

taken and changed, abandoned or altered, and reviewed the record on it as carefully as I could. I reviewed the Uhler report. I reviewed the report of the Regional Director. And I determined to consult with Secretary Cain, with Director Gottschalk, and in Director Hartzog's absence, with the most knowledgeable member of the Park Service staff in this area, Mr. Robert Horne. I had never visited this area before. I am not a local resident of long duration.

I determined that I should make a visit to the area. I took Mr. Horne from the Park Service with me and Mr. Gottschalk, Director of Fish and Wildlife, and Mr. Mangan accompanied me also. I inspected the area, the whole area, I think, that is immediately affected.

We visited the bulkheaded area. We visited the Jones Point Park site, the Bellehaven picnic ground area adjacent to the George Washington Parkway, and the northern edge of Dyke Marsh. And we spent a good deal of time in observing and discussing the area, and what possible impact this application might have.

This generally was the method and the extent of my review. But I would like, if I could, to just observe briefly, to highlight the factors that I consider to be relevant to the determination that was made.

First, we might take a look at the recreation values. Much has been said here, at least at the June 24 hearing, about the position taken by the Park Service on the question of park land or recreation values in the area. I think it might be gathered from the questioning and the discussion that a consistent and longstanding objection to the permit had been raised by the Park Service on that ground. I would like to urge that this is simply not the case; that until Director Hartzog's memorandum of April 4, which was substantially contemporaneous with my very earliest awareness of the case, my first awareness, the record so far as I can ascertain shows that the National Park Service concern was restricted to one issue, and that was infringement on the riparian property interest of the United States in the Jones Point Park site. No recreational values were claimed or asserted, as nearly as I can ascertain, as being affected by the project.

And Director Hartzog's testimony on June 24 indicates that his concerns on these grounds were satisfied. As to the property rights issue, we have not retreated at all, Mr. Chairman. In fact, my response to the corps delineated that issue in even sharper focus than I thought it had previously been expressed.

Director Hartzog has stated that that objection has been overcome by eliminating a further portion of the fill area, which is the little pie-shaped tip at the edge. And so, in effect, I would suggest that our view on Park Service values, so far as they are related certainly to riparian rights, have clearly prevailed.

When I visited Jones Point we had available the site development plans for that park.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Secretary, when you say that your views on the riparian rights have prevailed, have they in fact—have you an agreement recognizing your rights to the area that was cut out and to the other area which would be under the line generally agreed to by your Department?

Mr. BLACK. Well, the permit at issue—the permit involved now is restricted to an area which limits—

Mr. Moss. I know, but there are two other permits pending.