



ENVIRONMENTAL NEWS SUMMARY

August 9, 1974

Office of Public Affairs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, D.C. 20460

OCEANS

At three-day hearing in Pensacola, Fla., Gulf states' officials attack DuPont Co.'s request to dump poisonous wastes into Gulf of Mexico (New Orleans Times-Picayune, 7/23/74). Officials from Tex., La., Miss., Ala., and Fla. tell EPA that dumping harms marine life, ecology of waters off Fla., and possibly entire Gulf. Dr. Paul Templet of La. Atty. Gen.'s Environmental Advisory Committee says antimony--"as potentially deadly as mercury"--is part of waste. FLA. ASST. ATTY. GEN. KEN HOFFMAN says EPA guilty of "improperly conducting" hearings. Says T.A. Wastler, head of EPA ocean dumping program, who approved DuPont dumping (see 7/12/74, News Summary), tried to "rationalize his decision" by "badgering a state witness" from a Fla. pollution bureau (Jacksonville Times-Union, 7/24/74). N.Y. Times (7/27/74) says loser in hearing "will almost certainly take the winner to federal court," providing first test of fed law regulating offshore dumping. During hearing, Fla. Dept. of Pollution Control says it will file lawsuit to halt all industrial waste dumping in Gulf. TRAIN WILL RULE BY LATE SEPTEMBER on whether to rescind DuPont dumping permit (Atlanta Journal, 7/25/74). HEARING-RELATED STORIES in Birmingham News (7/20/74), Times-Picayune (7/19/74), Mobile Register (7/16/74), Jacksonville Times-Union (7/21/74), Pensacola Journal (7/20/74). DUPONT FILES 500-PAGE REPORT with Fla. Pollution Control Department contending its waste will not damage Gulf marine life (Mobile Register, 7/16/74), but Fla. Pollution Control Dir. Peter Baljet says DuPont press release on report "casts a giant shadow of doubt on the good will" of the company, since it leaves impression that it came from Baljet's Dept.--which finds release "not acceptable" (Tampa Tribune, 7/17/74). SEN. CHILES (D-FLA.) DEMANDS EPA REASONS for allowing dumping: "We have repeatedly pointed out that the EPA has prepared no environmental impact statement about the effects of the chemicals on Florida waters" (Miami Herald, 7/19/74). COMMENTING ON FLA. POLLUTION CONTROL DEPT. STATEMENT THAT DuPont waste is toxic, and that the state had never been informed of seven waste sites off Fla. shores, Pensacola Journal (7/17/74) says: "[EPA], in addition to doing a poor job of protection, has little regard for the attitude of states bordering salt water...this seemingly indiscriminate issuance of dumping permits by the EPA is inexcusable."

IN OTHER OCEAN DEVELOPMENTS. Dr. Richard Dewling, Region 2 Surveillance and Analysis head, says claims that sewage sludge is moving toward Long Island beaches "at an alarming and unprecedented rate have not been substantiated" (see 7/26/74 News Summary), and "it's safer to swim in the ocean than in a pool." Dewling adds, however, that while dumping poses no current threat, EPA recommends that both dump sites (6 and 12 miles out) be moved by '76. EPA plans to phase out municipal ocean dumping by '81 (AP in Asbury Park Press, 7/25/74), (N.Y. Times, 8/3/74), (N.Y. Daily News, 7/25/74), (N.Y. Post, 7/25/74) (Newsday, 7/25/74), (Bergen County Record, 7/25/74). L.I. sludge feature in Newsday (7/15/74). Same paper (7/22/74) criticizes EPA for moving too slowly in solving sludge problem, and for encouraging "short dumping" (sludge barges discarding waste before reaching dump site) by allowing barge firms to dump at night--making it harder for the Coast Guard to monitor the situation. PROGRESS OF THE UN LAW OF THE SEAS CONFERENCE is "painfully slow" says N.Y. Times (8/3/74). "While everyone here puts a good face on what is going on when speaking for the record, unofficially the participants...talk of stalemate. The votes are there, says an American delegate, but the means for setting up a strong international authority for the deep seabeds are not. The private and national interests rep-

resented here seem as various and complex as the animal and plant life of the sea itself." Wash. Star-News(7/24/74): Ecuador, Peru stick to claims of sovereignty up to 200 miles off their coasts, despite pressure from U.S., Russia--"could endanger" conference. Large nations push 12-mile limit for absolute control, 200 miles for economic jurisdiction. Wash. Star News(7/29/74): Russia accuses China of playing "lord over the sea"; in response, China accuses Russia and U.S. of "frantic expansion and plunder" of developing nations' offshore resources. Wash. Star News(7/30/74): Nine nations introduce working paper to break conference deadlock--key provision would give nations effective control over ocean up to 200 miles offshore. Cleveland Plain Dealer(7/25/74): "...The idea of a comprehensive international seabed authority...seems withered and largely forgotten...The 200-mile economic zone is no solution to the problems that the U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea set out to solve. The oceans still are an ecological whole. Without a strong international system, the economic zone arrangement will create more problems than it can solve...Most of the world's offshore oil, and about 85% of the fish, are in these 200-mile-wide economic zones. Outside them, the principal seabed resources currently usable are nodules of various minerals such as manganese...The idea of economic zones is presented as a generous concession by the rich to the poor...But...It is the rich, technologically advanced countries that will profit most from the 200 mile economic zones. Already, companies from the nodule-mining nations are negotiating to exploit seabed minerals, and they are unlikely to give the developing nations a voice in decision and management. Interest in building an international seabed authority is bound to wane to the extent that the potential wealth it might manage is consigned instead to the...zones. The danger is that there will be a patchwork of contending national jurisdictions and overlapping functions, and that developing nations will suffer." Wash. Post(7/30/74): "Sharp disagreements still exist...and there is no assurance that the full text of a treaty will be reached in this summer's session. But it is clear that the old system--or nonsystem--of rights and responsibilities which has prevailed on the high seas is gone. The very concept of "high seas", open equally to all, is buckling as particular nations assert sovereignty or special rights over areas further and further from their shores, and as the international community collectively asserts certain kinds of authority over areas further out."

UNLEADED GAS

Duval Dickey, Exxon marketing head, has some "reservations" about ability of '75's to run on unleaded gas(Dallas Morning News,7/30/74). Company will hold mid-August meeting to "determine the situation." Dickey says there is tendency for new cars to run acceptably on lower octane fuel than specified; but with increased use car runs better on higher octane fuel--trouble is, no higher octane unleaded fuel currently available...Same paper(7/23/74) says EPA backing off on "harsh" \$10,000-a-day fine for any dealer who puts leaded into '75's, especially in emergency situation, or who does not have unleaded available now. ..."THE WHOLE MATTER" of catalysts and unleaded gas, says Deseret News(7/20/74) "is like a time bomb waiting to explode this fall. Not only are the U.S. auto men fearful of what this may do to '75 sales, but importers wonder about how they can sell their cars on a tourist delivery basis, where a person picks up his car in Europe, drives it around, then ships it home." Quotes EPA official: "We will operate on the assumption that if the car has a converter and it has been driven in Europe, then the converter is inoperative and must be changed."

We are working out arrangements with customs officers now but the only exception to changing the converters will be if the driver can show us he used only unleaded gas overseas--admittedly an almost impossible task." EPA says cars driven to Canada, Mexico won't be inspected because these governments give assurance of unleaded availability in their countries. ...Automotive News(7/22/74)runs feature on

devices available to service station owner for making sure gas is really lead free. ...Jack Crollard, PRES. OF IDAHO AUTO DEALERS ASSN., predicts unleaded will be generally available in state in time for '75's (Idaho Statesman, 7/22/74). ...COMMENTING ON EPA UNLEADED REGS, syndicated columnist M. Stanton Evans (Arizona Republic, 7/22/74) says agency "is at it again--inventing solutions for which there are no discernible problems, thereby creating some brand-new problems of its own. In its brief but counterproductive history, EPA has racked up some truly epic failures...Now EPA is out to top its previous performance." Calls EPA program "authoritarian," "Big Brother." "There is not and never has been any proof that leaded gasoline is harmful to anybody ...Even EPA has been compelled, somewhat awkwardly, to admit as much...Lead is not being banned therefor, because it is harmful to your health," but "for the sake of the converters--but it develops that the converters themselves are none too healthy in their environmental impact...it was revealed last fall that they also have the characteristic of changing sulfur into sulfates...potentially quite dangerous to people with respiratory ailments--as lead, for instance, is not." Quoting Train statement that to be deterred by sulfate danger indications would thwart momentum of emission control strategy, Evans concludes: "Remember that one, fellow motorists, when you are out in your '75 Belchfire and a gas station short of nonlead fuel refuses to sell you the other kind. To have done otherwise, after all, would have inconvenienced the folks at EPA."

SOLID WASTE

A bill designed to change national solid waste disposal policies, encouraging resource recovery with incumbent financial incentives, and authorizing EPA to set standards against "unreasonable threats" to the environment caused by waste disposal, was reported by an 11-1 vote in the Senate Commerce Comm. (Wash. Post, 8/3/74). The Resource Conservation and Energy Recovery bill would change present interstate commerce rates favorable to the shipment of virgin materials, require the federal government to buy recycled materials, and provide funds for research in improved technologies in resource recovery and in the use of solid waste as a source of fuel. The Post feels the measure could (and "ought to") give EPA authority to ban the use of the 60 billion throwaway beer and soft drink containers manufactured each year. "The ... vote," continues the Post, "...is extremely encouraging...The...measure...constitutes a strong response to the "no deposit-no return" existence that is costing this nation in so many critical ways...national wastefulness is more than shameful; it is causing serious health and safety problems and is using up energy at an excessive rate."

DETERGENTS & PHOSPHATES

Phosphates, "an environmental villain just a few years back...once again the hero of the laundry room," reports the Wall Street Journal (7/29/74). Journal finds that communities in Conn., Fla., Ill., Md., which earlier banned the use of phosphate detergents have now rescinded bans, because of difficulty in finding acceptable substitutes and because of new evidence showing that detergents cause only 1/3-1/2 of all phosphate pollution in waterways. Conn. Dept. of Environmental Protection urges phosphate removal at sewage treatment stage. Environmentalist Barry Commoner calls new claims "hogwash," maintaining the "...entire problem of excess algae growth is caused by phosphates detergents...When they get smelly algae on the beach again they'll remember...."

DIELDRIN

After two years of scientific and legal controversy, EPA announces intention to ban Shell Oil Co.-manufactured pesticides aldrin, dieldrin intended for '75 crop growing season (Wash. Post, 8/3/74, N.Y. Times, 8/3/74, Wall St. Journal, 8/5/74). Citing National Cancer Society evidence that dieldrin presents "unacceptably high cancer risk," EPA Administrator Russell Train orders suspension of further production, effective immediately, with Shell's opportunity to request public hearing not to exceed 15 days. Aldrin, dieldrin have been under EPA administrative review for many months with current proceeding likely to continue as long. In light of new scientific data showing dieldrin causing cancerous tumors in mice, and "measurable amounts" recently found in 99.5% of human tissue samplings, 88% of all garden fruits, 96% of all meat and poultry, and 83% of all dairy products, with children exposed to greatest risk, immediate suspension was effected. Train's action, authorized by the federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, still allows current supplies of dieldrin to be sold and used. Shell denies carcinogenic hazard to humans and promises significant price rise in crops, especially corn. New York Times, in editorial (8/8/74) calls Shell's arguments "shockingly irresponsible..Shell itself conducted experiments, and only after a substantial number of the animals developed malignant liver tumors did it decide that what affected mice did not necessarily affect men." Times also states that "...more than 80% of United States cornfields do without these chemicals now(growers have something like a dozen alternatives at their disposal)...case gets down to public risk for private gain."

ENERGY, ENVIRONMENT AND EPA

In an interview with the Bergen County(N.J.) Record(7/25/74), Russell Train expresses feeling that the "federal government's concern for the environment has slackened appreciably...priorities...are giving less weight to the environment and more to energy." The Clean Air Act survived the crisis last winter, says Train, but the conflict around it will continue. With concern developing over federal preemption of decision-making with regard to local siting of energy projects, Train states beliefs...there should be some coherent regional planning for refineries in an area like New England. But I don't think the federal government should preempt the states' rights unless national security demands it..."



POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
EPA-335

OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460
A-107