

Index

A

air toxics, *see* hazardous air pollutants
adaptability
 definition of criterion, 182-183
 factors for comparing instruments, 183-184
 ease of program modification, 184
 ease of source changes, 184
 instrument-by-instrument comparison, 186-190
 instrument effectiveness
 challenge regulations, 118, 120, 186-187
 design standards, 95, 96, 187-188
 harm-based standards, 91, 188
 information reporting, 133, 134, 186
 integrated permitting, 107, 188
 liability, 127, 128, 186
 pollution charges, 124, 189-190
 product bans, 101, 102, 187
 subsidies, 138, 190
 technical assistance, 142, 186
 technology specifications, 97-98, 99, 187
 tradeable emissions, 114, 188-189
 summary of instrument effectiveness, 27-28, 185-186
assurance of meeting environmental goals
 definition of criterion, 146
 factors for comparing instruments, 146-147
 degree of action forcing, 146
 familiarity through use, 147
 monitoring capability, 146-147
 instrument-by-instrument comparison, 148-153
 instrument effectiveness
 challenge regulation, 120, 152
 design standards, 95, 96, 149-150
 harm-based standards, 89, 91, 150
 information reporting, 131, 134, 151-152
 integrated permitting, 104-105, 107, 150
 liability, 128, 153
 pollution charges, 122, 124, 152-153
 product bans, 100, 102, 148,
 subsidies, 136-137, 138, 152
 technical assistance, 140-141, 142, 152

 technology specifications, 97, 99, 148-149
 tradeable emissions, 110-111, 114, 150-151
 summary of instrument effectiveness, 26, 147-148

B

bubble policy, EPA, *see* tradeable emissions

C

California Air Toxics “Hot Spots” Information and Assessment Act, *see* “Hot Spots” California air toxics program
California Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act, *see* Proposition 65
case studies
 summary of criteria and key issues, 30, 58
 see also individual case studies: “Hot Spots,” California air toxics program; Massachusetts Office of Technical Assistance (MassOTA); New Jersey facility-wide permitting; Proposition 65, California; RECLAIM tradeable emissions program.
challenge regulation
 debates about, 120
 definition of instrument, 16, 84, 113, 115
 extent of use, 18, 86-87, 115-117
 key criteria affecting tool selection
 adaptability, 118, 120, 186-187
 cost-effectiveness and fairness, 117-118, 120, 171
 demands on government, 118, 120, 178
 environmental equity and justice, 117, 120, 164
choosing instruments, framework for
 key questions for matching instruments to problems, 34
 pollutants, characteristics of, 35-36
 sources, characteristics of, 36
 uncertainty and expectations for change, 36-37

- multiple instrument use, 15, 37-40
- responsibility for choosing instruments, 29-31
- consolidated permitting, *see* integrated permitting
- cost of pollution abatement
 - as percent of sector total expenditures, 52-53
 - by major statute, 20, 49
 - for air pollution
 - expenditures by sector, 21, 49, 51
 - improvements achieved by, 49
 - for hazardous waste
 - expenditures by sector, 21, 49, 51
 - for solid waste
 - expenditures by sector, 21, 49, 51
 - improvements achieved by, 50
 - for water pollution
 - expenditures by sector, 21, 48-49, 51
 - improvements achieved by, 48-49
 - pollution prevention, capital expenditures, 52
- cost-effectiveness and fairness to sources
 - definition of criterion, 166-167
 - factors for comparing instruments, 167-168
 - administrative burden for sources, 168
 - fairness to sources, 168
 - cost-effectiveness for individual sources, 167-168
 - cost-effectiveness for society, 167
 - instrument-by-instrument comparison, 170-175
 - instrument effectiveness
 - challenge regulations, 117-118, 120, 171
 - design standards, 96, 174
 - harm-based standards, 91, 173
 - information reporting, 132, 134, 172
 - integrated permitting, 105, 107, 170-171
 - liability, 128, 174
 - pollution charges, 124, 174
 - product bans, 100, 102, 172
 - subsidies, 138, 174-175
 - technical assistance, 141-142, 172
 - technology specifications, 97, 99, 172-173
 - tradeable emissions, 111-112, 113, 114, 170
 - summary of instrument effectiveness, 24-25, 168-170
- criteria
 - definitions and important factors, 23
 - summary tables of instrument effectiveness on, 33, 39, 199
 - see also* individual criteria: adaptability, assurance of meeting environmental goals, cost-effectiveness and fairness to sources, demands on government, environmental equity and justice, pollution prevention, technology innovation and diffusion

D

- demands on government
 - definition of criterion, 175
 - factors for comparing instruments, 175-177
 - costs, 175-176
 - ease of analysis, 176-177
 - instrument-by-instrument comparison, 178-182
 - instrument effectiveness
 - challenge regulation, 118, 120, 178
 - design standards, 94, 96, 179-180
 - harm-based standards, 89-90, 91, 178-179
 - information reporting, 132-133, 134, 178
 - integrated permitting, 105-106, 107, 180-181
 - liability, 126-127, 128, 182
 - pollution charges, 124, 181-182
 - product bans, 102, 179
 - subsidies, 137, 138, 179
 - technical assistance, 142, 182
 - technology specifications, 99, 179
 - tradeable emissions, 114, 181
 - summary of instrument effectiveness, 25, 177-178
- deposit-refund, *see* subsidies
- design standards
 - debates about, 96
 - definition of instrument, 9, 10, 84, 90, 92
 - extent of use, 16, 86-87, 92-93
 - key criteria affecting tool selection
 - adaptability, 95-96, 187-188
 - assurance of meeting goals, 93, 96, 149-150
 - demands on government, 94, 96, 179-180
 - pollution prevention, 94, 96, 156

E

- emissions trading, *see* tradeable emissions
- environmental equity and justice
 - definition of criterion, 159-160
 - factors for comparing instruments, 160-161
 - distributional outcomes of policies, 160-161
 - effective participation in policymaking, 161
 - remediation of existing problems, 161
 - instrument-by-instrument comparison, 163-166
 - instrument effectiveness
 - challenge regulation, 117, 120, 164
 - design standards, 96, 165
 - harm-based standards, 91, 165
 - information reporting, 131-132, 134, 163
 - integrated permitting, 107, 165-166
 - liability, 128, 166
 - pollution charges, 122-123, 124, 164-165
 - product bans, 102, 165

- subsidies, 137, 138, 163
 - technical assistance, 141, 142, 163-164
 - technology specifications, 99, 165
 - tradeable emissions, 111, 114, 164
 - summary of instrument effectiveness, 27, 161-163
- H**
- harm-based standards
 - debates about, 91
 - definition of instrument, 9, 10, 84, 85, 88
 - extent of use, 16, 86-87, 88-89
 - key criteria affecting tool selection
 - assurance of meeting goals, 89, 91, 150
 - demands on government, 89-90, 91, 178-179
 - hazardous air pollutants, 89, 93, 94-95
 - see also, “Hot Spots.”
 - “Hot Spots,” California air toxics program
 - criteria discussed
 - assurance of meeting goals, 74, 131
 - environmental equity and justice, 131
 - description of program, 72-73
- I**
- information reporting
 - debates about, 134
 - definition of instrument, 11, 13, 85, 127, 129-133, 134
 - extent of use, 18, 86-87, 130-131
 - key criteria affecting tool selection
 - adaptability, 133, 134, 186
 - assurance of meeting goals, 131, 134, 151-152
 - cost-effectiveness and fairness, 132, 134, 172
 - demands on government, 132-133, 134, 178
 - environmental equity and justice, 131-132, 134, 163
 - see also Proposition 65, California; “Hot Spots,” California air toxics program
 - instruments
 - categorical definitions, 10-11, 81-85, 119
 - examples of early uses, 17
 - summary of performance on 12 criteria, 33, 39, 199
 - used under major environmental statutes, 13-15, 86-87, 88-89, 92-93, 97, 98-100, 103, 108-110, 115-117, 119, 121-122, 125-126, 130-131, 135-136, 139-140
 - used for risk based strategies and technology-based strategies, 42
 - see also individual instruments: challenge regulation, design standards, harm-based standards, information reporting, integrated permitting, liability provisions, pollution charges, product bans and limitations, subsidies, technical assist-
- ance, technology specifications, and tradeable emissions.
 - integrated permitting
 - debates about, 107
 - definition of instrument, 10, 12, 84, 101, 103
 - extent of use, 18, 86-87, 103
 - key criteria affecting tool selection
 - assurance of meeting goals, 104-105, 107, 150
 - cost-effectiveness and fairness, 105, 107, 170-171
 - demands on government, 105-106, 107, 180-181
 - see also New Jersey facility-wide permitting
- L**
- liability provisions
 - debates about, 128
 - definition of instrument, 11, 13, 85, 123-125
 - extent of use, 19, 86-87, 125-126
 - key criteria affecting tool selection
 - adaptability, 127, 128, 189-190
 - demands on government, 126-127, 128, 181-182
 - pollution prevention, 126, 128, 156-157
- M**
- Massachusetts Office of Technical Assistance (MassOTA)
 - criteria discussed
 - adaptability, 79
 - technology innovation and diffusion, 79-80
 - description of program, 76-78
- N**
- New Jersey facility-wide permitting
 - criteria discussed
 - adaptability to change, 71
 - assurance of meeting goals, 104, 105
 - demands on government, 106
 - pollution prevention, 70-71
 - description of program, 67-70
- O**
- options for Congress, *see* stumbling blocks that limit use of desirable instruments
- P**
- performance standards, *see* harm-based standards
 - pollution charges
 - debates about, 124
 - definition of instrument, 11, 13, 85, 119
 - extent of use, 18, 86-87, 119, 121-122
 - key criteria affecting tool selection

- assurance of meeting goals, 122, 124, 152-153
- environmental equity and justice, 122-123, 124, 164-165
- technology innovation and diffusion, 123, 124, 194

pollution prevention

- definition of criterion, 153-154
- factors for comparing instruments, 154
 - focuses on organizational learning, 154
 - gives an advantage to prevention, 154
- instrument-by-instrument comparison, 155-159
- instrument effectiveness
 - challenge regulations, 120, 158
 - design standards, 94-95, 96, 156
 - harm-based standards, 91, 157
 - information reporting, 134, 158-159
 - integrated permitting, 107, 157
 - liability, 126, 128, 156-157
 - pollution charges, 124, 158
 - product bans, 100, 102, 155
 - subsidies, 138, 159
 - technical assistance, 140, 141, 155-156
 - technology specifications, 97, 99, 156
 - tradeable emissions, 114, 157
- summary of instrument effectiveness, 26-27, 154-155

product bans and limitations

- debates about, 102
- definition of instrument, 9, 10, 84, 98
- extent of use, 16, 86-87, 98-100
- key criteria affecting tool selection
 - adaptability, 101, 102, 187
 - assurance of meeting goals, 100, 102, 148
 - cost-effectiveness and fairness, 100, 102, 172
 - pollution prevention, 100, 102, 155
 - technology innovation and diffusion, 100, 102, 193-194

Proposition 65, California

- criteria discussed
 - assurance of meeting goals, 73-74, 131
 - demands on government, 132-133
 - environmental equity and justice, 75-76, 131
 - pollution prevention, 74-75
- description of program, 71-72, 130

R

ranking of environmental problems

- by EPA-region studies, 53-56
- by national studies, 52-53
- by state studies, 56-57

RECLAIM tradeable emissions program

- criteria discussed
 - administrative burden to sources, 61-62

- assurance of meeting goals, 65-67, 109
- cost-effectiveness for sources, 60-61, 109
- environmental equity and justice, 63-65
- fairness for sources, 62-63, 112
- description of program, 57-60, 109

S

stumbling blocks that limit use of desirable instruments

- to learning about strengths and weaknesses of less-often used instruments, 44-45
 - congressional options, 45
- to a results orientation, 43-44
 - congressional options, 44
- to a risk-based approach, 41-42
 - congressional options, 42-43

subsidies

- debates about, 138
- definition of instrument, 11, 13, 85, 133-135
- extent of use, 19, 86-87, 133-135
- key criteria affecting tool selection
 - assurance of meeting goals, 136-137, 138, 152
 - demands on government, 137, 138, 179
 - environmental equity and justice, 137, 138, 163

T

technical assistance

- debates about, 142
- definition of instrument, 11, 12, 85, 137-139
- extent of use, 19, 86-87, 139-140
- key criteria affecting tool selection
 - adaptability, 142, 186
 - assurance of meeting goals, 140, 142, 142, 152
 - cost-effectiveness and fairness, 141-142, 172
 - environmental equity and justice, 141, 142, 163-164
 - pollution prevention, 141, 142, 155-156
- see also Massachusetts Office of Technical Assistance

technology innovation and diffusion

- definition of criterion, 190-191
- factors for comparing instruments, 191-192
 - diffusion of known technologies, 192
 - innovation in the eg&s industry, 191, 192
 - innovation in the regulated industries, 191
- instrument-by-instrument comparison, 193-198
- instrument effectiveness
 - challenge regulations, 118-119, 120, 195
 - design standards, 96, 196
 - harm-based standards, 91, 195-196
 - information reporting, 134, 197-198

- integrated permitting, 107, 196-197
- liability, 128, 197
- pollution charges, 123, 124, 194
- product bans, 101, 102, 193-194
- subsidies, 138, 198
- technical assistance, 142, 198
- technology specifications, 99, 196
- tradeable emissions, 112-113, 114, 194-195
- summary of instrument effectiveness, 28-29, 192-193
- technology specifications
 - debates about, 99
 - definition of instrument, 9, 10, 84, 95, 97
 - extent of use, 16, 86-87, 97
 - key criteria affecting tool selection
 - adaptability, 97-98, 99, 187
 - assurance of meeting goals, 97, 99, 148-149
 - cost-effectiveness and fairness, 97, 99, 172-173
 - pollution prevention, 97, 99, 156
- tradeable emissions
 - debates about, 114
 - definition of instrument, 10, 12, 84, 106, 108
 - extent of use, 16, 86-87, 108-110
 - key criteria affecting tool selection
 - assurance of meeting goals, 110-111, 114, 150-151
 - cost-effectiveness and fairness, 111-112, 114, 170
 - environmental equity and justice, 111, 114, 164
 - technology innovation and diffusion, 112-113, 114, 194-195
 - see also RECLAIM tradeable emissions program