

Mr. VANDER JAGT. One final question.

Dr. CAIN. But I might say that I admire General Woodbury very highly. And I might add gratuitously, because the Corps of Engineers is discussed one way or the other quite a bit, that in the something over 3 years that I have worked with General Woodbury, and now with General Noble in several connections, I have the personal strong belief that he and his immediate people are very desirous of accommodating the conservation interests—very desirous. So, I regret that I embarrassed General Woodbury.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I think that is correct, Dr. Cain. And it is difficult for him to accommodate the conservation interests when he is misled into believing that there are no strong conservation objections on a decision that he has to make, when in fact, there are.

I have one final question. Experts have made their inspection and given a decision as to whether this would adversely affect those conservational interests. Do you believe that their opinion is based on factual evidence which would in any way support a valid objection?

Dr. CAIN. There are possibly two aspects to an answer to that. One is that I think that any wetlands that are usable by wildfowl, particularly in or near large cities, should be preserved if it is reasonable to do so. I state that as a general proposition. And I think that there are sufficient values in the region so that a person who is considering only these values could feel very strongly about the possible loss even of nine and a half acres. I understand this thoroughly.

The other aspect of an answer to your question, if I understand it, is that the actual supporting data with respect to this particular part of that region, or that area, are really pretty thin. And if you look at the statistical data there are presented on the basis of 5 years, I guess, of Audubon Christmas counts, or something like that, that there is no doubt that this general area is used in the winter sometimes by large numbers of ducks. But these statistics also have a tremendous range of variation, and if one were to handle them in a statistical way, the meaning would not be as great as that which is ascribed to it.

Furthermore, there is nothing in these data that pinpoint or make clear the damage which the filling of these few acres would have with respect to the region as a whole that we are talking about.

So one has two problems. One has first a statistical problem with respect to birds—and I have freely granted that lots of ducks, particularly diving ducks, do find this general area useful in the winter, there is no denial of this—but there is not any evidence that I understand as to how the reduction of, say, nine and a half acres, or 30, or this given number, whichever way we are talking about in a general way, would have on the Dyke Marsh, there is no evidence of it. There is an assumption, and it is a reasonable one, that there could be an adverse effect.

So we have got both the statistical problem of how observations are presented when they are based on extremely variable data, and there is a question of area to which they apply.

And so, as I have said before, my feeling is that this is not a very significant area.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. I can appreciate that there are many considerations that must be made. And again, just so that the record is clear, I gather from what you have told us that you must take into considera-