

If requirements for secondary treatment are limited to those areas where it is justified, the final cost will be somewhere between the \$370 and the \$1,800 million a year.

The next few months are crucial for the development of our water pollution control programs. The public needs to know the costs of pollution control and the benefits to be gained, so that our policy makers can make the right decisions in directing the use of the limited resources of our municipalities and industries and thus, the people. This is a responsibility of the technical leaders.

In summary, let me say again that the best incentive that could be made available to the industrial community, and I am sure to the municipalities, would be the establishment of reasonable standards, coupled with a realistic timetable, that would protect the water quality in our rivers, streams, and lakes. If we are concerned with the quality of water as differentiated from the quality of the effluents, the question of reasonableness—reasonable standards and reasonable time periods—can be easily determined by you, the administrators of the state programs, the federal officials, and representatives of the business-industrial community.

I appreciate the opportunity of discussing these problems with you.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1968.

HON. JAMES A. RHODES,
Governor of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio.

DEAR GOVERNOR RHODES: I am pleased to inform you that, except as noted below, I have approved the water quality standards of the State of Ohio, based upon my determination that they are consistent with the protection of the public health and welfare, the enhancement of the quality of the water, and the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as provided by Section 10 (c) (3) of that Act. Accordingly, the standards as approved are those applicable under the Act to the interstate waters of Ohio.

A basic policy of the Act is to protect and enhance the quality and productivity of the Nation's waters. Our review and study of the standards to date has reinforced our conclusion that implementation of this policy requires a standard substantially in accordance with the following:

Waters whose existing quality is better than the established standards as of the date on which such standards become effective will be maintained at their existing high quality. These and other waters of your State will not be lowered in quality unless and until it has been affirmatively demonstrated to the State water pollution control agency and the Department of the Interior that such change is justifiable as a result of necessary economic or social development and will not interfere with or become injurious to any assigned uses made of, or presently possible in such waters. This will require that any industrial, public or private project or development which would constitute a new source of pollution or an increased source of pollution to high quality waters will be required, as part of the initial project design, to provide the highest and best degree of waste treatment available under existing technology and, since these are also Federal standards, these waste treatment requirements will be developed cooperatively.

The standards submitted by your State did not include a comparable provision, and, since it is our mutual desire to carry out the purposes and intent of the Act, I would appreciate your early concurrence with regard to incorporating such a comparable provision as a part of the enforceable standards of your State. Please advise, in addition, the time when the procedure for this purpose can be initiated and completed.

You will recall that my letters of July 18 and August 7, 1967, indicated that the water quality criteria and plans of implementation submitted by Ohio for its interstate waters had been reviewed. In each letter, I noted some of the significant issues which had to be resolved between our water pollution control agencies before these criteria and plans could be approved as Federal standards under the Act. Our water pollution control agencies have met and have reached agreement on a number of revisions. I wish to commend your water pollution control officials for their cooperation, and I am gratified by the high water