

Mr. Moss. But it merely placed it in a higher category. Would you explain the nature of that higher category?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I will put it this way. Many of the Corps of Engineers projects will have very little effect on fish and wildlife and are of no real significance from the standpoint of conservation. But in this case, we felt that the project was of sufficient importance that it should be scheduled for study. Therefore, it was taken from a category in which it would not have been studied and was put in a higher category, in which category it would be given a field study and a report.

Mr. Moss. In other words, the upgrading previously referred to occurred at the time the original study was ordered.

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. Moss. After that original study was made, nothing else happened insofar as your office, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is concerned.

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. With respect to the report and the conclusions of the report, that is quite correct.

Mr. Moss. The findings remained valid, the values were proper, and no change of any character was made.

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. Moss. So the upgrading was prior to the actual filing of the report?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. Moss. I am very much interested in the failure of the Department to appear at the public hearing in Alexandria, Va.

You have explained that a discussion was held, and that the conclusion was reached that because of a change in the departmental position, it would not be necessary or desirable—which of those words would you use to characterize?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I would use both of them in this case with respect to Dr. Uhler's testimony.

Mr. Moss. It would be neither necessary nor desirable for the Department to make an official appearance and participate in the hearing.

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Only with respect to Dr. Uhler. I want to make that clear. I want to make it clear that those terms apply only to the appearance of Dr. Uhler.

Mr. Moss. The departmental position finally became one of non-participation, nonappearance, nonattendance, however it might be characterized; is that correct?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. Moss. Here we have an issue where among many conservation groups strong feelings were engendered as a result of this threatened fill, and your own biologist felt that it would be a major error to approve, and yet with the Department changing its position, but not its position paper—not its underlying work—it was not felt necessary to inform the public or the community of Alexandria as to the reasons for that change of position; is that correct? It was not felt either necessary or desirable?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I would not apply either of those terms to that particular decision. I am not fully capable of responding to it because the decision was made at the secretarial level and not within the Bureau.