

get standards that we could approve, so that they are the State's standards.

We first put together teams of water experts, scientists of all kinds, and with their help a year ago, or 2 years ago, actually, we came in with a set of guidelines for establishing water quality standards.

Now, this was an indication, we wanted to indicate to all of the States what we felt the Congress had in mind and what guidelines they should follow in coming up with acceptable standards.

The hearings that have been taking place on the standards are conducted by the States, not by us. And in each State in this country during the last 18 months, there have been all kinds of public hearings—in fact, Commissioner Moore, here, held them all over the State of Texas for a period of 4 months.

So the hearings were held and should have been held, but they were hearings in all cases by the States and not by the Federal Government.

Then once the hearings were completed, the States got up their proposed water quality standards, submitted them to us, and then this process of negotiation went forward, and this is the procedure by which we have arrived at agreement with 31 States on water quality standards.

Mr. CRAMER. But those agreements are all made with some reservation, is that not correct?

Secretary UDALL. They are, with reservations, in some cases because of necessity, because this is a dynamic process.

REVISION IN STANDARDS

Mr. CRAMER. I understand that. However, we specifically set out that if the State does not file the necessary letters and so forth, and if the Secretary desires a revision, the Secretary may, after reasonable notice and conference with representatives, prepare regulations, and thereafter there shall be hearings before a hearing board; and on the basis of the evidence presented at the hearing, the hearing board will make findings, and so forth.

So there is a clear procedure set out for accomplishing, if justified, such things as "the nondegradation standard as guidelines", but this appears to have been accomplished by your decision without following this procedure for revision of the previous published guidelines of Saturday, May 14, 1966, and reconfirmed January 24, 1968.

NO STATE'S STANDARDS REJECTED

Secretary UDALL. Congressman, I want to explain the situation we are in right now, and I think it is very important that the committee understand this. The procedure that you describe is in the law, and it is directed to what we do in the event we reject State standards. We have not rejected any. Indeed, our effort has been to negotiate very strenuously where we have disagreements and to resolve all of the issues we can and then, if there are some remaining issues, simply put them aside, to approve everything, and put these issues aside.

Now, we chose to do this, and I think it was a wise decision, rather than to say if we approve 99 percent of their standards, and 1 percent we disagree, we disapprove the whole thing and set Federal standards. I think that would have been a very foolish thing to do.