

servation as to how do we handle this as we go along. Is our capability improving? Are we going to be stuck with this criteria only because we have come to some kind of estimated estimates to make these?

Are we going to remain flexible and change things around and be willing to admit mistakes if we need to?

Dr. WEINBERGER. Certainly, we have to be willing to modify some of these numbers when additional information is developed.

Let me comment on the validity or the amount of information that we have regarding the scientific base for setting these standards.

I think that we have a pretty good idea as to the maximum amount of these impurities that we can have in our environment. In other words, it is not that we have just an unrestricted range of values which we can tolerate. This is not really the issue. If one looks at some of the debates it may very well be as to whether the temperature should be 90° or 95°. It is not the question of whether it should be 90 or 110. So that I think that the information that we have begins showing that at certain concentrations we will have deleterious effects.

I think the problem in setting standards relates to making sure that we don't set the value too high because we don't fully understand all of the long-range effects and interrelationships among impurities.

I don't think there is anything inconsistent in establishing, if you will, a factor of safety which would say that we know that an organism will be destroyed at a certain concentration so let us apply a factor of two, three, four, or five since we don't fully understand what some of the more subtle effects will be.

Mr. DADDARIO. That is very fine, except there comes a great question of our ability to monitor so we know enough ahead of time. The problem is knowing enough ahead of time to be able to take the steps necessary to meet an emergency. Admitting that all of what you say is so, we still have to get the information to the people at the right time, and in sufficient time to enable them to do what is necessary to handle the emergency.

The ability to get an injunction to prevent automobiles from entering New York City, for example. It gets tremendously mixed up even though we have some idea about this criteria. Therefore, as we accept certain standards, are we also forcing the communities to develop the necessary steps? Are we developing the proper laws within which the courts can take action if the local officials refuse to?

Dr. WEINBERGER. I can respond very specifically to that.

The standards which are being set by the States and currently being reviewed and acted upon by the Secretary actually consist of two parts.

The standards consist of one part where the various criteria, the analyses, what measures we should take to determine the quality, are set forth. That is one part of the standards. The second part of the standards being submitted, or that have been submitted, involves an implementation program. Every State as part of its standards must come forward with an effective implementation program. The implementation program includes monitoring programs, insuring that they have proper legislation, insuring that they have the proper means for seeing that pollution control is carried out.

This is part of the standards setting.