

Table of Contents

Volume 15

CHAPTER 1. ORIGINS OF THE ACT

- § 1:1 Introduction
- § 1:2 Brief summary of CEPA
- § 1:3 The Connecticut Environmental Policy Act distinguished
- § 1:4 Standing and aggrievement
- § 1:5 Environmental litigation prior to CEPA
- § 1:6 Citizen suits in federal court
- § 1:7 Citizen suit statutes in sister states
- § 1:8 The enactment of CEPA

CHAPTER 2. THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF CEPA

- § 2:1 Introduction
- § 2:2 Executive branch initiatives
- § 2:3 Legislative branch initiatives, S.B. 400, S.B. 675 and H.B. 5037
- § 2:4 The legislative debates on CEPA
- § 2:5 Amendments to CEPA since adoption

CHAPTER 3. THE RULES OF STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION AS APPLIED TO CEPA

- § 3:1 Introduction
- § 3:2 The plain meaning rule
- § 3:3 Interpretation to avoid absurd consequences or bizarre results
- § 3:4 Liberal construction of remedial statutes
- § 3:5 Construction in accordance with legislative policy
- § 3:6 Reliance on legislative history
- § 3:7 Construction of related statutes
- § 3:8 Legislative action in related fields
- § 3:9 Deference to administrative agency interpretations
- § 3:10 Common sense
- § 3:11 Case law from other jurisdictions
- § 3:12 Common law principles
- § 3:13 Stare decisis
- § 3:14 Conclusion

CHAPTER 4. NATURAL RESOURCES PROTECTED UNDER THE ACT

- § 4:1 Introduction

CONNECTICUT ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

- § 4:2 Legislative finding
- § 4:3 The concept of the public trust
- § 4:4 The evolution of the term “natural resource”—Red Hill Coalition, Inc. v. Town Plan & Zoning Commission
- § 4:5 The evolution of the term “natural resource”—Paige v. Town Plan & Zoning Commission
- § 4:6 The evolution of the term “natural resources”—Other cases

CHAPTER 5. JURISDICTIONAL ASPECTS OF § 22A-16 ACTIONS

- § 5:1 Introduction
- § 5:2 Introduction to standing
- § 5:3 Standing as the threshold issue
- § 5:4 CEPA confers statutory standing
- § 5:5 Standing of potential plaintiffs under § 22a-16
- § 5:6 Standing distinguished from burden of proof
- § 5:7 The requirement of a “colorable claim” of harm to natural resources—Belford v. New Haven
- § 5:8 The requirement of a “colorable claim” of harm to natural resources—Lewis v. Planning & Zoning Commission (1998)
- § 5:9 The requirement of a “colorable claim” of harm to natural resources—Fort Trumbull Conservancy, LLC v. Alves
- § 5:10 The requirement of a “colorable claim” of harm to natural resources—Fort Trumbull Conservancy, LLC v. New London
- § 5:11 The requirement of a “colorable claim” of harm to natural resources—Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone v. Rocque
- § 5:12 The requirement of a “colorable claim” of harm to natural resources—Rocque v. Mellon; Ventres v. Goodspeed Airport, LLC
- § 5:13 The requirement of a “colorable claim” of harm to natural resources—Lewis v. Planning & Zoning Commission (2005)
- § 5:14 Section 22a-16 standing to enforce other environmental laws—Introduction
- § 5:15 Section 22a-16 standing to enforce other environmental laws—Manchester Environmental Coalition v. Stockton
- § 5:16 Section 22a-16 standing to enforce other environmental laws—Middletown v. Hartford Electric Light Co.
- § 5:17 Section 22a-16 standing to enforce other environmental laws—Fish Unlimited v. Northeast Utilities Service Co. (*Fish II*)
- § 5:18 Section 22a-16 standing to enforce other environmental laws—Waterbury v. Washington
- § 5:19 Section 22a-16 standing to enforce other environmental laws—Fort Trumbull Conservancy, LLC v. Alves
- § 5:20 Section 22a-16 standing to enforce other environmental laws—Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone v. Rocque

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:21 Section 22a–16 standing to enforce other environmental laws—Against municipality or agency without environmental jurisdiction
- § 5:22 CEPA allegations—Legal sufficiency
- § 5:23 CEPA allegations—Miscellaneous
- § 5:24 Exhaustion of administrative remedies—The exhaustion requirement
- § 5:25 Exhaustion requirement—*Arrieu v. Litchfield*
- § 5:26 Exhaustion requirement—*Fish Unlimited v. Northeast Utilities Service Co. (Fish I)*
- § 5:27 Exhaustion requirement—*Waterbury v. Washington*
- § 5:28 Exhaustion requirement—*Pac v. Inland Wetlands & Water Courses Commission*
- § 5:29 Exhaustion requirement—*Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone v. Rocque*

CHAPTER 6. SUBSTANTIVE AND PROCEDURAL ISSUES IN § 22A–16 ACTIONS

- § 6:1 Introduction
- § 6:2 Applicability of the act—Exemptions within CEPA
- § 6:3 Applicability of the act—Exemptions in other provisions of the General Statutes
- § 6:4 Right to jury trial
- § 6:5 Venue
- § 6:6 Unreasonable conduct defined—No explicit standard provided by legislature
- § 6:7 Compliance with statutory or administrative scheme—*Waterbury v. Washington*
- § 6:8 Compliance with statutory or administrative scheme—*Ventres v. Goodspeed Airport, LLC; Rocque v. Mellon*
- § 6:9 Compliance with statutory or administrative scheme—*Animal Rights Front, Inc. v. Jacques*
- § 6:10 Violation of an environmental statute
- § 6:11 Unreasonableness as a question of fact
- § 6:12 Unreasonableness based on hypothetical questions to experts
- § 6:13 Failure of a municipality to abate a public nuisance as unreasonable conduct
- § 6:14 What unreasonableness does not mean
- § 6:15 Rejection of the de minimis standard
- § 6:16 Conclusion
- § 6:17 The class of potential defendants—The class broadly defined
- § 6:18 The class of potential defendants—The state as CEPA defendant
- § 6:19 The class of potential defendants—Company officials who participate in unreasonable conduct

CONNECTICUT ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

- § 6:20 The class of potential defendants—Unreasonable conduct affecting the environment
- § 6:21 The class of potential defendants—Defendant’s action considered along with others’ actions
- § 6:22 Allocation of burden of proof
- § 6:23 The prima facie showing that the defendant’s conduct is unreasonable
- § 6:24 The statutory affirmative defense: no feasible and prudent alternative
- § 6:25 Other affirmative defenses—Statute of limitations
- § 6:26 Res judicata and collateral estoppel—In general
- § 6:27 Res judicata and collateral estoppel—Transactional test
- § 6:28 Res judicata and collateral estoppel—Privity
- § 6:29 Res judicata and collateral estoppel—Inability to appeal initial finding
- § 6:30 Res judicata and collateral estoppel—Effect on subsequent CEPA plaintiffs of actions brought by prior CEPA plaintiffs
- § 6:31 Use of master or referee

CHAPTER 7. SECTION 22A-19 INTERVENTION IN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

- § 7:1 Introduction
- § 7:2 Administrative, licensing or other proceedings
- § 7:3 The verified petition—In general
- § 7:4 The verified petition—Content of the petition
- § 7:5 The verified petition—Status of the CEPA intervenor
- § 7:6 The verified petition—Assumption of party status
- § 7:7 Administrative agency jurisdiction—In general
- § 7:8 Administrative agency jurisdiction—Connecticut Fund for the Environment, Inc. v. Stamford
- § 7:9 Administrative agency jurisdiction—Red Hill Coalition, Inc. v. Town Plan & Zoning Commission
- § 7:10 Administrative agency jurisdiction—Burton v. Dillman
- § 7:11 Administrative agency jurisdiction—Connecticut Post Ltd. Partnership v. South Central Connecticut Regional Council of Governments
- § 7:12 Administrative agency jurisdiction—Nizzardo v. State Traffic Commission
- § 7:13 Administrative agency jurisdiction—Pathways, Inc. v. Planning & Zoning Commission
- § 7:14 Administrative agency jurisdiction—Keiser v. Zoning Commission
- § 7:15 Who may intervene—Introduction
- § 7:16 Who may intervene—Class of potential intervenors

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:17 Who may intervene—Nature of the intervenor’s interest
- § 7:18 Agency consideration—Introduction
- § 7:19 Agency consideration—Two-step inquiry
- § 7:20 Agency consideration—Two-step inquiry—Gardiner v. Conservation Commission
- § 7:21 Agency consideration—Two-step inquiry—Post—*Gardiner* two-step inquiry cases
- § 7:22 Agency consideration—Two-step inquiry—River Bend Associates, Inc. v. Conservation & Inland Wetlands Commission
- § 7:23 Agency consideration—Burden of proof on alternatives
- § 7:24 Agency consideration—Burden of proof on alternatives—Quarry Knoll II Corp. v. Planning & Zoning Commission
- § 7:25 Agency consideration—Burden of proof on alternatives—Lack of alternatives
- § 7:26 Agency consideration—Burden of proof on alternatives—Requirement of finding on alternatives

CHAPTER 8. SECTION 22A-19 INTERVENTION IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

- § 8:1 Introduction
- § 8:2 Intervention in judicial review of administrative proceedings
- § 8:3 Judicial review—Intervention in general
- § 8:4 Judicial review—CEPA intervention
- § 8:5 Judicial review—CEPA intervention—Red Hill Coalition, Inc. v. Conservation Commission
- § 8:6 Judicial review—CEPA intervention—Subsequent decisions
- § 8:7 Initiation of appeals from administrative agency decisions—In general
- § 8:8 Initiation of appeals from administrative agency decisions—Mystic Marinelife Aquarium, Inc. v. Gill
- § 8:9 Initiation of appeals from administrative agency decisions—Hyllen-Davey v. Plan & Zoning Commission
- § 8:10 Initiation of appeals from administrative agency decisions—Specificity required in pleadings
- § 8:11 Initiation of appeals from administrative agency decisions—Fort Trumbull Conservancy, LLC v. Planning & Zoning Commission
- § 8:12 Applicant for administrative relief as CEPA appellant
- § 8:13 Timeliness of the appeal
- § 8:14 Effect of CEPA intervention on the conduct of judicial proceedings—Scope of judicial review
- § 8:15 Effect of CEPA intervention on the conduct of judicial proceedings—Scope of issues raised on appeal

CONNECTICUT ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

- § 8:16 Effect of CEPA intervention on the conduct of judicial proceedings—Scope of issues raised on appeal—What constitutes an “environmental issue”
- § 8:17 Effect of CEPA intervention on the conduct of judicial proceedings—Scope of issues raised on appeal—Right to raise procedural issues
- § 8:18 Settlement of claims—In general
- § 8:19 Settlement of claims—Ralto Developers, Inc. v. Environmental Impact Commission
- § 8:20 Settlement of claims—Dietzel v. Planning Commission
- § 8:21 Settlement of claims—Rocque v. Northeast Utilities Service Co.
- § 8:22 Settlement of claims—Brookridge District Assn. v. Planning & Zoning Commission
- § 8:23 Intervention in “other proceedings”—Introduction
- § 8:24 Intervention in “other proceedings”—Polymer Resources, Ltd. v. Keeney
- § 8:25 Intervention in “other proceedings”—Zoning Commission v. Fairfield Resources Management, Inc. and Keeney v. Fairfield Resources, Inc.
- § 8:26 Intervention in “other proceedings”—Conclusion

CHAPTER 9. SECTION 22A–19A: HISTORIC STRUCTURES AND LANDMARKS OF THE STATE

- § 9:1 Introduction
- § 9:2 Protection afforded historic structures and landmarks
- § 9:3 Judicial construction
- § 9:4 84 Connecticut Attorney General Opinions, No. 80 (1984)
- § 9:5 State historic preservation board

CHAPTER 10. RELIEF AFFORDED UNDER CEPA: POWERS OF THE COURT

- § 10:1 Introduction
- § 10:2 Declaratory and injunctive relief
- § 10:3 Mootness
- § 10:4 Declaratory relief
- § 10:5 Equitable relief—Statutory authority
- § 10:6 Equitable relief—Necessary parties
- § 10:7 Equitable relief—No showing of irreparable harm and inadequate remedy at law required
- § 10:8 Equitable relief—Temporary injunctions: prohibitory and mandatory
- § 10:9 Equitable relief—Temporary injunctions: grounds for issuance

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 10:10	Equitable relief—Temporary injunctions: posting of a bond
§ 10:11	Equitable relief—Injunctions issued in CEPA suits: temporary injunctions
§ 10:12	Court remand to administrative proceedings
§ 10:13	Procedure on remand
§ 10:14	Retention of jurisdiction to conduct two-pronged review: first prong—Whether substantial evidence in the record supports agency decision
§ 10:15	Second prong: adequacy of agency consideration
§ 10:16	Judicial review of adequacy of existing administrative and regulatory procedures
§ 10:17	Court may grant judgment by stipulation of the parties
§ 10:18	Costs and attorney's fees—References to "costs" within CEPA
§ 10:19	Costs and attorney's fees—Costs—General
§ 10:20	Costs and attorney's fees—Taxable costs
§ 10:21	Costs and attorney's fees—Taxable costs in equitable causes of action
§ 10:22	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—The American rule
§ 10:23	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—Purpose of attorney's fees
§ 10:24	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—Who may seek an award of attorney's fees
§ 10:25	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—Caselaw—A reasonable attorney's fee
§ 10:26	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—Rule 1.5 (a) of the rules of professional conduct
§ 10:27	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—Existence of reasonable fee agreement: effect
§ 10:28	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—Proponent's burden to make evidentiary showing of entitlement of attorney's fees
§ 10:29	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—Timely objection to award of attorney's fees by opposing counsel
§ 10:30	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—Award of attorney's fees at the appellate level
§ 10:31	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—The taxing of costs pursuant to § 22a-19a—When applicable
§ 10:32	Non-taxable costs and attorney's fees—The taxing of costs pursuant to § 22a-19a—Scope of costs included
§ 10:33	Court may order supplemental environmental projects or financial contribution: § 22a-16a
§ 10:34	CEPA is supplementary to administrative procedures

CHAPTER 11. FORMS

§ 11:1	Complaint—§ 22a-16 action
§ 11:2	Special Defense—§ 22a-16 action

CONNECTICUT ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT

- § 11:3 Motion to Dismiss—§ 22a-16 action
- § 11:4 Motion to Strike—§ 22a-16 action
- § 11:5 Notice of intervention—Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency
- § 11:6 Notice of intervention—Planning & Zoning Commission
- § 11:7 Notice of intervention—State administrative agency
- § 11:8 Notice of intervention—Pending civil action
- § 11:9 Notice of intervention—Administrative appeal
- § 11:10 Objection to motion for approval of settlement agreement in land-use appeal

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Connecticut Environmental Protection Act—General Statutes §§ 22a-14 to 22a-20
- Appendix B Senate Bill No. 400, 1971 Connecticut General Assembly
- Appendix C Senate Bill No. 675, 1971 Connecticut General Assembly
- Appendix D House Bill No. 5037, 1971 Connecticut General Assembly
- Appendix E Legislative History—CEPA
- Appendix F 84 Connecticut Attorney General Opinions, No. 80 (1984)
- Appendix G Bibliography
- Appendix H Chronological List Of Cases

Table of Laws and Rules

Table of Cases

Index