Vindication of the Public Interest in a Clean Environment: Superior Air Products Co. v. NL Industries, Inc.
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Protecting the environment is a critical societal concern in New Jersey. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that New Jersey is the source of more hazardous waste than any other state. In response, the New Jersey legislature passed some of the toughest and most innovative laws in the United States to control pollution. Three significant New Jersey legislative efforts are the Environmental Rights


3. See Urgency, supra note 1, at 1672. BNA based its conclusion concerning New
Act (ERA), the Spill Compensation and Contract Act (Spill Act), and most recently the Environmental Cleanup Responsibility Act (ECRA). ECRA’s impact on New Jersey’s previously existing environmental legislation is critical to practitioners in New Jersey and to states considering adopting laws similar to ECRA. In Superior Air Products Co. v. NL Industries, Inc. the court examined the relationship among ERA, the Spill Act, and ECRA and held that a suit under ERA or the Spill Act does not delay an ECRA proceeding and cleanup plan.

Consideration of the ERA and the Spill Act is necessary before focusing on ECRA and its impact on New Jersey’s environmental legislation. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is responsible for regulating activity affecting the state’s environment. Thus, the DEP enforces the state’s pollution laws. Further, the DEP has wide latitude in exercising its statutory duties to advocate the public’s interest in a clean environment.

By enacting the ERA, the state legislature recognized the public in-
terest in abating and preventing environmental damage. Although ERA does not itself provide any substantive cause of action, the Act's primary goal is to ensure that all persons interested in protecting the environment have access to the courts. The state, however, retains primary responsibility for enforcing environmental legislation. Under ERA, the role of the courts is to adjudicate the impact of the alleged "conduct on the environment and on interest of the public."

13. The legislative findings and determinations read:

14. The Act in pertinent part reads:


The Act also allows courts to remit an action to administrative or investigative proceedings to determine the legality of defendant's conduct.\textsuperscript{17}

New Jersey's Spill Act expressly prohibits the discharge of hazardous substances\textsuperscript{18} and provides for cleanup and removal of spills.\textsuperscript{19} The Act grants the DEP discretion to perform the cleanup itself or to direct the responsible party to do so.\textsuperscript{20} Further, the Spill Act establishes the New Jersey Compensation Spill Fund which pays for all cleanup and removal costs and for all direct and indirect damages resulting from a spill.\textsuperscript{21} The Spill Fund recovers its costs by holding responsible parties strictly liable for cleanup and removal costs.\textsuperscript{22}

In \textit{Township of Howell v. Waste Disposal, Inc.},\textsuperscript{23} the Superior Court of New Jersey discussed the relationship between ERA and the Spill Act. In \textit{Howell}, the township brought an action against Waste Disposal, Inc. under ERA after DEP had commenced Spill Act proceed-

\begin{footnotes}
\item[17] ERA § 8 reads in pertinent part: If administrative or other proceedings are required or available to determine the legality of the defendant's conduct, the court shall remit the parties to such proceedings, except where immediate and irreparable damage will probably result. N.J. STAT. ANN. § 2A:35A-8 (West 1987). See infra notes 47-53 and accompanying text for a discussion of remitting an ECRA action to the DEP for investigative proceedings.
\item[18] N.J. STAT. ANN. § 58:10-23.11c (West 1982).
\item[19] The Spill Act reads in pertinent part: a. Whenever any hazardous substance is discharged, the department may, in its discretion act to remove or arrange for the removal of such discharge or may direct the discharger to remove, or arrange for the removal of, such discharge . . . . The department may monitor the discharger's compliance with any such directive. Any discharger who fails to comply with such a directive shall be liable to the department in an amount equal to three times the cost of such removal, and shall be subject to the revocation or suspension of any license or permit he holds authorizing him to operate a hazardous or solid waste disposal facility. N.J. STAT. ANN. § 58:10-23.11f(a) (West Supp. 1988).
\item[22] N.J. STAT. ANN. § 58:10-23.11g(d) (West 1982). Acts of God, war, and sabotage are defenses to the imposed strict liability. N.J. STAT. ANN. § 58:20-23.11g(d) (West 1982).
\end{footnotes}
VINDICATION OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

ings. The DEP intervened as a plaintiff in the township's ERA action. The court addressed whether the DEP's intervention preempted the township's right to maintain a private suit under ERA. The court held that the DEP's preemptive authority is a factually dependent question. According to the court in Howell, commencement of DEP proceedings preempts private rights under ERA unless the DEP's enforcement actions prove insufficient to vindicate the public interest. Thus, a private party can maintain an action under ERA if a court finds DEP enforcement inadequate.

Within this legislative scheme, the New Jersey Legislature sought to further reduce the risks associated with hazardous substances and waste by enacting ECRA. The Act requires, as a precondition to a

24. Id. at 84-86, 504 A.2d at 21-22.
25. Id. at 87, 504 A.2d at 22.
26. Id. at 94-95, 504 A.2d at 26.
27. Id. at 97, 504 A.2d at 27. The court noted that environmental legislation entrusts the DEP with the authority to determine initially the appropriate course of action against persons who damage the environment. Id. at 95, 504 A.2d at 27. This authority is most effective where the DEP has freedom to use its expertise to determine the best course of action to remedy the problem. Id.
28. Id. at 96, 504 A.2d at 27. DEP action is insufficient when it is asserted that DEP failed in its mission, neglected to take action essential to fulfill an obvious legislative purpose, or failed to adequately consider local or individual interests. Id. Therefore, a private party can continue an action under the ERA where the DEP neglected to act in the best interest of the citizenry or acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or unreasonably. Id.

The court apparently balanced two competing interests. First, the court noted that in a given situation DEP may fail to seek the full relief available under the appropriate legislation. Id. Under such circumstances, ERA clearly grants private persons the right to seek relief. Id. Secondly, the court expressed concern that unrestricted allowance of multiple enforcement actions might prove counterproductive to legitimate DEP action. Id. The court harmonized the competing interests, concluding that primary prosecutorial authority rests with the DEP, while a private right to sue exists if the DEP action is insufficient. Id.

ERA does not, however, provide a private party with a right to compel a state's discretionary action. In Ironbound Health Rights Advisory Comm'n v. Diamond Shamrock Chem. Co., 216 N.J. Super. 166, 175, 523 A.2d 250, 255 (App. Div. 1987) the court found that Howell did not support the argument that the ERA enables a court to compel an executive agency to perform a discretionary function. Rather, the court cited Howell and concluded that the ERA simply broadened the rights of a citizen to pursue an action directly against the pollution. Id. The court held that a judicial order compelling an executive agency to take discretionary action would violate the state's separation of powers. Id.
30. The legislature expressed its motive in its findings which state:
sale, closure, or transfer of operations,\textsuperscript{31} that owners and operators of industrial establishments\textsuperscript{32} provide the DEP with either a cleanup plan\textsuperscript{33} or a negative declaration\textsuperscript{34} indicating that the site contains no that the generation, handling, storage and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes pose an inherent danger of exposing the citizens, property and natural resources of this State to substantial risk of harm or degradation; that the closing of operations and the transfer of real property utilized for the generation, handling, storage and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes should be conducted in a rational and orderly way, so as to mitigate potential risks; and that it is necessary to impose a precondition on any closure or transfer of these operations by requiring the adequate preparation and implementation of acceptable cleanup procedures thereof.

\textbf{N.J. STAT. ANN. \S 13:1K-7 (West Supp. 1988).}


\textbf{31. N.J. STAT. ANN. \S 13:1K-9 (West Supp. 1988).} The Act defines closing, terminating, or transferring operations as:

the cessation of all operations which involve the generation, manufacture, refining, transportation, treatment, storage, handling, or disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, or any temporary cessation for a period of not less than two years, or any other transaction or proceeding through which an industrial establishment becomes non-operational for health or safety reasons or undergoes a change in ownership, except for corporate reorganization not substantially affecting the ownership of the industrial establishment, including, but not limited to sale of stock in the form of a statutory merger or consolidation, sale of the controlling share of assets, the conveyance of the real property, dissolution of corporate identity, financial reorganization and initiation of bankruptcy proceedings.

\textbf{N.J. STAT. ANN. \S 13:1K-8(b) (West Supp. 1986).} Commentators have criticized this definition, describing it as “cryptically drafted.” \textit{See also} Note, \textit{The Environmental Cleanup Responsibility Act (ECRA): New Accountability for Industrial Landowners in New Jersey}, 8 SETON HALL LEGIS. J. 331, 344-58 (1985) (discussing problems with ECRA's definition of selling, closing, or transferring). \textit{See also} Schmidt, \textit{supra} note 1, at 743-46 (discussing ECRA's definition of selling, closing, or transferring operations).

\textbf{32. The Act defines “industrial establishment” as:}

any place of business engaged in operations which involve the generation, manufacture, refining, transportation, treatment, storage, handling, or disposal of hazardous substances or wastes on-site, above or below ground, having a Standard Industrial Classification number within 22-39 inclusive, 46-49 inclusive, 51 or 76 as designated in the Standard Industrial Classifications Manual prepared by the Office of Management and Budget in the Executive Office of the President of the United States.


\textbf{33. The Act defines “Cleanup Plan” as:}

a plan for the cleanup of industrial establishments, approved by the department, which may include a description of the locations, types and quantities of hazardous substances and wastes that the generation, handling, storage and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes pose an inherent danger of exposing the citizens, property and natural resources of this State to substantial risk of harm or degradation; that the closing of operations and the transfer of real property utilized for the generation, handling, storage and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes should be conducted in a rational and orderly way, so as to mitigate potential risks; and that it is necessary to impose a precondition on any closure or transfer of these operations by requiring the adequate preparation and implementation of acceptable cleanup procedures thereof.

\textbf{N.J. STAT. ANN. \S 13:1K-9 (West Supp. 1988).} The Act defines closing, terminating, or transferring operations as:

the cessation of all operations which involve the generation, manufacture, refining, transportation, treatment, storage, handling, or disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, or any temporary cessation for a period of not less than two years, or any other transaction or proceeding through which an industrial establishment becomes non-operational for health or safety reasons or undergoes a change in ownership, except for corporate reorganization not substantially affecting the ownership of the industrial establishment, including, but not limited to sale of stock in the form of a statutory merger or consolidation, sale of the controlling share of assets, the conveyance of the real property, dissolution of corporate identity, financial reorganization and initiation of bankruptcy proceedings.

\textbf{N.J. STAT. ANN. \S 13:1K-8(b) (West Supp. 1986).} Commentators have criticized this definition, describing it as “cryptically drafted.” \textit{See also} Note, \textit{The Environmental Cleanup Responsibility Act (ECRA): New Accountability for Industrial Landowners in New Jersey}, 8 SETON HALL LEGIS. J. 331, 344-58 (1985) (discussing problems with ECRA's definition of selling, closing, or transferring). \textit{See also} Schmidt, \textit{supra} note 1, at 743-46 (discussing ECRA's definition of selling, closing, or transferring operations).

\textbf{32. The Act defines “industrial establishment” as:}

any place of business engaged in operations which involve the generation, manufacture, refining, transportation, treatment, storage, handling, or disposal of hazardous substances or wastes on-site, above or below ground, having a Standard Industrial Classification number within 22-39 inclusive, 46-49 inclusive, 51 or 76 as designated in the Standard Industrial Classifications Manual prepared by the Office of Management and Budget in the Executive Office of the President of the United States.


\textbf{33. The Act defines “Cleanup Plan” as:}

a plan for the cleanup of industrial establishments, approved by the department, which may include a description of the locations, types and quantities of hazardous substances and wastes that the generation, handling, storage and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes pose an inherent danger of exposing the citizens, property and natural resources of this State to substantial risk of harm or degradation; that the closing of operations and the transfer of real property utilized for the generation, handling, storage and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes should be conducted in a rational and orderly way, so as to mitigate potential risks; and that it is necessary to impose a precondition on any closure or transfer of these operations by requiring the adequate preparation and implementation of acceptable cleanup procedures thereof.

\textbf{N.J. STAT. ANN. \S 13:1K-9 (West Supp. 1988).} The Act defines closing, terminating, or transferring operations as:

the cessation of all operations which involve the generation, manufacture, refining, transportation, treatment, storage, handling, or disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, or any temporary cessation for a period of not less than two years, or any other transaction or proceeding through which an industrial establishment becomes non-operational for health or safety reasons or undergoes a change in ownership, except for corporate reorganization not substantially affecting the ownership of the industrial establishment, including, but not limited to sale of stock in the form of a statutory merger or consolidation, sale of the controlling share of assets, the conveyance of the real property, dissolution of corporate identity, financial reorganization and initiation of bankruptcy proceedings.
hazardous substances. ECRA's provisions, therefore, are self-executing when a closure, transfer, or sale of operations occurs. Further, ECRA does not limit, restrict, or prohibit the DEP from directing cleanup efforts under any other statute, rule, or regulation. 35

Failure to comply with any provision of the Act allows the transferee to void the sale or transfer. 36 In addition, the DEP has authority to void the transfer or sale if the owner or operator fails to submit a negative declaration or cleanup plan. 37 The transferee may recover damages from the transferor if the sale or transfer is voided. 38 The owner or operator is strictly liable under ECRA for all cleanup costs and damages resulting from the failure to implement the cleanup plan. 39 Finally, the Act imposes fines up to 25,000 dollars a day for each offense. 40

In *Superior Air Products Co. v. NL Industries, Inc.*, 41 the Superior Court of New Jersey determined the relationship between ERA, the Spill Act, and ECRA. 42 NL Industries sold land contaminated with hazardous waste to Superior. 43 Superior learned of the contamination

substances and wastes that will remain on the premises; a description of the types and locations of storage vessels, surface impoundments, or secured landfills containing hazardous substances and wastes; recommendations regarding the most practicable method of cleanup; and a cost estimate of the cleanup plan.


34. The Act defines "negative declaration" as:

a written declaration, submitted by an industrial establishment and approved by the department, that there has been no discharge of hazardous substances or wastes on the site, or that any such discharge has been cleaned up in accordance with procedures approved by the department, and there remain no hazardous substances or wastes at the site of the industrial establishment.


39. Id.
42. Id. at 49, 522 A.2d at 1027.
43. Id. at 48, 522 A.2d at 1026.
when it attempted to resell the property. Superior filed suit against NL Industries and the DEP under ERA for enforcement of the Spill Act. The DEP counterclaimed seeking Superior's compliance with ECRA. The trial court remanded the action to DEP pursuant to section 8 of ERA to determine responsibility for the cleanup. The trial court required DEP to consider both the Spill Act and the ECRA action in one administrative investigation. On appeal the superior court held that it was improper to remit the ECRA proceeding to the DEP under section 8 of the ERA.

After reviewing ERA, the Spill Act, and ECRA, the court concluded that the legislature intended ECRA to prevent the delay inherent in litigating liability for contamination. The court found that responsibility for contamination is irrelevant to an ECRA proceeding. Thus, the remittance of the ECRA proceeding to DEP conflicted with ECRA's goal of preventing cleanup delays.

The court also determined under what circumstances an appropriate party may sue to enforce rights under ERA, the Spill Act, and

44. Id. at 48-49, 522 A.2d at 1026.
45. Id. at 49, 522 A.2d at 1026.
46. Id.
47. See supra note 17 and accompanying text for a discussion of the court's authority to remand an action to DEP under ERA § 8.
48. 216 N.J. Super. at 49, 522 A.2d at 1026. The trial court found that ERA § 8 mandated the remand. Id. at 51, 511 A.2d at 1027. The trial court also stayed further proceedings pending the outcome of the administrative investigation. Id.
49. Id. at 55, 522 A.2d at 1029.
50. Id. at 55-56, 511 A.2d at 1030. The court reasoned that the ECRA proceeding vindicates the public interest because ECRA is self-executing, thereby assuring cleanup. Id. at 64, 522 A.2d at 1035. There is no reason, therefore, to compel the DEP to expend resources investigating the responsible party. Id.
51. Id. at 63, 522 A.2d at 1035. The court noted that the state legislature enacted ECRA largely in response to the case of State Dep't of Envtl. Protection v. Ventron Corp., 94 N.J. 473, 468 A.2d 150 (1983). 216 N.J. Super. at 62, 522 A.2d at 1034. The Ventron litigation was expensive and lasted more than seven years. Id. Lengthy litigation, where contamination poses an immediate threat to the environment, concerned the New Jersey legislature. Id. See Note, supra note 31, at 331-32 (discussing the relationship between the passage of ECRA and Ventron).
52. 216 N.J. Super. at 65, 522 A.2d at 1035. The court reasoned that ECRA imposes a self-executing duty to remediate and that noncompliance renders a violator strictly liable for costs. Id. at 64, 522 A.2d at 1035.
53. Id. at 65, 522 A.2d at 1035.
ECRA.54 The transfer of land triggers ECRA.55 Thus, the transferor must comply with ECRA's provisions regardless of who is responsible for the contamination.56 The current owner or operator may, however, pursue common law actions to assess liability against the generators of the hazardous wastes.57 If, on the other hand, a contaminated site is not closed, transferred, or sold, then ECRA will not apply and the DEP may commence proceedings under the Spill Act.58 Should the DEP proceedings prove insufficient, a private party may file an action under ERA to obtain relief.59

ECRA's impact on existing environmental legislation advances the public interest in prompt, orderly cleanup of hazardous substances. ECRA is self-executing, thus assuring cleanup without time-consuming litigation to determine responsibility.60 Furthermore, private parties finance ECRA cleanups, thereby diminishing the taxpayer's burden to fund cleanup efforts. ECRA also prevents abandoned hazardous waste sites from becoming environmental threats. Additionally, ECRA encourages voluntary efforts to minimize pollution in order to facilitate ECRA clearance for future transactions.61 In the final analysis, ECRA's primary benefit is its vindication of the public interest in securing an environment free from threatening hazardous waste.
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54. In construing the three acts, the court sought to harmonize the laws, giving effect to all of their provisions. Id. at 63-64, 522 A.2d at 1035.
55. Id. at 64, 522 A.2d at 1035.
56. Id. For a discussion of the duties ECRA imposes, see supra notes 30-40 and accompanying text.
57. Id. at 65, 522 A.2d at 1035. See Note, supra note 30, at 163-70 (discussing common law environmental tort recovery).
58. 216 N.J. Super. at 64, 522 A.2d at 1035.
59. Id. The court reached this conclusion in Howell. For a discussion of Howell, see supra notes 23-29 and accompanying text.
60. See supra note 51 discussing ECRA's purpose of eliminating delays in cleanup. See also Note, supra note 31, at 335. Mortgage lenders will also aid indirectly in ECRA's enforcement because of their apprehension of voidable sales of property.
61. Schmidt, supra note 1, at 753.
* J.D. 1988, Washington University.