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EDITOR'S PERSPECTIVE

I would like to debut my tenure at the Missouri Environmental Law & Policy Review by thanking the outgoing board for their work on selecting the article and case notes in this edition. I would particularly like to thank the former Editor-in-Chief, Elijah Haar, for bringing strong leadership to the journal and building on this journal’s reputation in the academic community. I also thank Lakshmi Lakshmanan for selecting our featured article, and Darryl Chatman, John Griesedieck, and Jennifer Wieman for their work with the note authors published in this edition. These individuals generously relinquished further involvement with this edition to allow the incoming board to take the reigns and the credit for the summer issue. The bar exam motivates such altruism.

In the first article of our summer edition, Derald Hay, Esq. examines global warming and the responsibility that western countries have for altering the current trend. He discusses the value of multilateral treaties and offers insight as to how the world might make much needed reductions in greenhouse gases. Hay argues that developed countries must not only have responsibility for their own emissions, but as a practical matter, developed countries such as the United States must also contribute to the efforts of less developed countries.

Lee Stockhorst follows with our first note discussing the environmental impact of a decision involving genetically modified corn. Stockhorst’s insightful note is relevant to an agricultural state such as Missouri, and her emphasis on Missouri policy marks a new dimension for case notes published in making the case notes in this journal an important source for Missouri policy makers.

The Third Circuit brings new consistency to the circuits by adopting the majority rule promoting voluntary cleanups of Superfund sites. Sheila Needles supports the decision with a highly competent analysis of the legal background.

Our third note, written by Breanne Ardila, explores the limited power of the state to enact some ambitious environmental regulations. A
federal district court in Vermont upheld that state’s automobile regulations that were based on the pending California regulations and were more stringent than the federal regulations. However, the environmental victory anticipated in the Vermont court never materialized because the EPA rejected California’s regulations which had the effect of rejecting Vermont’s regulations as well.

Andrew Reed takes up a very hot topic in environmental law: the “nuclear renaissance.” He takes a look at a U.S. appeals case in the District of Columbia that approves a permit allowing a private company to enrich uranium, a process necessary to make the uranium a viable fuel source for nuclear reactors. The Court gives deference to the agency decision to approve the permit and the agency’s authority to have a flexible, cost-conscious approach to potential environmental issues.

Rounding out this edition are the always-important Environmental Updates. Each one offers a brief synopsis of the environmental decisions handed down by courts all around the nation in 2008. Several of these cases will be the focus of case notes and scholarly articles of next year.

As this is the first publication for the new board, I would like to comment upon our intended direction. Like the last board, the new board is committed to bringing our readers the most relevant and thought provoking articles and notes. In an effort to improve upon the accomplishments of previous boards, we have decided to add a new emphasis to this journal by making the Missouri Environmental Law & Policy Review a forum for environmental issues relevant to the Midwest and the South, a position fit for the oldest law school west of the Mississippi. Our first topic will address water issues on the Missouri River. Our intention is to voice multiple views by publishing one or two articles on this topic in a few of our upcoming issues beginning in December or next April. We hope that such a topic will encourage points and counterpoints from states, Native American tribes, environmental groups, and others that have a stake in the Missouri River. Such a debate would initiate a number of articles that would make this journal a premiere source for policy makers.
For this issue, I would like to extend a special thanks to Mike Quillin, Lee Stockhorst, and Jerry Zhang for their work on the footnotes.

Brett M. Maland
Editor-in-Chief