

The Paradigm Shifts of TURA

They bear on the big question of how we invest in our future.

What is the proper role of government?

In a Nutshell:

Should we go back to this?

We make many complex rules and expect people to know of them automatically and manage on their own.

And punish them when they don't.

AND:

The rules themselves are a compromise: how much can we squeeze polluters before there's too strong a backlash.

We get progress by adding costs, and the standards we set become fairly frozen in place.

OR?

We learn from this big demonstration project called TURA.

An investment in government using a suite of tools to foster innovation, behavioral and culture change, to help people, and get to the root of problems works and needs to keep happening.

TURA was a change in how we do government, which caused changes in how business is done.

The government change part is not widely understood.

TURA engages with toxics users *to enlist their motivation* to solve the problems toxics use causes.

TURA is a new set of tools for prompting self-correction.

Its use engenders respect for shared responsibility, for cooperation.

It is tailored to the individual, which is a civilized advance in governance, and it is flexible.

It is like gardening: through nurturing, it produces a feast for the community.

Its success does not mean that policing is not necessary: enforcement is essential.

The important contrast is not between enforcement and assistance. It is between enforcement unsupplemented by assistance, and integrated strategies. ***TURA is a two-handed, fully-equipped approach.***

TURA established the idea that this is a good thing for government to do. It shares this credit with every other similar program, but TURA was one of the leaders.

Many paradigms have shifted as a result of TURA, and the work of similar programs.

The first big change, the **right to know**. Toxics will be in the open. Toxics users can't hide. *People have the right to know about risks that are imposed on them.*

Responsibility. We added to the idea that the Polluter Pays, the idea that the Polluter Must Think (plan), and we need to Watch the Polluter Think to make sure they take their Responsibility Seriously.

Sharing Responsibility. We, through our government agencies, should Help Polluters, work with them.

The Power of Good Faith: We can expect some progress by motivating good faith action. **Trust:** We can get business to trust government. **Recognition:** when people do good things.

Shifted Paradigms

(Extent of shift varies and may be temporary)

Before

Command and control rigidity:
prescriptive standards

The best way to address pollution
is treatment

We resolve pollution problems
through compromise

Static picture of regulations,
frozen feasibility

We deal with each medium
separately

After

Flexibility, business chooses
what works

The best strategy is
prevention

We find answers through
fostering innovation

Dynamic picture of
what can develop

Addressing issues at the source
(toxics use) helps each medium

BEFORE

Adversarial relationship between gov. and regulated community

The Polluter Must Pay!

Toxics are handled in secrecy

The public has a right to know about toxic releases

The public has no right to know about company operations

If you ask an environmental agency for help, they will find violations and fine you.

AFTER

Collaborative partnerships, assistance

Must also Think

Toxics must be brought into the daylight

The public has a right to know about toxic use

The public has a right to know that an entity imposing risks is taking action to reduce the risk

It can be safe to ask for help.

Everyone's a polluter and you need to police them

Everyone's a potential performer and you need to help them.

The only place to get help with environmental matters is from the private sector, which can be expensive: or hire.

Providing assistance gets you oriented, helps you use the private sector effectively, and sets a standard for the private sector concerning how to do pollution prevention.

Government shouldn't compete with private by providing free assistance.

Government generates business for green services and products and mitigates the imposition of regulatory burden.

The only people who can fix a problem by making changes in process are those who know that process very very well.

The problem is polluters.

The problem is production.

The problem is industry.

The problem begins when toxics leave the facility.

We can only treat the symptom.

A pair of fresh eyes can provide useful insight about the process thinking out of the box, objective observation, cross-disciplinary ideas.

The problem is all of us.

Consumption, too.

Households, schools, hospitals, agencies, commercial, consumers.

The problem begins when the decision to use toxics is made.

We can treat the cause.

Management will find the solution

Progress costs money

Pollution control slows productivity

Environmental progress costs jobs

Government's role is to stop the bad

Being friendly with polluters is wrong,
it makes it harder to enforce

Assistance should say nothing about
the requirements, they'll get it wrong

Teams and champions helps

Progress saves costs

Pollution prevention prompts
innovation and efficiency

P2 saves and creates jobs

Also: to promote the good

It is possible to be friendly as well
as firm

Working with enforcement assistance
can greatly boost understanding of
rules

Businesses will not share information with each other.
information.

If they learn something it will be a competitive edge
if they want to share it they will market it.

You can measure prevention: what you prevented
is not there

Corporations can boast about performance
many ways and we can't tell what's greenwash

Rules can't be changed, it's just too hard

Businesses gain a lot by sharing P2

Businesses are willing to share and
Information for many reasons:
citizenship, pride, public image,
and the recognition that bad actors
in their group make them look bad.

Production-adjusted input/output
provides good measurement of
what's avoided

We can assess and compare in
performance accurately using
resource use efficiency

Innovative policy developments
become more feasible because of
the consensus that grows out of
engagement with the regulated.

Rules have to be what they are and the impact on business is regrettable

We get progress by figuring out the best thing to do and telling people what it is

Rigid, prescriptive

Adversarial, punishing

Diminishing Returns

If we are mindful of the alternatives businesses can implement we can reduce burden

We can get progress by requiring good faith efforts, right to know reporting, and assisting.

Flexible, adaptive

Reflexive, Responsive, Relational

Cornucopic

You see how big this is if you think strategically about environmental policy development.

Here we have a method that works.
What should we do about it?

Should we use it?

What are the opportunity costs of
**NOT EXPANDING DEMONSTRATED
SUCCESS?**

TURA was an experiment that worked.

These shifts were hard won.

The finely crafted tool is being left out to rust.

The most important paradigm shift – about how these tools can make a huge difference - has become unshifted and is in danger of being lost.

If TURA dwindles, we should create a nonprofit to preserve the ***Social and Intellectual Capital the state has created.***

The body of knowledge - the cooperative energies - the can do outlook - the ideas and the demonstrated examples of win/win

We have institutional expertise - a library - business networks - grateful companies - courses - knowledge of where this and that good green thing has been done and how it was done.

Once, nobody in government knew anything like that sort of thing.

Once, nobody in government was good friends with people in companies. *They were hated and feared.* What has been created has incalculable value. It needs to be preserved and kept alive.

Applying the Tools of TURA to Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

Use efficiency measures – partial progress

Give the people the right to know about performance – partial progress

Provide assistance – going in wrong direction

Apply a fee – not yet

Require the consideration of alternatives – no planning requirement on the table yet

Paradigms shifted to SOME EXTENT. TURA example not having sufficient impact!

TURA shifted: 1. our paradigm about how to reduce pollution so we see that we can and should go forward, employing preventive strategies; and 2. our ideas about the role of government: “friendly” can work with “firm.”

The first has helped cause green businesses and green consumerism. But the P2 programs have dwindled as if the problems don't need addressing anymore. Success and Failure at the same time.

How well has the second paradigm shift stood up? Innovative governance, the reform of regulatory programs to adopt user-friendly modes, seems forgotten, bungled and moribund in 2009. But perhaps not!