

eral shoreline than the fill area would be. So from the greater part of the Jones Point Park and the most significant item of interest, which is the historic lighthouse, that portion of the fill area to be developed by structures would not be visible.

Mr. Moss. Were you familiar with this Holland engineering brochure of 1966, which is approximately 2 years after the 1964 cutback in the application?

Mr. BLACK. I don't believe so.

Mr. Moss. This is their projected development for the entire 36 acres.

Mr. BLACK. I haven't seen that picture.

Mr. Moss. And it goes on to describe the fact that it is going to be chewed off in three separate applications. There is parcel No. 1, parcel No. 2, and parcel No. 3. And if you would like to look at it, I would be very happy to present it to you.

Mr. BLACK. I am not sure of what is in that particular document. But the Park Service representative who accompanied us on this visit a very short time ago, subsequent to the preparation of that document, indicated that the current plans would provide for substantial maintenance of the vegetation and leafy growth at that area.

Mr. Moss. Was there any reversal of the—

Mr. BLACK. These are the plans of the apartment developers—the fill plans. I thought you were referring to the Department's Jones Point plans. The developers' plan goes out 36 acres, Mr. Chairman. You may have been misled by looking at it. We are talking about a 9-acre piece here.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Secretary, I am not misled at all. My point is that this is but the first bite. And the precedent, Hunting Towers' existence, has been cited now on about three occasions as justification for this second site. And if we get development on the second site, then I think it will be justification for a third and fourth high-rise development in the area.

Mr. BLACK. I can only disagree with you, Mr. Chairman, on legal grounds. And again, I can't contribute much by arguing the question of riparian rights at this point. I am trying to explain the basis upon which I exercised the decision. We talked originally in terms of 36 acres. We are now talking about 9. And our lawyers assured us that we have an entirely defensible position against acquisition of the remainder.

Mr. Moss. Mr. Secretary, I am not questioning that. My question was, were you familiar with the plans of the joint developers which were produced in January 1966 following their modified application of 1964, which I believe occurred in June or July of 1964?

Mr. BLACK. I don't know that I was specifically familiar with the chronology or the development. I knew that originally we had been talking about a 36-acre wedge that extended far out into the river.

Mr. Moss. That still is not responsive to my question. You had two things before you. You had the modified application of 1964, which was the one upon which action was being urgently pursued. But in arriving at a decision on that I asked the further question as to whether or not you were familiar with these plans.

Mr. BLACK. No, sir, I was not familiar with these plans.

Mr. Moss. That is all I asked.