

Unless such research is undertaken there will inevitably be a tendency for one jurisdiction merely to copy the actions of another, whether appropriate or not. The result could be wasteful expenditures in some areas and inadequate control in others.

Meanwhile, the development of better methods for determining what specific control measures are needed to accomplish specific air quality objectives should be an item of the highest priority. Otherwise, our air pollution control efforts may fail to produce the desired effect on air quality.

In concluding, I should like to make one observation concerning an aspect of the Air Quality Act which we may tend to overlook. Under the abatement conference procedure established back in 1963, which also carries over into the new law, the Federal Government still can and does recommend specific control measures for pollutants on which no criteria have been issued. Certainly the control measures recommended and adopted under these abatement procedures ought to be subject to the same tests of economic and technologic feasibility.

I want to thank the committee once again for the opportunity to appear here today.

That concludes my statement.

With your permission, I would like to address myself to a question asked yesterday of Mr. Ryan. I see he is not here today. I don't think he got a good answer and I think I can give a little better one.

Mr. DADDARIO. Will you restate the question and tell us your answer?

Dr. ECKARDT. He inquired yesterday about what action was taken by New York City during the November 1966 air pollution episode and I got the impression that he left here and maybe the committee felt that no action was taken. This was not true. In fact, three steps were taken in New York. Consolidated Edison was asked to use the lowest possible sulfur content fuel they could. Incineration in apartment houses, and the city incinerators was stopped and people were asked voluntarily not to drive into the city.

Then another corollary question he asked was, does New York have a plan? Well, this is part of it, but there is an additional plan that is available in New York for action if they have another air pollution emergency. I happen to serve on the Medical Advisory Committee for the Air Pollution Control Authority up there and they have recently asked us to review this plan and in essence we approved it, from a medical standpoint, with one exception, and an interesting one, and that was that they had recommended that the heat in apartment buildings not be permitted to exceed 60° Fahrenheit. We, on the medical advisory committee, thought that this was too low a temperature and would probably cause more hardship and perhaps more deaths than the air pollution itself, so we recommended this be raised to 68° Fahrenheit. But other than this one recommendation, the plan was approved and so far as I know it is in effect in New York City.

Mr. DADDARIO. Dr. Eckardt, having brought up the question of a serious episode coming about, let's say one even more serious than the Thanksgiving episode 2 years back, should there not be a plan which can take effective action? Should there not be, for example, the ability to prevent unnecessary traffic in New York and have some way to enforce this?