General NOBLE. I guess it is lack of new water coming into the park, sir. They lose what they have got, it flows away and evaporates.

Mr. CRAMER. I want to make sure I understand. There is no cost breakdown on this. The local cooperation comment on page 2—assurances to make a cash contribution of 20 percent of the contract—for all items of work to be provided by the corps estimated at $11.8 million.

Now, what items of this total project are not included for local participation that would relate to the park?

Colonel SEIDEL. Sir, based on the quantities of water that we estimated would be available for the park and for nonpark use, this broke out in the ratio of roughly 50–50—48 to 52.

Now, the Federal Government is paying for all costs—paying all costs that would be involved in providing the water for the park. The percent of cost for the nonpark users is on a 50–50 basis. So the Government is going to pay for the water supply portion of this project 74 percent versus 26.

Mr. CRAMER. That gets to the point that I wanted to ask. That is why I wanted a breakdown.

The present project for central and southern is on an 80–20 basis. Wasn't that your testimony?

Colonel SEIDEL. Sir, that is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. So why is this portion of it on a 50–50 basis?

Mr. MCALEER. Sir, the present project comprises Federal or public uses of flood control, and all the flood control portion of the original project was set up as 100 percent Federal in cost. The drainage and irrigation in the original project was divided 50–50 between the local interests and the Federal Government, and the local interests were expected to maintain and operate the overall project. The result of this was that for the $300 million overall project on an average annual basis—the local people pay about 40 percent of the cost. And the modification comes out approximately the same with water for the park on a 100-percent cost basis.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I am sort of wondering here, in light of the comments Mr. Cramer has brought up, if there should not be some very serious thought given to the genuine benefits to the Federal Government, and something included as a factor in the benefits to the Everglades National Park.

Mr. JONES. I am afraid I am not following you. It seems to me that what we are trying to do is to try to take a hundred percent Federal responsibility as being applied to the project to supply money for the Everglades, and then take credit for local participation. That is not the theory at all. The theory is if you follow the logical conclusion to what you are propounding there, you would go back to the $32 million, and then strike out the Everglades, and you would have the same arrangement we have at the present time. The fact that you are not including the Everglades reflected in the cost of your local people—it was not assumed that in the first place.

What you are getting to is injuring your own project. It seems to me you better let well enough alone—because the Federal Government is paying for all the costs of water in the Everglades—I do not see how that would be affected in local participation.

Mr. CRAMER. What did you say is a hundred percent Federal—what phase of the project?