

# Index

---

- adaptive federalism 109–13
- Adelman, David 109–10
- Adler, Jonathan 105
- Affordable Care Act 2010 413
- Air Conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration Institute v. City of Albuquerque (2008)* 255–7
- air pollution
  - shift from state to federal controls 13
    - CAA Amendments 1977 16–18
    - CAA Amendments 1990 18–19
    - CAA 1970 13–16
- Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation v. EPA (2004)* 4–5
- Amalgamated Society of Engineers v. Adelaide Steamship Co Ltd (1920)* 278, 280
- Arizona v. United States (2010)* 391
- Australia
  - constitutional law
    - background 271, 273–4
    - Commonwealth power, scope of 279–81
    - state and Commonwealth relationship 274–5, 279–81
    - treaties, ratification and implementation processes 288–90
  - cooperative federalism
    - coercive centralism, and 271–2
    - Council of Australian Governments (COAG) 292–3
    - democracy deficit 293–4
    - intergovernmental agreements 293–8
    - Ministerial Councils 292–3
    - reform proposals 272–3, 297–301
    - trends 271–2, 277, 291, 301–2
- environmental federalism
  - challenges 273, 295, 302–3
  - Commonwealth powers 281–3, 287–8
  - compared with US authority 284–90
  - cooperative approach 291
  - external territories,
    - Commonwealth authority over 288–9
  - generally 271–2, 290–91
  - initiative impacts 273
  - Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment (IGAE) 294–5
  - intergovernmental initiatives 291–8
  - National Environment Protection Council (NEPC) 295
  - national strategies 291, 298–9
  - oceans, Commonwealth authority over 287–8
  - preemption 272
  - Standing Committee on Environment and Water (SCEW) 292
  - trends 301–2
- environmental protection policy
  - biodiversity 286–7
  - carbon price scheme 273
  - Commonwealth initiatives 286–7
  - Commonwealth legislative power 281–3, 287–8
  - cooperative approaches 291
  - Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 295–7
  - Lake Eyre Basin 297–8
  - legislative drafting 283–4

- matters of national environmental significance (MNES) 296
  - Murray-Darling Basin 272, 282, 297
  - National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development 298–9
  - Natural Reserves System 286–7, 298
- federalism
  - centralism, and 271–2, 274–5
  - coercive approach 271–2, 277
  - competitive approach 277
  - federal land ownership and management role 285–6
  - general features 273–7
  - judicial influences on 278–81
  - opportunistic focus 276–7
  - pragmatism 276–7
  - reform proposals 275–6
  - state sovereignty, revival proposals 298–303
- Bakies v. City of Perrsburg (2006)* 251
- balanced federalism 369–70, 414, 417–18
- Ball v. James (1981)* 251–2
- Bankhead, John 88
- Bedford Affiliates v. Sills (1998)* 59–60
- Bentsen, Lloyd 19
- Bieber, Eric 412–13
- biodiversity *see also* endangered species
  - Australian protection mechanisms 286–7
  - climate change impacts on 111–12, 258–9
  - cooperative federalism
    - adaptive management approach, need for 110–13
    - climate change impacts, and 110–13
    - geographic range changes 111–12
- Board of County Com'rs v. Brown Group Retail (2009)* 61
- Building Industry Association of Washington v. Washington State Building Code Council (2012)* 257
- Burger, Michael 134
- Burlington N. and Santa Fe Ry. Co. v. United States (2009)* 54
- Buzbee, William 109, 126
- Clean Air Act 1970
  - amendments
    - compliance deadlines 19
    - criticism of 19
    - generally 6, 10
    - 1977 16–18
    - 1990 18–19
  - cooperative federalism
    - conditional preemption 406–7, 409
    - emphasis shifts 13–19
    - enforcement powers and penalties 8–9
    - initial approach 3–6
    - limitations of 21–5, 183–4
    - need for 7, 26–7
    - performance of 20–23
    - shared and general permit programs 407–8
- EPA role and powers
  - development of 13–19, 25–7
  - dominance of 5–10
  - emissions guidelines 25–6
  - enforcement 8–10
  - purpose 25–6
  - state program supervision 9–10
- generally
  - amendments 6, 10, 16–19
  - background 3–4
  - California's emissions standards 9, 14, 24–5
  - environmental law, influences on development 4–5
  - non-compliance penalties 406–7
  - purpose 7–8, 13–16, 407
  - successes and limitations of 20–23, 27
  - suitability for addressing climate change 23–5
- state role and powers
  - changing emphasis 13–19
  - distrust of 14–15, 17–18
  - higher standards adoption 9, 14, 16
  - limitations 8–9, 24–5

- non-attainment penalties 8–9, 17
- preemption of state laws 229–30
- rights vs. responsibilities 7–10, 17–18
- state implementation plans (SIPs) 8, 406
- uniformity, and 24–5
- California v. FERC (2008)* 218
- cap-and-trade programs 145, 153–6, 166–7, 174–5, 183–5
- CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act 1980)
- cooperative federalism
  - Congressional intention 49, 54–5
  - discovery rule 63
  - federal claims preemption 53–5, 57–67
  - limitations 163
  - personal injury or property damage 62–6
  - remediation costs recovery 63–4
  - spending power partnerships 403–4
  - statutes of limitations or repose 62–6
  - successes 401
- generally
  - background 49–50
  - cost recovery and contribution claim 51–2
  - hazardous substances, definition 52
  - limitations 52–3
  - National Contingency Plan (NCP) 51, 57–8
  - purpose 49–54, 63–4
- state role and powers
  - common law, reliance on 56–7
  - contribution claims 59–62
  - cost recovery claims 57–62
  - double recovery claims 60–61
  - NCP non-reliance implications 57–8
  - personal injury or property damage claims 62–6
  - preemption of state law claims 53–5, 57–67
  - presumption against preemption 66
  - scope of claims function 53–5
  - state Superfund statute variations 55–6
  - statutes of limitations or repose 62–6
  - unjust enrichment claims 61–2
- clean air standards 175–6, 183–4
- Clean Power Plan (2015) 163–4
- climate change, generally
  - adaptation challenges 209
  - democratic legitimacy 195–7
  - effectiveness 193–5
  - free-riding 196
  - liberty rights protection 197–8
  - prevention of tyranny 197–8
- federal adaptation initiatives
  - Climate Action Plan 204
  - Climate Data Initiative 204
  - Climate Resilience Toolkit 204
  - disaster law programs 206–7
  - federal agency role 205–7
  - Interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force 203–4
  - multi-jurisdictional programs 207–9
  - National Flood Insurance Program 206–7
  - program development and interaction 203–7
  - support recommendations 204–5
- impacts
  - economic 190–92
  - ecosystem degradation 258–9
  - human settlements 191–2
  - infrastructure 190–91
  - natural adaptation 192
  - physical 190–91
  - public health 191
  - scale of 188–91
  - significance of 23
- predictions 189
  - challenges 148–9
- climate change policies
  - bottom-up approaches 150–51

- cap-and-trade methods 145, 153–6, 166–7, 174–5, 183–5
- carbon taxes 166–7
- cooperative federalism
  - adaptation governance functions 198–203
  - anti-patchwork arguments 159–60
  - biodiversity and wildlife protection challenges 110–13
  - clean car standards 183–4
  - Coastal Zone Management Act 205
  - collective response role 202–3
  - democratic legitimacy 195–7
  - dynamic federalism, and 194–5
  - effectiveness 193–5
  - extra-jurisdictional impacts 194–5
  - federal standards or requirements 199–202
  - federal support functions 202–3
  - federalism values 192–8
  - first mover advantage 181
  - funding 200, 202
  - housing programs 208–9
  - incremental improvements 163–4
  - individualized source obligations 159–60
  - initiative support
    - recommendations 204–5
  - innovation incentives 160–61, 179
  - inter-jurisdictional challenges 196–7
  - interest group capture, and 197
  - judicial challenges 384–5
  - justifications for 194–5
  - liberty rights protection 197–8
  - multi-jurisdictional program development 207–9
  - multilevel structure, advantages of 194–5
  - path dependence 164–5
  - policy diffusion 161–6
  - political incentives 180–82, 185–6
  - potential benefits 152–3
  - prevention of tyranny 197–8
  - program development and interaction 203–7
  - regulatory webs 161–3
  - similarly targeted regulation 161–3
  - suboptimal innovation theory 180–82
  - substantive and procedural requirements 199–202
  - suitability for addressing 23–5
  - systemic political challenges 196–7
  - water programs 207–8
- federal role and powers
  - implementation failure risks 157–8
  - laxity risks 155–7
  - limitations 167–8
  - preemption of state law 146, 152–4, 158–64
  - regulatory limitations and challenges 154–5
- international approach, need for 145–6
- legal durability, need for 147, 165–6
- legal influences 145–7, 151–2, 165–6, 188
- market influences 147–8, 151–4, 165–7
- regulatory challenges
  - authority, establishing 151–2
  - conservation motivations 158–9
  - cross-border nature of problem 150, 154
  - derailment risks 146–8, 154–8
  - free-riding 154, 170, 180–81, 196
  - hedging 155–7
  - implementation failure 157–8
  - innovation incentives 155–7, 169–71, 180–82
  - inter-jurisdictional competition 196–7
  - interest group capture 197
  - leakage 154–6
  - legislative inertia 165–6
  - liberty rights protection 197–8
  - market forces 147–8, 151–4
  - overinclusion risks 158–60
  - policy reversal 157–8
  - prediction variations 148–9
  - private and corporate interest 149–50, 167–8
  - regulation avoidance 154
  - regulatory commons dynamics 150

- regulatory entrenchment 160–66
- skepticism 149
- state, local and federal conflicts
  - 153–4
- under-innovation 181–2
- state role and powers
  - adaptation effectiveness, and 193–4
  - advantages 147, 151–2, 169–70
  - catalyst roles 155–7
  - clean car standards 175–6, 183–4
  - electricity generation emission caps 176
  - extra-jurisdictional impacts 194
  - federal preemption of 146, 152–4, 158–64
  - free-riding, and 170
  - GHG emission targets and registries 172–3, 183
  - individualized oversight 159–60
  - innovation incentives 156–7, 169–71, 179
  - inter-jurisdictional policy impacts 207–9
  - ‘laboratories of democracy’ theory 162, 169–70, 179, 182–3, 187
  - limitations 147, 193–4
  - low carbon fuel standards 176–7
  - path dependence risks 164–5
  - policy diffusion, and 161–3, 165–6
  - policy reversal 157–8
  - political risks, and 185–6
  - regional agreements 146
  - renewable portfolio standards 177–9
  - risk aversity, and 180–82
  - scale innovation, and 171, 182–7
  - standard adoption creativity 184–5
  - state agencies 186
  - subnational cap-and-trade programs 174–5
- Coastal Zone Management Act 2006
  - 205, 208
  - amendments 238–9
  - reverse preemption 214
    - judicial interpretation and legislative amendment 225–6
    - practical application 226–9, 397–8
  - state veto of inconsistent federal actions 214, 222–4, 238–9, 396–7
- collective action theory 10–13, 16
  - cooperative federalism, justifications for 10–13, 16–17, 23–5, 105
  - ‘not in my back yard’ (NIMBY) syndrome 12–13, 25, 115–16
  - ‘race to the bottom’ 4–5, 12, 16–18
  - resource pooling 11–12, 16
  - transboundary externalities 11, 18, 24
  - uniform standards 12, 16, 24–5
- Commonwealth v. Tasmania* (1983) 279–80
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act 1980 *see* CERCLA
- constitutional federalism, in US
  - forestry management policies 76–81, 87
  - wetland management policies 78–9
- constitutional law
  - Australia, in
    - background 271, 273–4
    - Commonwealth power, scope of 279–81
    - state and Commonwealth relationship 274–5, 279–81
    - treaties, ratification and implementation processes 288–90
  - federalism, relationship with 361–2
  - US, in
    - definitions of state 247–8
    - local governance rights and controls 250–52
    - Supremacy Clause 248–9, 365, 393
    - treaties, ratification and implementation 288–90
- cooperative federalism, generally
  - adaptive management approach, need for 109–13
  - advantages 368–9
  - climate change mitigation, suitability for 23–5
  - collective action theory, and 10–13
  - criticism of 368–9
  - enhanced approach 107–10

- environmental policy applications
  - 398–400
  - capacity coordination 401, 413
  - conditional preemption 404–7, 409
  - federally supported state
    - implementation 401–4, 413
  - intergovernmental partnerships
    - 400–401
  - shared and general permit
    - programs 407–12
  - spending power partnerships
    - 402–3
- flexibility, and 414–15
- functions 3–4, 368–9
- health policy 408–9
- judicial interpretation role 417
- jurisdictional overlaps, and 398–400, 415–16
- justifications for 10–13, 16–17, 23–5, 105
- matching principle 105–6, 134
- merits and criticism of 4–5
- ‘not in my back yard’ (NIMBY)
  - syndrome 12–13, 25, 115–16
- ‘race to the bottom’ 4–5, 12, 16–18
- regulatory opportunities 399–400
- resource pooling 11–12, 16
- standard approach 106–7
- successes and failures 413
- transboundary externalities 11, 18, 24
- uniform standards 12, 16, 24–5
- CTS Corp. v. Waldburger (2014)* 64–7
- Clean Water Act 1972
  - amendments 35–6, 39, 43–7
    - best management practices 45
    - coastal zones regulation 44–5
    - state authority 45–7
- cooperative federalism
  - best management practices 45
  - Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) 44–5
  - Coastal Zone Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA) 44–5
  - conditional preemption 404–5
  - dynamic federalism, development of 43–8
  - hydromodifications 30–31, 47–8
  - judicial restrictions on reach of
    - 382–4
  - non-point source program 30–31, 35–7, 43–7, 77
  - point source program 33–5, 43
  - quality standards 34
  - rights vs. responsibilities 7–8
  - State Revolving Fund 405
  - stormwater permits 410–11
  - successes and failures 30–32
  - water quantity/ flow management
    - 38–40, 47–8
- EPA role and powers 29
  - best management practices 45
  - enforcement 34
  - non-point source program 36–7, 43–7, 77
  - oversight authority 33–4, 37
  - point source program 33–5
  - successes and limitations 45–6
  - total maximum daily load (TMDL)
    - 36–7, 45–7
  - water quantity/ flow management
    - 36–7, 40, 45–8
- generally
  - amendments 35–6, 39, 43–4
  - background 28–9, 32
  - importance 28–9
  - judicial challenges 382–4
  - pollution, definition 39
  - successes and limitations 28–32, 40–46, 48
- state role and powers
  - authority restrictions 41, 45–7
  - coastal zone management 44–5
  - enforcement 34, 41–2
  - higher standards adoption 42–3
  - legislative amendments regarding
    - 45–7
  - non-point source program 35–6, 41, 44–7
  - point source program 33
  - preemption 34–5, 39
  - regulatory and quality standards
    - 33–4
  - restrictive legislation 40–41
  - reverse preemption provisions
    - 214–17

- savings clauses 35
  - successes and limitations 40–43
  - total maximum daily load (TMDL)
    - 41, 45–6
  - veto of FERC permits 218–22
  - veto of inconsistent federal actions
    - 214–17
  - veto of wetlands permissions
    - 220–22
  - water quality certification 42–3, 216–17
  - water quantity/ flow management
    - 39–40, 47–8
- Decker v. Northwest Environmental Defense Center* (2013) 77–8
- DeShazo, J.R. 220
- Dillon, John F. 252–3
- Dole, Bob 19
- Duane, Timothy 107–8
- Dwyer, John 106–7
- ecosystems
  - ecological economics of 244–5
  - ecosystem services analysis 244–5, 261–3
  - functionality degradation predictions
    - 258–9
  - local governance and protection role
    - 261–5, 267
- Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (2011) 401
- Endangered Species Act 1973 99–104
  - critical habitat designation 100
  - Joint Task Force on Endangered Species Act Policy (ESA JTF)
    - 103–4
  - listed species recovery plans 100–101
  - state conservation programs 100–102
  - state–federal cooperation
    - benefits 94, 102, 104–6
    - enhanced model 107–10
    - jurisdiction conflicts 108–9
    - limitations 103
    - in practice 102–4
    - requirements 100–102
    - spending power partnerships
      - 403–4
    - standard model 106–7
- endangered species policies, in US
  - game laws 96–7
  - migratory birds 97
- endangered species protection policies, in US
  - common law development 95–6
  - cooperative federalism
    - adaptive management approach, need for 110–13
    - climate change impacts, and 110–13
    - cooperation in practice 102–4
    - cooperation requirements 100–102
    - critical habitat designation 100
    - dual system, benefits of 94, 102, 104–5
    - enhanced approach 107–10
    - Joint Task Force on Endangered Species Act Policy (ESA JTF)
      - 103–4
    - jurisdiction conflicts 108–9
    - limitations 103
    - listed species recovery plans
      - 100–101
    - standard approach 106–7
    - state conservation programs
      - 100–102
- Endangered Species Act 1973
  - 99–104
- federal role and powers 96–100
  - advantages of 104
  - federal aid for wildlife restoration
    - 97
  - game laws 96–7
  - maritime mammals 98–9
  - migratory birds 97
  - preemption of state powers 97–9
  - wild horses 98
- fragmentation 71
- geographic range changes 111–12
- Montana gray wolf 107–8
- state role and powers 95–6, 104
  - federal preemption 97–9
- energy policy, in US
  - cooperative federalism
    - environmental regulation
      - interaction 125

- governance impacts 134–6
- implementation 138–9
- information sharing 137–8
- initiative overlaps 125–6
- justifications for 115–16, 135–6
- local–federal conflicts 378–9
- matching principle 134
- negotiated federalism 135–6
- participation maximisation 136–7
- preemption, avoiding 136
- federal role and powers
  - potential advantages of 134–5
  - regulatory overlaps 125–6, 375–6
- generally
  - controversies in 375–9
  - costs 119–23
  - damage mitigation and compensation 139–40
  - development benefits 123–4
  - development duration 120
  - electricity generation emission caps 176
  - endangered species regulation impact 125
  - environmental impacts 120–22
  - location impacts 119–20, 122
  - standardized approach, need for 140–41
  - transportation impacts 120–21
- industry trends 117–18
  - development costs 119–23
  - development impacts 119–23
  - development times 120
  - economic impacts 123–4
  - industry governance role 131–2
  - private sector governance role 131–2
  - renewable energy 117–21, 129–30, 377–9
  - shale gas fracking 117, 131–2, 377–9
  - wind energy 117–20, 129–30
- state role and powers 375–9
  - damage mitigation and compensation 139–40
  - development burdens 123
  - economic benefits 124
  - federalised approaches 138–9
  - hybrid regulatory controls 130–31
  - interstate jurisdiction conflicts 376–9
  - judicial interpretation 132–4, 376–7, 379–85
  - local governance and state joint regulation 129–30, 375–6
  - local governance preemption 127–9, 133–4
  - local governance role 126–7
  - local impact minimisation 139–40
  - participation maximisation 136–7
  - preemption, avoiding 136
  - production and transportation change influences 114–15, 377
  - regulatory challenges 133–4, 376
  - regulatory floors and ceilings 129–30
  - regulatory overlaps 125–6, 376
  - regulatory standards 127–9, 131
  - regulatory variations 126–7
- Engel, Kirsten 109–10
- environmental federalism, generally
  - controversies in 357–8, 371–5
    - causes 371
    - crime or public health impacts 372–3
  - decision-making goals and priorities 374
  - energy policy, and 375–9
  - greenhouse gas regulation 384–5
  - judicial interpretation 132–4, 376–7, 379–85
  - jurisdictional overlaps 370–74
  - radioactive waste management 380–82, 416
  - regulatory overlaps 372–4
  - state regulatory claims 372–5
  - ultimate control dilemma 358, 371, 374, 384–5, 392–8, 416–18
  - water pollution 382–4
- governance responses 386–7
  - cooperative federalism 398–400
  - jurisdiction overlaps 389–400
  - jurisdictional collaboration 392–8
  - jurisdictional separation 391–2



- environmental federalism, in Australia
  - see* Australia
- environmental federalism, in Germany
  - see* Germany
- environmental federalism, in India
  - India
- environmental federalism, in US
  - Australian authority, compared with 284–90
  - challenges 246, 250–51
    - decision-making controversies 255–7
    - greenhouse gas regulation 384–5
    - invisible and social costs 258–65
    - judicial rulings 379–85
    - National Land Use Policy Act 1996 (proposed) 255
    - radioactive waste management 380–82, 416
    - Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act 2000 255
    - water pollution 382–4
  - cooperative federalism 398–400
  - capacity coordination 401, 413
  - conditional preemption 404–7, 409
  - federally supported state
    - implementation 401–4, 413
  - intergovernmental partnerships 400–401
  - shared and general permit programs 407–12
  - spending power partnerships 402–3
  - historical development 248–9, 255
  - local governance
    - boundaries, importance of 252
    - community role, importance of 258–67
    - ecological identity, and 260–61
    - ecosystem regulation and protection 261–5, 267
    - local priorities, role of 264–5
    - political engagement, and 263
  - preemption
    - conditional 404–7, 409
    - examples 255–7
    - extraterritorial impacts 253–4
    - floor preemption 395
    - judicial influences 249–50, 253–4, 265–7, 394–6
- environmental policy, in US *see also* environmental federalism
- federal role and powers
  - Australian approach, compared with 284–90
  - Commerce Clause 76, 78–9, 87, 98, 284–5, 394–5
  - constitutional supremacy 248–9, 393
  - historical development 245–6, 249–50
  - implications 245–6
  - governance challenges
    - generally 412–13
    - multiscalar approach 413–14
  - Resource Conservation and Recovery Act 1976 406, 408
  - state and local role and powers 245–6
    - community role, importance of 258–67
    - historical development 245–6
  - Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act 1977 405–6, 408
- equal footing doctrine 389
- Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act 1937 97
- federalism, generally *see also* cooperative federalism; environmental federalism; federalism theory; reverse federalism
  - constitutional structure, relationship with 361–2
  - definition 247–8
  - democracy, and 363
  - disadvantages 243–4
  - federal-sensitive governance 370
  - functions 244, 362–6
  - good governance, and 361–3
  - judicial interpretation 247–57
  - jurisdictional overlaps 387–9, 414, 415–16
  - local governance, and

- authority of 247–8
- boundaries, role of 252–4
- challenges of 266–7
- community role, importance of 259–67
- constitutional rights and controls 250–52
- controversies 255–7
- decision making controversies 255–7
- extraterritorial impacts of local actions 253–4
- limitations of 249–50
- marginalization 254–5
- origins of power 252–3
- preemption of 247–55, 253–7
- self-governance implications 243–4, 250–51
- objectives 360–63
- preemption, judicial interpretation 249–50, 253–4
- regulatory backstop, as 364–5
- sovereignty, and 247–8, 360
- Supremacy Clause of US Constitution 248–9, 365, 393
- trends 108
- ultimate control dilemma 355–7, 366–7, 392–8, 416–18
- uncertainty, and 390–400, 416
- values 362–3
  - flexibility, and 414–15
  - tensions and conflicts between 363–6
- federalism theory *see also* cooperative federalism
  - adaptive federalism 109–13
  - balanced federalism 369–70, 414, 417–18
  - benefits of 414
  - challenges of 366–71
  - dual federalism 368–9
  - negotiated federalism 370
  - New Deal federalism 368
  - zero-sum federalism 370, 417
- First Iowa Hydro-Electric Cooperative v. Federal Power Commission (1946)* 218
- forestry policies, in US
  - federalism, fragmentation of
    - Capper Report (1919) 88
    - Commerce Clause authority 76, 78–9, 87
    - constitutional federalism 76–81, 87
    - federal prescription policies 86–8
    - historical influences 86–92
    - institutional influences 81–4
    - legal influences 80–81
    - overcoming, need for 91–2
    - political culture influences 84–6
    - public/ private forest ownership influences 81–4, 92
    - Roosevelt administration influences 86–9
    - spillover effects 81–3
    - state preemption influences 79–81
    - vertical and horizontal controls 71–5, 79
    - voluntary assistance and incentive programs 92
  - generally
    - federal role 71–2
    - flexibility advantages 73–4
    - forest fire, influences on policy development 86–7, 90
    - forestry land loss forecasts 72–3
    - forestry parcelization 82–3
    - fragmentation 71–5
    - interconnected nature of forestry, implications 80–81
    - National Industrial Recovery Act 1933 87
    - policy focus patterns 86, 90–91
    - political and legal impacts 73
    - public/ private ownership patterns 81–3, 92
    - regional management trends 86–92
    - REIT ownership 83, 92
    - social and economic impacts 72–3
    - state and local government role 72
  - resource management approaches
    - forest preservation 75
    - timber operations 74–5
  - state role and powers
    - attitudes to land use management 76–9

- federal controls, resistance to 78–9
  - forest preservation 75
  - management success trends 91–2
  - policy preemption 79–81
  - timber management 74–5
- Freeman, Jody 220
- Frug, Gerald 266
  
- Galle, Brian 181–2
- Galligan, B. 277
- Gavin, Steven 135
- Geer v. Connecticut* (1896) 95
- Germany
  - environmental federalism
    - challenges 305, 309, 311, 323–4
    - concurrent legislation 312–14
    - deviation rights 313–14
    - EU legislative role 312–16
    - European Court of Justice
      - oversight 312
    - executive dominance, and 317
    - framework legislation 313–14
    - national and local government
      - interaction 316–17
    - strengths and weaknesses 323–4
  - environmental protection policy
    - agenda-setting process 315–18
    - Bundestag and Bundesrat role
      - 306–8, 314, 317, 320–21
    - challenges 305, 309
    - co-decision procedure 318–19
    - Conference of Ministers (UMK)
      - role 316–17, 322
    - decision-making process 318–21
    - development 313–14
    - EU influences 310–21, 323–4
    - fragmentation 311
    - judicial review 322–3
    - legislative competences 312–15
    - multi-level governance conflicts
      - 312
    - national interests, promotion of
      - 316–17
    - Nature Protection and Landscape
      - Conservation Act 2010 314
    - networks, role of 314–15
    - policy instrument trends 311–12
    - ratification and implementation
      - 321–2
    - regulatory conflicts 312–15
    - shift of competences 309–11
  - federalism
    - Basic Law/ constitutional
      - influences on 306–7
    - concurrent legislation 307–8,
      - 312–14
    - deviation rights 313–14
    - EU influences on 304–8, 317–21
    - general principles 304–8
    - Länder role and powers 306–8, 313
    - legislative powers 306–8
    - reform 313, 321–4
    - shared rule principle 307–8
    - sovereignty and self-government
      - powers 306
    - structure 306–8
    - subsidiarity, and 317–18, 320
    - unitary federalism 307, 313
  - Goa Foundation and Peaceful Society v. Union of India* (2013) 346
  - greenhouse gas emissions
    - cap-and-trade programs 145, 153–6,
      - 166–7, 174–5
    - carbon taxes 166–7
    - clean car standards 175–6
    - emissions targets 172, 183
    - energy generation emission caps 176
    - low carbon fuel standards 176–7
    - regulation, judicial challenges 384–5
    - renewable portfolio standards 177–9
    - reporting and registries 173
  - Guercio, Lara 107–8
  
  - Hart, Gary 46
  - Holt Civic Club v. City of Tuscaloosa* (1978) 250–51
  - Hughes v. Oklahoma* (1979) 95, 98
  
  - Illinois Central Railroad v. Illinois* (1892) 95
  - India
    - Bhopal Disaster
      - policy, influences on 332–4
    - constitution
      - amendments 332

- division of powers 328–9, 334–5
- general principles 327–8
- international obligations 335–6
- semi-federal status 327–8
- environmental federalism
  - background 330–34
  - biodiversity protection regulation 342, 349–50
  - centre–state relationships 332–5, 337–338
  - challenges 331, 337–8, 351–2
  - coastal zone regulation 343
  - Concurrent List policies 331–2, 334, 340–42
  - cooperative federalism 337–47, 351–2
  - decentralization, and 347–50
  - dispute resolution 336–7, 339–40, 344–6
  - division of powers 328–9, 334–5
  - Environmental Impact Assessments 344
  - forestry regulation 340–41, 348–9
  - implementation 338
  - international obligations 335–6
  - judicial role 336–7, 339–40
  - legislative powers 333–4
  - local administrative units (*Gram Panchayat*) 349–50
  - National Green Tribunal (NGT) 344–6
  - public interest impacts 339–40
  - reforms 338
  - residuary powers 334–5, 345–6
  - state law preemption 347
  - State List policies 332, 334–5, 345–6, 348, 350
  - structural influences on 328
  - water regulation 339–40
  - wildlife protection 341–2
- environmental protection policy
  - Bhopal Disaster influences on 332–4
  - biodiversity 342
  - coastal environment 336–7, 343
  - commercial conflicts 337
  - Concurrent List policies 331–2, 334, 340–42
  - Environmental Protection Act 1986 342–4
  - forestry 340–41
  - fundamental duties 329
  - implementation and enforcement 338
  - inter-state rivers 336–7
  - National Biodiversity Authority (NBA) 342
  - noise pollution control 343
  - population control 332
  - state controls 343
  - water resource allocation 336–7
  - wildlife 341–2
- federalism
  - centre–state relationships 337–8
  - cooperative federalism 330–31, 337–8
  - general features 327–8
  - government organization 328–9
  - structure 328, 348
  - subordination, role of 330
- Jefferson County v. Washington Department of Ecology [PUD No. 1] (1994)* 42, 46, 218
- Joint Task Force on Endangered Species Act Policy (ESA JTF) 103–4
- Kerwin, Cornelius 219–20
- Kleppe v New Mexico (1976)* 98
- Kyoto Protocol 173, 183
- ‘laboratories of democracy’ theory 162, 169–70, 179, 182–3, 187
- Lacey Act 1900 96–7
- Leahy, Peter 181–2
- Levinson, Daryl 239
- local governance
  - energy policy
    - governance preemption 127–9, 133–4
    - local and state joint regulation 129–30
    - local governance role 126–7
  - environmental governance
    - boundaries, role of 252–4

- community role, importance of 259–67
- ecological identity, and 260–61
- ecosystem regulation and protection 261–5, 267
- local priorities, role of 264–5
- political engagement, and 263
- federalism, and
  - authority of 247–8
  - challenges of 266–7
  - constitutional rights and controls 250–52
  - controversies 255–7
  - decision making controversies 255–7
  - extraterritorial impacts of local actions 253–4
  - limitations of 249–50
  - marginalization 254–5
  - origins of power 252–3
  - preemption of 247–55, 253–7
  - self-governance implications 243–4, 250–51
  - origins of power 252–3
- low carbon fuel standards 176–7
- McDonald v. Sun Oil Co. (2008)* 65
- Madisonian theory 236–9
- Maritime Mammal Protection Act 1972 98–9
- Massachusetts v. EPA (2007)* 358, 384–5
- matching principle 105–6, 134
- Metro. Taxicab Bd. of Trade v. City of N.Y. (2010)* 249
- Migratory Bird Treaty 1918 97
- Minnesota Environmental Rights and Liability Act 2014 (MERLA) 56
- Missouri v. Holland (1920)* 97
- Montana gray wolf 107–8
- MPM Silicones v. Union Carbide Corp. (2013)* 60–61
- National Audubon Society v. Superior Court (1983)* 96
- National Contingency Plan (NCP) 51
- National Land Use Policy Act 1996 (proposed) 255
- natural resources *see also* endangered species policies; forestry policies
  - US policies, generally
    - federal role 71–2
    - fragmentation 71–2
    - wetland management 78–9
  - negotiated federalism 370
  - New South Wales v. Commonwealth (2006)* 279–80
  - New South Wales v. Commonwealth (1975)* 287
  - New York v. United States (1992)* 358, 380–82, 416
  - New York v. West Side Corp. (2011)* 60
  - Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. v. Chevron USA (2010)* 59
  - Nolon, John 135, 259
  - ‘not in my back yard’ (NIMBY) syndrome 12–13, 25, 115–16
- Outka, Uma 135
- Percival, Robert 106–7
- Perry, M. 280
- Pharmacia v. Union Elec. Co. (2013)* 62
- Pildes, Richard 239
- PMC. v. Sherwin-Williams Co. (1998)* 61
- pollution
  - air pollution
    - Clean Air Act amendments 16–19
    - shift from state to federal controls 13
  - definitions 39
  - noise pollution policy in India 343
  - water pollution
    - judicial rulings 382–4
- preemption, generally *see also* reverse preemption
  - conditional preemption 404–7, 409, 413
  - conflict preemption 253
  - express preemption 253
  - extraterritorial impacts 253–4
  - implied preemption 253
  - judicial interpretation 249–50, 253–4
  - public trust doctrine 95–6, 389

- 'race to the bottom' 4–5, 12, 16–18
- radioactive waste management 380–82, 416
- Rapanos v. United States* (2006) 358, 382–4, 391–2, 416
- Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act 2000 255
- renewable energy 117–21, 129–30, 377–9
- renewable portfolio standards 177–9
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (1976) 406, 408
- resource pooling 11–12, 16
- reverse preemption
- Clean Water Act permissions
    - veto of FERC permits 218–22
    - veto of inconsistent federal actions 214–17
    - veto of wetlands permissions 220–22
  - Coastal Zone Management Act
    - permissions
    - judicial interpretation and legislative amendment 225–6
    - practical application 226–9
    - veto of inconsistent federal actions 214, 222–4, 238–9, 396–7
  - generally 213–14, 241
    - background 237–9
    - congressional power, and 236–40, 242
    - environmental federalism, and 231–5
    - federalism promotion, and 235–6
    - incentive function 230–31
    - motivations for 230–40
    - potential benefits 214–15, 241–2
    - separation of powers, and 236–9
    - trends 229–30
- Robinson Township v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (2013) 80
- Rocky Mountain Farmers Union v. Corey* (2013) 376
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan 170, 180–81
- Ruhl, J.B. 412–13
- S.D. Warren Co. v. ME Environmental Board of Protection* (2006) 219
- self-governance
- constitutional protections 250–51
  - federalism implications for 243–4, 250–51
  - state powers of 250–51
  - US judicial interpretation 245–6, 250
- separation of powers
- reverse preemption, and 236–9
  - shale gas fracking 117, 131–2, 377–9
- Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. US Army Corp of Engineers* 391–2
- South Australia v. Commonwealth* (1942) 278–9
- Spence, David 134, 139
- standards
- clean car standards 175–6, 183–4
  - energy policy regulation 127–9, 131
  - justification for federal action 12, 16, 24–5
  - low carbon fuel standards 176–7
  - renewable portfolio standards 177–9
  - state higher standards adoption 9, 14, 16, 42–3
- State of Tamil Nadu v. State of Kerala and Union of India* (2014) 340
- Superfund *see* CERCLA
- Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (1977) 405–6, 408
- Tennessee Valley Authority v. Hill* (1978) 99
- Tocqueville, Alexis de 243, 267
- Toyne, Philip 290–91
- transboundary externalities 11, 18, 24
- Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA* (2014) 411–12
- Victoria v. Commonwealth* (1957) 278–9
- Wallop, Malcolm 46–7
- Washington Department of Fisheries v. Gillette* (1980) 96

- water law *see* Clean Water Act; Coastal Zone Management Act
  - water pollution
    - judicial rulings 382–4
  - wetlands
    - regulation, judicial interpretation 391–2
    - reverse preemption of federal permissions 220–22
    - US management policies 78–9
  - Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act 1971 98
  - wildlife regulation, in US *see also*
    - Endangered Species Act
    - common law development 95–6
    - cooperative federalism 94, 104–5
      - adaptive management approach, need for 110–13
    - climate change impacts, and 110–13
    - enhanced approach 107–10
    - jurisdiction conflicts 108–9
    - standard approach 106–7
  - federal role and powers 96–9
    - advantages of 104
    - Commerce Clause power 98
    - federal aid for wildlife restoration 97
    - game laws 96–7
    - maritime mammals 98–9
    - migratory birds 97
    - preemption of state laws 97–9
    - scientific role development 98–9
    - wild horses 98
  - police powers 95
  - property-based protection 95–6
  - public trust doctrine 95–6
  - state role and powers 95–6, 104
    - federal preemption of 97–9
  - Williams v. Commonwealth* (2012) 280–81
  - wind energy 117–20, 129–30
- Zero Emission Vehicle programs 175–6
- zero-sum federalism 370, 417

