The Policy Perspective - A Look to the Grass Roots

US Environmental Protection Agency

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.brockport.edu/wr_misc

Part of the Water Resource Management Commons

Repository Citation


This Government Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Studies on Water Resources of New York State and the Great Lakes at Digital Commons @Brockport. It has been accepted for inclusion in Government Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @Brockport. For more information, please contact kmyers@brockport.edu.
The Policy Perspective—A Look to the Grass Roots

WELCOME TO CONFERENCE

LEE M. THOMAS
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

We have made steady progress toward attaining the Nation's water quality goals since the passage of the Clean Water Act of 1972. Much of this forward movement has been accomplished by controlling industrial and municipal point sources. Further achievement will require accelerated implementation of nonpoint source management programs in addition to our ongoing point source control efforts.

Many States and local governments have already taken steps to address their nonpoint source challenges. Given the nature of nonpoint source pollution, State and local management is a key. Only at this level does enough flexibility exist to make site-specific and source-specific decisions that really work.

Of course, EPA and other Federal agencies have an important role as well. Our nonpoint source pollution control program is getting increasing attention as we implement recommendations of our interagency Nonpoint Source Task Force established a year ago. The Task Force's national policy provides direction for future initiatives by Federal, State, and local agencies, and, most importantly, by the private sector.

We intend to incorporate nonpoint source concerns into all aspects of water management. It is EPA's job to provide national coordination and oversight, give practical assistance for nonpoint program development, and promote innovation. We are intensifying our efforts in each of these areas. We will continue to work with other Federal agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, to better use their existing programs to address nonpoint source needs.

In a report to Congress in 1984, EPA summarized what is known about nonpoint source pollution, concluding that it is among the leading causes of the Nation's remaining water quality problems. Specifically, the report said that in six of 10 EPA regions nonpoint sources are the principal remaining cause of water quality problems. Half of the States say that nonpoint pollution is a significant source of their difficulties, and virtually every State reports some kind of water quality problem related to these sources. Research suggests that lakes, reservoirs, and estuaries, like Chesapeake Bay, are particularly vulnerable to nonpoint pollutants.

The report identified agricultural operations as the most pervasive nonpoint source in every region. Nonpoint source impacts from urban areas, mining, forestry activities, and construction sites also deserve attention.

As you well know, managing nonpoint source pollution is not easy, institutionally or technically. Nonetheless, effective steps can be taken to control it. The basic approach under the Clean Water Act for managing point sources—technological controls for classes of dischargers—is not appropriate for nonpoint sources. Instead, flexible site-specific and source-specific decisionmaking is the key to success.

States must take the lead in managing nonpoint sources because they have the adaptability, perspective, and intimate knowledge to develop such site-specific solutions. They can easily reach individual landowners and operators and help them change the way they manage their land.

Experts at this level are in the best position to determine which surface or ground water problems are related to nonpoint sources, establish which waters will receive priority attention, determine what type of control strategy is needed, and evaluate progress.

Substantial, cost-effective water quality improvements have been made by carefully targeting control activities. Targeting schemes need to identify the principal sources of nonpoint pollutants as well as determine which waterbodies are most likely to benefit from intensive work.

Recent studies indicate that off-site impacts of erosion cost the Nation an estimated $6 billion a year, with over $2 billion accounted for by cropland erosion alone. These costs include:

• waterways polluted by sediment and agricultural chemicals,
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- destruction of breeding grounds for fish,
- increased expenses for dredging harbors and treating wastewater,
- higher riverbeds leading to greater flooding, and
- reservoirs and lakes silting up more quickly than anticipated.

Although it takes resources to address nonpoint problems, direct and indirect costs are clearly associated with not coming to grips with this problem.

An area of growing concern is toxics, from pesticides and other chemicals applied to the land, entering ground water. A new study of pesticides in drinking water drawn from ground water, now in the design phase, will provide a national picture of the extent of the problem. We are also working on policies to reduce this potential threat to drinking water supplies.

A new report to be completed this fall by the Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators will provide an important baseline of data on State nonpoint problems and the status of current State management efforts. This information will be used to better assess nonpoint problems and as a basis for policy decisions.

The challenge for this conference is to exchange knowledge of the nature of nonpoint problems and what control approaches work. I am hopeful that this conference will be a turning point for nonpoint source management—that the exchanges of ideas here will result in a surge of awareness and commitment to nonpoint implementation efforts at all levels.

On a final note, I want to emphasize that nonpoint source control is at the top of EPA's agenda; it is clearly identified as a priority issue in EPA's Agency Operating Guidance for FY 1986-87. We are committed to work with States to incorporate nonpoint control measures into their water quality programs. This issue must receive attention at all levels of government; but a more aggressive approach at State and local levels, in concert with the private sector, is absolutely essential for substantial progress. With that commitment we will eventually get a grip on this persistent and growing problem and begin to bring it under control.
KEYNOTE ADDRESS

PAT ROBERTS
U.S. House of Representatives
First District, Kansas

I noticed from the program that this conference's co-sponsors are a very diverse group. I think that is very appropriate and in keeping with the purpose of the conference—to gather practical information from the grass roots level. Too often in Washington we create laws and programs without listening to those back home who know better.

I thought today I would try to bring you up to date on what is happening in Washington in regard to the nonpoint source pollution issue and make a comment from my perspective on what needs to be done. In terms of precedence the budget and the farm bill come first.

But let me give you a little background. I represent a district that produces more wheat than any other State. My district, the First District of Kansas or as we call it "the Big First," is larger than the State of Virginia. From the time that our pioneer forefathers brought "Turkey Red wheat" to Kansas in the 1870's we have excelled in producing hard red winter wheat. In addition to wheat, however, my district is number one in the production of grain sorghum and the cattle industry is a vital segment of our economy. As a matter of fact, I noticed the other day a "Washington Post" story on the 20 counties in the Nation that are most dependent on farming as a source of income. In that list of 20 counties, I have the privilege of representing five. Needless to say, the difficult times we are experiencing in farm country have had a severe impact on my district and the high plains.

As a footnote, my district during the "Dirty 30's" was always on the move. One day it might be blowing into Nebraska and the next day back into Oklahoma. That was back in the days before we called the Kansas wind a nonpoint source of pollution. Perhaps air coming from Washington is a point source!

Our number one priority this year is writing a farm bill that will put a profit back into agriculture. Without profit, any rural management plan be it local, county, State or Federal will not be successful. The very existence of the farmer-stockman, agribusiness and main street rural America is threatened today by the continuing problems of the budget deficit, low commodity prices, and the high interest rates. I won't go through the long list of problems that have plagued the farmer. Instead I am going to try to outline some solutions.

First the budget. Two weeks ago the Senate passed a budget resolution that does represent a ray of hope. The budget package calls for $56 billion in cuts in 1986 and about $295 billion over the next 3 years. It effectively freezes defense spending, and provides for a one year cost of living adjustment freeze on Social Security, Veterans, and Military Civilian Retirement. It does not call for tax increases.

The package has a long way to go. It is our turn now in the House, but it is a good start towards reducing the deficit, bringing interest rates down, and keeping the economy on a steady path.

Specifying for agriculture, the budget was very positive. It added $3.5 billion back to earlier agricultural budget proposals. It provides for a 2 percent matching interest rate buy-down for credit-strapped farmers, restored some funding to soil and water conservation, provided $1 billion per year for farm credit guarantees and a new export incentive program using a billion dollars worth of CCC stocks to counter foreign subsidies and get our grain competitive in world markets. While this budget is not the across the board freeze I have been supporting, it is a major step in getting our Nation's fiscal house in order.

SEEDS OF RECOVERY

Let me turn now to the farm bill. Because of the budget battle, work on the farm bill has been delayed. The farm bill we write will have to be budget responsible. Given the limited budget, one of the major hurdles we face is how to be competitive and regain export markets without bankrupting a whole generation of farmers.

In spite of the tight budget, there seems near unanimous support in Congress this year for some type of long-term land retirement program to take highly erodible cropland out of production. I predict that the farm bill signed into law later this year (I hope it gets done this year) will have a long term land retirement program that will take up to 20 million highly erodible acres out of production for 10-15 year periods. I also predict that the farm bill will contain strong "sod buster" language to end the current policy of rewarding farmers who plow up fragile land.

These two programs will go a long way in reducing soil and water erosion and hopefully in controlling nonpoint sources of pollution from agriculture. This is not to say that agriculture's role regarding nonpoint pollution will not be significant or without controversy. In their 1984 report to Congress, EPA identified agricultural operations as the most pervasive nonpoint source in every region of America. As a result of this report and our substantial gains in controlling point source pollution, attention has once again focused on nonpoint pollution as a problem that must be addressed.

It is the opinion of this member of Congress that the most effective control of nonpoint source pollution can best be accomplished with Federal help at the State and local level. States must take the lead in managing nonpoint sources because they have the adaptability, perspective, and knowledge to develop appropriate site-specific solutions. The last thing the farmer needs in these difficult economic times is a massive new set of Federal regulations to tell him how to control runoff. Let's get the problem solved—let us not repeat EDB.

On May 2, the Senate Environment Committee rejected a provision during consideration of the Clean Water Act to set specific limits for pesticides, fertilizers, and other point source pollutants. However, the Senate Committee did adopt a provision to require States to establish a management program and authorized $300 million in grants to help States set up the programs. Action on the Clean Water Bill is still pending in the House.

Farmers are faced with the challenge of surviving in a very competitive industry. In an effort to reduce costs, the use of conservation and minimum tillage is on the rise. However, this has the downside risk of increasing pesticides and herbicides use to control what tillage used to control. One of the best nonpoint pollution controls is promoting sound conservation practices.

I have always felt that the farmer is the true conservationist. But in these perilous economic times, the farmer is often forced to choose between building terraces and pay-
ing the mortgage. I urge this conference to bear in mind throughout your discussions that the farmer is undergoing a cost-price squeeze. Any new policies for controlling nonpoint pollution must not impose heavy financial burdens on the agricultural community. You must keep in mind the cost versus the benefits of nonpoint control.

And, you cannot expect the farmer to bear the entire cost of controlling nonpoint sources of pollution while most of the benefits will accrue to society as a whole. If we must have expensive new control methods, society must share in the cost. With the record budget deficits we have in Washington, the money may not be there to help. Again, that is why we must make this effort one of a partnership.

Once again, thank you for the invitation. My final thought is best summed up by a statement from EPA Administrator Lee M. Thomas:

Nonpoint pollution . . . must receive the attention it deserves at all levels of government, but a more aggressive approach at State and local levels is absolutely essential for substantial progress. With that commitment, the Nation will eventually get a grip on this persistent problem and ensure that continued progress is made towards meeting our water quality objectives.
On May 20, 1927, a young American aviator took off from a New York airfield—alone—and headed for Paris, France. That historic flight across the Atlantic by Charles Lindbergh helped set the stage for a technological revolution in space that still goes on today. But equally important, it reminds us that American know-how, American initiative, and American success, are based on one important ingredient: the determination that makes Americans willing to take a chance.

I prefer to think of those chances as challenges. And when it comes to nonpoint source pollution, I suspect that many of those challenges will require as much determination as Lindbergh needed if we are to really succeed in our role as stewards of our natural resources.

It's no secret that we have serious water quality problems all across this country. The sources of these problems cut across every segment of our society, including agriculture and governmental policies. But nothing can be gained by each of us pointing a finger at someone else. Likewise, nothing will be accomplished toward correcting these problems by complaining that someone else is not doing enough. Rather, the true measure of success will come only after we have cast aside such judgmental temptations and have joined together to make maximum use of our limited resources.

The Department of Agriculture is celebrating the 50th anniversary of the soil and water conservation movement this year. Over the years, we have faced many challenges as stewards of our nation's soil and water resources. And we are, understandably, proud of the accomplishments made through USDA programs in meeting those challenges.

Nonpoint source pollution control is one specific challenge that has come to the forefront in recent years. Contrary to what some may believe, we have not shied away from this challenge in the Department of Agriculture. We have been providing financial and technical assistance—as well as a proven educational delivery system—all along. Those efforts are part of our mission. We call it conservation. And we shall continue to fine tune our efforts and adjust to meet new goals as they are established.

Certainly, preserving and protecting the quality of our water resources is now, and shall continue to be, an important part of this overall effort. We know about the challenges; we know about the limitations on available resources. And, we know that we need your cooperation—and your ideas—to implement a workable strategy that will contribute to raising the quality of our water supplies.

The President's 1982 National Soil and Water Conservation Program established nine priorities for the use of USDA soil and water conservation program funds. Our commitment to solving water problems is second only to erosion control. In 1984, our USDA conservation-agencies spent $66 million to improve water quality alone. We are indeed committed to improving the quality of our Nation's water supplies—within the limits of our financial resources and our traditional responsibilities.

Currently we are looking at the off-site effects of soil erosion, particularly as it concerns water quality. We are also funding special studies to look at nonpoint source pollution relationships to ground water quality. We have our work cut out for us. Where State and local officials have identified water quality to be more important than gross soil erosion, we stand ready to target our resources into nonpoint source pollution from agriculture.

"Winston Churchill once said: "You can always count on the Americans to do the right thing...after they've tried everything else." Well, I think this is the time and the place to prove Mr. Churchill wrong. Let's not wait until we've each tried everything else.

Let's begin working closer together now, joining forces, to find out what does and does not succeed; and then let's draw upon that combination of good-old-fashioned American determination and modern technology, to solve our water-quality problems.
A CONGRESSIONAL VIEWPOINT ON NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION

ARLAN STANGELAND
U.S. House of Representatives
7th District, Minnesota

I commend the organizers of the conference on nonpoint source pollution for scheduling 3 days of intense study and discussion of what is a growing and increasingly visible problem. With the mechanisms for point source pollution largely in place, although certainly not without flaws, a major thrust is needed to address nonpoint source pollution. The beginnings of that thrust are reflected to a significant degree in the 1985 amendments to the Clean Water Act, which are receiving committee action in Congress now.

The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee has reported its version of the Clean Water Act amendments, and the Water Resources Subcommittee of the House expect to mark up our own bill with full committee action to follow. The bill is designed to significantly improve the effectiveness of the Nation's water pollution control program, and nonpoint source pollution control is a very important part of this legislation. And well it should be.

We have been at this procedural point before, of course, with a very similar legislative vehicle. I am hopeful that this year, unlike last year, clean water legislation will reach the floor in both houses. However, while the Senate committee has indeed reported its bill, filed its report, and scheduled a tentative date for floor consideration, some 20 holds have been placed on the bill as reported, mostly because of disagreements over the allotment formulas.

Despite our disappointment in not finalizing Clean Water Act amendments last congress, I think it is fair to say that the time spent on this issue has been time well spent. As a quick summary, our subcommittee has developed over the past 3 years an extensive record on possible provisions in the Senate bill.

At a very substantial hearing record, we reported a bill and brought it to the House floor, where it passed on June 26, 1984, by the overwhelming bipartisan vote of 405 to 11. However, the Senate failed to bring its bill to the floor before adjournment.

This year, Chairman Jim Howard has introduced H.R. 8, of which I am a cosponsor, and which could reauthorize the Clean Water Act into the next decade, including a number of significant new programs and improvements in many existing ones. Although this bill is quite similar to that which our committee reported and which the House passed in the last congress, substantial changes have been made. In fact, as the result of weeks of study, including 2 days of hearings, our subcommittee has developed new language taking into account recommendations of the Administration and affected interest groups as well as provisions in the Senate bill.

Consequently, the bill we will be marking up in subcommittee reduces the authorizations for the Construction Grants Program from the $3.4 billion annually contained in last year's bill to $2.4 billion per year in FY 1986-90, retaining the Federal share at 55 percent rather than raising it to 65 percent as the House bill proposed earlier.

Grants for State water pollution control revolving funds would be cut from $1.6 billion annually to $500 million annually for FY 1986-90. Then, when the construction grants cease, $6 billion would be authorized for the revolving fund program over the next 4 fiscal years.

NPDES permits would continue for a maximum of 5 years, except in those cases where nontoxics are involved, or only insignificant amounts of toxics and no adverse effects on the environment. For these cases, permits could be for 10 years, but quality standards would still apply.

The 4 percent set aside of construction grant funds for rural areas would be increased. States that have 25 percent or more of their population in rural areas will be able at the Governor's request, to use from 4 percent to 7.5 percent of their State allotment under the Program for Alternatives to Conventional Treatment. The Senate bill would make no change in the current 4 percent set aside.

Fundamentally different factors (FDP), at a facility, variances from the best available technology based on the presence of fundamentally different factors from those considered by EPA in developing the best available technology (BAT) effluent guidelines, could continue to be granted, but only in those cases where the facility involved furnished information to EPA during the rulemaking or did, not have a reasonable opportunity to do so.

Of course, when we get to subcommittee and full committee markup, amendments could be added to our subcommittee's preliminary deliberations on the bill. We have a number of new programs with large price tags in this bill, and even though we have pared funding back in a number of programs, some programs may not survive in conference. Moreover, even if this legislation authorizes funding at higher levels, the budget process might impose additional limits on the appropriation committee's ability to appropriate funds above current levels.

The legislation now before our committee, like its predecessor in the 98th Congress, reflects what has become the conventional wisdom that the uses desired for our Nation's rivers and streams will not be achieved without control of nonpoint sources of pollution. We have not lost sight of the fact that the 1972 act had as one of its goals the achievement by July 1, 1983, wherever attainable, of fishable and swimmable water quality in all of the rivers, lakes, and streams of this Nation. In the past, the primary thrust to achieve this goal has been through the discharge of pollutants from point sources. We are rapidly learning, however, that point sources are not the whole problem, and unless the problem of nonpoint pollution is solved, many rivers and lakes will not be able to meet this fishable--swimmable goal.

Nonpoint source pollution is an enormous problem for our farmers, just to cite one example, both in terms of the loss of billions of tons of topsoil and the degradation of water quality in nearby streams and lakes. Millions of acres of productive farmland are removed from cultivation each year because of eroded soils. By the same token, the
herbicides, pesticides and nutrient-rich fertilizers that flow in streams along with the eroding topsoil destroy aquatic life. It poses a strong land management challenge, and one which must be met.

This problem underlines the urgency of seeking methods of controlling nonpoint source pollution to provide the desired environmental benefits without placing intolerable operational costs on the agricultural community.

In many areas, throughout this country, nonpoint sources are the major cause of water pollution. In fact, estimates are that more than half of all the pollution in the Nation's streams comes from nonpoint sources. More specifically, the Environmental Protection Agency testified a few years ago that of the Nation's 246 river basins, 68 percent were affected wholly or in part by agricultural runoff, 52 percent by urban stormwater runoff, and 30 percent by mine runoff.

The threat posed by nonpoint sources, as well as point sources, makes it clear that we need a balanced approach to the problem of water pollution control in general. H.R. 8 underlines the point well at the outset by expressing that the National policy plans for the control of nonpoint source pollution be developed and implemented in an expeditious manner, so that the goals of the act may be met through the control of both point and nonpoint sources of pollution. In other words, as a National policy, we should control point and nonpoint sources in a balanced manner.

And once nonpoint source pollution is given its proper priority, it is important that the States play a role in the planning and implementation of the required nonpoint abatement measures. Land use management has traditionally been a State role, and, while the Federal Government has a legitimate interest in addressing certain National topics, the States should be permitted to develop their own programs and management practices.

In H.R. 8, we give them that responsibility. We require States to set up programs to take a look at the problem of nonpoint source pollution, to examine the courses of action that might be taken and the alternatives available to deal with the problem.

The bill provides some important funding authorizations for programs dealing with the control of nonpoint sources. It reauthorizes the existing section 208 areawide planning and clean lakes programs and provides some major new initiatives.

One such new initiative is a program of grants to States to control nonpoint sources of pollution, for which $150 million would be authorized through 1986. States would be required to develop and implement nonpoint source pollution control plans on a watershed-by-watershed basis, with the Federal Government providing grants of up to 50 percent to States to implement their plans.

The Federal share could rise to as high as 60 percent if a significant number of nonfederal and nonstate interests in a watershed agree to participate in nonpoint source pollution control measures. In developing and implementing its plan, a State would be required, to the maximum extent practicable, to use local, public, and private agencies and organizations of expertise in control on nonpoint sources of pollution.

In a similar fashion, the bill reported by the Senate committee provides 75 percent grants to assist in the implementation of approved management programs. The Senate bill authorizes somewhat lower funding levels: $70 million for 1986, $100 million for FY 1987, and $130 million for FY 1988. In addition, the Senate bill contains a new set aside of 1 percent of a State's allotment or $100,000, whichever is greater, for the purpose of carrying out a State's nonpoint source pollution program.

The cause of nonpoint source pollution control is certain to be advanced further by a significant change our bill makes in the discretionary funding provided under the Construction Grants Program.

The 20 percent of a State's annual allotment is now available at the Governor's discretion for otherwise ineligible categories and is specifically available for control of nonpoint source pollution, including innovative and alternative approaches.

Another important nonpoint source provision in H.R. 8 authorizes $100 million annually through 1990 in grants to States for priority projects designed to control nonpoint sources of pollution that contribute to the degradation of water quality in lakes. In addition, the Clean Lakes Program would be made applicable to saline, as well as to fresh water lakes. Federal funding could provide up to 70 percent of the cost of a project implemented under this provision. This amounts to a major expansion of grant authority for restoration of the water quality of lakes.

Our House bill also addresses the problem of acid deposition in our lakes and streams. It authorizes $25 million per fiscal year for each of the FY1986 through 1990 for grants to States to carry out approved methods and procedures to restore water quality, which has deteriorated because of high acidity. We also provide $25 million annually over the same period for a demonstration program to restore the biological integrity of acidified lakes and watersheds through liming. The purpose would be to determine the effectiveness of liming in reducing the acidity of lakes and watersheds, and in restoring their biological integrity.

The bill also extends the Rural Clean Water Program at a level of $50 million per fiscal year. This program is administered by the Department of Agriculture and provides valuable assistance to farmers to control pollution runoff from agricultural land.

As a means of improving the water quality of estuaries, the bill adds a new provision to the Clean Water Act authorizing the EPA administrator to convene an interstate management conference where he or she determines that control of point and nonpoint sources of pollution is needed in more than one State. The provision is founded on the definition of the term "estuarine zone," which is intended to include an entire basin of watershed.

The management conferences would develop a comprehensive master plan for the estuary, coordinate the implementation of that plan by participating States, recommend corrective actions to be taken against the most serious point and nonpoint sources of pollution, and finally, monitor the program's effectiveness.

To fund these management conferences, H.R. 8 as introduced would have authorized $195 million over the next 5 years. The bill we expect to mark up will reduce this amount to $75 million. The Senate's bill has a similar provision but at an even lower funding level. Under our bill the Federal grants to participating States or interstate agencies would amount to 55 percent of a State's or agency's cost of implementing the master plan for each fiscal year.

Estuaries have all too often been the dumping grounds of much of our National waste. Estuarine habitats are disappearing, and we need to act swiftly to protect these natural ecosystems while there is still time to act. The provisions in H.R. 8 help meet that need by providing important protections for our estuaries.

The problem of ground water contamination from both point and nonpoint sources is also addressed in H.R. 8. It authorizes $150 million for each of 1986-88 to provide grants to public water system operators and units of local government, to make alternative water supplies available to users whose water from nonpublic water systems is made unfit for consumption because of ground water contamination.

The grants can be used for providing these alternative water supplies on a temporary basis, and for permanent...
remedies, including drilling new wells and installing new pipes.

The Federal share will be 50 percent, with an annual maximum grant of $2 million per applicant. EPA will report to Congress each year on progress made under the grant program.

The Agency would also be authorized to make grants to assist States in carrying out ground water quality protection activities as part of a comprehensive, nonpoint source pollution control program; $7.5 million each year for 5 years is authorized for this purpose. The activities eligible for the grant program include research, planning, ground water assessments, demonstration programs, enforcement, technical assistance, and education and training to protect the quality of ground water and to prevent contamination of ground water from nonpoint sources of pollution.

The importance of controlling ground water contamination has been given special emphasis with the establishment of a National Ground Water Commission, which actually was approved as part of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act passed in the 98th Congress and signed into law last November.

Although the administration has not recommended funding, the 18-member commission would be responsible for inventorying the Nation's ground water resources and the extent of contamination, projecting the future availability of usable ground water, examining methods for the abatement and containment of ground water contamination and for aquifer restoration, and assessing the roles of government (State, local and Federal) in managing ground water quality and quantity.

All in all, our proposed bill is another strong response to the need to preserve and enhance the quality of our Nation's precious water supplies. Of special importance to those at the nonpoint conference, it expands the scope of its coverage to address many of the issues raised by nonpoint source pollution.

In many respects, it is a new beginning, but a strong beginning, as we seek to develop the most cost-effective and politically feasible ways of dealing with this problem.

I think the clean water bills under consideration in the House and the Senate are coming together. The Senate clearly has a major problem to iron out concerning a new and highly controversial allotment formula based on logarithms and logarithms cubed. If they can resolve the allotment formula and agree to take the bill to the floor, I believe the chances of enacting meaningful reauthorization legislation—legislation that will introduce new directions in the field of nonpoint source pollution—would be greatly enhanced.