

Mr. BELL. You also sell a great deal of the heavy fuel oil to vessels, don't you, ships and trucks and trains and so forth.

Mr. GAMMELGARD. Yes, though trains are pretty much out of that market. They are practically all diesels now; vessels, yes.

Vessels out in the ocean are not an air pollution problem and they can burn high-sulfur residual, and may do that. They have a problem when they get into a port like New York where they have to burn a low-sulfur fuel while in port.

Dr. ECKARDT. I think one of the things we have said here applies strictly to the petroleum industry. What the costs of controlling sulfur for the coal industry are I am not in a position to say, and I am not sure that anybody is because it seems at the moment the only way you are going to do this is to desulfurize the stack gases. I am not sure we have any valid estimates of how much this would cost at the present time.

Mr. BELL. In many areas you are not allowed to stack gases, isn't that true?

Dr. ECKARDT. I beg your pardon?

Mr. BELL. Are you still allowed to stack gases?

Dr. ECKARDT. Yes.

Mr. BELL. I thought there was some restriction on that.

Mr. GAMMELGARD. Mr. Bell in some areas you are not permitted unrestricted sulfur oxides coming out of a stack. Some of the regulations are written in such a manner as to say you must burn a half percent maximum sulfur fuel or you may alternatively desulfurize the stack gases to the same amount of sulfur dioxide coming out the stack as you would have to put out by burning a half percent sulfur fuel. There are two ways to go.

Mr. DADDARIO. Continue, please, Dr. Eckardt.

Dr. ECKARDT. Nevertheless, we do feel strongly that the public interest will best be served if it is recognized that such judgments are based on scant or inconclusive evidence. As new evidence is developed, a reassessment, and possibly new judgments, will have to be made.

Once a judgment has been reached, however, it should be possible to determine what course of action will best serve the public interest in a given situation. It must be recognized, however, that the public interest may not be served well if we fail to give proper weight to economic and technologic factors.

For example, recently reported studies of the population residing in the Nashville, Tenn., area reveal a very close correlation between socioeconomic status and health, whereas the correlation between relative exposure to air pollution and health in the same population sample was far less consistent. This is not to say that air pollution may not be health related, but socioeconomic status unquestionably plays a more significant role in public health than does air pollution.

For the reasons I have just given, we would favor a procedure—regardless whether it is applied at the regional, State, or local level—whereby proposed standards be published far enough in advance of final hearing and adoption to permit affected parties to determine what their control requirements and cost of compliance will be. This would permit an assessment of benefits versus costs at final public hearing before adoption of standards and rigid timetables for compliance.