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Policymaking Under Pressure:
The Perils of Incremental Responses to Climate Change

CARY COGLIANESE* & JOCELYN D’AMBROSIO**

In Notes from a Climate Change Pressure Cooker, Cinnamon Carlarne chronicles a series of recent American legal decisions and policy developments responding to global climate change, many of them arising at the state level.¹ Carlarne, like others, treats these incremental developments as commendable, at least insofar as they provide stepping stones to a comprehensive national response.² This positive posture is certainly understandable. After all, when faced with potentially catastrophic consequences from global warming, surely it would seem that some action is better than no action at all. It has even been suggested recently that, when it comes to addressing climate change, “smaller environmental contracts, deals, and ad hoc arrangements may do more good” than waiting to forge comprehensive national or international solutions.³ Carlarne’s work therefore raises an important question: Should citizens and policymakers laud the blooming of climate change policy “flowers” across the land? In other words, should they support these and other similar incremental policy efforts to respond to climate change, at

---

³ Eric W. Orts, Closing Statement, in Debate: Collaborative Environmental Law: Pro and Con, 156 U. PA. L. REV. PENNUMBRA 289, 300, 304–05 (2007), http://www.pennnumbra.com/debates/pdfs/collabenvlaw.pdf; see also BARRY G. RABE, STATEHOUSE AND GREENHOUSE: THE EMERGING POLITICS OF AMERICAN CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY, at xi–xii (2004) (“American states have enacted multiple policies that show considerable promise of reducing greenhouse gases.”); Id. at 27 (“[S]tates may be unusually well equipped to fashion reduction strategies that make sense, given their particular mix of economic and governance realities and the fact that no government or private entity has mastered ‘how to do’ climate change policy.”).
least until a coalition can be forged to secure a more comprehensive strategy?

An affirmative answer has no doubt garnered considerable support given the urgency of the health, environmental, and welfare concerns created by climate change. It also finds support in political science accounts of policymaking and in recent arguments in favor of democratic experimentalism. In his classic work on political decisionmaking, for example, political scientist Charles Lindblom argued that policymaking inevitably proceeds incrementally. More recently, scholars have celebrated decentralized, self-consciously incremental approaches to environmental problems, arguing that they result in more legitimate, innovative, and effective solutions. Both of these streams of scholarship imply that immediate, albeit incremental and decentralized, policies on climate change will necessarily be better than waiting to develop, analyze, and build political support for a comprehensive policy strategy for climate change.

We disagree. Whatever the merits of decentralized experimentalism in other contexts, it is not well-suited for reducing global emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases [GHGs]. Perhaps not all global problems require a comprehensive, global solution—but reversing the

---


5 *See, e.g., Daniel J. Fiorino, The New Environmental Regulation* 221 (2006) (arguing that “an incremental but conceptual and learning-based strategy for change offers the best alternative for speeding up the transition to a new environmental regulation”); *DeWitt John, Civic Environmentalism: Alternatives to Regulation in States and Communities* 272 (1994) (arguing that states hold the advantage of being better able “to customize their policies to local circumstances, to engage citizens and organizations, and to span interagency and professional boundaries”); David L. Markell, *States as Innovators: It’s Time for a New Look to Our “Laboratories of Democracy” in the Effort To Improve Our Approach to Environmental Regulation*, 58 ALB. L. REV. 347, 355 (1994) (lauding “the existence of fifty state governments” which “inherently creates both numerous ‘innovation centers’ and the opportunity to try a wide variety of approaches simultaneously or within short periods of time”); Charles Sabel et al., *Beyond Backyard Environmentalism, in Beyond Backyard Environmentalism* 3, 9 (Joshua Cohen & Joel Rogers eds., 2000) (proposing a new system of environmental regulation that takes advantage of local autonomy as an alternative to “the notorious inflexibility of centralized command systems”); Richard B. Stewart, *A New Generation of Environmental Regulation?*, 29 CAP. U. L. REV. 21, 133-34 (2001) (noting proponents’ argument that “any solution to current concerns with the U.S. environmental regulatory system is likely to be and is best served by an incremental approach”).

6 The Supreme Court’s decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA* employs this line of reasoning. *See Massachusetts v. EPA*, 127 S. Ct. 1438, 1457 (2007) (“Agencies, like legislatures, do not generally resolve massive problems in one fell regulatory swoop . . . They instead whittle away at them over time, refining their preferred approach as circumstances change and as they develop a more-nuanced understanding of how best to proceed.” (citation omitted)).

7 *Cf. Daniel C. Esty, Revitalizing Environmental Federalism*, 95 MICH. L. REV. 570, 625-26 (1996) (noting that despite the advantages of decentralization “global concerns such as ozone layer depletion and possible climate change due to the accumulation of greenhouse gases” give rise to “transboundary harm [that] demands some form of overarching governmental action across the scope of the harm”).
trajectory and effects of GHG emissions most assuredly does.\textsuperscript{8} Contemporary policy developments like those described by Carlmarne, as well as those occurring elsewhere in the world, raise the potential of hidden perils as much as they hold out promise of incremental or eventual improvement. Rather than signifying valuable policy progress, or even serving as potential stepping stones toward a more comprehensive solution, existing piecemeal state, federal, and even regional climate change policies pose nontrivial risks of policy failure.\textsuperscript{9} In some cases, the policies themselves could lead to problems at least as severe as the ones the policies originally aimed to solve.

In this article, we elaborate on the problems associated with incremental policymaking as applied to climate change. Specifically, we focus attention on six types of problems that we label: (1) Non-effects; (2) Leakage; (3) Climate Side Effects; (4) Other Side Effects; (5) Lock-in; and (6) Lulling. Our aim in chronicling the perils of incrementalism is not to argue against taking meaningful and appropriate policy action to address climate change; rather it is to temper the impulse to act with a frank elicitation of the perils of acting impulsively. Citizens and policymakers should not confuse the pace of action with its ultimate wisdom. Some of the uncoordinated policy developments taking place now, under the pressure for action, may well be worse than making no legal change at all until a well-considered and comprehensive global (or at least national) strategy on climate change can be forged.

I. THE PROMISE OF INCREMENTALISM

In his celebrated conception of incremental policymaking, Charles Lindblom explained that because decisionmakers act without perfect information, policymaking tends to proceed via a series of iterative adjustments.\textsuperscript{10} Policymakers, in other words, move in small steps based on


\textsuperscript{10} See Lindblom, supra note 4, at 84 (explaining that limits on both available information and cognitive ability cause policymakers to approach problem solving systematically); see also CHARLES E. LINDBLOM, POLITICS AND MARKETS: THE WORLD’S POLITICAL-ECONOMIC SYSTEMS 314 (1977)
accessible knowledge. Lindblom offered the incremental model to contrast with the rational-comprehensive or synoptic model, in which policy begins with policymakers stating their values and goals, identifying all possible means of achieving these goals, and systematically comparing the alternatives to arrive at an approach that maximizes intended values. 11

Incrementalism is attractive because of the difficulties of synoptic policy analysis. 12 Rather than urging policymakers to attempt to consider and respond to all issues comprehensively, incrementalists prefer that policymakers exclude some considerations from their analysis and take action before they can assess fully the possible consequences. This method relies on new information derived from policy experiments ("trial and error") to help public policy evolve over time. Experimentation can thus also generate and illuminate solutions that may not have even been known when the policy was proposed. 13 The ability to learn from each round of experiments is viewed as one of the primary benefits of incrementalism. In this way, incrementalism also provides a type of insurance against large-scale policy disaster. If problems are addressed bit by bit, and if solutions can be modified over time, the negative consequences of policy mistakes will be neither extensive nor long-lived.

Incrementalism embraces two distinct types of policy variation and change. First, policies can be spatially incremental, in much the way Carlarne describes. 14 Ad hoc state and local experiments are incremental because the limited jurisdiction to which they apply ensures they can never be more than a step toward more synoptic, encompassing policies for problems that cross jurisdictional boundaries. Second, policies can be focally incremental if they focus on only part of what causes a policy problem. In this way, even jurisdictionally large policies (that is, those adopted at the national or international level) can be incremental if their focus is constrained. For example, adopting a national motor vehicle emissions standard to address climate change would be more spatially comprehensive than any of the policies discussed by Carlarne, in that it would apply to vehicles across the country; however, such a policy would still be focally incremental because automobiles are only one source of

("Since people cannot intellectually master all their social problems ... they depend on various devices to simplify problem solving.").

11 See Lindblom, supra note 4, at 79 (proposing alternate ways to formulate policy).

12 Incrementalists argue that in approaching any policy, there are barriers to a comprehensive understanding. These barriers to synopsis include: (1) policy problems which by their very nature tend to escape complete cognition; (2) policies that often cannot be effectively compared because there is no set of agreed upon criteria upon which we judge all policies; and (3) problem solvers who naturally tend toward non-synoptic techniques, such as excluding certain value considerations to reach a result. LINDBLOM, supra note 10, at 322.

13 Id. at 257–58, 316.

14 See Carlarne, supra note 1, at 1381 (describing "[t]he flood of independent and collaborative climate change law and policy-making activities taking place at the state and local level" and acknowledging that these state and local measures are not "comprehensive, robust regulatory structures for climate change").
greenhouse gas emissions.¹⁵

Proponents of democratic experimentalism encourage both of these types of incremental policies. Because they favor giving discretion to local entities to set, and experiment with, their own standards, the policies emanating from democratic experimentalism are spatially incremental.¹⁶ Democratic experimentalism “replaces central command regulation with a combination of local experimentation and centralized pooling of experience.”¹⁷ National policymakers compile information and help diffuse innovations, but locals choose their own performance targets and means of redress. This means that many experimentalist policies will also be focally incremental.

Both democratic experimentalists and incrementalists favor local knowledge and learning by trial and error, even for some of the largest scale problems such as climate change.¹⁸ As such, intellectual enthusiasm for incremental policymaking appears fused, for the moment at least, with the current piecemeal policy trajectory with respect to climate change. Many climate change innovations are being pursued in ways that are either spatially or focally incremental—or both.

---

¹⁵ In addition to spatial and focal incrementalism, there is a third, temporal dimension to incrementalism. The IPCC appears to have had this temporal dimension in mind when, in its fourth report, it explained that “[r]esponding to climate change involves an iterative risk management process that includes both mitigation and adaptation.” INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE, CLIMATE CHANGE 2007: SYNTHESIS REPORT 64 (2007), available at http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr.pdf (emphasis added). To some extent, temporal incrementalism can be said simply to grow out of the recognition that, in principle, policies always can be modified. When doing so would correct policy failures or otherwise improve overall outcomes for society, policy changes should be made. In some cases, temporal incrementalism might even support the use of sunset provisions as part of new policies, so as to require renewed attention and re-analysis by policymakers at designated intervals if policies are to remain in effect. However, as our discussion of the pitfalls of incrementalism in the next part of this article should make clear, we think a strong version of temporal incrementalism that favors quicker decision-making over more labored attempts at synopticism, and that relies on the inherent opportunity to modify policy as part of the justification for making quicker (and potentially more error-prone) decisions, represents a fundamentally misguided approach to the problems associated with climate change. Such a strong version of temporal incrementalism, which Lindblom advocated, also dovetails with the case for both spatial and focal incrementalism that we highlight in the text, since it is usually easier and quicker to make decisions that affect smaller domains (or fewer actors) or that implicate only part of a larger, more complex problem.

¹⁶ See generally Michael C. Dorf & Charles F. Sabel, A Constitution of Democratic Experimentalism, 98 COLUM. L. REV. 267 (1998) (envisioning a system in which power is decentralized, allowing citizens and local organizations the opportunity to fashion solutions to societal problems based on their individual circumstances); Sabel et al., supra note 5, at 6-8 (envisioning a “rolling rule” framework that would replace regulation based on central commands, with a combination of local experimentation and centralized pooling of experience).

¹⁷ Sabel et al., supra note 5, at 7.

¹⁸ See, e.g., id. at 14–15 (noting that under the authors' proposed rolling-rule regime the local actors that implement policies are able to conduct monitored experiments that help shape responses to larger, more diffuse problems); Orts, supra note 3, at 304–05 (stating that “global climate change provides an example of why scholars and policymakers should not bind themselves too closely to traditional lawmaking” and urging that “smaller environmental contracts, deals, and ad hoc arrangements may do more good in this context”).
II. THE PERILS OF INCREMENTALISM

This current path is not as promising as incrementalists or experimentalists might lead us to believe. While incrementalism may well be appropriate for many important public problems, it does not necessarily work for all problems. Some problems require more than can be achieved with successive small steps, or simply cannot be divided into small steps that produce a meaningful result. Sometimes nothing short of a large-scale, focally comprehensive policy will do.

Climate change appears to fall into this category. Not only might it be impossible to solve the climate change problem through incremental steps, but when policymakers proceed incrementally, they do so with a degree of peril. Rather than providing insurance against catastrophic consequences, incremental approaches to climate change could either contribute to or fail to prevent catastrophic consequences altogether. Consider the following six perils of incremental climate change policymaking.

A. Non-effect

Incremental state and federal policies are unlikely to reverse climate change. Even in the aggregate, their limited scope and focus can make it difficult, if not impossible, to produce large improvements in this global problem. State and local programs may change behavior within their jurisdiction, but unabated rates of emissions growth from other areas can cancel out even seemingly significant effects within a single jurisdiction. Greenhouse gases accumulate in the atmosphere for years, making the problem bound to continue unless there are widespread, coordinated reductions throughout the world.

Even national-scale programs that have a narrow focus, such as the recently revamped Renewable Fuel Standard [RFS], are unlikely to have

---

19 For a critique of incremental policymaking, see Paul R. Schulman, Nonincremental Policy Making: Notes Toward an Alternative Paradigm, 69 AM. POL. SCI. REV. 1354, 1354–67 (1975), which contends that for some policies, including large-scale undertakings in response to major problems, the incrementalist approach of successive limited comparisons is inadequate.

20 Id.


22 See Pierre Friedlingstein, A Steep Road to Climate Stabilization, 451 NATURE 297; 297–98 (2008), available at http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v451/n7176/pdf/nature06593.pdf (explaining the difficulty of stabilizing atmospheric GHG concentrations because as air concentrations decrease land and ocean ecosystems might actually absorb fewer emissions, thus requiring still greater emissions reductions).

much of an effect on climate change in the absence of more global reform. Although vehicle emissions do constitute a large portion of the emissions that cause climate change, because of the confluence of factors that contribute to climate change, limiting this one source of emissions is not likely to be sufficient. Thus by definition, the limited scope of focally as well as spatially incremental policies make it unlikely that they will be able to put a dent in the emissions reductions necessary to reverse global warming.

B. Leakage

Not only is it likely that incremental policies will do little or nothing to affect global warming, but certain incremental policies, including state-level efforts like the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative [RGGI],\(^\text{24}\) might also worsen the global climate change problem because of leakage from other jurisdictions.\(^\text{25}\) By “leakage,” we mean to refer to situations where a stringent climate change policy unintentionally induces an increase in emissions in another jurisdiction with a less stringent or nonexistent policy.

Leakage can occur for a number of reasons.\(^\text{26}\) For example, if the supply of energy is restricted via regulation, the price of goods and services will increase, sparking an increase in supply from non-regulated sources. This supply-style leakage could be a concern for RGGI as it is possible that non-RGGI states will increase production and export “dirtier” energy to RGGI states. Some estimates indicate that leakage due to increased imports from other states could offset as much as sixty to ninety percent of RGGI-related reductions, substantially undermining the initiative’s objectives.\(^\text{27}\)

Leakage can also occur if incremental regulations greatly increase the cost of production in some states or regions. Facing such a cost increase,
industry might be tempted to move to an area where costs are lower because of less stringent regulations. The states in which firms re-locate may choose to avoid or reduce the stringency of their regulations to attract additional firms, thus exacerbating the leakage. Once relocated, industry will have an incentive to keep the cost of production low and can be expected to lobby against climate regulations. If many industries relocate to one unregulated jurisdiction, they will likely constitute a more powerful anti-regulatory coalition there than before.

Leakage can reduce, and potentially even reverse, the effects of proactive efforts wherever there are gaps in the geographic areas, fuels, or industries that are regulated. Even global programs, like the Kyoto Protocol, create the possibility of leakage when they do not cover all major developed and developing nations.

C. Climate Side Effects

In the rush to take action, policymakers have tended toward discrete, politically popular plans, including greenhouse gas targets, energy efficiency regulations, and renewable fuels standards. Yet when these hastily adopted policies are not subjected to careful analysis, they can carry with them the risk of unintended consequences. As now appears to be the case with policies requiring or encouraging the expansion of biofuels, some of these unintended consequences may even exacerbate the problem of climate change itself.

Biofuels have played a major role in first-generation climate policies. In the United States, biofuel incentives feature prominently in the federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 and the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, and have emerged in various state climate change policies.

---

28 Wiener, supra note 8, at 1968.
30 See Wiener, supra note 8, at 1967 (“Even the Kyoto Protocol is not sufficiently global, because it omits emissions limits on the world’s largest sources—the United States and China, as well as Australia, India, Brazil, and others.”).
They have also played a large role in the European Union’s climate change proposals, which relied on biofuels as the primary means of limiting greenhouse gases from the transportation sector. However, a recent re-examination of biofuels has uncovered that not all ethanol is created equal. Depending on whether producers of biofuels use diesel trucks, apply nitrogen fertilizer, or plant where there once was rainforest, biofuels might actually leave a negative carbon footprint. In response to these discoveries, the EU is now drafting legislation to ensure it encourages the right kind of biofuels, yet the infrastructure for the wrong fuels has already begun to take hold. Rainforests have been clear-cut and producers have made the investments necessary to keep up with the estimated demand. Even if EU and American authorities were to issue a moratorium on carbon intensive or high footprint biofuels, the deforested land and newly invigorated biofuel industry will not disappear. Producers might simply seek out less environmentally conscious markets for these alternative fuels. Although policymakers may well learn from this experiment, the mistake’s effects are not easily undone.


36 Kanter, supra note 34.
37 Id.
38 In light of the EU’s experience, as well as the recent scientific reports disclosing the fuels’ negative footprint, there is growing movement against biofuels in the United States. While Congress is not yet rethinking the Renewable Fuel Standard in the 2007 Energy Act, environmentalists recently sent a letter to the President and the Speaker of the House urging an EU-style revision. Rosenthal, supra note 35; Biofuels Digest, Science Magazine Reaction: US Scientists Write to President Bush, Speaker Pelosi: Berkeley Professor Says Recent Policy Decisions Moving in the Right Direction, http://biofuelsdigest.com/blog/2008/02/14/science-magazine-reaction-us-scientists-write-to-president-bush-speaker-pelosi-berkeley-professor-says-recent-policy-decisions-moving-in-the-right-direction/ (Feb. 14, 2008, 10:03 EST).
D. Other Side Effects

Not only can incremental policies generate side effects in terms of climate change, they can create other side effects in terms of general health and welfare.\(^39\) To reduce energy usage, for example, the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 requires light bulb manufacturers to meet energy efficiency standards that currently can only be met with compact fluorescent light bulbs.\(^40\) Yet compact fluorescent light bulbs contain mercury.\(^41\) As such, broken or disposed of bulbs could cause problems of mercury contamination. While producers claim the bulbs only contain small amounts of mercury, the amount is enough to require special disposal procedures.\(^42\) As the EPA cautions, once a bulb is broken, the user is supposed to don protective plastic gloves before collecting the broken glass with stiff cardboard, not a broom or vacuum cleaner (which could disperse the mercury).\(^43\) The user must seal the collected glass in air-tight plastic bags before disposing of it.\(^44\) Because of the potential for contamination, some states prohibit disposing of mercury-containing glass in landfills.\(^45\) To remedy this problem, some manufacturers offer customers the option of shipping the bulbs back to the factory, adding, of course, to the carbon footprint.\(^46\) Even so, it is questionable whether all consumers will take advantage of companies’ return policies. Additional amounts of mercury are likely to make their way into the nation’s waste stream and pose increased risks of mercury contamination. Although replacing incandescent light bulbs can reduce energy demand and decrease

\(^{39}\) Although we used biofuels in the preceding part to illustrate climate side effects, the production of biofuels may cause other side effects as well, such as the depletion of water supplies or the creation of water pollution. *Ethanol and Water: Don’t Mix*, ECONOMIST, Feb. 28, 2008, available at LEXIS, News Library, ECON File; Brenda Goodman, *Pollution Is Called a Byproduct of a ‘Clean’ Fuel*, N.Y. TIMES, Mar. 11, 2008, at A12, available at LEXIS, News Library, NYT File.


\(^{41}\) See ENERGY STAR, EPA, *FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS: INFORMATION ON COMPACT FLUORESCENT LIGHT BULBS (CFLS) AND MERCURY* (Feb. 2008), http://www.energystar.gov/ia/partners/promotions/change_light/downloads/Fact_Sheet_Mercury.pdf (“Mercury currently is an essential component of CFLs and is what allows the bulb to be an efficient light source.”).


\(^{43}\) Id.

\(^{44}\) Id.

\(^{45}\) See id. (“Check with your local or state government about disposal requirements in your specific area. Some states prohibit such trash disposal and require that broken and unbroken mercury-containing bulbs be taken to a local recycling center.”).

greenhouse gas emissions, in its zeal to focus on one environmental problem, Congress has taken an incremental step that will likely add to another environmental problem.

In addition to the possibility of creating other environmental problems, incremental climate change policies pose nontrivial economic risks. By increasing energy costs, climate change policies can obviously induce dramatic welfare and distributional effects. The widely expressed concern that biofuel mandates have contributed to increases in global food prices shows how climate policies may induce economic effects that spread far beyond the price of energy.

E. Lock-In

In addition to creating side effects, incremental policies can create a path dependence that prevents or inhibits the development of better alternatives. Implementing, monitoring, and maintaining any policy requires start-up costs, making it harder to change policies mid-stream.

---

47 The EPA estimates that replacing incandescent light bulbs with compact fluorescent bulbs could "save enough energy to light more than 3 million homes for a year, more than $600 million in annual energy costs, and prevent greenhouse gases equivalent to the emissions of more than 800,000 cars." Energy Star, Compact Fluorescent Light Bulbs, http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=cfls.ulcfls (last visited Mar. 24, 2008).

48 To its credit, Congress at least recognized this potential side effect and called for the Department of Energy and the EPA to prepare for Congress within one year "a report describing recommendations relating to the means by which the Federal Government may reduce or prevent the release of mercury during the manufacture, transportation, storage, or disposal of light bulbs." Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, Pub. L. No. 110-140, § 321(h) (2007).


51 See Stewart & Wiener, supra note 31, at 98 ("Experience shows that, once adopted, piecemeal initiatives rarely evolve into a comprehensive strategy.").

52 See Schulman, supra note 19, at 1356 ("Nonincremental policies in particular must expand greatly if they are to expand at all. Only then can they overcome the inertia, external resistance, or internal start-up problems which act as barriers to policy expansion.").
The learning required to work within any new policy framework makes the regulated entities (and regulators) less likely to favor changing to an unfamiliar approach. When legislators and voters think an issue has already been addressed, it requires a lot of political heavy lifting to change established policies. And perhaps most importantly, those who have an interest in the status quo under an incremental policy can be expected to resist policy change—including the regulators, the regulated companies that make compliance investments, and the advocates of the initial incremental approaches.  

The biofuels saga shows that those who make investments in response to a new policy, such as biofuels producers, have an interest in continuing to market their products. Companies that have built expensive ethanol distilleries, for example, will not readily abandon their investments for different technologies. Nor can it be expected that politicians will eagerly want to force ethanol producers to shut down operations that both employ thousands of constituents and address, if only symbolically, a pressing environmental problem. Consequently, as Jeff Bingaman, Chair of the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, noted in commenting on the federal Renewable Fuel Standard, “there is little room in the RFS for technological advance.”

The factors that contribute to policy lock-in can also inhibit national efforts to displace the patchwork of state climate change policies and programs. As Carlarme notes, over the past decade there have been 189 efforts by states, including eight regional compacts, to reduce global warming. Although many suggest we can learn from these state experiments, perhaps modelling a national response on some of these efforts, legal scholar Jonathan Wiener reminds us that “the flip side of experimentation is that a proliferation of different GHG policies and allowance markets in different states—and across countries—may generate conflicting approaches and vested interests that are difficult to reconcile and mesh in a larger national or international regime.” The sheer number

---

54 Cf. Grunwald, supra note 35, at 44. Of course, we recognize that Congress and state legislatures could still retreat from their policies promoting renewable fuels, and perhaps one or more of these institutions will. Our point is simply that doing so will not be easy.
56 See Carlarme, supra note 1, at 1365 (noting that “forty-two states have greenhouse gas inventories; twenty-nine states have adopted climate action plans; fourteen states have adopted greenhouse gas emission targets; fourteen states are in the process of adopting greenhouse gas emission standards for automobiles; six states have mandatory greenhouse gas reporting programs; twenty states have formed climate change advisory boards; . . . twenty-five states are participating in one or more of eight existing regional climate change initiatives” and “sixteen states have public benefit funds for clean energy supply[] and twenty-four states have renewable energy portfolio standards”).
57 Wiener, supra note 8, at 1974.
of climate change efforts, with every state having some climate change policy or law, suggests that displacing them at the national or global level will not be easy.\footnote{See David Hodas, State Initiatives, in \textit{GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE AND U.S. LAW} 343, 343 (Michael B. Gerrard ed., 2007) ("As of July 2006, every state in the country has adopted some sort of law or policy to address climate change.").}

F. \textit{Lulling}

Finally, incremental policies may lull the public into thinking climate change is being addressed, thus dampening demand for the costly and comprehensive policies that will achieve the most meaningful results. In the wake of a proliferation of incremental policies, comprehensive solutions must garner additional support in order to overcome bias toward the status quo.

Alternatively, since incremental policies are inherently less effective in addressing global problems, the failures of incremental climate change policies might breed increased cynicism about whether any policy solution can work. When small commitments fail to produce large policy pay-offs, policies can become harder, not easier, to expand.\footnote{See Schulman, \textit{supra} note 19, at 1366 (arguing that once a policy has overcome the initial hurdles of passage and implementation, "[w]ithout major mobilizing commitments (such as landing a man on the moon and returning him safely) these policies simply cannot generate and sustain the support required for their collective payoffs").} Moreover, because the risks of climate change are not yet palpable—there has been no massive coastline loss, for example—the necessity of more comprehensive action might not be immediately obvious.

III. TOWARD COMPREHENSIVE CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY

The perils of incrementalism in the face of climate change are certainly not inconsequential. Despite the evident support for piecemeal climate change policies, policymakers should carefully consider the types of harms we have outlined whenever they are confronted with proposals for ad hoc state or national prescriptions. Given the risks of error in climate change policy, it will almost certainly be better to pass on adopting piecemeal policies today to wait to develop alternative, comprehensive policies less prone to the types of perils we have outlined.

Ironically, some of the perils of incrementalism stem from the very policymaking constraint that incrementalism is designed to help overcome: limited information.\footnote{Cf. Cary Coglianese, \textit{Social Movements, Law, and Society: The Institutionalization of the Environmental Movement}, 150 U. PA. L. REV. 85, 88 (2001) (contrasting the "tangible environmental problems" addressed by early environmental legislation with the "less palpable" problem of climate change).} We agree that this constraint is real.\footnote{For a discussion of limited information as a basis for an incrementalist approach, see \textit{supra} Part I.} Indeed, that
is precisely why policymakers should take the time needed to develop more comprehensive climate change responses, gathering more information and conducting more careful analyses. Rather than adopting a series of ad hoc, piecemeal policies and trying eventually to learn something through trial and error, the better way in this context is to invest additional time and resources up front in policy analysis and robust deliberation, so as to increase the probability of maximizing policy effectiveness and minimizing side effects and policy failures. Of course, we also recognize that waiting forever is not an optimal strategy. The challenge is to design a comprehensive policy response that is both manageable and does not demand omniscience of policymakers.

An upstream cap-and-trade policy is an example of the type of comprehensive policy that would fare better than the myriad piecemeal reforms under way and would be well worth closer inspection by policymakers. Such a policy would be best implemented globally, in a way that covers all nations and all greenhouse gases, but even a cap-and-trade policy at the national level in the United States would be better than the uncoordinated status quo. Under a domestic upstream cap-and-trade approach, the federal government would establish a national cap on the production and sale of carbon-based and other GHG fuels, but would allow energy companies to trade and bank fuel allowances. As described in a recent policy analysis by economist Robert Stavins, such a comprehensive upstream cap-and-trade would encompass the entire economy, phase in caps over time to allow for planning and encourage innovation, and would accommodate uncertainties by allowing banking and trading as well as by using multi-year compliance periods.

Capping fuels upstream has several advantages. Perhaps most importantly, it is administratively feasible, while capping emissions “downstream” is not, due to the millions of emissions sources that would need to be monitored. In addition, because a comprehensive upstream cap-and-trade would cover the entire economy, it would prevent leakage in a way that piecemeal approaches cannot. Yet as with piecemeal approaches, an upstream cap-and-trade recognizes that central policymakers lack full information. The flexibility built into a cap-and-
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63 Our discussion of an upstream cap-and-trade policy in this part of the article illustrates simply one promising policy we think would be less prone to the perils of incrementalism we have highlighted in this article. Given space constraints, our discussion clearly does not reflect the type of comprehensive policy analysis that should precede selection of a cap-and-trade proposal or any other policy over other potential alternatives, such fuel or emissions taxes.


65 Id. at 18–19.
trade system gives private actors, who have better information, the ability and the incentive to find new ways to adapt to fuel constraints.

To be sure, private actors might respond to the flexibility of a cap-and-trade system by adopting technologies that pose new kinds of risks.\(^{66}\) For example, one could easily imagine market actors converting the nation’s lighting to fluorescent light bulbs, with the same kind of side effects that would result from a fiscally incremental prescription imposed by a central policymaker. As such, vigilance will still be needed. Policy makers need to continue to monitor for such side effects from the introduction of unsafe products. But these side effects will be easier to address through ordinary regulatory oversight of market activities because they would arise from market innovation rather than legislative prescription. Unsafe technologies that are “locked-in” by legislation require new legislation to address them; such technologies introduced by private actors require only responsive action by regulatory agencies charged with administering their normal safety missions.

Lulling will be less of a concern too. Once there is support for a comprehensive cap-and-trade program, the regulated firms themselves determine and implement their own response, without the need for building additional public support. By designing the system to include increasingly more stringent limits over time on the production and sale of carbon-based and other GHG fuels, an upstream cap-and-trade system would continually give economic actors the incentive to search for better solutions.

Although a coordinated approach like an upstream cap-and-trade regime will better avoid the perils associated with incrementalism, we can imagine several responses from adherents of incrementalism and democratic experimentalism. First, some incrementalists might fully support an upstream cap-and-trade, but nevertheless argue that the current incrementalist path is the only (or the quickest) way to see it implemented.\(^{67}\) Current ad hoc policies, it might be suggested, both signal intense public demand for a response to climate change and also change the political dynamic in Washington. Under this view, as disjointed policies proliferate, industry can be expected to support a centralized approach over the minefield of diffuse, ad hoc policies. Despite the plausibility of this argument, we find it unconvincing for reasons we have already discussed, such as the countervailing lock-in effect.\(^{68}\) Moreover, taking more action at the state level hardly seems necessary to generate
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\(^{67}\) See Engel, supra note 2, at 1564–65 (arguing that state-initiated climate change litigation is likely to be just as effective if not more effective than positive regulation and that third-party GHG emissions offsets can function well until a federal regulatory program is adopted).

\(^{68}\) See supra Part II.E.
additional support for comprehensive federal legislation. It is hard to imagine climate change gaining more prominence on the political agenda in Washington or climate change policies eliciting more political support than they have right now. National policymakers no longer debate the question of whether climate change is a problem. Indeed, candidates from both parties in pursuit of the White House in 2008 have pledged to address climate change. Because those in Washington, the public, and industry are already clamoring for a definitive response, each additional incremental response will bring only marginally more pressure on the center—and as we have suggested, incremental responses can also quite likely undermine further action if the public becomes lulled into thinking the problem is getting solved through numerous ad hoc responses.

Second, incrementalists might object that it is risky to do nothing while waiting for a comprehensive cap-and-trade solution, since support for such a solution might never materialize, even under the most supportive political conditions. Incrementalists might argue that piecemeal state policies, even if some of the policies are largely symbolic, at least represent something—and something is better than nothing. Yet an incremental “something” is hardly appealing if it locks in ineffective programs that will be difficult to displace. Furthermore, side effects from myopic policies, either on climate change or other societal concerns, can set back progress, sometimes significantly. When scientists predict that the catastrophic effects of global warming loom just over the horizon, there is little time to learn and adjust in response to the trials and errors of incremental experiments.
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71 See, e.g., Massachusetts v. EPA, 127 S. Ct. 1438, 1458 (2007) (reasoning that concerns over the potential ineffectiveness of a motor vehicle emission standard are unfounded because any “reduction in domestic emissions would slow the pace of global emissions increases, no matter what happens elsewhere”).
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74 One interim step that can always be taken—and probably should have been taken years ago for climate change—would be to adopt information collection policies that would generate data helpful to policymakers, both in selecting a comprehensive policy and later in providing a basis for evaluation of subsequently adopted substantive policies. For example, the final provision in Division A, Title II of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008 calls for EPA to “require mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions above appropriate thresholds in all sectors of the economy of the United States.” Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-161, 121 Stat. 1844, 2128 (2008).
CONCLUSION

Although it may seem to take more time to develop an effective, coordinated system than to adopt piecemeal approaches, the total time to make meaningful improvements in climatic conditions may prove to be less than if we continue to proceed on a piecemeal basis. Settling on a comprehensive solution through trial-and-error will demand significant time due to the need to evaluate and adjust incremental policies. A better alternative appears to be analyzing and building support for a comprehensive, upstream cap-and-trade that is able to achieve some of the benefits of incrementalism by allowing market actors some flexibility, but without falling prey to many of the perils of incrementalism.

State experimentation has been described as one of the great hallmarks of the U.S. democracy. However, with respect to climate change, there is good reason to doubt the appropriateness of the current ad hoc, state and local responses to this global problem. At their most benign, current incremental reforms will have little or no effect on climate change. Yet at the worst, leakage from unregulated areas can undermine the reductions made in more policy active states. As we have illustrated with the examples of the biofuel and light bulb mandates, side effects can exacerbate climate change problems or create other public health problems. Furthermore, disjointed experimentation can entrench interests and lull the public into thinking progress is being made, thus making comprehensive policymaking more challenging to achieve. Under these circumstances, it appears better to wait to develop a comprehensive and effective climate change policy rather than to continue succumbing to pressure to adopt incremental options that will ultimately prove ineffective or otherwise problematic.
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