

September 1994

A Ride on the Environmental Liability Roller Coaster

Brian S. B. Lee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/pelr>

Recommended Citation

Brian S. B. Lee, *A Ride on the Environmental Liability Roller Coaster*, 12 Pace Env'tl. L. Rev. 445 (1994)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58948/0738-6206.1533>

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/pelr/vol12/iss1/14>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at DigitalCommons@Pace. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pace Environmental Law Review by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Pace. For more information, please contact dheller2@law.pace.edu.

COMMENT

**A Ride on the Environmental Liability
Roller Coaster**

BRIAN S. B. LEE*

Lending institutions remain focused, as they must, on the risk of environmental liability under CERCLA arising from their borrowers' activities. They must temper their desire to protect their security interests with consideration of the very real threat of liability for environmental cleanup costs. Recent interpretations by courts and the Environmental Protection Agency, and intervention by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, have further altered the equation. This comment examines CERCLA, its underlying purpose, and the impact recent events will have on secured creditors as they rattle down the tracks of the headiest of rides, the environmental liability roller coaster.¹

* The author wishes to thank the entire Pace Environmental Law Review for all their assistance and a special thanks to Scott N. Koschwitz and his group for invaluable editing.

1. The author has adopted the effective metaphor of a roller coaster first introduced by authors Stephen L. Kass & Michael B. Gerrard in *New Worries for Banks*, N.Y. L.J., June 25, 1993, *Environmental Law*, at 3.

I. Introduction

In 1980, Congress enacted the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA)² to address the environmental and health dangers resulting from unfettered disposal of hazardous wastes, and to combat increasing cleanup costs. However, for secured creditors, CERCLA has become an unstable vehicle for determining environmental liability, resembling that of a roller coaster ride.³ Today, secured creditors "continue to be shaken by the roller coaster of environmental liability."⁴ In 1990, "they strapped themselves in for a high speed plunge"⁵ when the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit in *United States v. Fleet Factors Corp.*,⁶ ruled that a secured creditor could be liable for a borrower's hazardous waste even if it never foreclosed its security interest in the real property.⁷ "In 1992, they breathed a sigh of relief, and loosened the straps a bit,"⁸ when the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued the National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Lender Liability Under CERCLA (Lender Liability Rule)⁹ limiting secured creditors' financial liability for their borrowers' hazardous waste.¹⁰

On February 25, 1993, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) issued guidelines recommending that all FDIC-supervised lenders implement programs to reduce environmental risk,¹¹ causing creditors to again "hang on

2. Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) §§ 101-405, 42 U.S.C. §§ 9601-9675 (1988 & Supp. V 1993).

3. See Stephen L. Kass & Michael B. Gerrard, *New Worries for Banks*, N.Y. L.J., June 25, 1993, Environmental Law, at 3 [hereinafter Kass & Gerrard, *New Worries for Banks*].

4. *Id.*

5. *Id.*

6. 901 F.2d 1550 (11th Cir. 1990) [hereinafter *Fleet Factors II*].

7. See *id.* at 1557-60.

8. Kass & Gerrard, *New Worries for Banks*, *supra* note 2, at 3.

9. 40 C.F.R. § 300 (1993).

10. *Id.* § 300.1100.

11. See Letter from Stanley J. Poling, Director, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to Chief Executive Officers of FDIC-Supervised Banks (Feb. 25, 1993) (on file with author) [hereinafter Poling Letter].

tight.¹² Then, on February 4, 1994, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (D.C. Circuit) invalidated the Lender Liability Rule, which, for a short while, had provided a safe harbor for secured creditors.¹³

These recent events have significantly altered the issue of environmental liability for secured creditors under CERCLA. To illustrate the meaning and impact of the FDIC guidelines, and the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule, this comment provides an overview of potential environmental liability for secured creditors. It continues with Part II, which introduces CERCLA and its underlying purpose. Part III analyzes *Fleet Factors I* and *II* and their impact on environmental liability. Part IV reviews the Lender Liability Rule and its countervailing approach toward lender liability. Part V analyzes *Fleet Factors III* and *IV*, focusing on the influence of the Lender Liability Rule on the *Fleet Factors* case. Part VI examines the FDIC guidelines. Part VII examines the holding of the D.C. Circuit in *Kelly v. EPA*, which invalidated the Lender Liability Rule. Part VIII predicts how the FDIC guidelines and the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule will affect the environmental liability for secured creditors.

II. CERCLA

Congress enacted CERCLA to address the environmental and health dangers resulting from the mishandling of hazardous waste.¹⁴ Congress intended CERCLA to be "a comprehensive remedial plan . . . that addresses the Nation's hazardous substance environmental problems."¹⁵ CERCLA places the ultimate responsibility for removing hazardous waste on those responsible for the hazards created by im-

12. Kass & Gerrard, *New Worries for Banks*, *supra* note 2, at 3.

13. *Kelley v. EPA*, 15 F.3d 1100, 1109 (D.C. Cir. 1994).

14. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d 1150, 1553 (11th Cir. 1990).

15. *United States v. Fleet Factors Corp.*, 819 F. Supp. 1079, 1083 (S.D. Ga. 1993) [hereinafter *Fleet Factors III*].

proper disposal,¹⁶ the potentially responsible parties (PRPs). To this end, CERCLA allows the federal government to remove and dispose of the hazardous waste and collect the resulting costs (response costs) from PRPs.¹⁷

Those PRPs liable for government response costs include: (1) the present owner and operator of the facility; (2) the owner or operator of the disposal facility at the time of disposal of any hazardous substance; (3) any person who arranged for the treatment or disposal of a substance at that facility; and (4) any person who transported the hazardous substances to the facility, from which there is a release, or a threatened release.¹⁸ CERCLA defines "owner and operator . . . in the case of any facility [or] title, . . . control of which was conveyed due to . . . foreclosure . . . to a unit of State or local government, [as] any person who owned, operated or otherwise controlled activities at such facility immediately beforehand."¹⁹ CERCLA holds such owner or operator strictly liable for government response costs.²⁰

CERCLA excludes from the definition of "owner and operator" any "person, who, without participating in the management of a . . . facility, holds indicia of ownership primarily

16. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1553 (citing *Florida Power & Light Co. v. Allis Chalmers Corp.*, 893 F.2d 1313, 1316 (11th Cir. 1990); *Dedham Water Co. v. Cumberland Farms Dairy*, 805 F.2d 1074, 1081 (1st Cir. 1986)).

17. *Id.* See *United States v. Maryland Bank & Trust Co.*, 632 F. Supp. 573, 576 (D. Md. 1986). Response costs include:

(A) all costs of removal or remedial action incurred by the United States Government or a State or an Indian tribe not inconsistent with the national contingency plan; (B) any other necessary costs of response incurred by any other person consistent with the national contingency plan; (C) damages for injury to, destruction of, or loss of natural resources, including the reasonable costs of assessing such injury, destruction or loss resulting from such a release; and (D) the costs of any health assessment or health effects study carried out under [§ 104(i)]

CERCLA § 107(a)(4)(A)-(D), 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a)(4)(A)-(D). The responsible party must also pay interest on the response costs at the rate set for the Hazardous Substance Superfund. CERCLA § 107(a), 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a).

18. CERCLA § 107(a), 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a).

19. CERCLA § 101(20)(A)(iii), 42 U.S.C. § 9601(20)(A)(iii).

20. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1554.

to protect his security interest in the . . . facility.”²¹ This exclusion is commonly known as the Secured Creditor Exemption.

III. The Birth of *Fleet Factors*

Swainsboro Print Works, Inc. (SPW) operated a cloth printing business from 1963 through February, 1981, in Swainsboro, Georgia.²² In 1976, SPW and Fleet Factors Corp. (Fleet) executed a factoring agreement.²³ Pursuant to this agreement, Fleet advanced funds to SPW in return for an assignment of SPW's accounts receivable.²⁴ SPW conveyed to Fleet a security interest in the facility in the form of a deed “to secure a debt conveying title to the realty.”²⁵

In August, 1979, SPW, unable to pay its outstanding debts, filed for bankruptcy.²⁶ Fleet continued to finance SPW, until SPW ceased operations on February 27, 1981.²⁷ In May, 1982, a bankruptcy court granted Fleet approval to foreclose its security interest on part of SPW's inventory and equipment.²⁸ Fleet hired Baldwin Industrial Liquidators, Inc. (Baldwin) to sell the inventory and equipment at public

21. CERCLA § 101(20)(A)(iii), 42 U.S.C. § 9601(20)(A)(iii). CERCLA excludes from liability any person who can show that the hazardous waste release was “caused solely by: (1) an act of God; (2) an act of war; or (3) an act or omission of a third party other than an employee or agent . . . if [the party sued for response costs] establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that (a) he exercised due care with respect to the hazardous substance concerned, . . . and (b) he took precautions against foreseeable acts or omissions of any such third party” CERCLA § 107(b)(1)-(3), 42 U.S.C. § 9607(b)(1)-(3).

22. *United States v. Fleet Factors Corp.*, 724 F. Supp. 955, 957 (S.D. Ga. 1988) [hereinafter *Fleet Factors I*].

23. *Id.* A factoring agreement is an agreement whereby a financier (the factor) lends capital to a principal. In return, the factor takes a security interest in the principal's accounts receivable or other suitable security. BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 592 (6th ed. 1990).

24. *Fleet Factors I*, 724 F. Supp. at 957.

25. *Id.*

26. *Id.*

27. *Id.*

28. *Id.* Fleet never foreclosed on SPW's real property. On July 7, 1987, the real property was conveyed to Emanuel County, Georgia, at a foreclosure sale, pursuant to a tax lien established by SPW's failure to pay state and county taxes. *Id.*

auction.²⁹ On June 22, 1982, Baldwin auctioned the collateral "as is" and "in place," with the purchasers responsible for removal.³⁰ On August 31, 1982, Fleet hired Nix Riggers (Nix) to remove all sold and unsold equipment remaining after the auction, and to leave the site "broom clean."³¹ Nix completed its task and left the site in December, 1983.³²

On January 20, 1984, the EPA inspected the facility, discovered asbestos and 700 fifty-five gallon drums holding toxic chemicals, and concluded that they were "an immediate threat to public health and the environment."³³ From February 6 to 24, 1984, and from June 12 to July 11, 1984, respectively, the EPA disposed of the toxic chemicals and asbestos in an approved landfill, incurring total response costs of approximately \$400,000.³⁴ In *United States v. Fleet Factors Corp.* (*Fleet Factors I*), the EPA, on behalf of the federal government, brought suit for reimbursement, naming Fleet as a PRP.³⁵

A. *Fleet Factors I*

In *Fleet Factors I*, the Southern District Court of Georgia considered summary judgment motions from each side.³⁶ The EPA alleged that Fleet was liable for the response costs pursuant to section 107.³⁷ To prevail, the EPA had to establish that: "(1) [Fleet fell] within one or more of the classes of liable persons described in [section 107](a)(1)-(4) . . . ; (2) [a] 'release' or 'threatened release' of a 'hazardous substance' has occurred or is occurring; and (3) [t]he release or threatened

29. *Fleet Factors I*, 724 F. Supp. at 958.

30. *Id.* Goods sold "as is" have no express or implied warranty; the buyer must rely on his inspection, and assume the risk of any defect. BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 114 (6th ed. 1990).

31. *Fleet Factors I*, 724 F. Supp. at 958.

32. *Id.*

33. *Id.* at 959.

34. *Id.*

35. *Id.*

36. *Fleet Factors I*, 724 F. Supp. at 959.

37. *Id.*

release has caused the United States to incur 'response costs.'"³⁸

Fleet claimed that the first of these three elements, which required the EPA to demonstrate that Fleet was one of the classes of liable persons, could not be met.³⁹ The EPA rebutted that Fleet fell within the class of persons described as "the owner and operator of the facility," under section 107(a)(1).⁴⁰ The court agreed with Fleet, concluding that "Fleet did not own, operate, or otherwise control activities at the facility immediately before the tax foreclosure," since Fleet had never foreclosed on its security interest in the real property.⁴¹

The EPA alternatively argued that Fleet was liable under section 107(a)(2), which imposes liability on "any person who at the time of disposal of any hazardous substance owned or operated any facility at which such hazardous substances were disposed of"⁴² Invoking the Secured Creditor Exemption,⁴³ the court noted that the phrases "participating in the management of a . . . facility" and "primarily to protect his security interest," [permitted] secured creditors to provide financial assistance and . . . management advice to its debtors without risking CERCLA liability if the secured creditor[s] [do] not participate in . . . day-to-day management"⁴⁴

38. *Id.* See *New York v. Shore Realty Corp.*, 759 F.2d 1032, 1043-48 (2d Cir. 1985).

39. *Fleet Factors I*, 724 F. Supp. at 960.

40. *Id.*

41. *Id.*

42. *Id.*

43. CERCLA § 101(20)(A), 42 U.S.C. § 9601(20)(A). See *supra* note 20.

44. *Fleet Factors I*, 724 F. Supp. at 960. Cf. *United States v. Mirabile*, 1985 Env'tl. L. Rep. 10,944, 10,995 (E.D. Pa. 1985) (holding that a secured creditor's exclusion from CERCLA liability applies if the secured creditor "does not become overly entangled in the affairs of the actual owner or operator of a facility"). But see Michael I. Greenberg and David M. Shaw, Note, *To Lend or Not to Lend — That Should Not Be the Question: The Uncertainties of Lender Liability Under CERCLA*, 41 DUKE L.J. 1211, 1224-38 (1992) (discussing the different approaches used by the court to categorize "participation in management of a facility" and "primarily to protect his security interest").

The court found that Fleet's participation at the facility did not warrant the imposition of liability "before Baldwin entered the facility to prepare for, and conduct, the auction."⁴⁵ However, Fleet's activities at the facility between the time that Baldwin entered the facility to prepare for the auction on June 22, 1982, and the time that Nix finally left the facility in or around December, 1983,⁴⁶ presented a genuine issue of material fact⁴⁷ as to Fleet's liability; thus, the court denied both summary judgment motions.⁴⁸

B. *Fleet Factors II*

Less than two years later, in *United States v. Fleet Factors Corp. (Fleet Factors II)*, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals reaffirmed the district court's holding on the issue of Fleet's liability under section 107(a)(1),⁴⁹ concluding that "the plain meaning of the phrase 'immediately beforehand' means without intervening ownership, operation, and control."⁵⁰ Fleet could not be held liable because it did not own, operate, or control SPW immediately prior to Emanuel County's acquisition through the tax lien foreclosure.⁵¹ The court noted that "[t]o reach back to Fleet's involvement with the facility prior to December 1983 in order to impose liability would torture the plain statutory meaning of 'immediately beforehand.'"⁵²

The court then addressed whether Fleet was liable under section 107(a)(2),⁵³ focusing on whether the Secured Creditor Exemption excluded Fleet from the definition of a liable per-

45. *Fleet Factors I*, 724 F. Supp. at 960.

46. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d 1550, 1559-60 (11th Cir. 1990).

47. FED. R. CIV. P. 56(c). See *Adickes v. S.H. Kress*, 398 U.S. 144, 153 (1970); *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 250 (1986); *Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986).

48. *Fleet Factors I*, 724 F. Supp. at 961. Fleet then brought an interlocutory appeal against the district court's denial of its motion for summary judgment. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1552.

49. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1552.

50. *Id.* at 1555.

51. *Id.* See *supra* text accompanying note 40.

52. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1555.

53. *Id.*

son.⁵⁴ The court noted that Fleet maintained a security interest in the facility by holding "an 'indicia of ownership' in the facility through its deed of trust to SPW."⁵⁵ The issue of whether Fleet participated in the management sufficiently to incur liability, however, required a more critical review.

The court rejected the district court's "day-to-day operational test,"⁵⁶ and reasoned that the "construction of the statutory exemption [was] too permissive towards secured creditors who are involved with toxic waste facilities."⁵⁷ "In order to achieve the 'overwhelming remedial' goal of the CERCLA statutory scheme, ambiguous terms should be construed to favor liability for [government response costs]."⁵⁸ Accordingly, the court adopted a standard where the secured creditor need neither involve itself in day-to-day operations nor participate in management decisions regarding hazardous waste.⁵⁹ Under this standard, "a secured creditor may incur section [107](a)(2) liability, without being an operator, by participating in the financial management of a facility to a degree indicating a capacity to influence the corporation's treatment of hazardous wastes."⁶⁰ Hence, a lender "will be liable if its involvement with the management of the facility is sufficiently broad to support the inference that it could affect hazardous waste disposal decisions if it so chose."⁶¹

54. The construction of the Secured Creditor Exemption was an issue of first impression in the appellate courts. *Id.* at 1556.

55. *Id.*

56. See *supra* note 43 and accompanying text. See also Geoffrey K. Beach, Note, *Secured Creditor CERCLA Liability After United States v. Fleet Factors Corp.* — *Vindication of CERCLA's Private Enforcement Mechanism*, 41 CATH. U. L. REV. 211, 235 (1991).

57. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1557.

58. *Id.* See *Florida Power & Light Co. v. Allis Chalmers Corp.* 893 F.2d 1313, 1317 (11th Cir. 1990).

59. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1557-58.

60. *Id.* at 1557 (citation omitted).

61. *Id.* at 1558. Under this test, a secured creditor can continue to monitor any facet of a borrower's operation and involve itself in "occasional and discrete financial decisions" to protect its security interest without risking liability. *Id.* The court stated that fears that its interpretation would create "disincentives for lenders to extend financial assistance to businesses with potential hazardous waste problems and encourag[e] secured creditors to distance themselves from management actions" of borrowers were baseless. *Id.* The court intended

The court found that the Secured Creditor Exemption protected Fleet from liability in its involvement with SPW from 1976 until SPW ceased operations in February, 1991.⁶² However, Fleet's involvement increased substantially after the cessation of operations. For instance, Fleet required that SPW obtain its approval before shipping its goods to customers, dictated the nature and time of the shipment, supervised activities at the site, and contracted with Baldwin to dispose of the inventory and equipment.⁶³ The court determined that these facts, if proven, would be sufficient to remove Fleet from protection under the Secured Creditor Exemption. In addition, the court found Fleet's involvement in the financial and operational management of the facility sufficient to impose liability.⁶⁴ Furthermore, "Fleet's involvement at the facility from the time it contracted with Baldwin in May 1982 until Nix left the facility in December 1983 . . . [fell] outside"⁶⁵ the Secured Creditor Exemption. The court remanded the case for further proceedings, due to the district court's error in construing the Secured Creditor Exemption "to insulate Fleet from CERCLA liability for its conduct prior to June 22, 1982," and disputed issues of material fact which remained regarding liability under section 107(a)(2) for subsequent activities.⁶⁶

IV. The Lender Liability Rule

In *Fleet Factors II*, the Eleventh Circuit broadened the scope of lender liability to include secured creditors who did

its ruling to spur secured creditors to thoroughly investigate potential borrowers' hazardous waste policies and means of treatment, and to apprise borrowers that inadequate waste treatment and disposal would endanger current and future financing. *Id.* "Once a secured creditor's involvement with a facility becomes sufficiently broad that it can anticipate losing its exemption from CERCLA liability, it will have a strong incentive to address hazardous waste problems at the facility rather than studiously avoiding the investigation and amelioration of the hazard." *Id.* See Greenberg & Shaw, *supra* note 43, at 1212.

62. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1559.

63. *Id.*

64. *Id.*

65. *Id.* at 1559-60.

66. *Id.* at 1560.

not foreclose their security interests, fashioning a standard of environmental liability that "stirred the financial community."⁶⁷ The new standard meant that prudent secured creditors had to take preliminary measures, such as investigations of prospective borrowers, before lending.⁶⁸ No longer were creditors liable only if they influenced day-to-day operations;⁶⁹ a lender who participated in financial management to a degree indicating a capacity to influence the treatment of hazardous waste was liable by law.⁷⁰ The court determined that despite the "clear risk that innocent borrowers will find it difficult to obtain credit because of the nature of their business," such a narrow construction of the Secured Creditor Exemption was justified because Congress intended to spread cleanup costs over the entire industry.⁷¹

The Lender Liability Rule was the EPA's response to *Fleet II*'s failure to specify the degree of participation sufficient to support the inference that a secured creditor could influence a borrower's treatment of hazardous waste. The EPA issued the Lender Liability Rule to merely "define the meaning of certain statutory elements" of CERCLA.⁷² The EPA stressed that its interpretation should be construed not as an attempt to administratively overrule *Fleet Factors II*, but rather as an extension of the opinion.⁷³

The Lender Liability Rule provided that "[a] person who maintains indicia of ownership primarily to protect a security interest in a . . . facility, and who does not participate in the management of the . . . facility, is not an 'owner or operator' of such facility under CERCLA §§ [107](a)(1) or [107](a)(2)."⁷⁴

67. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. 1079, 1082 (S.D. Ga. 1993).

68. *Fleet Factors II*, 901 F.2d at 1558.

69. *Id.* at 1557.

70. *Id.* See also *supra* note 60 and accompanying text.

71. *Id.* at 1558 n.12 (citing Scott Wilsdon, *When a Security Becomes a Liability: Claims Against Lenders in Hazardous Waste Cleanup*, 38 HASTINGS L.J. 809, 817-20 (1992) (arguing that *Fleet Factors* standard is consistent with principles of CERCLA)).

72. National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Lender Liability Under CERCLA, 57 Fed. Reg. 18,344 (1992) [hereinafter Preamble].

73. See Preamble, *supra* note 71, at 18,369.

74. 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100.

More importantly, the Lender Liability Rule defined "participation in management," the provision of section 107 left unaddressed by *Fleet II*.⁷⁵ The EPA announced that, for the purpose of the Secured Creditor Exemption, "participation in the management of a . . . facility," meant the creditor's "actual participation in the management or operational affairs"⁷⁶ of the borrower. The term did not encompass the creditor's "mere capacity to influence, or ability to influence, or the unexercised right to control facility operations."⁷⁷ The Lender Liability Rule explained that a creditor participates in management, only if the creditor:

(i) Exercises decisionmaking control over the borrower's environmental compliance, such that the holder has undertaken responsibility for the borrower's hazardous substance handling or disposal practices or (ii) [e]xercises control at a level comparable to that of a manager of the borrower's enterprise, such that the holder has assumed or manifested responsibility for the overall management of the enterprise encompassing the day-to-day decisionmaking of the enterprise with respect to: (A) [e]nvironmental compliance or (B) [a]ll, or substantially all, of the operational (as opposed to financial or administrative) aspect of the enterprise other than environmental compliance. (emphasis added) (General Test).⁷⁸

75. *Id.* § 300.1100(c). In addition to the Eleventh Circuit, other jurisdictions have established different meanings of "participation in management" without establishing a uniform standard. See, e.g., *United States v. Maryland Bank & Trust Co.*, 632 F. Supp. 573 (D. Md. 1986); *United States v. Mirabile*, 15 Env'tl. L. Rep. 20,994 (E.D. Pa. 1985); *Guidice v. BFG Electroplating & Manufacturing Co.*, 732 F. Supp. 556 (W.D. Pa. 1989); *United States v. Nicolet*, 29 Env'tl. Rep. Cas. 1851 (E.D. Pa. 1989).

76. 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100(c)(1).

77. *Id.*

78. *Id.* § 300.1100(c)(1)(i)-(ii). "Operational aspects of the enterprise include functions . . . of the facility or plant manager, operations manager, chief operating officer, or chief executive officer. Financial or administrative aspects include functions such as that of credit manager, accounts payable/receivable manager, personnel manager, controller, chief financial officer, or similar functions." *Id.* § 300.1100(c)(1)(ii)(B). A holder "maintains indicia of ownership . . . primarily to protect a security interest . . . [and] includes the initial holder . . . , any subsequent holder . . . , a guarantor of an obligation, surety, or any other

The Lender Liability Rule identified a range of specific activities a secured creditor could conduct without incurring liability, subdividing them into four categories: (1) actions at the inception of the loan or other transaction;⁷⁹ (2) policing the security interest or loan;⁸⁰ (3) work out activities;⁸¹ and

person who holds ownership indicia primarily to protect a security interest" *Id.* § 300.1100(a)(1).

79. *Id.* § 300.1100(c)(2)(i). This section further provides in part:

A prospective holder who undertakes or requires an environmental inspection of the . . . facility in which indicia of ownership are to be held, or requires a prospective borrower to clean up a . . . facility or to comply . . . with any applicable law or regulation, is not by such action considered to be participating . . . in the facility's management.

Id.

80. *Id.* § 300.1100(c)(2)(ii)(A). This section further provides in part:

A holder who engages in policing activities prior to foreclosure will remain within the exemption provided that the holder does not by such actions participate in the management of the . . . facility. . . . Such actions include, but are not limited to, requiring the borrower to clean up the . . . facility during the term of the security interest; requiring the borrower to comply with . . . applicable federal, state, and local environmental and other laws, rules and regulations during the term of the security interest; securing or exercising authority to monitor or inspect the . . . facility . . . in which indicia of ownership are maintained, or the borrower's business or financial condition during the term of the security interest; or taking other actions to adequately police the loan or security interest. . . .

Id. The courts, however, have failed to clarify whether a lender can pursue this policing function without incurring liability.

81. 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100(c)(2)(ii)(B). This section further provides:

A holder who engages in work out activities prior to foreclosure and its equivalents will remain within the exemption provided that the holder does not by such action participate in the management of the . . . facility. '[W]ork out' refers to those actions by which a holder, at any time prior to foreclosure and its equivalents, seeks to prevent, cure, or mitigate a default by the borrower or obligor; or to preserve, or prevent the diminution of, the value of the security. Work out activities include, but are not limited to, restructuring or renegotiating the terms of the security interest; requiring payment of additional rent or interest; exercising forbearance; requiring or exercising rights pursuant to an assignment of accounts or other amounts owing to an obligor; requiring and exercising rights pursuant to an escrow agreement pertaining to amounts owing to an obligor; providing specific or general financial or other advice, suggestions, counseling, or guidance; and exercising any right or remedy the holder is entitled to by law or under any warranties,

(4) foreclosure or post-foreclosure activities.⁸² The General Test applied only to the first three categories. To avail itself of the foreclosure provisions under the fourth category, a creditor must not have participated in management, as defined by the General Test, prior to foreclosure.

The Lender Liability Rule clearly reduced a secured creditor's risk of liability absent clear participation in management, in direct contrast with the EPA's prior policy of imposing stringent lender liability.⁸³ Moreover, the EPA once again embraced the "day-to-day" analysis rejected by the *Fleet II* court. Further, the Lender Liability Rule reinforced the Secured Creditor Exemption, furthering CERCLA's purpose of protecting creditors against hazardous waste disposal liability.⁸⁴ In response to the promulgation of the Lender Liability Rule, both parties, in *United States v. Fleet Factors Corp.* (*Fleet Factors III*), again filed motions for summary judgment.⁸⁵

V. Return to *Fleet Factors*

A. *Fleet Factors III*

Resolution of the motions required a "meshing of the *Fleet Factors II* decision and the EPA's . . . Lender Liability Rule [regarding] CERCLA's Secured Creditor Exemption."⁸⁶

covenants, conditions, representations or promises from the borrower.

Id.

82. *Id.* § 300.1100(d). This subsection provides in part:

A holder, who did not participate in the management prior to foreclosure and its equivalents, may sell, re-lease property held pursuant to a lease financing transaction, . . . liquidate, maintain business activities, wind up operations, undertake any response action under § 107(d)(1) of CERCLA or under the direction of an on-scene coordinator, and take measures to preserve, protect or prepare the secured asset prior to sale or other disposition.

Id. § 300.1100(d)(2).

83. Greenberg & Shaw, *supra* note 43, at 1239 ("Bowling to political pressures from both lenders and advocates for federal agencies, . . . the EPA . . . proposed a ruling that reversed its hard-line position.").

84. 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100.

85. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. 1079, 1082 (S.D. Ga. 1993).

86. *Id.* at 1085.

The Southern District Court of Georgia recognized that it must defer to the EPA's reasonable interpretation of CERCLA.⁸⁷ Since the EPA administers CERCLA and the scope of the Secured Creditor Exemption was ambiguous,⁸⁸ the court noted that deference to the EPA's interpretation of the Lender Liability Rule was warranted.⁸⁹ However, since the court need only rule on Fleet's motion for summary judgment, and not establish a comprehensive test for resolving all Secured Creditor Exemption issues, the court recognized its duty to follow the direction of the Court of Appeals concerning a statute silent on or ambiguous about a particular issue.⁹⁰ Unwilling to upset the balance, the court, rather summarily, determined that subjecting the theories of lender liability established under *Fleet Factors II*, which imposed "liability when the secured creditor either (1) acts as a day-to-day manager, or (2) without acting as day-to-day manager, otherwise 'directly affects or controls the facility's hazardous substance handling or disposal practices,'"⁹¹ was consistent with the General Test of the Lender Liability Rule.⁹²

Having concluded that the Lender Liability Rule is a consistent extension of *Fleet Factors II*, the court applied the Rule to decide whether Fleet was protected by the Secured Creditor Exemption. The court addressed Fleet's activities in two parts: "(1) the period after SPW ceased operations (February 1981 to May 1982) and (2) the period after Fleet foreclosed on SPW's inventory, equipment, and machinery (May 1982 to December 1983)."⁹³

The General Test required actual participation and not mere capacity to influence.⁹⁴ "A secured creditor is within

87. *Id.*

88. See Greenberg & Shaw, *supra* note 43, at 1212.

89. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1085.

90. *Id.* at 1088.

91. *Id.* See Preamble, *supra* note 71, at 18,359.

92. See *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1088. Cf. Greenberg & Shaw, *supra* note 43, at 1242 (the EPA's proposed rule, which was codified as the General Test, explicitly "rejects the *Fleet Factors II* 'capacity to influence' language . . .").

93. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1089.

94. *Id.* See *supra* text accompanying note 76.

[this] definition if it exercises decision making control . . . at the level comparable to that of a general manager"⁹⁵ as specified by the General Test.⁹⁶ The court acknowledged that the parties did not dispute Fleet's involvement with SPW operations during the pre-foreclosure period.⁹⁷ The issue was whether Fleet's actions rose to a level that warrants liability as defined in the General Test.⁹⁸

The EPA and the Court of Appeals recognized that Congress intended the Secured Creditor Exemption to protect secured creditors normally conducting business.⁹⁹ Thus, the court considered "whether a reasonable factor facing Fleet's circumstances" would have conducted itself as Fleet had.¹⁰⁰ Such analysis was "not intend[ed] to abrogate the provisions of the [R]ule; instead, the reasonableness of Fleet's actions [was] included to ensure that . . . the Secured Creditor Exemption protects secured creditors involved in the normal course of their business."¹⁰¹

Applying the General Test to Fleet's production and personnel activities,¹⁰² the court determined that Fleet's exemption hinged on whether Fleet extended its control beyond the mere financial and administrative aspects of SPW's operations. The court denied the EPA's summary judgment motion, concluding that Fleet did not participate in the management of SPW as contemplated by the Lender Liability Rule.¹⁰³ However, the court found that many unanswered

95. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1089.

96. 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100(c)(1)(i). *See supra* text accompanying note 77 (the General Test in full).

97. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1089.

98. *Id.*

99. *Id.*

100. *Id.*

101. *Id.*

102. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1090. Fleet's production and personnel activities included: wiring of funds to SPW's payroll account; making all decisions concerning credit and price terms and the terms of the shipment for all finished goods and for certain overage goods; pre-approving all shipments of goods; approving sale of overage goods and chemical waste drums, and empty drums; and deciding when to terminate the crew of SPW employees. *Id.*

103. *Id.*

questions remained regarding Fleet's presence during the pre-foreclosure period, and denied Fleet's motion as well.¹⁰⁴

Section 300.1100(d) of the Lender Liability Rule addressed a secured creditor's post-foreclosure activities.¹⁰⁵ Under that subsection, a secured creditor may, with "considerable leeway," wind-up¹⁰⁶ a borrower's operations and "dispose of the foreclosed-upon assets" and still remain protected by the Secured Creditor Exemption.¹⁰⁷ Yet, this protection would be available only if Fleet promptly removed itself from both the property and any management control of the facility.¹⁰⁸ Since the issue of whether Fleet participated in the management of the facility at SPW before foreclosure remained unresolved, the court concluded the foreclosure provision must also await resolution at trial.¹⁰⁹

The EPA contended that Fleet's failure to foreclose on the real property precluded application of the foreclosure component of the Lender Liability Rule.¹¹⁰ The court held that the foreclosure component applied because Fleet foreclosed on the inventory, equipment, and machinery,¹¹¹ reasoning that although "it is true that the [R]ule does not specifically embrace the foreclosure of inventory, equipment, and machinery, . . . it is equally true that the [R]ule does not restrict itself to real property."¹¹² Accordingly, the court denied the summary judgment motions of both parties.¹¹³

However, the EPA raised a new claim, contending that Fleet was liable for having arranged for disposal of a hazard-

104. *Id.*

105. 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100(d).

106. Post-foreclosure "winding-up" includes actions necessary to "close down a facility's operations, secure the site, and otherwise protect the value of the foreclosed assets for subsequent sale or liquidation." Preamble, *supra* note 71, at 18,379.

107. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1091. See 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100(d)(1)-(2) for allowable activities by lenders after foreclosure. See also *supra* note 81.

108. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1091. See 40 C.F.R. § 301.1100(d)(2).

109. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1091.

110. *Id.*

111. *Id.*

112. *Id.*

113. *Id.*

ous substance.¹¹⁴ Despite the untimely assertion, the court found that Fleet would not be unduly prejudiced, since the factual analysis would be similar under section 107(a)(2) and (3), and permitted the claim.¹¹⁵ Moreover, the court felt the EPA's strategy adjustment was understandable, since the "promulgation of the Lender Liability Rule significantly changed the character of [the] case."¹¹⁶ To resolve Fleet's participation prior to the foreclosure and address the new governmental claim, the case was remanded.¹¹⁷

B. *Fleet Factors IV*

Finally, in *United States v. Fleet Factors Corp. (Fleet Factors IV)*,¹¹⁸ the Southern District Court of Georgia addressed Fleet's liability under CERCLA for the last time. The court considered whether Fleet was liable as an owner or operator at the time of hazardous waste disposal under section 107(a)(2), or for having arranged for disposal of a hazardous substance under section 107(a)(3). The court also considered whether the Secured Creditor Exemption protected Fleet's actions. Under the Lender Liability Rule, "a secured creditor forfeits the Exemption's protection by either holding ownership indicia other than primarily to protect security interest or by participating in management."¹¹⁹ The court found that Fleet obtained indicia of ownership primarily to protect its security interest, and thus addressed whether Fleet's participation rose to levels sufficient to impose liability.¹²⁰ The court divided its analysis into three areas: "(1) the activities of Fleet at SPW before the arrival of Baldwin [before June 22, 1987]; (2) the activities of Baldwin (Fleet's agent [from May through June, 1982]); and (3) the activities of Nix (another of

114. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1092. See CERCLA § 107(a)(3), 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a)(3).

115. *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. at 1092.

116. *Id.*

117. *Id.* at 1093.

118. 821 F. Supp. 707 (S.D. Ga. 1993) [hereinafter *Fleet Factors IV*].

119. *Id.* at 714.

120. *Id.*

Fleet's agents [from August, 1982 through December, 1983])."¹²¹

1. Section 107(a)(2) Owner and Operator Liability

a. Secured Creditor Exemption

i. Pre-Baldwin Period

Although Fleet's presence increased noticeably between the cessation of SPW operations and Baldwin's arrival, the court held that it did not rise to the level of participation in management.¹²² In its attempt to show a violation of the first prong, the EPA claimed Fleet blocked the sale of SPW chemicals and allowed those chemicals to remain on-site and continue leaking.¹²³ However, the court found that the aborted sale resulted from miscommunicated requests for permissions to sell between Fleet and the then-executive officers of SPW.¹²⁴ Fleet's actions did not demonstrate that they took responsibility for handling or disposing of hazardous substances even under the narrow construction of the Lender Liability Rule.¹²⁵ Therefore, Fleet's action during that period did not satisfy the first prong of the General Test.¹²⁶

The court also concluded that Fleet did not satisfy the General Test's second prong.¹²⁷ The court explained that

121. *Id.*

122. *Id.*

123. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 714.

124. *Id.*

125. *Id.*

126. Under the first prong, a lender participates in management only if it "exercises decisionmaking control over the borrower's environmental compliance, such that the lender has undertaken responsibility for the borrower's hazardous substance handling or disposal practices." 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100(c)(1)(i). See *supra* note 77 and accompanying text.

127. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 716. Under the second prong a lender participates in management only if it

exercises control at a level comparable to that of a manager of the borrower's enterprise, such that the [lender] has assumed or manifested responsibility for the overall management of the enterprise encompassing the day-to-day decisionmaking of the enterprise with respect to . . . environmental compliance or . . . all, or substantially all, of the operational (as opposed to financial or administrative) aspects of the enterprise other than environmental compliance. 40 C.F.R. § 300.1100(c)(1)(ii)(A)-(B).

when analyzing a secured creditor's action under this provision, it must consider "whether the potentially liable secured creditor exercised control over the facility in furtherance of its normal course of business, [and] . . . whether a reasonably and similarly-situated secured creditor would have engaged in those actions."¹²⁸ Applying these standards, the court found that Fleet's efforts to ship and sell goods and cloth remaining at SPW and to collect on the accounts receivable for those goods did not constitute the required level of control contemplated under the second prong of the General Test.¹²⁹ Thus, Fleet fell outside the General Test because its actions were "tailored" to removing the remaining cloth, a reasonable course of action for a similarly situated secured creditor.¹³⁰

ii. Post-foreclosure: Baldwin and Nix

The Lender Liability Rule included two standards by which secured creditors' actions are measured - the General Test and the foreclosure provisions, which apply to foreclosure and its equivalents.¹³¹ Baldwin's entry onto the SPW facility fell within the definition of foreclosure and its equivalents because Fleet essentially took possession of SPW's assets for liquidation.¹³²

Baldwin tidied up and grouped and moved hazardous waste drums in preparation for the liquidation auction.¹³³ Such actions, the court noted, fell within the meaning of the foreclosure provision, but were still not protected.¹³⁴ Under the Lender Liability Rule, removal of hazardous waste must be done as directed by the National Contingency Plan (NCP)

See supra note 77 and accompanying text.

128. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 715. The Secured Creditor Exemption and the Lender Liability Rule expressly require such consideration to "ensure consistency between Congress' intent in creating the Exemption and its application of the Exemption." *Id.*

129. *Id.* at 716.

130. *Id.*

131. *Id.* at 717.

132. *Id.*

133. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 718.

134. *Id.*

or by an NCP on-site coordinator.¹³⁵ Baldwin removed “several hundred damaged, corroded, leaking drums” without NCP approval or supervision, and thus, lost protection of the foreclosure provisions.¹³⁶ The court stated that “when hazardous substances are readily identifiable as such, are present in significant quantities, and are in such a condition that the environmental threat they pose is apparent, the handling of those substances indicates impermissible participation in management unless it is done in accordance with [the foreclosure provisions].”¹³⁷ Baldwin’s handling of the drums constituted such impermissible participation because the threat to the environment posed by the handling was “apparent and serious.”¹³⁸ “Those several hundred drums posed precisely the type [of] threat CERCLA is designed to alleviate, and Baldwin’s handling falls far short of the incidental handling that must be tolerated to ensure the foreclosure provisions serve their intended function.”¹³⁹

Nix also voided Fleet’s protection under the Secured Creditor Exemption by: (1) impermissibly handling a hazardous substance; (2) seriously aggravating a conspicuous environmental hazard; and (3) failing to complete its salvage operation in a reasonably expeditious manner.¹⁴⁰ Having contracted to salvage any equipment and machinery remaining after the liquidation auction in exchange for leaving the site broom-clean, Nix “undertook its task with all the finesse of a Viking raiding party.”¹⁴¹ Nix carelessly deposited drums of chemicals around the site, and permitted asbestos-laden insulation and garbage to collect on the floor.¹⁴² This haphazard activity constituted the same impermissible activity as Baldwin’s handling.¹⁴³

135. Preamble, *supra* note 71, at 18,379.

136. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 718.

137. *Id.* at 719.

138. *Id.*

139. *Id.* at 720.

140. *Id.*

141. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 720.

142. *Id.*

143. *Id.*

Nix's blatant aggravation of existing environmental problems at the site provided the second basis for voiding Fleet's protection under the Secured Creditor Exemption. "Like handling hazardous substances . . . , aggravating a site's environmental problem should void the Exemption only if it indicates participation in management" ¹⁴⁴ Nix must have known that its harsh treatment of the corroding drums and the haphazard care of the asbestos-laden insulation would compound the environmental risk at the SPW plant. Thus, the court concluded that Nix had consciously decided to proceed despite the known danger, and thereby participated in management. ¹⁴⁵

Nix's failure to complete its contractual agreements in a reasonable time was the third reason for voiding Fleet's protection. ¹⁴⁶ The court explained that when real property is not foreclosed, "the real property must be vacated in a reasonably expeditious manner." ¹⁴⁷ Nix remained at the site for more than eighteen months after Baldwin's liquidation auction, thereby outstaying any reasonable departure date. ¹⁴⁸ Nix's presence constituted an exercise of post-foreclosure control over the facility and a participation in management sufficient to void Fleet's exemption. ¹⁴⁹

b. Disposal

The court next addressed whether Fleet disposed of hazardous substances while Fleet owned or operated SPW. ¹⁵⁰ Section 101(29) of CERCLA defines "disposal" by incorporating the meaning provided in the Solid Waste Disposal Act. ¹⁵¹

144. *Id.*

145. *Id.* at 721.

146. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 721.

147. *Id.* (quoting *Fleet Factors III*, 819 F. Supp. 1079, 1091 (S.D. Ga. 1993)).

148. *Id.*

149. *Id.*

150. *Id.*

151. CERCLA § 101(29), 42 U.S.C. § 9601(29).

The term "disposal" means the discharge, deposit, injection, dumping, spilling, leaking, or placing of any solid waste or hazardous waste into or on any land or water so that such solid waste or hazardous waste or any constituent thereof may enter the environment

The court held that Baldwin disposed of a hazardous substance when it moved drums of chemical waste and spilled the contents of one drum.¹⁵² Similarly, Nix disposed of a hazardous substance when it spilled chemical waste and left asbestos insulation around the site.¹⁵³ Therefore, Fleet did not qualify for the Secured Creditor Exemption since Fleet's agents, Baldwin and Nix, disposed of a hazardous substance at the SPW site.¹⁵⁴ Accordingly, Fleet was liable under section 107(a)(2) for hazardous waste response costs incurred by the government.¹⁵⁵

2. Section 107(a)(3) Disposal Liability

Section 107(a)(3) imposes liability on any person who arranges for the disposal or treatment of a hazardous substance at any facility owned or operated by another.¹⁵⁶ Courts have liberally interpreted the words "arranged for" to achieve CERCLA's remedial goals,¹⁵⁷ and to "give effect to Congressional intent that all who participate in the generation and disposal of hazardous wastes should share in cleaning up the harm from their activity."¹⁵⁸ The phrase, however, does require a sufficient connection between the PRP and waste in order to impose liability.¹⁵⁹ This connection may be proven by showing a decision or an obligation to control the hazardous substance.¹⁶⁰

or be emitted into the air or discharged into any waters, including ground waters.

Solid Waste Disposal Act §§ 1002-11012, 1004(3), 42 U.S.C. §§ 6901-6992(k), 6903(3) (1988 & Supp. V 1993).

152. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 721.

153. *Id.*

154. *Id.* at 723-24.

155. *Id.* at 724.

156. CERCLA § 107(a)(3), 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a)(3).

157. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 724 (citing *Florida Power & Light Co. v. Allis Chalmers Corp.*, 893 F.2d 1313, 1318 (11th Cir. 1990); *United States v. Northeastern Pharmaceutical & Chem. Co.*, 810 F.2d 726, 733 (8th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 484 U.S. 848 (1987)).

158. *Id.* (quoting *CPC Int'l, Inc. v. Aerojet-General Corp.*, 759 F. Supp. 1269, 1277 (W.D. Mich. 1991)).

159. *Id.* (citing *General Electric Co. v. AAMCO Transmissions, Inc.*, 962 F.2d 281, 286 (2d Cir. 1992)).

160. *Id.* (citing *General Electric Co.*, 962 F.2d at 286).

The court found that Fleet arranged for disposal because its agreements with Baldwin and Nix specifically involved the disposal of hazardous wastes.¹⁶¹ When Fleet hired Baldwin to prepare for and conduct an auction, Fleet was aware that such activities would involve cleaning the site and removing the remaining chemical drums, and thus Fleet should have been aware that Baldwin would be handling a hazardous substance.¹⁶² Fleet's contact with Baldwin was the type of arrangement for disposal defined in section 107(a)(3).¹⁶³ Also, where Fleet ordered Nix to leave the premises in a "broom-clean" condition, knowing that the site contained hazardous waste, Fleet basically told Nix to dispose of the hazardous waste at SPW.¹⁶⁴ In engaging Nix, Fleet specifically chose to dispose of a hazardous substance, and thus "arranged for" disposal.¹⁶⁵

The court concluded, however, that under the Secured Creditor Exemption's definition of "owner," Fleet could not be liable under section 107(a)(2) and (3).¹⁶⁶ Having determined that the actions of Baldwin and Nix voided Fleet's protection under the Secured Creditor Exemption, the court noted that Fleet was liable under CERCLA as the owner and operator of the facility, rather than as a person who "arranged for" disposal of a hazardous substance.¹⁶⁷

VI. FDIC GUIDELINES

On February 25, 1993, before the *Fleet IV* ruling, Stanley J. Poling, Director of the FDIC, sent a letter containing guidelines to the chief executive officers of all FDIC-supervised banks and lending institutions.¹⁶⁸ Mr. Poling's purpose for writing the letter was to provide the lenders with "information and recommendations about implementing an envi-

161. *Id.*

162. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 725.

163. *Id.*

164. *Id.*

165. *Id.*

166. *Id.*

167. *Fleet Factors IV*, 821 F. Supp. at 724.

168. Poling Letter, *supra* note 10.

ronmental risk program that can be tailored to the needs of the lending institution."¹⁶⁹ The letter also included procedures that would help limit environmental liability associated with real property held as collateral.¹⁷⁰

These guidelines, in accordance with CERCLA, warned that a secured creditor may incur direct liability for the cost of removing hazardous waste from real property held as collateral.¹⁷¹ In addition, the guidelines cautioned that a loan may be adversely affected even where real property is neither foreclosed nor taken for collateral.¹⁷² The letter further warned that a secured creditor may be liable for cleanup costs that may far exceed the amount of the loan made to the borrower.¹⁷³

The FDIC guidelines declared that "as part of the institution's overall decision-making process, the environmental risk program should establish procedures for identifying and evaluating potential environmental concerns associated with lending practices and other actions relating to real property."¹⁷⁴ The guidelines advised eight methods to avoid potential environmental liability: (1) train the staff to identify potential environmental hazards; (2) set environmental policy, guidelines and procedures; (3) require environmental review or analysis during the application process; (4) establish structured environmental risk assessment for loan applications raising environmental concerns; (5) set standards for documentation of loan requirements for environmental law compliance; (6) monitor borrowers' activities; (7) avoid participating in the management of the borrowers' operations; and (8) carefully assess liability risk before foreclosure.¹⁷⁵

To ensure the proper implementation of the environmental risk program, the FDIC recommended training sufficient to enable the secured creditor's staffs to recognize and evalu-

169. *Id.* at 1.

170. *Id.*

171. *Id.*

172. *Id.*

173. Poling Letter, *supra* note 10, at 1.

174. *Id.* at 2.

175. *Id.* at 2-4.

ate potential environmental concerns that may expose the institution to liability.¹⁷⁶ The FDIC also recommended secured creditors provide borrowers with loan policies, manuals, and written procedures when appropriate, and conduct an environmental risk assessment during the loan application process.¹⁷⁷ In addition, where a possible environmental concern exists, the FDIC recommended that a more detailed and structured assessment by a qualified individual be performed.¹⁷⁸

The FDIC recommended that secured creditors carefully draft their loan documentation to safeguard the institution against potential environmental liability.¹⁷⁹ The environmental risk assessment was to continue for the duration of the loan by monitoring the borrower and the real property for potential environmental concerns.¹⁸⁰ The secured creditor may then claim an exemption from liability as the holder of a security interest, but may lose the exemption if its actions constitute participation in management.¹⁸¹ In addition, the FDIC cautioned that exposure to environmental liability would significantly increase if the secured creditor took title to the real property through foreclosure.¹⁸²

VII. The Lender Liability Rule Invalidated

On February 4, 1994, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals invalidated the Lender Liability Rule. In *Kelley v. EPA*, the State of Michigan and the Chemical Manufacturers Association (CMA) challenged the Lender Liability Rule, claiming it provided an unauthorized safe harbor for secured creditors, thereby denying Michigan and the CMA the opportunity to recover response costs from secured creditors.¹⁸³ Michigan and the CMA "argued that EPA lack[ed] statutory authority

176. *Id.* at 3.

177. *Id.*

178. Poling Letter, *supra* note 10, at 3.

179. *Id.* at 4.

180. *Id.*

181. *Id.* See Preamble, *supra* note 8.

182. Poling Letter, *supra* note 10, at 4.

183. *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1104.

to define, through its regulations, the scope of lender liability under section 107, an issue only federal courts may adjudicate."¹⁸⁴

The court recognized that the President had broadly delegated his statutory powers to the EPA, the "administering agency" of CERCLA.¹⁸⁵ However, with respect to specific regulations, the EPA must show "either explicit or implicit evidence of congressional intent to delegate interpretative authority."¹⁸⁶ Absent such congressional intent, the EPA's authority to promulgate the Lender Liability Rule could not be upheld.

The EPA, in its strongest argument,¹⁸⁷ asserted that section 106(b)(2) impliedly authorized it to define "liability" under CERCLA. Under that section, a party that has incurred cleanup costs may petition the EPA for reimbursement of reasonable costs.¹⁸⁸ If the EPA denies the request, the party may appeal to a district court, which can order the reimbursement if the party is not liable.¹⁸⁹ The court may also order reimbursement to a liable party, if the party can demonstrate that the EPA arbitrarily, capriciously, and unlawfully ordered the cleanup.¹⁹⁰ The EPA argued that because it determines whether to reimburse, it must also determine the extent of a party's liability.¹⁹¹

184. *Id.* at 1104-05.

185. *Id.* (citing *Wagner Seed Co. v. Bush*, 946 F.2d 918, 920 (D.C. Cir. 1991), *cert. denied*, 112 S. Ct. 1584 (1992)). See 42 U.S.C.A. § 9615 (1993).

186. *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1105 (citing *Linemaster Switch Corp. v. EPA*, 938 F.2d 1299, 1303 (D.C. Cir. 1991)). See *Adams Fruit Co. v. Barret*, 494 U.S. 638 (1990) (holding that an agency may not issue a regulation covering "an area in which it has no jurisdiction").

187. The EPA also argued that under § 105, it was authorized to promulgate the national contingency plan (NCP) setting forth the actions and procedures to be taken in response to contamination. The Court of Appeals refuted the claim, noting that although § 105 "provide[s] the EPA with broad rulemaking authority to craft the NCP, it is hardly a specific delegation of authority . . . to interpret section [107]." *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1105 (citing *Ohio v. EPA*, 838 F.2d 1325, 1331 (D.C. Cir. 1988)).

188. *Id.*

189. *Id.* at 1107.

190. *Id.* at 1106.

191. *Id.*

The court responded that under section 106(b)(2), the EPA does not finally determine liability since the party denied reimbursement may bring action in district court under section 106(b)(2)(B).¹⁹² If the party establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that it is not liable, it prevails under section 106(b)(2)(C). Moreover, a liable party may challenge the reasonableness of the EPA's response order under section 106(b)(2)(D).¹⁹³ Therefore, the district court decides the issue of ultimate liability. "Although EPA may well enjoy authority to issue regulations interpreting or implementing subparagraph [106](b)(2)(D), it does not seem that Congress intended the same authority with respect to subparagraphs [106](b)(2)(B) and (C)."¹⁹⁴

Since the private parties can put questions of liability at issue in district court without government involvement, the EPA cannot argue that Congress intended it to define liability for a class of potential defendants.¹⁹⁵ "Congress, by providing for a private right of action under section 107, had designated the courts, and not the EPA, as the adjudicator of the scope of CERCLA liability."¹⁹⁶

The court then addressed whether the Lender Liability Rule could be sustained as an interpretive rule. An interpretive rule is based on specific statutory provisions,¹⁹⁷ represents an agency's interpretation of a statute, and is entitled to substantial judicial deference.¹⁹⁸

The court found that the Lender Liability Rule bore little resemblance to the traditional meaning of "interpretive

192. *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1106-07.

193. *Id.* at 1107.

194. *Id.*

195. *Id.*

196. *Id.*

197. *United Technologies Corp. v. EPA*, 821 F.2d 714, 719 (D.C. Cir. 1987).

198. *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837 (1984). *Chevron* "sets forth the reigning rationale for judicial deference to agency interpretation of statutes, . . . premised on the notion that Congress implicitly delegated to the agency the authority to reconcile reasonably statutory ambiguities." *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1108. Thus, a logical precondition is that Congress delegate specific administrative authority. *Adams Fruit Co. v. Barrett*, 494 U.S. 638, 649 (1990).

rule.”¹⁹⁹ The “EPA does not really define specific statutory terms, but rather takes off from those terms and devises a comprehensive regulatory regimen to address the liability problems facing secured creditors.”²⁰⁰ Moreover, the same logic “that prevents the [EPA] from issuing the rule as a substantive regulation precludes judicial deference to [its] offered ‘interpretation.’”²⁰¹ Where Congress meant the judiciary, not the EPA, to determine liability issues, the EPA’s interpretation of liability may not be given deference.²⁰² Because Congress does not give the EPA authority to interpret a statute, “and gives the agency authority only to bring the question to a federal court as the ‘prosecutor,’ deference to the agency’s interpretation is inappropriate.”²⁰³ In addition, “even if the EPA enjoys authority to determine” the liability issues administratively, “deference is withheld if a party can bring the issue independently to federal court under a private right of action.”²⁰⁴ Since the EPA has no authority to determine liability, the court therefore held the Lender Liability Rule invalid.²⁰⁵

VIII. Discussion

Until a few years ago, the EPA seemed almost invincible in its interpretation of CERCLA.²⁰⁶ Even in the face of the *Fleet Factors II* decision, the EPA was able to provide a “safe harbor” for lenders within its Lender Liability Rule.²⁰⁷ With

199. *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1108.

200. *Id.*

201. *Id.*

202. *Id.*

203. *Id.* See *United States v. Western Electric Co.*, 900 F.2d 283, 297 (D.C. Cir. 1990).

204. *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1108. See *Litton Financial Printing Div. v. NLRB*, 111 S. Ct. 2215 (1991).

205. *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1109.

206. Stephen L. Kass & Michael B. Gerrard, *The Taming of the EPA*, N.Y. L.J., April 23, 1993, at 3 [hereinafter Kass & Gerrard, *The Taming of the EPA*].

207. *Hearing on Lender Liability Issues Under Superfund Before the Subcomm. on Transportation and Hazardous Materials of the Comm. on Energy and Commerce*, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 37 (1990) (statement of James M. Strock, EPA Assistant Administrator for Enforcement, promising agency interpretive rule to provide “safe harbor” for lenders). See Randall J. Burke, *Much Ado*

the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule by the D.C. Circuit, the reign of EPA's dominance over the interpretation of CERCLA appears to have come to an end. The loss of the Lender Liability Rule's safe harbor calls into question the value of the FDIC guidelines which served as a map to the safe harbor. Again lost at sea are the secured creditors.²⁰⁸ The following sections discuss the implications of the FDIC's guidelines and the effect that the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule will have on secured creditors in terms of environmental liability.

A. Impact of the FDIC Guidelines on Lending Institutions and Environmental Liability

Because of the FDIC guidelines, "environmental precautions for banks have moved from being prudent to being mandatory."²⁰⁹ Lenders that fail to adopt sufficient precautions and fail to comply with the guidelines risk being censure by the FDIC and possible shareholder derivative actions.²¹⁰ Lenders must now concern themselves with implementing environmental risk programs to avoid additional liability.

According to a FDIC representative, the guidelines were designed to provide some security for FDIC-supervised lending institutions against environmental liability.²¹¹ The guidelines were presented to banks to facilitate FDIC's determination of which banks and lending institutions were in an "unsafe and unsound" condition.²¹² In fact, the guidelines are not regulations and were never intended to act as such.²¹³ To date, the representative added, the FDIC has neither sanc-

About Lending: Continuing Vitality of the Fleet Factors Decision, 80 GEO. L.J. 809, 811 (1992); Patricia T. Bayermer, *New EPA Lender Rule: Safe Harbor or Shoals?*, N.J. L.J., October 5, 1992, at 7.

208. Cf. Beach, *supra* note 55, at 250 (CERCLA "has created a very effective private enforcement mechanism in which the lender play a commanding and . . . constructive role.").

209. Kass & Gerrard, *New Worries for Banks*, *supra* note 2, at 4.

210. *Id.*

211. Telephone Interview with a FDIC Representative (Oct. 17, 1994).

212. *Id.*

213. *Id.*

tioned nor withdrawn the insurance of any lender.²¹⁴ The FDIC's primary concern is the stability of FDIC-insured banks rather than sanctioning or censoring banks who fail to comply with the guidelines.²¹⁵

The guidelines seek to assist secured creditors in avoiding CERCLA liability at the outset. Full compliance with the FDIC guidelines help assure that secured creditors maintain their FDIC status,²¹⁶ and also helps protect lending institutions from incurring environmental liability. The risk assessment programs help protect the secured creditor by encouraging them to explore the potential environmental risk of the borrower before incurring lender liability.

From the perspective of the secured creditor, the FDIC guidelines are old news.²¹⁷ By the time the FDIC issued the guidelines, most lending institutions had already developed environmental risk assessment programs.²¹⁸ The broad and reasonable nature of the guidelines caused secured creditors to make only insignificant revisions to their risk analysis scheme.²¹⁹ Although Stanley J. Poling's letter may have been a "wake-up call" for small to medium sized lending institutions, Evan Henry, Manager of Environmental Services at Bank of America, stated that the guidelines created no new concerns for the larger lending institutions because most of them had already implemented risk assessment programs that complied with the guidelines.²²⁰

In most instances, Evan Henry added, the costs required to implement these programs are passed on to the borrowers, as part of the loan application process.²²¹ Lending institutions nowadays will generally require borrowers to incur the cost of examining the borrower's assets and conducting an en-

214. *Id.*

215. *Id.*

216. See Kass & Gerrard, *New Worries for Banks*, *supra* note 2, at 3.

217. Telephone Interview with Evan Henry, Manager of Environmental Services, Bank of America (Nov. 16, 1994).

218. *Id.*

219. *Id.*

220. *Id.*

221. *Id.*

vironmental risk assessment before loans are secured.²²² Few lending institutions actually incur the costs as overhead.²²³ For these reasons, the FDIC guidelines have not proven to be as deleterious to the lending institutions as predicted by environmental lawyers when they were first issued.

B. The Defeat of the Lender Liability Rule

When the EPA issued the Lender Liability Rule, over 350 entities responded, some expressing their approval while others opposing the Rule.²²⁴ Those who hoped that the Lender Liability Rule would limit environmental liability for secured creditors were heavily disappointed by the decision of *Fleet Factors IV*. All hope appeared to have been lost when the D.C. Circuit struck down the Lender Liability Rule in *Kelley*.

With the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule, the *Fleet Factors* cases pose a significant hurdle for secured creditors. The "safe harbor" that the EPA once provided for lenders had disappeared. However, the essence of the Lender Liability Rule has reappeared in recent judicial decisions.²²⁵ In those cases, the courts have employed an analysis similar to the Lender Liability Rule.²²⁶ Moreover, no cases to date have applied the *Fleet Factors* "capacity to influence" standard. As one commentator noted, "[t]he evolving judicial consensus on the parameters of the Secured Creditor Exemption resembles the invalidated EPA rule more than the *Fleet Factors* standard that created such apprehension among lenders."²²⁷ Thus, the fear that the courts would immediately adopt the *Fleet Factors* standard has remained unrealized.²²⁸

222. Telephone Interview with Evan Henry, Manager of Environmental Services, Bank of America (Nov. 16, 1994).

223. *Id.*

224. Bayermer, *supra* note 206, at 7.

225. Jean M. McCarroll, *CERCLA Spreads Its Traps to Snare Lenders, Contractors*, N.Y. L.J., June 13, 1994, at S2.

226. See *Northeast Doran Inc. v. Key Bank of Maine*, 15 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 1994); *United States v. McLamb*, 5 F.3d 69 (4th Cir. 1993); *Waterville Industries Inc. v. Finance Authority of Maine*, 984 F.2d 549 (1st Cir. 1993).

227. McCarroll, *supra* note 224, at S4.

228. See Burke, *supra* note 206, at 809-10. Mr. Burke argues that

In addition, lending institutions consider the *Fleet Factors* decision an "aberration."²²⁹ According to Evan Henry, despite the *Fleet Factors* cases and the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule, most lending institutions have not changed their environmental policy on lending.²³⁰

The calm which presently exists, however, may end after the courts completes their digestion of the Lender Liability Rule. The courts may adopt the *Fleet Factors* "capacity to influence" standard in place of its current-trend analysis. Although courts to date have been lenient in their application of the rigid standard expounded in *Fleet Factors II*, they have unimpeded authority to change the standard if they so please.

When the EPA sought congressional relief it was rebuffed.²³¹ As suggested in *Kelley v. EPA*, the only way to protect the lender from the court's strict interpretation of the Secured Creditor Exemption may be by congressional intervention. Whether the EPA can succeed in getting a bill through Congress which can withstand the scrutiny of the court remains to be seen.

C. Continuing the Ride on the Roller Coaster

The FDIC guidelines and the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule are concerns for lenders and may impact their policies toward borrowers. The FDIC guidelines place lending institutions in a difficult position in which they now must implement procedures to avoid environmental liability as well as shareholder action. The FDIC guidelines appear to impose a duty upon the lender to avoid environmental liabil-

[d]espite the proliferation of negative commentary which greeted the *Fleet Factors* opinion, the decision has resulted not in a credit crunch or disruption of the commercial economy, as many a Cassandra was quick to prophesize, but rather the decision has led to positive reevaluation of the role of the lender in ensuring compliance with environmental regulations

Id.

229. Telephone Interview with Evan Henry, Manager of Environmental Services, Bank of America (Nov. 16, 1994).

230. *Id.*

231. See *Kelley*, 15 F.3d at 1109.

ity, regardless of the borrower's actions or omissions.²³² The guidelines administer the *Fleet Factors* holding by requiring the secured creditor's to implement the environmental risk assessment programs. Unlike *Fleet Factors*, however, not only will lending institutions incur liability under federal law, they may also incur additional liability from shareholders suits and sanctions from the FDIC.

The imposition of liability on "secured creditors for low-level participatory conduct will reduce lending to businesses, prevent secured creditors from conducting effective loan workout activities, and destroy any incentive for secured creditors to assist in resolving a debtor's environmental problems."²³³ Those in the financial community stunned by *Fleet Factors II* will have even greater difficulty accepting the new guidelines. Lending institutions, who already considered securing debt to corporations a risky investment, now must decide whether allocating capital to such potentially liable investments is worth the risk.

Even businesses that operate to eradicate environmental hazards will suffer as secured creditors shy away from environmentally risky loans. "Ironically, this [institutional shyness] does not differentiate between financings that would benefit the environment and those that would 'price out' environmentally risky enterprises, and ignores that financially impaired firms may be more likely to evade environmental laws."²³⁴

Although in theory the FDIC guidelines appear highly intrusive to lending institutions in their policy toward borrowers, response by the lending institutions themselves creates a different picture. For lenders, the FDIC guidelines were a very reasonable reaction to the increase in environmental liability among secured creditors.²³⁵ Most lending institutions already had an environmental risk assessment program that is as stringent as, if not more so than the FDIC

232. See Kass & Gerrard, *New Worries for Banks*, *supra* note 2, at 3.

233. Beach, *supra* note 55, at 250.

234. Greenberg & Shaw, *supra* note 43, at 1213.

235. Telephone Interview with Evan Henry, Manager of Environmental Services, Bank of America (Nov. 16, 1994).

guidelines.²³⁶ That, coupled with the purpose of the FDIC guidelines: to prevent liability of FDIC-insured banks and to determine which banks are "unsafe and unsound,"²³⁷ makes the FDIC guidelines innocuous in terms of its impact on lending institutions and environmental liability.

The invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule altogether eliminated the "safe harbor" the lenders temporarily enjoyed. With no relief in sight, the *Fleet Factors* cases suddenly become an even greater obstacle for lending institutions. The reason the *Fleet Factors* court narrowed the liability of lenders under CERCLA was because of EPA's timely intervention. But with the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule, the courts appear to have unfettered discretion to apply the *Fleet Factors* standard.

Early indications, as noted previously, show that despite the invalidation, remnants of the Lender Liability Rule's principles are still lingering. Lenders do not anticipate the return of *Fleet Factors* but the court's next move is uncertain. This impairs lending institutions from making a decision regarding its own environmental ramifications. As a result, it appears that the roller coaster of environmental liability continues on.

IX. Conclusion

The roller coaster of lender liability which started with the enactment of CERCLA continues. Secured creditors clung to their seats as Congress, the judiciary, and the administrative agencies sent them tumbling down the tracks. They experienced their first plunge when the Eleventh Circuit in *Fleet Factors II* ruled that lenders may be liable for the cost of cleanup under CERCLA even where they had not foreclosed on the facility. In response to the stringent ruling, EPA enacted the Lender Liability Rule which promised a "safe harbor" for secured creditors and attempted to stabilize the ride. Yet, despite the introduction of the Lender Liability Rule, the district court in *Fleet Factors III* found Fleet liable.

236. *Id.*

237. Telephone Interview with FDIC Representative (Oct. 17, 1994).

In 1993, while the *Fleet Factors* cases were pending, the FDIC issued guidelines suggesting that banks and lending institutions implement environmental risk assessment programs to avoid environmental liability and imposition of sanctions. Most of the impact of the guidelines was absorbed because lending institutions had already adopted effective risk assessment programs before the issuance of the guidelines. The D.C. Circuit's invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule in *Kelly*, however, may have a serious impact on lenders and their environmental liability. Absent further efforts from the EPA, it appears that the lending institutions will be puppeted by the courts. The FDIC guidelines may have been intended to smooth the roller coaster ride but the invalidation of the Lender Liability Rule may cause lenders to plummet again in the environmental lender liability roller coaster.

PACE ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REVIEW

**CUMULATIVE ARTICLES
INDEX
Fall 1994**



**Pace University School of Law
White Plains, New York**

CUMULATIVE ARTICLES INDEX

AUTHORS INDEX

- Abrams, Jamie C., *Biological Control Agents in Integrated Pest Management: Are They Regulated?* 8:89
- Abrams, Robert, *Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation (SLAPP) Address* 7:33
- Altman, Richard S., *United States v. Tull: A Polluter's Right to a Jury Trial*4:473
- Anderson, Martin G., *Ocean Dumping: An Old Problem Continues* 1:37
- Anthony, Sheila F., *Groundwater Pollution Control: A National Aim, A Regional Strategy*2:215
- Babb, Susan E., Ottinger, Hon. Richard L., Barbanes, Elizabeth & Padron, Carol, *Least-Cost Utility Planning and Demand-Side Management: A Bibliography* 6:79
- Babcock, Hope, *Federal Wetlands Regulatory Policy: Up to Its Ears in Alligators*.....8:307
- Bader, Harry R., *Potential Legal Standards for Resolving R.S. 2477 Right of Way Crisis*11:485
- Barbanes, Elizabeth, Ottinger, Hon. Richard L., Babb, Susan E. & Padron, Carol, *Least-Cost Utility Planning and Demand-Side Management: A Bibliography* 6:79
- Battle, Laura Carlan, *Regulation of Medical Waste in the United States*11:517
- Bennett, Kyla S. & Meyers, Gary D., *Answering "The Call of the Wild": An Examination of U.S. Participation in International Wildlife Law* 7:75
- Bennett, Richard E. & McCarthy, Richard F., *Statutory Protection for Farm Animals*3:229

Bergen, G.S. Peter, <i>Conflict in Implementing Environmental and Energy Policies</i>	1:123
Bickford, Walter E., <i>Modernizing Animal Law: The Case for Wildlife</i>	3:257
Bliss, John, <i>Greater Public Participation in the Enforcement of the Clean Water Act</i>	9:753
Bloch, Julie B., <i>Preserving Biological Diversity in the United States: The Case for Moving to an Ecosystems Approach to Protect the Nation's Biological Wealth</i> ...	10:175
Blomquist, Robert F., <i>American Toxic Tort Law: An Historical Background, 1979-87</i>	10:85
Bolin, Jr., James H., <i>Of Razorbacks and Reservoirs: The Endangered Species Act's Protection of Endangered Colorado River Basin Fish</i>	11:35
Bolin, L. Alenna, <i>An Ounce of Prevention: The Need for Source Reduction in Agriculture</i>	8:63
Bono, Louis L., <i>The Implementation of the EC Directive on Environmental Impact Assessments With the English Planning System: A Refinement of the NEPA Process</i>	9:155
Bowen, Joanna, Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.: <i>The Second Circuit Affirms the NPDES Permit as a Shield and Tries to Sink the Clean Water Act</i>	12:269
Bowers, Gail, <i>New York's SEQRA in the Courts</i>	5:25
Boyt, Jeb, <i>Struggling to Protect Ecosystems and Biodiversity Under NEPA and NFMA: The Ancient Forests of the Pacific Northwest and the Northern Spotted Owl</i>	10:1009
Brinchuk, M.M., <i>Ecological and Legal Problems of Agro-Chemicalization</i>	7:171
Brinchuk, M.M., <i>Legal Protection of the Environment from Pollution by Dangerous Industrial Wastes</i>	5:509
Brooks, Richard O., <i>Les Mains Sales: The Ethical and Political Implications of SLAPP Suits</i>	7:61

Brozdowski, Paul L., <i>United States v. Waste Industries: Federal Common Law and Imminent Hazards</i>	2:116
Builder, Jane P., <i>Village of Ossining v. The Planning Board of the Town of Ossining: When SEQRA Leaves No Alternative But to Study the Alternative</i>	8:237
Bull, Andrea L., <i>Superfund and the Hazardous Waste Site Next Door: Can Citizens Clean It Up?</i>	6:643
Butler, W.E., <i>Law Reform in Soviet Environmental Law</i>	5:425
Cambell, Faith, <i>Legal Protection of Plants in the United States</i>	6:1
Canan, Ph.D., Penelope, <i>The SLAPP from a Sociological Perspective</i>	7:23
Caramanian, Lori L., <i>Hazardous Waste Management After Shell Oil</i>	11:265
Chananie, Steven, <i>Determining "Takings" Under Coastal Zone Management Programs in New York and Connecticut</i>	1:91
Clark, Cheryl Kessler, <i>State Liability Under CERCLA for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal: Preparing for the Inevitable</i>	11:587
Cohen, Harry, <i>Developing and Producing Coalbed Gas: Ownership, Regulation, and Environmental Concerns</i> .	2:1
Cooney, William A., <i>Wedinger v. Goldberger: A Victory for Freshwater Wetlands</i>	7:357
Cooper, Jon C., <i>Broad Programmatic, Policy and Planning Assessments Under the National Environmental Policy Act and Similar Devices: A Quiet Revolution in an Approach to Environmental Considerations</i>	11:89
Crespi, Robert, <i>Land Use Law in New York State: Playing "Hide & SEQRA" with the Elusive Comprehensive Plan</i>	11:835

Cunningham, Carolyn, <i>Norfolk Southern Corp. v. Oberly: Coastal Protection Wins in Delaware</i>	4:439
Cuomo, Mario, <i>Remarks By Governor Mario Cuomo, Pace Law School Graduation Address: Commencement 1989</i>	7:1
Curry, Virginia A., <i>Japan Whaling Association v. American Cetacean Society: The Great Whales Become Casualties of the Trade Wars</i>	4:277
Dale, Nina, <i>County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation: The Continuing Saga of American Indian Territorial Wars</i>	4:221
DeSevo, Alex R., <i>Rubanick v. Witco Chemical Corp. and Landrigan v. Celotex Corp., The Admissibility of Expert Testimony in Toxic Tort Litigation</i>	10:423
Diederich, Jr., Michael, <i>Does Garbage Have Standing?: Democracy, Flow Control and a Principled Constitutional Approach to Municipal Solid Waste Management</i>	11:157
Dinkins, Carol E., <i>Enforcement of the Statutes Governing Disposal and Cleanup of Hazardous Wastes</i>	1:1
Dower, Roger C. & Repetto, Robert, <i>Green Fees and the Need for Fiscal Restructuring: Opportunities and Challenges</i>	12:161
Dutcher, Valle Simms, <i>The Asbestos Dragon: The Ramifications of Creative Judicial Management of Asbestos Cases</i>	10:955
Economides, James A., <i>The Reunion of Great Camp: The Sagamore Amendments to the N.Y. Constitution</i> ..	3:29
Edelman, Paul S., <i>The Oil Pollution Act of 1990</i>	8:1
Erlandson, Dawn, <i>The Btu Tax Experience: What Happened and Why It Happened</i>	12:173
Eschweiler, Peter O., <i>In Accordance with a Comprehensive Plan, The Need for Planning Consistency in New York State</i>	10:603

- Euston, Andrew, *NEPA and the Next America: Designing Our Transition to Global Sustainability* 7:289
- Everett, David R., *The Hazy Future: Are State Attempts to Reduce Visibility Impairment in Class I Areas Caught Between Scylla and Charybdis? The Effects of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 on Visibility Protection* 8:115
- Falkin, Lawrence, *Taub v. State: Are State Anti-Cruelty Statutes Sleeping Giants?* 2:255
- Farer, David B., *ECRA Verdict: The Successes and Failures of the Premiere Transaction-Triggered Environmental Law* 5:113
- Favre, David, *Laboratory Animal Act: A Legislative Proposal* 3:123
- Ferretti, Joan M., *Looking for the Big Picture — Developing a Jurisprudence for a Biotechnological Age* 10:711
- Ferretti, Joan M., *Restoring the Nation's Wetlands: Can the Clean Water Act's Dredge and Fill Guidelines Do the Job?* 1:105
- Finegan, Pamela A., *FIFRA Lite: A Regulatory Solution or Part of the Pesticide Problem?* 6:615
- Foster, Tara J., *Securing a Right to View: Broadening the Scope of Negative Easements* 6:269
- French, III, John, *Ethical Issues in the Practice of Environmental Law* 2:66
- Futrell, J. William, *Public Participation in Soviet Environmental Policy* 5:487
- Galvin, Roger W., *What Rights for Animals? A Modest Proposal* 2:245
- Galyatin, Mikhail, *Comparative American-Soviet Environmental Land Use Laws: A Soviet View* 5:531
- Gardner, Geraldine, *Illegal Drug Laboratories: A Growing Health and Toxic Waste Problem* 7:193

Garrison, John L., <i>The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Debate Over Sustainable Use</i>	12:301
Giroux, Roland A., <i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow: Is This Just What the EMF Doctor Ordered?</i>	12:393
Giusti, Gina L. & Grasso, Nancy J., <i>Alternatives to Ocean Dumping: A Municipal Dilemma</i>	6:157
Golanski, Alani, <i>Judicial Scrutiny of Expert Testimony in Environmental Tort Litigation</i>	9:399
Goldman, Marshall I., <i>The Development of Environmental Policies in the United States and the Soviet Union</i>	5:455
Goodman, Peter, <i>Zoning in the Fourth Dimension</i>	3:75
Grasso, Nancy J. & Giusti, Gina L., <i>Alternatives to Ocean Dumping: A Municipal Dilemma</i>	6:157
Greco, Catherine V., <i>State Implementation Plans under the 1990 Clean Air Act: Can New York Conform?</i>	11:869
Greenberg, Millicent, <i>Milwaukee v. Illinois: An Interstate Water Pollution Dispute</i>	1:50
Greene, Nathanael & Ward, Vanessa, <i>Getting the Sticker Price Right: Incentives for Cleaner, More Efficient Vehicles</i>	12:91
Guiffrida, Grace C., <i>The Proposed Indoor Air Quality Acts of 1993: The Comprehensive Solution to a Far-Reaching Problem?</i>	11:311
Harness, III, Cotton C., <i>Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council: Its Historical Context and Shifting Constitutional Principles</i>	10:5
Healy, J. Kevin, <i>The Environmental Review Process in the City of New York: CEQR</i>	5:93
Henderson, Mark H., <i>United States v. County of Westchester: Invalidation of an Airport Curfew</i>	2:83
Hinchey, Maurice, <i>The New York City Water Supply System - An Assessment</i>	5:149

Hodas, David, <i>Natural Resource Damages: A Research Guide</i>	9:107
Hoerner, J. Andrew & Muller, Frank, <i>Greening State Energy Taxes: Carbon Taxes for Revenue and the Environment</i>	12:5
Humbach, John A., <i>Economic Due Process and the Takings Clause</i>	4:311
Humbach, John A., <i>Public Rights in the Navigable Streams of New York</i>	6:461
Humbach, John A., <i>What Is Behind The "Property Rights" Debate?</i>	10:21
Iconitskaya, I.A., <i>Legal Protection of Land in the USSR</i>	7:161
Iskoyan, Aida Bagratovna, <i>Issues Related to Legal Protection of Wild Plants</i>	5:519
Jamieson, Cheryl Lynn, <i>An Analysis of Municipal Wetlands Laws and Their Relationship to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar)</i>	4:177
Jamieson, Cheryl Lynn, <i>Protection of the Everglades Ecosystem: A Legal Analysis</i>	6:23
Jones, Janet Morris, <i>Attorney Fees: CERCLA Private Recovery Actions</i>	10:393
Karlsson, Gail V., <i>The Impact of Environmental Liabilities on Real Estate Contract Negotiations</i>	8:37
Keenan, Bernard V., <i>A Perspective: New York Communities and Impact Fees</i>	7:329
Kennedy, Patrick, <i>The United States Claims Court: A Safe "Harbor" from Government Regulation of Privately Owned Wetlands</i>	9:723
Kennedy, Jr., Robert F., <i>Falconry: Legal Ownership and Sale of Captive-Bred Raptors</i>	4:349
Kennedy, Jr., Robert F., <i>Thoughts on Environmental Rights and Ownership</i>	11:11

Kolbasov, Oleg S., <i>Modern Ecological Policy and the Utilization of a Global Environmental Protection Strategy</i>	5:445
Kolbasov, Oleg S., <i>Environmental Law Administration and Policy in the USSR</i>	5:439
Komanoff, Charles, <i>Pollution Taxes for Roadway Transportation</i>	12:121
Kovacs, Leanora A., <i>United States v. Cherokee Nation - Indian Water Rights: Giving With One Hand and Taking With the Other</i>	6:255
Kuchta, Lynn M., <i>"Superiorfund" — An Answer to State Court Holdings that Government-Mandated Cleanup Costs Constitute "Damages" Under Comprehensive General Liability Policies</i>	9:187
LaBelle, Judith M., <i>Takings Law in Light of Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council</i>	10:73
Lafferty, David, <i>Juzwin v. Amtorg Trading Corp.: Multiple Assessments of Punitive Damages in Toxic Tort Litigation</i>	8:647
Larson, Marina T., <i>Consent Decrees and the EPA: Are They Really Enforceable Against the Agency?</i>	1:147
Latini, Michael, <i>National Wildlife Federation v. Watt: The Property Clause and the Legislative Veto</i>	2:100
Lee, Brian S.B., <i>A Ride on the Environmental Liability Roller Coaster</i>	12:445
Lee, Henry, <i>The Political Economy of Energy Taxes: An Assessment of the Opportunities and Obstacles</i>	12:77
Lenihan, James M., <i>RCRA versus CERCLA: The Clash of the Titans in Colorado v. United States Department of the Army</i>	8:621
Leont'eva, A.V., <i>New Aspects in the Structure and Jurisdiction of COMECON Regarding the Protection of the Environment</i>	7:179

- Levine, Gerald M., *The Rhetoric of Public Expectation: An Enquiry into the Concepts of Responsiveness and Responsibility Under the Environmental Laws* 8:389
- Lima, Paul Xavier, *Asian Americans for Equality v. Koch: The Battle Over Affordable Housing* 4:491
- Lindauer, Patricia, *The CERCLA's Daily Penalty and Treble Damages Provisions: Is Any Cause "Sufficient Cause" to Disobey an EPA Order?* 11:657
- Lobenfeld, Eric J., *The 42nd Street Development Project: How Litigation Obstructs Public Goals* 7:347
- Loper, Joe, *Evaluating Existing State and Local Tax Codes from an "Environmental Tax" Perspective: The Case of Energy-Related Taxes* 12:61
- Madnick, Michael D., *NAFTA: A Catalyst for Environmental Change in Mexico* 11:365
- Mallach, Alan, *The Tortured Reality of Suburban Exclusion: Zoning, Economics, and the Future of the Berenson Doctrine* 4:37
- Marsh, J. Langdon, & Ruzow, Daniel A., *Hearing Reports Under the Environmental Conservation Law: Their Function, Preparation, and Importance* 2:191
- Marion, Jolene R., *Whose Wildlife Is It Anyway? How New York's Fish and Game Statutes, Regulations and Policies Endanger the Environment and Have Disenfranchised the Majority of the Electorate* 4:401
- McCarthy, Richard F. & Bennett, Richard E., *Statutory Protection for Farm Animals* 3:229
- McCulloch, Christine J., *Wetlands: Federal Law and National Policy Research Guide* 5:167
- McGovern, Robert T., *United States v. Johnson & Towers, Inc.: Corporate Employee Criminal Liability Under RCRA* 2:316
- Meyer, Steven F., *Jackson v. New York State Urban Development Corporation: Standard of Review for Sufficiency of Environmental Impact Statements* 5:279

Meyers, Gary D. & Bennett, Kyla S., <i>Answering the Call of the Wild: An Examination of U.S. Participation in International Wildlife</i>	7:75
Meyland, Sarah J., <i>Land Use & The Protection of Drinking Water Supplies</i>	10:563
Miskiewicz, James & Rudd, John S., <i>Civil and Criminal Enforcement of the Clean Air Act After the 1990 Amendments</i>	9:281
Molodstova, Elena, <i>Nuclear Energy and Environmental Protection: Responses of International Law</i>	12:185
Moore, David Montgomery, <i>Pre-enforcement Review of Administrative Orders to Abate Environmental Hazards</i>	9:675
Moore, William B. & Ottinger, Richard L., <i>The Case for State Pollution Taxes</i>	12:103
Morris, Eugene J., <i>New Developments in Federal Takings Law</i>	7:309
Mostow, Peter, <i>Reassessing the Scope of Federal Biotechnology Oversight</i>	10:227
Muller, Frank & Hoerner, J. Andrew, <i>Greening State Energy Taxes: Carbon Taxes for Revenue and the Environment</i>	12:5
Murphy, Lois R., <i>Byram River v. Village of Port Chester: Winning is Not Enough</i>	1:63
Nolon, John R., <i>A Comparative Analysis of New Jersey's Mount Laurel Cases with the Berenson Cases in New York</i>	4:3
Nolon, John R., <i>Private Property Investment, Lucas and the Fairness Doctrine</i>	10:43
Nolon, John R., <i>The Erosion of Home Rule Through the Emergence of State-Interests in Land Use Control</i>	10:497
Nolon, John R., <i>Toward a Housing Imperative and Other Reflections on Balanced Growth and Development</i>	7:319

O'Brien, James F., <i>Ayers v. Township of Jackson: Damages for Enhanced Risk of Future Disease</i>	5:257
Oliva, Louis P., <i>The International Struggle to Save the Ozone Layer</i>	7:213
O'Neill, Kathleen, <i>LeFrancois v. Rhode Island: A Case in Which the Leaf Falls Very Far from the Tree</i>	7:259
Ottinger, Richard L. & Moore, William B., <i>The Case for State Pollution Taxes</i>	12:103
Ottinger, Hon. Richard L., <i>Energy and Environmental Challenges for Developed and Developing Countries: Keynote Address Presented at the 1991 United Nations Meeting on Energy and Environment in the Development Process</i>	9:55
Ottinger, Hon. Richard L., Babb, Susan E., Barbanes, Elizabeth & Padron, Carol, <i>Least-Cost Utility Planning and Demand-Side Management: A Bibliography</i>	6:79
Ottinger, Hon. Richard L., <i>Strengthening of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1984: The Original Loopholes, the Amendments and the Political Factors Behind Their Passage</i>	3:1
Paden, Peter R., <i>DEC's Part 617 Regulations, As Amended: A Guide to the Implementation of SEQRA</i> ..	5:51
Padron, Carol, Ottinger, Hon. Richard L., Babb, Susan E. & Barbanes, Elizabeth, <i>Least-Cost Utility Planning and Demand-Side Management: A Bibliography</i>	6:79
Palmer, Arthur E., <i>Environmentally Based Land Use Planning and Regulation</i>	2:25
Pastore, III, Joseph M., <i>The Uncertain Future of the Class Action Suit in School Asbestos Litigation</i>	8:667
Pizzulli, Elizabeth, <i>Foundation on Economic Trends v. Heckler: Genetic Engineering and NEPA's EIS Requirement</i>	2:138
Popovic, Neil A.F., <i>The Right to Participate in Decisions that Affect the Environment</i>	10:683

Pring, George W., <i>SLAPPs: Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation</i>	7:3
Pritchard, Jayne S.A., <i>A Closer Look at Title III of SARA: Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986</i>	6:203
Raymond, George M., Berenson: <i>An Obligation Undefined is an Obligation Unfulfilled</i>	4:131
Reagan, Kinsey S., <i>Federal Regulation of Testing with Laboratory Animals: Future Directions</i>	3:165
Repetto, Robert & Dower, Roger C., <i>Green Fees and the Need for Fiscal Restructuring: Opportunities and Challenges</i>	12:161
Rimland, Marcia H., <i>Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corp.: Federal Regulatory Scheme in Nuclear Industry Does Not Preclude Application of State Tort Law</i>	1:166
Robinson, Nicholas A., <i>After a Decade: "Theory as Practice" at the Center for Environmental Legal Studies</i>	11:1
Robinson, Nicholas A., <i>Perestroika and Priroda: Environmental Protection in the USSR</i>	5:351
Robinson, Nicholas A., <i>Soviet Environmental Protection: The Challenge for Legal Studies</i>	7:117
Romanova, O.B., <i>Tourism and Environmental Protection</i>	7:185
Roth, Warren J., <i>Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. EPA: EPA's Need to Protect its Confidential Sources Versus Its Duty to Disclose Under the Freedom of Information Act</i>	7:271
Rubin, Marla B., <i>Pacific Gas & Electric: Opening the Door to State Regulation in the Nuclear Field</i>	1:180
Rubinton, David Scott, <i>Toward a Recognition of the Rights of Non-States in International Environmental Law</i>	9:475

- Rudd, John S. & Miskiewicz, James, *Civil and Criminal Enforcement of the Clean Air Act After the 1990 Amendments* 9:281
- Rusinko, Rosalie K., *Bersani v. EPA: Wetlands Protection - The EPA Veto Power Under the Clean Water Act*..... 7:375
- Ruzow, Daniel A. & Marsh, J. Langdon, *Hearing Reports Under the Environmental Conservation Law: Their Function, Preparation, and Importance* 2:191
- Ryan, Karen P., *Hallstrom v. Tillamook County: Interpreting the Notice Provision of Environmental Statutes* 8:255
- Sappe, Robert R., *Buttrey v. United States: The Meaning of "Public Hearings" Under Section 404* 2:270
- Shanley, Timothy E., *Applying A Strict Limitations Period To RCRA Enforcement: A Toxic Concept With Hazardous Results?* 10:275
- Skalak, Diane Rosenwasser, *Dow Chemical Co. v. United States: Aerial Surveillance and the Fourth Amendment* 3:277
- Skalyo, Anne M., *The WEPCO-"Fix": Out of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co. v. Reilly Decision, and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, a Pro-Utility Solution Evolved* 10:331
- Smith, Matthew J., *"Thou Shalt Not Violate!": Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act Authorizes Citizen Suits For Wholly Past Violations — Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. v. Whiting Roll-Up Door Manufacturing Corp.* 10:1051
- Snow, Robert F., *Platte River: Reservation and Quantification of Federal Reserved Water Rights - Firefighting & Administrative Purposes Only!* 11:411
- Sorell, Louis S., *Biotechnology Regulation Under the Toxic Substances Control Act* 3:57

Stein, Ralph Michael, <i>SLAPP Suits: A Slap at the First Amendment</i>	7:45
Stein, Rochel, <i>Grandfathering Under SEQRA: How to Determine Which Actions are Excluded from the Environmental Impact Statement Requirement</i>	1:214
Sterthous, Michael G., <i>Accommodating Growth and Development After Guilderland: Is the New York Legislature About to (Re)Act on Impact Fees?</i>	8:175
Stever, Jr., Donald W., <i>A Brief Essay on Inclusionary Zoning and Environmental Values</i>	4:155
Stever, Jr., Donald W., <i>Comparative American-Soviet Environmental Land Use Laws: An American View</i> ...	5:535
Stever, Jr., Donald W., <i>Litigating Against the Government for Fun and Profit? A Review of Recent Environmental Attorneys' Fee Decisions</i>	1:12
Stilo, Terri, <i>Failure to Warn of a Known Environmental Danger: Limits on United States Liability Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA)</i> ..	6:589
Takerka, Bruce, <i>Security and Innocence Under CERCLA: The Battle Against Confusion</i>	9:215
Teclaff, Ludwik A., <i>The River Basin Concept and Global Climate Change</i>	8:355
The Committee on Environmental Law of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, <i>Proposed Revision of New York CPLR § 5519(a)(1) to Assure Consistency with SEQRA</i>	1:28
Theis, Joseph G., <i>Wetlands Loss and Agriculture: The Failed Federal Regulations of Farming Activities Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act</i>	9:1
Thornton, Scott A., <i>Cumulative Impacts in Environmental Review: The New York Standpoint</i>	9:253
Timoshenko, Alexandre S., <i>Ecological Security: The International Aspect</i>	7:151

- Timoshenko, Alexandre S., *The Problem of Preventing Damage to the Environment in National and International Law: Impact Assessment and International Consultations* 5:475
- Timoshenko, Alexandre S., *Protection of Wetlands by International Law* 5:463
- Turchick, Peter A., *Supplemental Environmental Impact Statements: How Significant Should New Information Be?* 2:298
- Vanderhoef, C. Scott, *Aquifers: The Porous Legal State of a Primary Water Resource* 1:81
- Vinal, Robert W., *Enhancing Criminal Penalties for Catastrophic Discharges: Closing a Clean Water Act Loophole that a Leaking Supertanker Can Sail Through* 8:23
- Wagner, Amelia M., *United States v. Pollution Abatement Services of Oswego, Inc.: Expansion of Shareholder Corporate Officer Liability in a Closely-Held Corporation* 4:253
- Wagner, Karen L., *For Whom the Bell Tolls: Religious Properties as Landmarks Under the First Amendment* . 8:579
- Wamsley, Brian L., *Return to Vermont Yankee and the Foreclosure of Judicial Review of the NRC's Generic Rulemaking: Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. v. National Resources Defense Council* 1:200
- Ward, Vanessa & Greene, Nathanael, *Getting the Sticker Price Right: Incentives for Cleaner, More Efficient Vehicles* 12:91
- Waxmonsky, Dr. Gary, *U.S.-USSR Cooperation in Environmental Policy* 5:541
- Weinberg, Philip, *A Powerful Mandate: NEPA and State Environmental Review Act in the Courts* 5:1
- Weisberg, Daniel M., *Taking Out The Trash — Where Will We Put All This Garbage?* 10:925

Wenderoth, Stephen J., <i>The Summary Jury Trial and Toxic Tort Litigation</i>	6:565
Winslow, Stephen P., <i>Transplanting Emissions Trading to Interstate Areas: Will it Take Root?</i>	5:297
Wise, Steven M., <i>Of Farm Animals and Justice</i>	3:191

TABLE OF BOOK REVIEWS

Boschken, Herman L.: <i>Land Use Conflicts: Organizational Design and Resource Management</i> - (Nicholas A. Robinson)	1:97
Callies, David L.: <i>Regulating Paradise: Land Use Controls in Hawaii</i> - (Ralph Michael Stein)	3:115
Case, Fred E., & Gale, Jeffrey: <i>Environmental Impact Review and Housing: Process Lessons from the California Experience</i> - (Nicholas A. Robinson)	1:97
Croke, Kevin G., Swartzman, Daniel & Liroff, Richard A., eds.: <i>Cost-Benefit Analysis and Environmental Regulations: Politics, Ethics and Methods</i> - (Shari Chrimes)	1:229
Duerksin, Christopher J.: <i>Environmental Regulation of Industrial Plant Siting</i> - (Arthur E. Palmer)	3:297
Freedman, Warren: <i>Hazardous Waste Liability</i> - (M. Stuart Madden)	4:517
Gale, Jeffrey, & Case, Fred E.: <i>Environmental Impact Review and Housing: Process Lessons from the California Experience</i> - (Nicholas A. Robinson)	1:97
Gunn, Alastair S., & Vesilind, P. Aarne: <i>Environmental Ethics for Engineers</i> - (R.J. Piaggione) .	5:333
Hoffman, Abraham: <i>Vision or Villainy: Orgins of the Owens Valley-Los Angeles Water Controversy</i> - (James E. Coombs)	1:237
Lemire, Robert A.: <i>Creative Land Development: Bridge to the Future</i> - (Nicholas A. Robinson)	1:97
Leonard, H. Jeffrey: <i>Are Environmental Regulations Driving U.S. Industry Overseas?</i> - (Gary D. Cohen)....	2:166
Liroff, Richard A., Swartzman, Daniel & Croke, Kevin G., eds.: <i>Cost-Benefit Analysis and Environmental Regulations: Politics, Ethics and Methods</i> - (Shari Chrimes)	1:229
Palmer, Arthur E.: <i>Toward Eden</i> - (Nicholas A. Robinson)	1:97

Pawlick, Thomas: <i>A Killing Rain, The Global Threat of Acid Precipitation</i> - (Robert H. Boyle)	2:180
Robinson, Nicholas A., ed.: <i>New York Environmental Law Handbook</i> - (Daniel J. McMahon)	6:301
Swartzman, Daniel, Liroff, Richard A. & Croke, Kevin G., eds.: <i>Cost-Benefit Analysis and Environmental Regulations: Politics, Ethics, and Methods</i> - (Shari Chrimes)	1:229
Vietor, Richard H.K.: <i>Energy Policy in America Since 1945: A Study of Business-Government Relations</i> - (William R. Slye)	4:299

TABLE OF CASENOTES

<i>Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. EPA</i> , Warren J. Roth ..	7:271
<i>Asian Americans for Equality v. Koch</i> , Paul Xavier	
Lima	4:491
<i>Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. v. Whiting Roll-Up Door Manufacturing Corp.</i> , Matthew J. Smith ..	10:1051
<i>Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.</i> , Joanna Bowen	12:269
<i>Ayers v. Township of Jackson</i> , James F. O'Brien	5:257
<i>Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. v. National Resources Defense Council</i> , Brian L. Wamsley	1:200
<i>Bersani v. EPA</i> , Rosalie K. Rusinko	7:375
<i>Buttrey v. United States</i> , Robert R. Sappe	2:270
<i>Byram River v. Village of Port Chester</i> , Lois R. Murphy	1:63
<i>Colorado v. United States Dep't of the Army</i> , James M. Lenihan	8:621
<i>County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation</i> , Nina Dale	4:221
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow</i> , Roland A. Giroux	12:393
<i>Dow Chemical Co. v. United States</i> , Diane Rosenwasser Shalak	3:277
<i>Foundation on Economic Trends v. Heckler</i> , Elizabeth Pizzulli	2:138
<i>Hallstrom v. Tillamook County</i> , Karen P. Ryan	8:255
<i>In the Matter of the Amended Application of the United States of America for Reserved Water Rights in the Platte River</i> , Robert F. Snow	11:411
<i>Jackson v. New York State Urban Development Corp.</i> , Steven F. Meyer	5:279
<i>Japan Whaling Association v. American Cetacean Society</i> , Virginia A. Curry	4:277
<i>Juzwin v. Amtorg Trading Corp.</i> , David Lafferty	8:647

<i>Lefrancois v. Rhode Island</i> , Kathleen O'Neill	7:259
<i>Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council</i> , Cotton C. Harness, III	10:5
<i>Milwaukee v. Illinois</i> , Millicent Greenberg	1:50
<i>National Wildlife Federation v. Watt</i> , Michael Latini ..	2:100
<i>Norfolk Southern Corp. v. Oberly</i> , Carolyn Cunningham	4:439
<i>Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. State Energy Resources</i> , Marla B. Rubin.....	1:180
<i>Rubanick v. Witco Chemical Co.</i> and <i>Landrigan v. Celotex Corp.</i> , Alex R. DeSevo	10:423
<i>Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corp.</i> , Marcia H. Rimland	1:166
<i>Southern Burlington County NAACP v. Township of Mount Laurel</i> , John R. Nolon.....	4:3
<i>Taub v. State</i> , Lawrence Falkin	2:255
<i>United States v. Cherokee Nation</i> , Leanora A. Kovacs .	6:255
<i>United States v. County of Westchester</i> , Mark H. Henderson.....	2:83
<i>United States v. Johnson & Towers, Inc.</i> , Robert T. McGovern	2:316
<i>United States v. Pollution Abatement Systems of Oswego, Inc.</i> , Amelia M. Wagner	4:253
<i>United States v. Tull</i> , Richard S. Altman.....	4:473
<i>United States v. Waste Industries</i> , Paul L. Brozdowski	2:116
<i>Village of Ossining v. The Planning Board of the Town of Ossining</i> , Jane P. Builder	8:237
<i>Wedinger v. Goldberger</i> , William A. Conney	7:357
<i>Wisconsin Electric Power Co. v. Reilly</i> , Anne M. Skalyo	10:331

TOPICS INDEX

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT (APA)

- Pre-enforcement Review of Administrative Orders to Abate Environmental Hazards*, David Montgomery Moore 9:675

AGRICULTURE

- Biological Control Agents in Integrated Pest Management: Are They Regulated?*, Jamie C. Abrams . 8:89
- Ecological and Legal Problems of Agro-Chemicalization*, M.M. Brinchuk 7:171
- An Ounce of Prevention: The Need for Source Reduction in Agriculture*, L. Alenna Bolin 8:63
- Wetlands Loss and Agriculture: The Failed Federal Regulation of Farming Activities under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act*, Joseph G. Theis 9:1

ANIMAL RIGHTS

- The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Debate Over Sustainable Use*, John L. Garrison 12:301
- Falconry: Legal Ownership and Sale of Captive-Bred Raptors*, Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. 4:349
- Of Farm Animals and Justice*, Steven M. Wise 3:191
- Federal Regulation of Testing with Laboratory Animals: Future Directions*, Kinsey S. Reagan 3:165
- Laboratory Animal Act: A Legislative Proposal*, David Favre 3:123
- Statutory Protection for Farm Animals*, Richard F. McCarthy & Richard E. Bennett 3:229
- Taub v. State: Are State Anti-Cruelty Statutes Sleeping Giants?*, Lawrence Falkin 2:255
- What Rights for Animals? A Modest Proposal*, Roger W. Galvin 2:245

ATTORNEYS' FEES

- Attorney Fees: CERCLA Private Recovery Actions*,
Janet Morris Jones10:393
- Litigating Against the Government for Fun and Profit?*
A Review of Recent Environmental Attorneys' Fee
Decisions, Donald W. Stever, Jr..... 1:12

BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

- Preserving Biological Diversity in the United States:*
The Case for Moving to an Ecosystems Approach to
Protect the Nation's Biological Wealth, Julie B.
Bloch10:175
- Struggling to Protect Ecosystems and Biodiversity*
Under NEPA and NFMA: The Ancient Forests of the
Pacific Northwest and the Northern Spotted Owl, Jeb
Boyt 10:1009

BIOTECHNOLOGY

- Biotechnology Regulation Under the Toxic Substances*
Control Act, Louis S. Sorell..... 3:57
- Foundation on Economic Trends v. Heckler: Genetic*
Engineering and NEPA's EIS Requirement, Elizabeth
Pizzulli 2:138
- Looking for the Big Picture — Developing a*
Jurisprudence for a Biotechnological Age, Joan M.
Ferretti.....10:711
- Reassessing the Scope of Federal Biotechnology*
Oversight, Peter Mostow10:227

CLEAN AIR

- The Proposed Indoor Air Quality Acts of 1993: The*
Comprehensive Solution to a Far-Reaching Problem?,
Grace C. Guiffrida.....11:311

CLEAN AIR ACT

- Civil and Criminal Enforcement of the Clean Air Act After the 1990 Amendments*, James Miskiewicz & John S. Rudd 9:281
- Dow Chemical Co. v. United States: Aerial Surveillance and the Fourth Amendment*, Diane Rosenwasser Skalak 3:277
- The Hazy Future: Are State Attempts to Reduce Visibility Impairment in Class I Areas Caught Between Scylla and Charybdis? The Effects of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 on Visibility Protection*, David R. Everett 8:115
- Pre-enforcement Review of Administrative Orders to Abate Environmental Hazards*, David Montgomery Moore 9:675
- State Implementation Plans under the 1990 Clean Air Act: Can New York Conform?*, Catherine V. Greco 11:869
- Transplanting Emissions Trading to Interstate Areas: Will it Take Root?*, Stephen P. Winslow 5:297
- The WEPCO-“Fix”: Out of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co. v. Reilly Decision, and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, a Pro-Utility Solution Evolved*, Anne M. Skalyo 10:331

CLEAN WATER ACT

- Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.: The Second Circuit Affirms the NPDES Permit as a Shield and Tries to Sink the Clean Water Act*, Joanna Bowen 12:269
- Bersani v. EPA: Wetlands Protection - The EPA Veto Power Under the Clean Water Act*, Rosalie K. Rusinko 7:375
- Buttrey v. United States: The Meaning of “Public Hearings” Under Section 404*, Robert R. Sappe 2:270
- Byram River v. Village of Port Chester: Winning is Not Enough*, Lois R. Murphy 1:63

<i>Enhancing Criminal Penalties for Catastrophic Discharges: Closing a Clean Water Act Loophole that a Leaking Supertanker Can Sail Through</i> , Robert W. Vinal	8:23
<i>Greater Public Participation in the Enforcement of the Clean Water Act</i> , John Bliss	9:753
<i>Pre-enforcement Review of Administrative Orders to Abate Environmental Hazards</i> , David Montgomery Moore	9:675
<i>Restoring the Nation's Wetlands: Can the Clean Water Act's Dredge And Fill Guidelines Do the Job?</i> , Joan M. Ferretti.....	1:105
<i>United States v. Tull: A Polluter's Right to a Jury Trial</i> , Richard S. Altman	4:473
<i>Wetlands Loss and Agriculture: The Failed Federal Regulation of Farming Activities under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act</i> , Joseph G. Theis	9:1
COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE COMPENSATION AND LIABILITY ACT	
<i>The CERCLA's Daily Penalty and Treble Damages Provisions: Is Any Cause "Sufficient Cause" to Disobey an EPA Order?</i> , Patricia Lindauer.....	11:657
<i>Enforcement of the Statutes Governing Disposal and Cleanup of Hazardous Wastes</i> , Carol E. Dinkins	1:1
<i>Illegal Drug Laboratories: A Growing Health and Toxic Waste Problem</i> , Geraldine Gardner	7:193
<i>Pre-enforcement Review of Administrative Orders to Abate Environmental Hazards</i> , David Montgomery Moore	9:675
<i>RCRA versus CERCLA: The Clash of the Titans in Colorado v. United States Department of the Army</i> , James M. Lenihan	8:621
<i>A Ride on the Environmental Liability Roller Coaster</i> , Brian S.B. Lee	12:445

- Security and Innocence Under CERCLA: The Battle Against Confusion*, Bruce Taterka 9:215
- State Liability Under CERCLA for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal: Preparing for the Inevitable*, Cheryl Kessler Clark 11:587
- Superfund and the Hazardous Waste Site Next Door: Can Citizens Clean it Up?*, Andrea L. Bull 6:643
- "Superfund" — An Answer to State Court Holdings that Government-Mandated Cleanup Costs Constitute "Damages" Under Comprehensive General Liability Policies*, Lynn M. Kuchta 9:187
- United States v. Pollution Abatement Services of Oswego, Inc.: Expansion of Shareholder Corporate Officer Liability In a Closely-Held Corporation*, Amelia M. Wagner 4:253
- United States v. Waste Industries: Federal Common Law and Imminent Hazards*, Paul L. Brozdowski 2:116
- see also* Sixth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

- Does Garbage Have Standing?: Democracy, Flow Control and a Principled Constitutional Approach to Municipal Solid Waste Management*, Michael Diederich, Jr. 11:157
- Dow Chemical Co. v. United States: Aerial Surveillance and the Fourth Amendment*, Diane Rosenwasser Skalak 3:277
- For Whom the Bell Tolls: Religious Properties as Landmarks Under the First Amendment*, Karen L. Wagner 8:579
- LeFrancois v. Rhode Island: A Case in Which the Leaf Falls Very Far from the Tree*, Kathleen O'Neill 7:259
- National Wildlife Federation v. Watt: The Property Clause and the Legislative Veto*, Michael Latini 2:100

The Rhetoric of Public Expectation: An Enquiry into the Concepts of Responsiveness and Responsibility Under the Environmental Laws, Gerald M. Levine 8:389

SLAPP Suits: A Slap at the First Amendment, Ralph Michael Stein 7:45

Taking Out The Trash — Where Will We Put All This Garbage?, Daniel M. Weisberg 10:925

United States v. Tull: A Polluter's Right to a Jury Trial, Richard S. Altman 4:473

see also Fifth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

DUE DILIGENCE PROPERTY TRANSFERS

ECRA Verdict: The Successes and Failures of the Premiere Transaction-Triggered Environmental Law, David B. Farer 5:113

The Impact of Environmental Liabilities on Real Estate Contract Negotiations, Gail V. Karlsson 8:37

EMERGENCY PLANNING AND COMMUNITY RIGHT-TO-KNOW ACT

A Closer Look at Title III of SARA: Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986, Jayne S.A. Pritchard 6:203

Illegal Drug Laboratories: A Growing Health and Toxic Waste Problem, Geraldine Gardner 7:193

"Thou Shalt Not Violate!": Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act Authorizes Citizen Suits For Wholly Past Violations — Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. v. Whiting Roll-Up Door Manufacturing Corp., Matthew J. Smith 10:1051

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Debate Over Sustainable Use, John L. Garrison 12:301

<i>Legal Protection of Plants in the United States</i> , Faith Campbell	6:1
<i>Of Razorbacks and Reservoirs: The Endangered Species Act's Protection of Endangered Colorado River Basin Fish</i> , James H. Bolin, Jr.	11:35
<i>Struggling to Protect Ecosystems and Biodiversity Under NEPA and NFMA: The Ancient Forests of the Pacific Northwest and the Northern Spotted Owl</i> , Jeb Boyt	10:1009

ENERGY LAW AND POLICY

<i>After a Decade: "Theory as Practice" at the Center for Environmental Legal Studies</i> , Nicholas A. Robinson...	11:3
<i>Conflict in Implementing Environmental and Energy Policies</i> , G.S. Peter Bergen	1:123
<i>Developing and Producing Coalbed Gas: Ownership, Regulation, and Environmental Concerns</i> , Harry Cohen	2:1
<i>Energy and Environmental Challenges for Developed and Developing Countries: Keynote Address Presented at the 1991 United Nations Meeting on Energy and Environment in the Development Process</i> , Hon. Richard L. Ottinger	9:55
<i>Least-Cost Utility Planning and Demand-Side Management: A Bibliography</i> , Hon. Richard L. Ottinger, Susan E. Babb, Elizabeth Barbanes & Carol Padron	6:79
<i>Pacific Gas & Electric: Opening the Door to State Regulation in the Nuclear Field</i> , Marla B. Rubin	1:180

ENFORCEMENT

Citizen Enforcement

<i>Consent Decrees and the EPA: Are They Really Enforceable Against the Agency?</i> , Marina T. Larson	1:147
--	-------

Hallstrom v. Tillamook County: *Interpreting the Notice Provisions of Environmental Statutes*, Karen P. Ryan 8:255

Superfund and the Hazardous Waste Site Next Door: Can Citizens Clean it Up?, Andrea L. Bull .. 6:643

Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act

see Second Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

Clean Water Act

Atlantic States Legal Foundation, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.: *The Second Circuit Affirms the NPDES Permit as a Shield and Tries to Sink the Clean Water Act*, Joanna Bowen 12:269

Greater Public Participation in the Enforcement of the Clean Water Act, John Bliss 9:753

see First Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

National Environmental Policy Act

see Fourth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

Applying A Strict Limitations Period To RCRA Enforcement: A Toxic Concept With Hazardous Results?, Timothy E. Shanley 10:275

Civil Enforcement

Civil and Criminal Enforcement of the Clean Air Act After the 1990 Amendments, James Miskiewicz & John S. Rudd 9:281

Pre-enforcement Review of Administrative Orders to Abate Environmental Hazards, David Montgomery Moore 9:675

Criminal Enforcement

Civil and Criminal Enforcement of the Clean Air Act After the 1990 Amendments, James Miskiewicz & John S. Rudd 9:281

Enhancing Criminal Penalties for Catastrophic Discharges: Closing a Clean Water Act Loophole that a Leaking Supertanker Can Sail Through, Robert W. Vinal 8:23

Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine

United States v. Johnson & Towers, Inc.: Corporate Employee Criminal Liability Under RCRA, Robert T. McGovern 2:316

see also Third Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Consent Decrees and the EPA: Are They Really Enforceable Against the Agency?, Marina T. Larson ... 1:147

Pre-enforcement Review of Administrative Orders to Abate Environmental Hazards, David Montgomery Moore 9:675

ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS

Ethical Issues in the Practice of Environmental Law, John French, III 2:66

Thoughts on Environmental Rights and Ownership, Robert F. Kennedy, Jr. 11:11

ENVIRONMENTAL INSURANCE

A Ride on the Environmental Liability Roller Coaster, Brian S.B. Lee 12:445

"Superiorfund" — An Answer to State Court Holdings that Government-Mandated Cleanup Costs Constitute "Damages" Under Comprehensive General Liability Policies, Lynn M. Kuchta 9:187

ENVIRONMENTAL TAX

The Btu Tax Experience: What Happened and Why It Happened, Dawn Erlandson 12:173

The Case for State Pollution Taxes, Richard L. Ottinger & William B. Moore 12:103

Evaluating Existing State and Local Tax Codes from an "Environmental Tax" Perspective: The Case of Energy-Related Taxes, Joe Loper 12:61

Getting the Sticker Price Right: Incentives for Cleaner, More Efficient Vehicles, Nathanael Greene & Vanessa Ward 12:91

Green Fees and the Need for Fiscal Restructuring: Opportunities and Challenges, Roger C. Dower & Robert Repetto 12:161

Greening State Energy Taxes: Carbon Taxes for Revenue and the Environment, Frank Muller & J. Andrew Hoerner 12:5

The Political Economy of Energy Taxes: An Assessment of the Opportunities and Obstacles, Henry Lee 12:77

Pollution Taxes for Roadway Transportation, Charles Komanoff 12:121

FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT

FIFRA Lite: A Regulatory Solution or Part of the Pesticide Problem?, Pamela A. Finegan 6:615

FEDERAL LAND POLICY MANAGEMENT ACT

National Wildlife Federation v. Watt: The Property Clause and the Legislative Veto, Michael Latini 2:100

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

Failure to Warn of a Known Environmental Danger: Limits on United States Liability Under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA), Terri Stilo 6:589

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT (FWPCA)

See CLEAN WATER ACT

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. v. EPA: EPA's Need to Protect its Confidential Sources Versus Its Duty to Disclose Under the Freedom of Information Act, Warren J. Roth 7:271

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The International Struggle to Save the Ozone Layer, Louis P. Oliva 7:213

The River Basin Concept and Global Climate Change, Ludwik A. Teclaff 8:355

HABITAT PROTECTION

An Analysis of Municipal Wetlands Laws and Their Relationship to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar), Cheryl L. Jamieson 4:177

Bersani v. EPA: Wetlands Protection - The EPA Veto Power Under the Clean Water Act, Rosalie K. Rusinko 7:375

Federal Wetlands Regulatory Policy: Up to Its Ears in Alligators, Hope Babcock 8:307

Protection of the Everglades Ecosystem: A Legal Analysis, Cheryl Lynn Jamieson 6:23

Protection of Wetlands by International Law, Alexandre S. Timoshenko 5:463

Restoring the Nation's Wetlands: Can the Clean Water Act's Dredge And Fill Guidelines Do the Job?, Joan M. Ferretti 1:105

The United States Claims Court: A Safe "Harbor" from Government Regulation of Privately Owned Wetlands, Patrick Kennedy 9:723

<i>Wedinger v. Goldberger: A Victory for Freshwater Wetlands</i> , William A. Cooney	7:357
<i>Wetlands: Federal Law and National Policy Research Guide</i> , Christine J. McCulloch	5:167
<i>Wetlands Loss and Agriculture: The Failed Federal Regulation of Farming Activities under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act</i> , Joseph G. Theis	9:1

HAZARDOUS WASTES

<i>Enforcement of the Statutes Governing Disposal and Cleanup of Hazardous Wastes</i> , Carol E. Dinkins	1:1
<i>Hazardous Waste Management After Shell Oil</i> , Lori L. Caramanian	11:265
<i>Superfund and the Hazardous Waste Site Next Door: Can Citizens Clean it Up?</i> , Andrea L. Bull	6:643
<i>see also</i> Fifth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs	

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

<i>For Whom the Bell Tolls: Religious Properties as Landmarks Under the First Amendment</i> , Karen L. Wagner	8:579
---	-------

IMPACT FEES

<i>Accommodating Growth and Development After Guilderland: Is the New York Legislature About to (Re)Act on Impact Fees?</i> , Michael G. Sterthous	8:175
<i>A Perspective: New York Communities and Impact Fees</i> , Bernard V. Keenan	7:329

INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND POLICY

<i>After a Decade: "Theory as Practice" at the Center for Environmental Legal Studies</i> , Nicholas A. Robinson...	11:3
<i>Answering "The Call of the Wild": An Examination of U.S. Participation in International Wildlife Law</i> , Gary D. Meyers & Kyla S. Bennett	7:75

- Comparative American-Soviet Environmental Land Use Laws: A Soviet View*, Mikhail Galyatin 5:531
- Comparative American-Soviet Environmental Land Use Laws: An American View*, Donald W. Stever, Jr. 5:535
- The Development of Environmental Policies in the United States and the Soviet Union*, Marshall I. Goldman 5:455
- Ecological and Legal Problems of Agro-Chemicalization*, M.M. Brinchuk 7:171
- Ecological Security: The International Aspect*, Alexandre S. Timoshenko 7:151
- Environmental Law Administration and Policy in the USSR*, Oleg S. Kolbasov 5:439
- The International Struggle to Save the Ozone Layer*, Louis P. Oliva 7:213
- Issues Related to Legal Protection of Wild Plants*, Aida Bagratovna Iskoyan 5:519
- Japan Whaling Association v. American Cetacean Society: The Great Whales Become Casualties of the Trade Wars*, Virginia A. Curry 4:277
- Law Reform in Soviet Environmental Law*, W.E. Butler 5:425
- Legal Protection of Land in the USSR*, I.A. Iconitskaya 7:161
- Modern Ecological Policy and the Utilization of a Global Environmental Protection Strategy*, Oleg S. Kolbasov 5:445
- NAFTA: A Catalyst for Environmental Change in Mexico*, Michael D. Madnick 11:365
- New Aspects in the Structure and Jurisdiction of COMECON Regarding the Protection of the Environment*, A.V. Leont'eva 7:179
- Nuclear Energy and Environmental Protection: Responses of International Law*, Elena Molodstova ... 12:185

<i>Perestroika and Priroda: Environmental Protection in the USSR</i> , Nicholas A. Robinson	5:351
<i>The Problem of Preventing Damage to the Environment in National and International Law: Impact Assessment and International Consultations</i> , Alexandre S. Timoshenko	5:475
<i>Protection of Wetlands by International Law</i> , Alexandre S. Timoshenko	5:463
<i>Public Participation in Soviet Environmental Policy</i> , J. William Futrell.....	5:487
<i>Soviet Environmental Protection: The Challenge for Legal Studies</i> , Nicholas A. Robinson.....	7:117
<i>Tourism and Environmental Protection</i> , O.B. Romanova	7:185
<i>Toward a Recognition of the Rights of Non-States in International Environmental Law</i> , David Scott Rubinton	9:475
<i>U.S.-USSR Cooperation in Environmental Policy</i> , Dr. Gary Waxmonsky	5:541

LAND USE

<i>The 42nd Street Development Project: How Litigation Obstructs Public Goals</i> , Eric J. Lobenfeld	7:347
<i>Asian Americans for Equality v. Koch: The Battle Over Affordable Housing</i> , Paul Xavier Lima	4:491
<i>Berenson: An Obligation Undefined is an Obligation Unfulfilled</i> , George M. Raymond	4:131
<i>A Brief Essay on Inclusionary Zoning and Environmental Values</i> , Donald W. Stever, Jr.	4:155
<i>Comparative American-Soviet Environmental Land Use Laws: A Soviet View</i> , Mikhail Galyatin	5:531
<i>Comparative American-Soviet Environmental Land Use Laws: An American View</i> , Donald W. Stever, Jr.	5:535

<i>A Comparative Analysis of New Jersey's Mount Laurel Cases with the Berenson Cases in New York</i> , John R. Nolon.....	4:3
<i>Determining "Takings" Under Coastal Zone Management Programs in New York and Connecticut</i> , Steven Chananie	1:91
<i>Environmentally Based Land Use Planning and Regulation</i> , Arthur E. Palmer	2:25
<i>The Erosion of Home Rule Through the Emergence of State-Interests in Land Use Control</i> , John R. Nolon ..	10:497
<i>In Accordance with a Comprehensive Plan, The Need for Planning Consistency in New York State</i> , Peter O. Eschweiler	10:603
<i>Land Use & The Protection of Drinking Water Supplies</i> , Sarah J. Meyland	10:563
<i>Land Use Law in New York State: Playing "Hide & SEQRA" with the Elusive Comprehensive Plan</i> , Robert Crespi	11:835
<i>Norfolk Southern Corp. v. Oberly: Coastal Protection Wins in Delaware</i> , Carolyn Cunningham	4:439
<i>Potential Legal Standards for Resolving the R.S. 2477 Right of Way Crisis</i> , Harry R. Bader	11:485
<i>Securing a Right to View: Broadening the Scope of Negative Easements</i> , Tara J. Foster	6:269
<i>The Tortured Reality of Suburban Exclusion: Zoning, Economics, and the Future of the Berenson Doctrine</i> , Alan Mallach	4:37
<i>Toward a Housing Imperative and Other Reflections on Balanced Growth and Development</i> , John R. Nolon....	7:319
<i>Zoning in the Fourth Dimension</i> , Peter Goodman	3:75
MEDICAL WASTE	
<i>Regulation of Medical Waste in the United States</i> , Laura Carlan Battle.....	11:517

MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

<i>Alternatives to Ocean Dumping: A Municipal Dilemma,</i> Gina L. Giusti & Nancy J. Grasso	6:157
<i>Does Garbage Have Standing?: Democracy, Flow Control and a Principled Constitutional Approach to Municipal Solid Waste Management,</i> Michael Diederich, Jr.....	11:157
<i>Ocean Dumping: An Old Problem Continues,</i> Martin G. Anderson	1:37
<i>Taking Out The Trash — Where Will We Put All This Garbage?,</i> Daniel M. Weisberg	10:925

**PACE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW MOOT
COURT COMPETITION**

**First Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1988-1989**

Judges' Memorandum	6:343
--------------------------	-------

Winning Briefs

Hastings College of the Law, University of California, Appellant	6:355
Arizona State University College of Law, Appellee	6:393
Arizona State University College of Law, Intervenor	6:423

**Second Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1989-1990**

Judges' Memorandum	7:411
--------------------------	-------

Winning Briefs

Southern Illinois University School of Law, Appellant	7:433
Santa Clara University School of Law, Appellee	7:471
Vermont Law School, Intervenor	7:509

**Third Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1990-1991**

Confidential Judges' Bench Brief..... 8:445

Winning Briefs

Western New England College School of Law,
Appellant 8:475

Vermont Law School, Appellant 8:513

Arizona State University College of Law,
Appellee 8:549

**Fourth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1991-1992**

Confidential Judges' Bench Brief..... 9:505

Winning Briefs

University of Akron School of Law,
Appellant 9:561

Vermont Law School, Appellee..... 9:591

University of Tennessee College of Law,
Appellee 9:639

**Fifth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1992-1993**

Confidential Judges' Bench Brief..... 10:759

Winning Briefs

Widener University School of Law,
Appellant 10:807

Santa Clara University School of Law,
Appellant 10:845

George Mason University School of Law,
Appellee 10:879

**Sixth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1993-1994**

Judges' Bench Brief 11:683

Winning Briefs

Detroit College of Law, Appellee 11:725

University of Baltimore School of Law,
Appellant 11:759

Brooklyn Law School, Appellee 11:787

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

*Broad Programmatic, Policy and Planning Assessments
Under the National Environmental Policy Act and
Similar Devices: A Quiet Revolution in an Approach to
Environmental Considerations*, Jon C. Cooper 11:89

*Foundation on Economic Trends v. Heckler: Genetic
Engineering and NEPA's EIS Requirement*, Elizabeth
Pizzulli 2:138

*The Implementation of the EC Directive on
Environmental Impact Assessments with the English
Planning System: A Refinement of the NEPA Process*,
Louis L. Bono 9:155

*NEPA and the Next America: Designing Our Transition
to Global Sustainability*, Andrew Euston 7:289

*A Powerful Mandate: NEPA and State Environmental
Review Acts in the Courts*, Philip Weinberg 5:1

*Struggling to Protect Ecosystems and Biodiversity
Under NEPA and NFMA: The Ancient Forests of the
Pacific Northwest and the Northern Spotted Owl*, Jeb
Boyt 10:1009

see also Fourth Annual Pace National Environmental Law
Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT ACT

*Struggling to Protect Ecosystems and Biodiversity
Under NEPA and NFMA: The Ancient Forests of the
Pacific Northwest and the Northern Spotted Owl*, Jeb
Boyt 10:1009

NATIVE AMERICANS

- County of Oneida v. Oneida Indian Nation: *The Continuing Saga of American Indian Territorial Wars*, Nina Dale 4:221
- United States v. Cherokee Nation - *Indian Water Rights: Giving With One Hand and Taking With the Other*, Leanora A. Kovacs 6:255

NATURAL RESOURCES

- Natural Resource Damages: A Research Guide*, David Hodas 9:107
- see also Second Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

NEW JERSEY

- ECRA Verdict: The Successes and Failures of the Premiere Transaction-Triggered Environmental Law*, David B. Farer 5:113

NEW YORK

New York City

- The 42nd Street Development Project: How Litigation Obstructs Public Goals*, Eric J. Lobenfeld 7:347
- The Environmental Review Process in the City of New York: CEQR*, J. Kevin Healy 5:93
- The New York City Water Supply System - An Assessment*, Maurice Hinchey 5:149

New York State Constitution

- The Reunion of Great Camp: The Sagamore Amendments to the N.Y. Constitution*, James A. Economides 3:29

New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA)

- Cumulative Impacts in Environmental Review: The New York Standpoint*, Scott A. Thornton 9:253

<i>DEC's Part 617 Regulations, As Amended: A Guide to the Implementation of SEQRA</i> , Peter R. Paden .	5:51
<i>Grandfathering Under SEQRA: How to Determine Which Actions are Excluded from the Environmental Impact Statement Requirement</i> , Rochel Stein	1:214
<i>Greater Public Participation in the Enforcement of the Clean Water Act</i> , John Bliss	9:753
<i>Jackson v. New York State Urban Development Corporation: Standard of Review for Sufficiency of Environmental Impact Statements</i> , Steven F. Meyer	5:279
<i>New York's SEQRA in the Courts</i> , Gail Bowers ...	5:25
<i>Proposed Revision of New York CPLR § 5519(a)(1) to Assure Consistency with SEQRA</i> , The Committee on Environmental Law of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York ...	1:28
<i>Supplemental Environmental Impact Statements: How Significant Should New Information Be?</i> , Peter A. Turchick	2:298
<i>Village of Ossining v. The Planning Board of the Town of Ossining: When SEQRA Leaves No Alternative But to Study the Alternative</i> , Jane P. Builder.....	8:237

NOISE POLLUTION

<i>United States v. County of Westchester: Invalidation of an Airport Curfew</i> , Mark H. Henderson	2:83
--	------

NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT (NAFTA)

<i>NAFTA: A Catalyst for Environmental Change in Mexico</i> , Michael D. Madnick	11:365
--	--------

NOTICE

<i>Hallstrom v. Tillamook County: Interpreting the Notice Provisions of Environmental Statutes</i> , Karen P. Ryan .	8:255
--	-------

OCEAN DUMPING

- Alternatives to Ocean Dumping: A Municipal Dilemma*,
Gina L. Giusti & Nancy J. Grasso 6:157
- Ocean Dumping: An Old Problem Continues*, Martin G.
Anderson 1:37

OIL POLLUTION ACT OF 1990

- The Oil Pollution Act of 1990*, Paul S. Edelman 8:1

PESTICIDES

- Biological Control Agents in Integrated Pest
Management: Are They Regulated?*, Jamie C. Abrams . 8:89
- FIFRA Lite: A Regulatory Solution or Part of the
Pesticide Problem?*, Pamela A. Finegan 6:615
- An Ounce of Prevention: The Need for Source Reduction
in Agriculture*, L. Alenna Bolin 8:63

POLLUTION PREVENTION

- An Ounce of Prevention: The Need for Source Reduction
in Agriculture*, L. Alenna Bolin 8:63

PUBLIC LANDS

- National Wildlife Federation v. Watt: The Property Clause
and the Legislative Veto*, Michael Latini, Vol. 2, No. 1, p.
100.

- The Reunion of Great Camp: The Sagamore
Amendments to the N.Y. Constitution*, James A.
Economides 3:29

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

- Greater Public Participation in the Enforcement of the
Clean Water Act*, John Bliss 9:753
- Hearing Reports Under the Environmental
Conservation Law: Their Function, Preparation, and
Importance*, Daniel A. Ruzow & J. Langdon Marsh 2:191
- Public Participation in Soviet Environmental Policy*, J.
William Futrell 5:487

<i>The Right to Participate in Decisions that Affect the Environment</i> , Neil A.F. Popovic	10:683
--	--------

PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE

<i>Public Rights in the Navigable Streams of New York</i> , John A. Humbach	6:461
---	-------

RESEARCH GUIDES

<i>Biological Control Agents in Integrated Pest Management: Are They Regulated?</i> , Jamie C. Abrams .	8:89
<i>Natural Resource Damages: A Research Guide</i> , David Hodas	9:107
<i>Wetlands: Federal Law and National Policy Research Guide</i> , Christine J. McCulloch.....	5:167

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT

<i>Applying A Strict Limitations Period To RCRA Enforcement: A Toxic Concept With Hazardous Results?</i> , Timothy E. Shanley	10:275
<i>Enforcement of the Statutes Governing Disposal and Cleanup of Hazardous Wastes</i> , Carol E. Dinkins	1:1
<i>Hazardous Waste Management After Shell Oil</i> , Lori L. Caramanian	11:265
<i>Illegal Drug Laboratories: A Growing Health and Toxic Waste Problem</i> , Geraldine Gardner	7:193
<i>Legal Protection of the Environment from Pollution by Dangerous Industrial Wastes</i> , M.M. Brinchuk	5:509
<i>Pre-enforcement Review of Administrative Orders to Abate Environmental Hazards</i> , David Montgomery Moore	9:675
<i>RCRA versus CERCLA: The Clash of the Titans in Colorado v. United States Department of the Army</i> , James M. Lenihan	8:621

- Strengthening of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act in 1984: The Original Loopholes, the Amendments and the Political Factors Behind Their Passage*, Hon. Richard L. Ottinger 3:1
- Taking Out The Trash — Where Will We Put All This Garbage?*, Daniel M. Weisberg10:925
- United States v. Johnson & Towers, Inc.: Corporate Employee Criminal Liability Under RCRA*, Robert T. McGovern2:316
- United States v. Waste Industries: Federal Common Law and Imminent Hazards*, Paul L. Brozdowski2:116
- see also* Third Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition — Winning Briefs

SPEECHES

- Energy and Environmental Challenges for Developed and Developing Countries: Keynote Address Presented at the 1991 United Nations Meeting on Energy and Environment in the Development Process*, Hon. Richard L. Ottinger 9:55
- Remarks by Governor Mario Cuomo, Pace Law School Graduation Address: Commencement 1989*, Mario Cuomo 7:1
- Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation (SLAPP) Address*, Robert Abrams 7:33
- Thoughts on Environmental Rights and Ownership*, Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.11:11

STRATEGIC LAWSUITS AGAINST PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (SLAPP SUITS)

- Les Mains Sales: The Ethical and Political Implications of SLAPP Suits*, Richard O. Brooks 7:61
- The SLAPP from a Sociological Perspective*, Penelope Canan, Ph.D. 7:23
- SLAPP Suits: A Slap at the First Amendment*, Ralph Michael Stein 7:45

<i>SLAPPs: Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation</i> , George W. Pring	7:3
<i>Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation (SLAPP) Address</i> , Robert Abrams	7:33

TAKINGS

<i>Determining "Takings" Under Coastal Zone Management Programs in New York and Connecticut</i> , Steven Chananie	1:91
<i>Economic Due Process and the Takings Clause</i> , John A. Humbach	4:311
<i>Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council: Its Historical Context and Shifting Constitutional Principles</i> , Cotton C. Harness, III	10:5
<i>New Developments in Federal Takings Law</i> , Eugene J. Morris	7:309
<i>Private Property Investment, Lucas and the Fairness Doctrine</i> , John R. Nolon	10:43
<i>Takings Law in Light of Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council</i> , Judith M. LaBelle	10:73
<i>What Is Behind the "Property Rights" Debate?</i> , John A. Humbach	10:21

TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT

<i>Biotechnology Regulation Under the Toxic Substances Control Act</i> , Louis S. Sorell	3:57
<i>Illegal Drug Laboratories: A Growing Health and Toxic Waste Problem</i> , Geraldine Gardner	7:193

TOXIC TORT LITIGATION

<i>American Toxic Tort Law: An Historical Background, 1979-87</i> , Robert F. Blomquist	10:85
<i>The Asbestos Dragon: The Ramifications of Creative Judicial Management of Asbestos Cases</i> , Valle Simms Dutcher	10:955

- Ayers v. Township of Jackson: Damages for Enhanced Risk of Future Disease*, James F. O'Brien 5:257
- Daubert v. Merrell Dow: Is This Just What the EMF Doctor Ordered?*, Giroux, Roland A., 12:393
- Judicial Scrutiny of Expert Testimony in Environmental Tort Litigation*, Alani Golanski 9:399
- Juzwin v. Amtorg Trading Corp.: Multiple Assessments of Punitive Damages in Toxic Tort Litigation*, David Lafferty 8:647
- Rubanick v. Witco Chemical Corp. and Landrigan v. Celotex Corp., The Admissibility of Expert Testimony in Toxic Tort Litigation*, Alex R. DeSevo 10:423
- Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corp.: Federal Regulatory Scheme in Nuclear Industry Does Not Preclude Application of State Tort Law*, Marcia H. Rimland 1:166
- The Summary Jury Trial and Toxic Tort Litigation*, Stephen J. Wenderoth 6:565
- The Uncertain Future of the Class Action Suit in School Asbestos Litigation*, Joseph M. Pastore, III 8:667

UTILITY REGULATION

- Least-Cost Utility Planning and Demand-Side Management: A Bibliography*, Hon. Richard L. Ottinger, Susan E. Babb, Elizabeth Barbanes & Carol Padron 6:79
- Pacific Gas & Electric: Opening the Door to State Regulation in the Nuclear Field*, Marla B. Rubin 1:180
- Return to Vermont Yankee and the Foreclosure of Judicial Review of the NRC's Generic Rulemaking: Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. v. Natural Resources Defense Council*, Brian L. Wamsley 1:200
- Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corp.: Federal Regulatory Scheme in Nuclear Industry Does Not Preclude Application of State Tort Law*, Marcia H. Rimland 1:166

WATER RESOURCES

Land Use & The Protection of Drinking Water Supplies, Sarah J. Meyland10:563

Milwaukee v. Illinois: An Interstate Water Pollution Dispute, Millicent Greenberg 1:50

The New York City Water Supply System - An Assessment, Maurice Hinchey5:149

Allocation

Platte River: Reservation and Quantification of Federal Reserved Water Rights - Firefighting & Administrative Purposes Only!, Robert F. Snow ..11:411

United States v. Cherokee Nation - Indian Water Rights: Giving With One Hand and Taking With the Other, Leanora A. Kovacs 6:255

Groundwater Protection

Aquifers: The Porous Legal State of a Primary Water Resource, C. Scott Vanderhoef..... 1:81

Groundwater Pollution Control: A National Aim, A Regional Strategy, Sheila F. Anthony 2:215

WETLANDS

An Analysis of Municipal Wetlands Laws and Their Relationship to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar), Cheryl L. Jamieson 4:177

Bersani v. EPA: Wetlands Protection - The EPA Veto Power Under the Clean Water Act, Rosalie K. Rusinko 7:375

Federal Wetlands Regulatory Policy: Up to Its Ears in Alligators, Hope Babcock 8:307

Protection of Wetlands by International Law, Alexandre S. Timoshenko 5:463

Restoring the Nation's Wetlands: Can the Clean Water Act's Dredge And Fill Guidelines Do the Job?, Joan M. Ferretti..... 1:105

- The United States Claims Court: A Safe "Harbor" from Government Regulation of Privately Owned Wetlands*, Patrick Kennedy 9:723
- Wedinger v. Goldberger: A Victory for Freshwater Wetlands*, William A. Cooney 7:357
- Wetlands: Federal Law and National Policy Research Guide*, Christine J. McCulloch 5:167
- Wetlands Loss and Agriculture: The Failed Federal Regulation of Farming Activities under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act*, Joseph G. Theis 9:1

WILDLIFE REGULATION

- Answering "The Call of the Wild": An Examination of U.S. Participation in International Wildlife Law*, Gary D. Meyers & Kyla S. Bennett 7:75
- The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Debate Over Sustainable Use*, John L. Garrison 12:301
- Japan Whaling Association v. American Cetacean Society: The Great Whales Become Casualties of the Trade Wars*, Virginia A. Curry 4:277
- Modernizing Animal Law: The Case for Wildlife*, Walter E. Bickford 3:257
- Whose Wildlife Is It Anyway? How New York's Fish and Game Statutes, Regulations and Policies Endanger the Environment and Have Disenfranchised the Majority of the Electorate*, Jolene R. Marion 4:401

*TABLE OF PACE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW
MOOT COURT COMPETITION PUBLICATIONS*

**First Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1988-1989**

- a. Introduction, Jeffrey G. Miller, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 325;
- b. Winning Briefs, Vol. 6, No. 2.
 - 1. Appellant, Hastings College of the Law, University of California, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 355;
 - 2. Appellee, Arizona State University College of Law, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 393; and
 - 3. Intervenor, Arizona State University College of Law, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 423;
- c. Judges' Memorandum, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 343;
- d. Order, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 333; and
- e. List of Judges and Participants, Vol. 6, No. 2, p. 329.

**Second Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1989-1990**

- a. Winning Briefs, Vol. 7, No. 2,
 - 1. Appellant, Southern Illinois University School of Law, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 433;
 - 2. Appellee, Santa Clara University School of Law, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 471; and
 - 3. Intervenor, Vermont Law School, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 509;
- b. Judges' Memorandum, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 411;
- c. Background Order, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 543; and
- d. List of Judges and Participants, Vol. 7, No. 2, p. 405.

**Third Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1990-1991**

- a. Winning Briefs, Vol. 8, No. 2,
 - 1. Appellant, Western New England College School of Law, Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 475;

2. Appellant, Vermont Law School, Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 513; and
3. Appellee, Arizona State University College of Law, Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 549;
- b. Confidential Judges' Bench Brief, Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 445; and
- c. List of Judges and Participants, Vol. 8, No. 2, p. 435.

Fourth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition, 1991-1992

- a. Winning Briefs, Vol. 9, No. 2,
 1. Appellant, University of Akron School of Law, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 561;
 2. Appellee, Vermont Law School, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 591; and
 3. Appellee, University of Tennessee College of Law, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 639;
- b. Confidential Judges' Bench Brief, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 505; and
- c. List of Judges and Participants, Vol. 9, No. 2, p. 496.

Fifth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot Court Competition, 1992-1993

- a. Winning Briefs, Vol. 10, No. 2,
 1. Appellant, Widener University School of Law, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 807.
 2. Appellant, Santa Clara University School of Law, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 845.
 3. Appellee, George Mason University School of Law, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 879.
- b. Confidential Judges' Bench Brief, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 759.
- c. List of Judges and Participants, Vol. 10, No. 2, p. 921.

Sixth Annual Pace National Environmental Law Moot
Court Competition, 1993-1994

- a. Winning Briefs, Vol. 11, No. 2,
 - 1. Appellant, Detroit College of Law, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 725.
 - 2. Appellant, University of Baltimore School of Law, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 759.
 - 3. Appellee, Brooklyn Law School, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 787.
- b. Confidential Judges' Bench Brief, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 683.
- c. List of Judges and Participants, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 675.