

Mr. McCLOSKEY. This procedure that you stated against your people testifying in public hearings—is that set out in writing in a departmental memorandum anywhere?

Mr. HARTZOG. No, I don't recall that it is. It is a part of our operating procedure with our regional directors when they get the notice of these hearings, that they ascertain if there is any information that the chief scientist or our Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation has on this subject that is not available at the local level, and a position is taken by our professional staff on that particular issue. That is a matter of public record.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Yes.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. As I understand it, you relay the views and the opinions of the National Park Service and when they have public hearings I assume that those views are laid out and are available to the people.

Mr. HARTZOG. That is right, sir. Sometimes they are presented by a superintendent, sometimes by a regional director, sometimes they are presented by one of our professional staff. It just depends on who is available at that time.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I think you said you would in fact be shocked if those views weren't made available at that time.

Mr. HARTZOG. That is right. In other words, I think this is what you have your professional staff do, to tell you what this is.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Now, in 1964 you had felt that the fill would adversely affect the recreational and conservational value of this area; is that correct?

Mr. HARTZOG. That is correct.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Did the Cain memorandum of October 10, 1967, given at the hearings then, represent your views:

We have concluded that the granting of the applications would not significantly affect recreation or conservation values in the Hunting Creek area.

Mr. HARTZOG. Sir, I think the memorandum speaks for itself.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I am asking you about February, before this little $\frac{3}{4}$ -acre, pie-shaped area was taken out, whether this Cain statement represented your views in February, when the corps hearing was held:

We have concluded that the granting of the applications would not significantly affect recreation or conservation values in the Hunting Creek area.

Did that represent your best professional judgment as of February?

Mr. HARTZOG. It did not.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Thank you.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Reuss?

Mr. REUSS. Director Hartzog, I just want to be absolutely clear on the nature of the Park Service's views here.

As I gather it, prior to the removal of the little $\frac{3}{4}$ -acre slice from the 9-acre application—which application was the subject of the permit granted by the Corps of Engineers on May 29, 1968—the National Park Service had four basic objections to the fill proposal:

One, it would interfere with the National Park Service's riparian rights.

Two, because sewage discharge from the outfall on South Royal Street, Alexandria, would discharge into the area lying between the