

Table 1—Forty sites posing health risks under current land uses that have not warranted removal action

Environmental medium that posed health risks	Number
Groundwater .....	18
Soil .....	13
Sediment .....	2
Air .....	1
Surface water .....	0
Multiple media .....	6
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>40</b>

Source: GAO's analysis of data from EPA's RELAI data base.

#### AGENCY COMMENTS

We requested that EPA provide comments on a draft of this report. On June 19, 1995, we met with officials from EPA's OERR, including the Chief, Response Operations Branch, to obtain the agency's comments on the draft report. The officials told us that they were generally satisfied that the information presented in the report is accurate. The officials provided additional perspectives on several issues discussed in the report and also suggested technical corrections on a few matters. We revised the draft report to incorporate these comments.

#### SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

To provide information on the extent to which Superfund sites may pose serious health risks under current land uses and on the nature of those risks, we analyzed pertinent information from EPA's most comprehensive data base on the health risks from Superfund sites. While we did not independently verify the accuracy of EPA's data, we reviewed the agency's data collection and verification guidelines and internal quality assurance procedures, and determined these internal controls to be adequate. We worked closely with EPA officials to ensure a proper interpretation and analysis of the data. Although the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry—the Public Health Service agency responsible for identifying health problems in the communities around Superfund sites—also assesses sites' health risks, we did not analyze the agency's evaluation data on Superfund sites for this report because of time constraints.

To provide information on whether EPA's short-term response actions have reduced the health risks from Superfund sites, we obtained EPA's data on the removal actions that have occurred at the 71 sites where current health risks existed. Although we did not verify this information, we discussed the information and EPA's removal policy and actions with officials from OERR's Response Standards and Criteria and Response Operations branches.

We performed our work between April and June 1995 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

As arranged with your office, unless you publicly announce this report's contents earlier, we plan no further distribution until 10 days after the date of this letter. At that time, we will send copies to the Administrator, EPA; the Director, Office of Management and Budget; and other interested parties. We will also make copies available to others on request.

The major contributors to this report are listed in appendix I. If you or your staff have any questions about this report, please call me at (202) 512-6111.

Sincerely yours,

PETER F. GUERRERO,

Director, Environmental Protection Issues.

#### APPENDIX I—MAJOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS REPORT

Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, Washington, D.C.: Eileen R. Larence, Assistant Director, Patricia J. Manthe, Evaluator-in-Charge, Karen A. Simpson, Evaluator, Barbara A. Johnson, Program Analyst, Jeanine M. Brady, Reports Analyst.

Chicago Regional Office: Sharon E. Butler, Senior Evaluator.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>The Congress created the Superfund program under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), which authorized the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), among other things, to clean up contamination at the nation's hazardous waste sites. EPA places the sites it considers to be the most severely contaminated on the NPL for cleanup.

<sup>2</sup>The Total Costs of Cleaning Up Nonfederal Superfund Sites, CBO (Washington, D.C.: Jan. 1994).

<sup>3</sup>EPA considers the risk serious enough to warrant cleanup if (1) an individual has more than a 1 in 10,000 chance of developing cancer from exposure to the site's contaminants or (2) if exposure to the site's contaminants might exceed the level humans can tolerate without developing other ill health effects, such as birth defects or nerve or liver damage.

<sup>4</sup>According to officials in EPA's Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, while permanent removal actions are preferred over temporary measures, EPA must consider several factors, including competing needs at other sites, in determining the appropriate removal action for a site.

<sup>5</sup>At some sites, EPA may take removal actions before the risk assessment occurs, which could reduce somewhat the risk estimated in the baseline assessment of the site.

<sup>6</sup>According to EPA officials, the Superfund program is supposed to address significant health risks under both current and future land uses. About 85 percent of sites in the RELAI data base meet EPA's criteria for serious health risk under either current or future land uses.●

#### FIRE, READY, AIM

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Bosnian policy of the United States is lacking in backbone and commitment.

I confess, it discourages me.

I am not the only one who is discouraged.

A column by Tom Friedman appeared in the Sunday July 30, 1995, New York Times that is, unfortunately, on target. And I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, July 30, 1995]

#### FIRE, READY, AIM

(By Thomas L. Friedman)

Washington: Lost in the commotion about the Senate vote to lift the arms embargo on Bosnia, and President Clinton's threat to veto such a move, is a small fact of some importance: Both the President's policy and the Congress's policy duck the real issue in Bosnia and are formulas for continued war.

What are our real interests in Bosnia? They are four: halt the killing, prevent the conflict from spreading, prevent the conflict from turning into a Christian-Muslim holy war and insure that it does not end in a way that permanently damages America's ties with its European allies, NATO and Russia.

The only way to realize those objectives is for the U.S. and its allies to draw up a map that divides Bosnia roughly along the lines of the NATO-Russia Contact Group proposal—50 percent Serb, 50 percent Muslim-Croat—and then use all necessary force, including bombing Belgrade if necessary, to impose those cease-fire lines on all the parties.

But, you might say, that would drag the U.S. into the war. Hey, we're already in the war. The U.S. and NATO last week committed to using their air power to defend a Muslim safe haven from further murderous

Serbian attacks. Well, if we are ready to use what Defense Secretary William Perry called "massive" air bombardments to defend an isolated Muslim safe haven, why not use them to defend a cease-fire and a settlement map that could stop the killing altogether? Why not use them to defend a peace plan that would establish a Bosnian Muslim state centered around Sarajevo, next to a Bosnian Serb entity that would be federated with Serbia and a Bosnia Croat entity that would be federated with Croatia?

Moreover, since we want the British, French and U.N. to keep their peacekeeping troops in Bosnia, and they are willing, why not have them use their power to oversee a partition plan and cease-fire lines, instead of to just oversee further carnage?

Usually countries decide their war aims first and commit their military power second. The Clinton Administration has done just the reverse. It has decided to get involved militarily in Bosnia, but with no clearly defined plan for achieving America's basic interests. If we are going to enter this war, it should only be to end this war—and the only way to do that is through some form of partition.

Of course it would be preferable to have a pluralistic, multi-ethnic Bosnian society and state, where everyone lives together. But the parties had that once. It was called Yugoslavia, and the Serbs, Muslims and Croats all helped to rip that state apart. That is why the only way to stabilize things now is to divide Bosnia among them.

But instead, the Administration and Congress are posturing. The Administration doesn't want to lift the arms embargo, but it also doesn't want to impose any settlement, because it fears that would involve America too deeply and because it knows it would mean accepting the very partition plans it advised the Muslims for years to reject. The Clinton Administration wants more of the status quo because its only clear goal is to get through November 1996 without U.S. troops in Bosnia.

The Congress, by contrast, just wants to get through the evening news. It wants to feel good about lifting the embargo, but does not want to recognize that this will only trigger a heavier Serbian onslaught against the Muslims, which they will only be able to resist in the short term with the help of direct Western military intervention, which is precisely the sort of deep involvement Congress is actually trying to avoid.

With the Administration plan the Muslims lose slowly. With the Congress plan the Muslims lose quickly.

Neither the Administration nor the Congress wants to recognize what the Europeans already have—that the ideal multi-ethnic, democratic Bosnia, if it were ever possible, cannot be achieved now. The only way to achieve it would be to force the Serbs, Muslims and Croats to live together under one roof, which they demonstrably do not want to do. None of the parties right now are fighting to live together. They are each fighting for ethnic survival or independence.

We can lament the idea of a multiethnic, pluralistic Bosnia but we cannot build it from the raw material at hand. The only sane thing left is to stop the killing and build the least bad peace around the Bosnia we have, which is one in which Serbs, Croats and Muslims live apart until they can learn again to live together.●

#### THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE 19TH AMENDMENT

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President. It is my pleasure to submit for the RECORD, Executive Order 95-32, issued by the

Governor of New Mexico, Gary E. Johnson, in recognition of the 75th Anniversary of women's suffrage.

Whereas, since the founding of our nation women have played a vital role in the formation of the United States of America; and

Whereas, women have fought battles, built homes, set up governments and donated many hours to help make this nation the great nation that it is today; and

Whereas, despite all of their support and hard work, women were denied the right to vote; and

Whereas, it is proper and fitting to recognize the 75th anniversary of the struggle for women's suffrage;

Therefore, I, Gary E. Johnson, Governor of New Mexico, do hereby order that on August 26, 1995, at twelve noon Mountain Standard Time, bells shall be rung in recognition and celebration of the adoption of the 19th amendment to the United States Constitution.

Through the efforts of a committed group of New Mexican citizens, organized by Elizabeth Iolene McKinney-Brown, an organization was established to pay special tribute to the 75th anniversary of the 19th amendment, Celebrate Partners United. As the group said about August 26, "This is a special day and we need to recognize it as such so that all can participate in the celebration." As a result of this group's efforts, New Mexico issued its executive order to set aside 12 noon on August 26, 1995 for the ringing of bells in celebration of the adoption of this important amendment. I understand that New Mexico is the first State to set aside a certain time of day as a special tribute to the amendment.

The members of Celebrate Partners United and the Governor of New Mexico are to be commended for their dedicated efforts to recognize this special day. As Lieutenant Governor Bradley stated in the letter of transmittal of the executive order:

The people of this nation are indebted to those who fought bravely in the face of adversity for the right of women to vote. This all important right is at the heart of our democracy. As we continuously strive for equality in this great nation, we must never forget the struggles of the past. We can only learn from the historic efforts of women fighting for suffrage and will continue to tell their story and celebrate their victory.

Elizabeth Iolene McKinney-Brown brought the Celebrate Partners United activities to my attention. It is her and the group's hope that all the States' Governors will consider the New Mexico example and issue similar proclamations. She pointed out that the ringing of bells "is reminiscent of the simple act, first done by our forefathers when they rang the Liberty Bell." She suggests that if there are no bells in the little towns and communities, that horns or sirens are just as good because "anyone, anywhere, can make a sound in remembrance of the 75th anniversary of the 19th amendment."

I am pleased that New Mexico has taken the initiative to honor August 26 in this unique way. I am also equally proud that many men and women of

New Mexico, at the grassroots level, have led this statewide effort to make a sound for this very important amendment to our U.S. Constitution. I urge my colleagues to share a similar challenge within their own States—it is a unique way for all Americans to acknowledge their appreciation for the special significance of this date in history.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JOHN M. CURRAN

● Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to John M. "Mike" Curran, an outstanding public servant from my State, who will soon retire from Government service after a distinguished 32-year career with the U.S. Forest Service.

Mike began his career with the U.S. Forest Service in 1965 as a landscape architect in the Intermountain Regional Office in Ogden, UT, and was later reassigned to the Ashley National Forest. In 1968, he moved to the Rocky Mountain Regional Office in Denver, CO. From there he went to the San Juan National Forest in Colorado where he served as forest landscape architect for 5 years. Mike held District Ranger positions from 1975 to 1981 in Wyoming, Buffalo Ranger District, and Colorado, Taylor River Ranger District. In 1981, he was selected as a Loeb Fellow at Harvard University. He then spent 4 years in the Forest Service's Washington office in programs and legislation where, during 1984, I was privileged to have Mike assigned to my staff as a Legislative Fellow to the U.S. Senate. In working with Mike on a daily basis, I developed a great respect and appreciation for his intelligence, his integrity, his judgment, and his sensitivity to the many complexities of environmental issues. Imagine my delight when, in 1986, Mike became the Forest Supervisor of the Ouachita National Forest, headquartered in Hot Springs, AR.

During his tenure in the Ouachitas, Mike has worked hard to forge a unique partnership between research and the forest which fosters the advancement of ecosystem management. His vision, initiative, and tireless efforts have earned the Ouachita National Forest national and international recognition for leadership in the evolving concept of sustainable forestry. He also made involvement of the public in the decisionmaking process a priority, always striving for new and innovative ways to improve this relationship. Significant recognition of his efforts include the Chevron Conservation Award, the Oklahoma and Arkansas Wildlife Federation Forest Conservationist of the Year Awards, the United Nations Environment Programme Award, the Chief's Ecosystem Management Award, and the Charles L. Steele Award by the Arkansas Nature Conservancy.

On a personal note, it was a unique set of circumstances which combined to forge the decade-long relationship

Mike and I have enjoyed. From a valued staff member to an agency head in my home State, Mike has also become a personal friend. We have argued over issues and worked together to preserve and protect the beautiful land surrounding Lake Ouachita, and we have celebrated together those accomplishments which have added to Arkansas' deserved reputation as the Natural State. After he retires, Mike and his wife, Leslee, will be dividing their time between Arkansas and Colorado. I am pleased that although my State and our Nation are losing an exemplary public servant, I will be keeping a valued friend and constituent.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JOHN FRAZER

● Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to John Frazer, a resident of Frankfort, KY, who is being recognized as a man who has contributed more than two decades of his life to the lobbying and leadership of Kentucky's coalition of private colleges.

At 66 years of age, this man retired in July after serving 21 years as the president of what is now referred to as the Association of Independent Kentucky Colleges and Universities. Mr. Frazer served as lobbyist and leader of the coalition which comprises 20 Kentucky schools, including Alice Lloyd, Bellarmine, Centre, Thomas More, Transylvania, and Union. Together, these colleges represent about 20,000 students, which is about 12 percent of Kentucky's college students and about 20 percent of its annual graduates.

Mr. President, this man's dedication to the liberal arts education and the institution of the private college is admirable. Mr. Frazer used funds from the Kentucky General Assembly to provide a private school education to students who were unable to afford otherwise. In addition, he coordinated libraries and created a central information system for the 20 colleges. A future problem solver, he started a joint insurance program that saves the colleges more than \$300,000 each year.

In an age where educational reform has become one of the leading concerns among Kentuckians, Mr. Frazer's dedication to ensuring the tradition of excellence of the liberal arts education and the accessibility of such an education lives on. This lobbyist, leader, and good friend is being recognized today not only for this earnest dedication, but for the admirable way he represented these colleges.

Gary Cox, executive director of the Kentucky Council on Higher Education, recently described Mr. Frazer's honorable character this way in a recent Louisville Courier-Journal article: "He's a gentleman, a fella above reproach. That has added to his credibility, and to the stature of the schools he represents."

It is my honor to pay tribute today to this representative of Kentucky—this fine example for the future educators of our Nation.●