

One need is a common language. I urge the development of a relatively fine-grained set of standard water and air qualities, in which amounts of various contaminants and the frequencies and combinations in which they occur are all combined together—with some choice as to weighting. At the detailed level, there may be need to go over each of the locally important contaminants separately, but if we are to have effective intercomparison of standards, both proposed and in force, we are going to need some relatively simple way of handling the very many different contaminants that may be of importance.

And let me expand on this just a moment. I am sure an expert would quote higher figures but it seems to me clear that in a major river for example, it is very easy for there to be one or two hundred different contaminants that are of some importance. Now, if we are going to have adequate discussion, and intercommunication, about the levels of quality that are being required in one place as compared to those that are required in another, I think we have got to have a common language that is much simpler than saying: "Here is a list of 200 contaminants that we dreamed up for our particular river—here are the concentrations of each that we don't want exceeded more than so many times per month, per year or per decade" and find that the place we want to compare this with has a different list of contaminating materials, has different key concentrations and has different frequencies with which they appear. This is going to make the comparison problem too difficult. I think it would, on the other hand, be an attempt to make it much too simple if we said we are going to have water quality grades 1 to 12 and prescribe just what these are for all the contaminants, especially because the problem of making proper balances is going to be different in different parts of the country where different considerations become important—possibly even in different rivers quite close together. The only way I can see to get on with this with probable effectiveness is to have a set of standard qualities of moderate complexity where you could not only go from higher to lower quality but you could move in various directions with regard to the relative importance of different kinds of contaminants. I think if we had a framework of this sort—and this is not something that can be established easily, but it won't come about through standing still—decisions at the local level, decisions at the congressional level, decisions by administrative agencies of all sorts would in the long run be much more easily made and much more likely to reflect what people really wanted to do.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Mosher?

Mr. MOSHER. What authority or agency or group or industry would take responsibility for doing this? Would it be the Bureau of Standards?

Dr. TURKEY. It seems to me this is something that is only going to be effective in the long run if it is done collaboratively.

I would say myself, that Federal Government leadership, I think undoubtedly some Federal Government financial support—and the professional societies of all sorts, the engineers, the waterworks people, and the biologists who are concerned with water, just to pick up the water side. This is not a question of saying what shall be the