

ALI-ABA Course of Study
**The Impact of Environmental Law on Real Estate and Business Transactions:
Brownfields and Beyond**

October 18 - 19, 2007
Washington, D.C.

CERCLA Rights and Liabilities

By
Gene A. Lucero
Kelly E. Richardson
Gwendolyn M. Toczko
Ryan R. Waterman
Jessica W. Ziparo
Ashley W. Green
John A. Hellmann
John W. Everett, Jr.
Nicole B. Hebert
Justin D. Rieger
Latham & Watkins LLP
Los Angeles, California

FOREWORD

This August 2007 update of CERCLA Rights and Liabilities is intended as a handy reference for important statutory and case law developments on many key CERCLA topics. Statutes and cases cited in the summary were chosen to illustrate important topics in the world of CERCLA litigation. However, the summary is not intended to provide a comprehensive description of every CERCLA issue or CERCLA case. Nevertheless, the authors hope that readers will find the topics and cases selected for the summary to be a useful research aid.

Gene A. Lucero, Esq.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	A. How to Use This Handbook	1
	B. Overview of 2007 CERCLA Cases	1
	C. New Cases Cited in the 2007 Outline	3
II.	RELEVANT STATUTORY EXCERPTS	8
	A. 42 U.S.C. § 9601. Definitions.....	8
	1. § 9601(20) “Owner or Operator”	8
	2. § 9601(35) “Contractual Relationship” for 9607(b)(3), “Reason to Know,” and Other Liability under 9607(b)(3).....	8
	3. § 9601(39) Brownfield site	11
	4. §9601(40) Bona fide prospective purchaser	14
	5. § 9601(41) Eligible response site.....	16
	B. 42 U.S.C. § 9605. National Contingency Plan.....	17
	1. § 9605(h) NPL deferral	17
	C. 42 U.S.C. § 9607. Liability	18
	1. § 9607(a) Covered persons; scope; recoverable costs and damages; interest rate; “comparable maturity” date	18
	2. § 9607(b) Defenses	19
	3. §9607(q) Contiguous properties	20
	4. § 9607(r) Prospective purchaser and windfall lien	23
	D. 42 U.S.C. § 9613. Civil Proceedings.....	24
	1. § 9613(f) Contribution	24
	2. §9613(g) Period in which action may be brought.....	25
	E. 42 U.S.C. § 6903(3). “Disposal” Definition Incorporated Into CERCLA.....	27

- 1. “Disposal,” 42 U.S.C. § 6903(3).....27
- 2. Caselaw27
- III. LIABLE PARTIES27**
- A. Overview—Categories of Potentially Responsible Parties (“PRPs”).....28**
- B. Owners28**
- 1. “Owner or Operator” Defined—CERCLA § 101(20) (42 U.S.C. § 9601(20)).....28
- 2. Current Owners/Operators29
- 3. Past Owners/Operators: “Disposal” Requirement37
- 4. Subsequent Owners.....47
- 5. Miscellaneous “Arrangements for Disposal”.....48
- C. Special Classes of Owners or Operators.....49**
- 1. Control of Operations or Decisions Involving Hazardous Substances.....49
 - a. The Supreme Court’s Decision in Bestfoods.....49
 - b. Post-Bestfoods Cases.....51
 - c. Pre-Bestfoods Cases.....60
- 2. Officers, Directors, and Shareholders as Operators.....62
- 3. State/Federal Government as Operator.....67
- 4. Lessors/Lessees as Operators.....74
- 5. Cleanup Contractors as Operators.76
- 6. Easement Holders as Owners or Operators.78
- D. Trustee/Receiver Liability79**
- E. Generators—“Arranging for Disposal”.....80**
- 1. Product vs. Waste.....80
- 2. Superfund Recycling Equity Act.87

3.	Knowledge/Control of Third-Party Operations.	90
4.	Sale of Property.....	99
5.	Cutting Edge Questions in “Arrangements for Disposal”	100
6.	Causal Link	108
F.	Transporter Liability.....	112
G.	Dissolved Corporations	115
H.	Defenses to CERCLA Liability.....	117
1.	Third-Party Defense.....	117
a.	Statutory Basis: CERCLA § 107(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. § 9607(b)(3)).....	117
b.	SARA’s Definition of a “Contractual Relationship”— CERCLA § 101(35) (42 U.S.C. § 9601(35)).....	118
c.	Legislative History—H.R. Rep. No. 962, 99th Cong., 2d Sess. 187 (1986).....	119
d.	ASTM’s Standard Practices for Environmental Site Assessments.	120
e.	Issues with Respect to the Third-Party Defense	120
(1)	Contractual Relationship.....	120
(2)	Innocent Purchaser Exception to “Contractual Relationship”.....	128
(3)	Pollution Caused Solely by a Third Party.....	136
(4)	Activities Constituting “Disposal”.....	138
(5)	Precautions to Prevent the Threat or Release of Contamination.....	142
2.	“Indicia of Ownership” Exception for Secured Creditors.	146
a.	Language of the Exception—Section 101(20)(A):	146
b.	Former EPA Rule—40 C.F.R. § 300.1100	146
c.	D.C. Circuit Vacates EPA Rule.	146

- d. 1995 EPA/DOJ Policy Statement Adopting Former Rule as Enforcement Policy.....147
- e. Application of the Exemption to Lenders and Other Secured Creditors Prior to EPA’s Promulgation of Its Former Rule Implementing This Exemption.147
- f. Application of the Exemption to Lenders and Other Secured Creditors After EPA Promulgated Its Former Rule Implementing This Exemption, but Before the Rule Was Vacated.148
- g. Application of the Exemption After the Former EPA Rule Was Vacated.150
- h. Congress Codifies Exception: 1996 Lender Liability Act.....151
 - (1) Actions which *will not* constitute “participation in management” and therefore will not trigger CERCLA liability:151
 - (a) Financial Management.....151
 - (b) Environmental Management.....151
 - (2) Actions that *will* constitute “participation in management” and therefore will trigger CERCLA liability:152
 - (a) Financial or Operational Management.....152
 - (b) Environmental Management.....152
 - (3) Caselaw152
- i. Application of the Exemption to Land Contract Vendors154
- j. Application of the Exemption to Sale-Leaseback Transactions155
- 3. Act of God Defense/War Defense155
- 4. Consumer Product Exception156
- IV. OTHER ELEMENTS OF CERCLA LIABILITY157**
 - A. “Hazardous Substance”.....157**

1.	Defining “Hazardous Substance” – CERCLA § 101(14) (14 U.S.C. § 9601(14)).....	157
2.	Petroleum Exclusion	161
3.	Service Station Dealer Exemption	166
4.	The “Bevill Amendment”	167
5.	Municipal/Household Waste.....	167
a.	Case Law	167
6.	Threshold Concentration of Hazardous Substances	169
7.	Relevance of State Law	172
B.	“Release”.....	173
1.	CERCLA § 101(22) (42 U.S.C. § 9601(22)).....	173
2.	Qualifying Releases	174
3.	Miscellaneous Exceptions—Asbestos	181
C.	Relationship Between “Releases” and “Necessary Costs of Response”	184
1.	Private Plaintiff Must Prove Costs Are “Necessary” as Part of Prima Facie Case.....	184
2.	Types of Costs that Are “Necessary”.....	187
a.	Definitions.....	188
(1)	“Response Costs” CERCLA § 101(25) (42 U.S.C. § 9601(25)).....	188
(2)	“Removal Costs” CERCLA § 101(23) (42 U.S.C. § 9601(23)).....	188
(3)	“Remedial Actions” CERCLA § 101(24) (42 U.S.C. § 9601(24)).....	188
b.	Case Law.....	188
3.	Indirect Costs Can Qualify as Necessary Response Costs.....	203
D.	Consistency with the National Contingency Plan (“NCP”) — a Prerequisite to Recovery of Response Costs.....	209