

Mr. REUSS. Was he familiar with Dr. Uhler's findings and reports?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. Yes; he was.

Mr. REUSS. In your judgment those findings and reports did, in fact, rely on factual evidence and did not use subjective judgment considerations, is that not so?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. REUSS. Thank you.

Mr. REUSS. You spoke earlier of the alleged upgrading by the Washington office of the initial report and your testimony was, I believe, there was, in fact, no upgrading, that there was no Atlanta region report that had to be upgraded. Is that not so?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. REUSS. In other words, no one in the Fish and Wildlife Service at any level ever did any upgrading of a lower level report because the reports from the lowest level that did report were all to the effect that this 9-acre fill was not in the public interest, was that not so?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. That is correct.

Mr. REUSS. I now call your attention to the memorandum of April 8, 1968, by Assistant Secretary Cain, which is part of the record, in which Secretary Cain says:

I would like to clarify my role, which has not been an enviable one. I was told by BSFW—

Which is the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—

that the original field report on the area under discussion was in weak opposition to the permit and that the fish and wildlife values claimed for the area were "upgraded" here in Washington.

Did you tell Assistant Secretary Cain that the original field report was in weak opposition to the permit and that it had been upgraded in Washington?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. No; I did not.

Mr. REUSS. That statement in Secretary Cain's memorandum is not in accord with the facts, is it?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. No; it is not.

Mr. REUSS. And you don't know who told them that?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I do not know who told him that, but I think what Secretary Cain was actually told was that the area was of so little importance that the regional office had not intended originally to make a study until they were directed to do so by the Washington office and I think that is possibly the upgrading that Secretary Cain referred to. There was not any upgrading of values so far as I know, and I have made extensive inquiries among my staff on this point.

Mr. REUSS. In your memorandum of April 9, as Chief of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, to Secretary Cain, you said this:

Although the present permit application of the Howard P. Hoffman Associates, Inc., would result in significantly less fill than the original 1964 application, the effects on waterfowl use of the area would not materially change. The diversity of the wetland habitat provided by Dyke Marsh and Hunting Creek would be altered by the project and its resultant development to the detriment of waterfowl and other aquatic birds.

Do you stand by that statement?

Dr. GOTTSCHALK. I stand by that statement. I think I should comment about Dyke Marsh. We had early apprehensions that the placement of the fill itself might result in increased sedimentation in the