

*How far should restoration of environmental quality be carried if costs and benefits cannot be appraised in a free market manner, nor most hazards demonstrated to have public health effect?*

We do need to consider economic costs of maintaining and, for the most part, restoring environmental quality. There are instances, however, where serious consideration should be given to upgrading environmental quality beyond benefits which can be appraised in a free market. Restoration also may go beyond those standards generally considered adequate to protect the public health. Although it is generally possible to express costs of restoration fairly accurately, it is difficult to convert certain types of benefits to monetary values. Such factors as aesthetics, public health, and other social values must be placed on the scales. Much of the final determination must depend upon present and foreseeable beneficial uses, taking into account the trend for increased leisure time.

Lake Tahoe is an example of a situation which warrants consideration of the type suggested. Renowned for its clarity and beautiful blue hue, this body of water remains as one of the three clearest lakes of the world. Although the major dischargers of domestic sewage within the basin of the lake all provide for treatment of their wastes, one even providing tertiary treatment to reduce phosphate levels, it has been determined that all sewage effluent must be exported from the basin to prevent the lake from turning into a green pool of algae. Here, the need for preservation of a unique natural resource was recognized and has required that monetary costs should not be the determining factor.

*What techniques of social science can be used to establish public opinion and public support in pollution abatement?*

I do not believe that any new techniques are needed to gain public understanding and support in pollution abatement matters. In California, there is a growing understanding and increased appreciation of the need for a clean environment. The public wants it. What remains to be done is to implement action programs necessary to provide this environment.

Mr. DADDARIO. Do you think the public understands the pollution problem well enough to be willing to pay for it?

Mr. WARNE. I think in some instances they probably do not but I don't think we need any new techniques. If someone came up with a new technique, I would not be adverse to employing it. I don't think the question of public understanding is the main problem that we have in this field today. As a matter of fact, in general, I would say the public has outrun most of its representatives in this desire to see something done about cleaning up the waters and the atmosphere. They don't mean that they, no more than we, always relate their desires to their actions. They might still be opposed to setting up a drainage district. But they are interested in having the drainage function performed.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Warne, sometimes they see or know or smell the problem, and they become quite vocal. They would treat the symptoms of the disease and not get at the basis of it.

Mr. WARNE. Yes.