

his technical expertise one iota. I think it would certainly be presumptuous of me to do so. I question simply the conclusion that is drawn from this report covering a large area, particularly the Dyke Marsh area, which is valuable to waterfowl. The conclusion is drawn from that that, therefore, there should not be a fill at the Hunting Creek site, even a small fill.

Mr. Moss. From the testimony of Dr. Uhler of yesterday:

The Hunting Creek area is one, in my opinion, of the key areas for preserving a local opportunity to view diving duck activity in the Washington region. The area immediately below Hunting Creek, and including Hunting Creek, has been recognized as an important area in connection with the establishment of the George Washington Memorial National Parkway.

The Dyke area still supplies a moderate amount of good tidal marsh. But that is at this moment rapidly being whittled away by dredging operations, and actually there is just a token remnant of the original marsh today.

The Hunting Creek Cove, which lies at the head of the Dyke Marshes, is an integral part of the very complex and useful feeding grounds. It supplies the shallow open-water zone that is particularly of great importance to the diving species, whereas the marsh along the Dyke Overlook has attracted more of the shoal-water species of ducks; species like the black duck, the mallard, the pintail, and at times in the early season, the bluewing teal, the wood duck, and others.

Without the companion shallow marshy zones and the shallow, open waters (I refer to waters less than 5 feet in depth) in which light penetration is sufficient for diving ducks to see their feed—the area would be of limited value. Most of Hunting Creek Cove is less than 5 feet in depth, and much of it is less than 3 feet in depth.

He seemed in his testimony yesterday to place great emphasis on the importance of the Hunting Creek Cove, the Hunting Creek area.

Mr. BLACK. I didn't hear his testimony.

Mr. Moss. Did you consult with him?

Mr. BLACK. No, sir; I have consulted with him, yes, but I haven't consulted with him since these hearings commenced.

Mr. Moss. Did you consult with him before reversing the departmental position?

Mr. BLACK. I read his report and discussed it with his superior.

Mr. Moss. But not with him?

Mr. BLACK. No, sir.

Mr. Moss. Did his superior, Dr. Gottschalk, at any time agree that the judgments of Dr. Uhler and his Bureau of Sport Fisheries were founded on subjective judgment considerations rather than any factual evidence which would support valid objection by this Department?

Mr. BLACK. I don't know if we specifically argued about Dr. Uhler's report. I discussed the subject matter of Dr. Uhler's report with him. And he indicated in so many words that his concern was largely subjective.

Mr. Moss. In his testimony yesterday he denied that it was subjective, and he denied that Dr. Uhler's was subjective. In fact, he expressed quite emphatically and specifically, in response to questions from Congressman Reuss, and I believe Congressman Vander Jagt and myself, a contrary conviction; namely, that the studies were not subjective.

Mr. BLACK. Not the studies.

Mr. Moss. The judgments were not subjective.

Mr. BLACK. This may become a matter of argument on semantics, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Moss. It is very important.