COURSE INFORMATION:
U.S. Environmental Policy
11:374:313
Spring 2013, M&W 3:55 to 5:15 PM, Blake Hall 131

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Instructor: Daniel J. Van Abs, PhD, PP/AICP, Associate Research Professor, Dept of Human Ecology
Office Location: Cook Office Building, 55 Dudley Road, Room 224
Office Hours: Spring 2013 Semester: Monday and Wednesday, 1:30-3:30 PM
Phone: 848-932-9243 (email contact preferred)
Email: vanabs@sebs.rutgers.edu

COURSE MATERIALS:
There is no textbook for this course. All materials are provided through the Sakai course site.

COURSE DESCRIPTION:
To further develop student capacity to evaluate environmental policy issues, including: how policy issues rise to national action; the science and scientific controversies; major actors in U.S. environmental policy creation and their roles; the relationship between environmental policies and the context in which they operate; how budgets and public administration affect environmental policies; and how environmental policy issues reflect or do not reflect regional or factional differences. Given the enormous variety of environmental issues active at any one time, this course will focus on four high-profile issues as examples for learning about environmental policy development:
• Wetlands protection
• Land preservation and development
• Hazardous waste sites
• Water supply management
The class will also address agency roles and organization, environmental standards, and financing.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:
By the end of the class, students should have the ability to apply techniques of policy analysis to other environmental issues, including those for which they personally lack detailed knowledge. These skills are critical for anyone interested in broad-based environmental policy work, where they will learn the details of the issues through ongoing work assignments. For those who will ultimately focus on a single environmental field, this course will help them understand how others may affect policy development in their field.

ASSIGNMENTS/RESPONSIBILITIES & ASSESSMENT:
Class participation is critical to the learning process. In addition, there will be interactive assignments, readings, and the development of a briefing paper on a major environmental issue (other than those listed above) in a style appropriate to be presented to a Member of Congress. The briefing paper is submitted in draft for review, and then in final written form and presented to the class.

OTHER INFORMATION:
Students will be responsible for adhering to the academic integrity policies found at http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu.
It is important that students have the tools to succeed in this course. Please see the instructor *as soon as possible* with any difficulties or questions regarding the course materials. In addition, the Office of Student Affairs is available at http://studentaffairs.rutgers.edu for any other needs or concerns.

**COURSE SCHEDULE:**
See attached.
United States Environmental Policy, Spring 2013

11:374:313, Blake 131, M&W 3:55 to 5:15 pm
Daniel J. Van Abs, PhD, PP/AICP
Rutgers email address: vanabs@sebs.rutgers.edu
Office Hours: Monday 1:30 to 3:30 PM, Wednesday 2:00 to 3:30 PM, and by appointment.

Instructor: Dr. Van Abs is an Associate Research Professor in the Department of Human Ecology. He retired from NJ State government in 2012, from his position of Senior Director for Planning & Science with the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council, where he managed staff development and implementation of the Highlands Regional Master Plan since 2007. He previously worked as Director of Watershed Protection, NJ Water Supply Authority for over eight years; with the NJ Department of Environmental Protection for 12 years, six as manager for statewide water resources planning; and as Technical Director of the Passaic River Coalition for four years. He holds a Ph.D. in Environmental Science from SUNY-College of Environmental Science and Forestry and a B.S. in Environmental Studies from Cook College. He is a licensed Professional Planner in New Jersey, a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners, a public member of the New Jersey Clean Water Council, and an advisor to the New Jersey Water Supply Advisory Council.

Course objectives: To further develop your capacity to evaluate environmental policy issues, including: how policy issues rise to national action; the science and scientific controversies; major actors in U.S. environmental policy creation and their roles; the relationship between environmental policies and the context in which they operate; how budgets and public administration affect environmental policies; and how environmental policy issues reflect or do not reflect regional or factional differences. Given the enormous variety of environmental issues active at any one time, this course will focus on four high-profile issues as examples for learning about environmental policy development:

- Wetlands protection
- Land preservation and development
- Hazardous waste sites
- Water supply management

Class time will also be focused on agency roles and organization, environmental standards, and financing. By the end of the class, you should have the ability to apply techniques of policy analysis to other environmental issues, including those for which you personally lack detailed knowledge. These skills are critical for anyone interested in broad-based environmental policy work, where you will learn the details of the issues as you become involved with them. For those who will ultimately focus on a single environmental field, this course will help you understand how others may affect policy development in your field. All readings are on the Sakai class site or public web sites. There is no text book for the course.

Albert Einstein: *Education is what remains after one has forgotten what one has learned in school.*

Course activities: Class participation is critical to the learning process. In addition, there will be interactive assignments, readings, and the development of a briefing paper on a major environmental issue (other than those listed above) in a style appropriate to be presented to a Member of Congress. Your briefing paper will be submitted in draft for review, and then in final written form and presented to the class.

Student Evaluation: Students will be evaluated on the following basis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Class involvement in discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Series of short assignments on issue analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Issue &amp; Science paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Draft Briefing paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Final Briefing paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Briefing presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Version: February 18, 2013
THE RULES

Adapted from http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/integrity.shtml

1. NO PLAGIARISM. All major work is checked using Turnitin. Plagiarism is essentially theft of intellectual property – the work of others. Give credit where credit is due! Doing so reflects well on them and on you. Students can be failed or referred to the University for discipline if intentional plagiarism is evident.

2. NO CHEATING – it destroys the learning experience, demeans and harms you now, and is an exceptionally bad habit for the working world.

3. LATE ASSIGNMENTS WILL LOSE A GRADE STEP FOR EACH CALENDAR DAY LATE. For example, if your paper is an A- level product, then it will be marked as a B+ for a day late, a B for 2 days late, etc. If you must miss a deadline due to bona fide illness or emergency, notify me via email on or before the due date. Proof may be required.

4. PARTICIPATION COUNTS. Only two unexcused absences from class will be accepted. No unexcused absences will be accepted during the last two classes. Otherwise, you must provide a bona fide excuse for absences – contact the professor by email, provide notification at a prior class, bring a note from a medical office, or whatever. Proof may be required. Recognize that this is standard business practice, so get used to it.

5. THERE IS NO EXTRA CREDIT. No additional assignments or revised work for re-grading will be accepted to offset missing assignments or poor grades. Instead, focus on quality work the first time and make sure assignments are posted on time. I am also willing to answer questions before any work assignment is due, in class, in my office, or by email.

6. IF YOU CONTEST A GRADE, you must do it in writing to me. Write your argument presenting evidence supporting a grade change and submit it by email or in person.

7. POSTING TO SAKAI. Work must be posted as readable text. Some assignments will be loaded directly to a Sakai text box, but the Pro/Con and Briefing papers are acceptable only as attachments. These two major assignments must be in a file format compatible with MSWord so that I can edit in that format. Posting work as Adobe pdf or any other pdf document is not acceptable. Please note: correct posting to Sakai is the student’s responsibility, including verification that the posting actually worked.

DO NOT ASSUME THAT A SAKAI POSTING WORKED – ALWAYS VERIFY.

Will Rogers - People's minds are changed through observation and not through argument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Readings (on sakai, some URLs also provided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Course Intro. Environmental policy – What makes it “environmental”? What makes it “policy”? Overview and discussion of what causes policy making to occur, critical actors and critical factors. Why is environmental policy so important; why is it so difficult? • Discussion of topic selections, Issue &amp; Science assignment, Briefing Papers and presentations. • Assignment: To be posted on Sakai day of class. <strong>Due Noon, Tuesday, January 27</strong></td>
<td>1. Examination of Environmental Policy Issues (attached)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wetlands Protection, Continued • Readings Assignment: To be posted on Sakai day of class. <strong>Due by end of day, February 9.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Readings (on sakai, some URLs also provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Build/Preserve, Continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Environmental Public Administration, Continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hazardous site cleanup. 31 years of Superfund and Spill Fund – why do these sites still exist? Overview and discussion of the identification, diversity, complexity, feasibility and administration of sites, and the funding and liability issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hazardous Sites, Continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Readings (on sakai, some URLs also provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mar25</td>
<td>Guest Speaker: Dr. Barry Frasco, Assistant Director, Hazardous Site Science Element, NJDEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mar27</td>
<td><em>Environmental Standards.</em> How are environmental standards set, and who sets them? What makes some standards controversial, and not others? Draft Briefing Papers due! (digital form only, as an attachment on the Sakai site, compatible with MS Word 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Apr1</td>
<td><em>Environmental Standards, Continued</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Apr3</td>
<td><em>Water Supply Management.</em> Brief history of water supply development and protection. Water rights, East and West. What are the new issues? Water, land, development and technology – how can they be coordinated to provide and protect water supplies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 20   | Apr8  | *Water Supply, Continued*  
• Blog Assignment: To be posted on Sakai day of class. **Due by end of day, April 13.** |
| 21   | Apr10 | Guest Speaker: Dennis L. Ciemniecki, President, Strategic Performance Consulting, LLC |
### Topic: Paying for Environmental Protection

**Week 23**
- **Apr 17**
  - **Topic:** Paying for Environmental Protection. Programs cost money – where does it come from? Who controls the purse strings? What effect does that have on implementation?

**Readings**

**Week 24**
- **Apr 22**
  - **Topic:** Paying for Environmental Protection, Continued

**Week 25-28**
- **Apr 24**
- **Apr 29**
- **May 1**
- **May 6**
  - **Briefing Paper Presentations.** Students will individually present the results of their briefing papers using visual media. All students not giving a presentation will assess the other presentations being given.
    - **Final Briefing Papers due TBD!**
      (digital form only, as an attachment on the Sakai site, compatible with MS Word 2007)

**Readings**
None
Examination of Environmental Policy Issues

Defining the Issues

1. Why is the issue “environmental” in nature? To what extent is it environmental?
2. What caused the issue? Are the causes still active, or are they historic (“legacy”) issues?
3. What is the intensity of the issue, (e.g., catastrophic, chronic, growing or declining, episodic)?
4. Is the issue local, state, regional, national or international in geographic scope?
5. Does the nature of the issue vary significantly within its geographic scope?
6. Does the scope or intensity of the issue vary over time? In what manner, and why?

Defining the Affected Interests

7. Is the actual scope, intensity and variability of the issue recognized as such by the affected interests, the administration, Congress and the news media? Do perceptions of the issue match the actual situation, or do people or interests exaggerate or minimize the issue for subjective reasons?
8. Who is affected by the issue, either positively or negatively? Are the impacts equitable, or do they fall exclusively, primarily or inequitably on any one or several interests?
9. Who would benefit by resolution of the issue? What is the scope of the likely benefits, and are they short or long term in nature?
10. Who would benefit by failure to resolve the issue? What is the scope of the likely benefits, and are they short or long term in nature?

Defining the Dispute

11. Is there agreement on the facts of the issue, or disagreement? Why? If agreement, is the consensus due to science or politics? If agreement, is the lack of consensus due to science or politics?
12. Is the science behind the issue “mature” (that is, long established, well documented and accepted by all but those with strong motivations to disagree), “innovative” (that is, new and different from prior thinking, but well documented and generating acceptance), “developing” (that is, not yet well grounded due to lack of information, theoretical foundations, good models, etc.), or “junk” (that is, based primarily on selective evidence and thinking provided by those with strong non-scientific motivations to affect policy)?
13. Is there agreement on the desired objective (e.g., environmental, ecological, resource use, public health) regarding the issue, or disagreement? Why?
14. Is there agreement on who should bear the burden of addressing the issue (e.g., costs, changed behaviors, changed technology, changed products)?

Defining Potential Solutions

15. Can the issue be addressed through public policy mechanisms? If not, is it a uniquely private sector matter, or does its scope require international or multi-jurisdictional activities that cannot be required by the federal government?
16. Is there agreement on the best solution regarding the issue, or disagreement? Why?
17. Do the proposed solutions actually address the issue, or do they address symptoms or surrogates for the issue?
18. Is there agreement on indicators or measures of success? Can the results of the proposed solutions be measured effectively?
Assessing Feasibility

19. Do the proposed solutions have the potential, if funded and implemented as planned, to achieve the objectives? Or are they temporary, stopgap or limited solutions?

20. Do the proposed solutions have “opportunity costs” for society or specific interests? If so, are those opportunity costs acceptable or may they exceed the benefits intended?

21. Are the costs to all affected interests equitable?

22. Are the costs to all affected interests bearable? What means of determining the “ability to pay” are appropriate to use in this assessment?

23. Can the proposed solutions be implemented by existing “actors” or will new or revised institutions or mechanisms be necessary? If the latter, what costs will be incurred to put the appropriate structure in place?

24. Does the political will exist to continue implementation of the solution beyond the initial surge of interest, especially in face of mounting opposition or evidence of partial success?

25. What interests are likely to continue support of solutions to the issue beyond the initial public policy response, and which are likely to continue opposition? What influence is the balance between these interests likely to have over time?

26. Does solution of the environmental issue in the United States have international repercussions, either positive or negative? To what extent do these international effects influence the sustainability of the solution?