

minimize timber harvest and other forest resource use conflicts:

- Closely coordinate timber harvest and other forest use objectives by identifying areas to be managed for multiple uses and by specifying harvest constraints to be imposed in each area. If conflicts occur, resolutions should minimize the harvesting effect on other forest uses.

- Consider the nesting areas of endangered wildlife species when determining harvest levels and scheduling and approving timber sales.

GAO also recommended that Congress:

- Provide its [Congress'] views to the Forest Service on the need for reliable timber harvest levels so that congressional oversight on forest management activities can be more effective in improving management and use of forest resources;

- Require the Forest Service, in determining harvest levels, to base management assumptions and options on the results of past accomplishments and research studies, if possible, and to document such options in timber management plans; and

- Provide guidance to the Forest Service indicating whether timber growth from planned management practices in future decades should be used and to what extent, to justify increases in harvest levels and timber sales in the current decade.

Copies of the GAO report, "Timber Harvest Levels For National Forests—How Good Are They?," January 24, 1978, CED-78-15, are available to the public at a cost of \$1.00 per copy. Requests should be forwarded to U.S. General Accounting Office, Distribution Section, P.O. Box 1020, Washington, D.C. 20013.

gation

COALITION SEEKS TO ENJOIN HIGHWAY FUNDS UNTIL AIR QUALITY IMPACTS ARE CONSIDERED

A coalition of environmental groups January 26 filed suit against the U.S. Department of Transportation and the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), seeking to enjoin DOT's disbursement of funds for highway projects in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area until statutory air quality requirements are met (*Continued Action on Transportation and Environment, Inc. v. Adams*).

The suit, filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, alleges violations of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, the Clean Air Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and the Department of Transportation Act.

It contends that the Federal-Aid Highway Act and its regulations allow DOT to grant federal funds for major highway planning and construction in an urban area only if there is a regional transportation plan that considers alternatives to minimize harmful environmental effects.

It says also that under the Act "the transportation planning process must be coordinated with air quality planning conducted under the Clean Air Act [and] the transportation plan itself must be consistent with applicable transportation elements of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)."

Inconsistencies With SIPs Alleged

The coalition's suit alleges that TPB (a regional body representing the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and local metropolitan area governments) failed to comply with substantive and procedural requirements of the Highway Act in preparing its plans for five years up to and including fiscal 1977.

The suit also alleges that the TPB plan is inconsistent with the three metropolitan area SIPs because:

- Key transportation control strategies contained in the implementation plans have not been implemented;

- The transportation plan will delay the attainment of the primary National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS);

- The transportation plan is not compatible with the attainment of the primary NAAQS for carbon monoxide and photochemical oxidants in the designated attainment year;

- The transportation plan is not compatible with the maintenance of NAAQS for carbon monoxide and photochemical oxidants once standards are achieved; and,

- The transportation plan does not provide for a relative or absolute reduction in the number of vehicle miles travelled in the region."

The suit says that because of the inadequacies in the TPB plan DOT's approval of it and subsequent disbursement of funds for its highway components was arbitrary and capricious, and an abuse of discretion.

NNEPA Claim Made

The coalition's suit also says, in a National Environmental Policy Act claim, that TPB's transportation plan will "profoundly affect the public works, zoning, transportation, land use, and other plans of the Washington Metropolitan Area," and that DOT therefore was required to prepare an environmental impact statement on the plan.

As judicial relief, the environmental groups' suit asks the court to grant a declaratory judgment that the defendants' past actions in preparing the Washington area transportation plan violated the Federal-Aid Highway Act and the Clean Air Act.

Stopping of Highway Funding Requested

The suit also asks for a mandatory injunction to restrain DOT from disbursing highway funds until it complies with the statutes and additionally to require disapproval "of any program of projects previously approved on the basis of... unlawful certification."

Finally, the complaint asks for a declaratory judgment stating that DOT is required to prepare an environmental impact statement on TPB's long range transportation plan.

Water Pollution

65 SPECIFIED TOXIC CHEMICALS LISTED; MORE TO COME SOON, AS EPA SEEKS COMMENTS

The 65 toxic pollutants to serve as the basis for developing effluent limitations under the amended Federal Water Pollution Control Act were listed formally by the Environmental Protection Agency January 31 (43 FR 4108).

EPA said it plans to add to the list "in the near future."

The pollutants are those specified in the 1976 *Natural Resources Defense Council v. Train* consent decree (8 ERC 2120) and subsequently adopted by the House and Senate in the Clean Water Act of 1977 (Current Developments, December 16, 1977, p. 1289).

The agency previously had listed nine of the 65 pollutants as toxics — aldrin/dieldrin, benznidine, cyanide, cadmium, DDT, endrin, mercury, PCBs, and toxaphene. EPA has adopted toxic pollutant effluent standards for six of them — all except cyanide, cadmium and mercury.

The listing itself poses no direct economic costs. EPA said, but the list does "form a basis for the development of effluent limitations for categories or classes of point sources pursuant to Section 301(b)(2)(A) and 304(b)(2) or Section 307(a)(2) of the Act.

Adding, Removing Toxics

In formally publishing the list of toxic pollutants under the Water Act, EPA noted that the amended law allows the agency to add to or remove pollutants depending on toxicity, persistence, degradability, "usual or potential presence of the affected organisms in any waters," importance of the affected organisms, and nature and extent of the effect of the toxic on those organisms.

EPA says it welcomes help in revising the list, and it says it has received no data so far indicating that any of the listed pollutants should be removed. Comments on additions or deletions to the list should be addressed to Kenneth M. Mackenthum, Director, Criteria and Standards Division (WH-585), 401 M St., SW, Washington, D.C. Telephone (202) 755-0100.

Petitions to modify the list should include "sufficient information to support the proposed modification," EPA said.

The list of toxic pollutants is:

1. Acenaphthene.
2. Acrolein.
3. Acrylonitrile.
4. Aldrin/Dieldrin.
5. Antimony and compounds.*
6. Arsenic and compounds.
7. Asbestos.
8. Benzene.
9. Benzidine.*
10. Beryllium and compounds.
11. Cadmium and compounds.
12. Carbon tetrachloride.
13. Chlordane (technical mixture and metabolites).
14. Chlorinated benzenes (other than dichlorobenzenes).
15. Chlorinated ethanes (including 1,2-dichloroethane, 1,1,1-trichloroethane, and hexachloroethane).
16. Chloroalkyl ethers (chloromethyl, chloroethyl, and mixed ethers).
17. Chlorinated naphthalene.
18. Chlorinated phenols (other than those listed elsewhere; includes trichlorophenols and chlorinated cresols).
19. Chloroform.
20. 2-chlorophenol.
21. Chromium and compounds.
22. Copper and compounds.
23. Cyanides.
24. DDT and metabolites.*
25. Dichlorobenzenes (1,2-, 1,3-, and 1,4-dichlorobenzenes).
26. Dichlorobenzidine.
27. Dichloroethylenes (1,1-, and 1,2-dichloroethylene).
28. 2,4-dichlorophenol.
29. Dichloropropane and dichloropropene.
30. 2,4-dimethylphenol.
31. Dinitrotoluene.
32. Diphenylhydrazine.
33. Endosulfan and metabolites.
34. Endrin and metabolites.*
35. Ethylbenzene.
36. Fluoranthene.
37. Haloethers (other than those listed elsewhere; includes chlorophenylphenyl ethers, bromophenylphenyl ether, bis(dichloroisopropyl) ether, bis-(chloroethoxy) methane and polychlorinated diphenyl ethers).
38. Halomethanes (other than those listed elsewhere; includes methylene chloride, methylchloride, methylbromide, bromoform, dichlorobromomethane, trichlorofluoromethane, dichlorodifluoromethane).
39. Heptachlor and metabolites.
40. Hexachlorocyclohexene.
41. Hexachlorocyclohexane (all isomers).
42. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene.
43. Isophorone.
44. Lead and compounds.
45. Mercury and compounds.

46. Naphthalene.
47. Nickel and compounds.
48. Nitrobenzene.
49. Nitrophenols (including 2,4-dinitrophenol, dinitroresol).
50. Nitrosamines.
51. Pentachlorophenol.
52. Phenol.
53. Phthalate esters.
54. Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs).*
55. Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (including benzanthracenes, benzopyrene, benzo(a)fluoranthene, chrysene, dibenzanthracenes, and indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene).
56. Selenium and compounds.
57. Silver and compounds.
58. 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin (TCDD).
59. Tetrachloroethylene.
60. Thallium and compounds.
61. Toluene.
62. Toxaphene.*
63. Trichloroethylene.
64. Vinyl chloride.
65. Zinc and compounds.

*Effluent standard promulgated (40 CFR Part 129).

*The term "compounds" shall include organic and inorganic compounds.

Sewage Treatment

SEWAGE AGENCY OFFICIALS WANT MORE EPA RESEARCH FUNDS

MIAMI BEACH — (By an Environment Reporter staff correspondent) — Members of the Association of Metropolitan Sewage Agencies meeting here February 1 called for increases in the Environmental Protection Agency's budget for research and development, especially for programs exploring new wastewater treatment technologies.

The local sewage agency officials met to discuss the ramifications of a recent Federal District Court order requiring Milwaukee, Wis. to significantly upgrade its sewage treatment facilities. The city was ordered to install expensive, advanced wastewater treatment, and a massive system for controlling and treating combined sewer overflows.

Combined sewers carry both direct discharge sewage from households and commercial establishments, and runoff from city streets. Combined sewer systems sometimes become overloaded, resulting in discharges of untreated sewage.

Data Called Inadequate

Metropolitan sewage agency officials said during the conference that the court may have issued the proper order in the Milwaukee case, but they contended that the decision was based on inadequate data.

William Katz, director of planning for Milwaukee's sewage district, said the court was provided with technical modelling data on the effects of the city's overflow discharges. But he said the models, in many cases, were undocumented by data gathered through sampling.

"The judge had no hard data," Katz said, "but experts probably wouldn't have done better" in issuing an opinion.

"He is greatly in ignorance and so are we," Katz said.

Research Program Overtaxed

The AMSA members' demands for increased research and development funding were fueled by disclosures from an EPA official, who said the agency's program is overtaxed because of years of budget cuts.