



Environmental ADVISORY ■

OCTOBER 3, 2014

Seventh Circuit Addresses UAO Enforcement and CERCLA Arranger Liability in Fox River PCB Litigation

The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit recently addressed several important CERCLA issues in litigation arising from the cleanup of PCBs in the Lower Fox River in Wisconsin. They include whether the U.S. EPA is permitted to obtain permanent injunctive relief to enforce a unilateral administrative order (UAO) and the type of “intent” necessary to establish a valid claim for arranger liability under CERCLA.

***United States v. P.H. Glatfelter Co.*, 2014 WL 4755483 (7th Cir. Sept. 25, 2014) and UAO Enforcement**

In 2007, the EPA issued UAOs to several potentially responsible parties (PRPs) directing them to perform the remedial work for Operable Unit Nos. 2-5 in the Lower Fox River. NCR Corporation initially complied with the UAO, but reduced its work in 2011 before stopping work altogether in 2012. The EPA sued NCR and certain other UAO recipients and in 2012 obtained a preliminary injunction compelling NCR to resume UAO work in Operable Unit No. 4. The Seventh Circuit affirmed the preliminary injunction on appeal. *United States v. NCR Corp.*, 688 F.3d 833 (2012). Following a subsequent bench trial, the district court ruled in the government’s favor and entered a permanent injunction requiring NCR and the other remaining non-settling PRPs to complete the work required by the UAO.

The Seventh Circuit vacated the permanent injunction and held that the equities a district court is required to consider when it imposes permanent injunctive relief can play no part in an action to enforce an EPA UAO. The appellate court added that when the UAO involves implementing a complex cleanup, permanent injunctive relief may run afoul of the “reasonable detail” requirement of Rule 65(d)(1)(C) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, “which requires that very injunction ‘describe in reasonable detail—and not by referring to the complaint or other document—the act or acts restrained or required.’” The Seventh Circuit also distinguished its prior approval of the preliminary injunction, which required NCR to resume the UAO work, on the grounds that such relief can be appropriate in “emergency” situations. Lastly, the court noted that the EPA has other potential recourse in the event of UAO noncompliance, including seeking declaratory relief and civil penalties.

This advisory is published by Alston & Bird LLP to provide a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

***NCR Corp. v. George A. Whiting Paper Co.*, 2014 WL 4755491 (7th Cir. Sept. 25, 2014) and CERCLA Arranger Liability**

In *Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. United States*, 556 U.S. 599, 601 (2009), the U.S. Supreme Court held that a valid claim for CERCLA “arranger liability” requires showing a defendant took “intentional steps to dispose of a hazardous substance.” 42 U.S.C. 9607(a)(3). Applying that legal standard, the Seventh Circuit affirmed the district court’s ruling that NCR’s predecessor, Appleton Coated Paper Company, did not “arrange for disposal” when it sold a byproduct containing PCBs to recycling paper mills. Two recycling mills argued that CERCLA liability should attach because Appleton knew (or should have known) that the recycling mills would separate out the PCBs and discharge them into the Fox River. In other words, Appleton’s actions amounted to “intentional steps” to dispose of the PCBs in its byproduct given that Appleton knew that some of the PCBs would end up in the river.

The Seventh Circuit disagreed. In its view, these transactions constituted a sale of a useful product into a competitive market, even if it was not a “new” product and even though the sales proceeds did not cover the costs incurred in preparing the byproduct for sale to the recycling mills. The Seventh Circuit also noted that after Appleton sold its byproducts to the recycling mills, what was ultimately done with the PCBs embedded in the byproduct “was completely out of the seller’s hands.”

Conclusion

The breadth of CERCLA’s liability continues to be a moving target. In addition to these two Seventh Circuit opinions, there have already been a number of important appellate decisions this year, including rulings from the U.S. Supreme Court and the Second, Sixth, Eighth and Ninth Circuits. Importantly, the Seventh Circuit’s holding in *Glatfelter* makes clear that CERCLA does not permit the EPA to make an end-run around the legal requirements for permanent injunctive relief. Similarly, the holding in *Whiting* reconfirms that CERCLA arranger liability is not limitless. The Fourth Circuit will be hearing oral argument later this month on another arranger liability appeal, so we expect at least one more CERCLA appellate ruling soon.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact **Doug Arnold** at Doug.Arnold@alston.com, **Jonathan Wells** at Jonathan.Wells@alston.com or **Ronnie Gosselin** at Ronnie.Gosselin@alston.com.

If you would like to receive future *Environmental Enforcement Advisories* electronically, please forward your contact information to **environmental.advisory@alston.com**. Be sure to put "**subscribe**" in the subject line.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact your Alston & Bird attorney or any of the following:

Doug Arnold
404.881.7637
doug.arnold@alston.com

Edward Casey
213.576.1005
ed.casey@alston.com

Mark Johnson
213.576.1089
mark.johnson@alston.com

Jocelyn Thompson
213.576.1104
jocelyn.thompson@alston.com

Sarah Babcock
404.881.7632
sarah.babcock@alston.com

Lee DeHihns
404.881.7151
lee.dehinhns@alston.com

Clay Massey
404.881.4969
clay.massey@alston.com

Andrea Warren
213.576.2518
andrea.warren@alston.com

Ward Benshoof
213.576.1108
ward.benshoof@alston.com

Skip Fulton
404.881.7152
skip.fulton@alston.com

Elise Paeffgen
202.239.3939
elise.paeffgen@alston.com

Jonathan Wells
404.881.7472
jonathan.wells@alston.com

Meaghan Goodwin Boyd
404.881.7245
meaghan.boyd@alston.com

Maureen Gorsen
916.498.3305
maureen.gorsen@alston.com

Bruce Pasfield
202.239.3585
bruce.pasfield@alston.com

Diane Wizig
404.881.4954
diane.wizig@alston.com

Andrew Brady
213.576.2527
andrew.brady@alston.com

Ronnie Gosselin
404.881.7965
ronnie.gosselin@alston.com

Geoffrey Rathgeber
404.881.4974
geoff.rathgeber@alston.com

Nicki Carlsen
213.576.1128
nicki.carlsen@alston.com

Maya Lopez Grasse
213.576.2526
maya.grasse@alston.com

Beverlee Silva
404.881.4625
beverlee.silva@alston.com

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2014

ATLANTA: One Atlantic Center ■ 1201 West Peachtree Street ■ Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30309-3424 ■ 404.881.7000 ■ Fax: 404.881.7777

BRUSSELS: Level 20 Bastion Tower ■ Place du Champ de Mars ■ B-1050 Brussels, BE ■ +32 2 550 3700 ■ Fax: +32 2 550 3719

CHARLOTTE: Bank of America Plaza ■ 101 South Tryon Street ■ Suite 4000 ■ Charlotte, North Carolina, USA, 28280-4000 ■ 704.444.1000 ■ Fax: 704.444.1111

DALLAS: 2828 North Harwood Street ■ 18th Floor ■ Dallas, Texas, USA, 75201 ■ 214.922.3400 ■ Fax: 214.922.3899

LOS ANGELES: 333 South Hope Street ■ 16th Floor ■ Los Angeles, California, USA, 90071-3004 ■ 213.576.1000 ■ Fax: 213.576.1100

NEW YORK: 90 Park Avenue ■ 15th Floor ■ New York, New York, USA, 10016-1387 ■ 212.210.9400 ■ Fax: 212.210.9444

RESEARCH TRIANGLE: 4721 Emperor Blvd. ■ Suite 400 ■ Durham, North Carolina, USA, 27703-85802 ■ 919.862.2200 ■ Fax: 919.862.2260

SILICON VALLEY: 1950 University Avenue ■ 5th Floor ■ East Palo Alto, California, USA, 94303-2282 ■ 650.838.2000 ■ Fax: 650.838.2001

WASHINGTON, DC: The Atlantic Building ■ 950 F Street, NW ■ Washington, DC, USA, 20004-1404 ■ 202.756.3300 ■ Fax: 202.756.3333