

These are the kind of arguments we had for many weeks. And after filtering out all this information we didn't think we ought to say, "Stop putting tetraethyl lead in gasoline." We should at least take a good look at the problem now and we ought to stop increasing the current potentially high level of lead in the air.

Mr. DADDARIO. The reason I asked you about this is that people are disturbed. It seems that Los Angeles is the base of the criteria on which you make these judgments.

For example, on page 8, of part II. On the right-hand half of the page, the first paragraph goes into that, substantiating what you have said that there is not sufficient medical evidence, which qualifies your statement, that there is no medical evidence, or not sufficient. Then you say:

Accordingly—

In the last sentence—

in certain metropolitan areas such as Los Angeles County, the present levels of atmospheric lead are considered to present a public health hazard and it would be a prudent public health policy to prevent further elevation of atmospheric lead levels in such areas as well as to take reasonable steps to reduce them.

The judgment here appears to be based on there being some medical testimony.

Dr. MORSE. Oh, yes.

Mr. DADDARIO. Since Los Angeles has this problem, others ought to be careful of not creating the same problem. This is the reason I ask the question. I think in a sense you clarified it.

Dr. MORSE. I just want to make it clear that the smog problem in Los Angeles is not the air pollution problem in other areas. It is a unique kind of problem because of geography, and the atmosphere, and lead does not contribute to that. We didn't come to our conclusion regarding lead because of Los Angeles, but after all the evidence from a number of aspects on a national basis.

Mr. DADDARIO. How did you work out the problem when the idea came that you ought to reduce this 10 percent per year, as you said it would have disruptive effects? What were the economic considerations which fit into that? How did they lead to other judgments, if they did?

Dr. MORSE. Well, we tried to strike a balance between practical recommendations, and one which would just be totally unacceptable economically, particularly in areas where there wasn't quantitative data that showed a health problem. I don't know how you would place a value in dollars upon, to my mind at least, the untenable situation of even living in Los Angeles. How do you evaluate the fact when you get up in the morning you can't see very well? I don't know how to put a dollar sign on that one.

The impact of pollution on the quality of life is difficult to consider in the usual cost effectiveness way. Fortunately the American Petroleum Institute had just made a very competent report, with respect to the capital investment and increased operating costs associated with producing nonleaded gasoline.

We looked at that. We had close collaboration with all the automobile manufacturers, and we weighed their judgment as to whether they really wanted to run engines at current high compression ratios