

POPULATION-SMSA REQUIREMENT

On page 5, line 21, the bill requires that the Secretary, prior to entering into any contract, must determine that the treatment works will serve an area of 125,000 people or more or the standard metropolitan statistical area, as defined by the Bureau of the Budget.

Literally interpreted, this might restrict the development of regional systems. The metropolitan standard statistical areas are quite large. They include large cities and many autonomous suburban and rural communities and scattered industrial plants.

Since there will be circumstances arising whereby the most effective method of treating the waste in certain circumstances within the metropolitan area could best be handled by a subregional system, I suggest you may want to consider, instead of speaking of an area with 125,000 people, a phrase along the line of ordinary producing waste with a population equivalent of 125,000 people. This would enable the creation of regional complexes, confine large industrial waste with lesser municipal loads.

I would cite the fact that this has been done to a limited extent under the earlier grant programs, the opportunity of engaging in it on a larger scale should not be foreclosed inadvertently at this time.

One other point with respect to this. Recreation reservoir areas very much need protection, but most of these have small year-round populations.

I suggest this section of the bill be changed also to include areas with a seasonal as well as permanent population in excess of 125,000 people.

As an example, the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area at present has a permanent population of about 80,000. During the peak operations this figure would swell to 300,000 for four months, and then drop off. It is during that period it will need regional protection and will need a massive system.

The rest of my remarks I will skip at this time and, knowing that they will be inserted into the record, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to make these points before your committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much, Mr. Wright. You made some very practical points, and they have to be given consideration, and they shall be given consideration.

Any further questions?

Mr. McCarthy?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I just want to thank you, Mr. Wright.

Mr. BLATNIK. Thank you very much, Mr. Wright.

We will recognize our colleague, Representative Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin.

**STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY S. REUSS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN**

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the Public Works Committee in support of H.R. 15907, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1968. Your committee has labored long, hard, and successfully to gain a high priority for clean water