

**PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
PROGRAMS IN URBAN AREAS**

LARRY J. GORDON, M.S.,M.P.H.

**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION, JUNE 29, 1976,
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE**

**I WILL INDICATE A FEW OF THE DIFFERENCES WHICH I PERCEIVE IN
DEALING WITH ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS IN AN URBAN RATHER
THAN IN OTHER SETTINGS.**

**1) I DO NOT PERCEIVE THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS ARE
DIFFERENT EXCEPT IN DEGREE AND EMPHASIS.**

**2) MY EXPERIENCE AND OBSERVATIONS LEAD ME TO BELIEVE THAT
URBAN INHABITANTS MAY FREQUENTLY BE MORE DEMANDING REGARDING
SERVICES THEY DESERVE OR DESIRE.**

3)THE "ACTION" IS DEFINITELY FASTER IN URBAN AREAS,

**4) GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURE AND INTER-GOVERNMENTAL
RELATIONS ARE USUALLY MORE COMPLEX AND DIFFICULT IN AN URBAN
AREA, THUS COMPOUNDING PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS.**

**5) MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS AND CERTAIN OTHER LOCAL
GOVERNMENTS HAVE PROPRIETARY POLLUTION PRODUCING FUNCTIONS
AS WELL AS CERTAIN REGULATORY ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
FUNCTIONS, THEREBY CREATING AN INHERENT AND CONTINUING
CONFLICT OF INTEREST REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH.**

**6) WITH BUT FEW EXCEPTIONS, URBAN ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
SERVICES ARE NOT RENDERED ON THE BASIS OF RATIONAL
ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM-SHEDS, BUT ARE MORE COMMONLY FOUND
TO BE ORGANIZED ON A CRAZY PATCHWORK BASIS OF COMPETING AND
OFTEN OVERLAPPING POLITICAL JURISDICTIONS. THIS FREQUENTLY**

MAKES PROBLEM SOLUTION MORE DIFFICULT AND CREATES SPIN-OFF ISSUES SUCH AS LACK OF UNIFORMITY OF STANDARDS REQUIRED OF THOSE INTERESTS BEING REGULATED.

7) SATELLITE COMMUNITIES AND SPECIAL-PURPOSE DISTRICTS USUALLY PREVENT NEEDED AND LOGICAL EXTENSION OF CORE CITY BOUNDARIES, THUS PRECLUDING MUNICIPAL REVENUE COMMENSURATE WITH MUNICIPAL SERVICES RENDERED, NOT ONLY TO CORE CITY RESIDENTS BUT TO TRANSIENT POPULATIONS FROM SURROUNDING AREAS.

I PREVIOUSLY INDICATED THAT I DO NOT FEEL THAT THE BASIC ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS ARE DIFFERENT IN URBAN AREAS, BUT, RATHER, ARE DIFFERENT IN DEGREE AND EMPHASIS. TO ME, THE BASIC ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED ARE THE SAME WHETHER DEALING WITH SO-CALLED URBAN ENVIRONMENT, THE OCCUPATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, THE INSTITUTIONAL ENVIRONMENT, THE RECREATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, OR THE RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT. MANY HAVE ATTEMPTED TO ORGANIZE PROGRAMS AND THE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT THEREOF ALONG THE LINES OF THESE "ENVIRONMENTS." I DO NOT PERCEIVE ANY REAL DIFFERENCE EXCEPT AS A MATTER OF POSSIBLE CONVENIENCE. EACH HAS PROBLEMS OF AIR POLLUTION, WATER POLLUTION, WATER SUPPLY, SOLID WASTES, ENVIRONMENTAL INJURY, BIOLOGICAL INSULTS, ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMICALS, FOOD SAFETY, RADIATION, NOISE, ENERGY, LAND-USE, POPULATION NUMBERS AND DISTRIBUTION, AND SHELTER. THESE BASIC ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS MUST BE ADDRESSED WHETHER DEALING WITH THE SO-CALLED URBAN ENVIRONMENT, THE RURAL ENVIRONMENT, THE OCCUPATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, OR EVEN THE ENVIRONMENT OF A WILDERNESS AREA, THEREFORE, I SUGGEST THAT

PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT BE DIRECTED TO THE PREVENTION AND SOLUTION OF THESE BASIC ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS RATHER THAN TO ANY OTHER ALLEGED DIFFERENCES. THE DIFFERENCES, AS I PREVIOUSLY INDICATED, LIE IN THE SEVERITY AND THEREFORE THE PRIORITY OF THE BASIC PROBLEMS, I SUGGEST THAT THE USUALLY IGNORED PROBLEMS OF POPULATION NUMBERS AND DISTRIBUTION, LAND USE, TRANSPORTATION, AND SHELTER, MAY BE MORE IMMEDIATELY IMPORTANT, COMPELLING, AND DEMANDING IN AN URBAN ENVIRONMENT THAN THE ATTENTION GIVEN THEM BY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PERSONNEL WOULD INDICATE.

THE LACK OF FIRM, EXPLICIT AND PRACTICAL MANAGEMENT FOUNDATIONS FOR MANY OF OUR NATION'S FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS HAS BEEN ALL TOO OBVIOUS IN RECENT YEARS. THIS WEAKNESS HAS BEEN PINPOINTED AND NOTICEABLE DURING THIS "AGE OF THE ENVIRONMENT" WHICH BEGAN IN THE LATE 60s AND WILL NO DOUBT CONTINUE FAR INTO THE FUTURE, THERE IS NO LONGER ANY DOUBT THAT THE ENVIRONMENT MUST BE MANAGED AND WILL BE MANAGED. THE ONLY REMAINING QUESTIONS RELATE TO "HOW" AND BY WHOM". TRADITIONALLY, TRAINED AND EXPERIENCED "ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTHERS" HAVE FREQUENTLY NOT EXHIBITED THE MANAGEMENT KNOWLEDGE AND CAPABILITY TO COPE WITH OR SHOW LEADERSHIP REGARDING THE NEWFOUND PUBLIC AND POLITICAL PRESSURES, ORGANIZATIONAL TRENDS, EXPANDED PROGRAM METHODOLOGY, LEGISLATIVE DEMANDS AND MANDATES, BROADENED PROGRAM SCOPE, AND EVOLVING PROGRAM GOALS. ALL TOO FREQUENTLY OUR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH LEADERS HAVE BEEN VIEWED AS NEGATIVE

OBSTRUCTIONISTS RATHER THAN CONSTRUCTIVE LEADERS, AND HAVE EXHIBITED TERRITORIAL DEFENSE MECHANISM IN LIEU OF CREATING, PROMOTING, AND JUSTIFYING EFFECTIVE PROGRAM AND ORGANIZATIONAL CONCEPTS TO MEET THE PUBLIC CLAMOR FOR A QUALITY ENVIRONMENT. "THERE GO MY PEOPLE AND I AM THEIR LEADER" HAS BECOME A TRUISM.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND PERSONAL HEALTH

FIRST OF ALL, AND PARTICULARLY FOR PERSONS USUALLY INTERESTED IN ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS, IT MAY BE NECESSARY TO INDICATE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS AND PERSONAL HEALTH PROGRAMS, ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS ARE SIMPLY ORGANIZED METHODS OF SOLVING ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS WHICH HAVE A SIGNIFICANT HEALTH COMPONENT THROUGH MEANS OF MANIPULATING OR MANAGING THE ENVIRONMENT. CONTRARY-WISE, PERSONAL HEALTH PROGRAMS SHOULD BE ADDRESSING THOSE HEALTH ISSUES WHICH CAN BEST BE HANDLED BY MANIPULATING THE INDIVIDUAL.

GOALS

BASIC TO THE PROBLEM OF MANAGEMENT INADEQUACIES HAS BEEN THE LACK OF AN UNDERSTANDABLE, STATED GOAL FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS AND AGENCIES. A GOAL MAY BE SIMPLY DEFINED AS AN "ULTIMATE DESIRED CONDITION". EVEN THOUGH A GOAL MAY BE STATED IN SOMEWHAT NEBULOUS TERMINOLOGY, SUCH A STATEMENT IS STILL NECESSARY AS A MEANS OF MAINTAINING CONSISTENT PROGRAM DIRECTION. A SUGGESTED GOAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS MIGHT BE "ENSURING AN ENVIRONMENT THAT WILL CONFER OPTIMAL HEALTH, SAFETY, COMFORT, AND WELL-BEING ON THIS AND FUTURE GENERATIONS." YOU WILL NOTICE THAT I USE THE TERMINOLOGY

"HEALTH, SAFETY, COMFORT, AND WELL-BEING" WHICH SIGNIFIES MY BELIEF THAT FEW, IF ANY, ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS CAN BE SUCCESSFULLY SOLVED ON A "HEALTH" BASIS ONLY.

MISSION

ANOTHER BASIC FACTOR IN MANY ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS IS THE STATEMENT OF MISSION. SIMPLY STATED, A MISSION IS A STATEMENT INDICATING AN AGENCY'S CONSTITUENCY OR CLIENTELE. FOR EXAMPLE, AN ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY SHOULD HAVE A MISSION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND PUBLIC SERVICE. A LABORATORY SHOULD HAVE A MISSION OF PROVIDING SERVICE TO OTHER AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENTS. CERTAIN TYPES OF AGENCIES SUCH AS AN AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT, HAVE A MISSION OF PROMOTING AND PROTECTING A GIVEN INDUSTRY. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OCCUR WHEN SUCH MISSIONS ARE MIXED WITH THE RESULTANT "FOX IN THE HEN HOUSE" SYNDROME. IT IS PATENTLY IMPOSSIBLE TO HAVE A MISSION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION COUPLED WITH A MISSION OF PROTECTING AND PROMOTING A GIVEN INDUSTRY OR OTHER SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP, THESE SITUATIONS DO EXIST AND CONTINUOUSLY RESULT IN THE PUBLIC BEING, DEFRAUDED INSTEAD OF BEING PROTECTED.

SINCE MANY ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES HAVE NOT FULLY DEVELOPED THE CONCEPT OF A MISSION, THESE AGENCIES HAVE BEEN READY PREY FOR THOSE BUSINESSES AND INDUSTRIES WHICH THEY ARE EMPOWERED TO REGULATE. THIS HAS FREQUENTLY RESULTED IN THE REGULATING AGENCIES ACTUALLY PROTECTING OR EVEN PROMOTING THE INTERESTS OF THOSE THEY ARE CHARGED WITH REGULATING.

EVEN LAWS AND REGULATIONS MUST BE VIEWED WITH SKEPTICISM TO DETERMINE IF THEY ARE REALLY DESIGNED TO PROVIDE FOR RAPID

AND EQUITABLE RESOLUTION OF ALLEGED VIOLATIONS, OR IF THEY ARE SO COUCHED IN HAZY PROCEDURAL DELAYS AS TO SERVE THE PURPOSE OF PROTECTING THE POLLUTER.

PROGRAM SCOPE

ANOTHER MANAGEMENT CONCEPT WORTH UNDERSTANDING IS THAT OF PROGRAM SCOPE AND PROGRAM-PROBLEM RELATIONSHIPS. A "PROGRAM" MAY BE DEFINED AS "A RATIONAL GROUPING OF METHODS OR ACTIVITIES DESIGNED TO SOLVE ONE OR MORE PROBLEMS." AN ENVIRONMENTAL "PROBLEM" MAY BE DEFINED AS "A REASONABLY DISCRETE ENVIRONMENTAL FACTOR HAVING AN IMPACT ON MAN'S HEALTH, SAFETY, COMFORT, OR WELL BEING."

PROGRAM SCOPE IS USUALLY DEFINED BY A GOVERNMENTAL BODY SUCH AS THE CONGRESS, A LEGISLATURE, A BOARD, COUNCIL, OR COMMISSION. HOWEVER, TO UNDERSTAND THE VALUE OF AND NEED FOR HAVING MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION REGULATORY PROGRAMS MANAGED WITHIN A SINGLE AGENCY, IT IS IMPERATIVE TO UNDERSTAND PROGRAM-PROBLEM DEFINITIONS AND INTERRELATIONSHIPS. MUCH OF THE RECENT ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM FRAGMENTATION AT FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LEVELS MIGHT HAVE BEEN PREVENTED IF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM MANAGERS, CITIZENS, AND POLITICAL LEADERS HAD A WORKING CONCEPT OF THESE RELATIONSHIPS.

A FEW EXAMPLES OF ENVIRONMENTAL "PROBLEMS" WITH A BIASED INDICATION OF THEIR RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OR LEVEL OF PRIORITY MIGHT BE IN ORDER, AS FOLLOWS: (A) LEVEL I: POPULATION NUMBERS AND DENSITY; (B) LEVEL II: ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND

LAND USE; AND (C) LEVEL III: AIR POLLUTION, SOLID WASTES, WATER POLLUTION, FOOD, ENVIRONMENTAL INJURIES, ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMICALS, NOISE POLLUTION, RADIATION, AND WATER SUPPLY.

SOCIETY, THROUGH ITS LEGISLATIVE PROCESSES, HAS GENERALLY DECREED A DEGREE OF CURATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT THROUGH FORMAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS FOR THE TYPE OF PROBLEMS LISTED IN PRIORITY LEVEL III. HOWEVER, FORMAL PROGRAMMING TO EFFECTIVELY ADDRESS THE MORE BASIC AND PREVENTIVE ISSUES IN LEVELS I AND II HAS NOT BEEN ALLOWED OR DECREED. THOSE LISTED IN LEVEL II ARE NOW BEING WIDELY DISCUSSED, BUT THUS FAR MOST EFFORTS HAVE BEEN RESTRAINED TO "SKIRTING AND FLIRTING."

IT WILL UNDOUBTEDLY BE MANY DECADES BEFORE FORMAL PROGRAMMING IS SERIOUSLY CONSIDERED TO DEAL WITH THE MOST BASIC AND HIGHEST PRIORITY ISSUES -- THOSE OF (A) POPULATION NUMBERS AND DENSITY, AND (B) POPULATION LIFE STYLES AND RESOURCE CONSUMPTION OF THE HUMAN ANIMAL. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCIES. THEREFORE, THEY ARE USUALLY ONLY DEALING WITH THE BY-PRODUCTS OF THE BASIC PROBLEMS. PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO SOLVE THE LEVEL III PROBLEMS ARE, THEREFORE, ACTUALLY CURATIVE RATHER THAN PREVENTIVE. THE BASIC ISSUES ARE NOT YET SUBJECT TO PROGRAMMING. HOWEVER, SUCH BASIC PROBLEMS ARE STILL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOLUTIONS MUST HAVE INPUT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES AND PERSONNEL.

INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

THE QUESTION OF ORGANIZATIONAL OR INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS IS

ANOTHER MANAGEMENT CONCEPT THAT HAS COMPLETELY DUMBFUNDED MANY OF THE OLD-STYLE "PUBLIC HEALTHERS." EVERYONE MANAGES THE ENVIRONMENT TO SOME DEGREE. DOZENS OF AGENCIES AT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT HAVE A SHARE OF THE ACTION IN TERMS OF REGULATION, EDUCATION, RESEARCH, DEMONSTRATION, AND CONSULTATION.

FOR REASONS OF OPERATIONAL ECONOMY AND PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, IT IS IMPORTANT AND VALID TO RECOMMEND THAT MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL ,REGULATORY FUNCTIONS AT EACH LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT \$E MANAGED WITHIN A SINGLE AGENCY. I HAVE PREVIOUSLY INDICATED THAT THIS CAN BE EXPLAINED AND SUPPORTED IN TERMS OF ENVIRONMENTAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAM PROBLEM INTERDIGITATION.

THE TYPE AND ORGANIZATIONAL LOCATION OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY IS ANOTHER MATTER. HISTORICALLY, RELATIVELY NARROW, SINGLE-PURPOSE (I.E., HEALTH) ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS WERE ALMOST SOLELY THE PROVINCE OF HEALTH DEPARTMENTS AND THE HEALTH PROFESSION AT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT. PUBLIC AND POLITICAL CLAMOR AND CONCERN OVER THE RAPIDLY DETERIORATING ENVIRONMENT IN THE LATE 1960s CAUSED A WIDESPREAD RE-EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS, PROGRAM GOALS, PROGRAM SCOPE, PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, PROGRAM SUPPORT, ENVIRONMENTAL LEGISLATION, AS WELL AS PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND INSTITUTIONAL SETTINGS. PROGRAMS ` WERE SHIFTED TO NEW AND/OR DIFFERENT AGENCIES FOR A VARIETY OF REASONS -- SOME VALID AND SOME QUESTIONABLE. EAGER CITIZEN ENVIRONMENTALISTS AND CITIZEN ACTION GROUPS SOMETIMES

CONFUSED CHANGE WITH PROGRESS, PUBLIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICIALS GENERALLY EXHIBITED A HIGH DEGREE OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE AND A RELATIVELY LOW TITER OF ORGANIZATIONAL AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT KNOWLEDGE. POWERFUL POLLUTER LOBBYISTS DELIGHTED IN THE OPPORTUNITY TO RETARD AND CONFUSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT THROUGH REPEATED REORGANIZATIONS, AND BY PLACING ENVIRONMENTAL PERSONNEL AND AGENCIES IN POSITIONS OF GREATER "POLITICAL RESPONSIVENESS." THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY HAS BEEN TOUTED AS A MODEL FOR STATE ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES AND THIS, IN TURN, HAS LED TO FURTHER UNDESIRABLE PROGRAM FRAGMENTATION IN MANY STATES IMBUED WITH THE DESIRE TO FOLLOW THE FEDERAL "MODEL. " THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST ALSO SHARE OR ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPOSITION ON STATES OF NARROWLY ORIENTED, SINGLE PURPOSE CODES CONCEIVED THROUGH TUNNEL VISION. THE FEDERAL CODES AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO SUCH PROBLEMS AS FOOD, MILK, OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, AIR POLLUTION, WATER POLLUTION-, ETC., ARE ALL BEAUTIFUL EXAMPLES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEM OF SINGLE PROBLEM ORIENTED CODES WHICH TRULY RESULT IN A DISSERVICE AND EXTRA EXPENSE TO OUR TAXPAYERS.

ANOTHER ISSUE BASIC TO AN ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATION IS THE DETERMINATION OF THE COMPLETE SPECTRUM OF PROBLEM SOLVING METHODS WHICH CAN OR SHOULD BE UTILIZED TO SOLVE THE PREVIOUSLY LISTED SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS. AND NEXT COMES THE HIGHLY IMPORTANT PROCESS OF DEVELOPING "PROGRAMS" WHICH, AS PREVIOUSLY DEFINED, ARE "RATIONAL GROUPINGS OF ACTIVITIES DESIGNED TO SOLVE ONE OR MORE ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS."

IT IS IN THIS PROCESS THAT WE TRULY NEED SOME ORGANIZATIONAL AND MANAGEMENT CREATIVENESS AND INNOVATION

IF WE ARE TO DELIVER ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY, AGAIN, THIS RELATES TO MENTALISTS AND CITIZEN ACTION GROUPS SOMETIMES CONFUSED CHANGE WITH PROGRESS, PUBLIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICIALS GENERALLY EXHIBITED A HIGH DEGREE OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE AND A RELATIVELY LOW TITER OF ORGANIZATIONAL AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT KNOWLEDGE. POWERFUL POLLUTER LOBBYISTS DELIGHTED IN THE OPPORTUNITY TO RETARD AND CONFUSE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT THROUGH REPEATED REORGANIZATIONS, AND BY PLACING ENVIRONMENTAL PERSONNEL AND AGENCIES IN POSITIONS OF GREATER "POLITICAL RESPONSIVENESS." THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY HAS BEEN TOUTED AS A MODEL FOR STATE ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES AND THIS, IN TURN, HAS LED TO FURTHER UNDESIRABLE PROGRAM FRAGMENTATION IN MANY STATES IMBUED WITH THE DESIRE TO FOLLOW THE FEDERAL "MODEL. " THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST ALSO SHARE OR ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR IMPOSITION ON STATES OF NARROWLY ORIENTED, SINGLE PURPOSE CODES CONCEIVED THROUGH TUNNEL VISION. THE FEDERAL CODES AND REGULATIONS RELATING TO SUCH PROBLEMS AS FOOD, MILK, OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, AIR POLLUTION, WATER POLLUTION, ETC., ARE ALL BEAUTIFUL EXAMPLES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEM OF SINGLE PROBLEM ORIENTED CODES WHICH TRULY RESULT IN A DISSERVICE AND EXTRA EXPENSE TO OUR TAXPAYERS.

ANOTHER ISSUE BASIC TO AN ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATION IS THE DETERMINATION OF THE COMPLETE SPECTRUM OF PROBLEM SOLVING METHODS WHICH CAN OR SHOULD BE UTILIZED TO SOLVE THE PREVIOUSLY LISTED SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS. AND NEXT COMES THE HIGHLY IMPORTANT PROCESS OF DEVELOPING "PROGRAMS" WHICH, AS PREVIOUSLY DEFINED, ARE "RATIONAL GROUPINGS OF ACTIVITIES DESIGNED TO SOLVE ONE OR MORE

ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS." IT IS IN THIS PROCESS THAT WE TRULY NEED SOME ORGANIZATIONAL AND MANAGEMENT CREATIVENESS AND INNOVATION IF WE ARE TO DELIVER ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY, AGAIN, THIS RELATES TO THE PREVIOUSLY MENTIONED ISSUE OF SINGLE PROBLEM CODES.

NO DOUBT, MANY OF OUR PROGRAMS SHOULD PROPERLY BE REPACKAGED AND RENAMED. EVEN INDUSTRY HAS LEARNED THAT PRODUCTS MUST BE REPACKAGED, RE-TITLED, AND RE-PROMOTED OCCASIONALLY TO PROVIDE THE BEST SALES POSSIBLE. HAVING PROPERLY DESIGNED PROGRAMS WHICH ADDRESS VARIOUS IMPORTANT ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS MIGHT ALSO BE A STEP TOWARD DISCOURAGING THE PRACTICE OF CONTINUING TO APPLY UNDUE EFFORT TOWARD A PROBLEM WHICH HAS BEEN BASICALLY SOLVED. PROGRAM PERSONNEL MAY NOT DESIRE TO COMPLETELY SOLVE THE PROBLEM IF IT MEANS THAT THEY WOULD HAVE TO GO OUT OF BUSINESS, THEREFORE, THEY FREQUENTLY INVENT NEW ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM OR, STILL WORSE, APPLY NEW AND UNNECESSARY REQUIREMENTS TO THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM,

CONCLUSIONS

VERY SIMPLY, THE ENVIRONMENT CAN BE DEFINED AS "THAT WHICH SURROUNDS." WE SHOULD ALL UNDERSTAND THE VALUE OF APPROACHING THE ENVIRONMENT ON A COMPREHENSIVE BASIS WITH COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMMING AND WE SHOULD ALSO UNDERSTAND THE ECOLOGICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF PROGRAMS. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS ARE ESSENTIAL SERVICES OF STATE GOVERNMENT, AN UNQUESTIONABLY GOOD INVESTMENT, AND THEY ARE USUALLY EXPECTED AND DEMANDED BY OUR TAXPAYERS.

OTHER ITEMS IN COMMON FOR MOST ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS ARE THOSE NECESSARY PROGRAM RESOURCES. MANY OF THE BASIC ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS REQUIRE A COMMON TYPE OF MANPOWER, EQUIPMENT, FACILITIES, LEGISLATION, AND LABORATORY SUPPORT SERVICES.

THERE ARE NO STANDARD "MODELS" TO BE FOLLOWED, BUT THERE ARE SOME BASIC ORGANIZATIONAL PRINCIPLES TO BE CONSIDERED WHEN ORGANIZING ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES AT THE STATE OR LOCAL LEVEL, THESE INCLUDE (A) ORGANIZATIONAL VISIBILITY, (B) PROGRAMMING ON A MULTIPLE GOAL BASIS, (C) FREEDOM OF INTERAGENCY COMMUNICATION AND COORDINATION, (D) OPERATING WITH A MISSION OF PUBLIC SERVICE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION, (E) RESPONSIVENESS TO PUBLIC SENTIMENT, (F) USE OF REGULATORY ACTIONS., (G) COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMMING, (H) LEGISLATION DESIGNED FOR RAPID EQUITABLE RESULTS INSTEAD OF PROCEDURAL DELAYS, (I) LINE ITEM BUDGETS FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY, (J) PROGRAMMED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION RATHER THAN ENVIRONMENTAL UTILIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT, AND (K) REGULATIONS AND STANDARDS PROMULGATED BY A BOARD OR COMMISSION REPRESENTING BALANCED PUBLIC INTERESTS.

THE FOREGOING PRINCIPLES MAY BE ATTAINED IN A VARIETY OF ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS RANGING FROM AN APPROPRIATE ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY WITHIN A HEALTH DEPARTMENT TO A SEPARATE, FREE-STANDING ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY OR DEPARTMENT. IN ANY EVENT, HOWEVER, ADHERENCE TO THE FOREGOING PRINCIPLES IS NECESSARY IF THERE IS TO BE AN EFFECTIVE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION EFFORT

AND SINCE PROGRAMS AND ORGANIZATIONS REQUIRE MANPOWER, A FEW WORDS ABOUT MANPOWER. WHEN ONE GRASPS THE MAGNITUDE AND SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS, UNDERSTANDS THEIR VITAL IMPORTANCE TO THIS AND FUTURE GENERATIONS, SCANS THE MAZE OF

ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR DELIVERING PROGRAMS, AND VIEWS THE VARIETY OF USEFUL PROGRAM METHODS, IT BECOMES OBVIOUS THAT THE SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANPOWER REQUIRED IS AS BROAD AS THE ENVIRONMENT. SUCH MANPOWER NECESSITATES EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS THROUGH A SPECTRUM FROM THE LOWEST ASSISTANT OR INSPECTOR THROUGH THE VARIOUS TYPES OF DOCTORAL LEVEL ENVIRONMENTALISTS. TRULY, THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS DEMAND AN ALLIANCE OF PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS, LIFE SCIENTISTS, SOCIAL SCIENTISTS, ENGINEERS, PLANNERS, TECHNICIANS, LABORATORY SCIENTISTS, VETERINARIANS, LAWYERS, PHYSICIANS -- THE LIST IS ENDLESS AND ALL TYPES ARE NECESSARY.

TRADITIONALLY, ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS WERE ERRONEOUSLY THOUGHT TO BE (AND PERHAPS WERE) THE PROVINCE OF ENGINEERS, WITH OTHER PROFESSIONS SUCH AS "SANITARIANS" PLAYING AN ANCILLARY AND SUBORDINATE ROLE. THAT MANPOWER CONCEPT IS NOW KNOWN TO BE INAPPROPRIATE AND ARCHAIC, THE MANTLE OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM LEADERSHIP NOW FALLS TO THOSE WHO EARN IT.

A FINAL THOUGHT ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE ECONOMY. IT ISN'T A CASE Or "VERSUS" OR "EITHER/OR". THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE ECONOMY ARE NOT CONTRADICTORY EXPECTATIONS OR VALUES AND, IN FACT, ARE MUTUALLY INTERDEPENDENT. WE CAN'T HAVE AN ECONOMY WITHOUT AN ENVIRONMENT. AND TWO BASIC ECOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS SHOULD BE KEPT FOREMOST IN MIND WHEN CONSIDERING THE ENVIRONMENT AND ECONOMY: (A) EVERYTHING IS CONNECTED TO EVERYTHING ELSE, AND (B) WE SHOULD STRIVE FOR THE GREATEST GOOD FOR THE LARGEST NUMBER OVER THE LONGEST PERIOD.

I AM ADVISED THAT "ECOLOGY" AND "ECONOMY" ARE BOTH DERIVATIVES OF THE GREEK WORD "ECOS" (OIKOS) WHICH MEANS

**HOUSE. AN ECONOMIST WAS A KEEPER OF THE HOUSE, AND AN
ECOLOGIST IS A KEEPER OF THE BIG HOUSE VIE ALL LIVE IN -- OR OUR
ENVIRONMENT, THE PLACE IN WHICH WE ARE ALL GOING TO SPEND
THE REST OF OUR LIVES,**