

Mr. WILLIAMS. It has been suggested many times that we deal with the problem of air pollution mainly by relying on emergency plans which could be put into action whenever a buildup of pollution might occur. Such plans would include, for example, switching from high-sulfur to low-sulfur fuels. This approach was suggested most recently by the American Petroleum Institute, which hired an engineering firm to make a study of its feasibility. The firm's report, issued in May 1967, concluded that the plan would be impractical, principally because of the difficulty of making accurate forecasts of pollution buildups and of administering a system which would require action by hundreds, and, in large cities, thousands, of private facilities on relatively short notice. Furthermore, such a system, even if it would work, would not be a substitute for full-time control of air pollution. This kind of system might, in theory, take care of the worst possible situations, but it would do nothing about the greater threat to human health associated with daily exposure to so-called ordinary levels of pollution in urban communities. An emergency plan is a necessary adjunct to an effective program for achieving and maintaining acceptable air quality in a community, but it clearly is not and cannot be used as a substitute for such a program.

Mr. AUERBACH. Your next question [reading] :

How do you reconcile the difference in physiological response among members of an urban population? Is the air quality which would not affect even the sick or allergic or weakened person a practical goal? Are there alternatives for this portion of the population?

I think this has already been answered, in part.

Dr. MIDDLETON. I will give you the answers I put down here.

Is the air quality which would not affect even the sick or allergic or weakened person a practical goal? Yes. It is quite practical to establish goals to take care of these people.

Mr. FELTON. May I interject?

Practical, yes, from a scientific standpoint. I keep having problems, though, with this abatement business, where you go before a court and they have to consider technological and economic considerations. It is going to have to be a very wise court that makes this final judgment. So I do think the "Yes" has to be modified to some degree to take care of the practicalities of implementation.

Dr. MIDDLETON. I don't think we have to modify whether it is a practical goal at all, Mr. Felton. I disagree with you, however I understand your question.

If you are talking about implementation of the goal into a set of local actions where economic and technical feasibility and so forth are involved, that's the area where you need to find out what it is going to cost and whether society is willing to support it. It is a different situation.

Let's be sure we get goals separated from criteria from standards. When you asked the question, "Is it a practical goal?" unequivocally the answer is yes, it is a practical goal. Whether you can attain that by an action program, and have standards and an implementation plan, and is that practical, I have to say I don't know. This has to be evaluated by all the factors involved.

Mr. FELTON. OK.

Mr. CARPENTER. That is a very good answer.