

Specifically, what is the role of OST in this regard? What can it do if it finds unnecessary overlap, that areas are not well covered, or that the priorities are not correct? Is this authority primarily one of persuasion rather than decision making?

Answer. As a member of the Executive Office of the President, OST is a staff office to the President. According to Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, the Office is to . . . "assist the President in discharging the responsibility of the President for the proper coordination of Federal science and technology functions." More particularly, it is charged with advising and assisting the President with respect to: "Review, integration, and coordination of major Federal activities in science and technology..."

Its first role, therefore, is to understand, and to assist the agencies to understand, the program as a whole so that priorities, overlaps, and gaps can be identified. When a redefinition of roles and missions is called for, it can be formally effected through such mechanisms as a Bureau of the Budget circular. Presidential memorandum to the heads of the concerned agencies, or through an Executive Order. Most actions, however, are undertaken through discussion and persuasion, and this proves quite effective when the relevant facts are known and understood. Agreement achieved in this way can be formalized if necessary through a written interagency agreement. Finally, considerable leverage can be exercised through our role in the formulation of the President's budget each year.

Question 2. The FY 1969 budget notes "The obligations of the Coast Guard for the conduct of research and development will increase from \$9 million in 1968 to \$17 million in 1969. Major elements of this increase are research on the control of pollution by oil or other wastes and the development of buoy technology to collect oceanographic and environmental data." How is this coordinated between the Department of Transportation and the Department of the Interior?

Answer. The joint Interior-Transportation study on oil pollution revealed the need for considerable research on techniques for preventing spills, and for handling oil and other hazardous substances once they are on the water. During the course of this work, and also in the preparation of the Administration bill on oil pollution control, informal agreement has been reached by the Interior and Transportation Departments that the mechanical aspects of oil pollution control will be the subject of research by the Coast Guard, and the chemical aspects by the Interior Department.

Programs of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and the Coast Guard are being coordinated in detail through meetings between the two agencies.

Question 3. Agency cognizance in automobile air pollution would appear to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for standards setting, the Department of Transportation for inspection and maintenance, the Department of Commerce for economic effects on industry and the Department of the Interior for fuels relationships. Has OST become involved in this or similar coordination problems? Please describe the procedures by which comprehensive Federal policy and practice can come about in such complex environmental quality issues.

Answer. The division of responsibility is correctly stated in the question, except that the Department of Transportation's responsibility for inspection and maintenance relates only to the certification that HEW grants for the development of State and local air pollution inspection programs are consistent with the highway safety program. An administration proposal to extend this requirement to the inspection and maintenance of air pollution controls was rejected by Congress.

In connection with automobile air pollution, the report prepared on this subject by a panel of the Commerce Technical Advisory Board was the result of a request from the Director of OST to the Department of Commerce to explore the implications of the 1965 PSAC report on environmental quality, with specific attention to this area.

With regard to a comprehensive Federal policy for environmental quality issues, I can prescribe no simple procedure for arriving at one. It involves the entire fabric of the economic, social and political system. The central problem is to understand what is involved in achieving a "livable environment," which costs are associated with steps to achieve it, what the ramifications of any steps proposed to improve it may be, and how the federal, state and local governments,