

environment. Our day-to-day experiences in Pennsylvania serve to strongly reinforce this conviction. Certainly there is a clear-cut need for adequate coordination and balancing of the respective functional areas and programs dealing with prevention and control of environmental pollution. Even more important may be the systematic analysis of future waste management requirements and comprehensive planning to meet over-all environmental objectives within economic feasibility. During the period ahead we will be attempting to apply this concept, not only on a statewide basis but with greater specificity in certain smaller geographical areas. Inherent in this process will be the use of improved systems analysis methodology. Much is being said about this field, but the actual application of this approach will require considerable experimentation.

As Chairman of the Committee on Environment (membership list attached) of the American Public Health Association, I wish to emphasize the views of the Committee as expressed recently on the subject of priorities for Federal Research and Development funds. Considering the substantial and growing problems in the field of environmental health and environmental pollution control, including those which are particularly serious in the more congested urban centers, the Committee feels that in the future a higher priority for Federal R & D funds should be accorded this area. The Committee is well aware of the implications of the R & D efforts relating to the space program and defense but feels that the future needs for achieving a livable environment will necessitate a larger share of available Federal R & D funds. In this connection it would be desirable to establish clear-cut sets of environmental objectives, with time tables, so that both mission-oriented and nonmission-oriented R & D projects might be assessed in terms of their contributions toward the accepted objectives.

For the information of your Committee I might comment on the extent of application of new air pollution control processes relating to sulfur which are now undergoing evaluation in Pennsylvania:

(1) A pilot plant was installed in 1967 and is now operating at Pennsylvania Electric Company's Seward Power Station to make use of the coal cleaning operation as a method for obtaining sulfur removal. The objective of this process, which appears attainable, is to remove from 60 to 70% of the total sulfur in coal during the pulverization and cleaning process and before combustion.

(2) A prototype plant began operation in August 1967 at the Portland generating station of Metropolitan Edison Company which may be characterized as a "catalytic conversion" process. This process has the objective of removing the following from the fluegas: 99.5% of particulate matter; 90% of SO_2 ; and 99.5% of sulfuric acid. The plant produces sulfuric acid as a byproduct.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT

Wesley E. Gilbertson, M.S.P.H., Chairman, Director, Bureau of Environmental Health, State Department of Health, P.O. Box 90, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120.

Robert Angelotti, Ph.D., National Center for Urban and Industrial Control, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.