

the salinity of normal sea water and at a temperature of about 12° F above ambient will be discharged. However, about 15 gallons of other sea water used for cooling the desalting plant and power plant, at the same salinity and about 12° F above ambient, will also be discharged. Combining these discharges will result in a composite effluent only slightly above the ambient salinity and about 12° F above ambient temperature. Thus, the discharge from a plant like MWD should present no more of a hazard to the ecology from a salinity and temperature standpoint than the discharge of cooling water from a large power plant due to the high dilution of the waste brine effluent from the large amount of cooling water required.

During the operation of a desalting plant small amounts of chemicals are sometimes introduced into the feed water for scale control and are contained in the discharge along with small amounts of other corrosion products picked up in the plant. The effects of these small perturbations on the effluent have been, and will continue to be, studied and monitored through bio-assays made prior to and during operation of various desalting plants. This has been done at the San Diego Test Facility. Further, by proper design and location of the effluent outfall other factors of safety can be added to negate any possible harmful effects to the ecology.

Mr. CARPENTER. The final question—

Dr. WEINBERGER. Let me just add one sentence to that. Again, even more effective communication is nonetheless warranted, and here you run into the problem of the amount of time that you do spend on liaison and coordination in getting your story across.

I would say that there is a good degree of exchange. I might say that steps are being taken in the executive branch to improve communication, with information storage and retrieval systems.

Mr. CARPENTER. This is right within one department. That is one of the reasons for our question, is whether on these complex subjects of ecological effects you had experience in your department here any conflict that required resolution. And this statement, then, in your answer, would indicate that you have had the OSW and Fish and Wildlife together, and they have agreed that the situation is—

Mr. BARNHILL. Well, we haven't done it, but they have gotten together within the department and apparently from that statement, and my conversation with Dr. Hunter—

Mr. CARPENTER. But you would cover these coastal waters?

Dr. WEINBERGER. Yes.

Mr. CARPENTER. The final question: In air pollution the law now calls for registration of fuel additives, not to show that they are safe or unsafe, but to simply alert the Surgeon General that these new chemicals might be entering the environment.

Would you advocate a similar law for effluents to surface waters, should industry or Government be responsible for forecasting or anticipating ecological effects of new effluents?

Dr. WEINBERGER. I will ask Mr. Barnhill to take a crack at that one.

Mr. BARNHILL. Well, the law does not now, at least not the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, require the registration or announcement of new chemicals or new wastes. This is obviously something that we discussed, and we were particularly concerned at the time with pesticides. And this was while we were in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. And we actually proposed that this needed to be done, but we ran into the difficulties that you would normally expect to, and that would be that we were encroaching on someone else's jurisdiction, and of course opposition from industry.