

The interpretation of the phrase "comparable degree of treatment" has caused much concern in the business community.

He says: "Does this phrase imply the actual construction of a secondary treatment facility? Does it imply that an industrial waste effluent should have a quality as high as an effluent from a municipal secondary treatment plant? Does this phrase imply a certain percentage reduction of waste load regardless of the quality of the receiving water body?"

Then you go on to say that Secretary DiLuzio answered that "comparable degree of treatment" could mean any or all of above definitions, depending upon the interpretation which State or Federal officials choose to use on any occasion.

Has there been any further answer or clarification to that?

Mr. COFFEY. No, sir; I have his answer here. I would like to include in the record also, if you would like.

Mr. McEWEN. Could we have that?

Mr. COFFEY. That is a copy of the correspondence that was between Mr. Watt and Secretary DiLuzio.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Correspondence follows:)

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., November 8, 1967.

Mr. FRANK C. DiLUZIO,
Assistant Secretary, Water Pollution Control,
U.S. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY DiLUZIO: On August 9, 1967, Secretary Udall appeared before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution to relate the progress of the federal water pollution control effort. In discussing the approval of state water quality standards, he remarked:

"The most significant single thing about the standards that I have approved is that they call for a minimum of secondary treatment for all municipal wastes and a comparable degree of treatment for industrial wastes."

The interpretation of the phrase "comparable degree of treatment" has caused much concern in the business community. Does this phrase imply the actual construction of a secondary treatment facility? Does it imply that an industrial waste effluent should have a quality as high as the effluent from a municipal secondary treatment plant? Does this phrase imply a certain percentage reduction in wasteload, regardless of the quality of the receiving water body?

These questions reflect the uncertainty of the business community, and the need for a clarification from your office, so that the correct interpretation of this phrase may be applied.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. WATT,
Secretary, Natural Resources Committee.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., December 29, 1967.

Mr. JAMES G. WATT,
Secretary, Natural Resources Committee, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. WATT: Following are my comments on the questions you raised in your November 8, 1967, letter concerning definitions of degree of treatment in relation to compliance with water quality standards.

Policy statement Number 8 in the "Guidelines for Establishing Water Quality Standards for Interstate Waters" includes the following statements: (1) "No standard will be approved which allows any wastes amenable to treatment or