

Now the enforcement recommendations and the water quality standards both give the city of New York until 1972 to comply both with the standards requirements and enforcement recommendations. You see, this is the reason why we feel that this kind of phased construction is quite adequate for our purposes. I think it would be quite unfair to the city of New York for the Federal Government to say, "We will not make a Federal construction grant at this time because you have not designed a plant that will remove 90 percent BOD in accordance with the water quality standards."

Mr. FELTON. I don't understand. You are requiring 90 percent by 1972?

Mr. BARNHILL. Well, we are requiring 80 percent at all times, which means the plant would have to be designed at 90-percent efficiency in order to guarantee.

Mr. FELTON. I thought you just said that you didn't expect this second additional facility to be completed until about 1975.

Mr. BARNHILL. I didn't say that. That was our guess, and I said I would hope so. I said I would hope so.

Mr. FELTON. You would hope actually by 1972 to meet the requirements?

Mr. BARNHILL. Well, as far as we are concerned, the time requirements on the water quality standards and the enforcement recommendations still hold. They are still going to try to get the city of New York to meet this commitment by 1972. They have not been relieved of this responsibility. And it has been agreed that the city, the State, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration will meet at 6-month intervals to discuss what progress has been made.

Mr. MOORE. Let me say almost any alternative you can mention would certainly almost have to extend the time beyond 1972.

Mr. BARNHILL. Yes. And there would be, I believe, a tremendous increase in cost for any new site and new construction. It has been reported that construction rates in that part of the country are going up an average of 8 percent. I think that might be a little high. But even if it is only 6 percent, 6 percent per year for a \$190 million project represents an awful lot of Federal, State, and local funds. So if this project were put off for 5 or 6 or 7 years, which could certainly happen, the cost increase would be very substantial. To relocate it, of course, would mean construction of substantially more intercepting sewer to convey the waste to the new site—I don't know where the relocation site would be. And in this project, just to give you an example, the existing interceptor sewer construction is costing roughly \$90 million.

Mr. CARPENTER. Is there any storm sewage going through this new plant?

Mr. BARNHILL. Well, I would assume there is.

Mr. CARPENTER. There is some combined storm and sanitary sewer?

Mr. BARNHILL. I really don't know, but I would have to guess, New York City being as old as it is and being Manhattan Island, that it is practically all combined sewers.

Mr. CARPENTER. And that might be the time when your 90 percent would degrade to 80, when you were bypassing—or are you referring to the 80 just meaning a portion of the time when you had to shut down a certain tank or for repairs? What is the relationship, again, of