

1999 FRASER INSTITUTE

CRITICAL

ISSUES

bulletin

Environmental Indicators

for North America and
the United Kingdom

*by Steven Hayward
and Laura Jones*

*with Liv Fredricksen, Kevin Lacey
and Kelly Torrance*

PACIFIC
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE
FOR PUBLIC POLICY



THE FRASER
INSTITUTE

iea

25

1974 • 1999

Critical Issues Bulletins

Critical Issues Bulletins are published from time to time by The Fraser Institute (Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada) as supplements to *Fraser Forum*, the Institute's monthly periodical. Critical Issues Bulletins are comprehensive studies of single issues of critical importance for public policy.

The authors have worked independently and opinions expressed by them are, therefore, their own, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the members or the trustees of The Fraser Institute.

For additional copies of Critical Issues Bulletins, any of our other publications, or a catalogue of the Institute's publications, call our toll-free order line: 1-800-665-3558 or visit our web site at <http://www.fraserinstitute.ca>.

For information about publications of The Fraser Institute and about ordering, please contact **Chris Howey**

via telephone: (604) 688-0221, ext. 580

via fax: (604) 688-8539

via e-mail: chrish@fraserinstitute.ca.

Copyright© 1999 by The Fraser Institute

Date of Issue: April 1999

Printed in Canada

Canadian Publications Mail

Sales Product Agreement #0087246

ISSN 1480-3666

Editing and design:

Kristin McCahon and

Lindsey Thomas Martin

Image for front cover copyright©

Gabriel M. Covian, The Image Bank

The Fraser Institute

The Fraser Institute is an independent Canadian economic and social research and educational organization. It has as its objective the redirection of public attention to the role of competitive markets in providing for the well-being of Canadians. Where markets work, the Institute's interest lies in trying to discover prospects for improvement. Where markets do not work, its interest lies in finding the reasons. Where competitive markets have been replaced by government control, the interest of the Institute lies in documenting objectively the nature of the improvement or deterioration resulting from government intervention. The work of the Institute is assisted by an Editorial Advisory Board of internationally renowned economists. The Fraser Institute is a national, federally chartered, non-profit organization financed by the sale of its publications and the tax-deductible contributions of its members, foundations, and other supporters; it receives no government funding.

To learn more about the Institute, please visit our web site at <http://www.fraserinstitute.ca>.

For information about membership in The Fraser Institute, please contact via mail to

Sherry Stein, Director of Development

The Fraser Institute, 4th Floor

1770 Burrard Street

Vancouver, BC, V6J 3M1

via telephone: (604) 688-0221, ext. 590

or via fax: (604) 688-8539.

In Toronto, you may contact us toll-free

via telephone: (416) 363-6575

or via fax: (416) 601-7322.

The work of The Fraser Institute is assisted by an **Editorial Advisory Board** that includes Prof. Armen Alchian, Prof. Jean-Pierre Centi, Prof. Friedrich Schneider, Sir Alan Walters, Prof. J.M. Buchanan, Prof. Michael Parkin, Prof. L.B. Smith, and Prof. Edwin G. West.

Contents

Acknowledgments	2	Oil spills	69
Introduction	3	Pesticides	72
Primary environmental indicators	7	Toxic releases	74
Air quality	7	Wildlife	76
Water quality	25	Index of environmental indicators	81
Natural resource use	46	Methodology	81
Land use and condition	54	Results	82
Solid waste	61	Conclusion	85
Secondary environmental indicators	65	Notes	98
Carbon dioxide emissions	65	References	101

About the authors

LIV FREDRICKSEN is a researcher at The Fraser Institute. While at the Institute, she has been the co-author of The Green Team and The Greening of Education for *Fraser Forum* and of “Green Team” Pollutes the Classroom for the *Financial Post*. She also assisted in the research and development for *Waiting Your Turn: Hospital Waiting Lists in Canada (7th edition)*, *Federal Regulatory Reform: Rhetoric or Reality?* as well as several upcoming publications including *Environmental Indicators 1999* and an inquiry into endangered species legislation in Canada. Ms Fredricksen received her B.A. in English Literature from the University of British Columbia in 1995 and also holds a Diploma from the Dubrulle French Culinary School. Before coming to the Institute, she worked in public relations and television production.

STEVEN HAYWARD is a Senior Fellow of the Pacific Research Institute. He has written on politics, economics, public policy, law, and environmental issues for scholarly and popular journals including *National Review*, *Modern Age*, *First Things*, *Policy Review*, *The Intercollegiate Review*, and the *California Journal*. He is a contributing editor for *Reason* magazine, a contributing author for the forthcoming *Encyclopedia of the American Right*, and his columns have appeared in many newspapers. He holds an MA in Government from Claremont Graduate School, and is currently completing his Ph.D. in American Studies at Claremont Graduate School. In 1990 and 1992, he was an Olive Garvey Fellow of the Mont Pelerin Society and recently held a two-year term as a Henry Salvatori Fellow of the Heritage Foundation in Washington, DC. This year, he is the Bradley Fellow at the Heritage Foundation.

LAURA JONES is the Director of Environmental Studies at The Fraser Institute. She joined The Fraser Institute in 1996 to develop the Institute's policy on the environment. During 1997, she edited *Fish or Cut Bait! The Case for Individual Transferable Quotas in the Salmon Fishery of British Columbia* and *Global Warming: The Science and the Politics*. Ms Jones has also published articles in *Fraser Forum*, *The Vancouver Sun*, the *Ottawa Citizen*, and the *Financial Post*, and was a co-author of the first and second editions of *Environmental Indicators for Canada and the United States*, a Fraser Institute Critical Issues Bulletin. She received her B.A. in Economics from Mount Holyoke College in Massachusetts, and her M.A. in Economics from Simon Fraser University in British Columbia. Prior to joining the Institute, she taught economics at Coquitlam College and is currently teaching Economic Issues at the British Columbia Institute of Technology.

KEVIN LACEY was born in Berwick, Nova Scotia, and grew up in Halifax. He is currently studying History at Dalhousie University. Mr Lacey held a joint internship with the Fraser Institute in Vancouver and the Pacific Research Institute in San Francisco during the summer of 1998 and served as an intern at the Atlantic Institute for Market Studies (AIMS) in Halifax. He has been quoted in the *Globe and Mail* and other newspapers throughout the Maritime provinces and his articles have appeared in publications of The Fraser Institute and of AIMS. He appeared as a commentator for the Atlantic Television Networks coverage of the 1997 federal budget and as a guest speaker at the AIMS student conference (1997) and at St. Mary's University Education week.

KELLY TORRANCE is completing a philosophy major at the University of British Columbia. She was summer intern at The Fraser Institute and was formerly a staff reporter at *Alberta Report*.

Acknowledgments

The Fraser Institute, the Institute of Economic Affairs, and the Pacific Research Institute wish to thank the Donner Canadian Foundation for providing the funding for a student internship for Kevin Lacey in the summer of 1998.



Introduction

Modern public attention to the environment dates roughly from the first Earth Day in 1970. But despite a generation of concern, public opinion about environmental issues remains confused and contradictory and, as a consequence, public policy on the environment is highly contentious and unsettled.

It is difficult to judge public sentiment about the environment accurately because the environment, taken as a whole, is a broad and all encompassing idea. “The environment” is an evocative term, suggestive of mankind’s relationship to nature, and having connotations of eternity and our generation’s bequest to succeeding generations. The environment, perhaps uniquely among public issues, invites citizens to engage in metaphysical speculations. Environmental issues comprise both narrow technical concerns, often measured in parts per billion, and broad emotional concerns, such as the symbolic value of a virgin forest.

The broad and amorphous nature of environmental issues works both for and against environmentalism. When pollsters ask specifically whether the environment is a serious problem, majorities answer strongly in the affirmative, and people are generally pessimistic about environmental trends. According to the most recent Wirthlin survey on environmental issues, 79 percent think that “problems regarding pollution and the environment will get worse during my lifetime”. The Wirthlin survey similarly finds that 76 percent agree with the statement that “protecting the environment is so important that requirements and standards cannot be too high, and continuing environmental improvements must be made regardless of cost.” (Wirthlin Group 1997)

On the other hand, if pollsters ask open-ended questions about what issues people regard as most important, the environment does very poorly, usually in the single digits. A 1995 Gallup Poll reported that only one percent of respondents ranked the environment as the “most important problem,” while a 1994 Roper Survey that listed the environment among 20 public problems

ranked the environment sixteenth, just above alcoholism. (The Gallup and Roper Surveys are included in Ladd and Bowman 1995. Crime, the economy, and education are usually picked as the most important public problems, with 40 to 60 percent being the typical range for respondents naming these as particular problems on open-ended or multiple-choice surveys.) This is not to suggest that public concern about the environment is overstated or misunderstood. Contradiction within public opinion is not a new or remarkable phenomenon and the environment is similar to many other public issues where the public often tells pollsters that the government does not spend enough money on the specific problem while also saying that the government as a whole is too big and spends too much. (If policy makers made policy according to the polls on an issue-by-issue basis, total government spending would soar.)

The fact that people rank the environment low on an open-ended ranking of public problems means that, while many people may have strong opinions on the environment in the abstract, the environment does not hold their immediate interest in the same way crime and education do. While public-policy debates seldom command close public attention, citizens are more informed on high-profile issues such as crime and education than they are on environmental issues, and public preferences are more accurately and fully reflected in policy changes that are made on the high profile issues. (The movement for tougher prison sentencing for criminals, such as “three strikes,” is a good example of strong and clear public preferences being translated into policy.)

How the people form an opinion about the environment

Given the fact that the public does not pay close attention to the details of environmental issues, it is not surprising that public opinion is not in harmony with the general

facts. Even as polls show that people think the environment is getting worse, by most measures environmental quality has dramatically improved over the last generation and is continuing to improve.

There are three ways in which the public comes to form its opinions about the environment. First, because people are less likely to spend time following environmental issues in detail and because the environment ranks low on the list of public concerns, environmental issues and policy tend to be driven by the most highly motivated interest groups, typically environmental organizations. And, since democratic government is most responsive to an atmosphere of crisis, it is in the interest of environmental organizations to promote a sense of crisis much of the time. A feature series on environmental issues in the *New York Times* observed that environmental organizations might be “in danger of becoming the green equivalent of the military lobby, more interested in sowing fear and protecting wasteful programs than in devising a new course” (Schneider 1993: A1). Other critics have described some environmentalists as “crisis entrepreneurs.”

Second, the news media, which like bad news—especially when it can be sensationalized—aggravates this problem by promoting images of environmental threats. News about positive environmental progress is down-played. In his magisterial book, *A Moment on the Earth*, environmental writer Gregg Easterbrook recounts how, in 1992, he was struck by finding the good-news story, “Air Found Cleaner in U.S. Cities,” in “a small box buried on page A24” of the *New York Times*. The story went unmentioned in most other media outlets. “Surely,” Easterbrook observed, “any news that air quality was in decline would have received front-page attention. The treatment suggested that the world was somehow disappointed by an inappropriately encouraging discovery” (Easterbrook 1995: xiii). This asymmetry in the way the media handle environmental issues further distorts public perception.

Third, public perception of environmental quality is powerfully driven by what economists call “the wealth effect.” Several studies have shown a positive correlation between rising incomes and demand for environmental quality. As people become more affluent, their tolerance for risk of all kinds diminishes. This helps explain some of the reason why citizens of wealthy nations believe their environment is getting worse even as the data show it is getting better.

The effect of public opinion on policy

Incorrect public perceptions about environmental trends can have important consequences for policy since, not only do they cause anxieties that may be unwarranted by facts or out of proportion to the true risks involved, but they can also lead to skewed policy priorities. In 1990, the United States Environmental Protection Agency’s Science Advisory Board warned that current laws and regulations “are more reflective of public perceptions of risk than of scientific understanding of risk” (USEPA Science Advisory Board 1990). Further, a 1993 report from the Center for Resource Economics found that EPA resources were allocated in amounts inversely proportional to genuine risk. “EPA’s budget and staff resources are not allocated on the basis of risk,” the report concluded. “Consequently, more than 80 percent of EPA’s resources are spent on pollutants considered to be relatively low risk by federal scientists” (Smolensky, Dickson and Caplan 1993: 1).

To be sure, public perceptions are often wrong on many other areas of public policy. Plant closing and layoff announcements often generate waves of anxiety among the public and the media and lower consumer confidence even when unemployment is falling and the economy is strong. In the fullness of time, however, public perception usually corrects itself as a clear sense of economic progress takes hold. One reason for this long-term confidence in the economy is that economic journalism and economic policy are fully informed today by a number of well-understood measures (i.e., money supply, the employment cost index, inflation, interest rates, housing starts, and, of course, the composite Index of Leading Economic Indicators).

Lack of reliable measures of environmental quality

For the environment, however, we lack a series of good, clear measures of environmental quality and progress. In part, this is true because our thinking about the environment is still in some ways in its infancy, which is reflected in the fact that the focus of environmental concern has so often shifted. Twenty-five years ago most environmental concern centered on problems of *pollution* and *scarcity*—the view that we were fouling our own nest and would quickly run out of natural resources. Today, it is clear that

anxieties about scarcity were unfounded, and concern has shifted to problems of global warming and “biodiversity,” for which we lack uncontested scientific theory and objective data. In equal part, the lack of good measures of environmental quality stem from the methodological difficulty of constructing such measures. As long ago as 1972, the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) wrote that “the process of developing dependable indices will be a long one.” The CEQ never got very far with the task and published reports on environmental trends only intermittently; the last *Environmental Trends* report was published in 1989.

State of the environment: things are improving

To fill this gap in public knowledge and perception about environmental progress, to separate the facts from alarmist misinformation, and to bring balance to the environmental debate, The Fraser Institute, the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy and the Institute of Economic Affairs have developed Environmental Indicators for North America and the United Kingdom. The indicators are designed to help the public assess more accurately the state of the environment in several key areas: air quality, water quality, natural resources, land use and condition, solid wastes, energy, pesticides, toxic releases, and wildlife.

This report finds that, contrary to public opinion, in most instances objectives for protecting human health and the environment are being met, pollution and wastes are being controlled, and resources and land are being sustainably and effectively managed. Environmental quality in Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States is *improving*, not deteriorating. In Mexico, environmental quality remains stable overall with improvements in specific areas such as air quality. Following are some salient points.

- Overall, environmental quality improved 10.8 percent in Canada, 18.6 percent in the United States and 10.4 percent in the United Kingdom relative to conditions in 1980. In Mexico, overall environmental quality remained the same relative to conditions in 1990.
- Air pollution from sulphur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, particulates, and lead has decreased considerably in Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom.

- The ambient level of sulphur dioxide decreased by 61.5 percent in Canada and 60.7 percent in the United States between 1975 and 1995. The ambient level of sulphur dioxide decreased 92 percent between 1976 and 1996 in the United Kingdom. In Mexico, ambient levels of sulphur dioxide in Mexico City decreased 50 percent between 1988 and 1996.
- Ambient lead concentration fell 99.9 percent both in Canada and in the United States between 1976 and 1994. Ambient lead concentrations fell 90.1 percent between 1980 and 1995 in the United Kingdom. In Mexico, ambient lead concentrations fell 82.5 percent between 1990 and 1995.
- In 1994, over 90 percent of the lakes tested in the United States supported overall use.
- In 1995, Alberta and Saskatchewan met their water quality goals over 90 percent of the time; British Columbia and New Brunswick met their goals over 80 percent of the time; Manitoba met its goals over 70 percent of the time.
- DDE concentrations have fallen over 75 percent in Lake Michigan and Lake Superior, over 80 percent in Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, and 90 percent in Lake Huron since 1977.
- Contaminants in fish found in the North Sea have fallen dramatically since 1982. For example, PCBs found in North Sea cod declined 75.8 percent between 1982 and 1996.
- Forests are increasing in North America and the United Kingdom as growth exceeds the harvesting of trees.
- The amount of land set aside for parks, wilderness, and wildlife is increasing in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Mexico.
- The amounts of toxic chemicals exposed to the environment is decreasing.
- Critical wetland habitat is not declining.

Objectives of the study

This document is designed to give the reader an overview of national environmental quality in Canada, the United States, the United Kingdom, and Mexico. While the indicators include many local or regional environmental

issues, such as the air quality of selected cities, the goal of this study is to provide a “big picture” of general environmental trends in these countries.

This report does not attempt to develop indicators for global controversies such as tropical rainforest deforestation, climate change, and bio-diversity.

Much of the data in this report comes from the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Environmental Data Compendium 1997. Where OECD survey results were unavailable, data were supplemented by information from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Environment Canada, the Department of Environment Transport Regions (DETR) in the United Kingdom or other official government sources.

The indicators are divided into primary and secondary categories. Within each category, there are several subsections. Primary environmental indicators include information about air quality, water quality, natural resources, land use and condition, and solid wastes. These

indicators provide direct information about environmental quality. The secondary indicators include often cited environmental measures such as carbon-dioxide emissions, oil spills, numbers of wildlife species, use of pesticides, and toxic releases. These indicators are considered “secondary” since they provide only indirect information about environmental quality.

In the final section of the report, the trend in environmental performance for the primary environmental indicators is compiled into an Index of Environmental Indicators (see page 81). This Index shows considerable improvement in the environmental condition of Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom. Since many indicators for Mexico have been available only since the early 1990s and since the number of available indicators is limited, it is more difficult to establish a trend for this country. The available data suggest, however, that Mexico’s overall environmental quality, as calculated for the Index, has been stable since 1990.