ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION

by

Victor John Yannacone, Jr.

Reprinted from *1971 Proceedings of the Section of Insurance, Negligence and Compensation Law of the American Bar Association*

ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION

VICTOR JOHN YANNACONE, JR.
Patchogue, New York

Remarks prepared for a program presented by the *Committee on Problems Arising from Environmental Litigation and Legislation of the Section of Insurance, Negligence and Compensation Law, American Bar Association.*

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. Declaration of Independence (In Congress, July 4, 1776).

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people. United States Constitution, Amendment IX.

We are all aware that among the "inalienable Rights" "retained by the people" are the right to air clean enough to breathe, water potable enough to drink safely and environmental quality sufficient to maintain and encourage the development and evolution of those uniquely human characteristics which transcend the mere biological heritage of mankind.

As attorneys we all recognize that our Government has been established as the Trustee for the sovereign People of the United States, and surely no one doubts that our natural resources are held in trust for the full benefit, use and enjoyment of all the People, not only of this generation, but of those generations yet unborn, subject only to wise use for the advancement of civilization during this generation.

It should be apparent that American Industry is attempting to provide the cleanest water that the existing state-of-the-art in pollution control technology can yield.

Portions of this paper are taken from Volume 1 and Volume 2 of the treatise *Environmental Rights & Remedies*, by Victor John Yannacone, Jr., and Bernard S. Cohen, published by Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co., Rochester, New York.

The author acknowledges the assistance of Steven Gebauer Davison on the briefs in the actions Defenders of Florissant v. Park Land Company, *et al.*, and Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council v. Austral Oil, *et al.*

The author acknowledges the assistance of Prof. Orie Loucks, Prof. Philip Lewis, Prof. Ian McHarg, Dr. Ian Marceau, Dr. Robert Cancro, and Captain Angelo Cerchione, U.S.A.F. in preparation of the material on land use and environmental rehabilitation.

combination of government agencies and private speculators act in concert to destroy the delicate ecological balance of the entire state of Florida?

"What can you do when the United States Department of Agriculture publicly states that it does not consider the possible adverse effects of chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides such as DDT on non-target organisms, but permits them to be sold and used even after their adverse effects become generally known?

"What can you do when timber and paper companies cut down entire forests of Redwoods and other exotic species in order to "reforest" the area with faster growing pulpwood trees?

"What can you do when real estate speculators insist on dredging estuaries in order to fill marshes or strip the topsoil from irreplaceable prime agricultural land in order to plant houses?

"Just what can you do?"

The attorney went on to say,

"The time has come for you who are committed to the preservation of our environment to . . . enter the courtroom to protect our natural resources. . . .

It is time to assert your basic rights as citizens. Rights guaranteed by the Constitution and derived from Magna Carta. It is time to establish once and for all time that our natural resources are held in trust by each generation for the benefit, use and enjoyment of the next. Today, while there is still time, you must knock on the door of courthouses throughout this nation and seek equitable protection for the environment. You must assert the fundamental doctrine of equity jurisprudence—a doctrine as old as the Talmud or the New Testament or the Roman Law; a doctrine as old as civilization, yet a doctrine as topical as today and as advanced as tomorrow: SO USE YOUR OWN PROPERTY AS NOT TO INJURE THAT OF ANOTHER—in particular that which is the common property of all mankind, the air we breathe and the water we drink. . . .

Experience has shown that litigation seems to be the only civilized way to secure immediate consideration of such basic principles of human rights. Litigation seems to be the only way to focus the attention of our legislators on these basic problems of human existence.

Conservationists! You who would make wise use of our natural resources. Look to the history of the human rights struggle in the American Courts. Look to the success of the American Labor Movement and the surprising corporate survival of General Motors, Chrysler and Ford, in spite of judicial recognition of the rights of the United Auto Workers.

The major social changes which have made the United States of America a finer place in which to live have all had their roots in fundamental constitutional litigation. . . .

vey paleobotanist set the stage for one of the most dramatic and effective demonstrations of federal equity jurisdiction in the short history of Environmental Law.

THE DEFENSE OF FLORISSANT

The Florissant fossils, located a short distance west of Colorado Springs, Colorado, are found in more than 6,000 acres of an ancient lake bed where seeds, leaves, plants and insects from the Oligocene period (34 million years ago) are remarkably preserved in paper-thin layers of volcanic shale which, unfortunately, disintegrate when left exposed to weather unless properly protected. A number of bills had been introduced in Congress to protect the Florissant fossil beds but did not receive extensive consideration until the United States National Park Service promulgated a master plan detailing the paleontological and palynological values of Florissant.

At the time the Florissant fossil beds National Monument bill passed the Senate, Park Land Company, a Colorado Springs real estate group had already contracted to purchase 1,800 acres of the ancient lake bed. While the House of Representatives was deliberating its version of the National Monument bill, Park Land Company announced it would bulldoze a road through a portion of the proposed national monument to open the area for development and immediate sale to anyone interested in recreational housing. A group of Colorado conservationists met with the principals of the Park Land Company in an attempt to persuade them to withhold excavation in the area to be included within the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument at least until the House of Representatives acted on the bill. This request was refused as was a similar request to confine development activities to the area lying outside the ancient lake bed. The only alternative offered the conservationists was the opportunity to purchase the land—for cash immediately—at $300 per acre, twice what Park Land Company had contracted to purchase the land for a week before, and a price considerably in excess of any appraised value based on recent land sales in the area.

Faced with the irreparable loss of a substantial portion of these unique and irreplaceable fossil beds, a small group of concerned citizens formed a non-profit, public benefit corporation called the Defenders of Florissant and commenced an action for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief against the Park Land Company and all the other land owners and contract vendees in the area to be included within the proposed National Monument.

The United States District Court for the District of Colorado heard the Defenders of Florissant application for a temporary restraining order on July 9, 1969, and although the plaintiffs' proof that the proposed excavations for roads and culverts would result in the destruction of some of the most valuable fossil areas in the proposed national monu-

After a short recess, the Court returned and announced that they were issuing an order restraining the defendants from

> disturbing the soil, subsoil or geological formations of the Florissant fossil beds by any physical or mechanical means . . .

After a trial on July 29, 1969, the District Court denied the Defenders application for a preliminary injunction for the same reasons it had previously denied the application for a temporary restraining order, and the Park Land Company announced that its bulldozer would begin excavation that afternoon. Several hours later, the Plaintiffs filed a motion for an emergency stay with the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, citing defendants threat, and the Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit dramatically issued an order extending the restraining order of July 10 indefinitely until further order.

On July 31, 1969, the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, through its Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation favorably reported an amended version of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument bill, and floor action by the House of Representatives was scheduled for August 4.

During the argument of the appeal before the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, the plaintiffs amplified their legal position, asserting that the Federal Courts had a duty to cooperate with Congress, and that by issuing the preliminary injunction, pending the final deliberation of the Congress of the United States, thereby aiding the orderly operations of the Legislative and Executive branches of government. Plaintiffs pursued their original theory that the Trust Doctrine protected the fossil beds, arguing that the land had acquured a public character due to the actions of Congress with regard to the bills pending to dedicate the land as a national monument. The Court reserved decision at the close of the arguments and continued the temporary restraining order. That afternoon the House of Representatives passed its version of the bill as a number of concerned Congressmen from all over the country turned out to suspend the rules and consider the bill out of the regular order because of the pending threat to the fossils. The Senate agreed to the House version of the bill on August 7, and the President signed the bill on August 14, 1969. The preliminary restraining order issued by the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals remained in effect while the United States of America instituted suit to acquire the Park Land Company land by condemnation. The Florissant fossil beds were saved.

The court order prohibiting excavation of the fossil beds may have deprived the landowners of the most profitable use of their land, but did not prohibit all uses of the land consistent with the protection of the fossil beds. The landowners were free to develop the land for tourism, scientific research, or other uses compatible with maintenance of the

dismissed when the second action was filed by the Colorado Open Space Coordinating Council. The title of that action in itself indicates the contrasting theories.

> COLORADO OPEN SPACE COORDINATING COUNCIL, on behalf of all those entitled to the protection of their health and safety and of the health and safety of those generations yet unborn, from the hazards of ionizing radiation resulting from the distribution of radioactive materials through the permanent biogeochemical cycles of the Biosphere as a result of the defendants conduct of *Project Rulison*, and
> on behalf of all those entitled to the full benefit, use and enjoyment of the national, natural resource treasures of the State of Colorado without degradation resulting from contamination with radioactive material released as a result of the defendants conduct of *Project Rulison*, and all others similarly situated,
>
> *Plaintiffs*,
>
> —against—
>
> AUSTRAL OIL COMPANY, INCORPORATED
> and
> CER GEONUCLEAR CORPORATION,
>
> *Defendants*
>
> U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
> BUREAU OF MINES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, and
> LOS ALAMOS SCIENTIFIC LABORATORY,
>
> *as their several interests may appear.*

The shift in emphasis in the COSCC action from an emotional outcry against the underground nuclear blast itself to a reasoned demand for care in the release of radionuclides to the environment led to a Court order restraining the "flaring" of the radioactive natural gas following the blast until the hearing and determination of the action brought by COSCC. By amending their complaint, the A.C.L.U., on behalf of Crowther and the other individuals concerned personally with the blast, remained in the action. Subsequently, the District Attorney of the Ninth Judicial District of the state of Colorado attempted to bring an action in the state court on public nuisance theory, but that action was summarily transferred to the U.S. District Court and consolidated with the COSCC and A.C.L.U. actions at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Among the procedural landmarks established in the Project Rulison litigation was the right of the plaintiff COSCC to take the depositions of experts prior to the determination of the defendants motion for summary judgment to dismiss the complaint. Plaintiffs argued that the motion for summary judgment could not be decided without considering the relevant testimony of certain experts under the control of the defendants and the Court directed the defendants to produce those experts for pre-trial deposition. The information obtained in those pre-trial exam-

the Court was able to sidestep the issue by holding that joinder of the nominal head of a federal administrative agency is sufficient to make the agency accountable under the Administrative Procedure Act if all the other elements of jurisdiction under the APA have been satisfied. After finding that the Administrative Procedure Act does apply to the Atomic Energy Commission and exploring the meaning of "agency action" in light of the exigencies of modern administrative operations, the Court found

> . . . that COSCC, as a public benefit corporation asserting the interest of all those persons entitled to the protection of their health and all those persons entitled to the full benefit, use and enjoyment of the natural resources of the state of Colorado, is adversely affected or aggrieved, if in fact the AEC is obligated by the Atomic Energy Act to consider the interests asserted by COSCC in its representative capacity.

The seemingly contrary holding of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in the Mineral King case can in large measure be attributed to the failure of the Sierra Club to adequately establish its position as a person or party aggrieved—a failure of proof rather than a return to the strict interpretation of standing. The real tragedy of the Mineral King case lies in the failure of the plaintiff Sierra Club to establish the basic requisites for equitable relief—serious, permanent and irreparable damage to a national, natural resource treasure.

It would be interesting if the Sierra Club would amend its complaint to challenge the proposed Disney development and its supporting State Highway and overhead transmission lines on the grounds that such development does not represent the highest and best use of the national natural resource treasure, Sequoia National Park, alleging that determination of the highest and best use of a national natural resource treasure such as Sequoia National Park must utilize modern techniques of systems ecology; and bringing the action "on behalf of all the people of the United States, not only of this generation, but of those generations yet unborn, who are entitled to the full benefit, use and enjoyment of that national natural resource treasure, Sequoia National Park, without degradation by reason of the failure of the defendants to determine the ecological impact of their proposed public improvement upon such a national, natural resource treasure in accordance with modern methods of environmental systems science.

ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION ON THE WAY

By Earth Day, April 22, 1970, environmental litigation was well established as a weapon in the armory of those seeking to defend the environment. Building on the rhetoric that had launched the Environmental Movement, speakers at college campuses throughout the country damned industry, government and free enterprise as the source of all environmental degradation.

13. Deep well burying.
14. Population.
15. Land.
16. Mining.
17. Forests. "Most forest areas still are under federal jurisdiction, but lumber interests are pushing hard with the National Timber Supply Act going through the congressional mill."
18. Strip mining.
19. Acid mines.
20. Estuaries.
21. Maritime.
22. Water pollution. "Pick your target. Still-clean Lake Superior, where the Reserve Mining Company continues to dump iron wastes, would be a good one. Also: Lake Erie, Lake Michigan, Lake Ontario, Lake Huron, San Francisco Bay, Hudson River, Cuyahoga River, Detroit River, Potomac River, Barnegat Bay, Long Island Sound. . . ."
23. Factory farming. "A particularly obnoxious practice where a chicken or animal is confined in a cell-like area for its lifetime, turned into a living machine to produce eggs or fatten for slaughter.
24. Oil Shale. "A trillion gallons or more locked up in the Rocky mountains. . . . The next target after Alaska."
25. Alaska. "The last great unspoiled bastion in the United States. Here is the chance to preserve virgin territory for posterity. The oil companies have been moving with great haste, but the House Interior Committee is taking its time. . . ."
26. Santa Barbara. "Law suits all over the place, but the drilling goes on. . . . Conservation lawyers complain that the oil companies have pre-empted key people in the case.
27. Everglades. "The Dade County Port Authority Jetport seems to be a choice for action with strong conservation and public feeling on the issue . . ."
28. Mineral King. "Recreation areas cannot be built without an access highway across Sequoia National Forest. Another encroachment. . . ."
29. Hudson River Expressway.
30. Colorado River.
31. Hell's Canyon.
32. Storm King.
33. North Cascades. "The Seattle City Light & Power Co. wants to intrude in the new national park by building an addition to Ross Dam that would supply only a small increment of power."
34. Challis National Forest. "ASARCO wants to go into Idaho's White Cloud Mountain Range to search for molybdenum. . . ."
35. Glacier Peak Wilderness. "The Kennecott Copper Company wants in here, and has that Mining Law going for it."

The most common method is to move against the complaint raising technical procedural issues such as standing, jurisdiction and existence of a cause of action. This is the kind of legal activity that is now cluttering up the appellate courts of the land. It is just the kind of fruitless exercise in futility that led the diverse wits and pens of Shakespeare, Swift, Dickens and Gilbert to taunt the Law and mock the lawyer.

I submit that the interests of justice would best be served, as would the particular interests of American Business and Industry by defending these actions on the merits. Try the case. In many of the pending actions you can win on the merits or at least negotiate a reasonable disposition of the issues. I call your attention to the recent litigation involving American Smelting & Refining Company which began in El Paso, Texas in a local Court and terminated in New York City in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York City in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. The action was dismissed without costs, but not without the defendant encouraging citizens to file great numbers of section 304 damage suits under the Clean Air Act of 1970 as amended. Instead of disposing of all the issues on a national basis in a single action which might have then become *res judicata* or at least a reasonable basis for asserting collateral estoppel, defendants' counsel, in the haste to dismiss the complaint on a procedural technicality opened a veritable Pandora's Box of local litigation.

Gentlemen, present your clients—American Business and Industry—with a real choice among alternatives. In addition to the negative responses of defending litigation and lobbying against legislation, there is the affirmative opportunity to use corporate power to encourage wise use of our natural resources, particularly that fundamental capital asset of civilization—land.

LAND USE

If we are to live in harmony with that which has been given to us from preceding generations, and from the earth before man, we must make certain assumptions with respect to every accessible parcel of real property in the United States.

The area is vulnerable.

Development of some kind is inevitable.

Development of the land to its highest and best use as an element of human ecology must be accommodated.

Development must be determined by the environment of the region and its natural ecological constraints.

The area should contain all prospective growth without limiting its highest and best use as an element of human ecology.

Planned growth towards the highest and best use of the land and its

the public interest, even if it appears to infringe upon private property rights.

It means that any master plan which fails to consider the ecological integrity of the region and fully determine the interrelationships among each element of the land and the landscape and each natural resource is scientifically incomplete and legally defective.

It means that any master plan which does, in fact, consider the ecological integrity of the region and does fully determine the interrelationships among each element of the land and landscape and each natural resource is scientifically complete and can be sustained as the basis for legal restraints upon land use even which such restraints appear to infringe upon private property rights.

Any comprehensive plan, be it for village, town, city, country, state or region, which fails to fully evaluate the effects of any proposed land use on the overall ecological integrity of the regional ecological system is an inadequate plan at best and is ultimately doomed to become a costly and deadly hoax on the community. Any zoning law—local, state or federal—based upon such an inadequate evaluation must fail. It should fail as legislation, and it will fail in the courts; just as every attempt to ignore the natural limitations imposed on man's use of natural resources must fail.

By simply insisting that no site for business or industrial property development will be considered unless the municipality having primary jurisdiction over the area has adopted an ecologically sophisticated, environmentally responsible, socially relevant and politically feasible zoning ordinance based on a comprehensive plan that recognizes the highest and best use of each element of land and landscape as determined by the intrinsic suitability of such areas, your clients could provide a major stimulus for regional planning and orderly development of the small and medium sized municipalities on the outskirts of major metropolitan areas.

ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION

Consider for a moment the evolution of "Conservation" as a social movement. Under the early leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, it seemed as if all the "conservationists wanted were ducks in the marsh, deer in the forest, trout in the streams, salmon in the rivers, robins on the lawn, a few parks here and there, some scenic highways to reach the parks, and a conservation commissioner or Secretary of the Interior to make them feel that they had the ear of government. Today, conservationists demand wilderness in sight of our great cities and clean air and clean water—NOW! All the while conveniently forgetting that government action programs cost public monies which, in large measure, are derived from the very business and industrial activities being condemned for damaging the environment.

entirely of agricultural chemical company executives; a law that will encourage efforts to maximize agricultural production over an extended period of time while minimizing disturbance to the environment and cost to the farmer over a similar extended period of time; a law that will encourage application of systems concepts in ecology, entomology, political science and agronomy?

The essential element of any such law is the criteria for administrative action. Such criteria must be written into the enabling legislation so that later determinations of the body administering the law can be tested in the courts, if necessary, against some objective standard.

In any pesticide control law there are of necessity three controlling definitions:

> *Control*—maintaining pest pollution at a density at or below the economic threshold.
>
> *Pest*—any organism that is present at a population density above the economic threshold.
>
> *Economic Threshold*—a pest population density above which there is significant damage to man or his interests.

These are definitions that each vested interest—agriculture, conservation and chemicals could tolerate. These definitions are acceptable, and acceptability is the hallmark of politically successful legislation.

Just what kind of defintions are needed in a general law regulating other airborne environmental toxicants such as mercury, lead and the other heavy metals, asbestos, sulfur dioxide, the oxides of nitrogen, hydrogen sulfide and the other reduced sulfur compounds, the many aliphatic hydrocarbons generated during the combustion process and radionuclides, just to mention a few?

If we are ever to have meaningful air pollution legislation, we need a definition for "environmental toxicant" in terms of its effect on man, the works of man, animals, vegetation, and the regional ecological systems in which such environmental toxicant acts or concentrates.

> *Environmental Toxicant*—Any substance which acts upon man, the works of man, animals, vegetation, or becomes an element of or affects the operations of any regional ecological system.

Having defined "environmental toxicant" in relevant terms, it is next necessary to consider the effects of the introduction of an environmental toxicant into a regional ecological system in order to develop criteria for action by an administrative agency. Following the pattern of the *Clean Air Act* we must next define:

> *Hazardous Environmental Toxicants*—Any environmental toxicant which is present in a regional ecological system at a level contributing to damage to man, the works of man, animals, vegetation, or any regional ecological system, provided such damage exceeds the economic threshold.
>
> *Economic Threshold*—The level of any hazardous environmental tox-

throughout the regional ecological system in which such environmental toxicant may be operative.

(5) The stability (persistence) of each such environmental toxicant in the regional ecological system in which such environmental toxicant may be operative.

(6) The characteristics of each such environmental toxicant in terms of its action and effects at points distant from the site of emission, alone or in combination with other environmental toxicants, or as added to existing levels of the same environmental toxicant already present as elements of the regional ecological system.

(7) Current market information indicating the state-of-the-art for the particular device or process from which each such environmental toxicant is emitted.

Modern environmental legislation must establish "state-of-the-art" as the industrial standard as far as pollution control is concerned. Only in this way can the legislation remain flexible enough to breathe.

Establishing "state-of-the-art" as the standard for pollution control technology assures the same type of rapid technological progress through expanded private sector research and development that imposition of the same standard by operation of free market processes on the electronics, office equipment and computer industries has generated.

At the same time, government must recognize that depreciation-amortization regulations applicable to corporate income tax must reflect the fast write-offs needed if state-of-the-art becomes the standard for capital equipment.

One of the major contributions of American Business has been creative innovations in financing. It is obvious that the actual cost of air pollution and water pollution control facilities are far beyond the rather modest estimates made during the past decade and that most of the private sector is unable to bear the full cost at present. There is great need for new techniques of corporate financing capable of meeting the substantial capital investment needs of industrial pollution control.

One suggestion has been cooperative financing with local municipalities. The local municipality furnishes the capital through a bond issue secured by a contract with a local industry to utilize the facility at an annual charge which includes interest and amortization of the municipal obligation. The industry avoids the need to increase its bonded indebtness and meets the costs of the pollution control operation but out of current income; and the municipality acquires a pollution control facility which can also serve its own needs without the need for a substantial increase in real property taxes.

Finally, no law is complete without that provision which makes it ultimately acceptable to all parties—the provision for judicial review on demand of any party aggrieved. This means that in any matter of great controversy the issues will be settled in court.

Enlightened environmental legislation must provide for a speedy,

AVAILABLE ALTERNATIVES

Again, Gentlemen, consider the choices available to your clients. They can lobby against the proliferation of environmental legislation and legislative authorizations for citizen originated environmental litigation. They can defend the many lawsuits already filed and under consideration throughout the country, winning some and losing others in the courts and before the administrative agencies, but on the whole losing the respect so hard won from the American public.

Or, they can recognize the existence of a new challenge and a new opportunity—the opportunity to particpate in the development of new business, new industry—environmental rehabilitation—the new business and new industry which can provide a solid economic base for the next generation.

There is already a clear and present danger of government interference with the free enterprise system in the name of pollution control, yet there is still time for business and industry to respond to our most critical problem—survival. Not merely the biological survival of man as just another animal species, but rather the survival of those uniquely human characteristics which transcend the mere biological heritage of mankind.

Your clients, American Business and Industry can lead the way toward national mobilization for the war on environmental degradation. Once before, Industry, Science and the American People joined together to meet a common enemy. During World War II, we had to put aside many of our individual professional differences and unite against a common threat. The technological revolution which followed this effort—radar, racons, shoran, loran, sonar, RDF, rangefinders, operations research, reconstructive plastic surgery, dried blood plasma, protein fractionation of whole blood, dynamic testing techniques, jet propulsion, rockets, insect repellents, magnetic airborne detection, aerial reconnaissance and remote sensing, atrabrine, chloroquine, and the other antimalarials, advances in psycho-acoustics, and psycho-physiology, rodenticides, anticoagulants, the sulfonamides, insecticides, and many more—that technological revolution has yet to be duplicated.

ENVIRONMENTAL REHABILITATION

Correlation between pollution of air and water and the incidence of poverty, social disease, chronic disease and social unrest has been established. The conclusion is inescapable.

The urban pressures resulting from dense packing of human beings act synergistically with any degradation of environmental quality to encourage social disorder, the manifest symptoms of which may be disease, social unrest or simply chronic, hopeless poverty. It has become a demonstrable fact of life that our core cities, if they are to survive,

reverse the processes of environmental degradation and rehabilitate those elements of the environment that have already been damaged.

The first phase of any such national mobilization would, of course, be influenced by

> Existing surveys of our remaining non-renewable resources, the extent of waste buildup, air and water quality degradation, and natural constraints on the timetable for the present decade during which the initial changeover to a recycling resource economy must be accomplished.
>
> Continued progress in the integrated study of complex ecological systems.
>
> The existing data, manpower and techniques available in both the public and private sector which could be combined in meaningful remedial action programs to rehabilitate the environment and restructure our natural resource economy.

Let us assume that we do mobilize to protect the environment. What are the short term, real time efforts that such a national mobilization should make?

> Analysis of regional processes such as urbanization, land utilization, land abandonment, atmospheric contamination, changes in water quality and population dynamics. Such studies must take advantage of the modern remote sensing techniques developed by the military, government and industry to furnish much of the data needed for meaningful simulation of regional ecological systems.
>
> Detailed description of the variables in existing social, biological and environmental systems and the processes by which their state values change. These studies would lead to descriptive conceptual models at first and finally operational models permitting computer simulation of environmental processes for the remainder of the century.
>
> Developing strategies for monitoring the secondary effects of environmental toxicants in the environment.
>
> Determination of the limits of mankind's tolerance of atmospheric, water and other environmental alterations.
>
> Examination of the psychological interaction of man with his environment and the adaptability of mankind as a species to technological change.
>
> Development of regional planning methods which take into account the ecological, social, economic and political factors involved in the development of real property—a quality of life approach to regional planning.
>
> Implementation of data collection, storage and information retrieval methods, systems modeling and optimization techniques in order to develop criteria for choice upon which elected officials and the voting public can act.
>
> Development of environmental science educational programs incorporating the results and experience derived from the national mobilization effort against environmental degradation.

There is little need to review the environmental litigation docket, or the announced policies of many organizations to "go after business and industry."

There is even less need, I am sure, to review the many bills pending