

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Chairman, we have worked very closely with the State Department and the National Capital Planning Commission in the development of this general plan for use of the property, but in all candor I must say to you that we regard this, and I hope I do not offend my colleagues from the National Capital Planning Commission, but this is merely a concept in our view. This has not been designed and refined into a detailed plan, for example that you could use as a basis for bidding and until our counsel advised me yesterday that you wanted our testimony we really had done no cost estimating. We have put in some figures.

Mr. GRAY. Well frankly, Mr. Moody, the thing that concerned the chair was section 6. This was the so-called open end authorization. It says, it is hereby to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this act. I do not need to remind you of the temperament of Congress and the country to cut back on expenditures. We feel this proposal does have merit. It was represented to us by the Department of State as being a bill that would not cost any money since the Government owns the property and since the General Services Administration indicated that most of the buildings at least presently on this tract would be torn down, whether or not this international center went there and so we wanted to try to get from you and the GSA some estimate of a ceiling to put in here, in order to eliminate this open end authorization.

Yesterday, Ambassador Linowitz testified that he felt that all of these improvements could be made for approximately \$250,000 which would be a \$20 or \$30 million OSA building and 16 chancery complexes would be a small amount of investment on the part of the Federal Government to get that kind of improvement in the Nation's Capital.

This is a very small amount and we, since it was an estimate, wanted to try to get more precise estimates from you and try to get some idea as to whether or not this figure was within the ball park.

Mr. MOODY. Let me say, Mr. Chairman, what we did. We have taken this concept and attempted to price it out, based on our own experience in these kind of developments. I have to say that these are subject to considerable change as the plan is actually designed and refined. To illustrate, this calls as you can see for quite a number of different chanceries.

Mr. GRAY. Sixteen was the maximum number to be located in that area and, of course, you see the proposed OAS building itself, the ground being for the chanceries.

Mr. MOODY. The road layout, for example, and the storm sewers incident to the road layout would vary considerably if all of them turned out to be large chanceries and you had larger tracts as distinguished from if there are a number of small chanceries in there, you would have a more extensive roadwork. This would affect considerably your cost estimates.

It is my understanding that the \$250,000 figure that the Ambassador talked about yesterday also did not include the cost of demolition of the existing improvements.

Mr. GRAY. This is correct and when I raised that point it was stated by NCPC I believe that in their opinion most of these buildings would be torn down anyway.

Mr. MOODY. That is right, they would have to be demolished.