success. She, in turn, points out that others, particularly Dan Glickman, Bob Dole, and Pat Roberts played equally critical roles; and Mike Horak reflectively observes that, in the final years, no one really did anything different from those who had been fighting fifty years for a tallgrass prairie park or preserve. Kassebaum, however, "saw this as a real opportunity to do something special for the State of Kansas," and consequently never thought of giving up. She "wanted to see if it was feasible to acquire [the ranch] privately" and she saw that the NPS had the ability to interpret the preserve professionally, and "she was pleased that a conservation group was involved in the project."[183]

The result is a public-private partnership that places land management responsibility in the collective hands of interests that embrace fundamentally different views on the nature of land stewardship. On the one hand, there are those who are philosophically inclined to equate good stewardship with land ownership by an entity created to serve the greater public good. On the other,

there are those who see no inherent contradiction between good land stewardship and land use for private economic benefit. Even so, all interests are finally and positively committed to working through these differences in order to create a place that protects an important grassland ecosystem and interprets the complex evolution of land use in the Flint Hills.

According to NPS landscape architect John Sowl, the legislative solution that various cooperating entities must now implement reflects "a real effort on the part of the NPS and other groups to try and get some answers up front and identify some concerns and to try and include those in the planning aspects, so that we can be sensitive to those concerns and needs and yet sensitive to the needs of the cultural and natural resources."[184] Still, Senator Kassebaum points out that "as we work through the management plan... I think we are all beginning to realize that it's terribly important how these partnerships are put together. It isn't as easy as it might look on paper."[185] While the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve can become a model for successful public-private partnerships in the national park system, the general management plan must address land use issues on which there are contrasting, and potentially divisive, points of view, such as the question of whether to reintroduce bison. Additionally, an unretired mortgage on the property presents land ownership issues that must be resolved. For these reasons, Kassebaum emphasizes that the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve is "still a work in progress."

Endnotes

Note on Sources and Citation Abbreviations

Duncan Papers KU = Patricia DuBose Duncan Collection, MS 535, Spencer Library, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

Duncan Papers TPNP = photographs and correspondence collected by Patricia DuBose Duncan and donated to the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, located at the NPS office in Cottonwood Falls, Kansas.

Glickman Papers = Papers of Dan Glickman, U.S. Representative, MS 97-05, Department of Special Collections, Ablah Library, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas.

Harpers Ferry Center = Unprocessed materials, 1937-1988, from a variety of collections housed at Anthony Library, Harpers Ferry National Historic Park, Harpers Ferry, West Virginia.

Kassebaum Papers = Papers of Nancy Landon Kassebaum, U.S. Senator 1979-1998, Collection No. 298, Kansas State Library and Archives, Kansas History Center, Topeka, Kansas. At the time of research, a preliminary inventory was available, but the collection was still unprocessed and stored off-site. KSHS archivists located some pertinent materials, but conversations with Senator Kassebaum and her former Senate aide, Mike Horak, indicate that considerably more material on the TPNP is located somewhere in the collection.

NPS Office of Park Planning = NPS Office of Park Planning and Special Studies, 1849 C St., NW, Washington, D.C. Various subject files contain a wide variety of materials pertinent to the TPNP, 1986-1997, as well as the effort to establish a prairie park in Oklahoma.

NPS reports are identified by regional office of origination, when known. Reference to the U.S. Department of the Interior has been omitted from footnotes.

TPNP Administrative Papers = Administrative Papers of the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, housed at the National Park Office of the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, located at Cottonwood Falls, Kansas. This collection contains a wide variety of materials, 1958-1996, assembled by TPNP Superintendent Steve Miller and the late Randall Baynes, former superintendent of Homestead National Monument of America. Baynes served as team leader for the 1990-1991 special resource study; Miller was a member of the team.

Wichita Eagle, Wichita Beacon, and *Wichita Eagle-Beacon.* Until 1989, Wichita's principal daily newspaper published morning and evening editions, which underwent several minor name changes. Generally speaking, until 1989 the *Eagle* title pertained to the morning paper, *Beacon* pertained to the evening edition, *Eagle-Beacon* to combined editions. From September 3, 1989 to the present, the newspaper, published once daily, has been called *The Wichita Eagle.*

[1] The ambivalence toward the plains and prairies that is expressed in contrasting images of "desert" and "garden" is explored in several essays that appear in *Images of the Plains: The Role of Human Nature in Settlement*, ed. Brian W. Blouet and Merlin P. Lawson (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1975). For "nature writing" treatments of the same phenomenon, see John Madson, *Where the Sky Began* (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1995, rev. ed.) and Ian Frazier, *Great Plains* (New York: Penguin Books, 1989). Except as noted, the quotations cited here can be found in these books.

[2] Paul M. Angle, *Prairie State: Impressions of Illinois, 1673-1967, By Travelers and Other Observers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

[3] Herbert Quick, *Vandemark's Folly* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1922).

[4] George Catlin, *Letters and Notes on the Manners, Customs and Conditions of North American Indians*, 1913 (reprint New York: Dover Press, 1973), 289-93.

[5] V. Shelford, "Preservation of Natural Biotic Communities," *Ecology* 14 (1933), 240-245; *Preliminary Environmental Assessment, Proposed Prairie National Park/Kansas-Oklahoma, Appendix A: Planning Directive*, 2 (NPS: Washington, D.C., 1975; published as House Document No. 96-12, Part II in 1979), [hereafter cited as *Preliminary Environmental Assessment,* 1975]; Dan L. Flores, "A Long Love Affair with an Uncommon Country: Environmental History and the Great Plains," in *Prairie Conservation*, ed. Fred B. Samson and Fritz L. Knopf (Washington, D.C. and Covelo, CA: Island Press, 1996), 14-15.

[6] Daniel S. Licht, *Ecology and Economics of the Great Plains* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 16-17, 90-97. See also R. Douglas Hurt, "Federal Land Reclamation in the Dust Bowl," *Great Plains Quarterly* 6 (1986), 94-106; H. H. Wooten, *The Land Utilization Program, 1934 to 1964: Origin, Development and Present Status*, Agriculture Economic Report 85 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, 1965).

[7] Flores, 15. Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Park is now called Theodore Roosevelt National Park. Scott's Bluff National Monument (Nebraska), also in the Great Plains, entered the national park system in 1919. Three other Great Plains areas were acquired and designated as national parks between 1900 and 1906: Wind Cave in South Dakota, Platt in Oklahoma, and Sully's Hill in North Dakota. NPS officials considered them to be "pork-barrel maneuvers" and budgeted allocations for them grudgingly. Sully's Hill, in particular, lacked the scenic qualities that the NPS wished to associate with national parks, and director Stephen Mather even sought to abolish it. See Hal Rothman, *Preserving Different Pasts* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 53., 128 Attitudes change with time, however; Wind Cave National Park is now considered to be a prime example of restored mixed-grass prairie.

[8] "Background report for western Nebraska meeting, National Research Council, Division of Biology and Agriculture, Committee on the Ecology of North American Grasslands," 22 April 1937; "Great Plains National Monument Project," *The Council Ring* [NPS newsletter], 8 January 1940; Victor H. Cahalane, "A Proposed Great Plains National Monument," reprint from *The Scientific Monthly* 51 (August 1940), 125-139. Harpers Ferry Center. See also James Lester Swint, "The Proposed Prairie National Park: A Case Study of the Controversial NPS" (Kansas State University, Master's Thesis, 1971), 33-35.

[9] *Preliminary Environmental Assessment* 1975, *Appendix A*,2. See Also Conrad L. Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), Ch. 9.

[10] G.W. Tomanek, *An Analysis of Three Areas in the Flint Hills* (1958); NPS, *Proposal for a True Prairie National Park* (Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, December 1958); Swint, 37-43. See also G.W. Tomanek and F.W. Albertson, *An Analysis of Some Grasslands in the True Prairie* (1959).

[11] Swint, 71.

[12] NPS, *Reevaluation Study, True Prairie Grasslands* (Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, 1960).

[13] NPS, *Statement Analyzing Studies and Preliminary Plan for Proposed Prairie National Park, Pottawatomie County, Kansas* (Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, September 1960). The 1960 report proposed a 57,000 acre park adjacent to the Tuttle Creek Reservoir as the "ideal solution" (3) in order to preclude private home development along the shoreline, which would "create definite intrusions on important views within the park" and "require access roads not located or designed for park purposes" (7).

[14] Swint, 71-82.

[15] NPS, *A Proposed Prairie National Park* (Secretary of the Interior's Office, 1961, publication paid for by privately donated funds).

[16] Gary Baldridge, "Pottawatomie County says *No* to Prairie Preservation," *Kansas History* 16:2 (1993), 100. See also Baldridge, "The Flint Hills: A Question of Control," Master's Thesis, Emporia State University, 1991.

[17] Baldridge, 99-101; H.R. 12538, Avery, 86th Cong. 2d sess., 1960; S. 3651, Schoeppel and Carlson, 86th Cong. 2d sess., 1960.

[18] Former Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, telephone interview with Rebecca Conard, 4 June 1998; Baldridge, 98-99.

[19] Baldridge, 101-103; Swint, 97-98.

[20] S. 73, Schoeppel and Carlson, 87th Cong. 1st sess., 1961. See also Stewart Udall, Secretary of the Interior, to Clinton P. Anderson, Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 14 November 1961; "Interior Department Recommends Legislation to Create Prairie National Park in Kansas," U.S. Department of the Interior news release, 15 November 1961, Harpers Ferry Center.

[21] Hall also was a member of the NPS Advisory Board.

[22] Baldridge, 104.

[23] Robert H. Clark, "A Prairie Park Fund is Sought," *Kansas City Star*, 17 January 1962; "Kansas House Passes $100,000 Park Grant," *Topeka Capital Journal*, 4 February 1962.

[24] Udall interview, 4 June 1998; Baldridge, 104-106; Swint, 108-115.

[25] Alvin S. McCoy, "Kansas Site As Ideal for Park," *Kansas City Times*, 5 December 1961.

[26] H.R. 4424, Avery, and S. 986, Pearson and Carlson. See Acting Secretary of the Interior, to Wayne N. Aspinall, Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, letter dated18 July 1963.

[27] Joe Lastelic, "Seek to Clear Way for Park," *Kansas City Star*, 4 March 1963; "Twin Mound Ranchers Plan Prairie National Park Meet," *Topeka Capital Journal*, 14 April 1963; Dick King, "Park Proposal Gets Protests," *Topeka Capital Journal*, 16 April 1963; "Senate Group Pledges Early Decision on Proposed Park," *Topeka Capital Journal*, 9 August 1963. See also Anthony Wayne Smith, President and General Counsel, National Parks Association, "An analysis of S. 986, submitted on invitation... at hearings of the Subcommittee

on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate of the United States," 8 August 1963, Harpers Ferry Center. See also Baldridge, 106-107; Swint, 141-146.

[28] NPS, *The Prairie Panorama: A Proposal for a Prairie-Great Plains Tourway* (1965), office of origin not identified.

[29] NPS, *The Living Prairie: The Opportunity for a True Prairie National Park, Oklahoma-Kansas* (1965), office of origin not identified.

[30] Swint, 149-150.

[31] Ray Morgan, "A Prairie Park Plea by Hickel," *Kansas City Times*, 10 October 1969.

[32] Norma Northrop to Lynn Burris, Jr., memorandum dated 22 January 1970 concerning January 21 meeting of the Prairie National Park Natural History Association meeting in Wichita, Kansas; Frank J. Anneberg, "A Prairie National Park in the State of Kansas," information sheet dated 1 January 1970, TPNP Administrative Papers.

[33] SB 390, Steineger, 1970, TPNP Administrative Papers.

[34] "Docking Names Manhattan Editor to Head Prairie Park Committee," *Wichita Eagle*, 22 April 1970; John Petterson, "Tall Grass Country Seen as Prairie Park Location," *Wichita Eagle*, 11 November 1970.

[35] John C. Higgins, Superintendent, Homestead National Monument to Acting Director, Midwest Region NPS, memorandum of 9 December 1970; Minutes, Governor's Advisory Committee for a Prairie National Park, 4 December 1970, TPNP Administrative Papers.

[36] "Tallgrass Prairie National Park, Local Problems and Possible Solutions - Questions and Probably Answers" issued by Prairie National Park Natural History Association, 15 September 1971, Duncan Papers,TPNP.

[37] H.R. 9621, Winn, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971; S. 2149, Pearson, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971. According to Patricia Duncan, this bill and subsequent bills introduced by Winn during the 1970s were principally drafted by attorney Lawrence Wagner, now deceased, of Overland Park. Patricia Duncan, unrecorded telephone conversation with Rebecca Conard, 28 August 1998.

[38] E. Raymond Hall to George Hartzog, Director, NPS, 13 August 1971; Gov. Robert Docking to Rep. William Roy, 14 June 1971, TPNP Administrative Papers. See also E. Raymond Hall, "Tallgrass Prairie National Park," *American Forests*, December 1971.

[39] S. 1159, Bellmon, 92nd Cong., 1st sess., 1971.

[40] J. Leonard Volz, Director, NPS Midwest Region to Director, NPS, memorandum of 22 November 1971, TPNP Administrative Papers.

[41] Richard K. Griswold, Chief, Division of Legislative Coordination and Support, NPS to Chief, Division of Legislation, memorandum of 10 November 1971, TPNP Administrative Papers.

[42] "Report On Status of Legislation, and Local Expressions of Opinion," 20 March 1972, Duncan Papers, KU.

[43] Minutes, Tallgrass Prairie National Park, 22 June 1972 [this appears to be the organizational meeting of STP]; press release issued by Citizens Environmental Council, Kansas City, Mo., 21 July 1972. Duncan Papers,

TPNP. Inasmuch as the Prairie National Park Natural History Association's visibility seems to fade at this point, it is likely that STP also succeeded this group.

[44] Patricia D. Duncan, "Is There Anything Worth Saving in Kansas?" *Environmental Action*, 11 July 1971, 3-7, Duncan Papers,TPNP.

[45] Keith Tillotson, "National Park Movement Revived," *K-State Collegian*, 28 July 1972.

[46] Forest Hintz, "Ribbon Concept Proposed for Park," *Wichita Eagle*, 21 March 1973; "Summary, Flint Hills National Parkway System Proposal," 18 April 1973, Duncan Papers, TPNP.

[47] Keith Tillotson to Patricia Duncan, letter dated 21 October 1972, Duncan Papers, TPNP.

[48] NPS, "(Preliminary) Statement for Management and Planning, (Proposed) Cherokee Strip National Historic Park (Kansas-Oklahoma)," Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, January 1973; Skubitz to Walker, letter dated 28 February 1973, Duncan Papers, TPNP.

[49] Roger Myers, "Skubitz Boosts Prairie Park Idea," *Topeka Daily Capital*, 26 January 1973; "Skubitz Says Congress Best Hope for Parks," *Wichita Eagle*, 26 Friday 1973.

[50] "Park Proposal To Be Studied, Says Skubitz," *Topeka Daily Capital*, 7 March 1973.

[51] "Chronology of Action by the Public in Kansas Following Release of the Cherokee Strip Suitability/Feasibility Study Report," c. November 1973; "Tallgrass Prairie Group Favors Separate Park," STP press release, 9 March 1973; "Prairie Park Citizens Lobby Proposes Park Location," STP press release, 13 March 1973, Duncan Papers, TPNP.

[52] "Flint Hills Park Draws Opposition," *Wichita Beacon*, 29 March 1973; Jerry Engler, "Tallgrass Prairie Reserve Opposed," *Topeka Daily Capital*, 20 April 1973. Hughes to Ronald Walker, director NPS, letter of 10 May 1973, Duncan Papers, TPNP.

[53] "Chronology of Action...." See also "Tallgrass National Park" position paper, Regional Development and Natural Resources Committee of the American Institute of Architects, 8 June 1973, Duncan Papers, KU.

[54] "Skubitz Says Prairie Park Battle is Futile," *Madison (Kansas) News*, 21 June 1973. See also "Skubitz Gives Views on Proposed Prairie Park in the Flint Hills Area," *Leon (Kansas) News*, 19 July 1973.

[55] H.R. 9262, Winn, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., 1973; "A Vital Hearing on Prairie Park Next Thursday in Topeka, *Kansas City Times*, 23 August 1973.

[56] "Chronology of Action...."; Ray Morgan, "Prairie Park Site Found," *Kansas City Star*, 30 August 1973. See also Duncan to Charles Pearson, Editor, *The Wichita Eagle-Beacon*, 9 August 1973 and Duncan to Editor, *The Wichita Eagle*, 10 September 1973, Duncan Papers, KU.

[57] John Petterson, "Foes of Prairie National Park Dealt Setback in Close Vote," *Wichita Eagle*, 28 September 1973; John Petterson, "Restrained Fervor: Group Cautious on Park Proposal," *Wichita Beacon*, 30 October 1973; Ken Peterson, "Ft. Riley Suggested Prairie Park Site," *Topeka Daily Capital*, 31 October 1973.

[58] Former U.S. Representative Larry Winn, Jr., interview with Rebecca Conard, Prairie Village, Kansas, 6 May 1998.

[59] Ray Morgan, "Prairie Park at Ft. Riley 'Unfeasible'," *Kansas City Times*, 15 November 1973.

[60] Ray Morgan, "Morton Agrees to Prairie Park Study," *Kansas City Times,* 21 December 1973.

[61] Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 74, *Reports of Special Committees to the 1974 Kansas Legislature*, 12-1 through 12-4, Duncan Papers, KU; "Gaines Nixes Federal Park," *Wichita Eagle-Beacon* 19 February 1974.

[62] Ray Morgan, "Caravan for Prairie Park, *Kansas City Times*, 20 April 1974; Joe Lastelic, "Students Petition for Tallgrass Park, *Kansas City Times*, 24 April 1974.

[63] "Energy Crises Insure Continuing Threats to Virgin Prairie," *Tallgrass Prairie News*, publ. by Save the Tallgrass Prairie, Inc., July 1974; "Will the Tallgrass Prairie Be Plowed Under?" *Not Man Apart*, published by Friends of the Earth and League of Conservation Voters, July 1974, Duncan Papers,TPNP.

[64] Roger Moore, "Udall Back in Flint Hills to Promote Prairie Park," *Kansas City Star*, 29 September 1974; "Udall Backs Need for Prairie Park," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 29 September 29, 1974.

[65] Moore, "Udall Back in Flint Hills...."

[66] Dave Bartel, "Prairie Park Backers Map Plans," *Wichita Eagle-Beacon*, 28 September 1974; Roger Moore, "Tallgrass Prairie Park May Be Close to Reality," *Kansas City Times,* 30 September 1974; "National Park Study to Take Until Mid-'76," *Topeka Daily Capital,* 30 September 1974.

[67] "Tallgrass Park Opposition Bill Goes to Senate," *Wichita Eagle*, 12 March 1975; "Prairie Park Supporters Before Committee Today," *Wichita Beacon*, 27 March 1975; Roger Myers, "Senate Against Park," *Topeka Daily Capital*, 11 April 1975. See also "STP Action Alert," c. April 1975; "Kansas Legislature" column in *Tallgrass Prairie News* 3:1 (June 1975), Duncan Papers TPNP. See also Carole Ise, "What Really Happened in Topeka," *Tallgrass Prairie News*, Conference Issue, (September 1975), Duncan Papers, KU.

[68] "Top Names Join STP Honorary Board," *Tallgrass Prairie News* 3:1 (June 1975).

[69] H.R. 8726, H.R. 9012, and H.R. 9376, 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975. See also Minutes, Eleventh Meeting of the Board of Councillors of Save the Tallgrass Prairie, Inc., 19 July 1975, Duncan Papers KU; "Winn, Udall to Co-Sponsor Park Bill," *Tallgrass Prairie News* 3:1 (June 1975), Duncan Papers KU.

[70] "Prairie Park Gains Sierra Club Backing," *Wichita Eagle*, 14 September 1975.

[71] Larry Winn, Jr., "Letter from Capitol Hill," *Tallgrass Prairie News,* Conference Issue (September 1975).

[72] *Preliminary Environmental Assessment,* 1975, 2-4.

[73] Ibid., 5, 7.

[74] Ibid., 5-6.

[75] Ibid., 33-34.

[76] "allgrass Prairie Foundation Makes Debut," *Tallgrass Prairie News* 4:1 (October 1976), Duncan Papers KU. Organization of the foundation in 1976 marked a transition point for STP as it sought to move beyond its origins as a political activist group and become a permanent organization with a public education mission. In 1983, the Tallgrass Prairie Foundation became the Grassland Heritage Foundation, which is still in existence and headquartered at Shawnee Mission, Kansas. Attorney Larry Wagner, one of the founders of STP, donated his 300-acre farm to the Grassland Heritage Foundation to be used for research and educational purposes. The

farm, calledThe Prairie Center, is located west of Olathe. Patricia Duncan telephone conversation, 28 August 1998; see also "The Prairie Center," informational brochure, c. 1983, produced by the Grassland Heritage Foundation, Duncan Papers, TPNP.

[77] "STP Annual Report 1976," *Tallgrass Prairie News*, 22 January 1977, Duncan Papers KU.

[78] Minutes of the Sixteenth Meeting of the Board of Councillors of Save the Tallgrass Prairie, Inc., 22 January 1977, Duncan Papers KU.

[79] "Mike" to Senator [James] Pearson, memorandum, 24 March 1977, Duncan Papers KU.

[80] Ibid.; "STP Annual Report 1976." P.L. 94-565 is the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976.

[81] "STP Annual Report 1976."

[82] "Briefing Paper: Tallgrass Prairie Park" (NPS Midwest Regional Office, Omaha, February 1979), 9; "Update on the Issue," *Tallgrass Prairie News,* February 1978, Administrative Papers TPNP. See also Bayard Webster, "Plan to Protect a Piece of the Prairie," *New York Times*, 15 March 1978; Linda M. Billings, "The Tall Grass Prairie: Vanishing Landscape or National Park?" *Sierra Club Bulletin*, April 1977. Wagner, a founding member of STP and active in Republican politics at the state level, appears to have been one of Winn's principal contacts among environmental interest groups. Winn interview, 6 May 1998; Patricia Duncan telephone conversation, 28 August 1998.

[83] H.R. 9120, Winn, 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977; H.R. 9955, Winn and 16 cosponsors, 95th Cong., 1st sess., 1977; "STP Annual Report for 1977," Duncan Papers KU; Winn interview, 6 May 1998.

[84] "STP Annual Report for 1977."

[85] Minutes of the Twenty-first Meeting of the Board of Councillors of Save the Tallgrass Prairie, Inc., 6 May 1978, Duncan Papers KU.

[86] Ibid.

[87] Art Eck, Keyman/MWRO, memorandum to file concerning January 23-24, 1979 trip to Shawnee Mission, Kansas to meet with Elaine Shea, Executive Director of STP, and Larry Wagner, STP Board of Councillors; "Remarks of Ira J. Hutchison, Deputy Director, NPS at the Fifth Annual Tallgrass Prairie Conference, Elmdale, Kansas, September 12, 1978," typescript, TPNP Administrative Files.

[88] Eck memorandum; "Briefing Paper: Tallgrass Prairie Park," February 1979.

[89] Ibid.

[90] Bill W. Dean, Executive Assistant to the Regional Director, to Foster Freeman, External Affairs, memorandum, 2 February 1979; J.L. Dunning, Regional Director, Midwest Region, to Director, memorandum,14 February 1979; Jimmy D. Taylor, Superintendent, Fort Larned NHS, memorandum to file, 16 March 1979, TPNP Administrative Files. Director Whalen is referenced only by title in Dunning's memorandum of 14 February, which reveals the internal lines of communication.

[91] Acting Regional Director, Midwest Region, to Chief of Legislation, WASO, memorandum, 13 April 1979, TPNP Administrative Files.

[92] Ibid.

[93] When Winn was asked how much consultation his office had with the NPS as H.R. 5592 was being drafted, he replied, "Practically none." Rather, it appears as though Winn and his advisors thought they could broaden support for the proposed park if the concept itself was "broadened." Winn interview, 6 May 1998.

[94] H.R. 5592, Winn and Udall, 96th Cong., 1st sess., 1979; Larry Winn, Jr. and Morris K. Udall, open letter to colleagues in the House of Representatives, 25 October 1979, TPNP Administrative Files.

[95] Winn and Udall open letter to colleagues; "New Tallgrass Prairie National Reserve Bill Explained," National Audubon Society news release, 18 October 1978; "The Tallgrass Prairie Reserve: A New Concept," Save the Tallgrass Prairie circular, November 1979; "Tallgrass Prairie Bill Introduced," *Tallgrass Prairie News*, November/December 1979, TPNP Administrative Files.

[96] *Tallgrass Prairie News*, February/March 1979, Duncan Papers TPNP.

[97] Dave Bartel, "Tallgrass Park Plan Introduced," *Wichita Eagle*, 16 October 1979; Ken Peterson, "Bill Introduced Takes New Tack to Prairie Park," *Topeka Daily Capital-Journal*, 16 October 1979. See also John Yemma, "Preserving U.S. Prairie Lands Is A Hot Issue," *Christian Science Monitor*, 17 January 1980.

[98] Joseph A. Lastelic, "Winn, Udall Seek Support For Prairie Reserve Proposal," *Kansas City Times*, 30 October 1979.

[99] Dan Glickman, standard constituent reply concerning H.R. 5592, 30 January 1980, Glickman Papers.

[100] Nancy Kassebaum, constituent replies concerning H.R. 5592, 27 November 1979, 30 November 1979; Bob Dole to Morris Udall, letter, 9 November 1979, Kassebaum Papers. Professor Lloyd Hulbert and other faculty members at Kansas State University recommended this site to The Nature Conservancy. After land purchases were completed, the site was formally named the Konza Prairie Research Natural Area. KSU assumed management responsibility, and Hulbert became the first director.

[101] "Prairie Park on Back Burner," *Wichita Eagle-Beacon*, 14 March 1980.

[102] Dave Bartel, "Tallgrass Park? Not During Reagan's Term," *Wichita Eagle*, 16 April 1980.

[103] Ibid.

[104] "Fight Over Park is Tough as the Hills," *Kansas City Times*, 23 June 1980.

[105] Winn interview, 6 May 1998.

[106] Jack Thompson, "Prairie Park Efforts Shift to Oklahoma," *Kansas City Times*, 12 September 1984; Ron Klataske, Regional Vice President of the National Audubon Society to Oklahoma chapter presidents, vice presidents, conservation chairpersons, education chairpersons, editors and to special citizen conservationists, memorandum, 27 July 1984, Duncan Papers KU.

[107] Douglas Faris, telephone interview with Rebecca Conard, 14 May 1998; John Linahan, telephone interview with Rebecca Conard, 26 May 1998. See Annick Smith, *Big Bluestem: Journey Into the Tall Grass* (Tulsa, OK: Council Oak Books, 1996), Ch. 9, for a discussion of the politics behind creation of the Nature Conservancy's Tallgrass Prairie Preserve in Osage County, Oklahoma.

[108] "Osage Prairie Preserve Task Force Makes Recommendations," *Tallgrass Prairie News* 5:2 (Spring 1985), Duncan Papers KU; Barbara Musfeldt, "Pathway Opens for a Prairie Park in Oklahoma," *Kansas City Star*, 12

June 1985; Dennis Farney, "Oklahomans Debate A New Kind of Park: Vast Prairie Expanse," *Wall Street Journal,* 13 August 1985.

[109] Faris interview, 14 May 1998.

[110] Oklahoma Senators David Boren and Don Nickles and Arkansas Senator Dale Bumpers co-sponsored the Senate bill; Congressman Mickey Edwards introduced legislation in the House, 100th Cong. 1st sess., 1987.

[111] Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, National Parks and Forests of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, *Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve*, 100th Cong., 2nd sess., 26 May 1988. See also Peter A.A. Berle, President, National Audubon Society to William Penn Mott, Jr., Director, NPS, 17 June 1986; Bransford Hunt Shoemake, President, Tallgrass Prairie Preserve Association to Donald Hodel, Secretary of the Interior, 23 July 1986; Osage Preservation Coalition news release, 3 July 1986; "Tallgrass Prairie Preserve, Osage County, Oklahoma," NPS Briefing Data, September 1986; "New Area Report, Study of Alternatives: Tallgrass Prairie Preserve, Osage County, Oklahoma" (NPS: Washington, D.C., 1987), all documents on file at NPS Office of Park Planning.

[112] Michael Martinez, "Prairie Park Loses Support of Oklahoma Backer," *Kansas City Times*, 6 August 1988. After the legislative effort collapsed, The Nature Conservancy stepped in and purchased aboaut 30,000 acres of the Chapman-Barnard Ranch to establish the Tallgrass Prairie Preserve. Since that time, several thousand acres have been added to the preserve.

[113] The entire preserve was designated as Spring Hill Ranch National Historic Landmark on 18 Februrary 1997. Prior to that, the Spring Hill Farm and Stock Ranch House was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1970, and the Lower Fox Creek School was listed on the NRHP in 1974.

[114] According to Ron Klataske, he was contacted in the fall of 1986 by Doug Wilden, a ranch real estate agent in Hutchinson, and notified that the Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch was undergoing management changes and might be for sale. Several months later, in February 1987, Klataske first spoke to Dudley Alexander, vice president of the trust department of Boatman's National Bank in Kansas City, who represented the ranch trustees. Discussions between Klataske and Alexander continued for about a year, during which time they discussed the potential of the property in terms of natural resource conservation and interpretation of the cultural history of ranching in Kansas. Early in 1988, Alexander indicated that he, and presumably the ranch trustees he represented, were willing to extend an option agreement to the Audubon Society. This agreement was finalized in June 1988. Ron Klataske, former West Central Regional Vice President, National Audubon Society, telephone interview with Rebecca Conard, 1 July 1998.

[115] Klataske to Glickman, 27 September 1988, Glickman Papers.

[116] Klataske interview, 1 July 1998.

[117] "Scott" to Dan [Glickman], memorandum concerning tallgrass prairie meeting with delegation and Ron Klataske, December 7, 1988; "discussion draft" bill to establish Flint Hills Prairie National Monument, dated 6 January 1989, Glickman Papers.

[118] Informational letter outlining the historic and cultural features of the ranch and specifying key points for legislation, prepared for attendees of January 5, 1989 meeting and signed by Ron Klataske, Glickman Papers. See also George Stanley, "Flint Hills Ranch to Become Preserve," *Wichita Eagle-Beacon*, 6 January 1989; John Chambers, "Monumental Plans for Sprawling Ranch," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 7 January 1989. These events are also discussed, briefly, in the Klataske interview, 1 July 1998.

[119] Kenneth Scott, "Home on the Range," *The Gazette*, 13 January 1989; "Prairie Monument: This Is the Time; This Is the Place," editorial, *Wichita Eagle-Beacon*, 13 January 1989; "Prairie Park's Time Has Come," editorial, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 23 January 1989. See also FJB, "National Monument Deserves Support," editorial, *Grass and Grain*, 24 January 1989; "Happy Birthday, Kansas," editorial, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 29 January 1989; VLA, "Editorial," *Chase County Leader-News*, 2 February 1989; "Prairie Prelude: Grassroots Support Monument," editorial, *Wichita Eagle-Beacon*, 25 February 1989; "A Monument in the Hills," editorial, *The Gazette*, 2 March 1989.

[120] William Robbins, "Stampede Is Feared on Range," *New York Times*, 8 February 1989; quote from Dirck Steimel, "Park Plan Sparks Disputes on Prairie," *Kansas City Star*, 26 February, 1989; Hank Ernst, "Flint Hills Tug-of-War," *Kansas Farmer*, 18 March 1989.

[121] W. Lee Fowler, interview with Rebecca Conard, 11 May 1998, Cottonwood Falls, Kansas. Fowler is now District Judge, Division 2, 5th Judicial District of Kansas.

[122] W. Lee Fowler to Rep. Dan Glickman, 31 March 1989, with attached draft of "Proposed Legislation for the Creation of the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument prepared by Flint Hills National Monument Committee," Glickman Papers.

[123] "Daring to Hope for Monument," editorial, *Manhattan Mercury*, 5 April 1989; "A Monument on the Prairie," editorial, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 5 April 1989; "Prairie Progress," editorial, *Wichita Eagle-Beacon*, 29 April 1989; "Preserve Prairie," editorial, *Salina Journal*, 21 May 1989; quote from "Range War," *Midway*, Sunday magazine section of the *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 9 April 1989.

[124] "Testimony of Congressman Dan Glickman (KS) on Behalf of the Kansas Congressional Delegation Before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior," 25 April 1989, Glickman Papers.

[125] Charles Magathan, Chairman, Kansas Grassroots Committee to Glickman, [undated letter stamped received] 20 April 1989; Magathan to Glickman, 19 April 1989, Glickman Papers.

[126] "Glickman Notified of Plans for Prairie Park Study by Park Service," media release, 8 September 1989, Glickman Papers.

[127] Nickie Flynn, "Ranch's Fate Cuts Rift Through Hills," *Wichita Eagle*, 1 October 1989. Lee Fowler concurs that the media over-played the controversy, but he also places some of the blame on the local newspaper editor. According to Fowler, "There appeared to be a lot more controversy than there really was if you talked to the people on the street. There is no question in my mind that there were people who were really upset, but at the same time I don't think it was near as bad as it was portrayed in the press. Especially the local paper." Fowler interview, 11 May 1998.

[128] M.E. O'Neal, "Grassroots Association Disrupts Monument Hearing Here," *Chase County Leader-News*, 29 March 1990; "Grassroots Tactics Wound Chase County, Not Monument," *Chase County Leader-News*, 29 March 1990.

[129] Baynes to Glickman, 2 May 1990, Glickman Papers.

[130] "Park Service Will Update Monument Study Progress," *Chase County Leader-News*, 21 June 1990; "Park Service Monument Meeting Tonight," *Chase County Leader-News*, 28 June 1990; "No More Black Eyes for Chase County," *Chase County Leader-News*, 28 June 1990; "Park Service Says Its Parks Don't Have Buffer Zones," *Chase County Leader-News*, 5 July 1990.

[131] "Two-Part Harmony," editorial, *The Emporia Gazette*, 2 July 1990.

[132] "Statement of Congressman Dan Glickman, Flint Hills Prairie National Monument Proposal," media release, 4 April 1991; Michael Bates, "Legislation Planned for 11,000-Acre Flint Hills National Park," AP release, 4 April 1991; Sherry [Ruffing] to Dan [Glickman], memorandum re: Tallgrass Monument Strategy, 8 April 1991; "Z Bar Ranch Study Completed," news release by NPS, Midwest Regional Office, 30 April 1991, Glickman Papers. See also Matthew Schofield, "Glickman Revives Proposal for Tallgrass Prairie Park," *Kansas City Star*, 5 April 1991; Lori Linenberger, "Proposed Park Fuels Conflicts," *Wichita Eagle*, 5 April 1991; "Marnet: Flint Hills National Monument Would be Kansas' No. 1 Attraction," editorial, *Wichita Eagle*, 6 April 1991, reprinted in *Chase County Leaader-News*, 11 April 1991; "Prairie Park? Let's Try Again," editorial, *Manhattan Mercury*, 9 April 1991; "Proposed Flint Hills Monument Pleases National Audubon Society," *Russell Record*, 11 April 1991.

[133] Myrne [Roe] to Dan [Glickman] and other staff members, memorandum re: Z Bar, 30 April 1991, Glickman Papers.

[134] Barry Massey, "Indecision Marks Plans for Z Bar," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 11 May 1991.

[135] H.R. 2369, Glickman, 102nd Cong., 1st sess., 1991. See also "Statement by Congressman Dan Glickman on the Establishment of the Flint Hills Prairie National Monument, 16 May 1991, Glickman Papers; "Visionary: Prairie National Monument Would be a Gift to the Future," editorial, *Wichita Eagle*, 17 May 1991, "Meyers Lends Support to Flint Hills Prairie National Monument," *Chase County Leader-News*, 30 May 1991; "Preserve a Piece of Prairie," editorial, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 3 June 1991.

[136] Sherry [Ruffing] to Dan [Glickman], memorandum re: NPS testimony, 16 July 1991; "Statement of Denis Galvin, Associate Director for Planning and Development, NPS, Department of the Interior, Before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands...," 16 July 1991, Glickman Papers. In interviews with Steve Miller, a member of the 1990-1991 NPS special resource study team, and with Lee Fowler, the consensus is that Galvin was responding to orders that came from within the Bush administration. Within the NPS and among park proponents locally, there was disappointment, but most people viewed this development as only a temporary setback. Stephen Miller, interview with Rebecca Conard, 11 May 1998, Cottonwood Falls, Kansas; Fowler interview, 11 May 1998.

[137] "Statement by Congressman Dan Glickman before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands in support of H.R. 2369," 16 July 1991, Glickman Papers.

[138] Prepared remarks submitted by all these individuals, either on July 16 or August 23, are contained in the Glickman Papers.

[139] Ibid.

[140] "Honorable Pat Roberts, Statement Before the House Interior Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands Regarding the Proposed Prairie National Monument," 16 July 1991, Glickman Papers.

[141] Ibid.

[142] Ibid.

[143] Action alert to "Grassroots Members" [undated but stamped as received 16 July 1991 in Rep. Glickman's office], Glickman Papers.

[144] Klataske to Glickman, 19 July 1991; Klataske to Dole, 19 July 1991, Glickman Papers.

[145] Tom Webb, "Park Service Pulls Rug Out From Under Flint Hills plan," *Wichita Eagle*, 17 July 1991; Tom Webb, "Finger-pointing Follows Setback for Prairie Park," *Wichita Eagle*, 20 July 1991; Brent Mitchell, "Prairie Park May Not Find Home on Range," *Washington Post*, 27 July 1991.

[146] Dana Neal, "County to Study Buying Z Bar ranch," *Topeka Capital-Journal* 20 July 1991; "Chase County Studies Buying Part of Z Bar," *Wichita Eagle*, 3 August 1991; "Wells: Wouldn't Hesitate to Take Z Bar By Eminent Domain," *Chase County Leaders-News*, 8 August 1991.

[147] Angela Herrin and Tom Webb, "Hayden Backs Rejection of Flint Hills Park Plan," *Wichita Eagle*, 25 July 1991.

[148] "Kansas Park Approved by Interior, but Faces State Opposition," *Congressional Monitor* 27:145 (26 September 1991), 4; Jack Thompson, "House Votes to Create Tallgrass Prairie Park," *Kansas City Star*, 16 October 1991.

[149] Press releases, 12 November 1991 and 22 November 1991, Kassebaum Papers; Klataske interview, 1 July 1998; Nancy Kassebaum Baker, former U. S. Senator from Kansas, telephone interview with Rebecca Conard, 29 August 1998.

[150] Kassebaum sought to accomplish two things through this commission: one, to bring opposing groups together to create a set of principles for land conservation and historic preservation/interpretation on the ranch, and two, to find a way to bring the ranch under private ownership, with managment and operation according to this set of principles. Kassebaum interview, 29 August 1998.

[151] Jim Suber, "Ag Groups Announce Z Bar Plan," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 22 November 1991; Steve Painter, "Farm Groups Give a Little on Z Bar," *Wichita Eagle*, 22 November 1991; Jim Suber, "Cattlemen Willing to Discuss Z Bar," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 7 December 1991. See also Mike Horak, interview with Susan Hess, 5 May 1998, Alexandria, Virginia.

[152] "Prairie Park Proposal Brings Sides Closer," *Kansas City Star*, 11 December 1991; "A Deal? Can Agriculture Interest Groups Compromise on Flint Hills Park?, editorial, *Wichita Eagle*, 11 December 1991.

[153] "Vision Statement," facsimile transmission from Kassebaum to Glickman, 16 January 1992, Glickman Papers. See also "Kassebaum Says Agreement Reached on Preserve," *(Pittsburg) Morning Sun*, 18 January 1992; "Groups Agree to Form Prairie Foundation," *Fort Scott Tribune*, 17 January 1992; "Positive News About Z Bar" (editorial); *Manhattan Mercury*, 30 January 1992; "Prairie Pact," editorial, *Hutchinson News*, 25 January 1992; "First Step," editorial, *Wichita Eagle*, 25 January 1992.

[154] Press releases, Sen. Nancy Landon Kassebaum, 4 March 1992 and 14 April 1992, Kassebaum Papers. See also "Fowler is Cottonwood Falls Choice for Monument Foundation," *Chase County Leader-News* 20 February 1992; "Flint Hills Park Has Future on the Line With Trustees," editorial, *Chase County Leader-News* 12 March 1992.

[155] Fowler interview, 11 May 1998; Horak interview, 5 May 1998; Tom Webb, "Progress Coming Slow for Prairie Preserve," *Wichita Eagle*, 29 November 1992; "Slow going: Inaction Threatens Park in Flint Hills," editorial, *Wichita Eagle*, 6 December 1992.

[156] "Glickman Gives Z Bar Commission A Push," *Chase County Leaders-News*, 3 December 1992.

[157] Tom Webb, "Prairie Park Gets Administration OK," *Wichita Eagle*, 4 May 1993; "Babbitt Backs Park on Prairie," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 5 May 1993.

[158] Mike Horak to Lee Fowler, Bill Kassebaum, and John Oswald, memorandum re: Z-Bar Ranch, 24 May 1993, TPNP Administrative Files.

[159] "Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch, Inc. Vision Statement and Development Plan, adopted by Board of Trustees, 9 June 1993," TPNP Administrative Files.

[160] Horak interview, 5 May 1998; Fowler interview, 11 May 1998. See also "Z Bar Future Uncertain," editorial, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 7 January 1994; Tom Webb, "Attempt to Buy Z Bar Fails," headline story, *Wichita Eagle*, 6 January 1994; Stephen Martino, "Z Bar Board Rejects Bank's Ranch Offer," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 6 January 1994. See also "Spring Hill/Z Bar Directors Reject Conditions Placed on Purchase of Chase County Ranch," press release, Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch, Inc., 5 January 1994 Glickman Papers; "Kassebaum Disappointed that Bank is Unwilling to Accept Offer on Z Bar Ranch," press release, Sen. Nancy Landon Kassebaum, 5 January 1994, Kassebaum Papers and Glickman Papers.

[161] Sen. Nancy Kassebaum, "Z Bar Never Was for Sale," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 9 January 1994. This, too, was a critical turning point; however, Dudley Alexander, who appears to have been the key player in this episode, was not interviewed. Information about what transpired was learned second-hand from others who were not present at discussions between Alexander and representatives from Spring Hill Z Bar Ranch, Inc. According to Ron Klataske, the discussions were not cordial in tone, and Alexander had strong personal reservations about the motives of some members of the new ranch foundation, which, in actuality, was a fragile coalition at that point. Additionally, Alexander felt that the property was worth the asking price and that it was inappropriate for the foundation to offer less. From Kassebaum's perspective, Alexander, who sat in on the foundation's board meetings, was well aware of where the entity was headed and might have been more forthcoming with the group earlier in the process. In any event, everyone took the decision in stride because by that time there was enough commitment from both sides to keep working toward resolution. Klataske interview, 1 July 1998; Kassebaum interview, 29 August 1998.

[162] Fowler interview, 11 May 1998.

[163] Kassebaum interview, 29 August 1998.

[164] Paul Pritchard, interview with Rebecca Conard, 4 May 1998, Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, Strong City, Kansas; Laura Loomis, interview with Susan Hess, 6 May 1998, Washington, D.C.; Klataske interview, 1 July 1998. According to Pritchard, Boatman's put pressure on him to raise the money quickly because it had another offer "on the table." Pritchard ended up borrowing part of the money from the NPCA and the remainder from a commercial bank. Loomis speculates that the bank's other offer came from Ed Bass, who subsequently donated $1 million, which NPT applied to the purchase, and negotiated a 35-year cattle-grazing lease on the ranch. Other individuals declined to comment about the other purchase offer tendered to Boatman's in 1994.

[165] Paul Pritchard, NPT Chairman to National Park Trust Board, Members, Other Interested Parties, confidential memorandum re: Tallgrass Prairie "Talking Points," 28 February 1994, Glickman Papers.

[166] "Glickman Optimistic About Prospects for Flint Hills Prairie Preserve," media release, 3 March 1994; "National Park Trust Gets Option to Buy Z Bar Ranch," AP news story, 4 March 1994, Glickman Papers; see also "Kassebaum Sees Initiative as Opportunity to Protect the Z Bar Ranch," press release Sen. Nancy Kassebaum, 3 March 1994, Kassebaum Papers. Subsequent news stories stated that NPT had agreed to pay $4.79 million for the ranch; see Maria S. Fisher, "Babbitt Says Plans for Z-Bar Still Developing," *Great Bend Tribune*, 29 April 1994, and Suzanne Perez Tobias, "National Park Trust Buys Z Bar Ranch," *Wichita Eagle*, 4 June 1994.

[167] Briefing Paper for Secretary Babbitt, 19 April 1994, TPNP Administrative Files; Maria S. Fisher, "Babbitt Says Plans for Z Bar Still Developing," *Great Bend Tribune*, 29 April 1994.

[168] Tobias, "National Park Trust Buys Z Bar Ranch," Matthew Schofield, "Deal Is Struck for Z Bar Ranch to Become a Park," *Kansas City Star*, 4 June 1994.

[169] Pritchard interview, 4 May 1998; Horak interview, 5 May 1998; Loomis interview, 6 May 1998; Kassebaum interview, 29 August 1998.

[170] H.R. 5000 and S. 2412, 103rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1994.

[171] "Z Bar Bills Introduced in Congress," *Wichita Eagle*, 21 August 1994; Curt Anderson, "Delegation United Behind Z Bar Ranch Legislation," *(Pittsburg) Morning Sun*, 20 August 1994.

[172] Tom Webb, "Another Delay in Z Bar Saga," *Wichita Eagle*, 29 September 1994; Jake Thompson, "It May Be Now or Never for a Prairie Park," *Kansas City Star*, 29 January 1995.

[173] The National Park Trust and the National Park and Conservation Association had a complementary relationship. NPT made the actual purchase of property, incurred the bank mortgage, and assumed management of the property. NPCA helped underwrite the project, assisted with the legislative effort, and helped fund raise.

[174] Loomis interview, 6 May 1998; Bruce Craig, interview with Susan Hess, 4 May 1998, Harpers Ferry. See also "Texan Pays $2 Million for Grazing Rights," *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 10 March 1995.

[175] Barbara Zurhellen, preserve director and former director of interpretation, TPNP, interview with Rebecca Conard, 4 May 1998, Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, Strong City, Kansas. Paul Pritchard, Laura Loomis, and Bruce Craig also gave Zurhellen much of the credit for helping to ease tension locally.

[176] Horak interview, 5 May 1998; Loomis interview, 6 May 1998; Craig interview, 4 May 1998; Linda Potter, interview with Susan Hess, 5 May 1998, Washington, D.C.

[177] S. 695 and H.R. 1449, 104th Cong., 1st sess., 1995. See also "Bill Aims to Limit U.S. Role in Prairie Park," *Kansas City Star*, 7 April 1995.

[178] Kassebaum interview, 29 August 1998.

[179] Horak interview, 5 May 1998; "Senate Adds Prairie Park Proposal to Bill," *Kansas City Star*, 26 March 1996; "Z Bar Park Stalls as Senate Sets Bill Aside," *Wichita Eagle*, 28 March 1996.

[180] Horak interview, 5 May 1998. See also Tom Webb, "Tallgrass Prairie Park Clears Senate Hurdle," *Wichita Eagle*, 2 May 1996; "Z Bar Bill Passes Senate," *Chase County Leader-News*, 9 May 1996; "Parks Bill Approved by House," *Kansas City Star*, 29 September 1996; Evan Katz, "Senate Votes to Preserve Kansas Prairie," headline story, *Topeka Capital-Journal*, 4 October 1996.

[181] "Prairie Preserve Becomes Reality," *Kansas City Star*, 13 November 1996.

[182] Section 1007 (b), Title X, P.L. 104-333; Charter, Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve Advisory Committee, 22 September 1997. Terms of the Advisory Committee vary between three to five years, and committee members can be repainted. There is no statutory termination date for the committee.

[183] Horak interview, 5 May 1998.

[184] John Sowl, NPS Midwest Support Office, telephone interview with Rebecca Conard, 14 May 1998.

[185] Kassebaum interview, 29 August 1998.