



THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION
RESEARCH · EDUCATION

50 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036
Telephone · 659-2180
Mailing Address · CONSERVIT

December 5, 1968

Dear Mr. Nixon:

The Report of the Task Force on Resources and Environment is submitted herewith.

The Task Force is unanimous in approving the report, although each member may not necessarily subscribe to every detail. The members of the Task Force have participated solely in their personal capacities.

This report concentrates on the environmental aspects of our assignment. A supplemental report will be submitted on such resource matters as minerals and energy policy. In addition, we expect to submit later short summaries on specific subjects such as environmental pollution, marine resources, the urban environment, and international conservation.

Respectfully,

Russell E. Train
Chairman
Task Force on Resources
and Environment

The Honorable Richard M. Nixon
The Hotel Pierre
New York, New York

December 5, 1968

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON

RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

(The members of the Task Force are listed in Attachment 1.)

SUMMARY

The Task Force on Resources and Environment recommends that improved environmental management be given high priority by the new Administration. Within that context, we urge that primary emphasis be placed where most people live -- the urban environment.

Pollution, loss of open space, crowding, ugliness, the declining biological health of the human environment -- these are some of the challenges at home and abroad. The issue of environmental quality is of rapidly growing public concern. The stake is man's survival in a world worth living in.

We suggest no panaceas, no mammoth new programs.

Rather, we recommend that emphasis be placed on performance -- on making existing programs work. We urge that funding needs be met, particularly in the anti-pollution programs; that better Federal coordination be achieved; that the role of industry and of state and local governments be strengthened; that new regional approaches be developed.

Inescapably, the key to more effective performance is Presidential leadership and commitment. To assist the President in this regard and to provide visible evidence of Presidential concern and initiative, we propose several actions which, while modest, could have high leverage potential. They preserve options for larger steps as larger steps become more clear.

We strongly recommend appointment by the President-elect of a Presidential Special Assistant for Environmental Affairs. He would provide a focal point for environmental responsibility and planning in a badly fragmented field.

We recommend that the existing inter-agency President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty be reconstituted the Council on the Environment and that the new Special Assistant be designated its Executive Secretary.

We recommend that the existing Citizens' Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty be reconstituted the Citizens' Committee on the Environment.

We recommend the establishment of focal points of environmental responsibility in each agency whose activities significantly affect the environment.

Major reorganization in this field should be deferred pending study by a Hoover-type commission or by a National Commission on Environment.

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON
RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

1. We recommend that improved environmental management be made a principal objective of the new Administration.

Effective management of our natural resources and environment is essential to our standard of living, the health and quality of life of our people, and the strength and security of the nation.

The stake is no longer simply the protection of wildlife, or of forests, or of open spaces or places of scenic beauty, or the production of minerals and other commodities.

The real stake is man's own survival -- in a world worth living in.

A concerned American biologist said recently: "I have reached this conclusion: We have come to a turning point in the human habitation of the earth. I believe that continued pollution of the earth, if unchecked, will eventually destroy the fitness of this planet as a place for human life."

Evidence of progressive environmental deterioration is incontrovertible. The poisoning of our lakes and rivers, the pollution of our air, the changing carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere, the progressive deterioration of the organic fertility of our soils, the pesticides and other chemicals that permeate our living environment, visual ugliness and urban sprawl, the growing inhumanity of our cities, the rising tide of human numbers that threatens to overwhelm us and our civilization -- these are challenges which now confront human society not only at home but on a global scale.

While time is running out rapidly on our ability to arrest and hopefully reverse these trends, we now possess the knowledge and technology to begin the job. Do we possess the will?

There are numerous signs that the American people themselves are ready and waiting for the necessary commitment.

Again and again, in state and local referendums across the nation, voters have given their approval -- often by lopsided margins -- to bond issues for open space acquisition, outdoor recreation programs, pollution abatement. (See Attachment 2.) Determined and effective citizen opposition to freeways, dams and loss of natural areas is commonplace.

Environmental matters were the subject of an unprecedented volume and variety of bills in the 90th Congress. (See Attachment 3.) Virtually the entire Federal government is now involved directly or indirectly with these problems. (See Attachment 4.)

There are the traditional concerns for forests and parks, fish and wildlife, soils and water, minerals and fuels. There is the new concern for the urban environment and for bringing outdoor recreation and natural values into the lives of city people. There is the need for more effective land-use planning. There is the new frontier of the oceans and the development and wise management of marine resources. There is the growing threat to the shorelines and estuaries of the coastal zone. There is the challenge of environmental pollution -- air, water, thermal, pesticides, noise and solid waste. There is the massive impact, frequently unpredicted or ill-considered, of technology upon the environment. There is the pressure of evermounting human numbers, probably the most significant single determinant of environmental quality. Internationally, these problems constitute an extraordinary opportunity for United States leadership and new initiatives.

Environmental quality is a unifying goal that cuts across economic and racial lines, across political and social boundaries. It is a goal that provides a new perspective to many national problems and can give a new direction to public policy. Its values and support come not from the divisions that plague our society but from the common aspirations of all for a life of dignity, health and fulfillment.

2. We recommend that priority be given to improving the quality of the surroundings in which most of our people live their daily lives -- in our growing urban regions.

Balance must be maintained between natural resources development on the one hand and environmental quality protection on the other. Both are essential to the nation's future. Indeed, both concerns are closely interrelated and this emphasizes the importance of developing natural resources in ways that minimize environmental pollution or disturbance. The health of our cities is tied inextricably to the health and productivity of the countryside.

Within that overall context, however, the declining environmental quality of our urban areas represents the most urgent need and greatest single opportunity for environmental programs for the next Administration.

The basic economic needs of the nation's growing urban and suburban middle classes are largely satisfied. They are now increasingly aware of the qualitative aspects of their environment which affluence is failing to provide. "Quality of life" is already a public value which enlists popular support, but our political system has not yet effectively mobilized this latent issue even in the great metropolitan areas where concern for environmental quality is strongest.

If cities are to be places in which human beings can live effectively and with dignity, we must do much to make healthier, more natural environments an integral part of urban living. Clean air and water, outdoor recreation opportunities, open space, natural areas, and freedom of access to these values should be part of everyday urban life.

The needs include comprehensive planning on a regional scale, systems analysis of environmental problems, demonstrations of improved forms of development in both urban and suburban areas, research to improve our knowledge of the relationships of human behavior to environmental needs, and utilization of natural resource programs to help meet urgent social needs for job training, employment, and recreation in low-income areas.

We urge a statement by the President of goals and priorities in this overall field, preferably in the form of a message to the Congress.

3. We recommend that emphasis be placed on performance -- on making existing programs work.

A host of conservation-environmental legislation has been enacted in recent years. Unfortunately, while these programs have raised hopes for a better environment, performance has in many cases been disappointingly low. There is a similarity here to the civil rights and poverty fields. Aspirations have been raised by the rhetoric of intent but improvement on the ground has been limited both in scope and in effectiveness.

Pollution abatement is an outstanding example. Authorizing legislation has held out hope of massive Federal help, but commensurate appropriations have not been forthcoming. This process has actually been counterproductive, for local government and industry have been understandably loath to move ahead on their own if they feel Federal help is on its way.

The gap between need (as indicated by authorized funding) and appropriations in the air and water pollution abatement programs is critical and growing. (See Attachment 5.) For example, in fiscal 1969, in the water pollution control program, there is an authorization of \$836 million, an appropriation of \$302.8 million and a possible demand in available state and local matching funds of \$1.2 billion. We attach the highest importance to these programs, and believe that adequate funding will remain a major key to their effectiveness.

The annual uncertainty of appropriation of adequate funds for the Federal cost-share also disrupts orderly local planning and financial arrangements and breeds distrust of the Federal government. One promising approach was proposed in the Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1968, which passed House and Senate but failed of enactment. This would have provided authority to make long-term contracts to spread the Federal cost-share over the life of state or local bond retirement schedules. Similar legislation can be expected early in 1969.

But more than funds is involved. Not only more efficient and imaginative administration but a spirit of closer cooperation with local and state government and with business can make many of the existing Federal assistance programs far more effective. Positive initiatives should also be taken to establish new regional intergovernmental instruments for environmental planning, development and management. The new Federal-interstate river basin commissions linked to the Water Resources Council provide constructive examples.

This is not to say that money will not be required. It will. But a new spirit of cooperation and new leadership can make the money that is available far more effective.

4. We recommend three immediate actions to strengthen national leadership for improved environmental management --
 - a. the appointment by the President of a Special Assistant for Environmental Affairs;
 - b. the reconstitution of the existing President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty as a Council on the Environment and of the existing Citizens' Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty as a Citizens' Committee on the Environment;
 - c. the establishment of a focal point of environmental responsibility within each Federal agency whose activities significantly affect the environment.

Federal programs with major resource and environmental impact are scattered throughout the Federal establishment. (See Attachment 4.) The present fragmentation, piecemeal approach, inadequate coordination, and lack of central policy direction and control of these programs constitute an obstacle to their effective implementation. More than just efficient administration is at issue. Federal programs with major environmental impacts, such as highway construction, should take into account the side effects, such as air pollution, which are the program responsibility of completely separate agencies. Present structure and, more important, present practice are grossly inadequate in this respect.

If a "Hoover-type" commission is established, it should be charged with specific responsibility in this area and be structured accordingly. In the absence of such an overall study, (or concurrently with one if lines of responsibility are carefully delineated), consideration should be given to establishing a National Commission on Environment to develop recommendations for a national policy on the environment and for more effective organization of government to serve such a policy.

Pending such a thorough study, major reorganization in the resource and environmental field should be deferred. While the new Administration should be responsive to opportunities for better interdepartmental coordination, agency shifts (or their proposal) could create frictions and uncertainties between the Executive and Legislative branches which should be avoided at the outset of the new Administration.

Special Assistant. -- The appointment by the President-elect of a Special Assistant for Environmental Affairs would evidence dramatically the new Administration's concern for a better environment, and we attach high priority to this proposal. It would

provide a focal point for the Federal government's environmental concerns, many of which are not primarily scientific or technological in nature. It would give the President for the first time a means of effectively influencing environmental policy across a wide range of agencies. It would establish for the first time a single office in the White House to deal with the problems of compartmentation and conflict -- often between Cabinet officers -- that arise constantly in resource and environmental matters. It would give the President a means of developing an environmental "strategy of quality" for the future and would permit him to take a significant initiative while maintaining his options for future organizational changes. (See Attachment 6 for a suggested press release.)

The Special Assistant for Environmental Affairs would work closely with three other Presidential advisors: the President's Science Advisor, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He also would work closely with the heads of Executive departments and agencies which have administrative and operating responsibilities for environment-related programs. The Special Assistant should be designated Executive Secretary of the President's Council on the Environment (see below).

Council on the Environment and Citizens' Committee on the Environment. -- While the establishment in the Executive Office of the President of a Council of Environmental Advisors has been widely proposed (e.g. Senators Jackson and Kuchel) and has considerable merit, we recommend that a new agency of this sort not be created at this time. We suggest making more effective use of existing agencies and opportunities.

The existing interagency Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty was created by executive order in response to needs for coordination in outdoor recreation and then expanded to include natural beauty. The Council should be reconstituted to broaden its area of responsibility to reflect the broader concern of the new Administration for the total environment.

The membership of the reconstituted Council should be broadened to reflect its wider concern. For example, the Smithsonian Institution and the Agency of International Development might be added, among other agencies, and the Council of Economic Advisors and Office of Science and Technology could be added as observers (the Budget Bureau already is represented in this role).

The duties of the Vice President should continue to include serving as chairman of the reconstituted Council to provide leadership superseding the interests of any single department. The new Presidential Special Assistant on Environmental Affairs should be designated as Executive Secretary of the Council. (The existing Council's staff is now directed by the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, in the Department of the Interior.)

While we are aware of the limitations of interagency groups in policy formulation, we believe that such a Council, tied to the White House through the Special Assistant, would prove a valuable device for more effective environmental coordination. It could also become a vehicle for consolidating other interagency groups with resource and environmental responsibilities, such as the Water Resources Council and the Marine Science Council. To be fully effective, staffing independent of any member-agency would be needed.

The existing Citizens' Committee has made valuable recommendations to the President based on citizen interest without the constraints of narrow departmental or agency missions. The reconstituted Citizens' Committee should represent a broad environmental coalition to help bring together the diverse elements of our society in a common concern for environmental quality. The Committee should assume special responsibility for developing more effective involvement of the private sector and for developing better communications between diverse environmental interests which tend today toward polarization of viewpoints.

These actions would provide additional visible evidence of the new Administration's broader concern for the total environment (rather than the present narrower focus on beauty and recreation) and, at the same time, help provide for more effective interagency coordination and public participation.

Environmental Offices in Agencies. -- Such focal points for environmental responsibility could be established by Executive Order and announced early in 1969 as part of a Special Message on Environmental Quality. Such a step will be particularly important in those agencies whose primary mission is not environmental protection but whose activities may substantially affect the environment. A major need in such agencies is to insure that environmental costs and benefits are fully considered along with other costs and benefits when plans and decisions are made.

The Army Corps of Engineers and the Department of Transportation already have established such environmental impact units. It is important that such units have direct access to the head of the agency whom they advise; the Corps of Engineers' Environmental Branch is located in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and the Department of Transportation's Office of Environmental Impact is located in the Secretary of Transportation's office. There can, of course, be no substitute for understanding, commitment, and determined leadership and follow-through by the principals involved.

###

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON
RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

ATTACHMENTS

1. List of Task Force Members
2. Voters and Environmental Programs
3. Selected Issues and Representative Legislation
Introduced in the 90th Congress
4. Federal Administration of Environmental Programs
5. The Gap Between Authorizations and Appropriations
6. Suggested Press Release on Proposed Presidential
Assistant for Environmental Affairs

RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

List of Task Force Members

Edward A. Ackerman	Executive Officer, Carnegie Institution Washington, D.C.
Stanley A. Cain	Professor, Department of Resource Planning and Conservation, University of Michigan (formerly Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks) Ann Arbor, Michigan
Charles H. Callison	Executive Vice President, National Audubon Society, New York, New York
Joseph L. Fisher	President, Resources for the Future Washington, D.C.
Loren V. Forman	Vice President, Scott Paper Company Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Charles H. W. Foster	Consultant, The Conservation Foundation (formerly Commissioner, Department of Natural Resources, State of Massachusetts) Washington, D.C.
Maurice K. Goddard	Secretary, Department of Forests and Waters, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
Norman B. Livermore, Jr.	Secretary, The Resources Agency State of California Sacramento, California
Charles F. Luce	Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Consolidated Edison Co. of New York (formerly Undersecretary of the Interior) New York, New York
John H. Meier	Executive Aide, Hughes-Nevada Operations Las Vegas, Nevada
H. Byron Mock	Attorney, Salt Lake City, Utah Vice Chairman, Public Land Law Review Commission

Bernard L. Orell	Vice President, Weyerhaeuser Company Tacoma, Washington
Nathaniel P. Reed	Conservation Advisor to Governor of Florida Tallahassee, Florida
S. Dillon Ripley	Secretary, Smithsonian Institution Washington, D.C.
Laurance S. Rockefeller	Chairman, Citizens' Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty New York, New York
Lelan F. Sillin, Jr.	President, Northeast Utilities Hartford, Connecticut
John O. Simonds	Landscape Architect Past President, American Society of Landscape Architects Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
M. Frederik Smith	American Conservation Association (formerly Vice President, Prudential Insurance Company of America) New York, New York
Russell E. Train	President, The Conservation Foundation Washington, D.C.
John W. Tukey	Professor and Chairman, Department of Statistics, Princeton University, and Executive Director, Bell Laboratory Princeton, New Jersey

VOTERS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Available evidence suggests that when voters are asked directly in bond referendums whether they want environmental improvement and whether they are willing to pay for it, they vote "yes" in an overwhelming majority of such elections.

In many instances environmental improvement proposals have passed comfortably at the same time that proposals for other purposes have failed.

This was the case last November 5th. Across the country voters continued to give a remarkably good reception to state bond issues for pollution control and open space-outdoor recreation, even though they defeated 49 per cent of all bond proposals. (See attached article in Engineering News-Record.) The biggest environmental bond issue on the November 5th ballot was Illinois' \$1-billion proposal for air and water pollution control and recreation land acquisition. Although it failed to win the necessary percentage required by Illinois law, 65 per cent of Illinois voters voted "yes."

During this decade voters of 14 states have had opportunity to vote on statewide outdoor recreation bond issue proposals. In all but one of the states and all but two of the elections the voters said "yes" -- by an average vote of 63 per cent. (See attached chart.)

Bond Approvals Hit Record

Voters approved a record \$4.1 billion worth of construction bond proposals appearing on the November 5 ballot, according to ENR tabulations. Last week's bond proposition total of \$8 billion shattered the previous high of \$3.4 billion set in 1960, when voters approved 90% of the proposals.

But many voters last week made it clear they were not willing to accept additional debt burdens resulting from spiraling state and local spending. Almost \$3.9 billion in bonds submitted to voters met defeat, a rejection rate of 49%. Last year, only 10% of the proposed bonds were turned down. In the last national election, though, 18% went under.

Some of the biggest bond propositions took the worst beating. Californians, reacting to rapidly rising sales and property taxes, rejected a proposition asking for construction of a \$2.5-billion, 89-mile rapid transit system in Los Angeles County. This proposal, the largest ever submitted to voters, would have authorized Los Angeles County to increase the sales tax by 0.5% to guarantee bonds for financing the project. The proposed transit system was intended to aid the smog problem, but it met heavy opposition from oil companies and auto associations. They contended that the Los Angeles citizen had become too acclimated to the freeway system to shift heavily to public transportation.

California voters also failed to provide a simple majority needed to approve a state \$250-million educational

bond issue. In an apparent protest over student disorders on California campuses, 55% voted against the referendum. They also turned thumbs down on \$25 million worth of bonds for juvenile protection and detention facilities. In November, 1966, voters delivered a similar verdict on a \$3.2-million proposal.

• **Some consolation**—California state and local officials do have something to smile over. Voters overwhelmingly defeated the controversial Watson amendment (ENR 9/12 p. 56), which would have severely limited the use of property taxes to support long-term construction financing. Instead they approved the legislature's alternative property-relief tax plan.

Citizens in Atlanta and neighboring Fulton and DeKalb counties also derailed transit bond referendums that would have authorized \$992 million in expenditures for an Atlanta-area transit system. Only in the Washington, D.C., area did voters give the green light to mass transit financing plans. Voters in five surrounding counties approved \$208 million in general obligation bonds toward payment of a system estimated to cost \$2.5 billion.

• **Colleges get green light**—With the exception of the California setback, college and university construction continues to win support from most voters. This year 67% of the \$668.7 million in proposals for higher education passed.

One of the biggest packages was approved in New Jersey. Out of a \$337.5-million proposal for state educational and health facilities, \$202 million is earmarked for expanding state colleges. Another issue calling for \$100 million for capital improvements for state colleges and universities in Ohio was passed, as was a Washington state issue for \$63 million for construction of college facilities.

A record volume of school proposals was on the ballot last week. But out of the \$719 million worth of proposals tabulated by ENR, only 63% passed. This was a slight change over last year when 57% of the proposals won approval.

The largest single school bond issue, for \$80 million, was approved by Baltimore voters. Cleveland and Atlanta proposals, each for \$50 million, also passed.

In St. Louis, a \$33.7-million school bond issue was defeated for the third time this year. Needing a two-thirds majority vote to pass, it received 55% in April and 57% in August at special elections, and 59% last week. However, plans to resubmit the issue may be more successful. In Tuesday's election, an amendment to Missouri's constitution was approved, lowering the majority required for school bond passage from 66% to 60%. Board of Education officials had originally proposed that a simple majority be necessary, but property owners fought the proposal, feeling that they were carrying too much of the debt for education.

(continued on next page)

\$4 Billion Despite 49% Rejection

• **Highways a winner**—Highway and street bond proposals gained almost nationwide acceptance. Slightly more than \$1.3 billion in road financing appeared on the ballot, with only \$4 million worth rejected. Three states accounted for the lion's share of the total: New Jersey with \$440 million, Ohio with \$500 million, and West Virginia with \$350 million to complete the state's Appalachian highway program.

Pollution control bond issues were successful in most areas of the country with more than \$663 million in sewer lines and sewage treatment plant issues gaining approval. But a massive \$1-billion air and water pollution bond proposal in Illinois was defeated. The proposal was designed to provide massive financial assistance to local communities for sewerage treatment plant construction. Voter apathy, especially in the rural areas of the state, and oversight were blamed for killing the issue. Because of the defeat, local governments will probably have to raise property taxes to pay for future pollution control requirements.

Propositions to finance the construction of recreational areas, swimming pools, parks and marinas continue to get a good reception by voters. This year almost \$129 million worth of proposals appeared, with less than 10% defeated. The largest, \$100 million, was in Michigan, and called for the development of major parks and land for wildlife and forest recreation.

Major Bond Issues Decided Last Week

(millions of dollars)

PURPOSE	PASSED	FAILED	GOVERNMENT UNIT
Airport	\$200	\$...	St. Louis, Mo.
Airport	10	Durham County, N.C.
Courthouse, jail, offices.....	...	39	Cuyahoga County, Ohio
Colleges, universities	203	...	New Jersey
Colleges, universities	100	...	Ohio
Colleges, universities	200	California
Colleges, universities	63	...	Washington
Hospitals, health centers.....	100	...	New Jersey
Hospitals, health centers.....	20	...	Durham County, N.C.
Highways, streets	500	...	Ohio
Highways, streets	440	...	New Jersey
Highways, streets	350	...	West Virginia
Mass transit	2,500	Los Angeles County, Calif.
Mass transit	750*	Atlanta, Fulton and DeKalb County, Ga.
Mass transit	132	...	New Jersey
Mass transit	88	...	Prince George County, Md.
Mass transit	62	...	Fairfax County, Va.
Pollution control	335	...	Michigan
Pollution control	1,000	Illinois
Pollution control	120	...	Ohio
Pollution control	100	...	Cleveland, Ohio
Port development	25	...	San Diego, Calif.
Recreation, parks	100	...	Michigan
Recreation, parks	40	...	Washington
Recreation, parks	20	...	Ohio
Schools	80	...	Baltimore, Md.
Schools	50	California
Schools	50	...	Cleveland, Ohio
Schools	45	...	Atlanta, Ga.
Schools	34	St. Louis, Mo.
Utilities (nuclear plant)	225	...	Eugene, Ore.

Total of approvals and rejections represents 99% of proposals tabulated by ENR.
* Estimated for construction.

RESULTS OF STATE OUTDOOR RECREATION BOND ISSUE ELECTIONS, 1960-1968

Election Year	State	Program Magnitude in Millions	Vote ("Yes" Vote First)	Percent Total "Yes" Vote
1960	New York	\$ 75	2,390,585 889,284	73
1961	New Jersey	60	742,396 507,897	60
1962	California	150	1,693,704 1,886,915	47
1963	New York	25	1,786,496 889,924	68
1963	Ohio	25	1,397,971 922,687	61
1963	Pennsylvania	70	1,104,745 994,087	53
1964	California	150	4,007,203 2,415,903	63
1964	Rhode Island	5	155,046 83,703	65
1964	Washington	10	614,903 434,978	59
1965	Kentucky	4.5	425,521 138,238	75
1965	Ohio	30	715,642 548,557	57

Election Year	State	Program Magnitude in Millions	Vote ("Yes" Vote First)	Percent Total "Yes" Vote
1966	Alaska	.9	29,214 4,927	86
1967	New York	200	1,951,090 1,325,000	60
1968	Alabama	\$ 43		66
	Illinois	200	1,425,293 842,908	65
	Maine	4		(approx.) 66
	Michigan	20		(approx.) 53
	Ohio	20	1,699,419 1,526,766	52
	Oregon	30		(approx.) 40
	Washington	40		(approx.) 72
Average "Yes" Vote				<u>62</u>

VOTERS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Some details of the record in both local and State bond referendums during the sixties:

1968

Michigan voters approved a \$335 million bond issue for water pollution control with a 70% yes vote, and \$100 million for recreation with a 53% yes vote.

Washington State voters approved a \$25 million bond issue for water pollution control and \$40 million for outdoor recreation acquisition and development, with a 72% yes vote.

Ohio voters approved \$120 million for water pollution control, \$20 million for parks, and \$30 million for scenic roads. The vote: 1,699,419 yes (52 %); 1,526,766 no.

Maine voters approved \$4 million for park and recreation area acquisitions by a vote of about 2-to-1.

Prince William County, Virginia, voters approved \$1.3 million for parks and recreation.

San Jose, California, voters approved \$25 million for water pollution control.

Riverview, Michigan, voters approved \$3.5 million for acquisition and development of park and recreation areas. 79% voted yes.

Seattle-King County, Washington, voters approved \$118 million for parks and recreation. The vote: 157,323 yes (65%); 85,790 no.

Baltimore County, Maryland, voters approved \$3 million for acquisition and development of school recreation centers, play areas, and waterfront parks. The vote: 108,404 yes; 46,024 no.

Baltimore City, Maryland, voters approved \$4 million for playgrounds and recreation centers. The: 86,864 yes (60%); 58,242 no.

(And in Santa Barbara County, California, voters rejected a rezoning ordinance which would have permitted construction of an oil and gas plant on their scenic ocean coast. The vote was 44,290 to 41,404 against the rezoning measure approved earlier by the county planning commission and board of supervisors.)

In contrast to the above, 1968 also saw:

Oregon voters rejected a \$30 million bond issue for beach acquisition. (The measure was placed on the ballot by the initiative process.)

Suburban Tacoma, Washington, voters rejected a \$26.6 million issue for water and sewer systems.

While San Francisco, California, voters gave more than a 50% majority to a \$6,425,000 issue for park and recreation facilities, the measure failed to receive the two-thirds vote necessary for ratification.

And while Illinois voters cast a healthy majority for a \$1 billion issue for air and water pollution control and acquisition of recreation areas, the proposal failed to win the necessary higher percentage required by Illinois law. The vote: 1,425,293 for (65%), 842,908 against.

1967

Alabama voters approved \$43 million for acquisition and development of parks by a 2-to-1 vote.

Pennsylvania voters approved \$500 million for the state's land and water conservation and reclamation fund programs.

Baltimore City, Maryland, voters approved \$3.65 million for parks and recreation. The vote: 64,444 yes; 33,934 no.

1966

Texas voters approved \$200 million for water resources improvement. The vote: 673,688 yes (64%); 375,801 no.

New York State voters approved \$200 million for park and recreation development. The vote: 1,951,090 yes (60%); 1,325,000 no.

Alaska voters approved \$900,000 for parks and recreation. The vote: 29,214 yes (86%); 4,929 no.

Maine voters approved \$1.5 million for land acquisition along the Allagash River. The vote: 184,937 yes (68%); 85,354 no.

Wayne County, Michigan, voters approved \$1.15 million for open space and recreation. The vote: 7,929 yes (53%); 7,087 no.

Ann Arbor, Michigan, voters approved \$1.5 million for park acquisition. The vote was 6,856 yes (55.5%); 5,497 no.

Fairfax County, Virginia, voters approved \$18 million for regional and local parks. The vote was 38,000 yes (63%); 22,000 no.

Washoe County, Nevada, voters approved \$1.75 million for park and recreation development. The vote: 14,046 yes (64%); 7,952 no.

Baltimore City, Maryland, voters approved \$3 million for park and playground projects. The vote: 85,354 yes (65%); 46,841 no.

Anchorage, Alaska, voters approved \$1.5 million for park and recreation area acquisitions. The vote: 2,097 yes (58%); 1,511 no.

On the negative side in 1966: While St. Louis County, Missouri, voters cast a 56% majority for \$25 million for park land acquisition, the measure was defeated because it needed a two-thirds majority. The vote: 112,969 yes (56%); 88,456 no.

Renton City, Washington, voters rejected a \$1 million issue for parks and streets by 1 vote: 2,668 yes; 2,669 no.

Skagit County, Washington, voters cast 53% of the vote for a \$500,000 issue for parks and recreation, but the issue needed a 60% majority. The vote: 7,333 yes; 6,563 no.

Lynnwood, Washington, voters cast 59% of the vote for a \$350,000 park and recreation area acquisition and development issue, but the measure needed a 60% majority. The vote: 1,489 yes; 1,026 no.

1965

Kentucky voters approved a \$176 million issue, of which \$4.5 million was for land acquisition and development at state parks. The vote: 425,521 yes (75%); 138,238 no.

Ohio voters approved \$30 million for acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas. The vote: 715,642 yes (57%); 548,557 no.

New York State voters approved a \$1 billion water pollution control bond issue by nearly 4 to 1.

1964

California voters approved \$150 million for beach, park, recreation and historical facilities acquisition and development. The vote: 4,007,203 yes (63%); 2,415,903 no.

Washington State voters approved \$10 million for acquisition of recreation lands. The vote: 614,903 yes (59%); 434,978 no.

Rhode Island voters approved \$5 million for acquisition and development of recreation and conservation lands. The vote: 155,046 yes (65%); 83,703 no.

1963

Florida voters approved an amendment to the state constitution authorizing revenue bond issue for outdoor recreation land acquisition and development and creating a land acquisition trust fund. The vote: 265,595 yes (56%); 209,844 no.

Pennsylvania voters approved \$70 million for land acquisition for recreation and conservation. The vote: 1,104,745 yes (53%); 994,087 no.

Ohio voters approved \$25 million for acquisition and development of park and recreation lands, water impoundment sites, and conservation. The vote: 1,397,971 yes (61%); 922,687 no.

1962

New York State voters approved \$25 million for outdoor recreation land acquisition. The vote: 1,786,496 yes (68%); 889,924 no.

1961

New Jersey voters approved \$60 million for acquisition of recreation and conservation lands. The vote: 742,396 yes (60%); 507,879 no.

1960

New York State voters approved \$75 million for acquisition of park and recreation land. The vote: 2,390,585 yes (73%); 889,284 no.

SELECTED ISSUES AND REPRESENTATIVE LEGISLATION INTRODUCED IN THE 90TH CONGRESS

SENATE

The bills are grouped as to committee referral. Nineteen committees and over 120 members are represented.

<i>Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:</i>	Bill number	Introduced by—
Resource and development projects for fish and wildlife.....	S. 852.....	Mr. McCarthy.
Pesticides: Safe and shipment of DDT prohibited.....	S. 1025.....	Mr. Nelson.
Federal Pesticide Control Act.....	S. 2059.....	Mr. Ribicoff.
<i>Committee on Commerce:</i>		
Tanker Disaster Act.....	S. 1585.....	Mr. Magnuson et al.
Alewife control, preventing damage to the ecology.....	S. 2123.....	Mr. Nelson.
Endangered Species Act.....	S. 2984.....	Mr. Yarborough.
<i>Committee on Finance:</i>		
Tax treatment of damages for crop injury through pollution.....	S. 84.....	Mr. Holland.
Incentive tax credits applicable to air or water pollution control and abatement facilities. Similar bills introduced by Senators Carlson, Cooper, and Ribicoff.	S. 187.....	Mr. Smathers.
<i>Committee on Foreign Relations:</i>		
Endorsement of International Biological Program.....	S. Con. Res. 26....	Mr. Harris.
<i>Committee on Government Operations:</i>		
Select Committee on Technology and Human Environment.	S. Res. 63.....	Mr. Muskie.
Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act; establishment of a Council of Social Advisers.	S. 843.....	Messrs. Mondale, Clark, Hart, Harris, Inouye, Kennedy, McGee, Muskie, Nelson, Proxmire.
Department of Natural Resources Act.....	S. 836.....	Mr. Moss.
<i>Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:</i>		
National Water Commission.....	S. 20.....	Mr. Jackson et al.
Wild Rivers Act: Public lands reserved for National Wild Rivers System.	S. 119.....	Mr. Church.
Nationwide System of Trails.....	S. 827.....	Messrs. Jackson and Nelson.
National Mining and Minerals Policy Act.....	S. 522.....	Mr. Allott et al.
Land and water conservation fund.....	S. 1401.....	Mr. Jackson et al.
National Lakes Preservation Act.....	S. 2001.....	Mr. Nelson.
Research program on natural environmental systems of the United States.	S. 2783.....	Mr. Nelson.
Council on Environmental Quality; Investigation of U.S. ecological systems, natural resources, and environmental quality.	S. 2805.....	Messrs. Jackson and Kuchel.
Mined land reclamation.....	S. 217.....	Mr. Lausche.
Inventory and study of the Nation's estuaries.....	S. 2677.....	Mr. Metcalf.
<i>Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:</i>		
Annual Presidential report on science and technology; Joint Committee on Science and Technology.	S. 1305.....	Mr. Allott et al.
Federal Council of Health.....	S. 1347.....	Mr. Javits.
Safe Drinking Water Act.....	S. 3147.....	Mr. Hill.
<i>Committee on Public Works:</i>		
Air Quality Act of 1967.....	S. 780.....	Messrs. Muskie, Baker, Bartlett, Bayh, Bible, Boggs, Brewster, Clark, Cooper, Fong, Gruening, Hartke, Inouye, Long (Mo.), Mansfield, Metcalf, Mondale, Montoya, Morse, Murphy, Nelson, Randolph, Ribicoff, Spong, Tydings, Yarborough, Young (Ohio).
Federal Water Pollution Control Act amplified by: Industrial Air Pollution Abatement and Prevention Act.	S. 847.....	Mr. Nelson.
Navigable Waters Pollution Control Act.	S. 2410.....	Mr. Nelson.
Clean Lakes Act.....	S. 849.....	Mr. Nelson.
Highway Beautification Act amendment.....	S. 1341.....	Mr. Mondale et al.
Acid mine pollution control.....	S. 1665.....	Mr. Cooper.
Improved control of pollution from vessels.....	S. 1870.....	Messrs. Randolph, Clark.
R. & D. program by Department of Interior for improved control and prevention of pollution.	S. 2525.....	Mr. Muskie et al.
Regional water pollution control advisory boards.....	S. 2760.....	Mr. Muskie et al.
Environmental Quality Prevention Act, Council on Environmental Quality.	S. 2820.....	Mr. Tower.
Extension of Federal assistance for solid waste disposal planning.	S. 3031.....	Mr. Nelson.
	S. 3201.....	Mr. Muskie et al.

(17)

Source: "Congressional White Paper on A National Policy for the Environment," Senate Committee on Interior & Insular Affairs and House Committee on Science & Astronautics, October 1968.

HOUSE

<i>Committee on Agriculture:</i>	Bill number	Introduced by—
Federal Pesticide Control Act.....	H.R. 11846.....	Mr. Dingell.
Control of noxious plants on federally controlled land.....	H.R. 14158.....	Mr. Foley.
<i>Committee on Banking and Currency:</i>		
Federal development grants for open space land.....	H.R. 5855.....	Mr. O'Hara.
<i>Committee on Government Operations:</i>		
Consolidation of water quality management and pollution control authorities in Department of the Interior.....	H.R. 3753.....	Mr. Dingell.
Establishment of Department of Marine and Atmospheric Affairs.....	H.R. 4393.....	Mr. Moss.
Uniform land acquisition policy in urban areas.....	H.R. 4190.....	Mr. Hathaway.
Council of Social Advisers.....	H.R. 5523.....	Mr. Dwyer.
National Commission on Urban Living.....	H.R. 10261.....	Mr. Ottinger.
Establishment of Department of Health.....	H.R. 12494.....	Mr. Goodell.
	H.R. 15661.....	Mr. Rosenthal.
<i>Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:</i>		
National scenic river system.....	H.R. 90.....	Mr. Saylor.
Investigation of the natural environmental systems in the United States by Department of the Interior.....	H.R. 253.....	Mr. Bennett.
Fresh water supply for the Northeastern United States.....	H.R. 1022.....	Mr. Ottinger.
Public Land Law Review Commission.....	H.R. 12121.....	Mr. Aspinall.
National Study Commission Act.....	H.R. 1416.....	Mr. Ullman.
National Study Commission on Water Conservation and Utilization.....	H.R. 5020.....	Mr. Wyatt.
Review of Nation's water resource problems.....	H.R. 6000.....	Mr. Halstoski.
Land and water conservation fund.....	H.R. 8578.....	Mr. Foley.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Similar bill: H.R. 15429 (Mr. Fulton of Tennessee).....	H.R. 15690.....	Mr. Fraser.
Nationwide trails system.....	H.R. 4365.....	Mr. Taylor.
<i>Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:</i>		
Pesticides: standards.....	H.R. 495.....	Mr. Dingell.
HUD study of potential damage to environment from erection of overhead electric transmission lines and towers.....	H.R. 4130.....	Mr. Ottinger.
Air Quality Act of 1957: The act incorporates provisions which appear as sections of numerous other bills. Some Members who authored similar bills are: Messrs. Horton, Halpern, Springer, Dingell, Adams, Eckhart, Minish, Ryan, Long of Maryland, McCarthy, Moorhead, Rosenthal, Adams, Dent, Farbstain, Delaney, Gilbert, Murphy, Van Deerlin, Walker, Mrs. Kelly, Messrs. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Patten, Howard, Corman, Halstoski, Tunney, Eilberg, Fine, Pucinski, Roybal.	H.R. 4279.....	Mr. Staggers.
Establishes regional airshed quality commissions and airshed quality regions.....	H.R. 8501.....	Mr. Biatnik.
Prohibits construction of power transmission lines on Interior-designated public lands.....	H.R. 11509e.....	Mr. Reuss.
Control and abatement of aircraft noise.....	H.R. 14335.....	Mr. Scheuer.
Solid wastes: extend and amend Public Health Service Act.....	H.R. 15733.....	Mr. Staggers.
<i>Committee on the Judiciary:</i>		
Conservation bill of rights.....	H.J. Res. 1321.....	Mr. Ottinger.
Marine Resources Conservation and Development Act.....	H.R. 17333.....	Mr. Willis.
<i>Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:</i>		
Development and preservation of U.S. estuarine areas.....	H.R. 25.....	Mr. Dingell.
Navigable Water Pollution Control Act.....	H.R. 488.....	Mr. Dingell.
Protection of fish and wildlife resources from effects of Federal projects.....	H.R. 6731.....	Mr. Ottinger.
Coast Guard R. & D. related to release of harmful fluids from vessels.....	H.R. 9116.....	Mr. Howard.
Establishment of Marine Sanctuaries.....	H.R. 11584.....	Mr. Keith.
Congressional policy concerning authority to control fish and wildlife resources.....	H.R. 14343.....	Mr. Vander Jagt.
Endangered Species Act.....	H.R. 11618.....	Mr. Lennon.
Coast Guard studies of oil pollution.....	H.R. 14352.....	Mr. Keith.
Prevention of damage to fish and wildlife from pesticides.....	H.R. 15379.....	Mr. Karth.
Environmental Science Services Administration Commissioned Officers Corps Act.....	H.R. 17333.....	Mr. Garmatz.
<i>Committee on Public Works:</i>		
Federal Water Commission Act.....	H.R. 1252.....	Mr. Ryan.
Detergent Pollution Control Act.....	H.R. 8752.....	Mr. Eilberg.
Department of Interior's R. & D. program to improve the quality of lake waters.....	H.R. 10751.....	Mr. Hanley.
Federal highway system beautification.....	H.R. 11705.....	Mr. Adams.
Clean Lakes Act.....	H.R. 13407.....	Mr. Zwach.
Control of acid and mine water pollution; similar bill introduced by Mr. Beville (H.R. 16133).....	H.R. 14000.....	Mr. Nedzi.
Oil and Hazardous Substance Pollution Control Act.....	H.R. 15906.....	Messrs. Fallon, Biatnik.
Water pollution control, Federal installations: prevention of discharge of heated effluents.....	H.R. 16352.....	Mr. Dingell.

HOUSE

Committee on Rules:

	Bill number	Introduced by—
Joint congressional committee to study problems of extraordinary pollution of air and navigable waters in the United States.	H. Con. Res. 307	Mr. St. Onge.
House Standing Committee on Urban Affairs	H. Res. 1062	Mr. Cowger.
Select Committee on Technology and Human Environment.	H. Res. 1116	Mr. Brown of California.

Committee on Science and Astronautics:

Congressional support of international biological program.	H. Con. Res. 6638	Mr. Miller of California.
Technology Assessment Board and General Advisory Council.	H.R. 6593	Mr. Daddario.
Council on Environmental Quality	H.R. 7795	Mr. Dingell.
Council of Ecological Advisers	H.R. 13211	Mr. Tunney.
Do.	H.R. 14505	Mr. Matsunaga.
Do.	H.R. 14627	Mr. Corman.

Committee on Ways and Means:

Incentive tax credit for construction of air or water pollution control facilities; similar bills presented by Messrs. Collier, Corbett, Feighan, Casey, Fuqua, Anderson, Perkins, Slack, Byrne, Reifel, Berry, King, Johnson of Pennsylvania, McClory, Zion, Whalley, Schweiker, Halpern, Schneebeli, Andrews, Steizer, Caderberg, Kupferman, Keith, Hall, MacGregor, Milze, Meskill, Smith of New York, Teague.	H.R. 385	Mr. Clancy.
Clean Lakes Act	H.R. 16257	Mr. Blackburn.

○

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

The Federal offices, agencies and committees listed below contribute a substantial share of their time and operating effort to administration and study of environment-oriented programs.

1. FEDERAL AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture:

Secretary.

Under Secretary.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.
Farmers Home Administration.
Rural Community Development Service.
Forest Service.
Soil Conservation Service.
International Agricultural Development Service.
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.
Agricultural Research Service.
Cooperative State Research Service.
Federal Extension Service.

Department of Commerce:

Secretary.

Under Secretary.

Assistant Secretary for Science and Technology.
Environmental Science Service Administration.
Environmental Data Service.
Weather Bureau.
Institutes for Environmental Research.
National Environmental Satellite Center.
Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Department of Defense:

Secretary.

Corps of Engineers.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:¹

Secretary.

Under Secretary.

Public Health Service.
Office of the Surgeon General.
Bureau of Disease Prevention and Environmental Control.
National Institutes of Health.
National Center for Air Pollution Control.
National Center for Urban and Industrial Waste.
National Environmental Sciences Center.
Food and Drug Administration.

¹ Currently reorganizing.

Source: "A National Policy for the Environment," U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, July 11, 1968.

Department of Housing and Urban Development:

Secretary.

Under Secretary.

Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development.

Deputy Assistant Secretary.

Land and Facilities Development Administration.

Urban Transportation Administration.

Office of Planning Standards and Coordination.

Department of the Interior:

Secretary.

Under Secretary.

Office of the Science Adviser.

Office of Ecology.

Office of Water Resources Research.

Assistant Secretary.

Fish and Wildlife and Parks.

Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

National Park Service.

Assistant Secretary of Mineral Resources.

Office of Oil and Gas.

Office of Mineral and Solid Fuels.

Office of Coal Research.

Bureau of Mines.

Geological Survey.

Assistant Secretary of Public Land Management.

Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Bureau of Land Management.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

Assistant Secretary of Water and Power Development.

Bureau of Reclamation.

Bonneville Power Administration.

Southeastern Power Administration.

Southwestern Power Administration.

Assistant Secretary of Water Pollution Control.

Office of Saline Water.

Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

Department of Justice:

The Attorney General.

The Deputy Attorney General.

Land and Natural Resources Division.

Department of State:

International Boundary and Water Commission—United States and Mexico.

International Scientific and Technical Affairs.

Agency for International Development.

International Joint Commission—United States and Canada.

Department of Transportation:

Secretary.

Under Secretary.

Transportation Policy Council.

Federal Aviation Administration.

Federal Highway Administration.

Federal Railroad Administration.

Office of High Speed Ground Transportation.

Coast Guard.

Executive Office of the President:

The President.

Bureau of the Budget.

Council of Economic Advisers.

Federal Committee on the Economic Impact of Pollution Abatement.

Office of Science and Technology.

President's Science Advisory Committee.

Panel on the Environment.

Federal Council for Science and Technology.

Committee on Environmental Quality.

Committee on Water Resources Research.

Executive Office of the President—Continued**The President—Continued**

President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty.

National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

Independent agencies:

Atomic Energy Commission.
 Civil Aeronautics Board.
 Federal Power Commission.
 National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
 National Science Foundation.
 Tennessee Valley Authority.
 Water Resources Council.
 Appalachian Regional Commission.
 Delaware River Basin Commission.
 Smithsonian Institution.

2. QUASIGOVERNMENTAL BODIES**National Academy of Sciences-National Academy of Engineering-National Research Council:**

Environmental Studies Board: Oversees all environmental quality studies of the NAS, NAE, and NRC. Provides a forum for development and exchange of new ideas and their application to environmental problems.

Committee on Persistent Pesticides.

Committee on Resources and Man.

Committee on Agricultural Land Use and Wildlife Resources.

U.S. National Committee for the International Biological Program.

Agricultural Board.

Committee on Solid Wastes Management.

Committee on Air Pollution.

Committee on Water Quality Management.

Committee on Remote Sensing of the Environment.

Committee Advisory to the Environmental Science Services Administration.

Committee for the Development of Criteria for Nonrail Transit Vehicles.

Committee on Environmental Physiology.

Committee on Water.

Advisory Committee to the Federal Radiation Council.

Building Research Advisory Board.

Committee on SST-Sonic Boom.

Committee on Ocean Engineering.

Committee on Geography.

Committee on Toxicology and the Advisory Center on Toxicology.

Committee on Hazardous Materials.

Ad Hoc Committee on Human Factors in Environmental Change.

Committee on Urban Technology and Committee on Social and Behavioral Urban Research.

Highway Research Board.

Committee on Hearing, Bioacoustics, and Biomechanics.

3. INTERAGENCY COMMITTEES**Source: Federal Council on Science and Technology:**

Interdepartmental Committee for Atmospheric Sciences.

Committee on Environmental Quality.

Committee on Scientific and Technical Information.

Committee on Solid Earth Sciences.

Committee on Water Resources Research.

Interagency Committee on Meteorological Services and Interagency Com-

mittee on Applied Meteorological Research.

Federal Committee on Pest Control.

Armed Forces Pest Control Board.

Interagency Aircraft Noise Abatement Advisory Committee.

Federal Advisory Committee on Water Data.

Interagency Committee on Coordination of Sewer and Water Programs.

Steering Committee: United States-German Cooperative Program in Natural Resources, Pollution Control and Urban Development.

THE GAP BETWEEN AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS

Increasing public concern over environmental deterioration has resulted in increasing attention by Congress to such problems as air and water pollution and outdoor recreation needs. As the dimensions of these environmental problems have become clearer, Congress has attempted to keep pace and meet the needs. The result has been an increase in Federal authorizations for the grant and research programs for air and water pollution control, and in Federal authorizations for acquiring needed recreation areas.

Actual appropriations for these programs have increased too. But despite these increases, the shortage of Federal funds has resulted in a growing gap between actual appropriations and authorized spending levels. The scope of some of these programs and the gap between authorizations and appropriations is evident in the following figures.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL
(in millions, for fiscal years)

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>
Authorization	\$30.5	\$46.0	\$109.0	\$185.0	\$134.3
Appropriation	\$26.6	\$40.1	\$ 80.2	\$ 88.7	

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL
(in millions, for fiscal years)

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>
Authorization	\$180	\$221	\$581	\$836	\$1,010	\$1,260
Appropriation	\$186.1	\$234.4	\$295.6	\$302.8		

WATER AND SEWER GRANTS (HUD)
(in millions, for fiscal years)

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>
Authorization	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$350*	\$115*
Appropriation	\$100	\$100	\$165	\$165	

* 1968 legislation in effect reenacted prior authorizations to the extent of unappropriated balances; thus effective authorizations for fiscal 1969 and 1970 will be \$420 million and \$605 million respectively.

As the figures show, air pollution control has grown from an authorization of \$30.5 million in fiscal 1966 to \$134.3 million in 1970. Appropriations have increased from \$26.6 million in 1966 to \$88.7 million in 1969. But the difference between the amount of money deemed necessary (the authorization) and the actual appropriations has increased to \$96.3 million in 1969.

The greatest gap is in the water pollution program, which consists primarily of grants to local governments for treatment plant construction. From an authorization of \$180 million in 1966, the program grew to an authorization of \$836 million in 1969. Appropriations grew from \$186.1 million in 1966 to \$302.8 million in 1969. But the gap in 1969 between authorization and appropriation is \$533.2 million. With authorizations already in the law for \$1 billion in 1970 and \$1.26 billion for 1971, the program will be in even more trouble and the prospects of clean water even more doubtful.

Another factor: an Interior Department study requested by Congress produced estimates that cash outlays for needed treatment plant construction alone should average \$1.6 billion a year for each of the next five years. Assuming the minimum Federal participation of 30%, the \$214 million authorized for treatment plant grants in 1969 would generate total construction funds of \$713 million -- well below half the estimated needs. Further, there is concern that Interior's estimates might be too low, meaning that needs will overshadow available funds even more.

The water and sewer grant program administered by HUD shows similar trends -- rising authorizations reflecting need for Federal assistance, a rise in Federal appropriation, but a growing gap between needed and available funds.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund offers another example of the recognition by Congress of the need for Federal assistance to help state and local governments acquire needed outdoor recreation areas and to finance authorized acquisitions by Federal land management agencies for recreation and conservation. Expenditures from the fund grew from \$13.2 million in 1966, to \$64.7 million in 1967, to \$100 million in 1968. Estimated expenditures in fiscal 1969 will be \$156 million.

When it became evident that demands upon the Fund were becoming far greater than available money, Congress in 1968 guaranteed the Fund \$200 million a year for five years.

And still another example of the need for and the recognition of increasing funds for environmental needs is HUD's open space grant program. In fiscal 1966 expenditures were \$8.4 million. In 1967, \$19.9 million. For 1968 and 1969, expenditures are estimated at \$60 million each year. And with the authorization for 1970 set at \$150 million to reflect growing demand for these grant funds, this program will also face the danger of an authorization-appropriation gap.

#

SUGGESTED PRESS RELEASE ON PROPOSED
PRESIDENTIAL ASSISTANT FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

The President-elect today announced a new White House position -- Special Assistant to the President for Environmental Affairs -- and appointed _____ to the post.

(biographical paragraph)

In announcing the appointment, the President-elect said:

Man's power to alter his environment through technology has been growing steadily. At the same time, population has been increasing steadily. Many of the problems caused by the combined impacts of these two forces on our environment are becoming extremely serious and it is now necessary that they be given careful and sustained attention at the highest level of the Government.

While technology has resulted in the highest standard of living achieved by any society, it has become increasingly apparent in recent years that there have also been undesirable -- and often unanticipated -- side effects. These include air and water pollution, congestion, noise, and pressures upon our rapidly diminishing natural land and water areas, particularly in and near urban centers.

Cumulatively, environmental problems such as these constitute a growing threat to the quality of the everyday lives of most Americans.

For too long government has reacted to environmental crises rather than anticipating and avoiding them. The stresses of the future will require that much more attention be paid to the prevention rather than the cure of environmental problems.

While most environmental problems are interrelated and interact upon one another, the Federal government's approach to their management is still very fragmented. Nine Cabinet-level departments, in addition to many independent agencies, and interagency committees and councils, administer a multitude of environment-related programs.

It will be the responsibility of the Special Assistant for Environmental Affairs to provide a focal point for resource and environmental quality concerns within the Federal government and to assist the President by --

- 1 -- Providing an objective overview of what is happening to the environment and of the environmental impacts of federal and federally-assisted activities, and applying a Presidential perspective to these interrelated problems and activities;

- 2 -- Keeping the President advised on environmental conditions and trends, and

3 -- Making recommendations to the President on policies and actions to foster environmental improvement.

The Special Assistant for Environmental Affairs will work closely with three other Presidential advisors: the President's Science Advisor, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, and the heads of departments and other Executive Branch agencies which have administrative and operating responsibilities for environment-related programs.