

Another point that bothered you was the fact that a sewage outflow occurred at the foot of Royal Street and by lopping off a tiny bit of the application, you could get that sewer extended through, so that the crud, when it is poured out, is not poured out on these new high-rise apartments but on the general public just past them. Well, thanks very much for that, but I wasn't particularly interested in that, either.

What I was and am interested in was your very cogently made assertion that here you have a future national park in the Capital area at Jones Point. If the Corps of Engineers is going to allow a 9-acre fill here, two things are going to happen when the harassed citizen, looking for a little bit of nature, comes down to Jones Point Park on a Sunday: First, instead of looking down the broad sweep of the Potomac where George Washington once looked, he is going to be looking at some high-rise apartments built by a fast-buck artist who managed to con the Corps of Engineers into issuing that permit. That obviously is not a very good way to fix up the landscape and the vista from the national park.

Secondly, you made a very cogent objection that the tidal Potomac, silt laden as it is, could well cause a destructive fill in the Hunting Bay estuary if this 9-acre fill is allowed to be made. I now come to my question:

It is a fact, is it not, that the permit issued by the Corps of Engineers on May 29, 1968, offends against both of those reasons for the National Park Service's objection to any fill there, and that the mere fact that you have settled the question of riparian rights, and settled the question of the dumping of raw pollution, while nice, does not make any meaningful contact with the main reasons for the National Park Service's objection?

Mr. HARTZOG. Sir, you pose a very difficult question and I think basically it is a question of judgment. I think the record, as you made it this morning, the memoranda and the file, is replete with the fact that our judgment is that it does affect the park and recreational values. You can get to Jones Point, and I am told by our people who have projected this that at that point you would simply not see all of these buildings, if they were built high rise as the Towers that are there now, but only one part of one building. Now, of course, as a park man—

Mr. REUSS. From where?

Mr. HARTZOG. From Jones Point.

Mr. REUSS. That is true, but irrelevant. I was not talking about Jones Point, where admittedly—particularly if you got on the lee side of the lighthouse, in which you couldn't see a thing—you would see only one building. But how about the nature walk all along the southern lip of the proposed Jones Point Park? I have walked that site of the nature walk and I can assure you that the erection of a high-rise apartment on that 9-acre land fill would squarely block the view across the Hunting Creek estuary. Is that not so?

Mr. HARTZOG. I think that is a fair statement. I would like for Mr. Horne to comment on this, particularly the second part of your observation about that sedimentation there, making that whole area fast land.

Mr. REUSS. I did not suggest that. I simply suggested that there was a possibility that if you put a thumb, sticking out there—

Mr. HARTZOG. Right; that it will silt in.