

Contents

Foreword	xv
Preface to the Second Edition	xvii
Acknowledgments	xix
Preface to the First Edition	xxi
Chapter 1	
Bulldozers at Your Doorstep: The Debris of <i>Kelo v. City of New London</i> By Michael Rikon	1
<hr/>	
I. Introduction	1
II. Public Purpose as Defined by the Courts	2
III. Blame the Supreme Court	3
IV. <i>Kelo v. City of New London</i>	4
V. The <i>Poletown</i> Case Reversed	7
VI. The Tide May Be Changing	9
VII. Conclusion	11
Chapter 2	
Legal and Practical Issues in the Taking of Contaminated Properties By Rebecca L. Urquhart	13
<hr/>	
I. Laws and Theories Applying to Contaminated Properties	14
A. Significant Environmental Laws Affecting Real and Personal Property	14

1. Common Law Liabilities	14
2. Federal and State Soil and Groundwater Regulation	15
a. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Conservation, and Liability Act	15
b. State Counterpart Statutes (“Little Superfunds”)	17
c. Other Laws Dealing with Contamination	17
3. Liability Reduction Under Voluntary Cleanup and “Brownfields” Policy	19
4. Environmental Impact Analysis	20
B. Contamination in Eminent Domain Law	21
1. Codified Law	21
2. Case Law	22
a. Evidentiary Issues	22
b. Liability Issues	23
c. Valuation Issues	27
II. Settlement of the Contaminated Property	
Condemnations	32
A. Nature and Extent of Contamination	32
B. Costs and Their Effect on Price	33
C. Specific Contractual Provisions in Marketplace Transactions	34
1. Fee or Easement Transfers	35
2. Disclosure and Caveat Emptor	35
3. Defining Contaminants or “Hazardous Substances”	37
4. Indemnities and Releases	38
5. Remediation Standards	38
a. Definition of Substances	38
b. Reasonableness Standards	38
c. Financial Responsibility	39
6. Post-Closing Access Rights	39
III. Trial of the Contaminated Property Condemnation	39
A. Document Review	40
B. Determining the Scope of Claim and Additional Parties	41

C. Locating, Consulting, and Designating Fact and Expert Witnesses	41
1. Base Core Evidence is Based on Appraiser Opinions	41
2. Analyze Comparable Sales	42
3. Utilize Other Supporting Experts	42
a. Internal Resources	43
b. Outside Litigation Consultants	44
D. Create a Preliminary Evidentiary and Appraisal Approach	45
E. Develop Discovery	46
F. Develop a Final Valuation Theory and Complete a Case Analysis	47
1. Adopt the Final Valuation Methodology To Be Used by Your Own Team of Experts and Compare to the Opposition’s Approach	47
2. Establish the Evidence and Witnesses To Support the Theories	48
3. Formulate a Motion and Pleading Strategy	48
a. Expend Taking From Easement to Feeby Inverse Condemnation Pleadings	48
b. Address Concurrent Liability Actions, Exclusion of Contamination from the Trial	49
c. Tailor Special Issues to the Evidence Presented	51
IV. Conclusion	51

Chapter 3

Valuing Contaminated Property in a Condemnation Proceeding

By Michael Rikon

53

I. Introduction	53
II. Highest and Best Use	54
III. The Premise for Remediation Cost	55
IV. Appraisal Institute of Standards	55
V. Deduction for Remediation Costs Is Fundamentally Unjust in a Condemnation Case	56

VI. Recent Case Law	57
VII. Conclusion	60

Chapter 4

Taking Rights Away: Ripeness, Abstention
and Res Judicata Principles in Takings Cases

By Allen A. Arntsen and Anat Hakim 61

I. The Ripeness Doctrine of the Takings Clause	65
II. The Ripeness Doctrine and Due Process and Equal Protection Claims	69
III. The Intersection of Ripeness and Res Judicata Concepts in Takings Cases	70
IV. State Ripeness Decisions	71
V. The Abstention Doctrine	72
VI. Navigating Around Procedural Bars	75
VII. How Application of the Ripeness and Abstention Doctrines Affects Property Rights	79

Chapter 5

Condemnation Blight: Analysis and Suggested Solutions

By Professor Robert H. Freilich 83

I. Introduction	83
II. Applicable Condemnation Principles	87
III. Types and Causes of Planning Blight	91
A. Generalized Blight	91
B. Condemnation Blight	93
IV. The Abutting Landowner	95
V. Suggested Solutions	96

Chapter 6

A Survey of Statutes of Limitations
in Inverse Condemnation Actions

By Bruce Botsford 101

I. Introduction	101
II. Applying Statute of Limitations to Inverse Condemnation Actions	102

III. Express Statute of Limitations	104
IV. Adverse Possession	104
V. Common Law Theories	106
A. Implied Contract	106
B. Injury to Property	107
C. Recovery of Real Property	107
VI. Catch-All Limitations Period	108
VII. Conclusion	108
Appendix: A Survey of Statutes of Limitations in Inverse Condemnation Actions	109

Chapter 7

Calculation of Damages in Temporary Takings

By Alan T. Ackerman and Darius W. Dynkowski

115

I. Supreme Court Precedent	115
A. U.S. v. General Motors	115
B. U.S. v. Petty Motor Co.—Lease Take for Remainder of Term	116
C. Kimball Laundry v. United States—Temporary Taking, Permanent Destruction	117
D. U.S. v. Pewee Coal—Strike Avoidance	120
II. Federal Application to Specific Issues	120
A. Damage Calculation Methodology	120
B. Moratoria on Developments	121
C. Temporary Reversible Takings	122
D. Temporary Taking—Delay in Development	123
E. Temporary or Permanent Takings	123
III. State Cases	125
A. Arizona—Open View for Total Compensability	125
B. Michigan—Flexible Approach	126
C. Texas—A Less Flexible Approach	128
D. Ohio—Moratoria and Date Initialing Calculation	129
E. New York—Development Cost Differentials	130
F. Virginia—Bridge Company Franchise	131
G. Nebraska—Lost Crops	131
H. Wisconsin—Delay of Development	132

IV. Natural Resource Cases	133
A. Bass Enterprises v. United States	133
1. Statute of Limitations	135
2. Damage Calculation	135
B. SDDS v. State	136
1. Dates for Which Damage Calculation Applies	136
2. Damage Calculation	137
3. Is the Taking Permanent or Temporary?	139
4. Destruction of Operation	139
5. The SDDS Conundrums	141
V. Conclusion	141
 Chapter 8	
Entrepreneurial Profit	
<i>By M. Robert Goldstein</i>	147
<hr/>	
I. The Term Defined	147
II. The Court Decisions	148
III. Methodology	152
 Chapter 9	
The Valuation of a Corridor in an Eminent Domain Case	
<i>By Michael Rikon</i>	155
<hr/>	
I. Introduction	155
II. Corridor Defined	155
III. Title to the Corridor	155
IV. Challenge to Expanding Use	156
V. Valuation of the Corridor	157
VI. Damages for a Corridor Taking	159
A. Criscuola v. Power Authority of the State of New York	159
1. New York State Court of Appeals Decision	162
2. Criscuola Formula	163
VII. Approach to Valuation	163

Chapter 10

Blazing a Trail: Condemning Private Ways of Necessity
in the New West*By Jack Sperber and Patrick Wilson*

165

I. Introduction	165
II. Constitutional and Statutory Framework	166
III. Availability of Action	172
A. Standing	172
B. Necessity	173
1. Present Enforceable Legal Right	173
2. Reasonably Practical Way	176
3. Condemning to Expand Access	178
IV. Scope of Use and Authorized Purpose	180
A. Type of Interest and Width of Easement	180
B. Future Uses and Development	180
C. Utilities	184
D. Duration	184
E. Location	185
V. Defenses to a Statutory Way of Necessity	186
VI. Compensation and Liability for Condemnee's Costs and Expenses	188
A. Just Compensation	188
B. Attorneys Fees and Costs	191
VII. Conclusion	192

Chapter 11

The Relevance of Rezoning and Comparable Sales
Occurring After the Date of Taking*By Alan T. Ackerman & Darius W. Dynkowski*

193

I. Introduction	193
II. General Impressions—USPAP and Nichols on Eminent Domain	194
A. USPAP and the Appropriateness of Retrospective Appraisals	194
B. Nichols on Eminent Domain—Date of Valuation	195

III. Evidence of Comparable Sales Occurring After the Date of Taking	200
A. Jurisdictions Permitting Post-Taking Sales Into Evidence	200
1. Federal Courts Permitting Post-Taking Sales Into Evidence	200
2. State Courts Permitting Post-Taking Sales Into Evidence	203
a. Massachusetts	203
b. Wyoming	204
c. Illinois	204
d. Texas	205
e. Hawaii	207
f. Michigan	208
g. Missouri	209
h. North Carolina	210
i. Connecticut	211
3. State Jurisdictions Not Admitting Post-Taking Sales	211
IV. Evidence of Rezoning After the Date of Taking	213
A. Jurisdictions Permitting Evidence of Post-Taking Rezoning	214
1. Federal Cases Admitting Evidence of Post-Taking Rezoning	214
2. State Cases Permitting Evidence of Post-Taking Rezoning	215
a. Maryland	215
b. New Jersey	216
c. Massachusetts	218
d. Texas	219
e. New York	222
f. Iowa	222
B. Jurisdictions Not Permitting Evidence of Post-Taking Rezoning	224
1. State Cases Not Admitting Post-Taking Rezoning Evidence	224
a. Colorado	224
b. Louisiana	226

c. New Jersey	229
d. Washington	233
e. New York	234
f. Ohio	234
g. Missouri	236
h. Michigan	237
V. Retrospective Evidence in Other Contexts	239
A. Liquidated Damages	239
B. Remedial Measures in Personal Injury Cases	241
VI. Conclusion	242

Chapter 12

Federal Eminent Domain Procedures

By Alan T. Ackerman

243

I. Complaint Process Followed by the U.S. Attorneys Office	244
II. Notice	244
III. Answer	245
IV. Deposit and Distribution	245
V. Federal Court Jurisdiction Over State Actions	245
VI. Discovery	246
VII. Right to Jury Trial, Commissioner Appointments, and Standards	247
VIII. Right to Take Issues	248
IX. Property Standards	249
X. Dismissal After Entry of Award, Costs, and Attorney Fees	250
XI. Just Compensation Standard	251
XII. Highest and Best Use, Changed Use, and Assemblage Standards	252
XIII. Date of Taking Issues	253

Chapter 13

The Public Use Limitation in Eminent Domain:
 Poor Relation to the Constitution's "Poor Relation"

By David K. Bowersox

255

I. Origins and Development of the Public Use Limitation	257
---	-----

II. Public Use and the Twentieth Century Supreme Court	259
III. Public Use in Twentieth Century State Courts	268
A. County of Wayne v. Hathcock	280
B. Kelo v. City of New London	283
IV. Conclusion	288

Chapter 14

Kelo v. City of New London: The Answer to the Public Use Question, or Just a Source of More Questions?

By Alan T. Ackerman 293

I. Introduction	293
II. The Constitutional Development of the Takings Clause	294
A. Dorrance and the Natural Right to Property Ownership	294
B. Incorporating the 5th Amendment Against the States	297
C. The Transition from “Public Use” to “Public Purpose”	298
D. <i>Berman and Midkiff</i> —Private Benefits May Not Nullify a Valid Public Use	299
III. The <i>Kelo</i> Decision	301
A. The Majority Decision—Deference to Legislative Decisions on Public Use	302
1. Applying the “Public Purpose” Standard to the “Public Use” Question	303
2. New London Is Not a Blighted Area	305
3. Deferring to the State—Localism and the Police Power	306
B. The Dissents	307
IV. The Federalism Debate on Public Use and the Questions that Remain	311
A. Deference to Local Decision-Makers—Benefits and Drawbacks	312
B. State Freedom to Set Higher Standards—Michigan and <i>Hathcock</i>	315
C. Limitations on the State Police Power	317

D. Exigencies as Justification for the Use of Eminent Domain	319
V. Conclusion	320

Chapter 15

Public Use Acquisitions:

The Experience in England and Wales

By Judge Andrew Gilbert QC

325

I. Introduction	325
II. Examples of the Use of Compulsory Purchase	327
III. The Statutory Procedure in Outline	331
A. Publication and Service of a Draft CPO	332
B. Entering Objections	333
C. Relationship to Other Statutory Procedures	333
IV. The Public Inquiry Process	335
V. Post Inquiry Procedures	343
VI. The Scope for Judicial Challenge	345
VII. An Outline of Compensation Law	347
VIII. Conclusion	350
IX. Glossary	351
About the Editors	353
About the Contributors	355
Index	359