

Mr. GRISWOLD. That is right. However, for the most part, and here is another common fallacy, anyone that thinks that concentrations of air pollution of any contaminant being uniform over a whole city is just as wrong as he can be. With 15 air monitoring stations over Los Angeles, over a period of 14 years, with 82 meteorological stations, with wind direction and velocity, we could plot wind trajectories in a manner where you could to some degree, not always but some degree, predict exactly when a high level of pollution—if it hit downtown Los Angeles at 10:30 in the morning, it would hit Pasadena at 1:30, it would hit Azusa out in the Pomona Valley at 3:30. While the previous concentrations were falling. This stuff goes in clouds, and follows trajectories and those people that are exposed to these areas, plus the stagnant areas—there are four big stagnant areas over the Los Angeles basin where you do have buildups.

But here again you get into a philosophy of control. In air monitoring, for instance, do you monitor the atmosphere, place your monitoring stations in those areas where you have a normal air condition, what might be considered a norm for the area, in order to determine the effective dose of a control program over a period of time, because control programs take periods of time to implement, or do you establish the air monitoring program to protect the public?

Now, if you want to do it to protect the public, you can put an air monitoring station downwind from a powerplant and you can have that thing going off at scale regularity, you see. I mean talking about what you are talking about, and if you were living downwind, in a prevailing wind direction from a powerplant, and understanding this, you wouldn't want any part of it.

But this one-tenth of a part per million—you talk about the difference between one-tenth and .15, for instance. Why I mean that doesn't mean a thing.

Mr. CARPENTER. Is that what you would recommend, that you would put your monitoring station downwind?

Mr. GRISWOLD. You monitor for two reasons: One, you monitor to protect the public, and the second thing is you monitor to find out what is the general situation on a given contaminant, in order to develop an orderly and phased plan to get the whole thing for the entire area down within a tolerable situation.

Mr. FELTON. Dr. Middleton, in your testimony, I think you made the statement that the Los Angeles plan was most effective as it applied to industries as opposed to, say, automobile traffic. I think you also said that in major cities automobiles caused 75 percent of the pollution.

Now, what does the State do in a situation like this?

Dr. MIDDLETON. You recognize that the reason that Los Angeles, as an example, has effective control for industries is that industries are a source of pollution that they have the authority to control. It is not that they wish to ignore the motor vehicle. It is the fact that the State in that instance, California, has the control of the motor vehicle.

I think that is the case today across the Nation. The Federal Government has assumed the authority and responsibility for motor vehicle pollution control. The moving source of pollution is to be controlled primarily by emission standards which are invoked across the country.

Now, in those situations, and they are not all on the west coast, they are anywhere across the country, in which the control of the motor