

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, RESEARCH
AND DEVELOPMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Question 1: Would you discuss, in the light of the Department of Defense experiences, the relationship between our capability to develop standards and criteria, and the establishment of realistic enforcement programs? (E.g., do we apply the same standards to our camps in the United States and at places like Adak?)

Answer: Based upon the experiences of the Department of Defense, any realistic program for enforcement must recognize the wide range on environmental quality which may be permitted to preserve or enhance a specific environment for its desired utilization. A major part of the problem, as indicated in our previous testimony is not so much in the realm of technical or professional environmental experts, as in that of socioeconomic-political value judgments.

Not only may different standards be appropriate for facilities in isolated and remote areas, such as Alaska, or some of the Pacific areas, but varying degrees of quality may be appropriate for different locations within the continental limits of the United States. Ipso facto application of a single "standard" for Federal installations would violate some of the fundamental principles of political economics. In that connection both the Executive orders on water pollution and air pollution recognize that varying degrees of control may be appropriate in different locations and for different situations, and provide for exemptions to the "standards" for water pollution and the use of "secondary treatment." This does not establish a degree of effluent quality, but rather establishes a treatment method to be used; and one that affords a widely varying degree of efficiency in waste water treatment. As an example, some secondary treatment processes might remove 85 percent of the organic loading from the influent to them, and others as high as 95 percent. In combination with other processes, depending upon the effluent desired, and the amount of expense willing to be undertaken, virtually any desired degree of removal might be achieved. The type of secondary treatment provided obviously must be based on professional judgment of the many methods which might be used to provide either effluent quality, or to prevent an adverse effect on desired conditions in the receiving environment.

The question of varying requirements for varying desired uses has long been studied by the specialists in the fields of water resources. As long ago as the 1930 time period, suggestions as to the possible classification of waters by intended usages were developed. (See "Tendencies and Standards of Rivers and Lake Cleanliness," Sewage Works Journal, vol. VI, July 1934; and "Sewage Treatment," Imhoff and Fair, McGraw-Hill Co., 1940.) The majority of existing statutes of the various States follow the general philosophy enunciated in these and similar authoritative works. The tremendous success of the participants in the Ohio River compacts may be attributed to the recognition of these differences in requirements, and the use of a wide variety