

*eral laboratory directors at the Executive Office level that would represent the view of both directly and contractor operated Federal laboratories?*

Answer. Most of the major AEC laboratory directors are today on national panels and committees. Their senior staff members are engaged in similar roles. Thus it appears that an input for laboratory directors participating in national advisory recommendations already exists. It is my belief that the establishment of an additional council would not appreciably add to the significant influence that the laboratory directors already have on national research programs. Within the AEC, laboratory directors on their own initiative meet annually as a group to consider mutual problems. While there are some common problems, it is an unfortunate fact that the difficult ones tend to be unique to one or at most a few laboratories. Nevertheless, learning about someone else's experience may be helpful for the future. The members of the Commission also meet privately (every six to eight months) with each laboratory director to discuss with him the status, programs, problems, plans, etc. of his laboratory. Additional opportunities for laboratory director inputs at Commission or staff meetings also exist.

Going beyond the AEC experience and as a general rule, it would appear that the advantage of participation in high level recommendations by laboratory directors permits input regarding current and potential laboratory capabilities at an early stage of national program planning. For the laboratories directly represented, and to a degree for other Government laboratories, this could lead to improved utilization of current laboratory resources.

The major disadvantage might be that possible recommendations could have an adverse effect on the mission of their sponsoring agency and of their own laboratory, and thus at times would place them in a situation with conflicting objectives.

*Question 8. In your testimony you mentioned the need for some modest authorization to Federal laboratories to develop proposals in areas of national concern that might be submitted to other agencies. How would you provide such funds, as an overhead charge against all program funds spent in a laboratory, as a special allowance, through funds from a potential user agency, or otherwise? What type of monitoring or evaluation system would you use?*

Answer. In my testimony I suggested that authorization to spend modest amounts in order to develop proposals in areas of national concern would be helpful. It is difficult to justify expenditure of agency funds for non-agency purposes. If this authority could be obtained, several mechanisms for providing the funds to laboratories could be used, such as overhead allocations, special funds, etc. Of these, my strong preference would be for a specific special allowance, since this would best permit evaluation and monitoring of such expenditures.

*Question 9. In your testimony, you touched briefly on the AEC's new authority to perform research relating to public health for other agencies (P.L. 90-190). Please supply more details about your present plans to exercise this authority, proposals that have been generated, and any obstacles that you consider serious enough to bring to our attention.*

Answer. AEC plans to use this authority for all non-nuclear work, in the areas of health and safety, which is undertaken at its facilities for non-federal Government sponsors and public-sector sponsors and for which we can make the determinations required under the authority. We foresee lesser use of the new authority in the case of work sponsored by the federal government, which is the major proportion of current and presently proposed work, since in the past we have experienced very little, if any, difficulty in conducting work of this sort under our other statutory authorities.

A number of the proposals listed in Attachment II have been received since the new authority was provided. Some of these might be authorized under this new authority.

*Question 10. The Subcommittee is interested in AEC's initiatives that you mentioned to use AEC's laboratories for research aimed at pollution abatement. Could you furnish more details about the role of AEC laboratory directors in generating proposals for such research? What proposals resulted? To which agencies have they been submitted? And with what result? We are also interested in the role of AEC headquarters in handling the proposals, particularly as a point of contact with potential user agencies. To what extent could the AEC laboratory directors deal directly with potential users, and how much is being handled through the AEC itself?*

Also, could you provide more detail about the arrangements for saline water research sponsored by Interior and AEC laboratories?