

—Areas of unique natural beauty, historical and scientific interest. *Well-being of people* is stated as the overriding determinant in considering the best use of water and related land resources:

Hardship and basic needs of particular groups within the general public shall be of concern, but care shall be taken to avoid resource use and development for the benefit of a few or the disadvantage of many. In particular, policy requirements and guides established by the Congress and aimed at assuring that the use of natural resources, including water resources, safeguards the interests of all of our people shall be observed.

Planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, insofar as practicable shall be comprehensive and consider the needs and possibilities for all significant resource uses and purposes:

All relevant means (including nonstructural as well as structural measures) singly, or in combination, or in alternative combinations reflecting different basic choice patterns for providing such uses and purposes—

shall be considered.

Formulation and evaluation of plans, document states, “shall normally be based on the expectation of an expanding economy.” But plans or alternative plans are to be formulated to permit timely application of standards appropriate to conditions of less than “full employment” nationally, and chronic and persistent unemployment or underemployment in designated areas:

The prices used for project evaluation should reflect the exchange values expected to prevail at the time costs are incurred and benefits accrued. Estimates of initial project costs should be based upon price relationships prevailing at the time of analysis. Estimates of benefits and deferred costs should be made on the basis of projected normal price relationships expected with a stabilized general price level and under relatively full employment conditions for the economy.

All plans shall be formulated with due regard to all pertinent benefits and costs, both tangible (i.e., capable of expression in monetary terms) and intangible (i.e., not capable of expression in monetary terms).

All viewpoints—national, regional, State, and local—shall be fully considered and taken into account in planning resource use and development.

Significant departures from a national point of view, required to accomplish regional, State, or local objectives, are to be set forth in planning reports.

When secondary benefits, as distinct from primary benefits (i.e., the value of goods for services directly resulting from the project, less associated or induced costs), are included in formulation and evaluation of a project proposal, then planning reports shall indicate:

(a) The amount of secondary benefits considered attributable to the project from a national viewpoint. Such benefits, combined with primary benefits, shall be included in the computation of a benefit-cost ratio.

(b) Secondary benefits attributable to the project from a regional, State, or local viewpoint. Such benefits shall also be evaluated, when this procedure is considered pertinent, and an additional benefit-cost ratio computed.

At this point, parenthetically, I would just like to say that this provision in Senate Document 97 with regard to secondary benefits is not as widely recognized, both within the Federal Government and among those concerned outside of the Federal Government, as it should be. It is a most significant provision; and is, in my professional judgment, a fully justifiable provision.

Now, turning to standards for formulation of plans in terms of benefits and costs, Senate Document 97 directs that comprehensive multiple-