

Mr. REUSS. And does not a fill of 9 acres in an estuarine area interfere with the preservation of estuarine areas?

Mr. HARTZOG. Well, sir—

Mr. REUSS. Would you just answer yes or no?

Mr. HARTZOG. I cannot answer yes or no, and I beg your pardon and I am sorry, because this is not in my area of competence and not in my area of responsibility. I am not an authority on estuaries, and furthermore, while the national park system has many splendid estuarine areas, many years ago we made a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries to advise us with respect to their management because we lack sufficient competence in this area.

I simply raised this as a factor I thought was in the frame of reference. That is all, I did not attempt to make any judgment on it. That is why as a layman I may speculate with you as to what my own personal judgment may be on it, but I am here to tell you professionally what I know and I professionally know nothing about it.

Mr. REUSS. Is it not a fact that in your memorandum of April 4 you set forth reference to the destructive nature of high-rise projects along the Potomac?

Mr. HARTZOG. Yes, sir; I certainly did, and I subscribe to that completely.

Mr. REUSS. Leaving aside any memoranda you may have written?

Mr. HARTZOG. Yes, sir.

Mr. REUSS. But just looking at the situation of today, this 24th day of June 1968, is it not a fact that the proposed Jones Point National Park would be less desirable if its waterfront area on the Hunting Creek estuary were confronted by this 9-acre fill and the erection of high-rise apartments on it?

Mr. HARTZOG. That is my judgment; yes, sir.

Mr. REUSS. Is it not further your judgment that the dangers of sedimentation within the area enclosed by the thumb caused by the fill would be increased by the making of the fill, and that increase in sedimentation might have an adverse effect on the recreational potential of the Jones Point Park?

Mr. HARTZOG. As we indicated earlier, I think this is a question that is very difficult to answer precisely, but that would seem to be the presumption of the evidence; yes, sir.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCloskey. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JONES. Yes, Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. McCloskey. Mr. Hartzog, you discussed your memorandum of April 4. On April 8, Dr. Cain sent a directive to you stating that his earlier decision in effect was "based on political considerations" and he would be happy to reverse himself if the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife made a strong case "and if the National Park Service can give me evidence of the important values." His memorandum is dated April 8.

Two days later, Dr. Cain had apparently been convinced he should reverse himself. Did you give him evidence of the important values between the 8th and 10th of April?

Mr. HARTZOG. In cooperation with the Director of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, we helped prepare the memorandum of April 9 to Dr. Cain, and I assume that your file must have a copy of that memorandum. I call your attention to it.