



Environment, Land Use & Natural Resources ADVISORY ■

APRIL 20, 2015

Ninth Circuit Affirms Use of Proportionate Share Approach in CERCLA Settlements

By Doug Arnold, Sarah Babcock and Ronnie Gosselin

The Ninth Circuit recently confirmed that district courts have discretion to use a proportionate share approach when crediting private party settlements under CERCLA. *AmeriPride Servs. Inc. v. Tex. E. Overseas Inc.*, No. 12-17245 (9th Cir. Apr. 02, 2015).

When determining how to credit settlements in CERCLA cases, courts generally have two options: the Uniform Contribution Among Tortfeasors Act (UCATA) *pro tanto* approach or the Uniform Comparative Fault Act (UCFA) proportionate share approach. Under the UCATA *pro tanto* approach, the amount of a settling defendant's settlement is subtracted from the overall claimed damages. Additionally, the defendant receives a bar against any contribution claims from the remaining parties. Because the settling defendant's payment is credited against the overall damages without regard to that defendant's actual equitable share, the remaining defendants bear the risk that the settlement amount is too low. As a result, courts are required to conduct a good faith and fairness hearing prior to approving the settlement.

The UCFA proportionate share approach, on the other hand, places the risk of an insufficient settlement on the plaintiff. Under this approach, the total damages amount is reduced by the amount of the settling party's *equitable share*, regardless of the actual settlement amount. If a plaintiff settles for too little and releases a defendant for less than its equitable share, the shortfall is borne by the plaintiff. The proportionate share approach therefore eliminates the need for a good faith and fairness hearing. Moreover, the settling defendant can potentially obtain a bar on contribution claims by both nonsettling defendants and any *future* claimants because the plaintiff has effectively taken on the settling party's equitable share of the liability.

These two settlement approaches met head to head in the recent *AmeriPride* decision. The case involved alleged releases of PCE and other hazardous materials by multiple parties into soil and groundwater in Sacramento, California. In addressing certain early settlements, the trial court adopted the UCFA proportionate share approach as the law of the case. Four years later, however, the court declined to apply that approach

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.

after determining that defendant Texas Eastern Overseas, Inc. (TEO) was liable for plaintiff AmeriPride's response costs, instead holding that the claims against TEO would be reduced only by the dollar value of the earlier settlements.

On appeal, TEO argued that CERCLA required the district court to apply the UCFA proportionate share approach when crediting the prior settlements. TEO also contended that the court had abused its discretion by first ruling that it would apply the UCFA proportionate share approach, and then refusing to apply that approach later.

Unsurprisingly, the Ninth Circuit rejected TEO's claim that CERCLA *requires* the application of UCFA. The Ninth Circuit found that CERCLA is silent as to which approach to use when crediting settlements among private parties. Moreover, the court found that CERCLA's provision allowing a court to "allocate response costs among liable parties using such equitable factors as the court determines are appropriate" gives district court judges the discretion to determine the most equitable method. In other words, a court can use the UCFA proportionate share approach whenever appropriate in the court's view, but is not required to do so. The Ninth Circuit also held, however, that the district court should not have changed settlement approaches midstream and remanded for further proceedings on that issue.

The *AmeriPride* decision reconfirms that the UCFA approach is an appropriate allocation method under CERCLA for purposes of crediting private party settlements. Accordingly, CERCLA defendants would be wise to evaluate the potential availability of UCFA as part of any settlement strategy. The contribution bar that UCFA potentially provides against future claims—by both parties and nonparties—can add a degree of finality that too often is absent in most Superfund settlements.

If you would like to receive future *Environment, Land Use & Natural Resources 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	Nicki Carlsen 213.576.1128 nicki.carlsen@alston.com	Clay Massey 404.881.4969 clay.massey@alston.com	Jocelyn Thompson 213.576.1104 jocelyn.thompson@alston.com
Sarah Babcock 404.881.7632 sarah.babcock@alston.com	Edward Casey 213.576.1005 ed.casey@alston.com	Elise Paeffgen 202.239.3939 elise.paeffgen@alston.com	Andrea Warren 213.576.2518 andrea.warren@alston.com
Paul Beard 916.498.3354 paul.beard@alston.com	Skip Fulton 404.881.7152 skip.fulton@alston.com	Bruce Pasfield 202.239.3585 bruce.pasfield@alston.com	Jonathan Wells 404.881.7472 jonathan.wells@alston.com
Ward Benschhoff 213.576.1108 ward.benschhoff@alston.com	Maureen Gorsen 916.498.3305 maureen.gorsen@alston.com	Geoffrey Rathgeber 404.881.4974 geoff.rathgeber@alston.com	
Meaghan Goodwin Boyd 404.881.7245 meaghan.boyd@alston.com	Ronnie Gosselin 404.881.7965 ronnie.gosselin@alston.com	Damien Schiff 916.498.3320 damien.schiff@alston.com	
Andrew Brady 213.576.2527 andrew.brady@alston.com	Maya Lopez Grasse 213.576.2526 maya.grasse@alston.com	Beverlee Silva 404.881.4625 beverlee.silva@alston.com	

ALSTON & BIRD

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2015

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