Table of contents

| Fore | Foreword: of bullets and churches | |
|---|--|----------|
| Chapter 1: Hercules, Leviathan or Promotheus? | | 1 |
| 1.1 | The age of ecology | 2 |
| 1.2 | Democratic institutions and their alternatives | 9 |
| 1.3 | The siting of hazardous waste facilities | 17 |
| 1.4 | Outline of this book; research questions and structure | 27 |
| Chap | oter 2: Knowledge, competition, or dialogue? Institutional | 33 |
| | variations and their relation to discourses on facility sit | ing. |
| 2.1 | Discourses on environmental decision-making | 34 |
| 2.2 | The managerial discourse on decision-making | 50 |
| 2.3 | The pluralist discourse on decision-making | 57 |
| 2.4 | The communitarian discourse on decision-making | 69 |
| 2.5 | An agenda for the rest of this book | 75 |
| Chap | oter 3: Hazardous decisions. The problems of hazardous wast institutional responses and the ideas underlying them | te, 81 |
| 2 1 | | 82 |
| 3.1 | The arrival of hazardous waste problems 3.1.1 Introduction | 82 82 |
| | 3.1.2 Regulations concerning hazardous waste | 82 82 |
| | 3.1.3 The rest of this chapter | 85 |
| 3.2 | The role of the market, experts and representatives | 88 |
| 3.2 | 3.2.1 Introduction | 88 |
| | 3.2.2 Shifting discourses and institutional arrangements | 89 |
| | 3.2.3 Institutional developments since 1940 | 99 |
| | 3.2.4 Review | 111 |
| 3.3 | The role of the courts | 113 |
| 5.5 | 3.3.1 Introduction | 113 |
| | 3.3.2 The general place of the courts in government | 113 |
| | 3.3.3 Judicial activism? | 119 |
| | 3.3.4 The authority of the court | 123 |

| | 3.3.5 The issue of standing; what are the boundary rules? | 124 |
|------|---|------------|
| | 3.3.6 Quasi-judicial procedures | 127 |
| | 3.3.7 Costs of judicial and quasi-judicial proceedings | 133 |
| | 3.3.8 Some conclusions | 135 |
| 3.4 | The role of the community | 136 |
| | 3.4.1 Introduction | 136 |
| | 3.4.2 Citizen participation in the pollution control system | 138 |
| | 3.4.3 Citizen participation in land use planning | 142 |
| | 3.4.4 Environmental assessment | 146 |
| | 3.4.5 Some conclusions on citizen participation | 155 |
| 3.5 | Conclusions | 158 |
| Chap | oter 4: The UK: Political control with the benefits | 165 |
| | of judicial authority? | |
| 4.1 | Seal Sands: linked incinerator proposals | 166 |
| | 4.1.1 Introduction | 166 |
| | 4.1.2 Internal preparations, first contacts with authorities | 167 |
| | 4.1.3 Official procedures | 169 |
| | 4.1.4 The role of various institutions and discourses | 177 |
| | 4.1.5 Some reflections | 186 |
| 4.2 | Newport: an attempt to reject the logic of the planning system | 187 |
| | 4.2.1 Introduction | 187 |
| | 4.2.2 The development of the proposal: private initiative | 189 |
| | 4.2.3 Official procedures start, decisions made | 190 |
| | 4.2.4 Appeal and inquiry | 192 |
| | 4.2.5 A new round and a new inquiry | 193 |
| | 4.2.6 The role of the various institutions and discourses | 195 |
| 1.2 | 4.2.7 Review | 204 |
| 4.3 | Rotherham: expertise from the local population 4.3.1 Introduction | 206 |
| | | 206 208 |
| | 4.3.2 Presentation of plans and broad rejection4.3.3 Inquiry | 211 |
| | 4.3.4 The role of the various institutions and discourses | 216 |
| | 4.3.5 Review of the case | 224 |
| 4.4 | Conclusions | 226 |
| T. T | 4.4.1 Introduction | 226 |
| | 4.4.2 Cross case comparison | 228 |
| | 4.4.3 Theoretical feedback | 236 |
| | | |

Table of contents vii

| C | Chapter 5: The Netherlands: participation through the court system | |
|------|--|-----|
| 5.1 | North Refinery: an example of the art of 'gedogen' | 246 |
| | 5.1.1 Introduction | 246 |
| | 5.1.2 Various proposals | 247 |
| | 5.1.3 The art of gedogen | 247 |
| | 5.1.4 The role of various institutions and discourse in this case | 257 |
| 5.2 | Kaliwaal: how to take rational decisions and still end in court | 266 |
| | 5.2.1 Introduction | 266 |
| | 5.2.2 The various proposals made | 267 |
| | 5.2.3 The role of various institutions and discourses | 278 |
| | 5.2.4 Some reflections | 288 |
| 5.3 | Dordrecht: national policy under stress | 290 |
| | 5.3.1 Introduction | 290 |
| | 5.3.2 Formal procedures | 292 |
| | 5.3.3 The role of the various institutions and discourses | 298 |
| 5.4 | Conclusions | 299 |
| | 5.4.1 Introduction | 299 |
| | 5.4.2 Cross case comparison | 300 |
| | 5.4.3 Theoretical feedback | 303 |
| Chap | oter 6: Canada: Community-based siting | 313 |
| 6.1 | Alberta: the development of an innovative approach to siting | 314 |
| | 6.1.1 Introduction | 314 |
| | 6.1.2 The genesis of invitational siting | 315 |
| | 6.1.3 Invitational siting is redesigned and applied, twice | 318 |
| | 6.1.4 Developments after facility construction | 323 |
| | 6.1.5 The role of the various institutions and discourses | 326 |
| | 6.1.6 Review | 337 |
| 6.2 | Manitoba: competition between rural and urban communities | 338 |
| | 6.2.1 Introduction | 338 |
| | 6.2.2 The development of a siting approach | 338 |
| | 6.2.3 Actual siting discussions | 342 |
| | 6.2.4 The role of various institutions | 348 |
| | 6.2.5 The role of discourse | 352 |
| | 6.2.6 Review of the case | 356 |
| 6.3 | Deep River: Low-level radioactive wastes | 356 |
| | 6.3.1 Introduction | 356 |
| | 6.3.2 The solution to the low-level waste problem | 357 |

| | 6.3.3 Implementation | 360 |
|------|--|------------|
| | 6.3.4 The role of various institutions and discourses | 369 |
| | 6.3.5 Review of the case | 377 |
| 6.4 | Conclusions | 379 |
| | 6.4.1 Introduction | 379 |
| | 6.4.2 Cross case comparison | 380 |
| | 6.4.3 Theoretical feedback | 385 |
| Chap | oter 7: Comparison of case studies. Institutions, discourses, actors, and decision quality in the nine cases | 391 |
| 7.1 | Introduction | 392 |
| 7.2 | The institutions involved | 394 |
| | 7.2.1 Introduction: private sector versus other institutions | 394 |
| | 7.2.2 Elected representatives | 395 |
| | 7.2.3 The role of experts | 396 |
| | 7.2.4 The role of the courts | 398 |
| | 7.2.5 The role of the community | 400 |
| 7.3 | The actors involved | 401 |
| | 7.3.1 Introduction | 401 |
| | 7.3.2 The role of experts | 401 |
| | 7.3.3 The role of market parties | 404 |
| | 7.3.4 Politicians | 406 |
| | 7.3.5 Voters | 409 |
| | 7.3.6 Parties to a court case | 415 |
| 7.4 | 7.3.7 Members of the community | 418 |
| 7.4 | The role of discourse | 421 |
| | 7.4.1 Introduction | 421 |
| | 7.4.2 The presence of various discourses | 422 |
| 7.5 | 7.4.3 The consequences of the use of discourses | 426 |
| 7.5 | The quality of decisions | 431 |
| | 7.5.1 Introduction7.5.2 Technical rationality | 431 431 |
| | 7.5.3 The economic quality of the proposals | 431 |
| | 7.5.4 The social quality of the decisions | 436 |
| | 7.5.5 The political quality of the decisions | 439 |
| | 7.5.6 Overall assessment of quality: patterns? | 441 |
| 7.6 | The interest-discourse divide | 444 |
| 7.7 | Conclusions | 445 |
| 1.1 | 7.7.1 Introduction | 445 |
| | 7.7.2 Conclusions within the theoretical framework | 445 |
| | 1.1.2 Conclusions within the theoretical framework | 443 |

| Table of contents | | ix |
|---|--|-------------------|
| | 7.7.3 Some conclusions about the theoretical framework | 447 |
| Chap | oter 8: Summary and conclusions | 451 |
| 8.1 | Introduction | 452 |
| 8.2 | The collective choice level: institutionalization | 453 |
| 8.3 | The concrete choice level: siting debates | 458 |
| 8.4 | Remarks about discourse analysis | 463 |
| 8.5 | Implications for environmental decision-making | 466 |
| | 8.5.1 Introduction | 466 |
| | 8.5.2 The practice of hazardous waste siting | 467 |
| | 8.5.3 The practice of environmental decision-making | 471 |
| References | | 479 489 497 |
| Appendix 1: List of interviewees Appendix 2: Explanation of case selection | | |
| | | |