

Water Pollution Control Act Grant on the basis of a 30-year payback instead of a one-time payment. This plan has been given much prior publicity and it is heralded as a means to achieve more mileage out of Federal Grant money, thereby placing the Pollution Control Program on schedule. Federal Funds used to pay off 30-year contractual obligations would be limited to 10 percent of a State's allocation and would apply only to those that serve 125,000 people or more.

In order to qualify for this grant, however, the local public body must establish a system of sewer service charges to recover operation and maintenance costs, a reserve, and plant amortization costs. While this method is used in many of the nation's cities and it can be shown to be a sound method of financing, it certainly is not the *only* sound method of financing. We believe that the method of financing such programs is, and should continue to be, a local problem and decision. Furthermore, it is our opinion that such a control is not needed. The establishment and imposition of State water quality standards, approved by the Secretary, is adequate control to assure continued efficient plant operation.

We are greatly concerned that the Bill would eliminate the tax exemption feature on municipal bonds issued for waste treatment purposes. This provision seems to contradict the intent of accelerating the pollution abatement program, in that it will result in a higher cost to municipalities and make less money available.

Section 5, of H.R. 15907, concerns itself with comprehensive studies of estuaries. These studies would determine the effects of pollution on almost the total environment and resources of estuarine zones of the United States, including fish and wildlife, sport and commercial fishing, recreation, water supply and water power, and exploitation of mineral resources and fossil fuels, land and industrial development, navigation, flood and erosion control and other uses. In our opinion, the "effects of pollution" on most of these disciplines is adequately known. The extensive studies, however, appear to go far beyond the scope of a "Pollution Control" Bill. There is general agreement that the funding of pollution abatement programs in the United States is inadequate, and the "in depth" studies proposed by this Bill would weaken this effort from the standpoint of funds alone. If pollution were non-existent in the country's estuaries, the development and exploitation of the potential of estuaries would still be a complex problem. We believe, however, that this program is not within the scope or objectives of pollution control efforts.

It appears that this proposed pollution legislation makes things too complicated and has too many strings tied to its provisions. This tends to confuse the program and will further slow down efforts to construct needed projects. Therefore, we feel that this proposed legislation should not be enacted and the present law retained and given an opportunity to be carried out effectively.

Very truly yours,

Milt
MILT GRAHAM,
Mayor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 22, 1968.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
Rayburn Building.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the author of H.R. 13407, which is a companion bill to H.R. 12759, I have a great deal of interest in the immediate passage of this legislation.

Of the 100,000 lakes in our Nation, Minnesota has over 14,000 of ten acres or more in size. These lakes are and can be a great resource in the future of our Nation and my own State.

As you know, lakes are not self cleaning, and, following each rain tons of debris or fertilizer may be washed into these lakes, only to settle to the bottom. Further decomposition on the bottom tends to make the lakes shallow, thus leading to a warming of the water temperature. Additional food nutrients and