

So may I assume that you would approve no State standard for dissolved oxygen for fish and other aquatic life which would be lower than 5 milligrams per liter during at least 16 hours of any 24-hour period?

Dr. WEINBERGER. Well, they have these figures. Now again, these are not our criteria. All I am indicating—you see this is about 4 or 5 years old.

We set up some technical advisory committees. We have asked them to go back and take a look at all of the information that has been developed, and on the basis of that to bring our current knowledge up to date.

Now, it is on the basis of this available knowledge that you are able to say that, now if you are going to protect a stream for trout, then this should be dissolved oxygen that you are going to maintain. They would not—John, correct me if I am wrong. We would not deviate from that if the uses for trout—we are talking about the same trout. Then this would be the criteria that would be established for DO and these would be the levels.

Mr. CARPENTER. Could we have that a month from now?

Mr. BARNHILL. Well, how would it be—let's have DO because that is one that is somewhat in controversy. I will have them provide you with the State and then a statement on the dissolved oxygen criteria that have been approved by the Secretary. There have been 16 State plans approved so far.

You are going to find in some of these instances they were approved without approving the DO criteria for certain streams. So whether we can eventually resolve this with the States or whether the Federal Government states the DO standard we don't know yet, but I will give you a status report on DO, on the 16 States that have been approved so far. And you will find variations in them. It is not really cut and dried. We have pushed the States as far as we could in getting them to upgrade their DO criteria. In some instances you will find that the Secretary appears to have approved the standard that is not as high as it should be, but this is an instance of the State cooperating with us and trying to upgrade and enhance the water that is already seriously polluted.

It is an attempt to bring it up to a good quality water. It is going to vary, because it depends on whether you are talking about a warm water fishery or a cold water fishery or whether you are talking about lake trout or stream trout, or whether you are trying to protect an anadromous fishery. So they will vary. You will see differences there.

Dr. WEINBERGER. May I suggest this, Dick, that when they come up with the thing—again, we worked on this thing. When you get the table, let us help you interpret it. Because as I say, it may not be uniform but it is consistent. I think this is the thing you want to get on the record, to show—I didn't mean to overwhelm you when I gave you this. The question raised, you know, well is there any scientific base. Well, here is a report which has 3,800 references. As a matter of fact, there was an addendum to this. Now these are all representing scientific investigations and studies.

Mr. BARNHILL. And difference of opinion.

(The information requested is as follows:)