With this first issue of EPA Journal, your Public Affairs Office launches a new venture designed to help:

Keep employees better informed about EPA’s many diverse programs.

Stimulate at headquarters as well as in regional offices, laboratories and various other installations scattered around the Nation a greater sense of esprit de corps in belonging to the EPA family.

Foster pride and enthusiasm for our role in the enormously difficult, complex and vital task of protecting the environment.

Support, whenever and however we can, the mission of defending public health and nature.

In the little more than four years since EPA burst upon the National scene, the agency has undergone major changes in leadership and organization.

The Normandy Building at 1626 K St., N.W., where EPA headquarters was formerly located, has been demolished and replaced with a brand new building.

The disappearance without a trace of the old headquarters where EPA spent the early days of its often stormy and exciting career is a symbol of the dramatic and swift changes which have swept over the agency like ocean waves.

These changes were often caused by external storms, such as the energy crisis, but they have made it difficult to develop a sense of tradition and loyalty within the agency.

WE BEGIN

While the numerous reorganizations were upsetting to many of us, they were usually necessary if the agency was to respond to the fresh challenges rising to confront it. The Challenge of 1975 is the major theme of this edition of the magazine.

EPA Journal will be an internal magazine for all agency employees and will not be available for sale to the public. The magazine intends to operate on the premise that its readers—be they clerks, bookkeepers, secretaries or program directors—recognize their stake in the protection of our only livable planet. The journal will replace the publication, Inside EPA.

The magazine will be an issue-oriented, generalist publication and we expect it to change and evolve in time even as the agency it serves. EPA Journal will not be a repository for bowling scores, social news or arcane technical or academic articles.

In addition to providing information about the agency’s diverse activities, EPA Journal also plans to supply some human interest stories, a helping of nostalgia, a dash of inspiration, a sprinkling of stardust and even, perhaps inadvertently, an occasional pinch of humour.

We want to make the journal readable and interesting, and a good magazine, like a symphony orchestra, needs more than just violins, trumpets and drums. The sound of the harp or the piccolo will occasionally be heard.

While EPA Journal has no illusions of great importance, we do want to make some small contribution. We will inevitably err from time to time, but be patient with us. We hope to prove useful.
The EPA Journal will be published monthly, with combined issues for July-August and November-December, for employees of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. It does not alter or supersede regulations, operating procedures or manual instructions. Contributions and inquiries should be addressed to the Editor, Room 209, West Tower, Waterside Mall, 401 M St., S.W. Washington, D.C. 20460. No permission necessary to reproduce contents except copyrighted photos and other materials.
n September of 1973, in my first speech as Administrator of EPA, I told the National Press Club: "I am convinced that the quality of the environment—and, in a broader sense, the quality of life—is emerging as the issue for the rest of this century. Our society is at a juncture where traditional ways of doing things are being confronted with new aspirations, new priorities and new values. The Environmental Protection Agency—more than any other institution of government—stands at the interface of these forces. Inevitably, we are a center of controversy—and probably should be." We were, I went on to say, "entering a period which will test the commitment of the American people to environmental goals."

That commitment has withstood more than a year of severe and sustained testing. It has held firm in the face of serious energy and economic difficulties, and of aggressive attempts by some to turn public concern and confusion over these difficulties into a full-fledged environmental retreat.

Today, I can report that the "environment" remains a matter of the highest national priority; that EPA has demonstrated its effectiveness as an instrument for the administration of our environmental laws; that the basic strength of those laws remains unimpaired; and that the commitment of the American people to environmental protection and progress remains deep and enduring.

Last winter, as the gas lines grew longer and tempers grew shorter, it seemed almost a foregone conclusion in some quarters that a strong environmental "backlash" would occur, and that crippling changes in the Clean Air Act were inevitable. Yet as I traveled around the country, I found that—far from regarding the environmental effort as responsible for our energy problems or supporting any relaxation of our environmental laws—people were almost uniformly disturbed and distressed over reports that those laws might be weakened. They understood that the energy crisis was, in a fundamental sense, an environmental crisis—a crisis whose root cause lay in excessive and unsustainable patterns and rates of consumption.

EPA, at the same time, did all that it reasonably and responsibly could—through such measures as the clean fuels policy and the granting of temporary variances—to help the country weather the winter. We demonstrated our willingness to take tangible steps to ease or offset the impact of fuel shortages over the winter while maintaining our commitment to the protection of the public health and welfare.

We have consistently displayed a willingness, throughout the past year, to do everything we legitimately could to minimize the adverse impacts of our regulations—on particular industries as on particular cities, on the nation's economy as on the nation's energy supply. We have, in so doing, earned the respect of other agencies and levels of government and the continued confidence of the American people.

We can be justly proud of our performance.

Since the Environmental Protection Agency was formed a little more than four years ago, this Nation has begun a broad, concerted and conscientious effort to clean up its environment.

We have moved to reduce air and water pollution, control pesticides, abate noise, dispose of solid waste and regulate ocean dumping. We have given strong leadership to international cooperation in some of these same areas.

EPA action has begun to produce measurable returns in the form of a cleaner and healthier environment.

In water, our investments in munici-

pal and industrial point source controls are beginning to pay off in pollution reduction—in lower counts of bacteria and biodegradable oxygen demand (BOD), and in less phenols.

In air, total suspended particulates (TSP) and sulfur dioxide (SO2) concentrations have significantly declined.

In these and other ways, EPA is beginning to make some real headway against some of our most recalcitrant environmental problems. With your good help, we will continue to do so.

The unsettling experiences of the past year have, I think, helped us all better understand that we cannot continue to grow and build and live in the same old wasteful ways. It has helped us recognize that there are some very difficult, often painful, choices to be made and that some cherished patterns of behavior may have to be changed. It has helped us grasp the truth of the basic ecological teaching that everything is related to everything else and that every choice involves a tradeoff.

We at EPA have learned that this teaching applies to us and our efforts as well. The nation's energy and economic difficulties have occurred at precisely the point when the nature and extent of the various costs and impacts of carrying out the nation's environmental laws are really beginning to become clear. All the available evidence is that the benefits of our pollution control expenditures are well worth their costs.

Indeed, the environmental effort, and the kinds of actions and changes it requires, have very constructive implications for the achievement of real economic growth over the decades ahead. The basic economic aim of the environmental effort is to improve the quality of growth in this country by encouraging the reduction or recovery of the enormous waste of energy and other resources within our economy—wastes that, in large measure, represent economic as well as environmental costs. To the degree that clean air and water, and indeed land itself, have become increasingly scarce and costly goods—and that energy and other resources, whose extraction, production and consumption generate the pollution we are trying to clean up, have themselves become increasingly scarce and costly, it makes both environmental and economic sense to make the conservation of energy and the reduction or recovery of waste a matter of the highest priority. In this sense, our environmental, energy and economic interests converge to put a premium upon greater and greater efficiency in our economy—a
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“The most immediate and effective way to reduce our dependence upon that oil is by a substantial reduction in the consumption of gasoline…”

new efficiency which can, at one and the same time, cut costs, conserve energy and curb pollution—a new efficiency which can help reduce inflation.

Once all this is said, however, it becomes increasingly imperative—as our economic difficulties continue and our environmental programs increasingly take hold—that we conduct those programs in the most efficient and cost-effective manner possible. Environmental expenditures cannot be justified simply on the grounds that their goals are important, even essential. We must, as an agency, be prepared to demonstrate that we get what we pay for with the expenditures we make or require, and that what we get is worth it.

We must, as well, be increasingly sensitive to the fact that many of our actions have a very real, sometimes even wrenching, impact upon our society. When EPA proposes transportation control plans for our cities, or rules designed to prevent any significant deterioration of air quality in the nation, it is dealing with very basic economic, social and institutional factors that affect the entire fabric of our society. Such proposals have important implications for the way of life and the patterns of behavior of individuals, families and communities across the country. It is critical that in the development of such proposals, we involve the public in the process to the greatest extent possible. Our ability and willingness to do so will be a major test of our leadership in the months and years ahead.

Our strong environmental statutes were forged in the crucible of the legislative process, after extensive public hearings, after lengthy debate and discussion. So much we all understand and accept. But what is not always so well understood and accepted is the fact that the great democratic process of policy-making does not come to an abrupt end once a law is enacted and signed, and an executive agency—such as EPA—assumes the responsibility for carrying out the law. This does not mean that the administrative agency can recast or reconsider the specific decisions embodied in the legislative language or the Congressional intent expressed in the legislative history of the statute. The job of the administrative agency is to carry out the law, not create it. And EPA’s responsibility is to execute the clear mandate of Congress.

We must, at the same time, recognize that administrative implementation itself involves the exercise of broad areas of discretion. The regulatory and administrative function is not merely mechanical or ministerial. It necessarily entails significant elements of policymaking.

Thus, it is vital that EPA, in the exercise of its regulatory function, actively seek out and encourage the broadest possible participation in the formulation of its plans and regulations by all levels of government and by all affected groups in the private sector. Our responsibility in this regard goes far beyond simply receiving comments and considering recommendations. Rather, we must exercise a positive, activist role in enabling all interested and affected parties outside our agency to become effective participants in our rule-making process.

I am firmly convinced that the success of our national environmental programs will depend, deeply and directly, upon our willingness to work with the citizens of this country—primarily through their State and local governments—not simply in the carrying out but in the actual creation of our regulations, guidelines and plans. Before we put together and publish regulations or plans, before we step in and start telling people where they can or cannot build, or where they can or cannot drive, we need—by working closely with them and with their elected officials at the State and local level—to make them a full partner in the process by which those decisions are made. The fact that we are not directly accountable through the elective process to the people whose lives we affect makes it all the more important that we talk and that we listen to those who are thus accountable as well as to those who are directly affected. Precisely because the full implementation of our programs will have an impact upon society that goes, for example, far beyond the goal of cleaning up the nation’s air and water, we must move with all possible sensitivity and skill in recognizing and responding to the legitimate concerns and problems of everybody affected and involved.

To the degree that we can thus continue to demonstrate our confidence in the American people, and our commitment to the democratic process, we can be certain of their continued confidence.
"It is your courage, your competence, and your commitment ... that have enabled us to do so much and so well."

in us and commitment to environmental progress.

I am convinced that this Agency, and the environmental effort as a whole, will play an increasingly important role in the nation's effort to come to grips with its economic, energy and other critical problems. For those problems are, in many respects, simply part of the larger and more inclusive environmental problem. The nation has, I think, increasingly come to recognize that our energy, environmental and inflationary ills are, in no small measure, a reflection of the fact that we are living beyond our means, of the fact that we can no longer afford to act—as we have all too often and all too long—on the assumption that "waste makes wealth."

There is no inherent conflict between our energy, environmental and economic goals. We can, and must, achieve them together. We can, and must, pursue our environmental goals in the most efficient manner possible—with the least adverse impact upon our economy and upon our supply of food and energy—just as we can, and must, pursue paths of economic, physical and energy growth with the least adverse impact upon our environment.

Indeed, the real challenge of 1975 and succeeding years is to find new and increasingly effective ways of integrating our various efforts to reach these goals.

Last November, in Portland, Oregon, President Ford declared: "I do not accept the dismal proposition that pollution is the inevitable price of prosperity nor that we must compromise the environment to gain economic growth. We cannot enrich our lives by impoverishing our land. We can raise both the standard of living and the quality of life."

There is, indeed, no surer way to sap the nation's economic strength than by squandering its energy and environmental resources.

All too often, the issue of growth is posed in false terms—as if our only choice was to grow or not to grow. We have no choice but to grow, just as we have no choice but to grow in less wasteful ways, to follow those patterns of growth that best enable us to meet the total needs of our society—economic, environmental and social.

This kind of growth will enable us to build a better life without destroying many of the things that make life worth living and devouring the precious and perishable resources that make a better life possible to begin with. It will permit us to fashion for ourselves and for our children a way of life that is increasingly worth living and saving.

How well we at EPA do our job will do much to determine how soon and how successfully we as a nation achieve that kind of growth and life.

We can take deep pride in our accomplishments thus far—in the fact that we remain, as we face our fifth year, an effective and independent agency whose job is vital to the nation's future. We are the captive of no group and we have no special brief to serve any single sector of our society. This independence, our reliance upon the democratic processes, our strong determination to involve the public in our decisions, our commitment to carrying out our responsibilities fully and fairly—these will continue to be our strengths over the next year and the years beyond.

We will need these strengths, and all the skill and support we can muster. For while our environmental gains are both solid and substantial, we have barely begun to make the fundamental changes in our accustomed patterns of behavior that alone will enable us to live in constructive and creative harmony with the natural world. We have barely begun to comprehend—much less cope with—the hazards to our lives and health posed by the hundreds of new chemicals we introduce into the world every year as well as by the known pollutants and poisons. We have barely begun to understand how seriously our national security and economic health are endangered as long as our wasteful and excessive levels of energy consumption leave us helplessly dependent upon foreign oil. The most immediate and effective way to reduce our dependence upon that oil is by a substantial reduction in the consumption of gasoline in this country. We must take prompt steps to achieve that reduction.

I am proud of your performance over the extremely difficult months we have just been through. It is your courage, your competence, and your commitment to our aims and efforts that have enabled us to do so much and so well. You have my admiration and my thanks. It has been a privilege to work with you, and I look forward to doing so in the year ahead.
uring the past year, the New York Times published a pithy quotation from the president of a successful seed company: "My customers aren't interested in my grass seed," he said. "They're interested in their lawns."

The words are worth reprinting to remind environmentalists and environmental bureaucrats alike to keep their eyes on the ball. The American public in 1975 will be less interested in problems, regulations, and grants to sewage treatment plants than in demonstrable progress toward a clean, safe environment that it can use and enjoy. This, after all, was the prize they sought by demanding legislation and Federal appropriations.

There has been demonstrable progress in cleaning the environment. Striped bass fishing is gaining on the Hudson River as a result of New York State's aggressive water pollution control program. Smoke and other visible pollutants are gone from the air in many New Jersey communities, thanks to the State's strong and effective air pollution control program. And San Juan's Condado Lagoon is clean again for local people and tourists because of decisive action by the Commonwealth government.

Environmental Protection Agency funds and staff assistance helped achieve such visible milestones of environmental progress. But they are only a beginning, and much more remains to be done.

By the end of 1975, most of the major polluters of the Nation's air and water will have begun work on specific projects to better control their emissions and discharges. There is increasing evidence that many owners of such facilities now accept pollution control as a responsibility rather than a burden.

There are few signs that the Government has adequately prepared the general public for the individual lifestyle changes that will be required to carry the Nation toward clean water, and, especially, clean air.

Public agencies at all levels in Region II need to conduct aggressive programs to emphasize the public and personal benefits of adopting and implementing a new environmental ethic.

Knowledgeable citizens must insure that competent agencies have the tools and the leadership needed to shape the kinds of communities that the public intends to leave for future generations.

Visible public benefits must quickly follow individual efforts and sacrifices to restore and protect the environment. Region II Administrator Gerald M. Hansler has focused on such benefits in EPA programs affecting the lifestyles of individual citizens. Two examples:

- New Jersey's inspection and maintenance program to ensure that automobiles meet manufacturers' tune-up (and emissions) specifications. This EPA-assisted program already has produced clean-air benefits and gasoline savings in excess of its cost to motorists, state officials report.

By Donald R. Bliss
Director, Public Affairs, EPA Region II
Region II’s requirement that owners of large employee-parking lots in 14 New Jersey counties must provide a program to encourage employees to commute to work by mass transit or carpools in order to reduce daily vehicle miles traveled. This program is paying off in cash savings to commuters as well as in cleaner air.

For the owners of the large lots, whose taxes have helped subsidize mass transit, the EPA program will produce some return on their investments and free space for future productive development to increase employment.

In the coming year, the opportunity to demonstrate public and personal benefits from environmental action will nowhere be more challenging than in New York City. The first major environmental test for Gov.-elect Hugh L. Carey will be in the planning and implementation of transportation controls needed to clean New York City’s air to meet health standards for carbon monoxide and smog.

If this goal cannot be achieved in New York City, where can it be done? Consider New York’s advantages:

- The most comprehensive mass-transit system of any city in the United States.
- The lowest per-capita ownership of automobiles (20%) of any major city.
- The existence of a mass-transit commuting habit. In spite of the dilapidation, noise, and discomfort encountered in much of the city’s transit system, more New Yorkers (70%) travel to the central business district by train, bus, and subway than by any other method. Off-hours riding is on the upswing, too, due to recent special fare plans.
- A new awareness of the real nature of the city’s relationship to the car is developing. Last winter’s paralytic shortage of gasoline had some beneficial effects on the garment and hotel businesses and was not the expected catastrophe. The restaurant business declined only 3 percent on Sundays.

Yet there are many hindrances to transportation controls. New York City has an immense investment in the automobile. Almost a third of Manhattan—the Nation’s most expensive real estate—has been paved to handle the explosion in the number of private cars that took place in the 75 years since the first American was killed by a car near Central Park in 1899.

And 51 percent of New York City residents in a New York Times poll (November, 1973) expressed a distaste for restricting cars in the shopping hubs.

The task of cleaning the city’s air also will affect lifestyles in suburbia, which is not itself free of carbon monoxide and oxidant problems and where per-capita use of energy for transportation is twice the amount used by New York City residents.

The acceptability of any transportation control plan in the New York metropolis will depend upon a demonstration by State and local officials that life in the city and suburbs will be more amenable—as well as more healthful—as a result of individual changes in lifestyle.
Longer-range public benefits in the quality of life are promised, and must be demonstrated, as a result of the implementation of air, water, and solid waste management planning requirements, the pre-construction review of large projects that may adversely affect air quality, and the environmental assessment of sewage treatment plant projects.

These programs, which some view as a "backdoor" approach to local land-use planning by the Federal government, simply require the responsible local and State authorities to look before they leap into projects that may imperil the environment. Region II expects to rely heavily on local and State decision makers to evaluate such projects in advance, since these officials are at the levels of government most responsive to local citizens.

EPA already has had success in this work. In Ocean County, N.J., a local sewerage authority scaled down its application for a huge waste water treatment plant when it was clear that construction as first planned would encourage the development of Los Angeles-type sprawl and air pollution problems in central New Jersey.

The local authority and the State both recognized that it would be absurd for EPA to help solve a water pollution problem by creating a future air pollution problem. The final resolution will not deter future growth in Ocean County, but will ensure that environmental considerations are taken into account as that growth takes place.

The coming year will bring more challenges to light. New York, New Jersey, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands include the most densely packed population centers in the United States and its outlying areas. Environmental solutions in these jurisdictions are difficult and complex.

For that reason, it may be that unsound projects will have to be prohibited by local or State officials, or EPA, as completely incompatible with the public health and welfare in the most densely populated areas.

Region II will make a major effort during 1975 to assist local and State governments, developers, and industry to make sound economic growth decisions that are compatible with environmental regulations. And before any projects are opposed, various alternatives will be explored in an effort to promote productive capacity as well as protect the environment.

The year ahead will enhance the strength and credibility of EPA's enforcement posture against major violators and pave the way for smooth action by local and State agencies to enforce environmental rules.

Finally, Region II expects to continue to help States to develop increased competence in and public support for reasonable environmental programs, including those relating to resource utilization and land use. The direct accountability of State government to its citizens makes it the most logical level of government to design and apply the social, economic, and political solutions that will correct and prevent environmental problems.
These reports of news developments in the environmental field are supplied by EPA's Regional Public Affairs offices.

**transportation**

Region I will hold public hearings Feb. 19, 20, and 21 at New England Life Hall in Boston on the transportation control plan for metropolitan Boston. The hearings will focus on the data used to develop the hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide reductions necessary to meet national air quality standards. The First Circuit Court of Appeals handed down a decision Sept. 27, ordering EPA to hold a public hearing for informal rule-making within 90 days. On Nov. 12, EPA requested the Justice Department to petition for a 60-day extension for holding the hearing to allow the Agency time to gather additional technical data.

**BOSTON**

**harbor**

A five-year Fordham University study on improving water quality in New York harbor and adjacent coastal areas will be funded by EPA's Pacific Northwest Environmental Research Laboratory in Corvallis, Ore. The $600,000 study, will determine the best practicable methods of waste water treatment for municipal sewage treatment plants. Attempts also will be made to discover techniques to remove plant nutrients from sewage. An explosive growth of algae in New York harbor could turn it into a gigantic "pea soup," causing obnoxious odors and harm to marine organisms.

**pesticide**

An 11-month, $126,000 contract went to Cornell University's Cooperative Extension Service in Ithaca, N.Y.,
to develop materials to train pesticide applicators for State certification. Under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, applicators must be certified before using pesticides classified for "restricted use." State-run certification programs approved by the EPA must be in effect by Oct. 21, 1976. Such programs are intended to ensure that applicators are competent to handle restricted-use pesticides, without endangering themselves, the public, or the environment. EPA recently issued final standards for pesticide applicator certification. Approximately 90,000 commercial applicators and more than two million farmers may wish to use restricted pesticides and will have to be certified.

Railservice

New Yorkers can look forward to improved rail efficiency and better service. New Yorkers voted an overwhelming 'yes' on a proposition to issue $250 million in bonds as part of an $811 million State and Federal program to increase rail service and safety. Eric B. Outwater, EPA Deputy Regional Administrator, earlier emphasized the need for this kind of increased support for railroads as a means of achieving clean air. Outwater said that using railroads for commuting to work would decrease the need for commuters to rely on cars, thus helping reduce harmful auto emissions.

Escambia Bay

There are signs that Pensacola's Escambia Bay, once derogatorily described as the South's answer to Lake Erie, is on the mend. At least there have been no more than minor fish kills there in two years—and none big enough to report in the news media during the past year. In bygone years, the Bay, rimmed by chemical plants, frequently was featured in news photographs across the nation when kills would occur and millions of menhaden and some game fish would be stretched out for acres. Photographs of the dead fish resembled snow scenes. But tough crackdowns by the State and EPA and its predecessor agencies apparently have brought results. A small surveillance team stationed there two years ago by Regional Administrator Jack Ravan soon will issue a detailed report on the bay. Meanwhile, industries and municipalities on the Bay have moved to clean up their waste.

Meetings

In Kentucky, the Jefferson County Air Pollution Control District (Louisville) is holding a public hearing on a proposed indirect source regulation in mid-February. Also scheduled in Louisville is the fifth Annual Environmental Engineering Science Conference, March 3-4. Contact: Ms. Patricia Bell, Assistant Director of Professional Development, Speed Scientific School, University of Louisville. Operator training workshops, under the aegis of the Mississippi Air and Water Pollution Control, will be held in Mississippi in early 1975. Sessions include: A three-day workshop in New Albany, Feb. 18-20; another three-day course in Natchez, March 18-20; and a one-day session in Belmont, Feb. 11. And the title of the annual meeting of the Georgia Conservancy, Jan. 31-Feb. 2, at Callaway Gardens, reveals the concerns of conservation groups. The statewide organization is meeting under this banner: "Facing the 'E's—Ecology, Energy, Economics, Education, Environment, etc...."

Great Lakes

The Great Lakes Water Quality Board of the International Joint Commission will hold a meeting March 5-6 in Toronto, to discuss the status of the Great Lakes clean-up and problem areas. Francis T. Mayo, Administrator of Region V, is Chairman of the U.S. section of the Board.

Water

A nationwide study to determine the concentration and potential effects of certain organic chemicals in drinking water has been launched by EPA. The study was announced after EPA released in New Orleans on Nov. 8 a study of that city's drinking water which showed the presence of minute quantities of 66 organic chemicals, some of which may be hazardous to human health. Arthur Busch, Region VI Regional Administrator, and Dr. Gordon Robeck, Director, EPA Water Supply Research Laboratory, Cincinnati, conducted a press conference in New Orleans on the day the study was released to answer questions from the news media. New Orleans officials have asked Busch about procedures necessary to receive EPA funding to conduct further in-depth research on the New Orleans drinking water supply problem.
landmark case
With the recent conviction of Independent Stave Company of Lebanon, Missouri, on Federal criminal charges of violating the Clean Air Act, EPA scored a landmark case, the first in the Nation, according to Jerome H. Svore, Region VII Administrator. The firm, which manufactures charcoaled whiskey barrels, was convicted of failure to comply with an EPA administrative order issued over a year ago and now faces possible fines of $3.9 million. According to Svore, the company failed to comply with EPA efforts to get them on a compliance schedule which would have set dates for certain aspects of their operation to meet requirements of the Clean Air Act. "This is the first criminal conviction against a stationary source," Svore said, "and I think it is a good indication of the teeth we are putting into our environmental laws through vigorous enforcement." The fine was to be set following a pre-sentence investigation ordered by U.S. District Court Judge William R. Collinson, who presided at the trial.

air scrubber
The Kansas City Star, one of the Midwest's most influential newspapers, carried an article on Nov. 12 with the headline "Success at Power Plant With Air Scrubber System." The article quoted officials of the Kansas City Power & Light Co. as stating that the flue gas desulfurization system at its La Cygne station is working well. "La Cygne is the first large generating station in the world to have a workable mechanism for getting sulfur dioxide out of its emission," the article states. "Visitors from Germany and the Soviet Union, as well as from all over the United States, have journeyed to La Cygne to marvel at the plant's stack gas 'scrubber' system."

water permits
As early as February 1975, the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality could take over a program regulating pollutant discharges into Wyoming waterways (currently administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in Denver). EPA Regional Administrator John Green said Gov. Stanley Hathaway had requested state assumption of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).
One other state in Region 8, Montana, already has assumed responsibility for this program.

oil pollution
San Francisco will host the 1975 Conference on Prevention and Control of Oil Pollution March 25-27, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. EPA is a co-sponsor of the conference together with the U.S. Coast Guard and the American Petroleum Institute.
Previous conferences have been held in Washington, D.C. About a thousand delegates attended the most recent meeting in March, 1973.
The 1975 conference will stress the development of new techniques for use in inland and coastal oil spill control operations.

lead in kellog
The United States Environmental Protection Agency recently awarded $130,000 to the Idaho State Department of Health and Welfare to assist in the evaluation of lead levels alleged to be a serious health hazard to children living in the Kellog, Idaho, area. According to Clifford V. Smith, Administrator of Region 10, these funds will produce a coordinated study, since the State and EPA are involved in different aspects of the situation.
"EPA is monitoring fugitive dust emissions in the air," Smith said, "while the State of Idaho is sampling water, soil and vegetation throughout the area." It is believed that the data obtained from these studies will facilitate a comprehensive appraisal of the Kellog problem.
The Environmental Protection Agency has been involved since abnormally high lead blood levels were detected by the Idaho Department of Health and Welfare in children living near Kellog. Early in October of last year, Regional Administrator Smith pledged full support of state and industry efforts to determine the source and extent of the extensive lead and to assure a prompt and effective resolution of the health hazard.
KEY ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AT A GLANCE

These photographs depict some of the more difficult environmental problems confronting the Nation - the future of the American automobile, strip mining, oil pollution and our "throw it away philosophy."

An oil slick, the lighter water area in this black and white reproduction, spreads in New York's Upper Bay past the Statue of Liberty. Many see a silhouette of George Washington at lower left.
A striking photograph of storm clouds at sunset near Bodega Bay, Calif., symbolizes many environmental problems: roads and automobiles, fences and land use, and electric power and communication lines.

Tricycle graveyard near a playground in Providence, R.I., shows how early in life Americans can get the habit of "use it up and throw it away."
The tiny figure of a worker and the huge strip mining machine near St. David, Ill., suggest the colossal scale of America's energy needs.
Jack D. Tarran, who wore the cap of a Navy Chief Petty Officer as communications director for three secretaries of the Navy, now wears at least four hats at EPA.

As manager of the Executive Communications Unit, Jack maintains an effective "top-down, bottom-up system" of communications within the agency. As an expeditor, he follows progress on assignments made by the Administrator and other top EPA executives.

Personnel responsibilities involve him in such matters as average grade and job ceilings for units within the Office of the Administrator. And, as allowance holder for the Administrator's office, he watches over the purse strings for that office and its five staff offices—the offices of Federal Activities, Civil Rights, Legislation, International Activities and Public Affairs.

Elaborating on his role as expeditor, Jack said: "I work very closely with Bill Dircks (executive assistant to the Administrator) and Jack Flynn (assistant to the Deputy Administrator), making sure that needed information gets to the Administrator and Deputy Administrator in a timely fashion. I attend the Administrator's staff meetings on Tuesdays and follow up assignments that are handed out at those meetings. I try to determine when those assignments can be completed and if there are any unexpected problems."

Before joining EPA in September, 1971, Jack spent 20 years in the Navy. He was deputy director for administration and correspondence in the Office of the Secretary of the Navy with Secretaries Paul Nitze, Paul Ignatius and John Chafee. Before appointment to his present post at EPA, Jack, who is 41, was executive assistant to Fitzhugh Green, the Associate Administrator for International Activities.

The Joint Service Commendation Medal and the Navy Commendation Medal were among various service medals and letters of commendation he was awarded in the Navy.

Jack and his wife, Helen, and their 10-year-old son, Andy, live in Falls Church, Va. Jack, who spends much of his spare time reading history books and detective yarns and playing golf, is a graduate of Hillsboro (Ill.) High School. A native of Jieserville, Ill., he attended Bailey Tech, St. Louis, between tours of duty in the Navy.

One of Tarran's former supervisors at EPA said: "We were lucky to get Jack for EPA. For years he had taught Navy Secretaries the ropes on inspecting the U.S. Navy's vast empire both floating and land-based. He knew how to operate worldwide whether he was sending Senators to the South Pole (Buckley and Goldwater) or Secretaries to the Far East or Europe. He is also about the finest communicator I've ever worked with on paper, on his feet—or seat—and in moving information up and down the bureaucratic rungs—a vital element in any organization." "Our international office became a 'disaster area' when he was promoted—but he certainly earned the boost. Sailors, with their built-in sense of order, service and discipline, should really be running the world."
Who among those present at the creation of EPA can ever forget the wild, wonderful days when headquarters was located in the now demolished old Normandy Building at 1626 K Street, N.W.? Watching the birth of a new Federal agency created to deal with a major national issue was a memorable experience. We've asked some of the EPA employees who worked for the agency then: What do you remember about the beginning days of the Environmental Protection Agency?
At the time EPA was formed I held a very low-ranking job in the lower levels of NAPCA. We were working on the Clean Air Act implementation. It was a very exciting time. I was in the Parklawn Building and never was stationed at the K Street building. I came directly from Parklawn to Waterside Mall.

It was nice to have a new agency created to serve the environmental cause. I feel our program has advanced because of the creation of EPA. In the early days we felt that the new leadership was doubtful about some of the people they had inherited from other agencies. We felt that they were more impressed by the new people coming into government for the first time. There was a lot of confusion, but eventually real talent was finally recognized. Things sort of sorted themselves out.

Total chaos—but it was fun. Everyone was a little more relaxed then, or so it seemed. We started with a two-person press office. I still can remember the enthusiasm created when Mr. Ruckelshaus was named Administrator of the Agency. The Press Office has grown considerably since the old days. I think I am the only one here now who was a member of the original press office staff.

The Environmental Impact Statement Office (the predecessor of the Office of Federal Activities) originally was housed in the Normandy Building. Thoughts of our beginning bring back memories of one room, six people, two telephones and a six foot stack of overdue environmental impact statements—topped by Chuck Fabrikan't's pet turtle. We often wondered if in the promised shining new building in Southwest there would be any “Out” boxes, an item for which we had no need in the beginning of OFA because we had such a huge volume of overdue work. Tom Carroll’s constant question, “Where are the comments on the Alaska Pipeline Environmental Impact Statement,” echoed down the halls. There may be a message in the fact that four years later, we find that the Alaskan Pipeline is just under construction while the former K Street building is no more. Of course, there was always the prevailing office gossip of who will be the Acting Director next week.
The thing I remember best about the creation of EPA was the three enforcement actions against the cities of Atlanta, Detroit and Cleveland shortly after EPA was formed. I remember all the furious activity in preparing these actions. I thought this was very good because it showed that the government meant business in dealing with water pollution and showed the commitment of EPA to being a regulatory agency.

I was stationed in Crystal Mall with the water program. We were kept very busy with moving people from Crystal Mall and within the Crystal Mall complex. We got a lot of complaints about people not satisfied with space, but we expect that. I am proud of the fact that I was one of five professionals in the Real Property and Space Management Office who got Gold Medals for our competence in acquiring over 1 million square feet of office and laboratory facilities for the rapidly expanding headquarters and regional offices.

All the hectic changes. The distribution list for Congressional materials just changed all the time. As soon as I got one list they had another reorganization. I had been getting Congressional materials for just the water program in the Department of the Interior. Then when EPA came in I had to order for all elements of the Agency across the board. It put a heavier load on me. We had some fun moments though. The demand for Congressional materials never has slowed down.
EPA OPENS
NEW TRAINING CENTER

Advance opportunities for all EPA employees will be offered by the EPA National Employee Training Center recently opened at the Agency’s Washington headquarters. Established by the Personnel Management Division and headed by Joseph Sullivan, the Center goes beyond the usual courses in clerical skills to include training useful to the professional and administrative staffs as well.

The prestigious Brookings Institution arranged a seminar on the economy and the environment held last October for EPA’s top management, including Administrator Train, his immediate staff, and some Assistant and Regional Administrators. The Center now envisions the periodic scheduling of similar seminars on policy issues for top and middle management.

Although the curriculum still is in the formative stage, courses are being offered in the fields of management, personnel, contracts and grants, and in reading for speed and comprehension. Another aspect of the Center’s work will be the development of pilot programs in personnel management for use by field personnel offices.

Other courses will be designed to answer the special needs of the technical and program offices. In May there will be a three-week course in the monitoring of toxic substances in water conducted by American University. An environmental studies program, staffed jointly by the Agency and Northern Virginia Community College, is projected for this Spring. This would be open to all personnel and would involve an hour of instruction weekly.

The Center has published a descriptive catalog “Audio-Visual Aids for Executive and Management Training.” From this listing of films and tape cassettes, Agency offices can select material to meet particular staff needs. The Center also has learning machines which permit each individual to choose his or her own program.

A major focus of the Center’s work, however, is still on the up-grading of the Agency’s non-professional staff. There are four of these programs in operation:

1 Clerical and Office Skills Training (COST) provides opportunities for the sharpening of existing skills and the acquisition of new ones. To date, approximately 500 employees have benefited from this instruction.

2 Aid to Competent Employees in Need of Training (ACCENT) is a channel for the promotion of clerical people to “targeted” technical and administrative positions. Training is geared to individual need and includes on-the-job direction, counselling, and formal instruction. This is a program of national scope.

3 Academic Career Advancement Program (ACAP) offers financial assistance for higher education in any field pertinent to EPA’s diverse needs. Now 51 people are attending Southeastern University, adjacent to Waterside Mall, but courses may be taken at any college in the Washington metropolitan area.

4 Insight Into Career Advancement (I CAN) is a less structured program than the others, and is primarily a vocational counseling service to help employees develop realistic career plans.

These programs to prepare employees for higher grades and pay are staffed by Gloria Woodard, Jean Brown, and Donna Weiner, under the general direction of Kathie Libby, coordinator, Headquarters’ Training Center Operations.

“We like to think of ourselves as ‘human resource developers,’” said Ms. Libby. “The existence of untapped or wasted skills is intolerable. Some employees will come to our classes to learn, some to refresh and up-date their skills, others to be stimulated. And perhaps most importantly, the development of staff potential is a necessity if the program goals of the Agency are to be accomplished.

For more information on training opportunities write to the EPA National Training Center, Room 2821 (PM212) EPA Washington, D.C. 20460.
CALIFORNIAN NOMINATED FOR TOP RESEARCH POST
Wilson K. Talley of Oakland, Calif., has been nominated as Assistant Administrator for Research and Development by President Ford. He will succeed Dr. Stanley M. Greenfield, who resigned last May. Dr. Talley, 39, had been serving as study director of the Commission on Critical Choices for Americans when he was selected for the EPA position. From 1971 to 1974, Dr. Talley was assistant vice president in the office of the president of the University of California. He formerly was a professor in the Department of Applied Science at the University.

NOISE LIMITS SET FOR INTERSTATE CARRIERS
The noisiest big tractor-trailers that pass you on the highway will have to be made quieter by next October when EPA's first regulations under the Noise Control Act of 1972 take effect. The rules set sound limits, as measured with instruments, which interstate trucks cannot exceed at either of two different speeds or in stationary revving of motors. They provide for inspection of exhaust systems and tires, two main sources of truck noise.

"SIGNIFICANT DETERIORATION" REGULATIONS ISSUED
Final regulations for preventing "significant deterioration" of air quality in areas where the air already is cleaner than required by Federal standards have been announced by Administrator Russell E. Train. The regulations provide for a three fold classification plan which will be put into effect by the states, subject to EPA review.

FUEL ECONOMY TO BE CONSIDERED IN AUTO HEARINGS
Fuel economy will be considered at hearings auto manufacturers may request early this year. The hearings will be held if applications are received for a one-year suspension of the stricter pollution standards required for 1977. In addition to the question of the feasibility of meeting the 1977 standards, the hearings will consider the auto industry's "ability to achieve a 40 percent fuel economy improvement by 1980, as called for by President Ford," Administrator Train said.
The Environmental Protection Agency will be charged with important new responsibilities under drinking water legislation passed by Congress last month after four years of consideration. This legislation gives EPA authority to set minimum national standards for drinking water.

In the past EPA merely shared authority with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enforce regulations to prevent interstate carriers from using water from systems that do not comply with Federal standards. These standards apply to only 700 of the roughly 40,000 public water supply systems. Further, the act adds chemical standards to the existing Federal bacteriological ones. These strengthened standards apply to community systems serving some 70 million Americans. EPA also is required to conduct a survey of suspected cancer-causing chemicals in the nation's drinking supplies.

Major provisions of the legislation include: EPA must promulgate primary and secondary drinking water regulations. The primary standards would limit the amount of contaminants that affect human health, to the extent feasible, using the treatment technology deemed generally available by the Administrator. Secondary regulations would protect public welfare and govern such problems as odor, taste, and other esthetic considerations. In applying the new regulations costs would be taken into consideration and an exemption procedure would be provided for communities with limited financial capability with which to comply.

The States would have primary responsibility for monitoring and enforcing the Federal standards. The water system operators would be required to notify consumers of any violations of standards or delay in complying with them.

States would be required to regulate underground drinking water and the underground injection of wastes, including waste brine from oil and gas production.

The legislation also would authorize EPA to guarantee loans of up to $50,000 per drinking water system in order to bring them into compliance with the proposed standards. The legislation provides for civil action by citizens against any Federal or other governmental agency which fails to comply with the proposed law.

At present, a minimum of 4,000 cases of waterborne communicable illnesses occur each year nationally and the actual total may be 10 times greater. The incidence of chemical disease is unknown. EPA is now conducting a nationwide study to determine the concentration and possible effects of certain organic chemicals in drinking water.