

Index

ABILITY TO PAY

- Evaluate comparative fault for the proposed consent decree, substantively fair, § 3:128
- Non-settling objectors contention, misleading the government, § 3:130

ABILITY TO PAY PRP

- De Minimis, De Micromis, and Ability to Pay PRP (this index)
- Fair and reasonable to settle, liability insurance, § 3:131

ABSOLUTE LIABILITY

- Common law torts, ultrahazardous conduct, § 1:13

ACQUIESCENCE

- Allocation law, court's consideration of owner's acquiescence in operator's activities, § 6:19

ACTUAL OR POSSIBLE CONTAMINATION

- Negotiating rights and responsibilities of each party, reprise of private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, § 9:78

AGREEMENTS

- Contracts and Agreements (this index)
- Different ways to prove a settlement, substantively fair, § 3:127
- Distinction between, allocate CERCLA costs between/ among parties (permissible) (impermissible), no exception exists
- CERCLA litigation, between the same parties, the government and its contractor, § 9:82

ALL APPROPRIATE INQUIRY

- Contiguous property owner, § 3:87
- Innocent landowners, proving site acquired after release, § 3:86
- Interview with Julie Kilgore, Chairperson of USEPA's Committee on "All Appropriate Inquiry," § App 9C
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, defense, § 10:55
- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, buying and selling, § 9:109

ALLOCATION AGREEMENT

- CERCLA costs between/among parties (permissible)(impermissible),transfer liability
- No exception exists, CERCLA litigation, allocation agreement, between government and its contractor, § 9:82

ALLOCATION LAW

- Generally, §§ 6:1 to 6:38
- Acquiescence by owner in operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:19
- Apportionment, quantum of proof required, § 6:34
- Benefit to owner from operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:20
- CERCLA
 - Judicial involvement with consent decree, § 6:36
 - Legislative history, § 6:9
- Contracts between parties regarding liability, § 6:18
- Cost allocation guidance from SARA, § 6:3
- Disputes arising among four classes of PRPs, § 6:10
- Disputes involving PRPs in more than one PRP class, § 6:32
- EPA
 - Acting as CERCLA prosecutor and judge, § 6:37
 - Cost allocation guidelines, § 6:5
- Generators vs.
 - Owners and operators, § 6:27
 - Transporters, § 6:28
- Gore factors, § 6:11
- Judicial involvement with CERCLA consent decree, § 6:36
- Judicial review of allocation factors, § 6:35
- Multiple generators, § 6:26
- NBAR allocations not subject to judicial review, § 6:4
- Negligible amount of harm, § 6:17
- Operators vs. operators, § 6:24
- Other factors considered by courts, §§ 6:16 to 6:22
- Owner and neighboring owner, § 6:31
- Owners
 - Acquiescence in operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:19
 - Benefit from operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:20
 - Operators, vs., § 6:25
 - Post-cleanup benefit, consideration by courts, § 6:21
- Post-cleanup benefit to owner, consideration by courts, § 6:21
- Present owners vs. past owners, § 6:23

ALLOCATION LAW—Cont'd

Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, state statutory liability, §§ **9:46 to 9:49**

PRP not a party, § **6:33**

Specific PRP vs. PRP disputes, §§ **6:23 to 6:32**

Statutory cost allocation provision, § **6:2**

Three prong test for CERCLA consent decree cases involving U.S., § **6:38**

Toxicity granted substantial deference by courts, § **6:7**

Transporters vs. municipal PRPs, § **6:30**

Volumetric data relied on by NBARs, §§ **6:6, 6:8**

Waste volume at generator related sites, consideration by courts, § **6:22**

ALLOCATOR'S REPORT

Litigation of environmental allocation issues, sample report, § **App 10A**

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Case law on CERCLA settlement, § **4:53**

Critique of settlement efforts, § **4:52**

Non-settlor PRP, CERCLA allocation settlements, §§ **4:51, 4:73**

AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF

Sample brief in support of appellant/defendant regarding divisibility, §§ **App 7D, App 7E**

APPEAL AND REVIEW

CERCLA consent decree, district court's approval of, § **4:56**

Divisibility

Amicus curiae brief in support of appellant/defendant regarding divisibility, sample, §§ **App 7D, App 7E**

Appellant/defendant's brief regarding divisibility, sample, § **App 7A**

Fact, question of, certification for immediate appeal under Section 1292(b), § **7:45**

Opposition, appellant/plaintiff's opposition/answering brief regarding divisibility, sample, § **App 7B**

Reply, appellant/defendant's reply brief regarding divisibility, sample, § **App 7C**

Evidentiary details, complex, trial court need not involve itself, § **4:55**

Experts in allocation disputes

Defendant/appellant's brief in government cost recovery action, sample, § **App 11G**

Defendant/appellant's reply brief in government cost recovery action, sample, § **App 11I**

Plaintiff/appellant's brief in government cost recovery action, sample, § **App 11H**

Plaintiff-appellee in private party CERCLA action regarding several expert witness issues, sample brief, § **App 11F**

APPEAL AND REVIEW—Cont'd

Non-settlor PRP, standards for review of proposed consent decree and other EPA actions under CERCLA, §§ **4:54 to 4:57**

APPROVAL OR CONSENT

Non-settlor PRP

Appellate review of district court's approval of CERCLA consent decree, § **4:56**

Lesser standard of deference given to state agencies, § **4:57**

Standards for review of proposed consent decree, § **4:54:56**

Proposed consent decree under CERCLA

Appellate review of district court's approval, § **4:56**

Non-settlor PRP, standards for review of proposed consent decree, §§ **4:54 to 4:57**

Opposition, sample points and authorities, § **App 3E**

Support

sample points and authorities, § **App 3D**

sample reply points and authorities, § **App 3F**

ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS STANDARD

Methodologies of allocation, allocable costs, § **3:233**

Standards for review of proposed consent decree and other EPA actions under CERCLA, §§ **4:54 to 4:57**

AREA OF CONTRIBUTION

Methodology of allocation, § **3:200**

ASSESSMENT OF SITE

Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, practical considerations, §§ **9:70 to 9:72**

ATTORNEYS

De micromis settlements, liaison counsel as communication tool, § **5:55**

Expert testimony in allocation disputes, § **11:9**

Interview with EPA Region IX attorney, § **App 2B**

Late notice defense, § **2:34**

List of insurance coverage resources for environmental attorneys, § **App 2C**

Malpractice for failure to tender, § **2:33**

ATTORNEY'S FEES

CERCLA limits, government recovery of, unavoidable response cost actions, § **3:224**

RCRA actions, § **8:14**

State common law claims, § **1:22**

AVIALL CASE

Litigation of Environmental Allocation Issues (this index)

BACKGROUND OR HISTORY

- Common law toxic tort actions, § 9:2
- Environmental liability claims, history of modern law, § 1:23

BANKRUPTCY COURT

- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, court approval of reorganization plan does not trigger statute of limitations, § 10:43

BASICS OF ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY CLAIMS

- Environmental Liability Claim Basics (this index)

BONA FIDE PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER

- Innocent landowners, defense, §§ 3:79, 3:92, 5:9

BURLINGTON NORTHERN & SANTA FE RY. CO. v. U.S.

- Brief for petitioners, § App 7G
- Divisibility of claims
 - Amended opinion of Ninth Circuit, § 7:20
 - Certiorari, petitions for, § 7:21
 - District court's opinion, § 7:18
 - Facts, § 7:17
 - Game changer view, § 7:24
 - Government's view, § 7:25
 - Impact on, §§ 7:23 to 7:27
 - Initial opinion of Ninth Circuit, § 7:19
 - Multiple orphan shares, Burlington's impact, § 7:30
 - Post-Burlington Northern case law, § 7:27
 - Proving, difficulty of, § 7:16
 - Restatement on law on divisibility, § 7:29
 - Supreme Court's opinion, § 7:22
 - Wait and see approach, § 7:26
- Opposition brief of the United States, § App 7H
- Petition for writ of certiorari, § App 7F

CALIFORNIA

- A non-scientist, With no formal legal training
 - Qualified, to testify as an expert on how the court should equitably allocate CERCLA liability, § 11:48
- A scientist, With no formal legal training
 - Qualified, to testify as public trust doctrine and its role in the equitable allocation of CERCLA liability, § 11:49
- Common law toxic tort of trespass, California approach, §§ 9:15, 9:20
- Environmental liability claim basics, § 1:33
- Federal case law, determinations, CERCLA settlement is in good faith
 - Fair and reasonable, § 4:79

CALIFORNIA—Cont'd

- Federal district courts often combine California case law, federal case law in their determinations
 - CERCLA settlement is in good faith (under California law) and fair and reasonable (under CERCLA), § 4:79
- Private cost recovery under state CERCLA, §§ 10:122, 10:124
- Tate Law Tort Claims that Impose Join and Several Liability
 - CERCLA Does Not Preempt, § 1:38

CANCERPHOBIA

- Common law torts, § 9:56
- Increased risk of cancer, § 9:57

CATEGORIZATION OF CERCLA CASES

- Contribution actions under CERCLA, § 10:5
- Cost recovery actions under CERCLA, § 10:6
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, §§ 10:3 to 10:6

CAUSES OF ACTION

- Jury's decision, negligence can, determine the courts subsequent decision on the third-party defense, § 3:83
- Selecting and drafting for complaint, §§ 10:127 to 10:141
- State Law Causes of Action (this index)

CAVEAT EMPTOR

- Negligence, § 1:5

CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

- Non-settlor PRP, EPA and charitable organizations, § 4:62

CHECKLISTS

- Contractual allocation of liabilities, checklist for practitioners in preparation for contractually allocating environmental risks, § App 9B
- Response to PRP letter, § App 2A

CHEM-DYNE CASE

- Divisibility of claims, § 7:15

CLAIMS

- CERCLA
 - Strike/dismiss third-party impleader, § 10:194
 - Viable, determine the settlement is equitably apportioned, bar contribution cost recovery, strictly liable and lack the ability to later reapportion damages to the settling parties in a contribution action, § 3:126
- CERCLA contribution
 - Inequitable liability, § 10:9
- CERCLA Does Not Preempt California State Law Tort
 - Impose Join and Several Liability, § 1:38

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Counter by the United States against it in one CERCLA action
- Plaintiffs liability to the United States in another (separate) CERCLA action, § 3:208
- Non-settling defendants, equitably apportioned
- Reapportion damages to the settling parties in a contribution action (§ 113(f)(1)), § 3:126
- Other solvent party
- Inequitable share of liability, § 3:9

CLASSIFICATION OF PRPS

- Allocation law, disputes involving PRPs in more than one PRP class, § 6:32

CLEAN AIR ACT OF 1970 (CAA)

- Environmental liability claim basics, § 1:28

COMMERCIAL LEASES

- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, § 9:106

COMMITTEE ON “ALL APPROPRIATE INQUIRY”

- Interview with Julie Kilgore, Chairperson of USEPA’s Committee on “All Appropriate Inquiry,” § App 9C

COMMON LAW

- Preemption of state common law claims for contribution and indemnity, § 10:151

COMMON LAW TORTS

- Generally, § 1:2
- Absolute liability of ultrahazardous conduct, § 1:13
- Chemical trespass, diversion of water, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9
- Damages theories in toxic tort personal injuries cases, §§ 9:50 to 9:55
- Economic loss doctrine, defense, § 1:4
- EPA memo as a regulatory order, negligence per se claim, § 1:7
- Fraud and negligent misrepresentation, § 9:41
- Manufactured products, strict liability, § 1:12
- Misrepresentation, § 9:41
- Negligence, §§ 1:3, 9:24 to 9:29
 - Economic loss doctrine, defense, § 1:4
- Negligence per se, §§ 1:6, 1:7, 9:27 to 9:29
- Nuisance, §§ 1:10, 1:11, 9:3 to 9:10
- Standing, government agency, § 1:10
- Strict liability, §§ 1:12, 9:30 to 9:40
- Toxic tort actions, reprise of private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:2 to 9:45
- Trespass, §§ 1:8 to 1:10, 9:11 to 9:22
- Ultrahazardous conduct, absolute liability, § 1:13

COMMON LAW TORTS—Cont'd

- Waste, § 9:42
- Water, diversion of, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9

COMPLAINTS

- Characterization of claim, § 10:133
- Consistency with NCP, § 10:139
- Cost recovery or contribution actions, § 10:136
- Counterclaim, PRP identification costs, contribution under CERCLA, § 10:135
- Disadvantages of CERCLA, § 10:138
- Inconsistent pleading, § 10:131
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, §§ 10:127 to 10:141
 - Appropriate causes of action, Introduction, § 10:130
- Pleading requirements, § 10:152
- Pursuit of claim after release from liability by state agency, § 10:134
- Reallocation of equitable liability shares, § 10:133
- Resolution of CERCLA liability to US or state required to state viable contribution claim under 113(f), § 10:134
- Selecting and drafting appropriate causes of action, §§ 10:127 to 10:141
- Substantial compliance, 1990-present NCP, § 10:140
- Successor liability allegations required, § 10:137
- Supplemental claims, § 10:142

COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSE, COMPENSATION AND LIABILITY ACT OF 1980 (CERCLA)

- Administrative settlement provision, RCRA compliance, response costs, § 3:7
- Allocation under. Methodologies of Allocation (this index)
- Alternative dispute resolution and CERCLA allocation settlements, § 4:51
- Appellate review of district court’s approval of CERCLA consent decree, § 4:56
- Approval of settlement, factors in, § 4:71
- California federal district courts often combine California case law with federal case law in their determinations
 - Settlement, is in good faith (under California law) and fair and reasonable (under CERCLA), § 4:79
- Causation and divisibility, §§ 7:2 to 7:4
- Claims against any other solvent party, inequitable share of liability, § 3:9
- Consent decree, judicial involvement with, § 6:36
- Consistency and faithfulness with objectives
 - Factors in approval of settlement, § 4:71

**COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
RESPONSE, COMPENSATION AND
LIABILITY ACT OF 1980 (CERCLA)**

—Cont'd

- Consistency and faithfulness with objectives
 - Cont'd
 - Review of proposed consent decree under EPA and other CERCLA actions, §§ **4:54 to 4:57**
- Cost Recovery Action under CERCLA (this index)
- Counterclaim, PRP identification costs, contribution under CERCLA, § **10:135**
- Counterclaim by the United States against
 - To contribute to the plaintiffs liability to the United States in another (separate) CERCLA action, § **3:208**
- Distinction between agreements, costs between/among parties (permissible)(impermissible)
 - Transfer liability, no exception exists, litigation between the same parties
 - are the government and its contractor, § **9:82**
- Divisibility, law for CERCLA claims, §§ **7:31 to 7:65**
- Does not preempt state statutes of repose (majority rule), § **1:37**
- Environmental liability claim basics, §§ **1:24, 1:25**
- Evidentiary details, complex, trial court need not involve itself, § **4:55**
- Fairness
 - Factor in approval of settlement, § **4:71**
 - Review of proposed consent decree under EPA and other CERCLA actions, §§ **4:54 to 4:57**
- Governs the beginning of the statute of limitations, state law causes of action for personal injury/property
 - Damage caused by/contributed to the release of hazardous substances
 - facility into the environment, § **1:36**
- Insurance, non-settlor PRP and CERCLA settlements, §§ **4:72 to 4:75**
- Intervention rights of non-settlor PRP, § **4:64**
- Liability scheme, cannot be used
 - To improve ones property at anothers expense, § **3:8**
- Litigation of Environmental Allocation Issues (this index)
- Litigation to leverage settlements from small companies
 - Profitable investment, courts will not countenance scams, § **3:10**
- Migration, evidence of causation, § **7:3**
- Non-settlor PRP, §§ **4:51, 4:54, 4:73**
- Objections to proposed settlements, non-settlor PRP, § **4:63**

**COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
RESPONSE, COMPENSATION AND
LIABILITY ACT OF 1980 (CERCLA)**

—Cont'd

- Off-site contaminated properties, CERCLA facility
 - Release of a hazardous substance, release sites owner/operator is liable
 - for the response costs to clean-up the off-site properties, § **3:20**
- Opposition to consent decrees that bar contribution rights, § **4:64**
- Preemption, state law tort claims, joint and several liability, § **1:38**
- Reasonableness
 - Factor in approval of settlement, § **4:71**
 - Review of proposed consent decree under EPA and other CERCLA actions, §§ **4:54 to 4:57**
- Response costs claim, reasonable and rational
 - Contribution to the facility's contamination, § **10:8**
- Settlement discussion used as evidence, § **4:75**
- Settlement must resolve, liability to trigger
 - § 9613s(F)(3)(B)s right to contribution, Territory of Guam v. United States, § **10:70**
- Settlement/proposed consent decree under CERCLA
 - Opposition, sample points and authorities, § **App 3E**
 - Support
 - sample points and authorities, § **App 3D**
 - sample reply points and authorities, § **App 3F**
 - Solvent identified partys share, costs qualifies as an orphan, § **3:211**
 - Standards for review of proposed consent decree, non-settlor PRP, §§ **4:54 to 4:57**
 - Strict liability scheme, fault, Gore factors, methodologies of allocation, § **3:237**
 - Strike/dismiss third-party impleader claims, § **10:194**
 - Third-party contribution claims against a non-settling defendant, § **4:28**
 - "Threatened releases," §§ **1:25, 1:26**

CONDUCT

- Ultrahazardous conduct, absolute liability, common law torts, § **1:13**

CONFERENCES

- Pre-trial conferences, litigation of environmental allocation issues, § **10:162**

CONSENT DECREES

- Ability to pay, need not evaluate comparative fault for the proposed consent decree to be substantively fair, § **3:128**

CONSENT DECREES—Cont’d

- Appellate review of district court’s approval of, § 4:56
- Approval of, data, believable/reasonable, district courts should not second guess, § 5:25
- Non-settlor PRP, standards for review of proposed consent decree, § 4:54
- Settlement/proposed consent decree under CERCLA
 - Opposition, sample points and authorities, § App 3E
 - Support
 - sample points and authorities, § App 3D
 - sample reply points and authorities, § App 3F

CONSULTANTS

- Agreement for retention of expert witness (consultant), sample, § App 11J
- Consultant engagement letter, sample, § App 9D

CONTIGUOUS PROPERTY OWNER

- All appropriate inquiry, § 3:87
- Innocent landowners, defense, §§ 3:89, 5:9
- Written assurances from EPA, § 3:91

CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS

- Allocation law, court’s consideration of contracts between parties regarding liability, § 6:18
- Experts in allocation disputes, sample agreement for retention of expert witness (consultant), § App 11J
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, sample PRP agreement, § App 10B
- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:1 to 9:115
- Reliance on government contracts by PRP, § 3:155

CONTRIBUTION

- Aviall case, implied right of contribution, § 10:60
- Burden of proving the existence
 - Appropriate allocation of orphan shares, § 3:205
- CERCLA action, elements of prima facie case, §§ 10:19, 10:34, 10:37
- Circuits split as to contribution claim where only state liability settled, § 10:60
- Claim, defendant to plaintiff, § 9:44
- Dismiss CERCLA claims, inequitable liability, § 10:9
- Divisibility victory, seeking contribution following, § 10:175
- Elements of prima facie case in CERCLA action, §§ 10:19, 10:34, 10:37
- Facility’s contamination, proof required for a successful CERCLA response costs claim, Reasonable and rational approximation, § 10:8

CONTRIBUTION—Cont’d

- Implied right to contribution, post-Aviall split of authority on meaning of 107, §§ 10:58 to 10:63
- Indemnity, § 1:21
- Methodology of allocation
 - Area of contribution method, § 3:200
 - Mass of contribution method, § 3:202
 - Mass/volume contribution method, § 3:203
 - Volume of contributions, § 3:201
- RCRA actions, suits against previous owners and operators, § 8:31
- Release of different contaminants at different sites, § 10:101
- Right to, cleanup expenses does not automatically bar it from suing for cost recovery of other cleanup expenses, § 10:71
- Settlement with government before suit cannot sue for contribution, § 10:81

COOPER INDUSTRIES, INC. v. AVIALL SERVICES, INC.

- Allocation, methodologies of, § 3:104
- Divisibility of claims, § 7:64

COST ALLOCATION

- CERCLA costs between/among parties (permissible)(impermissible), transfer liability
- No exception exists, CERCLA litigation, allocation agreement, between government and its contractor, § 9:82

COST ALLOCATION GUIDELINES OF EPA

- Generally, § 6:5

COST RECOVERY ACTION UNDER CERCLA

- CERCLA counterpart statutes, § 10:129
- Contribution claim, back-up claim, § 10:21
- “Core factors,” § 10:17
- Declaratory relief, § 10:127
- Declaratory relief available for future, § 10:15
- Dismiss, attorneys fees action, not premature, § 10:20
- Elements of prima facie case, § 10:19
- Equitable allocation, § 10:17
- Experts in allocation disputes, sample plaintiff expert witness report in private party CERCLA cost recovery action, § App 11E
- Government, by
 - Defendant/appellant’s brief in government cost recovery action, sample, experts in allocation disputes, § App 11G
 - Defendant/appellant’s reply brief in government cost recovery action, sample, experts in allocation disputes, § App 11I
 - Plaintiff/appellant’s brief in government cost recovery action, sample, experts in allocation disputes, § App 11H

COST RECOVERY ACTION UNDER

CERCLA—Cont'd

- Government, by—Cont'd
 - tion disputes, § **App 11H**
- Implied contribution under state counterpart statutes, § **10:129**
- Issue of reasonableness of response costs
 - Factual inquiry for summary judgment, § **10:28**
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, §§ **10:26 to 10:29**
- Methodologies of allocation, motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § **App 3A**
- Motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § **App 3A**
- Plaintiff expert witness report in private party CERCLA cost recovery action, sample, § **App 11E**
- Preemption of private state law claim, § **10:118**
- Private cost recovery under CERCLA counterpart statutes
 - Generally, §§ **10:122 to 10:126**
 - California Hazardous Substance Account, § **10:122**
 - Commencement, date of, state vs. federal statute of limitations, § **10:125**
 - County water district, §§ **10:126, 10:128**
 - Statutory indemnity, § **10:126**
- Remediation costs, methodologies of allocation, § **3:6**
- Reports, sample plaintiff expert witness report in private party CERCLA cost recovery action, § **App 11E**
- Response costs recovery
 - Opposition to motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § **App 3B**
 - Reply memorandum in support of motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § **App 3C**
- State CERCLA counterpart statutes, § **10:129**
- Summary judgments
 - Motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § **App 3A**
 - Opposition to motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § **App 3B**
 - Partial summary judgment, reply memorandum in support of motion, § **App 3C**
 - Reply memorandum in support of motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § **App 3C**

COSTS OF ACTION

- RCRA actions, §§ **8:14, 8:15**

DAMAGES

- Medical monitoring
 - Generally, §§ **9:51 to 9:55**
 - Background, § **9:51**
 - Common law, § **9:53**
 - Defenses, § **9:54**
 - Federal law, § **9:52**
 - Supervised funds or lump sums, § **9:55**
- Toxic tort personal injuries cases, theories of damages, §§ **9:50 to 9:55**

DAUBERT CASE

- Experts in allocation disputes, §§ **11:12, 11:19, 11:25**

DAUBERT HEARINGS

- Experts in allocation disputes, §§ **11:25, 11:30**

DAUBERT MOTIONS

- Experts in allocation disputes, §§ **11:28, 11:29**

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

- Actions are available, § **10:13**
- CERCLA actions, § **10:90**
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, §§ **10:13 to 10:16**
- Prima Facie Valid Foundational, § **10:16**
- Relief appropriate even if not all PRPs are named defendants, liability is speculative, § **10:14**
- Triggers the Running of the Statute of Limitations to Assert a Contribution, § **10:11**

DEFENSES

- All appropriate inquiry, contamination before purchase, § **3:90**
- Bona fide prospective purchaser defense, §§ **3:79, 3:92, 5:9**
- CERCLA, defenses under, §§ **10:53 to 10:56**
- Contiguous property owner defense, §§ **3:89 to 3:91**
- Divisibility, waiver of, § **7:71**
- Economic loss doctrine, § **1:4**

DE MINIMIS, DE MICROMIS, AND ABILITY TO PAY PRP

- Generally, §§ **5:1 to 5:60**
- Ability to pay settlements
 - Generally, §§ **5:56 to 5:58**
 - Benefits of ATP status, § **5:58**
 - Conditions to satisfy ATP status, § **5:57**
 - Financially challenged PRPs, statutory protections, § **5:11**
 - Installment payments sometimes available, § **5:56**
- Bona fide prospective purchaser defense, innocent landowners, §§ **3:79, 3:92, 5:9**
- Burdens of proof, § **5:47**
- Contiguous property owner defense, innocent landowners, §§ **3:89 to 3:91, 5:9**

DE MINIMIS, DE MICROMIS, AND ABILITY TO PAY PRP—Cont'd

- Contribution, de minimis PRP's liability for, § 5:15
- Covenants not to sue, EPA, § 5:14
- Definition and description of, §§ 5:44 to 5:48
- De micromis settlements
 - Generally, §§ 5:49 to 5:55
 - Baseline and premium payments, assessment by EPA, § 5:53
 - Communication tools, § 5:55
 - Department of Justice approval for consent decrees, § 5:54
 - Determination of de minimis and non-de minimis, § 5:52
 - Discretion of EPA, § 5:52
 - Qualifying for de micromis status, § 5:51
 - Waste-in lists and volumetric ranking, § 5:50
- De minimis PRP settlements, statutory support, § 5:59
- Determination of settlement amounts, § 5:59
- Documentary evidence, § 5:47
- Equitable allocation of response costs, § 3:256
- Expansion of innocent landowner provisions, innocent landowners, § 3:94
- Financially challenged PRPs. Ability to pay settlements, above
- Joint and several liability
 - Generally, §§ 5:35 to 5:43
 - Case by case examination by courts, § 5:37
 - Common attacks, § 5:40
 - Discretion of EPA to devise de minimis settlement proposals, § 5:41
 - Flexibility to diverge from apportionment formulas, § 5:38
 - Multi-faceted evaluations, § 5:43
 - Penalties on uncooperative PRPs, § 5:42
 - Proposed consent decrees and substantive fairness, § 5:39
 - Reasonableness test, § 5:36
- Liability defenses added to section 107 by section 122, § 5:45
- Liability protections to settling PRPs is limited, § 5:60
- Limitations on de micromis PRP defense, § 5:46
- Limited involvement, proving, § 5:13
- Low level of hazardous impact, proving, § 5:13
- National Priorities List
 - Apportionment of CERCLA liability, § 5:7
 - Bona fide prospective purchasers, statutory protections, § 5:9
 - Contiguous landowners, statutory protections, § 5:9
 - De micromis statutory protections, § 5:10
 - De minimis statutory protections, § 5:10

DE MINIMIS, DE MICROMIS, AND ABILITY TO PAY PRP—Cont'd

- National Priorities List—Cont'd
 - Financially challenged PRPs, statutory protections, § 5:11
 - Innocent landowners, statutory protections, § 5:9
 - Liability dependent on nature and extent of hazardous waste contribution, § 5:6
 - Multiple statutory protections, § 5:11
 - Primary purposes, § 5:3
 - Retroactive application of CERCLA, § 5:5
 - Sites proposed for, § 5:2
 - Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), § 5:8
 - Superfund eligibility, § 5:4
- Negotiating settlements for de minimis PRPs
 - Approaches and impediments to settlements, § 5:34
 - Approval of consent decree, data, believable/reasonable, district courts should not second guess, § 5:25
 - Challenging settlement by non-settling PRPs, § 5:26
 - Consent decree incorporated into Administrative Order on Consent, § 5:21
 - Covenant not to sue from EPA, § 5:18
 - De minimis landowner, § 5:31
 - District courts examination of adequacy of settlement, §§ 5:23, 5:24
 - Due process rights of non-settling PRPs, § 5:24
 - EPA may decline to settle with PRP, § 5:29
 - Global settlements, § 5:32
 - Impact of de minimis settlements on other PRPs, § 5:27
 - Joint defense and working groups, § 5:33
 - Limitations on government agencies, § 5:16
 - Proposed consent decree must undergo public review, § 5:22
 - Public interest before entering into covenant, § 5:20
 - Requirements for settlements, § 5:17
 - Settlement to PRP as soon as possible, § 5:30
 - Special covenant not to sue from EPA, § 5:19
 - Statutory duty for EPA to require settling de minimis PRP to waive claims, § 5:28
- Resolution of liability by PRP, impact on other PRPs, § 5:15
- Statutory support for de minimis PRP settlements, §§ 5:12 to 5:15, 5:59
- Toxicity contribution determinations, finality, § 5:48

DISCLOSURE

- Draft environmental settlement agreements, discoverability by non-parties, § 4:65

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

Experts in allocation disputes, failing to disclose opinions, § **11:31**

DISCOVERY

Draft environmental settlement agreements, discoverability by non-parties, § **4:65**
 Experts in allocation disputes, pre-trial discovery, §§ **11:37 to 11:41**
 Litigation of environmental allocation issues, §§ **10:155 to 10:158**

DIVISIBILITY

Generally, §§ **7:1 to 7:73**
 Amicus curiae brief in support of appellant/defendant regarding divisibility, sample, §§ **App 7D, App 7E**
 Analysis sua sponte, § **7:9**
 Appeal
 Amicus curiae brief in support of appellant/defendant regarding divisibility, sample, §§ **App 7D, App 7E**
 Appellant/defendant's brief regarding divisibility, sample, § **App 7A**
 Opposition, appellant/plaintiff's opposition/answering brief regarding divisibility, sample, § **App 7B**
 Reply, appellant/defendant's reply brief regarding divisibility, sample, § **App 7C**
 Appellant/defendant's brief regarding divisibility, sample, § **App 7A**
 Apportioned based on the contamination attributable to parcel, § **7:72**
 Apportionment, quantum of proof necessary, § **7:69**
 Avoidance of damages is not apportionment of damages, § **7:13**
 Avoidance of PRP status by claiming costs incurred regardless, § **7:36**
 Bases for CERCLA divisibility, § **7:7**
 Brief for petitioners, § **App 7G**
 Burden of proof, §§ **7:10, 7:40, 7:61**
 Burlington Northern case
 Amended opinion of Ninth Circuit, § **7:20**
 Certiorari, petitions for, § **7:21**
 District court's opinion, § **7:18**
 Facts, § **7:17**
 Game changer on divisibility, § **7:24**
 Government view, § **7:25**
 Impact of, §§ **7:23 to 7:27**
 Initial opinion of Ninth Circuit, § **7:19**
 Orphan shares, § **7:30**
 Post-Burlington Northern case law, § **7:27**
 Proving divisibility, difficulty of, § **7:16**
 Restatement on law on divisibility, § **7:29**
 Supreme Court opinion, § **7:22**
 Wait and see approach, § **7:26**

DIVISIBILITY—Cont'd

Causation under CERCLA, §§ **7:2 to 7:4**
 CERCLA, quantum of proof necessary for apportionment between CERCLA and non-CERCLA state statutes, § **7:69**
 CERCLA claims, law on divisibility, §§ **7:31 to 7:65**
 Chem-Dyne case, history, § **7:15**
 Commingled wastes, propriety of divisibility, § **7:39**
 Complete defense to CERCLA liability, § **7:43**
 Contribution after divisibility failure, § **7:51**
 Contribution distinguished, § **7:11**
 Contribution of contaminants but not PRP, argument, § **7:36**
 Cooper Industries, Inc. v. Aviall Servs. Inc., effect of, § **7:64**
 Costs, contractually indemnifiable, § **7:70**
 Counterclaim, necessity of, § **7:32**
 Defense costs, divisibility from response costs, § **7:68**
 Difficulty in proving, §§ **7:12, 7:13, 7:16**
 Distinct facilities and CERCLA liability, § **7:62**
 Distinct harms, determination, § **7:37**
 Effect of proving divisibility, § **7:34**
 Elements, § **7:73**
 Environmental harm and volume of waste, proportionality, § **7:57**
 Equitable liability allocation, finding contamination is divisible, § **7:52**
 Evidence
 Proving geographic divisibility, § **7:28**
 Requirements to escape joint and several liability, § **7:35**
 Fact, question of, certification for immediate appeal under Section 1292(b), § **7:45**
 Fraction of time PRP owned or operated property as basis for divisibility, § **7:49**
 Geographic divisibility, §§ **7:28, 7:48**
 Harms for which divisibility is improper, § **7:38**
 History, § **7:15**
 Illustrative cases on difficulty in proving divisibility, § **7:16**
 Inability to prove hazardous waste sources, impact on divisibility, § **7:54**
 Indemnity of costs, § **7:70**
 Indivisible harm, rebuttable presumption of, mixing pollutants, § **7:55**
 Indivisible pollution and joint and several liability, § **7:56**
 Jury, determination by, § **7:33**
 Law on divisibility of CERCLA claims, §§ **7:31 to 7:65**
 Methodologies of allocation, defense, § **3:76**
 Migration, evidence of causation, § **7:3**

DIVISIBILITY—Cont'd

- Multiple orphan shares, Burlington's impact, § 7:30
- Municipality and waste disposal site owner, divisibility of harms, § 7:47
- Operable units as basis for divisibility, § 7:58
- Opposition, appellant/plaintiff's opposition/answering brief regarding divisibility, sample, § App 7B
- Opposition brief of the United States, § App 7H
- Orphan shares, impact of Burlington Northern case, § 7:30
- Ownership and divisibility arguments, § 7:28
- Petition for writ of certiorari, § App 7F
- Pleading affirmatively, § 7:66
- Production records for apportionment of harm, § 7:59
- Proof, § 7:16
- Proportion of hazardous products present, § 7:50
- Proving, difficulty for PRP, § 7:41
- Reply, appellant/defendant's reply brief regarding divisibility, sample, § App 7C
- Requirement to pick a particular method, reasonable assumption harm is proportionate, § 7:60
- Restatement of Torts, role of, § 7:6
- Rulings by court, § 7:8
- Scientific basis, § 7:5
- Separate injuries, bases for divisibility, § 7:53
- Setoff
 - Amount received in settlement that exceeded amount ordered to be paid in damages, § 7:67
 - Determination, defense costs nondivisible from response costs, § 7:68
 - Non-divisible harm, against plaintiff's recovery, § 7:68
 - Non-settling defendant, offset to, § 7:65
- Special master, deference given by district court, § 7:46
- Standard of proof for divisibility of harm, § 7:42
- Standard of review for decisions, § 7:44
- Summary judgment
 - Burden of proof, trial vs., § 7:10
- Trends, § 7:63
- Two-step analysis, § 7:10
- U.S. v. Atlantic Research, use of evidence to support both divisibility defense and contribution claim, § 10:115
- Waiver of defense, § 7:71

DRAFT SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS

- Discoverability by non-parties, § 4:65

DUTY TO DEFEND

- Responses to US EPA and state agency PRP letters, §§ 2:30 to 2:34

ECONOMIC LOSS DOCTRINE

- Defenses, § 1:4

EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- Common law torts, § 9:56

ENDANGERMENT REQUIREMENT

- RCRA actions, imminent and substantial endangerment suits, § 8:21

ENFORCEMENT

- Government entity ordering remediation not necessary and indispensable party in enforcement, § 10:57

ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY CLAIM BASICS

- Generally, §§ 1:1 to 1:38
- Absolute liability of ultrahazardous conduct, common law tort, § 1:13
- Attorney's fees for state common law claims, § 1:22
- California environmental statutes, § 1:33
- CERCLA does not preempt state statutes of repose (majority rule), § 1:37
- CERCLA or OPA, What statute
 - Applies to Oil (OPA) mixed with hazardous substances, § 1:39
- Chemical trespass, diversion of water, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9
- Clean Air Act of 1970 (CAA), § 1:28
- Common law torts, §§ 1:2 to 1:12
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), §§ 1:24, 1:25
- Contribution and indemnity, § 1:21
- EPA memo as a regulatory order, negligence per se claim, § 1:7
- Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), § 1:31
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (CWA), § 1:29
- Hazardous substance under defendant's property, § 1:26
- Landowner's right to sue neighbors, ex-titleholders, ex-tenants, §§ 1:14 to 1:20
- Legal history of modern law, § 1:23
- Manufactured products strict liability, § 1:12
- Modern federal environmental statutes, §§ 1:23 to 1:31
- Negligence, §§ 1:3, 9:24 to 9:29
- Negligence per se, §§ 1:6, 1:7, 9:27 to 9:29
- New Jersey environmental statutes, § 1:34
- Nuisance, §§ 1:10, 1:11
- Pennsylvania environmental statutes, § 1:35
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA), § 1:27
- Source of contamination, hazardous substance under defendant's property, § 1:26

ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY CLAIM

BASICS—Cont'd

- Standing, government agency, § 1:10
- State “Superfunds” and other environmental statutes, §§ 1:32 to 1:35
- Statute of limitations, personal injury, property damage, § 1:35
- Statute of limitations, state law causes of action for personal injury/property
 - Damage caused by/contributed to the release of hazardous substances from a facility into the environment, § 1:36
- Strict liability of manufactured products, § 1:12
- “Threatened releases,” §§ 1:25, 1:26
- Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), § 1:30
- Trespass, §§ 1:8 to 1:10, 9:11 to 9:20
- Ultrahazardous conduct, absolute liability, § 1:13
- Water, diversion of, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9

EQUITABLE ALLOCATION

- Indemnification provision, environmental liability, time-barred, collateral estoppel, contractual
 - Separate litigation, § 3:150

EQUITABLE RESTITUTION

- RCRA actions, § 8:8

ESCROW

- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, litigation after escrow has closed, § 9:75

EVIDENCE

- Complex details, trial courts need not involve themselves, § 4:55
- Divisibility
 - Difficulty in proving, §§ 7:16, 7:28
 - Geographic divisibility, proving, § 7:28
 - Migration, § 7:3
 - Requirements to escape joint and several liability, § 7:35
 - Two-step analysis, § 7:10
- Geographical divisibility, difficulty in proving, § 7:28

EXCLUSION OF EXPERT REPORT AND TESTIMONY

- Experts in Allocation Disputes (this index)

EXPERTS IN ALLOCATION DISPUTES

- Generally, §§ 11:1 to 11:49
- Admissibility of expert testimony
 - Generally, §§ 11:3 to 11:8
 - Conclusiveness, § 11:5
 - Fact based, § 11:7
 - Preliminary findings by judges, § 11:3
 - Qualifications required, § 11:6

EXPERTS IN ALLOCATION DISPUTES

—Cont'd

- Admissibility of expert testimony—Cont'd
 - Relevant and material, § 11:8
 - Requirement of necessity, § 11:4
 - Sufficiency, § 11:46
- Agreement for retention of expert witness (consultant), sample, § App 11J
- Allowable opinion, § 11:47
- A non-scientist, no formal legal training, Is qualified to testify as an expert
 - How the court should equitably allocate CERCLA liability, § 11:48
- Attorneys, expert testimony by, § 11:9
- CERCLA indemnification dispute, under California law,
 - Expert testimonyadmissible, contracting parties position, § 11:50
- Compliance with applicable rules, § 11:26
- Confused expert testimony, Trinity Industries, Inc. v. Greenlease Holding Company, § 11:45
- Court appointed experts, § 11:44
- Courts are split on the breadth of allowable expert opinion in allocation
 - Cases, § 11:47
- Dangers of failing to disclose opinion of expert witness, § 11:31
- Data, application toward ultimate decision, § 11:18
- Daubert challenges, §§ 11:25, 11:35
- Daubert hearings, §§ 11:25, 11:30
- Daubert motion, §§ 11:28, 11:29
- Daubert standards, § 11:19
- Declaration, careful preparation, § 11:24
- Defendant/appellant’s brief in government cost recovery action, sample, § App 11G
- Defendant/appellant’s reply brief in government cost recovery action, sample, § App 11I
- Defendant’s motion in limine to exclude expert report and testimony of government’s expert witness
 - Plaintiff’s points and authorities in opposition, sample, § App 11B
 - Points and authorities in support, sample, § App 11A
 - Reply points and authorities in support, sample, § App 11C
- Deposition preparation and Daubert, § 11:27
- Dueling experts in allocation disputes, § 11:2
- Expert report by private party plaintiff in CERCLA contribution action, sample, § App 11D
- Experts declaration in summary judgment motions, § 11:23
- Methodology variation, § 11:21

EXPERTS IN ALLOCATION DISPUTES

—Cont'd

- Monte Carlo method of calculating volume of PRPs waste contribution, §§ 11:16, 11:17
- Non-testimonial expert consultants, §§ 11:42, 11:43
- Objection, necessity of Daubert hearing in response to, § 11:30
- Plaintiff/appellant's brief in government cost recovery action, sample, § App 11H
- Plaintiff-appellee in private party CERCLA action regarding several expert witness issues, sample brief, § App 11F
- Plaintiff's points and authorities in opposition to defendant's motion in limine to exclude expert report and testimony of government's expert witness, sample, § App 11B
- Points and authorities in opposition to defendant's motion in limine to exclude expert report and testimony of government's expert witness, sample, § App 11B
- Points and authorities in support of defendant's motion in limine to exclude expert report and testimony of government's expert witness, sample, § App 11A
- Preparation of declaration, § 11:24
- Pre-trial discovery, §§ 11:37 to 11:41
- Qualified allocation expert, choosing
 - Generally, §§ 11:32 to 11:36
 - Daubert challenges, § 11:35
 - Finding the right expert, § 11:33
 - Identifying issues, § 11:32
 - Initial telephone conference, § 11:36
 - Pitfalls, § 11:34
- Qualitative and quantitative data, application toward ultimate decision, § 11:18
- RCRA actions, expert's costs, § 8:15
- Reliance on other experts, § 11:22
- Reply points and authorities in support of defendant's motion in limine to exclude report and testimony of government's expert witness, sample, § App 11C
- Reports
 - Expert report by private party plaintiff in CERCLA contribution action, sample, § App 11D
 - Plaintiff expert witness report in private party CERCLA cost recovery action, sample, § App 11E
- Scientist, no formal legal training, Is qualified to testify the public trust doctrine
 - Its role in equitably allocate CERCLA liability, § 11:49
- Scope of model, § 11:20
- Special rules regarding scientific evidence
 - Generally, §§ 11:10 to 11:15
 - Daubert case, § 11:12

EXPERTS IN ALLOCATION DISPUTES

—Cont'd

- Special rules regarding scientific evidence
 - Cont'd
 - Daubert impact, § 11:14
 - Daubert progeny, § 11:13
 - Frye case, § 11:11
 - Gatekeeping function of the court, § 11:15
 - Submission of Daubert motion, § 11:28
 - Summary judgment motions, § 11:23
 - Trinity Industries, Inc. v. Greenlease Holding Company, confused expert testimony, § 11:45
 - Ways to attack Daubert motion, § 11:29
- FEDERAL INSECTICIDE, FUNGICIDE, AND RODENTICIDE ACT (FIFRA)**
 - Environmental liability claim basics, § 1:31
- FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972 (CWA)**
 - Environmental liability claim basics, § 1:29
- FEES AND COSTS**
 - RCRA actions, §§ 8:14, 8:15
- FRAUD AND NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION**
 - Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, § 9:41
- GENERATORS**
 - Generators vs. owners and operators, § 6:27
 - Generators vs. transporters, § 6:28
 - Multiple generators, § 6:26
 - Waste volume at generator related sites, consideration by courts, § 6:22
- GENERATORS vs. OWNERS AND OPERATORS**
 - Allocation law, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:27
- GENERATORS vs. TRANSPORTERS**
 - Allocation law, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:28
- GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIBILITY**
 - Proving, § 7:28
 - Strategy, § 7:48
- GOOD FAITH**
 - California federal district courts often combine California case law
 - Federal case law in their determinations, CERCLA settlement
 - fair and reasonable, § 4:79

GOOD FAITH—Cont'd

- Owner-Plaintiff cannot use CERCLA litigation to leverage
- Settlements from small companies, profitable investment, courts will not countenance CERCLA scams, § 3:10

GORE FACTORS

- Allocation law, §§ 6:11 to 6:15, 6:23
- Amount of pollutant discharged, § 3:163
- Applicability outside of CERCLA, § 6:14
- Application of factors, variance of, § 3:153
- Calculating and proving volumetric shares, § 3:166
- Court requirements, § 3:169
- Customer liability, § 3:167
- Degree of care, § 3:182
- Degree of cooperation, § 3:183
- Distinguishing contribution, § 3:178
- District courts commonly rely on factors, § 6:15
- Emphasis by parties, § 3:170
- Equitable allocation of environmental liability, time-barred, § 3:154
- Frustration by courts, § 3:171
- Generators vs. transporters, § 6:28
- Geographic location, considered in allocation, § 3:150
- Hazardous substances, amount of, § 3:179
- Involvement in manufacture, treatment, storage, transport or disposal, § 3:181
- Limitations on use of Gore factors, §§ 3:177 to 3:175
- Litigation exposure, considered in allocation, § 3:150
- Mass discharge, §§ 3:162, 3:164
- Methodology of allocation, §§ 3:149 to 3:175, 3:237
- Military contractors, costs incurred during war-effort production, § 3:158
- Other factors, § 3:152
- PRP prevailing on defense or claim, government should account for, § 3:157
- Reliance by courts, § 3:151
- Reliance on government contracts by PRP, § 3:155
- Responses to US EPA and state agency PRP letters, §§ 2:11, 2:12
- Scheme, court approved allocation, § 3:156
- Severability of contamination, § 3:165
- State courts' use of Gore and Gore to like factors, § 3:176
- Stipulation that party will not sign, § 3:168
- Toxicity, difficulty determining, § 3:180
- Validation or endorsement by circuit courts, § 6:14
- Volume of waste as predominant factor, § 3:161

GORE FACTORS—Cont'd

- War-effort production, military contractors, costs incurred during, § 3:158

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE

- Off-site contaminated properties, CERCLA facility, release
- Sites owner/operator is liable for the response costs to clean-up the off-site properties, § 3:20

HAZARDOUS WASTES

- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) (this index)

IMMINENCE REQUIREMENT

- RCRA actions, imminent and substantial endangerment suits, § 8:19

IMMINENT AND SUBSTANTIAL ENDANGERMENT SUITS

- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) (this index)

INCENTIVES TO SETTLE

- Non-settlor PRP, §§ 4:27 to 4:45

INDEMNITY AND INDEMNIFICATION

- Claim, defendant to plaintiff, § 9:44
- Contribution, environment liability claims, § 1:21
- Divisibility defense costs, § 7:70
- Leases, liability of ex-tenants under very old indemnification provisions, § 9:107
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, §§ 10:149 to 10:150
- Non-settlor PRP settlement incentives, contractual indemnity, § 4:31
- Preemption of state common law claims for contribution and indemnity, § 10:151
- Private Party Actions and Contractual Allocation of Liabilities (this index)
- Provision, relevant to an equitable allocation of environmental liability
- Time-barred, § 3:154

INDIVIDUAL OR STAND-ALONE PLUME

- Allocation of costs after determination for each PRP, § 3:199
- Analytical or numerical computer modeling, § 3:197
- Determination of extent of plume and relative contribution, § 3:196
- Distinguishing relative PRP contributions, § 3:198
- Methodology of allocation, §§ 3:195 to 3:199

INFORMATION REQUEST LETTERS

- Responses to EPA and state agency PRP letters, § 2:2

INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

RCRA actions, § 8:8

INNOCENT LANDOWNERS

Generally, § 3:80

Acquired site after release, proving

All appropriate inquiry, § 3:87

Assertion of defense, § 3:86

Contiguous property owner defense, §§ 3:89, 5:9

Full cooperative assistance and facility access, § 3:88

Written assurances, § 3:91

Amendment to CERCLA, § 3:80

Bona fide prospective purchaser defense, §§ 3:80, 3:92, 5:9

Burden of proof, defendants, § 3:82

Contiguous property owner defense, §§ 3:89 to 3:91, 5:9

Expansion of provisions, § 3:94

Financial benefit from occurrences, prevention, § 3:93

Lessors, third party defense not available, § 3:85

Narrowly construed, § 3:83

Property bought

After May 31, 1997 and until November 1, 2005, § 3:95

Environmental Site assessment Process, § 3:96

Before May 31, 1997, § 3:93

Between November 1, 2005 and November 1, 2006, § 3:97

Compliance with regulatory directives, § 3:98

State cause of action for negligence, § 3:83

Underwent amendment in 2002, § 3:81

INSURANCE

Interpretation of policy, § 2:28

Liability insurance fundamentals, responses to EPA and state agency PRP letters, § 2:14

List of insurance coverage resources for environmental attorneys, § App 2C

Non-settlor PRP, insurance and CERCLA settlements, §§ 4:72 to 4:75

Policy components

Generally, § 2:19

Conditions, § 2:24

Declarations page, § 2:20

Definitions, § 2:22

Endorsements, § 2:25

Exclusions, § 2:23

Insuring clause, § 2:21

Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:112 to 9:116

Response to EPA and state agency PRP letters, § 2:15

Tender letter to insurer, sample, § App 2F

INTERVENTION RIGHTS

Non-settlor PRP, §§ 4:63, 4:64

INTERVIEWS

EPA Region IX attorney, § App 2B

Methodology of allocation, interview with an allocator, § App 3G

JOINT AND SEVERAL LIABILITY

CERCLA Does Not Preempt California State Law Tort Claims

Impose Join and Several Liability, § 10:39

Costs incurred for cleanup of plaintiff's waste, § 10:66

U.S. v. Atlantic Research, § 10:117

LANDLORD AND TENANT

Commercial leases, reprise of private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, § 9:106

Ex-tenants, liability under very old indemnification provisions, § 9:107

Lessees and sublessors, PRP liability, § 3:44

LEAD AGENCY

Non-settlor PRP, issues, §§ 4:2 to 4:20

LEASES

Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities

Commercial leases, special problems, § 9:106

Ex-tenants, liability under very old indemnification provisions, § 9:107

PRP liability, lessees and sublessors, § 3:44

LEGAL TRAINING

A non-scientist, not trained

Qualified to testify as an expert on how the court should equitably allocate CERCLA liability, § 11:48

A scientist, not trained

Qualified to testify as the public trust doctrine and its role in the equitable allocation of CERCLA liability, § 11:49

LETTERS

Checklist for response to PRP letter, § App 2A

Consultant engagement letter, sample, § App 9D

De micromis settlements, communication tools, § 5:55

Information request letter, sample, § App 2D

Pre-PRP letters, responses to EPA and state agency PRP letters, § 2:2

PRP letter, sample, § App 2E

Responses to EPA and State Agency PRP Letters (this index)

Tender letter to insurer, sample, § App 2F

LIABILITY

- California State Law Tort Claims that Impose Join and Several CERCLA Does Not Preempt, § 1:38
- Claim of orphan PRP
 - Shares does not escape liability, § 3:206
- Claims against any other solvent party
 - Inequitable share, § 3:9
- Counterclaim by the United States against it in one CERCLA action
 - Shares does not escape liability, to contribute to the plaintiffs liability to the United States in another (separate) CERCLA action, § 3:208
- Courts must dismiss CERCLA contribution claims
 - Inequitable liability, § 11.8
- Equire exhaustive/conclusive/undisputed evidence of total costs v. the settling defendants individual
 - Liability to determine substantive fairness, § 3:132
- Existence/non-existence, insurance exception to a statute of repose, § 10:193
- Off-site contaminated properties, CERCLA facility, release of a hazardous substance , release sites owner/operator is liable
 - For the response costs to clean-up the off-site properties, § 3:20
- Transfer, for CERCLA costs between/among parties (permissible)(impermissible), allocation agreement, no exception exists, litigation is between the same parties
 - Government and its contractor, § 9:82
- Unpaid, not bare assertions
 - Future cleanup, constitute costs incurred in responding to a release, § 3:207

LIABILITY INSURANCE FUNDAMENTALS

- Responses to EPA and state agency PRP letters, § 2:14
- Substantively fair and reasonable to settle, PRP ability to pay, § 3:131

LITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOCATION ISSUES

- Generally, §§ 10:1 to 10:197
- Accurate reporting of response costs, NCP requirement, plaintiff's, § 10:35
- Agreements that allocate CERCLA costs between/ among parties (permissible)(impermissible), transfer liability, no exception exists
 - Allocation agreement, between government and its contractor, § 9:82
- All appropriate inquiry, defense, § 10:55
- Allegation plaintiff has accumulated expenses in excess of fair share, § 10:39

LITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL

ALLOCATION ISSUES—Cont'd

- Allocator's report, sample, § App 10A
- Amended complaints
 - Adding RCRA claims in violation of RCRA notice requirements, § 10:91
 - New parties where plaintiffs dilatory, § 10:92
- Attorney disqualification, § 10:166
- Aviall case
 - Additional post-Aviall issues, §§ 10:58 to 10:63
 - Conundrum of decision, § 10:59
 - Former conundrum, § 10:59
 - Implied right of contribution, § 10:60
 - Implied right to contribution, post-Aviall split of authority on whether 107 includes, §§ 10:58 to 10:63
 - Literature survey, post-Aviall practice tips, § 10:63
 - Practice tips post-Aviall, § 10:63
 - PRP allowed to sue under section 107, §§ 10:61, 10:62
- Bankruptcy court approval of reorganization plan does not trigger statute of limitations, § 10:43
- Burden of proof, §§ 10:7, 10:22
- Categorization of CERCLA cases, §§ 10:3 to 10:6
- Causes of action, selecting and drafting for complaint, §§ 10:127 to 10:141
- CERCLA claims against any other solvent party
 - Inequitable share of liability, § 3:9
- CERCLA cost recovery action
 - Cost effectiveness requirement of National Contingency Plan, §§ 10:29, 10:31
 - Investigatory costs, recovery of by PRP, § 10:33
 - Issues related to, §§ 10:26 to 10:29
 - National Contingency Plan, summary judgment based on inconsistency, § 10:30
 - PRP suing PRP, no justification to pursue section 107 cost recovery claim, § 10:121
 - Response costs paid for insured, insurers cannot file subrogation claims to recover, § 10:24
 - State agency, § 10:25
 - Voluntary cleanup must be by innocent party, § 10:27
- CERCLA cost recovery action
 - Cost effectiveness requirement, application, § 10:32
- CERCLA liability, PRPs admission of liability
 - Relevant cleanup liability, triggers running of CERCLAs statute of limitations, § 10:45
- CERCLA plaintiffs may move to strike/dismiss third-party impleader claims, § 10:194
- CERCLAs traditional defenses, § 10:53

LITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOCATION ISSUES—Cont'd

- Characterization of claim, § 10:132
- Claim preclusion, § 10:190
- Claims available to PRP under recent case law, § 10:178
- Coercion by government and voluntariness, § 10:83
- Collateral estoppel as bar to reallocation of equitable liability shares, § 10:82
- Commerce Clause, affirmative defense that CERCLA is violation of, § 10:153
- Complaints (this index)
- Consent order between ex-owner and state agency, § 10:119
- Contractual allocation, joint defense group, § 10:176
- Contractual indemnitors, section 107 rights, § 10:150
- Contribution (this index)
- Contribution or cost recovery actions, no juries in CERCLA, § 10:2
- Core factors, § 10:17
- Cost Recovery Action under CERCLA (this index)
- Counterclaims
 - Equitable apportionment, §§ 10:93, 10:164
 - PRP identification costs, contribution under CERCLA, § 10:135
- Courts dismiss CERCLA contribution claims
 - If plaintiff cannot show inequitable liability, § 10:9
- Declaratory Declaratory Judgment Actions
 - Determine Liability For, Not Recoverability of, § 10:97
- Declaratory judgments, §§ 10:13 to 10:16, 10:90
- Declaratory relief available for past and future response costs, § 10:96
- Defenses under CERCLA, §§ 10:53 to 10:56
- Different contaminants released, contribution claims in spite of, § 10:174
- Dilatoriness in amendment of complaints, denying leave to amend, § 10:163
- Discovery
 - Generally, §§ 10:155 to 10:158
 - EPA as key source of information, § 10:155
 - Formal and informal, §§ 10:155 to 10:158
 - Informal discovery, advantages of, § 10:156
 - Opponent's liability insurance coverage, dangers of overaggressive discovery, § 10:157
- Dismissal
 - Counterclaim for contribution under 113(f), § 10:146
- Dismissal, statute of limitations, expired, Amends the complaint to reassert a claim, § 10:51

LITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOCATION ISSUES—Cont'd

- Disqualification
 - Attorney due to membership in joint defense group, § 10:166
 - Law firm, screening remedy, § 10:94
- Divisibility and contribution from other PRPs, § 10:102
- Double recovery, § 10:143
- Elements of prima facie case
 - CERCLA contribution, §§ 10:21, 10:34, 10:37
 - CERCLA cost recovery, § 10:21
 - Contribution claim, back-up claim, § 10:20
- Environmental Liability Claim Basics (this index)
- Equitable allocation, §§ 10:17, 10:18
- Equitable defenses
 - Cost recovery actions, § 10:56
 - Differing availability, § 10:145
- Existence/non-existence of a liability insurance exception, § 10:193
- Experts Opinion, Equitable Allocation Factors
 - Interferes with the Judges Role, Impermissible Expert Lawyer Opinion on the Courts Ultimate Legal Conclusion, § 10:191
- Failed contribution claim, linkage to causes of action for indemnification and breach of contract, § 10:148
- Federal government, entitled to impose joint and several liability
 - Seeking from another PRP, § 10:88
- Federal government imposition of joint and several liability, § 10:88
- Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, directive on leniency, attorneys should not wait too long to amend, § 10:197
- Formal discovery, §§ 10:155 to 10:158
- Government agency, burden of proof, § 10:22
- Government-approved remediation plan as prerequisite, § 10:40
- Government approved remediation plan in not required for a court order
 - On equitable allocation of costs, § 10:195
- Government contractors, assertion of double recovery defense by government, § 10:158
- Guideposts
 - Response action is a removal action or remedial action, § 10:50
- Identification as PRP incorrect may recover resulting costs, § 10:84
- Immunity from 113 counterclaim, § 10:103
- Implied right to contribution, post-Aviall split of authority on whether 107 includes, §§ 10:58 to 10:63
- Incur Additional Cleanup Costs Does Not Make Its CERCLA Unripe, § 10:154
- Informal discovery, §§ 10:155 to 10:158

**LITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL
ALLOCATION ISSUES—Cont'd**

- Initial action, prior federal action and counterclaims for contribution, §§ **10:99, 10:100**
- Initial actions for CERCLA contribution purposes, § **10:172**
- Joint and several liability, § **10:88**
 - Imposition even if government is PRP, § **10:141**
 - Seeking from another PRP, § **10:86**
- Joint defense group, attorney's prior membership as disqualifying factor, § **10:95**
- Joint tortfeasors and named defendants, § **10:41**
- Jury trial under state counterpart statutes, § **10:179**
- Leverage settlements from small companies, profitable investment
 - Countenance CERCLA scams, § **3:10**
- Liability v. recoverability, § **10:36**
- Literature survey, post-Aviall practice tips, § **10:63**
- Most realistic defenses, § **10:54**
- Motions to dismiss, CERCLA contribution suit, payment of portion of liability, § **10:52**
- Mutually exclusive remedies of CERCLA, inconsistent pleading, § **10:131**
- NCP requirement, accurate reporting response costs, plaintiff's, § **10:35**
- No Federal Claim Survives Pre-Trial Motions, Federal Courts Will Not Exercise Jurisdiction Over the Remaining State Law Claims, Federal Courts Will Accept Supplemental Jurisdiction, § **10:192**
- Non-settling PRPs ability to bring CERCLA cost to recovery action, § **10:80**
- Nonsettling PRPs sidestepping contribution protection, § **10:89**
- Partys right to contribution for some of its cleanup expenses does not
 - Automatically bar it from suing for cost recovery of other cleanup expenses, § **10:71**
- Payment date of settlement sum, § **10:42**
- Petroleum exclusion, recovery under state law, § **10:147**
- Phase/operable units as trigger for CERCLA's statute of limitations, § **10:48**
- Plaintiff paid only its portion of liability, dismissal, § **10:51**
- Plaintiff's duties to cleanup and cost recovery, § **10:67**
- Pleadings, responsive pleadings by defendant, § **10:152**
- Pleadings as basis for allocation of response costs, § **10:182**

**LITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL
ALLOCATION ISSUES—Cont'd**

- Post-Aviall split of authority on whether 107 includes implied right to contribution, §§ **10:58 to 10:63**
- Practice tips post-Aviall, § **10:63**
- Preemption of private state law claim, § **10:118**
- Preemption of state common law claims for contribution and indemnity, § **10:151**
- Pre-trial conferences, § **10:162**
- Pretrial settlement sums, § **10:181**
- Prior claim against the defendant, regardless
 - Does not qualify as an initial action to recover response costs under, § **10:173**
- Prior claims against defendant, § **10:100**
- Private cost recovery under CERCLA counterpart statutes
 - Generally, §§ **10:122 to 10:126**
 - California Hazardous Substance Account, § **10:122**
 - Californias CERCLA counterpart statute, defendants release caused it to incur response costs
 - a county water district does not have to prove, § **10:124**
 - Commencement, date of, state vs. federal statute of limitations, § **10:125**
 - County water district, § **10:126**
 - Statutory indemnity, § **10:126**
- Private cost recovery under state CERCLA counterpart statutes, § **10:120**
- Private parties
 - Generally, §§ **10:22, 10:23**
 - Actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, litigation after escrow has closed, § **9:75**
- PRP agreement, sample, § **App 10B**
- PRP Does Not Have to Wait Until, Under a Legal Duty to Pay for
 - All/Part of a Sites Cleanup to Sue for Contribution, § **10:12**
- PRPs, option
 - Mechanisms to recover cleanup costs, § **10:73**
- Qualification. Disqualification, above
- Ratio of insurance recovery to damages award, § **10:180**
- Recovery of cleanup costs, CERCLA mechanisms allowing, § **10:64**
- Reimbursement of response costs
 - Insurers cannot file subrogation claims to recover, § **10:24**
 - Selection between CERCLA section 107 and section 113, § **10:61**
- Related causes of action, pleading, double recovery, § **10:143**
- Removal or remedial work, § **10:49**
- Report of allocator, sample, § **App 10A**

LITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOCATION ISSUES—Cont'd

- Response costs
 - Accurate reporting, plaintiff's, NCP requirement, § 10:35
 - Involuntary, PRP may not sue, § 10:65
- Responsive pleadings, § 10:152
- Sanctions include/maintain a section 107(a) claim after they enter into consent decree, § 10:196
- Screening to avoid disqualification in CERCLA case, § 10:165
- Section 107 cost recovery claim, PRP suing PRP, no justification, § 10:121
- Section 113(f)
 - Contribution claim after summary judgment, § 10:98
 - PRP suing PRP, no justification to pursue section 107 cost recovery claim, § 10:121
- Settlement
 - Considerations, §§ 10:159 to 10:162
 - With government before suit can recover response costs, § 10:81
- Settlement must resolve a CERCLA-specific liability to trigger, right to contribution, Supreme Court rules on who may sue for contribution under § 113(F)(3)(B) in Territory of Guam v. United States, § 10:70
- Split of authority, includes an implied right to contribution, § 10:60
- Standard of proof required, costs claim, reasonable and rational approximation
 - Defendants individual contribution to the facility's contamination, § 10:8
- State environmental agencies and settlements, § 10:85
- State grant to municipality, § 10:25
- State law claims to recover same CERCLA costs, pursuit of, § 10:177
- Statute of limitations, §§ 10:10, 10:44 to 10:51
- Statutory triggers for a contribution claim, occurred for particular site expenses, assert a cost recovery action for its other expenses, § 10:79
- Subrogation claims, insurer cannot file, § 10:24
- There is no independent cause of action
 - Declaratory relief under CERCLA, § 10:123
- Third-party CERCLA contribution claims against non-settling defendant, § 10:58
- Third-party payments as equitable factor or double recovery, § 10:144
- Trial considerations, §§ 10:167 to 10:169
- Trial phasing, § 10:87
- Two ways to categorize CERCLA cases, §§ 10:3 to 10:6
- Unilateral administrative orders not equivalent to "civil action" under majority rule, § 10:78

LITIGATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ALLOCATION ISSUES—Cont'd

- Unsigned stipulation, acceptance as evidence, § 10:189
- U.S. v. Atlantic Research, case law following, §§ 10:64 to 10:89
- Voluntariness
 - Performance by settling PRP, § 10:83
 - Response costs and impact on action for cost recovery, § 10:65
- Zero costs allocation on summary judgment, § 10:38

MANUFACTURED PRODUCTS

- Common law torts, strict liability, § 1:12

MASS OF CONTRIBUTION

- Methodology of allocation, § 3:202

MASS/VOLUME CONTRIBUTION

- Methodology of allocation, § 3:203

MERCURY WASTE

- Strict liability, § 9:35

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION

- Generally, §§ 3:1 to 3:257
- Acceptance of unsigned stipulation, § 3:168
- Allocable costs
 - Arbitrary and capricious standard, § 3:233
 - Arbitrary and capricious standard for government response costs, § 3:233
 - Attorney's fees, § 3:221
 - Attorney's fees, cost recovery and contribution actions are intertwined, § 3:226
 - Burden of proof, § 3:216
 - CERCLA limits, government recovery of attorneys' fees, unavoidable response cost actions, § 3:227
 - Composition of allocable costs, § 3:200
 - Costs of preliminary investigation and monitoring recoverable for private parties, § 3:199
 - EPA oversight costs, § 3:229
 - Experts' fees, § 3:225
 - Future costs, § 3:122
 - Future costs, Battle of dueling experts, § 3:228
 - Government recovery of costs, § 3:233
 - Indirect costs, § 3:230
 - Insurance policy, remediation for costs reimbursed under, § 3:233
 - Penalties and punitive damages, § 3:231
 - Prima facie case, § 3:196
 - Private parties can recover certain preliminary investigation
 - monitoring costs regardless of compliance with the NCP, § 3:217

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION

—Cont'd

Allocable costs—Cont'd

PRP cannot recover contribution for remediation costs, been reimbursed under an insurance policy, collateral source rule

does not apply, § 3:232

Public participation unnecessary if government environmental agency supervises cleanup, § 3:219

Specific issues regarding what allocable costs comprise, § 3:220

Standard of Appellate Review for Compliance With the NCP, § 3:215

Amount of pollutant discharged, § 3:163

Appellate court reverses the district courts environmental liability, § 3:267

Area of contribution method, § 3:200

Burden of proof

Allocable costs, § 3:216

Divisibility cases and equitable allocation cases, § 3:174

State CERCLA counterparts, § 3:175

Causal contribution, factual determinations regarding, § 3:262

CERCLA

Substantive fairness, viable claims against non-settling defendants, granting a motion to bar contribution claims

reapportion damages to the settling parties in a contribution action (0167 113(f)(1)), § 3:126

CERCLA defendant

Loaned equipment to an independent third-party who used the equipment to pollute is liable as an owner, § 3:30

CERCLA overview

Administrative settlement provision, RCRA costs, response costs under, § 3:7

Asbestos, § 3:24

Bona fide prospective purchaser defense, § 5:9

Contiguous property owner defense, § 5:9

Current owners of property, strict liability, § 3:27

Disposal

scope of term, § 3:22

Disposal, what constitutes, § 3:22

Fertilizer products, release exclusion, § 3:23

Hazardous substances, facility, § 3:21

Innocent landowner defense, § 5:9

RCRA costs, response costs under CERCLAs administrative settlement provision, § 3:7

Trustees and beneficiary liability, § 3:26

Types of individuals or entities subject to liability, § 3:25

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION

—Cont'd

CERCLA overview

Application of Burlington Northern, Appleton Township of Islip

specific state of mind concerning whether a substance is hazardous

arranger under § 107(a)(3), § 3:33

Arranger liability, §§ 3:32, 3:38, 3:65

causation, § 3:36

official designation, § 3:40

recycling exception, § 3:42

transformer sales, § 3:37

valves and tanks, § 3:39

Arranger liability, § 3:63

Assets of corporation, purchaser, § 3:53

Assumption of liability theory, redecessor corporation no longer exists, § 3:54

“Bare legal title” holder, § 3:17

Bona fide prospective purchaser defense, § 3:79

Causal connection between release and costs, § 3:35

Causal contribution of party, factual determinations and reimbursement actions, § 3:66

Causation, burden on government to prove, § 3:36

Common historical ownership/contaminant source, § 3:19

Compensability, §§ 3:11, 3:12

Contaminated building, sale with intent to dispose, owner liable, § 3:38

Contiguous property owner defense, § 3:79

Corporate veil, piercing to impose liability, § 3:67

Creation and objectives, § 3:3

Defenses, §§ 3:47, 3:75 to 3:79

Determination of subsection to be used for reimbursement, § 3:105

Direct spills/leaks onto land or into water, § 3:59

Disposal

sale of building, § 3:38

scope of term, § 3:57

timing of, § 3:41

Dissolved entities, § 3:14

Divisibility defense, § 3:76

Facility, liberally construed, § 3:21

Facility, what constitutes, §§ 3:18, 3:21

Fee title holder, § 3:16

Four classes of PRPs, §§ 3:15 to 3:18

Hazardous substance broadly defined, § 3:5

History of allocation under, § 3:99

Inequitable share of liability, § 3:9

Innocent landowner defense, § 3:79

Legal title establishes owner liability, § 3:43

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION

—Cont'd

- CERCLA overview—Cont'd
 - Lender liability, history, § 3:74
 - Lessees, PRP liability, § 3:44
 - Liability on a parent company, § 3:69
 - Momentary owner, § 3:41
 - Natural gas excluded, “hazardous substance” broadly defined, § 3:5
 - Natural resource damages liability, § 3:13
 - Non-owner, fee title holder, § 3:16
 - Operator liability, § 3:61
 - Original defenses, § 3:75
 - Owner and operator status, timing of determination, § 3:70
 - Party can be an ex-owner/operator of a facility although it owned/operated only a part of that facility, § 3:62
 - Passive disposal, split of authority, § 3:48
 - Passive migration, § 3:49
 - Petroleum excluded, “hazardous substance” broadly defined, § 3:5
 - Pleading successor liability, § 3:51
 - Private party compensation, § 3:2
 - Productive use of material, disposal as, § 3:64
 - Property improved at another’s expense, § 3:8
 - PRP to incur CERCLA liability, § 3:54
 - Purchaser liable for costs after purchase, § 3:45
 - Quantitative floor, § 3:46
 - Release of a hazardous substance, owner/operator is liable for the response costs to clean-up the off-site properties, § 3:20
 - Remediation costs, safe working conditions, § 3:6
 - Response cost liability, § 3:4
 - Responsibility for release of hazardous substance, § 3:61
 - Sale of contaminated site, § 3:58
 - SARA expansion of defenses, § 3:78
 - Separate allocation hearing, necessity of, § 3:107
 - Settlements from small companies courts will not countenance CERCLA scams, § 3:10
 - Shareholder who is not successor-in-interest, § 3:55
 - Status, timing of, § 3:60
 - Sublessors, PRP liability, § 3:44
 - Successive liability, § 3:66
 - Successor liability, §§ 3:50, 3:52, 3:53
 - Successor liability theory, pleading, § 3:55
 - Terror attack, war exception, § 3:77
 - Timing of allocation, § 3:106
 - Transformers, sending and selling of, § 3:37

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION

—Cont'd

- CERCLA overview—Cont'd
 - Unsold products, arranger liability, § 3:65
 - War exception, § 3:77
- CERCLA plaintiffs
 - Defendant’s equipment ownership is linked to releases or cleanup costs, § 3:29
 - Link between the defendant’s specific disposal and the site’s cleanup, § 3:28
 - Not prove the defendant’s waste contaminated plaintiff’s property to establish defendant’s CERCLA liability, § 3:31
- CERCLA requires knowledge that disposed-of-waste is hazardous
 - Open question, arranger liability, § 3:34
- Cleanups can demand reimbursement from other PRPs
 - Meticulous factual determinations concerning, § 3:210
- Consent decrees are not required to specify the extent of liability attributable to each settling defenda, § 3:116
- Contribution, right of PRP to sue for, § 3:209
- Cooper Industries, Inc. v. Aviall Services, Inc., § 3:104
- Cost recovery action
 - Motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § App 3A
 - Opposition to motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § App 3B
 - Reply memorandum in support of motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § App 3C
- Counterclaims for contribution
 - Generally, § 3:258
 - Funding of settlement claim, § 3:266
 - Nondivisible harm, § 3:261
 - Reimbursement from other PRPs, § 3:262
 - State law claims, § 3:259
 - State law claims, discretion to apply the UCFA contribution, § 3:260
- Court
 - Specific, factual information before deciding whether certain litigation related costs are recoverable, § 3:222
- Court requirements, § 3:169
- Court will not approve a CERCLA settlement
 - No personal jurisdiction over such parties, § 3:268
- Defaulting defendants, § 3:265
- Discretion in applying orphan share, § 3:214
- Distribution of orphan shares, § 3:204
- Employee health and safety costs are not recoverable under CERCLA, § 3:218
- EPA cost allocation guidelines, § 6:5

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION

—Cont'd

- Equitable allocation of response costs
 - Generally, §§ 3:245 to 3:268
 - Ability to pay, §§ 3:248, 3:256
 - Abuse of discretion, § 3:235
 - Abuse of discretion in failing to apply orphan share doctrine, § 3:249
 - Abuse of discretion standard, § 3:253
 - Broad discretion, § 3:245
 - Clear error, review for, § 3:235
 - District courts, broad discretion of, § 3:234
 - Fault, Gore factors, CERCLAs strict liability scheme, § 3:237
 - Future costs, accounting for, § 3:246
 - Government approved remediation plans, § 3:247
 - Government as owner, § 3:236
 - Multipliers, §§ 3:251, 3:254
 - Orphan share, creation, § 3:245
 - Orphan shares, accounting for, § 3:243
 - Prejudgment interest, § 3:255
 - Pro tanto, disclosure of settlement terms is not required for court approval of settlements UTCA (Pro Rata), § 3:241
 - Pro tanto or proportionate shares, § 3:240
 - Recalcitrance multiplier, § 3:251
 - Separate allocation hearing, § 3:250
 - Settled shares of other PRPs, accounting for, § 3:238
 - Settlements, apportionment in private party cost recovery actions, § 3:239
 - Solvent identified party's share as orphan, § 3:252
 - Uncertainty multiplier, § 3:254
- Federal common law CERCLA allocation, § 3:103
- Frustration by courts, § 3:171
- Funding of settlement claim, contribution, § 3:266
- Geographic location, considered in allocation, § 3:150
- "Gore Factors" used by courts in allocation, §§ 3:149 to 3:175
- Government liability
 - National defense program, contamination relating from, § 3:72
 - Operator liability, § 3:72
 - Payment of indirect charges, § 3:74
- Inability to pay a judgment, § 3:173
- Individual allocations for each contaminant of concern, § 3:184
- Individual or stand alone plume allocation method, §§ 3:195 to 3:199
- Interview with an allocator, § App 3G
- Joint and several liability, § 3:101

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION

—Cont'd

- Judgment proof PRP, effect on determination of equitable allocation, § 3:173
- Liability, defaulting party, § 3:244
- Litigation exposure, considered in allocation, § 3:150
- Magnitude and extent of environmental impacts, § 3:191
- Mass discharge, §§ 3:162, 3:164
- Mass of contribution method, § 3:202
- Mass/volume contribution method, § 3:203
- Military contractors, costs incurred during war-effort production, § 3:158
- Monetary judgments, availability of, § 3:257
- National defense program, liability of government for contamination from, § 3:72
- Nonbinding preliminary allocations for responsibility (NBARs)
 - Generally, §§ 3:146 to 3:148
 - Collection and assessment of information necessary to prepare, § 3:148
 - Divvy up 100 percent, not only the "arranger share" of, § 3:146
 - Preparation and formula, § 3:146
 - Settlers liability apportionments, § 3:146
- Non-divisible harm, setoffs, § 3:264
- Open question
 - Whether a jury can decide to pierce the corporate veil in a CERCLA Case, § 3:68
- Orphan shares under various allocation formulas, § 3:204
- PRP prevailing on defense or claim, government should account for, § 3:157
- PRP's right to sue, § 3:209
- Recoverability for demolition costs depends on whether they were necessary response costs consistent with the NCP, § 3:223
- Reform legislation proposals, § 3:263
- Reliance on government contracts by PRP, § 3:155
- Remand the district court
 - Equitable allocation ruling, § 3:267
- Risk vs. production, time on the, based allocation methodologies, § 3:159
- Scheme, court approved allocation, § 3:156
- Setoffs, non-divisible harm, § 3:264
- Settlement/proposed consent decree
 - CERCLA
 - Generally, §§ 3:108 to 3:131
 - Arms-length negotiations, § 3:111
 - conflict of interest do not constitute procedural unfairness, § 3:123
 - Consistency with CERCLA's purpose, § 3:145
 - Contingent insurance recovery, § 3:144

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION**—Cont'd**

Settlement/proposed consent decree—Cont'd

CERCLA—Cont'd

Control over disposal of contaminants vs. title to contaminants, § 3:160

court must not approve a CERCLA settlement, if it knows too little

would not be fair (procedurally or substantively), § 3:123

court must not approve a CERCLA settlement, insufficient information, unreasonable

foreseeable litigation risks and transaction costs, § 3:142

De minimis PRPs, inclusion of, § 3:119

Details needed for procedural review, § 3:114

Differing treatment for PRPs, § 3:136

Discounting EPA's claim for early settlement, § 3:134

Disproportionate liability to non-settlor and substantive fairness, § 3:137

EPA, delegation of negotiating authority, § 3:118

EPA need not prepare the allocation, § 3:124

Financial information provided by EPA, § 3:122

Four factors for reviewing settlements, § 3:109

Fragmented data supporting settlement, § 3:135

Guidelines in PRP Search Manual, § 3:139

Media, errors in, § 3:117

not dispositive in a court's decision to approve settlement agreement, § 3:140

opposed to splitting only the arranger share of, the remediation costs, § 3:143

Procedural fairness, §§ 3:110, 3:117 to 3:122

Procedural fairness, Use of a Private Mediator Evidences, § 3:112

Procedural fairness requires notice to non-settling parties, § 3:115

Procedurally/substantively, § 3:113

Reasonableness, § 3:141

Reasonableness, funding, contingent insurance recovery, § 3:144

settlement negotiations does not impact their procedural fairness, § 3:120

Specific allocation share for each PRP, § 3:138

Substantive fairness

ability to pay approach, evaluate comparative fault for the proposed consent decree, § 3:128

METHODOLOGIES OF ALLOCATION**—Cont'd**

Settlement/proposed consent decree—Cont'd

CERCLA—Cont'd

Substantive fairness—Cont'd

different ways to prove a settlement agreement, § 3:127

existence of orphan shares, determination, § 3:133

generally, §§ 3:125 to 3:139

non-settling objectors contention, misleading the government regarding its ability to pay is, § 3:130

objecting, non-settling party to successfully argue against the EPA's ability to pay determination, § 3:129

require exhaustive/conclusive/undisputed evidence of total costs v. settling defendants individual liability to determine substantive fairness, § 3:132

substantively fair and reasonable to settle based on the PRPs ability to pay

PRP liability insurance, § 3:131

Third party participation in negotiations, § 3:121

unsubstantiated allegations of cronyism, § 3:123

Opposition, sample points and authorities, § App 3E

Support

sample points and authorities, § App 3D

sample reply points and authorities, § App 3F

Severability of contamination, § 3:165

Site-specific factors and attributes, §§ 3:178 to 3:185

Solvent identified party, share of CERCLA costs as orphan, § 3:204

Solvent identified party's share of

CERCLA costs qualifies as an orphan, § 3:212

Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act, § 3:102

Thirty years of allocation under CERCLA, §§ 3:100 to 3:104

Tortuous legislative history, § 3:100

Triggering PRP's right to sue, § 3:209

Volume of contributions method, § 3:201

Volume of waste as predominant factor, § 3:161

War-effort production, military contractors, costs incurred during, § 3:158

Waste volumes of settling parties as primary equitable factor, § 3:172

MISREPRESENTATION

Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, § 9:41

MOTION IN LIMINE

- Experts in Allocation Disputes (this index)
- Viable claims against non-settling, settlement
 - Equitably apportioned, contribution claims, cost recovery, § 3:126

MULTIPLE GENERATORS

- Allocation law, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:26

MUNICIPAL PRPS

- Specific PRP vs. PRP disputes, transporters vs. municipal PRPs, § 6:30

NBARS

- Generally, §§ 3:146 to 3:148
- Collection and assessment of information, § 3:148
- Formula for, § 3:147
- Preparation of, § 3:147

NECESSARY AND INDISPENSABLE PARTY

- Government entity ordering remediation in private party action not necessary and indispensable party in enforcement, § 10:57

NEGLIGENCE

- Caveat emptor, § 1:5
- Common law torts, §§ 1:3, 9:24 to 9:29
- Defenses, § 9:26
- Environmental negligence, illustrative cases, § 9:25
- Jury's decision on a state cause of action
 - Determine the courts subsequent decision on the third-party defense, § 3:84
- Per se negligence, §§ 9:27 to 9:29
- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:24 to 9:29

NEGLIGENCE PER SE

- Common law torts, §§ 1:6, 1:7, 9:27 to 9:29
- Defenses, § 9:29
- Environmental negligence per se, illustrative cases, § 9:28
- EPA memo as a regulatory order, § 1:7
- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:27 to 9:29

NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, § 9:41

NEW JERSEY

- Environmental liability claim basics, § 1:34

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

- Non-settlor PRP, EPA and non-profits/charitable organizations, § 4:62

NON-SETTLOR PRP

- Administrative orders on consent, § 4:47

NON-SETTLOR PRP—Cont'd

- Allocations by EPA
 - NBARS, § 4:58
 - Personnel, § 4:59
- Alternative dispute resolution and CERCLA allocation settlements, §§ 4:51, 4:73
- Appellate review of district court's approval of CERCLA consent decree, § 4:56
- Beginning the settlement process, § 4:48
- California federal district courts, combined California case law with federal case law in their determinations
 - CERCLA settlement is in good faith, fair and reasonable, § 4:79
- Charitable organizations and EPA, § 4:62
- Common law torts, manufactured products, § 1:12
- Contribution rights, opposing consent decrees that might bar, § 4:49
- Draft environmental settlement agreements, discoverability by non-parties, § 4:65
- Effect of settlement on other PRPs, § 4:69
- EPA
 - Non-profits/charitable organizations, § 4:62
 - Personnel pursuing PRPs, § 4:21
 - Settlement goal of EPA, § 4:46
- Evidentiary details, complex, trial court need not involve itself, § 4:55
- Federal Alternative Dispute Resolution Act, § 4:66
- Filing suit against PRP defendants after settlement or EPA prevailing in suit, § 4:61
- Formal organization and steering committees, § 4:26
- Governmental agencies, dealing with, §§ 4:1 to 4:80
- Identification of PRPs, § 4:23
- Information gathering, § 4:24
- Insurance and CERCLA settlements, §§ 4:72 to 4:75
- Interacting with other PRPs, §§ 4:24, 4:26
- Intervening to oppose consent decrees, § 4:49
- Intervention rights, §§ 4:63, 4:64
- Lead agency
 - Generally, §§ 4:2 to 4:20
 - Abandoned waste sites, § 4:10
 - Defining, § 4:2
 - Determining, § 4:3 et seq.
 - Division of labor between federal and state agencies, § 4:8
 - EPA determination of whether it should be the lead agency, § 4:17
 - Executive orders, §§ 4:4, 4:5
 - Federal and state response lines, § 4:9
 - Federal government as lead agency, § 4:7
 - Friction between agencies, § 4:16

NON-SETTLOR PRP—Cont'd

- Lead agency—Cont'd
 - Legislative intent, § 4:12
 - Money, time and expertise, § 4:11
 - NCP direction of state, local and federal agencies, § 4:6
 - Practical differences with different lead agencies, § 4:19
 - Response and enforcement
 - difference between, § 4:13
 - same lead agency, § 4:20
 - Rights of PRPs who object, § 4:18
 - Scope of problem and requests for federal aid, § 4:14
 - States' independence, § 4:15
- Maintaining claim, § 4:65
- Non-profit organizations and EPA, § 4:62
- Notice of proposed settlement, § 4:50
- Objections to proposed CERCLA settlements, § 4:63
- Offsets, administrative judicial settlements qualifying as, § 4:68
- Penalties available against PRPs, § 4:22
- Procedural fairness requires notice to non-settling parties, § 3:115
- Settlement incentives
 - Generally, §§ 4:27 to 4:45
 - Administrative orders on consent, § 4:47
 - Beginning the settlement process, § 4:48
 - Contractual indemnity, § 4:31
 - Contribution protection, § 4:29
 - Covenants not to sue, § 4:39
 - Disproportionate liability for non-settlers, § 4:32
 - EPA's settlement goal, § 4:46
 - Joint and several liability, § 4:45
 - Limitation of contribution protection to matters addressed, § 4:33
 - Mixed funding, § 4:41
 - Municipalities, contribution protection after settlement with, § 4:36
 - Non-governmental parties, contribution protection after settlement with, § 4:34
 - Orphan share compensation, § 4:40
 - Potentially lower cleanup costs, § 4:44
 - Resolution of liability for response action, contribution claim availability, § 4:38
 - Sec. 9613(f)(2), municipality or special government entity constituting a state, § 4:35
 - Special accounts, § 4:42
 - State, municipality or special government entity constituting a, Sec. 9613(f)(2), § 4:35
 - State CERCLA counterparts, contribution protection, § 4:30

NON-SETTLOR PRP—Cont'd

- Settlement incentives—Cont'd
 - Strict liability, § 4:45
 - Suspended listing, § 4:43
 - Third-party contribution claim against non-settling defendant, § 4:28
 - Valid contribution claim, level of judicial approval of settlement, § 4:37
- Settlement negotiations PRPs, § 4:25
- Standards for review of proposed consent decree and other EPA actions under CERCLA, §§ 4:54 to 4:57
- Time to settle, § 4:60

NOTICE OF INTENT

- RCRA actions, failure to provide notice of intent to sue is fatal
- Notice to a previous owner suffices if the defendant purchased the facility subject to such notice, § 8:12

NOTICE OF SUIT

- RCRA actions, § 8:10

NUISANCE

- Abatement costs, § 9:22
- Common law torts, §§ 1:10, 1:11
- Common law toxic tort actions, §§ 9:3 to 9:10
- Continuing tort, non-nuisance, court split, § 9:21
- Defective products, environmental nuisance actions, § 9:9
- Defenses, § 9:10
- Environmental private nuisance, illustrative cases, § 9:7
- Environmental public nuisance, illustrative cases, § 9:5
- Landowners sued for nuisances on owned property, § 9:8
- New Jersey trend, § 9:23
- Private nuisance, § 9:6
- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:3 to 9:10
- Public nuisance, § 9:4
- Reliance on continuing tort doctrine by plaintiff, § 9:22
- Restoration costs, § 9:22
- Similarities between nuisance and trespass, § 9:18

OBJECTIONS

- Non-settlor PRP, proposed CERCLA settlements, §§ 4:63, 4:64

OPERATORS

- Acquiescence by owner in operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:19
- Benefit to owner from operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:20
- Generators vs. owners and operators, § 6:27

OPERATORS—Cont'd

- Government incurring CERCLA operator liability, § 3:71
- Operators vs. operators, § 6:24
- Owner's acquiescence in operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:19
- Owner's benefit from operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:20
- Owners vs. operators, § 6:25
- Previous Owners and Operators (this index)

OPERATORS, OWNERS vs.

- Allocation law, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:25

OPERATORS vs. OPERATORS

- Allocation law, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:24

ORPHAN SHARES

- Burlingtons impact on site with multiple orphan shares, § 7:30
- Claim of orphan PRPs, responsibility among the identified PRPs
 - Liability, § 3:206
- Contribution, burden of proving the existence and appropriate allocation, § 3:205
- Distribution of, § 3:204
- Divisibility, impact of Burlington Northern case, § 7:30
- Equitable allocation and accounting for, § 3:243
- Existence, not impact a substantiveness fairness determination, § 3:133
- Methodology of allocation, § 3:204
- Plaintiff cannot use a counterclaim by the United States, action to compel the defendant to contribute to the plaintiff's liability to the United States in another (separate) CERCLA action, § 3:208
- Solvent identified parties share of CERCLA costs qualifies, § 3:213
- Unpaid liabilities, § 3:207
- Unpaid liabilities, plaintiff will perform future cleanup
 - Constitute costs incurred in responding to a release, § 3:207

OWNERS

- Benefit to owner from operator's activities, consideration by courts, § 6:20
- CERCLA liability scheme. Methodologies of Allocation (this index)
- Contaminated building, sale with intent to dispose, owner liable, § 3:38
- Court's consideration of owner's acquiescence in operator's activities, § 6:19
- Generators vs. owners and operators, § 6:27
- Legal title establishes owner liability, § 3:43

OWNERS—Cont'd

- Owners vs. operators, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:25
- Pleading, successorship, CERCLA claims, § 3:55
- Post-cleanup benefit to owner, consideration by courts, § 6:21
- Present owners vs. past owners, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:23
- Previous Owners and Operators (this index)
- Private Party Actions and Contractual Allocation of Liabilities (this index)
- Purchaser liable for costs after purchase, § 3:45
- RCRA actions. Previous Owners and Operators (this index)
- Status, timing of determination in CERCLA allocation cases, § 3:70
- Strict liability of current owners of property, CERCLA overview, § 3:27
- Suing previous owners, tenants or neighbors for waste releases, §§ 1:14 to 1:20

PENNSYLVANIA

- Environmental liability claim basics, § 1:35

PERSONAL INJURIES

- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:50 to 9:55
- Statute of limitations, § 1:36
- Toxic tort cases, theories of damages, §§ 9:50 to 9:55

PLEADINGS

- Allocation of response costs based merely on pleadings, § 10:182
- CERCLA divisibility, § 7:66
- Responsive pleadings by defendant, § 10:152

POSSIBLE OR ACTUAL CONTAMINATION

- Negotiating rights and responsibilities of each party, reprise of private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, § 9:78

POST-CLEANUP BENEFITS

- Allocation law, court's consideration of post-cleanup benefit to owner, § 6:21

PRE-PRP LETTER INVESTIGATION

- Responses to EPA and state agency PRP letters, § 2:3

PRE-PRP LETTERS

- Responses to EPA and state agency PRP letters, § 2:2

PRESENT OWNERS vs. PAST OWNERS

- Allocation law, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:23

PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCES

- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, § 10:162

PRE-TRIAL CONFERENCES—Cont'd

Waiver, divisibility defense, § 7:71

PRE-TRIAL DISCOVERY

Experts in allocation disputes

Generally, §§ 11:37 to 11:41

Deposing witnesses, § 11:39

Duty to supplement discovery, § 11:38

Opposing expert, questioning, § 11:40

Preparing expert, § 11:41

PREVIOUS OWNERS AND OPERATORS

Allocation law, present owners vs. past owners,
§ 6:23

Landowner's right to sue former owners, §§ 1:14
to 1:20

RCRA actions, suits against previous owners and
operators

Generally, §§ 8:23 to 8:30

Allocation to avoid joint and several liability,
§ 8:30

Alternative liability, burden shifting, § 8:29

Causation nexus required, owner or operator
handled waste, § 8:27

CERCLA's innocent landowner defense
distinguished, § 8:26

Contribution, § 8:31

Fault considerations, § 8:23

Innocent owners after release occurred,
§§ 8:24, 8:25

Ownership after leaks, no liability, §§ 8:24,
8:25

Passive ownership after release occurred,
§ 8:25

Unremedied prior violation as basis for RCRA
citizen suit, § 8:28

Specific PRP vs PRP disputes, present owners vs.
past owners, § 6:23

**PRIVATE PARTY ACTIONS AND
CONTRACTUAL ALLOCATION OF
LIABILITIES**

Generally, §§ 9:1 to 9:116

Assessment of site, practical considerations,
§§ 9:70 to 9:72

Background of common law toxic tort actions,
§ 9:2

Buying and selling

Actual or possible contamination, negotiating
rights and responsibilities of each party,
§ 9:78

All appropriate inquiry and lenders, § 9:109

As is clauses, § 9:92

Barring other remedies, § 9:89

Boilerplate environmental indemnity provi-
sions, § 9:111

Buyer's considerations, § 9:76

Carve-out provisions, § 9:94

**PRIVATE PARTY ACTIONS AND
CONTRACTUAL ALLOCATION OF
LIABILITIES—Cont'd**

Buying and selling—Cont'd

Choice of law provision, § 9:90

Cost sharing agreements, §§ 9:103 to 9:105

Description of the property, § 9:95

Difficulties allocating liability between buyer
and seller, § 9:75

Disposal of wastes, addressing, § 9:79

Environmental reviews, § 9:110

Escrow closing, litigation following, § 9:75

Indemnities, environmental, § 9:110

Indemnity and release clauses

Allocation of CERCLA liability, § 9:81

Barring other remedies, § 9:89

Boilerplate environmental indemnity provi-
sions, § 9:111

CERCLA liability, impact of indemnity on,
§ 9:80

contractual right to allocate risk, § 9:83
environmental indemnification agreement,
explicitly covers All Claims, § 9:86

Escrows, § 9:101

Federal government, § 9:88

Holdbacks, § 9:100

Indemnification plus, §§ 9:99 to 9:102

Insurance, § 9:102

Mention of CERCLA not necessary, § 9:85

Military contractor, § 9:87

Pre-sale or post-sale conduct and indemnity
clauses, § 9:84

Scope of, § 9:80

Time limitations, § 9:96

Innocent Landowners (this index)

Lenders, §§ 9:108 to 9:111

Necessary issues in cost sharing agreements,
§ 9:105

Negotiating rights and responsibilities of each
party regarding actual or possible
contamination, § 9:78

Possible or actual contamination, negotiating
rights and responsibilities of each party,
§ 9:78

Post closing of escrow, litigation, § 9:75

Presumptions, § 9:98

Representations, environmental, § 9:110

Representations and warranties, § 9:97

Sale of assets and sale of stock, § 9:91

Secured creditor exemption, § 9:108

Seller's considerations, § 9:77

Survey of environmental cases, § 9:93

Three stages in transfer of contaminated real
property, § 9:60

Time limitations on indemnity, § 9:96

**PRIVATE PARTY ACTIONS AND
CONTRACTUAL ALLOCATION OF
LIABILITIES—Cont’d**

- Buying and selling—Cont’d
 - Transfer of contaminated real property, three distinct stages, § 9:60
 - Variation of environmental cost sharing agreements, § 9:104
- Checklist for practitioners in preparation for contractually allocating environmental risks, § App 9B
- Chemical trespass, diversion of water, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9
- Cleanup cap insurance, § 9:113
- Commercial leases, special problems, § 9:106
- Committee on “all appropriate inquiry,” interview with Julie Kilgore, Chairperson of USEPA’s Committee on “All Appropriate Inquiry,” § App 9C
- Common law toxic tort actions
 - Background, § 9:2
 - Damages theories in toxic tort personal injuries cases, §§ 9:50 to 9:55
 - Fraud and negligent misrepresentation, § 9:41
 - Misrepresentation, § 9:41
 - Negligence, §§ 9:24 to 9:29
 - Negligence per se, §§ 9:27 to 9:29
 - Nuisance, §§ 9:3 to 9:10
 - Standing, government agency, § 1:10
 - Strict liability, §§ 9:30 to 9:40
 - Trespass, §§ 1:8 to 1:10, 9:11 to 9:20
 - Waste, § 9:42
 - Water, diversion of, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9
- Consultant, sample environmental consultant engagement letter, § App 9D
- Contaminated real property, three distinct stages of property transfer, § 9:60
- Contract actions, § 9:45
- Contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:59 to 9:115
- Contribution claim, defendant to plaintiff, § 9:44
- Cost recovery under CERCLA counterpart statutes, § 10:129
- Damages theories in toxic tort personal injuries cases, §§ 9:50 to 9:55
- Difficulties allocating liability between buyer and seller, § 9:75
- Disclosure, state statutory requirements, § 9:74
- Distinction between agreements that allocate CERCLA costs between/
 - Among parties (permissible),(impermissible), CERCLA litigation, between the same parties, the government and its contractor, § 9:82
- Enforcement of private party indemnification provisions, § 10:57

**PRIVATE PARTY ACTIONS AND
CONTRACTUAL ALLOCATION OF
LIABILITIES—Cont’d**

- Engagement of consultant, sample letter, § App 9D
- Environmental assessment of site, practical considerations, §§ 9:70 to 9:72
- Environmental consultant, selecting, § 9:69
- Environmental insurance, §§ 9:112 to 9:114
- Escrow closing, litigation following, § 9:75
- Fraud and negligent misrepresentation, § 9:41
- Government entity ordering remediation not necessary and indispensable party in enforcement of private party indemnity, § 10:57
- Indemnity and release clauses. Buying and selling, above
- Indemnity claim, defendant to plaintiff, § 9:44
- Inherent problems for environmental site assessments, § 9:72
- Interview with Julie Kilgore, Chairperson of USEPA’s Committee on “All Appropriate Inquiry,” § App 9C
- Investigation of property for contamination
 - Generally, §§ 9:61 to 9:68
 - All appropriate inquiry, § 9:62
 - Benefits both buyers and sellers, § 9:66
 - Environmental due diligence, §§ 9:62 to 9:65
 - Environmental site assessment standards, §§ 9:63 to 9:66
 - Personnel conducting all appropriate inquiry, § 9:65
 - Phase III, § 9:68
 - Phase II of inquiry, § 9:67
 - Phase I of inquiry, §§ 9:61 to 9:66
 - Problems and responses, §§ 9:67, 9:68
 - Timing of all appropriate inquiry, § 9:64
- Leases
 - Commercial leases, special problems, § 9:106
 - Ex-tenants, liability under very old indemnification provisions, § 9:107
- Lenders, environmental insurance for, § 9:115
- Necessary and indispensable party in enforcement of private party indemnity, § 10:57
- Negligence, §§ 9:24 to 9:29
- Negligence per se, §§ 9:27 to 9:29
- Nuisance, §§ 9:3 to 9:10
- Personal injuries, theories of damages in toxic tort personal injuries cases, §§ 9:50 to 9:55
- Pollution liability insurance, § 9:114
- Potential problems when purchasing insurance, § 9:116
- Problem clients for environmental site assessments, § 9:70
- Problem consultants for environmental site assessments, § 9:71
- Real estate sales. Buying and selling, above

**PRIVATE PARTY ACTIONS AND
CONTRACTUAL ALLOCATION OF
LIABILITIES—Cont’d**

Real property contamination, three distinct stages of property transfer, § 9:60
 Risk allocation forms, sources, § App 9A
 Sample environmental consultant engagement letter, § App 9D
 Seller arranging assessment before placing on market, advantages, § 9:73
 Site assessments, practical considerations, §§ 9:70 to 9:72
 Sources of environmental risk allocation forms, § App 9A
 Standing, government agency, § 1:10
 State statutory liability, §§ 9:46 to 9:49
 Statutory liability of state, §§ 9:46 to 9:49
 Strict liability, §§ 9:30 to 9:40
 Theories of damages in toxic tort personal injuries cases, §§ 9:50 to 9:55
 Third party, liability to, § 9:44
 “Tortious contamination,” § 9:43
 Transfer of contaminated real property, three distinct stages, § 9:60
 Transfer of ownership of property. Buying and selling, above
 Trespass, §§ 1:8 to 1:10, 9:11 to 9:20
 Waste, § 9:42
 Water, diversion of, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9

PROOF

Allocation, quantum of proof required for apportionment, § 6:34
 Burden of, Party seeking contribution
 Proving the existence and appropriate allocation of orphan shares, § 3:205
 CERCLA/non-CERCLA statute claims, quantum of proof necessary for apportionment, § 7:69
 Divisibility, difficulty in proving, §§ 7:16, 7:28
 Geographical divisibility, difficulty in proving, § 7:28

PROPERTY DAMAGE

Statute of limitations, § 1:36
 Toxic torts, § 9:58

PRP LETTERS

Nature and purpose of PRP letters, § 2:4
 Responses to EPA and State Agency PRP Letters (this index)
 Sample letters, § App 2E

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Unnecessary if government environmental agency supervises cleanup, allocable costs, § 3:219

RADIATION WASTE

Strict liability, § 9:35

REAL ESTATE SALES

Private Party Actions and Contractual Allocation of Liabilities (this index)

RELIEF

RCRA actions, § 8:4

REPORTS

Expert report by private party plaintiff in CERCLA contribution action, sample, § App 11D
 Litigation of environmental allocation issues, sample allocator’s report, § App 10A
 Plaintiff expert witness report in private party CERCLA cost recovery action, sample, § App 11E

**RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND
RECOVERY ACT OF 1976 (RCRA)**

Actions under RCRA, §§ 8:1 to 8:31
 Attorney’s fees, § 8:14
 Compliance costs, response costs under CERCLAs administrative settlement provision, § 3:7
 Contribution, suits against previous owners and operators, § 8:31
 Costs and fees, §§ 3:7, 8:14, 8:15
 Creation of solid or hazardous waste, § 8:5
 Decisions in imminent and substantial endangerment suits, § 8:22
 Definitions of terms and criteria, § 8:5
 Elements of claims and relief available, § 8:4
 “Endangerment” requirement in imminent and substantial endangerment suits, § 8:21
 Environmental liability claim basics, § 1:27
 Equitable restitution, § 8:8
 Expert’s costs, § 8:15
 Failure to provide notice of intent to sue is fatal to a RCRA action
 Notice to a previous owner suffices, if the defendant purchased the facility subject to such notice, § 8:12
 Fees and costs, §§ 8:14, 8:15
 Hazardous wastes, creation, § 8:5
 “Imminence” requirement in imminent and substantial endangerment suits, § 8:19
 Imminent and substantial endangerment suits
 Generally, § 8:16
 Decisions, § 8:22
 “Endangerment” requirement, § 8:21
 “Imminence” requirement, § 8:19
 Key terms, § 8:17
 “May” requirement, § 8:18
 “Substantial” requirement, § 8:20

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 1976 (RCRA)

—Cont’d

- Injunctive relief but not equitable restitution, § 8:8
- Leave to amend or dismiss notice, broad discretion of courts, § 8:13
- Mandatory notice of suit, § 8:10
- “May” requirement in imminent and substantial endangerment suits, § 8:18
- Nature of liability, § 8:6
- Notice of suit, §§ 8:10 to 8:13
- Previous owners and operators, suits against
 - Allocation, § 8:30
 - Contribution, § 8:31
 - Successor landowners, suits under RCRA without regard to fault, §§ 8:23 to 8:29
- Private attorney generals to force cleanup, § 8:3
- Private right of action narrowly construed, § 8:9
- Proper notice, requirements, § 8:11
- Prospective application, § 8:7
- Relief available, § 8:4
- Solid waste, creation, § 8:5
- Standing to sue, § 8:9
- States, role of, § 8:2
- “Substantial” requirement in imminent and substantial endangerment suits, § 8:20
- Subtitle I of RCRA, addition of, § 8:2
- UST trust fund, § 8:2

RESPONSES TO US EPA AND STATE AGENCY PRP LETTERS

- Generally, §§ 2:1 to 2:36
- Additional insured status, § 2:35
- Allocation scheme, PRP role in formulation of, § 2:11
- Analysis of environmental insurance claim, § 2:29
- Binders, § 2:26
- Checklist for response to PRP letter, § App 2A
- Combination first party and third party insurance policies, § 2:16
- Definition of insurance for PRP letter purposes, § 2:15
- Duty to defend
 - Generally, §§ 2:30 to 2:34
 - Exception to the suit, § 2:32
 - Failure to tender, malpractice, § 2:33
 - Late notice defense, § 2:34
 - Tendering to trigger duty, § 2:31
 - Triggering duty, § 2:31
- Exception to the suit, § 2:32
- Excess liability insurance, § 2:17
- Expert witnesses to combat perceived unfair volume of waste methodology, § 2:13
- Gore factors, §§ 2:11, 2:12

RESPONSES TO US EPA AND STATE AGENCY PRP LETTERS—Cont’d

- Ignoring PRP letter, improper response to PRP letter, § 2:5
- Information request letter
 - Generally, § 2:2
 - Sample, § App 2D
- Insurance policy components, §§ 2:19 to 2:25
- Insurance policy interpretation, § 2:28
- Insurance types, § 2:16
- Insurers, tendering to, § 2:14
- Interview with EPA Region IX attorney, § App 2B
- Judicial review, demand only available after response, § 2:10
- Late notice defense, § 2:34
- Liability insurance, § 2:16
- Liability insurance fundamentals, § 2:14
- List of insurance coverage resources for environmental attorneys, § App 2C
- Marine insurance, § 2:16
- Multifaceted responses, best practice and elements of, § 2:6
- Nature and purpose of PRP letters, § 2:4
- Personal insurance, § 2:16
- Pollution insurance specialty policies, § 2:36
- Possibly applicable policies before tendering, gathering all, § 2:35
- Pre-PRP letters, § 2:2
- Primary liability insurance, § 2:17
- Proper response to PRP letter, §§ 2:5 to 2:7
- Property insurance, § 2:16
- PRP letter, sample, § App 2E
- PRP search by EPA
 - Assistance by PRP, §§ 2:8, 2:9
 - Conduct of, § 2:8
- Reinsurance, insurance for insurers, § 2:18
- Remainder of EPA’s pre-PRP letter investigation, § 2:3
- Settlement preparations, proper response to PRP letter, § 2:7
- Standardization, § 2:27
- Tender letter to insurer, sample, § App 2F
- “Tender” to insurers, § 2:14
- Third party combined with first party insurance policy, § 2:16
- Umbrella liability insurance, § 2:17
- Volume of waste methodology, § 2:13

RESPONSIVE PLEADING

- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, responsive pleadings by defendant, § 10:152

RETROACTIVITY

- RCRA actions, § 8:7

RISK

- Allocation forms, § **App 9A**
- Risk vs. production, time on the, based allocation methodologies, § **3:159**

SALES AND TRANSFERS

- Private Party Actions and Contractual Allocation of Liabilities (this index)

SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE

- Experts in allocation disputes, special rules, §§ **11:10 to 11:15**

SETTLEMENTS

- Ability to pay settlements, § **5:56**
- Alternative Dispute Resolution, § **4:80**
- Atlantic Research, impact on settlements, § **10:105**
- Bar to original contribution claim by state settlement with third-party PRP defendant, § **4:70**
- Considerations, §§ **10:159 to 10:162**
- De micromis settlements, §§ **5:49 to 5:55**
- De minimis settlements
 - Impact on other PRPs, § **5:27**
 - PRP settlements, statutory support, § **5:59**
- Determination of amounts, § **5:59**
- Different ways to prove, agreement is substantively fair, § **3:127**
- Draft agreements, discoverability by non-parties, § **4:65**
- EPA Allocation Report, Court not barred, § **4:77**
- EPA Allocation Report When Deciding Whether to Enter a Consent Decree, § **4:76**
- Equitably apportioned before granting a motion to bar contribution claims
 - Cost recovery, strictly liable and lack the ability to later reapportion damages to the settling parties in a contribution action, § **3:126**
- Evidentiary use of settlement discussions, § **4:75**
- Future liability, SARA's solution, § **10:159**
- Impact of settlement on nonsettling defendants, § **10:90**
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, §§ **10:83, 10:159 to 10:162**
- Negotiating settlements for de minimis PRPs, § **5:16**
- Non-settlor PRP
 - Alternative dispute resolution and CERCLA allocation settlements, §§ **4:51, 4:73**
 - CERCLA allocation settlements and alternative dispute resolution, § **4:73**
 - Draft agreements, discoverability by non-parties, § **4:67**
 - Insurance and CERCLA settlements, §§ **4:72 to 4:75**
 - Objections to proposed CERCLA settlements, § **4:63**

SETTLEMENTS—Cont'd

- Non-settlor PRP—Cont'd
 - SARA's pro-settlement mandates, § **4:74**
 - Settlement incentives, §§ **4:27 to 4:45**
- Objecting non-settling defendants
 - Negotiations does not impact their procedural fairness, § **3:120**
- Plaintiff's demand, determination of, § **10:161**
- Pre-trial conference, § **10:162**
- Proposed consent decree under CERCLA
 - Opposition, sample points and authorities, § **App 3E**
 - Support
 - sample points and authorities, § **App 3D**
 - sample reply points and authorities, § **App 3F**
- Resolve a CERCLA-specific liability to trigger § 9613s(F)(3)(B)s right to contribution, Territory of Guam v. United States, § **10:70**
- SARA's solution to future liability, § **10:160**
- Section 113(f)(3)(B) contribution claim, triggering events, § **10:160**
- Sidestepping contribution protection by non-settling PRPs, § **10:105**
- State substantive law, § **4:78**
- Statutory support for de minimis PRP settlements, § **5:59**
- Viable claims, equitably apportioned before granting a motion to bar contribution claims, cost recovery
 - Strictly liable, lack the ability to later reapportion damages to the settling parties in a contribution action, § **3:126**

SITE ASSESSMENT

- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, practical considerations, §§ **9:70 to 9:72**

SITE-SPECIFIC FACTORS AND ATTRIBUTES

- Area and location, § **3:189**
- Characteristics of hazardous substances, § **3:179**
- Criteria that could be used for an equitable allocation, § **3:186**
- History of site use and waste management practices, § **3:188**
- History of site use and waste management practices, not the dollar value of their settlements, § **3:185**
- Hydrogeology, § **3:190**
- Interaction with regulatory agencies, § **3:194**
- Magnitude and extent of environmental impacts, § **3:191**
- Methodology of allocation, §§ **3:178 to 3:185**
- Remediation, § **3:193**
- Toxicity, § **3:192**
- Types of hazardous substances, § **3:179**

SITE-SPECIFIC FACTORS AND ATTRIBUTES—Cont'd

Volumes, types and characteristics of hazardous substances, § 3:187

Volumes of hazardous substances, § 3:179

Waste volumes, primary equitable factor in cost allocation, § 3:172

SOLID WASTE

RCRA actions, creation of solid waste, § 8:5

STAND-ALONE PLUME

Methodology of allocation, §§ 3:195 to 3:199

STANDING TO SUE

Governmental agency, trespass/nuisance, § 1:10

RCRA actions, § 8:9

STATE COURTS

Methodology of allocation, use of Gore and Gore to like factors, § 3:176

STATE LAW

CERCLA Does Not Preempt California, Tort Claims

Impose Join and Several Liability, § 1:38

STATUTE

CERCLA, does not preempt state statutes of repose (majority rule), § 1:37

CERCLA and state law causes of action for personal injury/property, limitations

Damage caused by/contributed to the release of hazardous substances from a facility into the environment, § 1:36

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Bankruptcy court approval of reorganization plan does not trigger statute of limitations, § 10:43

CERCLA governs, state law causes of action for personal injury/property

Damage caused by/contributed to the release of hazardous substances a facility into the environment, § 1:36

Commencement, date of, state vs. federal statute of limitations, § 10:125

Costs not included within settlement agreements, § 10:44

Entry of the settlement and resultant consent order

Not the completion of the work to be performed under the settlement and consent order, § 10:47

Litigation of environmental allocation issues, §§ 10:10, 10:44 to 10:51

Personal injury, hazardous substances, § 1:36

Phase/operable units as trigger for CERCLA's statute of limitations, § 10:48

Property damage, hazardous substances, § 1:36

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS—Cont'd

Removal or remedial work, § 10:49

Sue for contribution, settlement must impose

Costs on party seeking contribution, § 10:46

STATUTE OF REPOSE

Existence/non-existence of a liability insurance exception to a statute of

Repose, it must be sufficiently pled, § 10:193

STATUTORY LIABILITY OF STATE

CERCLA

Cost recovery action, issues related to, §§ 10:26 to 10:29

CERCLA

Counterpart statutes, § 9:48

Triggers for a contribution claim, site expenses,

assert a cost recovery action for its other expenses, § 10:79

CERCLA, issue of reasonableness of response costs

Issue of reasonableness of response costs, § 10:28

Environmental statutes, types of, §§ 9:47, 9:49

Little Superfunds, states with, § 9:47

Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:46 to 9:49

STRICT LIABILITY

CERCLA, impact of, § 9:31

Common law torts, manufactured products, § 1:12

Defenses, § 9:40

Economic injuries, § 9:39

Evacuation of known contaminated site, § 9:38

Gasoline supplier liability for tank release, § 9:34

Mercury waste, § 9:35

Owner's right to sue neighbor, previous owner or previous tenant

Generally, §§ 1:14 to 1:20

Claims against previous titleholder or tenant, § 1:17

Contiguous landowner restriction, § 1:20

Current landowner

With knowledge, § 1:19

Without knowledge, § 1:18

Highly toxic hazardous wastes, § 1:15

Toxic hazardous wastes, § 1:16

Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:30 to 9:40

Radiation or mercury waste, § 9:35

Residences and drinking wells, storage tanks in proximity to, § 9:33

Subsequent landowners/occupiers, § 9:36

Trends, § 9:32

Underground gasoline tanks, §§ 9:33, 9:34

Waste disposal sites, releases from, § 9:37

SUBSTANTIAL REQUIREMENT

RCRA actions, imminent and substantial endangerment suits, § 8:20

SUMMARY JUDGMENTS

Cost recovery action under CERCLA

Motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § App 3A

Opposition to motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § App 3B

Reply memorandum in support of motion for partial summary judgment, sample points and authorities, § App 3C

Experts in allocation disputes, motion for summary judgment, § 11:23

Issue of reasonableness of response costs is often too detailed a

Factual inquiry for summary judgment, § 10:28

Motion for summary judgment

Experts in allocation disputes, § 11:23

Partial summary judgment in cost recovery action under CERCLA, sample points and authorities, § App 3A

Opposition to motion for summary judgment, partial summary judgment, cost recovery action under CERCLA, sample points and authorities, § App 3B

Waiver, divisibility defense, § 7:71

SUPERFUNDS

State “Superfunds,” basics of environmental liability claims, §§ 1:32 to 1:35

TIME

Indemnification provision can be relevant to an equitable allocation

Environmental liability even if it is time-barred,
contractual indemnity provision that another court in separate litigation held was time-barred, § 3:154

Non-settlor PRP, time to settle, § 4:60

Risk vs. production, time on the, based allocation methodologies, § 3:159

TORTS

Cancerphobia, § 9:56

Claims that Impose Join and Several Liability
CERCLA Does Not Preempt California State Law, § 1:38

Common law torts

Generally, § 1:2

Absolute liability of ultrahazardous conduct, § 1:13

Cancerphobia, § 9:56

Chemical trespass, diversion of water, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9

TORTS—Cont’d

Common law torts—Cont’d

Damages in personal injuries cases, §§ 9:50 to 9:55

Emotional distress, § 9:56

EPA memo as a regulatory order, negligence per se, § 1:7

Fraud and negligent misrepresentation, § 9:41

Increased risk of cancer, § 9:57

Manufactured products strict liability, § 1:12

Misrepresentation, § 9:41

Negligence, §§ 1:3, 9:24 to 9:29

Negligence per se, §§ 1:6, 1:7, 9:27 to 9:29

Nuisance, §§ 1:10, 1:11, 9:3 to 9:10

Standing, government agency, § 1:10

Strict liability of manufactured products, § 1:12

Toxic tort property damage cases, § 9:58

Trespass, §§ 1:8 to 1:10, 9:11 to 9:20

Ultrahazardous conduct, absolute liability, § 1:13

Waste, § 9:42

Water, diversion of, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9

Damages in tort personal injuries cases, §§ 9:50 to 9:55

Emotional distress, § 9:56

Increased risk of cancer, § 9:57

Toxic tort property damage cases, § 9:58

TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL ACT (TSCA)

Environmental liability claim basics, § 1:30

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY

Contaminated real property, three distinct stages of property transfer, § 9:60

TRANSPORTERS

Generators vs. transporters, § 6:29

Transporters vs. municipal PRPs, § 6:30

TRANSPORTERS vs. MUNICIPAL PRPS

Allocation law, specific PRP vs PRP disputes, § 6:30

TRESPASS

Abatement costs, § 9:22

California approach

Continuing nuisance and trespass, statute of limitations, § 9:20

Former owners and occupiers, § 9:15

Common law torts, §§ 1:8 to 1:10, 9:11 to 9:20

Continuing nuisance and trespass, statute of limitations, §§ 9:19, 9:20

Continuing tort, non-trespass, court split, § 9:21

Defenses, § 9:13

Environmental trespass, illustrative cases, § 9:12

TRESPASS—Cont’d

- Former owners and occupiers, §§ 9:14 to 9:16
- Measure of damages, § 9:17
- New Jersey trend, § 9:23
- Other approaches to former owners and occupiers, § 9:16
- Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, §§ 9:11 to 9:20
- Reliance on continuing tort doctrine by plaintiff, § 9:22
- Restoration costs, § 9:22
- Similarities between nuisance and trespass, § 9:18
- Standing, government agency, § 1:10
- Statute of limitations, §§ 9:19, 9:20
- Water, diversion of, consent to chemical trespass, § 1:9

TRIALS

- Administrative settlement, effect on contribution claims, § 10:167
- Amendment of complaint to assert contribution claim, § 10:168
- CERCLAs strict liability scheme does not trump ordinary summary judgment rules, § 10:171
- Circumstantial evidence, § 10:184
- Closing argument, § 10:188
- Example of extremely weak CERCLA contribution case, § 10:185
- Experts, § 10:186
- Initial actions for CERCLA contribution purposes, § 10:172
- Jury selection, § 10:183
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, generally, §§ 10:167 to 10:169
- Opening statement, § 10:187
- Prior claims are not initial actions, § 10:168
- Summary judgment, motions for, § 10:170
 - Calculation of Damages is Not Appropriate for Summary Judgment, § 10:169

TRINITY INDUSTRIES, INC. v. GREENLEASE HOLDING COMPANY

- Experts in allocation disputes, § 11:45

ULTRAHAZARDOUS CONDUCT

- Common law torts, absolute liability, § 1:13

U.S. v. ATLANTIC RESEARCH

- Administrative order as civil action for CERCLA contribution action, § 10:78
- Bankruptcy, co-liability of PRP to third-party creditor, § 10:106
- Case law following, §§ 10:64 to 10:89
- CERCLA administrative order qualifies as a “Civil Action”
 - Contribution action, § 10:108

U.S. v. ATLANTIC RESEARCH—Cont’d

- Civil action requirement and jurisdiction, § 10:112
- Cleanup need not be “voluntary”
 - For the PRP to sue under 0167 107(a)(4)(B), § 10:76
- Coercion by government and voluntariness, § 10:83
- Common liability among PRPs when underlying claim resolved, § 10:111
- Contribution for some of its cleanup expenses does not
 - Automatically bar it from suing for cost recovery of other cleanup expenses, § 10:71
- Cost recovery claims for sums PRPs paid under private settlements, § 10:104
- Costs incurred for cleanup of plaintiff’s waste, § 10:66
- Counterclaim by defendant, § 10:116
- Difficult to determine which CERCLA subsection must be used for
 - Parties seeking reimbursement of response costs, § 10:72
- EPA incorrectly identified as being a PRP may recover
 - Any costs it paid resulting from this incorrect identification., § 10:84
- Evidence same for divisibility defense and contribution claim, § 10:115
- Former law, § 10:75
- Government agency to evaluate and remediate, § 10:109
- Immunity from 113 counterclaim, § 10:103
- Implied right of contribution, § 10:114
- Joint and several liability, § 10:117
- Litigation of environmental allocation issues, § 10:67
- Non-settling PRPs
 - Ability to bring CERCLA cost to recovery action, § 10:80
 - Contribution protection, § 10:105
 - Sidestepping contribution protection, § 10:89
- Party may plead Section 107(a) and Section 113(f) claims in the alternative, § 10:69
- PRPs who have incurred costs
 - Involuntarily may not sue under Section 107(a) to recover response costs, § 10:68
- Recovery from bankruptcy estate, § 10:106
- Reimbursement under 107(a) or 113(f), § 10:72
- Reimbursement under 107(a) or 113(f), Tenth Circuit agreed
 - Administrative order or judicially approved settlement, § 10:77
- Service of complaint on government by private defendant, § 10:113

U.S. v. ATLANTIC RESEARCH—Cont’d

Settlement must resolve a CERCLA-specific liability

Supreme Court rules on who may sue for contribution under 113(F)(3)(B), § 10:70

Specific settlements may form

The basis for a CERCLA contribution claim, § 10:74

State environmental agencies and settlements, § 10:85

Voluntary performance by settling PRP, § 10:83

Voluntary response costs

Extent, § 10:107

Not allowed to sue for cost recovery, § 10:67

Waiver of objection to contribution claim, § 10:110

UST TRUST FUND

RCRA actions, § 8:2

VOLUME OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Methodology of allocation, § 3:201

VOLUME OF WASTE

Allocation law, court’s consideration of waste volume at generator related sites, § 6:22

WAIVER

Divisibility defense, § 7:71

Objection to contribution claim, U.S. v. Atlantic Research, § 10:110

WASTE

Allocation law, court’s consideration of waste volume at generator related sites, § 6:22

Hazardous wastes. See Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) (this index)

Private party actions and contractual allocation of liabilities, § 9:42

RCRA actions, solid waste, creation, § 8:5

WORKING CONDITIONS

Remediation costs, methodologies of allocation, § 3:6

WORKING GROUPS

De minimis settlements, communication tools, § 5:55

Negotiating settlements for de minimis PRPs, joint defense and working groups, § 5:33