

The effects, for the most part, have been to delay rather than forestall such development. For example, about 10 years ago a large paper concern had developed preliminary plans to construct a papermill on the upper reach of the Sacramento River but abandoned its plans when the cost of providing the degree of waste treatment to meet quality limits was recognized by itself. Today a papermill operated by a different concern is situated quite near the exact site originally proposed. The present plant, however, utilizes a different type of process than that originally proposed, one which produces a lesser amount of waste and wastes less costly to treat.

I do not regard the deferment of industrial development as in this case as a distortion of progress, but rather as a necessary action to protect the quality of the environment.

To what extent should zoning or selected industrial location with respect to population be used to decrease the need for effluent treatment?

Procedures for the establishment of waste discharge requirements as provided for in California laws have had the practical effect of creating industrial areas. These procedures require the regional water quality control boards to recognize beneficial uses when establishing quality requirements.

A trend has developed whereby many heavy industries have been pushed to the ocean shores and to the bays and estuaries rather than bear the additional treatment costs usually involved in locating inland. For the most part, however, we find that these industries are willing to pay the necessary costs of treatment in order to locate in proximity to the large population centers with a ready labor potential and reduced transportation costs.

We all must recognize that our waterways have been and will continue to be used to carry away our wastes. There is a necessity, however, to avoid degradation to the detriment of other beneficial uses. To avoid such a consequence, both the Congress and the California Legislature adopted laws in 1965 which require adoption of quality standards, to be maintained at various key points in our waterways, to protect these waters for beneficial use. We are establishing these standards in California.

The next problem we expect to confront will arise when the concentrations in our waterways begin to approach the adopted quality standards, and consideration must be given to upgrading treatment processes to stay within the recognized standard.

We do not believe that dischargers should be permitted to claim a prescriptive right to pollute, but rather that all dischargers should bear a proportionate share of the costs of needed remedial measures.

We are facing these water pollution control problems in the San Francisco Bay area. As waste-producing activities increase, the magnitude of the problems will expand. In recognition of this, the legislature authorized a comprehensive investigation of the effects of waste discharge into the bay with the directive that a plan be developed for the control of pollution. This is chapter 1351 of the Statutes of 1965. An amount of \$1,078,000 has been appropriated for the first of a 3-year investigation.

Waste dischargers should not flee from the population centers in order to pollute other waters. Instead, the problems should be faced squarely and efforts made to solve them.