that this can establish a precedent that conceivably can be very constructive throughout the country.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAUSEN. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I would like to point out that the Bureau of the Budget made representations to this committee in the consideration of Appalachia to include that provision and at no time was there any doubt in the Bureau of the Budget or any other agency of the Government that this would be part of Appalachia.

I do not see why they have hesitancy.

Mr. CLAUSEN. In your handout I notice that under Project Economics you have listed under the Water Control Elements, one, two and three and then you go on down and hit Economic Expansion, Element No. 5, that we do not see anything for No. 4 which is referred to as "land treatment measures" under Recommended Plan of Improvement.

Now, this is because it is agricultural. That is not considered a part of the Corps of Engineers?

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir; it is primarily the individual farmer that when you speak of operation and maintenance for instance we cannot make a calculation because it is the individual farmer taking care of his land in accordance with the recommendations from the Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. JONES. Land practices under TVA, those programs were adopted in that area, 17 or 18 land practices which the individual farmer would carry out.

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir. And on page 3 of the handout footnote, right about the center of the page, there at the (1), there is a note explaining that we didn't make an annual cost and annual benefit from this.

Now, the total costs are $1,170,000 Federal for the land treatment and $270,000 non-Federal, the initial cost.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Yes, that is the figure we wanted and I think this has been helpful even though it is an agricultural recommendation; it is helpful for the committee to understand how these are tied in with the interagency department liaison.

Colonel ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLAUSEN. I note that at least on the document referred to previously, I do not have the established benefit-cost ratio. Is there a reason for this or is it because you are applying other factors or what is the reason for this not being included?

Colonel ANDERSON. At the bottom of page 2 and at the top of page 3 you see the three indices that I mentioned—and the third one at the top of page 3, increased national income, can be regarded as comparable to the standard benefit to cost ratio, 0.67.

Colonel LEE. If I may add to that, sir, the report itself in several places discusses, of course, that this is only one of the objectives of the study. This is a traditionally computed benefit-cost ratio, but it does not include in it our estimates of the national interest in the new wages in bringing people off the welfare rolls and making them productive workers. That is not an element that is normally included in the benefit-cost ratio.