

Final Version (October 31, 2017)

PA 550
Environmental Policy
Meeting Time: Mondays, 6:00P-8:45P
Location: Caldwell Hall G110
Fall 2017

Associate Professor Christopher Galik
SPIA
227D Caldwell Hall
Phone: 919-513-6011
Email: csgalik@ncsu.edu
Office hours: Mondays, 4:00P-6:00P

Synopsis: This course provides an overview of environmental policy and policymaking in the U.S. The first half of the course emphasizes the historical and institutional context of environmental decision-making at all levels of government. The second half of the course emphasizes evaluation and applied problem solving, providing insight into the broad array of political, economic, social, biophysical, and technological considerations that are at the heart of contemporary environmental policy deliberations.

REQUIRED BOOKS

- Andrews, R.N.L. 2006. Managing the environment, managing ourselves: A history of American environmental policy. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Course Objectives:

This course focuses on the history, design, and implementation of environmental policy in the U.S. Following this course, you will be able to:

- Describe and discuss the historical and institutional basis for contemporary environmental policy in the U.S.;
- Describe in writing and conversation the current regulatory and market structure of domestic environmental policy regimes;
- Critically evaluate the individual tools and practices through which environmental policy objectives are achieved, as well as the role of individual actors, coalitions, and venues in the environmental policy process;
- Analyze complex environmental issues in real-time in an applied setting.

Course Requirements and Grading:

- Midterm (25%)
- Short paper 1: case study response (15%)
- Short paper 2: joint letter case study (15%)
- Short paper 3: lesson drawing policy memo (20%)
- Class participation (15%) (includes submitting reading questions on time)
- Discussion leadership (10%)

Midterm exam: There will be a closed-book midterm exam given, in class, to assess your understanding of important historical and institutional elements in U.S. environmental policy.

Research Papers: Students will be responsible for three short memos, scattered throughout the latter half of the semester. The first will take the form of a personal response paper, critically evaluating the first case study. The second memo will be a short group letter written to a hypothetical decision-maker, in which you will take the position of a coalition on one side of a contentious environmental problem. The third paper will be a group memo outlining your recommendations for policy solutions to yet another contentious environmental policy problem.

Discussion Leadership: You will be split into groups at the beginning of the semester and assigned a week of class. When it is your week, your group will form the basis of a small panel. Each individual will take a reading from that week and briefly discuss (5 minutes, tops) how it relates to current issues in the environmental policy arena. One group member will also serve as a moderator, and will be charged with both briefly setting the context for that day’s discussion and moderating a brief Q/A based on the questions posted by students to the Moodle discussion board.

Participation Grading: This is discussion-driven class, so participation from everyone is absolutely critical. All students will be required to post a question to the Moodle discussion board for at least two (2) classes between September 11 and October 9 that relates in some way to the readings for that week. Which classes you post for is up to you, but questions must be posted by 10pm the Sunday before a class for the questions to count towards that day’s discussion. In-class participation will be graded per the following rubric:

	A	B	C	D/F
Preparation (40%)	Strong evidence of active/critical reading, writing to complete all assigned tasks.	Good evidence of active/critical reading, writing to complete assigned tasks.	Some evidence of active/critical reading, writing to complete assigned tasks.	Little evidence of active/critical reading, writing to complete assigned tasks.
In-Class Participation (60%)	Always respects others by listening actively, asks questions and participates regularly, shares knowledge without dominating discussion; stays focused on task/topic.	Consistently respects others by listening actively. Routinely asks questions and participates, usually shares knowledge without dominating discussion; stays focused on task/topic.	Generally respects others by listening actively. Generally asks questions and participates, shares knowledge without dominating discussion; stays focused on task/topic.	Occasionally displays lack of respect for others by not listening actively. Inconsistent questioning or sharing of knowledge, at times dominating discussion or failing to remain focused on task/topic.

Reading Assignments:

1. August 21 – Course Introduction

- Thelen, K. 1999. Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 2: 369-404.

2. August 28 – The Rationale and Origins of Contemporary Environmental Policy

- Andrews (2006). Chapter 7.
- Green, H.M. 1997. Common Law, Property Rights and the Environment: A Comparative Analysis of Historical Developments in the United States and England and a Model for the Future. *Cornell International Law Journal* 30: 541-586. (PDF on Moodle)
- Hardin, G. 1968. The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science* 162: 1243-1248. (PDF on Moodle)
- Tietenberg, T., and L. Lewis. 2016. “The Economic Approach: Property Rights, Externalities, and Environmental Problems.” Ch.2 (p15-45) *In Environmental and Natural Resource Economics*. London and New York: Routledge. (PDF on Moodle)

3. September 11 – The Historical Basis of Contemporary U.S. Environmental Policy (Group 1 Discussion Lead)

- Andrews (2006). Chapters 2-6.
- Nash, R. 1982. “A Wilderness Condition”, p23-43, *In Wilderness and the American Mind*. New Haven: Yale University Press. (PDF on Moodle)
- Leopold, A. 1949. “Thinking Like a Mountain”, p129-133, *In A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. Oxford University Press: New York. (PDF on Moodle)

4. September 18 – The U.S. Environmental Movement (Group 2 Discussion Lead)

- Andrews (2006). Chapters 8 and 11.
- Carson, R. 1962. *Silent Spring*. Chapters 1 and 2. New York, NY: Houghton-Mifflin. (PDF on Moodle)
- Van Liere, K.D., and R.E. Dunlap. 1980. The social bases of environmental concern: A review of hypotheses, explanations and empirical evidence. *Public opinion quarterly* 44: 181-197. (PDF on Moodle)

5. September 25 – Shifting Philosophies and Emphases (Group 3 Discussion Lead)

- Andrews (2006). Chapters 12 and 13.
- Kaswan, A. 2013. Environmental justice and environmental law, *Fordham Environmental Law Review* 24: 149-179. (PDF on Moodle)
- Skim Endangered Species Act and American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 (H.R. 2454). (PDFs on Moodle)

6. October 2 – Political Action, Inaction, Oversight, and Devolution (Group 4 Discussion Lead)

- Andrews (2006). Chapters 9 and 16.
- Hirokawa, K.H., and L.M. Gryskewicz, Jr. 2014. Federalism: Conflicts and Cooperation among Local, State, and Federal Objectives, Chapter 12, *in* Fairfax, S.K., and E. Russel (eds). *CQ Press Guide U.S. Environmental Policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (PDF on Moodle)

- Whisnant, R. 2016. State versus local government power to regulate environmental problems in NC. <https://elinc.sog.unc.edu/state-versus-local-government-power-to-regulate-environmental-problemsin-nc/>.

7. October 9 – Contemporary Environmental Policy: Tools and Practices (Group 5 Discussion Lead)

- Goulder, L.H., and I.W.H. Parry. 2008. Instrument choice in environmental policy. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 2: 152-174. (PDF on Moodle)
- Salzman, J., and B.H. Thompson. 2010. *Environmental Law and Policy*, Chapter 3: The Practice of Environmental Protection. New York NY: Foundation Press. (PDF on Moodle)
- Andrews, R.N.L. 2014. Environmental Policy Tools (1700s-Present), Chapter 10 in Fairfax, S.K., and E. Russel (eds). *CQ Press Guide U.S. Environmental Policy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (PDF on Moodle)

8. October 16 – MIDTERM

9. October 23 – Case Study 1: The Cadiz Project and the continuing debate between private property and public resources (assignment: individual short review and critique)

- Brooks, P.H. 2017. Op-Ed The ludicrous plan to pump Mojave water to L.A. *The Los Angeles Times*, May 21, 2017 (PDF on Moodle);
- James, I. 2017. Trump administration green-lights Cadiz Inc. plan to pipe water from Mojave Desert to cities. *The Desert Sun*, October 16, 2017 (PDF on Moodle);
- Santa Margarita Water District. 2012. Overview, Water Quality, and Stabilizing Rates Fact Sheets. Rancho Santa Margarita, CA (PDF on Moodle);
- Steinberg, J. 2017. New obstacle in the Cadiz water project in the Mojave Desert? The company says no. *San Bernardino Sun*, October 14, 2017 (PDF on Moodle);
- Watson, R. 2016. Water from the Desert: Entrepreneurs Tap into Unlikely Water Sources. Bozeman, MT: The Property and Environment Research Center (PDF on Moodle).

10. October 30 – Venues and Coalitions

- Sabatier, P.A. 1988. An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of policy-oriented learning therein. *Policy Sciences* 21: 129-168.
- Weible, C.M., and P.A. Sabatier. 2009. Coalitions, science, and belief change: Comparing adversarial and collaborative policy subsystems. *Policy Studies Journal* 37: 195-212. (PDF on Moodle)
- Ley, A.J., and E.P. Weber. 2015. The adaptive venue shopping framework: How emergent groups choose environmental policymaking venues. *Environmental Politics* 24: 703-722 (PDF on Moodle).

11. November 6 – Case Study 2: Coalitions and mining bans in the Boundary Waters

(assignment: produce coalition letter in response to Boundary Waters mining moratorium debate).

- Fisher, R., and W. Ury. 1991. Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In. Chapter 6 (PDF on Moodle);
- Forgrave, R. 2017. In Northern Minnesota, Two Economies Square Off: Mining vs. Wilderness. *The New York Times Magazine*, October 12, 2017 (PDF on Moodle);
- U.S. Forest Service. 2016. Consent to renewal of two leases currently held by Twin Metals Minnesota (TMM) for lands within the Superior National Forest (SNF) in

northern Minnesota. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture (PDF on Moodle);

- **Memo 1 Due**

12. November 13 – Identifying and Implementing Solutions

- Stavins, R.N. 1998. What can we learn from the grand policy experiment? Lessons from SO₂ allowance trading. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12: 69-88. (PDF on Moodle).
- Jordan, A., R.K.W. Wurzel, and A.R. Zito. 2013. Still the century of ‘new’ environmental policy instruments? Exploring patterns of innovation and continuity. *Environmental Politics* 22: 155-173. (PDF on Moodle)
- Sapat, A. 2004. Devolution and innovation: The adoption of state environmental policy innovations by administrative agencies. *Public Administration Review* 64: 141-151. (PDF on Moodle)

13. November 20 – Case Study 3: Reimagining the NFIP: Development, disturbance, and resilience to climate change

- Botzen, W.J.W., van den Bergh, J.C.J.M. 2008. Insurance Against Climate Change and Flooding in the Netherlands: Present, Future, and Comparison with Other Countries. *Risk Analysis* 28: 413-426. (PDF on Moodle)
- Cottle, M. 2017. Can Congress Bring the National Flood Insurance Program Above Water? *The Atlantic*, August 5, 2017. (PDF on Moodle)
- Highfield, W.E., Norman, S.A., Brody, S.D. 2013. Examining the 100-Year Floodplain as a Metric of Risk, Loss, and Household Adjustment. *Risk Analysis* 33: 186-191 (PDF on Moodle).
- Rose, R. 1991. What Is Lesson-Drawing? *Journal of Public Policy* 11: 3-30 (PDF on Moodle).
- **Memo 2 Due**

14. November 27 – Past, Present, and Future Issues

- Andrews (2006). Chapter 17.
- Portney, P. 2000. Environmental problems and policy: 2000-2050. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14: 199-206. (PDF on Moodle)
- Sutherland, W.J., and H.J. Woodroof. 2009. The need for environmental horizon scanning. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 24: 523-527. (PDF on Moodle)

15. December 4

- **Memo 3 Due**

Attendance and Late assignments: Notify me by email if you know you are going to miss a class. If there is more than one missed class (other than for severe illness, accidents, or family emergencies), you will receive a zero for that day’s discussion and will be required to complete a make-up assignment to avoid a reduction in your final course grade (2 classes missed is a ½ letter grade reduction, 3 a full letter grade, and 4 is an incomplete). Late assignments will be penalized by a half letter grade reduction for each day late (A to A-, etc.) except in cases of severe illness, accidents, or family emergencies.

Academic Regulations: A complete list of reminders for the beginning of the semester can be found at: <https://registrar.ncsu.edu/announcements/beginning-of-semester-reminders/>.

University Non-Discrimination Policies: It is the policy of the State of North Carolina to provide equality of opportunity in education and employment for all students and employees. Accordingly, the university does not practice or condone unlawful discrimination in any form against students, employees or applicants on the grounds of race, color, religion, creed, sex, national origin, age, disability, or veteran status. See <https://policies.ncsu.edu/category/campus-environment/non-discrimination>.

Reasonable accommodations will be made for students with verifiable disabilities. See <https://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-02-20-01>.

Academic integrity: The University's Code of Student Conduct (<https://policies.ncsu.edu/policy/pol-11-35-01>) specifically addresses academic integrity in parts 7-9. Students should familiarize themselves with this policy. Plagiarism is of particular concern. In any case, any instance of plagiarism will result in a failing mark for the assignment. Other forms of misconduct outlined at this site will be similarly addressed. This list of resources and authorities is neither exclusive nor exhaustive, and any violation of academic integrity as traditionally understood in the American scholarly context will be referred for University action.

Academic dishonesty includes the following offenses:

- 1) Claiming as your own work a paper written by another student;
- 2) Turning in a paper that contains paraphrases of someone else's ideas but does not give proper credit to that person for those ideas;
- 3) Turning in a paper that is largely a restatement in your own words of a paper written by someone else, even if you give credit to that person for those ideas. The thesis and organizing principles of a paper must be your own;
- 4) Turning in a paper that uses the exact words of another author without using quotation marks, even if proper credit is given in a citation, or that changes the words only slightly and claims them to be paraphrases;
- 5) Turning in the same paper, even in a different version, for two different courses without the permission of both professors involved.

If a student is found to have committed one of the above offenses, he/she will receive a failing grade on the assignment or exam. The case may also be sent for University action concerning the student.