

(In addition, the Department of the Interior forwarded the following figures and comments, furnished by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration:)

FWPCA REVIEWS OF APPLICATIONS TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS FOR DREDGING PERMITS

	Fiscal year 1968 ¹	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1966 ²	Fiscal year 1965 ²	Fiscal year 1964 ²
1. Number of applications reviewed per year over the past 5 years.....	2,456	919	569	543	505
(a) Reviewed at field level.....	2,452	919	569	543	505
(b) Referred to headquarters.....	4				
2. Number of applications not commented upon.....	1,407	857	571	517	480
3. Number of applications receiving only desk or office review.....	2,417	909	564	538	500
4. Number of applications receiving field investigation.....	39	10	5	5	5

¹ Applications reviewed after Army-Interior memorandum understanding, July 13, 1967
² Records not complete prior to January 1967 in most regions.

As indicated by footnote 2 of the table, our records prior to January 1967 are generally incomplete or nonexistent. The July 13, 1967, Army-Interior memorandum of understanding did strengthen our position in the review of dredging permits. Our review and program procedures were also changed and strengthened by Corps of Engineers Circular 1145-2-2 of April 17, 1967, which requires compliance with conditions for instructions issued by FWPCA in connection with dredging permits. Corps of Engineers Regulation 1145-2-303 of March 18, 1968, also emphasizes the importance of complying with Executive Order 11288.

(Subcommittee note:—Eng. Circ. 1145-2-2 of Apr. 17, 1967, stated that its expiration date was Feb. 15, 1968. Its subject matter appears to be covered in Eng. Reg. 1145-2-303 of Mar. 18, 1968.)

Mr. BLACK. We have not yet operated under the memorandum of understanding for a full year.

Dr. CAIN. Almost.

Mr. BLACK. Almost a year.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Let me ask one final question: Did you review Director Hartzog's letter before you reached your decision? The letter I am referring to is the one he wrote to Dr. Cain.

Mr. BLACK. Which one?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. April 4.

Mr. BLACK. April 4? Yes, I read his letter.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Now, he points out, and he testified here quite persuasively, that the granting of this permit in April of 1968 was inconsistent with the goals of the Department of Interior with respect to the estuarine legislation in the Potomac River. Do you concur with that, Mr. Black?

Mr. BLACK. Did you assert that it was——

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Let me read to you from that letter.

Mr. BLACK. Or did he raise the question?

Mr. McCLOSKEY. An important principle, that is the preservation of our fast disappearing natural environment, which you have creatively defended with great honor and high distinction would appear to me to be involved here.

The bills before Congress to preserve estuarine areas, and the Potomac River study as well, highlight the need to preserve the natural environment along the Potomac estuary. Moreover, further studies of the area are being recommended.