

committee that not more than half of the urban areas which are in need of regulatory control programs for air pollution control now have them, and of these the majority of them are operated at an inadequate level to do the kind of job you are inferring might be looked for.

"On the State government level, it was only about 14 years ago, in 1952, that the first State set up a State air pollution control law and started operating a significant air pollution control program. In the intervening period, we now have about half the States that have significant laws on the books. But only a handful of these are operating programs that are at an effective level. So that I think what is lacking as related to this goal is not so much the technology as it is the development of the control programs on the State and local levels of government that would effectively see that the available technology is employed."

The following provides additional details concerning the inadequacy of State and local governmental programs of air pollution control: For the most part, local and State agencies are still not equipped to meet their present responsibilities for the prevention and control of air pollution, let alone the potentially greater responsibilities that may be thrust upon them as the potential for air pollution continues to grow. In many important respects, the progress made during the past 21½ years is not as impressive as raw statistics might indicate.

To begin with, people in many parts of the country will not share fully in the benefits of the increase that has taken place in State and local spending. A major share of such spending is still concentrated in the State of California. Local agencies in California accounted for 38 percent of all spending for local air pollution programs in 1965. The Los Angeles County budget alone represented about 25 percent of the national total for all local agencies and, combined with the budgets of the next five largest local agencies, made up over half the national total. And at the State level, nearly half of the increased spending has been in California. This means, of course, that State and local governments elsewhere in the country are still not attacking their air pollution problems with resources commensurate with the numbers of people those problems affect.

Though there are now 33 air pollution programs at the State level, many of them are scarcely more than nominal programs having neither the authority nor the resources needed to carry on effective control activities. In 19 States, some degree of abatement responsibility has been assigned to State agencies, but in most instances the abatement authority can be invoked only with respect to obvious nuisances or in response to complaints. Only a half dozen State agencies engage in more than nominal degree of abatement activity; the great majority are not even serving those communities which are too small to operate their own local programs but are nonetheless affected by serious air pollution problems, often from a single major source. There are many such communities in all parts of the country.

For the most part, efforts at the local level are equally deficient, indeed, more so when measured against the greater degree of activity that is generally expected of local governments. In the air pollution field, it has been traditional to take the position that local governments should bear the major responsibility for practical control action. In actual fact, however, tradition and practice have seldom coincided.