

ASPEN CASEBOOK SERIES

DRIESEN
ADLER
ENGEL

INTERNATIONAL LAW
AND
COMPARATIVE LAW

Second Edition
Comparative Law
and
International Law

*Second
Edition*



Wolters Kluwer

Law & Business


ASPEN CASEBOOK SERIES

Environmental Law
A Conceptual and
Pragmatic Approach
Second Edition

David M. Driesen
University Professor
Syracuse University College of Law

Robert W. Adler
James I. Farr Chair and Professor of Law
University of Utah, S.J. Quinney College of Law

Kirsten H. Engel
Professor of Law
University of Arizona



Wolters Kluwer

Law & Business

AUSTIN BOSTON CHICAGO NEW YORK THE NETHERLANDS

© 2011 Aspen Publishers. All Rights Reserved.
www.AspenLaw.com

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission to make copies of any part of this publication should be mailed to:

Aspen Publishers
Attn: Permissions Department
76 Ninth Avenue, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10011-5201

To contact Customer Care, e-mail customer.service@aspenpublishers.com, call 1-800-234-1660, fax 1-800-901-9075, or mail correspondence to:

Aspen Publishers
Attn: Order Department
PO Box 990
Frederick, MD 21705

Printed in the United States of America.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

ISBN 978-0-7355-9448-7

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Driesen, David M.

Environmental law : a conceptual and pragmatic approach / David M. Driesen, Robert W. Adler, Kirsten H. Engel. — 2nd ed.

p. cm. — (Aspen casebook series)

Includes index.

ISBN 978-0-7355-9448-7

1. Environmental law—United States. 2. Environmental protection—United States. 3. Liability for environmental damages—United States. I. Adler, Robert W., 1955- II. Engel, Kirsten H. III. Title.

KF3775.D75 2010

344.7304'6—dc22

2010049398

About Wolters Kluwer Law & Business

Wolters Kluwer Law & Business is a leading provider of research information and workflow solutions in key specialty areas. The strengths of the individual brands of Aspen Publishers, CCH, Kluwer Law International and Loislaw are aligned within Wolters Kluwer Law & Business to provide comprehensive, in-depth solutions and expert-authored content for the legal, professional and education markets.

CCH was founded in 1913 and has served more than four generations of business professionals and their clients. The CCH products in the Wolters Kluwer Law & Business group are highly regarded electronic and print resources for legal, securities, antitrust and trade regulation, government contracting, banking, pension, payroll, employment and labor, and healthcare reimbursement and compliance professionals.

Aspen Publishers is a leading information provider for attorneys, business professionals and law students. Written by preeminent authorities, Aspen products offer analytical and practical information in a range of specialty practice areas from securities law and intellectual property to mergers and acquisitions and pension/benefits. Aspen's trusted legal education resources provide professors and students with high-quality, up-to-date and effective resources for successful instruction and study in all areas of the law.

Kluwer Law International supplies the global business community with comprehensive English-language international legal information. Legal practitioners, corporate counsel and business executives around the world rely on the Kluwer Law International journals, loose-leaves, books and electronic products for authoritative information in many areas of international legal practice.

Loislaw is a premier provider of digitized legal content to small law firm practitioners of various specializations. Loislaw provides attorneys with the ability to quickly and efficiently find the necessary legal information they need, when and where they need it, by facilitating access to primary law as well as state-specific law, records, forms and treatises.

Wolters Kluwer Law & Business, a unit of Wolters Kluwer, is headquartered in New York and Riverwoods, Illinois. Wolters Kluwer is a leading multinational publisher and information services company.

To our parents, George and Sue Driesen, the late David and Juanita Adler,
and John Ronald and Joan Gibb Engel



Preface

This second edition teaches the principal concepts that underlie environmental law. The book's structure reflects this emphasis, as it offers chapters on key concepts, such as technology-based standard setting, economic incentives, and citizen enforcement. This approach takes advantage of some of the commonalities that bind environmental law together in order to provide a coherent introduction to environmental law.

While we weave detailed information about particular environmental statutes into the text, we single out for special emphasis details that help illustrate key concepts. This approach recognizes that it is not possible to teach all of environmental law, or even all of one of the more comprehensive statutes, in a single introductory environmental law course. This means that textbooks must reflect some selection principle or risk presenting environmental law as an incoherent mass of meaningless detail. We have employed a principle of choosing the materials that best illustrate the concepts most central to environmental policy and practice.

We also employ problems to give students practice in applying the law illustrating key concepts to concrete facts. Most of the problems focus on climate disruption — perhaps the defining environmental issue of our time — and its many environmental ramifications and potential legal and policy responses. By using this example in many different chapters, we help students see how many statutes and concepts can often address a single problem. Also, by using a common problem throughout the book, we hope to increase the depth of students' understanding and free them to devote most of their energy to learning the law.

No environmental law course can hope to teach practitioners all of the law they might need to know. But such a course can orient students, so that they know important aspects of the law and are well prepared to deeply understand new material, even material that is not part of the law today. We hope this book provides a coherent introduction to this complex field.

December 2010

David M. Driesen
Robert W. Adler
Kirsten H. Engel

xxiii



Acknowledgments

The authors want to express their great appreciation to Aspen's Richard Mixer, who supported this book from the time it was a mere possibility, and Eric Holt, our editor. We benefitted from thoughtful comments from Douglas Kysar, Amy Sinden, Amy Wildermuth, and anonymous reviewers of the text.

David Driesen would also like to thank George Aposporos for getting his book writing off to a great start by providing wonderful companionship and a great setting to get underway. Syracuse University colleague Robin Malloy helped him see the potential scholarly value of a textbook. He's grateful to Syracuse University College of Law (SUCOL) Dean Hannah Arterian for a research leave and other crucial support for the book. SUCOL and University of Michigan library staffs provided wonderful help in assembling materials, and Wendy Scott and Josh Gillette helped out with copyright permissions. He also thanks Meredith Lee-Clarke, Daniel Salstein, and Sarah Treptow for research assistance and Christy Ramsdell for editorial assistance with respect to the second edition. Finally, his students have made many helpful suggestions over the years.

Bob Adler also wants to thank Sandra Fatt and Laura Skousen for editorial and other assistance, and Kirsten Uchitel and Mason Baker for research assistance. The students in his Fall 2005 Environmental Law class served as guinea pigs by studying from the first draft of the first edition of the book, and from his Fall 2010 class for the second edition. Several of those students provided useful comments about everything from typos to improvements to questions and problems to case selection. The staff of the S.J. Quinney Law Library at the University of Utah provided their usual high level of service, and the College of Law's IT staff helped to solve a number of technical problems.

Kirsten Engel would like to thank the Law College Association of the University of Arizona for financial assistance during the summer of 2010 during which she made her contributions to the Second Edition of the book. Finally, she wishes to thank her co-authors, who have made working on this edition such an enlightening and collegial experience.

The authors would like to acknowledge the permission of the authors, publishers, and copyright holders of the following publications for permission to reproduce excerpts herein:

Bruce Ackerman, *Reforming Environmental Law: The Democratic Case for Market Incentives*, *Columbia Journal of Environmental Law*, 13, 171, 174 Copyright © 1988.

Bruce A. Ackerman & Richard B. Stewart, Comment: *Reforming Environmental Law*, *Stanford Law Review*, 37, 1334-47 Copyright © 1986 by Stanford Law Review. Reproduced with permission of Stanford Law Review in the format, Text-book via Copyright Clearance Center.

From *Restoring Colorado River Ecosystems* by Robert W. Adler. Copyright © 2007 Robert W. Adler. Reproduced by permission of Island Press, Washington, D.C.

From *People or Penguins: The Case for Optimal Pollution* by William F. Baxter. Copyright © 1974 Columbia University Press. Reprinted with permission.

Daniel Bodansky, *The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change: A Commentary*, *Yale Journal of International Law* 18, 451 Copyright © 1993. Reproduced by permission of Yale Law Journal Company, Inc. in the formats, Text and Other Book via Copyright Clearance Center.

Table from *Evolution of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement*. Reprinted with permission of Michigan State University Press from *Evolution of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement* by Lee Botts and Paul Muldoon. Copyright © 2005.

Excerpt from Robert D. Bullard, *The Quest for Environmental Justice: Human Rights and the Politics of Pollution* (section 4, page 30). Copyright © 2005. Reprinted by permission of the author.

From *Silent Spring* by Rachel Carson. Copyright © 1962 by Rachel L. Carson, Copyright © renewed by Roger Christie. Reprinted by permission of Frances Collin, Trustee. All copying, including electronic, or re-distribution of this text, is expressly forbidden.

Excerpt from R.H. Coase, "The Problem of Social Cost," *Journal of Law & Economics*, 3, 1-44. Copyright 1960. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

Excerpt from Herman E. Daly, *Sustainable Growth: An Impossibility Theorem in Valuing the Earth* (267-71), edited by Herman E. Daly & Kenneth N. Townsend. Copyright © 1992. Reprinted by permission of Palgrave Macmillan, UK.

John P. Dwyer, *The Pathology of Symbolic Legislation*, 17 *Ecology Law Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 2. Copyright © 1990. Reprinted by permission of the University of California Berkeley Law in the format Text via Copyright Clearance Center.

John P. Dwyer, The Pathology of Symbolic Legislation, 17 Ecology Law Quarterly, Vol. 1, No. 2. Copyright © 1990. Reprinted by permission of the University of California Berkeley Law.

Garrett Hardin, The Tragedy of the Commons, Science December 13, 1968. Copyright © 1968. Reprinted with permission from AAAS.

James A. Harris, Richard J. Hobbs, Eric Higgs & James Aronson, Ecological Restoration and Global Climate Change, 14 Restoration Ecology 170, 171-73 (2006). Reprinted by permission of John Wiley & Sons.

Krier, James E., The Irrational National Air Quality Standards: Macro- and Micro-Mistakes, 22 UCLA Law Review 323. Copyright © 1974-1975. Reprinted by permission.

Richard J. Lazarus, Restoring What's Environmental about Environmental Law in the Supreme Court, UCLA Law Review 47, 703. Copyright © 2000. Reprinted by permission.

Excerpt from pages 189-90 and 261-62 of circa 432 words from "Sand County Almanac" by Aldo Leopold. Copyright © 1970 Reprinted by permission of Oxford University Press.

From Lynton, Keith, Caldwell, The National Environmental Policy Act: An Agenda for the Future, 23-24. Copyright © 1998. Reprinted by permission of The Indiana University Press.

James E. Krier, The Irrational National Air Quality Standards: Macro-and Micro-Mistakes, UCLA Law Review, 22, 323-26. Copyright © 1975. Reprinted by permission of the author.

Excerpt from Thomas Princen & Matthias Finder (eds.), *Environment NGOs in World Politics: Linking the Local and Global* © 1994. Reprinted by permission of Taylor & Francis, a division of T&F Informa.

Clifford Rechtschaffen, Deterrence vs. Cooperation and the Evolving Theory of Environmental Enforcement, 71 Southern California Law Review, 1186-89 (1998) reprinted with the permission of the Southern California Law Review.

Arnold W. Reitze, Jr., Air Quality Protection Using State Implementation Plans: Thirty-Seven Years of Increasing Complexity, Villanova Law Review 15, 209. Copyright © 2004. Reprinted by permission.


James Salzman & J.B. Ruhl, Currencies and the Commodification of Environmental Law, Stanford Law Review, 53, 607, 609-13. Copyright © 2000 by Stanford Law Review. Reproduced with permission of Stanford Law Review in the format, Textbook via Copyright Clearance Center.

Richard Stewart, *Innovation and Administrative Law: A Conceptual Framework*, California Law Review 69, 1268-69. Copyright © 1981 California Law Review. Reprinted by permission in the format Text via Copyright Clearance Center.

From *Environmental Law Reporter Update* by Byron Swift. Copyright © 2001 by Environmental Law Institute. Reproduced with permission of Environmental Law Institute in the formats Text and Other Book via Copyright Clearance Center.

From *Resilience Thinking* by Brian Walker & David Salt. Copyright © 2006 Brian Walker and David Salt. Reproduced by permission of Island Press, Washington, D.C.

Edith Brown Weiss & Harold K. Jacobson (eds.), *Engaging Countries: Strengthening Compliance with International Environmental Accords*, excerpts from chapter 3, © 1998 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, by permission of The MIT Press.



Environmental Law

Summary of Contents

<i>Contents</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>xxiii</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>xxv</i>

<i>Introduction</i>	<i>1</i>
---------------------	----------

PART I	THE NATURE AND EVOLUTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL LAW	5
---------------	--	----------

Chapter 1	The Nature of Environmental Problems	7
Chapter 2	Common Law Solutions	31
Chapter 3	From Common Law to Administrative Law	69
Chapter 4	The Goals and Objectives of Environmental Statutes	107


PART II	GOALS FOR PARTICULAR REGULATIONS	125
----------------	---	------------

Chapter 5	Effects-Based Standards	127
Chapter 6	Technology-Based Standard Setting	185
Chapter 7	Cost-Benefit Approaches	225

PART III	THE MEANS OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	265
-----------------	--	------------

Chapter 8	Traditional Regulation	267
Chapter 9	Economic Incentives	297
Chapter 10	Information-Based Approaches	323

Chapter 11	Moving Upstream: Pollution Prevention and Recycling	375
Chapter 12	Environmental Restoration	403
PART IV	ALLOCATION OF RESPONSIBILITY	443
Chapter 13	Private Cleanup Responsibility	445
Chapter 14	Allocation of Government Responsibility	489
Chapter 15	Decision Making for International Environmental Problems	553
PART V	ENFORCEMENT	597
Chapter 16	Detecting Violations: Permitting, Monitoring, Record Keeping and Reporting	605
Chapter 17	Government Enforcement	623
Chapter 18	Citizen Enforcement	643
<i>Table of Cases</i>		683
<i>Index</i>		689




Contents

<i>Preface</i>	xxiii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xxv

<i>Introduction</i>	i
---------------------	---

PART I The Nature and Evolution of Environmental Law

 <i>I</i>	<i>The Nature of Environmental Problems</i>	7
A. Pollution		8
1. Air Pollution		8
2. Water Pollution		11
3. Solid and Hazardous Wastes		13
4. Toxic Chemicals		15
B. Overuse of Natural Resources		16
C. Ecosystem Degradation		18
D. Implications for Environmental Law		21
Richard J. Lazarus, Restoring What's Environmental about Environmental Law in the Supreme Court		22
Notes and Questions about Lazarus Article		25
A Continuing Case Study—Climate Disruption		25

2

Common Law Solutions

31


A.	Common Law Approaches—From Strict Rights to Balance	32
1.	Trespass	32
2.	Nuisance	34
	Trespass and Nuisance Review Problem	36
B.	The Promise and Limits of Common Law Solutions	36
1.	The Common Law Tradition	36
	<i>Madison et al. v. Ducktown Sulphur, Copper & Iron Co., Ltd.</i>	37
	Notes and Questions on <i>Madison v. Ducktown</i>	40
	<i>Missouri v. Illinois</i>	44
	Notes and Questions on <i>Missouri v. Illinois</i>	45
2.	Common Law Goals and Coase	46
	R.H. Coase, The Problem of Social Cost	47
	Notes and Questions on Coase	48
3.	More Recent Applications of Common Law	49
	<i>Boomer et al. v. Atlantic Cement Co., Inc.</i>	49
	Notes and Questions on <i>Boomer</i>	53
	<i>Anderson v. W.R. Grace & Co.</i>	53
	Notes and Questions on <i>Anderson v. W.R. Grace</i>	61
	Climate Disruption Common Law Review Problem	62
4.	The Adequacy of the Common Law and a Response to Coase	65
	Garret Hardin, The Tragedy of the Commons	65
	Notes and Questions on Hardin	67

3

From Common Law to Administrative Law

69

A.	The Idea of Statutory Schemes	70
1.	<i>Boomer v. Atlantic Cement</i> : A Reprise	70
2.	Statutory Responses: The Clean Air Act as an Example	72
	a. Setting Standards for Clean Air	72
	b. Setting Standards for Particular Source Controls	73
	c. Planning for Overall Air Quality	73
B.	The Role of Administrative Agencies and Judicial Review	73
1.	The Scope of Administrative Agency Authority (Delegation and Nondelegation)	74
2.	Agency Decision Procedures and the Role of Outside Parties	75
	Notes and Questions on Agency Procedures	77
3.	The Role of the Courts	78
	a. The Availability of Judicial Review	79
	b. Forcing Agency Action	80
	c. Challenges on the Merits—Standards of Judicial Review	82
	<i>Citizens to Preserve Overton Park v. Volpe</i>	83
	Notes and Questions on <i>Overton Park</i>	88

	<i>Chevron, U.S.A. v. Natural Resources Defense Council</i>	90
	Notes and Questions on <i>Chevron</i>	93
	Climate Disruption Administrative Law Problem	94
C.	Recapitulation: The Residual Role of the Common Law in a Statutory World	96
	<i>Illinois v. City of Milwaukee</i>	97
	Notes and Questions on <i>Illinois v. City of Milwaukee</i>	98
	<i>City of Milwaukee v. Illinois</i>	98
	Notes and Questions on <i>Milwaukee II</i>	104
	Common Law Preemption Problem	105
	<i>The Goals and Objectives of Environmental Statutes</i>	107
A.	What Should the Goals of Environmental Law Be?	108
	1. Ecology, Rights, and Ethics	108
	2. Human Health and Prevention	110
	3. Economic Efficiency	111
	4. Equity and Environmental Justice	112
	5. Sustainable Development	113
	Notes and Questions on Goals	110
B.	The Goals of Some of the Major Federal Environmental Statutes	114
	1. The Clean Water Act	114
	Notes and Questions on Clean Water Act Goals	115
	2. The Clean Air Act	117
	Notes and Questions on Clean Air Act Goals	118
	3. The Toxic Substances Control Act	118
	Notes and Questions on Toxic Substances Control Act	119
	4. The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	119
	Notes and Questions Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	120
	5. The National Environmental Policy Act	121
	Notes and Questions on the National Environmental Policy Act	122

PART II

Goals for Particular Regulations



Effects-Based Standards 127

A.	Defining “Effects”—Concepts of Risk and Precaution	128
	<i>Ethyl Corporation v. Environmental Protection Agency</i>	128
	Notes and Questions on <i>Ethyl Corporation</i>	133

B.	Ambient Effects-Based Standards	134
1.	National Ambient Air Quality Standards	135
	<i>Lead Industries Association, Inc. v. Environmental Protection Agency</i>	135
	Notes and Questions on <i>Lead Industries</i>	140
2.	Critiques of National Ambient Air Quality Standards	142
	James E. Krier, The Irrational National Air Quality Standards: Macro- and Micro-Mistakes	142
	Notes and Questions on Krier Critique	143
3.	Water Quality Standards	144
	<i>PUD No. 1 of Jefferson County v. Washington Dept. of Ecology</i>	145
	Notes and Questions on <i>Jefferson County</i>	149
C.	Effects-Based Output Standards (Release Limits)	152
	<i>Natural Resources Defense Council v. EPA</i> (1987)	152
	<i>Natural Resources Defense Council v. EPA</i> (2008)	158
	Notes and Questions on the Section 112 Cases	160
D.	Issues in Risk Assessment and Decision Making	162
	Climate Disruption, Toxics, and Risk	163
	An Atrazine Risk Assessment Problem	164
E.	Postscript: A Segue from Effects-Based to Technology-Based Regulation	168
	<i>Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO v. American Petroleum Institute</i>	168
	Notes and Questions on Benzene	182
	6 <i>Technology-Based Standard Setting</i>	185
A.	Feasibility	185
	<i>American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc. v. Donovan [Cotton Dust Case]</i>	186
	Notes and Questions on the <i>Cotton Dust</i> Case	189
1.	Technical Feasibility	190
a.	Demonstrated Technology	190
	<i>National Lime Association v. Environmental Protection Agency</i>	190
	Notes and Questions on <i>National Lime</i>	197
	A Note on the Follow-the-Leader Principle, the Problem of Categorization, and Variances	198
	A Note on the Value of Uniformity	201
b.	Technology-Forcing	201
	<i>Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</i>	202
	Notes and Questions on <i>NRDC v. EPA</i> and Technology Forcing	206