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I. Introduction

Americans generate an ever-increasing amount of municipal solid waste.¹ One has only to visit any supermarket chain and purchase a foil-lined drink box "decorated with a plastic-wrapped straw, and shrink-wrapped in plastic"² to understand the nature of the municipal solid waste management challenge that faces the nation. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) reports that Americans produced 88 million tons of municipal solid waste in 1960.³ By the year 2000, USEPA predicts that Americans will generate 222 million tons of municipal solid
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1. See N.J. STAT. ANN. § 13:1E-3.b (West 1994). Solid waste is defined as: garbage, refuse, and other discarded materials resulting from industrial, commercial and agricultural operations, and from domestic and community activities, and shall include all other waste materials including liquids, except for solid animal and vegetable wastes collected by swine producers licensed by the State Department of Agriculture to collect, prepare and feed such wastes to swine on their own farms.


3. See id.
This increasing production of municipal solid waste poses an environmental, economic, and technical challenge throughout the United States, but especially in the densely populated northeastern states.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, much of the municipal solid waste generated in the United States was disposed of in open dumps or was incinerated in uncontrolled burners. In New Jersey, public concern over the health impacts of improper municipal solid waste disposal, coupled with a shortage of available landfill space, caused the state to declare a solid waste disposal crisis. Projections made by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) in the early 1970s indicated that available landfill space would be fully depleted by 1982. The fact that many landfills had been sited within ecologically sensitive areas, such as wetlands, caused additional concern over the disposal of municipal solid waste in New Jersey.

As a result of this perceived solid waste disposal crisis, New Jersey passed the Solid Waste Management Act (SWMA) and the Solid Waste Utility Control Act (SWUCA) which established a complex and comprehensive program for regulating the treatment and disposal of solid waste. The SWMA established twenty-two solid waste management districts throughout the state. Each district was delegated the responsibility for developing a "District Solid Waste Management Plan" for the disposal of municipal solid waste generated within the respective district. New Jersey's solid waste management program relied on a system of

4. See id. at 14.
5. See id. at 2.
9. See id.
12. See id. N.J. STAT. ANN. § 13:1E-19 (West 1994). The statute provides that "every county in the State of New Jersey and the Hackensack Meadowlands District is hereby designated a solid waste management district." Id.
flow controls to manage the disposal of solid waste in the state. The SWMA allowed the districts to delegate the responsibility for managing solid waste to other entities, including municipal utilities authorities, county improvement authorities, and pollution control financing facilities. New Jersey's statutory solid waste management program resulted in the construction and operation of numerous solid waste management facilities, including sanitary landfills and transfer stations. Five districts invested in state-of-the-art energy recovery incinerators, designed to recover energy from the burning of municipal solid waste. These new solid waste management facilities, constructed in conformance with the state's legislative mandate, were funded in most cases with public bonds. The districts relied on the revenues generated through the flow control system to recover the debt incurred in the construction of the facilities.

Flow control of solid waste remained in place in New Jersey until May 1997, at which time the Third Circuit Court of Appeals held that New Jersey's waste disposal regulations discriminated against out-of-state facilities in violation of the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution, and were therefore illegal. The districts are now faced with the immediate challenge of develop-

14. See U. S. ENVTL. PROTECTION AGENCY, REPORT TO CONGRESS ON FLOW CONTROL AND MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE, EPA 530-R-95-008, at I-1, I-3-4 (Mar. 1995). Flow controls are legal authorities that allow state and local governments to mandate where municipal solid waste must be taken for processing, treatment, or disposal. These processing, treatment and disposal facilities may include, but are not limited to, landfills, transfer stations, and resource recovery facilities. Flow control laws allow designated management facilities to establish a monopoly on municipal solid waste. This monopoly is used by state and local governments to finance the construction of new waste management facilities, such as transfer stations and incinerators, which are typically financed through the sale of public bonds. State and local governments also find flow controls useful to finance the cost of other local solid waste management programs, such as curbside recycling, household hazardous waste collection, and public education, that do not lend themselves to the collection of revenues in the same manner as disposal of waste at a landfill or transfer station. Flow controls have been used to support these other waste management services through the revenues generated by tipping fees, which can be set at rates higher than prevailing market prices due to the monopoly provided by flow control laws. See id.

18. See id. at 346.
19. See id.
20. See id. at 348.
oping nondiscriminatory alternatives to flow control, while still recouping the outstanding debt on solid waste treatment and disposal facilities that is estimated at $1.6 billion dollars statewide.\(^{23}\) Without flow control, the tipping fees\(^{24}\) at current disposal facilities have plunged to competitive levels, but these new levels cannot pay for the hidden costs associated with solid waste disposal that resulted in inflated fees in the first place, most notably debt service.\(^{25}\) Since the New Jersey State Legislature has failed to enact any legislation to answer this challenge, the burden has fallen squarely on the shoulders of the districts.

The NJDEP issued a guidance document in 1997 to assist the districts in conforming to a post-flow control environment.\(^{26}\) The guidance document suggested the assessment of an Environmental Investment Charge (EIC)\(^{27}\) as one of the options available to local agencies to compete with private solid waste operators.\(^{28}\) The guidance document stated that an EIC could be utilized to recoup debt service, as well as host community benefits, state taxes, system-wide rate components, and other ancillary charges, thereby eliminating these charges from facility tipping fees.\(^{29}\) However, the municipalities that are required to pay the EIC charges view them as illegal taxes and filed challenges to the EIC assessments.\(^{30}\)

---


24. See REPORTING ON MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE, supra note 2. Tipping fees are defined as “the amount the operator charges for each ton of waste delivered to the facility.” Id.


27. EIC is defined as “a charge designed to generate funds to assure payment of debt incurred by utility authorities to fund local implementation of state solid waste management policies.” In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d 323, 326 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. 1999).

28. See GUIDANCE DOCUMENT, supra note 26, at 12.

29. See id.

This article reviews the theory behind the challenges to the EIC assessments and discusses the legality of the EICs. Part I introduces the context in which the issue of assessing EICs arose in New Jersey. Part II describes the legislative history of New Jersey's solid waste management program, and briefly reviews the legal challenges that resulted in the demise of New Jersey's flow control system. Part III discusses the challenges to the EICs that were filed in Atlantic and Passaic counties, and the response handed down by the Appellate Division in May 1999. Part IV explores the reasoning behind the decision, and analyzes the reasons why the courts should have declared the EICs an illegal tax, despite the dire economic straits faced by many of the counties in New Jersey. This section also reviews the enabling legislation under which the municipal utilities authorities were organized and finds that the state legislature did not grant the authorities the ability to levy an EIC. Therefore, the EIC assessments constitute an illegal tax under current New Jersey law and should have been declared such by the courts.

II. Background and History

A. Legislative History

New Jersey adopted the SWMA in 1970 to "establish a statutory framework within which all solid waste collection, disposal and utilization activity" in New Jersey could be coordinated. The intent was to prevent piecemeal reaction to local solid waste management issues, and promote coordinated regional planning. To implement this legislation, the state directed the NJDEP to develop extensive regulations governing solid waste collection and disposal. The SWMA also established twenty-two solid waste management districts comprised of the twenty-one counties in New Jersey and the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission. Each of the solid waste management districts was required to develop a "District Solid Waste Management Plan" to define existing solid waste management practices and to develop future solid waste management solutions


32. See id. § 13:1E-2.a.
for all waste generated by the municipalities within the respective district. The SWMA also required that the NJDEP develop a Statewide Solid Waste Management Plan designed to promote resource recovery and establish objectives, criteria, and standards for the formulation of the district plans. Each solid waste management district was required to submit its plan to the NJDEP for review and approval prior to implementation.

Each district's solid waste management plan mandated the disposal locations for solid waste generated in that district. Although ideally each district was to provide for appropriate treatment and disposal of solid waste within the district, the NJDEP did allow for interdistrict solutions if new facilities could not be sited within a district. Most districts created a separate governmental authority with the power to acquire, construct, operate, or contract for solid waste disposal services within the district. Among the twenty-two solid waste management districts in New Jersey, the power to control solid waste disposal has been delegated to eleven utilities authorities, four improvement authorities, and two pollution control financing authorities, with four counties and the Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission retaining direct control. This system resulted in the construction of five municipal solid waste incinerators in Camden, Essex, Gloucester, Union, and Warren counties for a total cost of almost $1 billion dollars, all funded with public bonds. Other counties constructed solid waste transfer stations and landfills, resulting in

35. See id. § 13:1E-20, 21.
36. See id. § 13:1E-6.
38. See id. § 13:1E-21(b)(3).
40. See N.J. Dep't of Envtl. Protection, Solid Waste Management Officials (visited January 6, 1999) <http://www.state.nj.us/dep/dshw/swr/fees.htm>. The eleven utilities authorities are: Atlantic County Utilities Authority, Bergen County Utilities Authority, Cape May County Municipal Utilities Authority, Essex County Utilities Authority, Hunterdon County Utilities Authority, Middlesex County Utilities Authority, Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority, Passaic County Utilities Authority, Salem County Utilities Authority, Sussex County Utilities Authority, and Union County Utilities Authority. The four improvement authorities are Cumberland County Improvement Authority, Gloucester County Improvement Authority, Hudson County Improvement Authority, and Mercer County Improvement Authority. The two pollution control financing authorities are Camden County Pollution Control Financing Authority and Warren County Pollution Control Financing Authority. Burlington, Monmouth, Ocean, and Somerset Counties retain direct control of solid waste management within the county. The Hackensack Meadowlands Development Commission is also designated as a solid waste management district. See id.
41. See Ahearn, supra note 25.
a total outstanding solid waste debt of approximately $1.6 billion dollars.\textsuperscript{42} These solid waste treatment and disposal facilities were financed with fifty-three separate bonds issued by the local authorities and counties prior to 1995.\textsuperscript{43} Flow control of solid waste was relied on to provide the revenue for these facilities and to recover the debt incurred to construct them.\textsuperscript{44} The system has been characterized as monopolistic, and many critics argued that the county-run facilities inflated their trash disposal fees to cover the costs of inefficient operations.\textsuperscript{45} The loudest critics accused the agencies of running grossly overstuffed and overpriced political patronage mills, resulting in the highest trash disposal costs in the nation.\textsuperscript{46}

However, defenders of flow control argue that it enables local governments to expand waste management services to include programs such as curbside recycling, household hazardous waste collection, and public education.\textsuperscript{47} A local community implementing flow control can pay for these ancillary services through the tipping fees at solid waste disposal facilities, which, in a flow control regulatory environment, can exceed market prices.\textsuperscript{48} In addition, there is a valid concern that without flow control, market factors would result in the disposal of municipal solid waste at the cheapest facilities, not necessarily the most environmentally sound.\textsuperscript{49} Since improper disposal of solid waste can have grave environmental consequences, including groundwater and surface water contamination, proponents of flow control argue that it is prudent to allow local governments to steer solid waste away from poorly managed sites, and into safely constructed disposal facilities.\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{42} See Rooney, \textit{supra} note 23.
  \item \textsuperscript{45} See Tom Johnson, \textit{Jersey Loses Appeal to Retain Trash Rules: Haulers Cannot be Forced to Use County Sites}, \textit{The Star-Ledger} (Newark, N.J.), May 2, 1997; see Ahearn, \textit{supra} note 25.
  \item \textsuperscript{46} See Bret Schundler, Editorial, \textit{The Last Thing New Jersey Needs is a New Trash Tax}, \textit{The Record} (Northern New Jersey), Aug. 27, 1998.
  \item \textsuperscript{48} See id.
  \item \textsuperscript{49} See id. at I-A-39.
  \item \textsuperscript{50} See id.
\end{itemize}
The response is that flow control is an economic scheme, not an environmental one. It is important to consider that eighty percent of the municipal solid waste generated in the United States is disposed of in landfills and incinerators. These types of disposal facilities are controlled by comprehensive state and federal regulations. The regulatory requirements are administered through permitting and compliance programs that afford a level of protection deemed adequate to protect human health and the environment. As stated in its Report to Congress on Flow Control and Municipal Solid Waste, USEPA found that “[t]here is no evidence that flow control either positively or negatively impacts the statutorily assured level of environmental protection, because the underlying regulatory requirements are controlling.”

B. Challenges to Flow Control

In 1994, the United States Supreme Court declared that a local ordinance in the town of Clarkstown, New York that directed all solid waste generated by a municipality to a designated processing facility discriminated against interstate commerce on its face and was therefore invalid. The Court stated, “[s]tate and local governments may not use their regulatory power to favor local enterprise by prohibiting patronage of out-of-state competitors or their facilities.” This decision removed the constitutional foundation of New Jersey’s solid waste management system. While NJDEP chose not to dismantle its solid waste management scheme without a direct court review of its own regulations, it was not long before the State of New Jersey was presented with this opportunity.

In 1995, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in Atlantic Coast Demolition & Recycling, Inc. v. Board of Chosen Freeholders of Atlantic County that New Jersey’s flow control system discriminated against interstate commerce and was therefore uncon-
stitutional, unless, on remand, the State could demonstrate that it served a valid public purpose that could not be achieved by other means. 

Subsequently, in 1996, after hearing additional arguments from the litigants, the District Court held that New Jersey's flow control system was unconstitutional to the extent that it discriminated against interstate commerce. In order to allow New Jersey to develop constitutional alternatives to replace the flow control system, the court issued a stay of two years following all rights of appeal from enforcing a permanent injunction against the flow control regulations.

On appeal, the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirmed that New Jersey's flow control regulations were unconstitutional. Furthermore, the two-year stay of the injunction ordered by the District Court was lifted. All appeals to the lifting of the injunction were exhausted as of November 10, 1997, the date that the United States Supreme Court denied certiorari to the petitioners. On December 1, 1997, NJDEP adopted amendments to the solid waste planning regulations to bring the existing flow control system into compliance with the decision rendered by the Third Circuit. Thus ended New Jersey's solid waste flow control system.

As a result of the deregulation of the solid waste industry in New Jersey, generators of solid waste are now permitted to dispose of their waste at whatever facility they choose. Within two days of the United States Supreme Court's decision not to grant certiorari, solid waste disposal fees in New Jersey fell by thirty-five to forty percent. By January 1999, tipping fees at virtually all of the county operated facilities in New Jersey dropped considerably. County facilities slashed their prices presumably to re-

59. See id.
61. See id.
63. See id.
64. See id.
66. See Ahearn, supra note 25.
main competitive with private haulers. However, questions concerning the financial viability of the county facilities caused Moody’s Investors Service, Inc.\(^{68}\) (Moody’s) to downgrade the bond rating of five solid waste facilities in New Jersey.\(^{69}\) Moody’s determined that “a scenario in which flow control is eliminated and these enterprises must face market competition could very well result in their demise, with attendant debt service defaults and potential bankruptcy filings.”\(^{70}\)

The Third Circuit considered the financial crisis facing the solid waste facilities in New Jersey, as noted in the following language:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Facility</th>
<th>Rate on 11/12/97 (cost per ton)</th>
<th>Rate on 1/6/99 (cost per ton)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic County U.A.*—Transfer Station</td>
<td>$120.42</td>
<td>$47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen County U.A.—Transfer Station</td>
<td>$101.88</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington County—Landfill</td>
<td>$49.50</td>
<td>$50.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden P.C.F.A.<strong>—R.R.F.</strong>*</td>
<td>$93.21</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape May County U.A.—Landfill, Transfer Station</td>
<td>$92.75</td>
<td>$76.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland County—Landfill</td>
<td>$60.37</td>
<td>$60.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex County U.A./American Refuel—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.R.F.</td>
<td>$72.75</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester County I.A.—R.R.F.</td>
<td>$101.32</td>
<td>$59.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson County I.A.—Landfill</td>
<td>$63.27</td>
<td>$59.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunterdon County U.A.—Transfer Station</td>
<td>$93.50</td>
<td>$57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer County I.A.—Transfer Station</td>
<td>$117.81</td>
<td>$98.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex County U.A.—Landfill</td>
<td>$55.42</td>
<td>$51.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth County—Landfill</td>
<td>$75.10</td>
<td>$55.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris County U.A.—Transfer Station</td>
<td>$88.40</td>
<td>$83.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean County—Landfill</td>
<td>$63.17</td>
<td>$55.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic County U.A.—R.R.F. (Essex)</td>
<td>$104.74</td>
<td>$49.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem County U.A.—Landfill</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
<td>$63.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset County—Transfer Station</td>
<td>$132.93</td>
<td>$72.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex County U.A.—Landfill</td>
<td>$105.55</td>
<td>$58.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union County U.A.—R.R.F.</td>
<td>$83.05</td>
<td>$49.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren P.C.F.A.—R.R.F.</td>
<td>$100.26</td>
<td>$48.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* U.A. – Utilities Authority
** P.C.F.A. – Pollution Control Financing Authority
*** R.R.F. – Resource Recovery Facility

See id.


69. See Martha M. Canan, Moody’s Drops Five New Jersey Waste Ratings to Junk Designation After Court Ruling, 311 THE BOND BUYER 29591 (Feb. 21, 1995), at Vol 311, No. 29591.

70. Id.
The . . . elimination of flow control laws will force local waste disposal authorities to compete with out-of-state firms. Competition, in turn, will preclude local facilities from charging inflated tipping fees. Consequently, local facilities constructed with bond money will attract lower volumes of waste and will lose operating revenue, reducing their ability to pay off their debt to the bondholders. Debt issues will risk default, and local waste disposal facilities will incur operating deficits. Finally, default on the solid waste disposal facilities will affect the health of debt instruments issued by other government entities in New Jersey.71

While accepting this characterization of New Jersey's dire financial condition, the court held that the state failed to demonstrate why the current flow control system was the only viable means of ensuring the financial integrity of its solid waste management districts.72 The court would not permit New Jersey to continue to discriminate against out-of-state industry simply to raise funds to service waste management debt.73 Sympathy towards New Jersey's plight was not permitted to cloud reason.74

C. The State Response

In anticipation of a final judgment in the Atlantic Coast case, Assembly Bill No. 50 was introduced in the New Jersey State Assembly in 1996 to address unrecoverable debt costs.75 The proposed law, entitled the "Solid Waste Management and Environmental Investment Cost Recovery Act," introduced the term "environmental investment charge" and defined the costs that could be recovered as "any expenses of a public authority or county related to . . . the planning, acquisition or construction of solid waste facilities, including debt service on bonds . . . to finance solid waste facilities, including abandoned or canceled solid waste facility projects . . . ."76 New Jersey municipalities have harshly

72. See id. at 665.
73. See id.
74. See id.
76. Id. The legislation was summarized in the Committee Statement as follows: In response to the May 1, 1997 Atlantic Coast decision . . . the Assembly Committee Substitute for Assembly Bill No. 50 would revise the solid waste management statutes and provide a mechanism for the recovery of the environmental investment costs incurred by the public authorities.
criticized EIC proposals because the charges would be assessed based on the tonnage these towns generated historically, regardless of whether the municipality continued to utilize the county facility. A municipality has no method to generate the revenue to pay for an EIC assessment except raising property taxes, which is an unpleasant prospect for any municipal government. Ultimately, this law was not passed, but the New Jersey State Legislature is considering other proposals.

Senator McNamara sponsored a bill introduced on May 18, 1998 that would create a State Solid Waste Facility Debt Retirement Fund. This fund would be used to pay the debt service on county facilities that cannot compete in a post-flow control environment with private solid waste operators. Funding for this program would be generated by a three percent tax on the gross revenues of all solid waste operators in the state. This method of assisting the debt-ridden county facilities is arguably fairer than an EIC because it distributes the tax burden more evenly throughout the state. Despite the urging of proponents of the bill that the state should “accept its moral obligation and pay for the stranded debt incurred by the counties at the state’s direction,” the bill has not made it out of committee.

and counties in implementing State-mandated district solid waste management plans. The bill would make numerous changes to existing law so that the statutes conform to the new solid waste management system established under the bill . . . . The bill authorizes every public authority and county to establish and implement a system to calculate, charge and collect environmental investment charges (EICs) as may be necessary to recover the environmental costs incurred by the public authority or county. . . . EICs may be collected by a public authority or county that has assumed responsibility for the collection of EICs, as follows: (1) as a portion of the tipping fee charged to users for solid waste disposal at the district solid waste facility; (2) as a separate bill to all previous users of the district solid waste facility; (3) as a separate bill to the constituent municipality or county for inclusion as an item in the municipal budget or the county budget, or any combination thereof, for the payment of environmental investment costs; or (4) in any other manner reasonably established by the public authority or county.

Id.

77. See Schundler, supra note 46.
78. See Rooney, supra note 23.
79. See Schundler, supra note 46.
81. See id.
82. See id.
83. Rooney, supra note 23.
84. See id.
The New Jersey Legislature has offered limited relief to the counties by appropriating $20 million dollars in the 1998 state budget to subsidize county or county authority debt service payments for environmental investments incurred as of June 30, 1997. The appropriation is intended to provide short-term financial assistance to entities that face significant stranded investment debt. To receive funds, the county or county authority must submit to an audit performed by the State Treasurer, and must implement the auditor's recommendations. The audit is intended to insure that all available cost savings measures have been taken prior to receiving funds. However, these funds are limited and are unlikely to offer significant relief to counties.

The concept was expanded in a statewide ballot proposal that was presented to New Jersey voters in November 1998. Voters approved a proposal to forgive a debt to the state of $160 million dollars that was advanced to Camden, Essex, Gloucester, Union, and Warren Counties for the construction of incinerators, and to Atlantic and Burlington Counties for the building of landfills and recycling facilities. The proposal is only a small step towards solving the problem of New Jersey's debt-ridden agencies, as it leaves the counties to deal with a remaining debt of more than $1 billion dollars.

III. Environmental Investment Charges

A. Description of Environmental Investment Charge Proposals

NJDEP has asked each of the solid waste management districts to submit solid waste management plan amendments to conform to the Atlantic Coast decision. The plan amendments must "define their revised solid waste disposal strategy in light of Atlantic Coast." The NJDEP recommended that the districts focus on

---

86. See id.
87. See id at 21.
90. See Kiely, supra note 88.
91. See Letter from Gary Sondermeyer, Director, N.J. DEPT OF ENVTL. PROTECTION, Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste to All Solid Waste Coordinators and Authority Officials (Aug. 22, 1997) (on file with author).
the disclosure of the revised system strategy each district is adopting in the plan amendments, particularly EIC assessments.93

As of January 1999, twenty of the twenty-two solid waste management districts had submitted proposed plan amendments to the NJDEP.94 Nine of the plans propose the assessment of an EIC of some form.95 In Atlantic, Cape May, Gloucester, Passaic, and Union Counties, the NJDEP has allowed county utility and county improvement authorities to begin assessing EICs ranging between $22 and $30 per ton.96 Many municipalities expected to pay the EICs oppose them, and have filed nineteen lawsuits throughout the state.97

B. The City of Paterson98 Challenge

1. Background

In 1987, Passaic County created the Passaic County Utilities Authority (PCUA) under the authority of the Municipal and County Utilities Authorities Law99 (MCUAL) and delegated solid waste planning responsibilities to the agency. The NJDEP and the Board of Public Utilities (BPU) granted the PCUA the exclusive right to control and provide for the disposal of solid waste generated within Passaic County.100 Initially, the PCUA adopted a solid waste disposal scheme that involved the construction of a

93. See id. The N.J. Dept’t of Envtl. Protection requires that a plan amendment proposing the assessment of an EIC contain the following elements: i) analysis of the current tipping fee to determine the various EIC components; ii) analysis of how costs of various EIC components could be reduced; iii) determination of the means of calculating the EIC; iv) determination of the billing mechanism for collecting the EIC; and v) analysis to demonstrate justness and reasonableness of the final EIC and ability to meet debt obligations. See Letter from Gary Sondermeyer, Director, N.J. Dept’t of Envtl. Protection, Division of Solid and Hazardous Waste to All Solid Waste Coordinators and Authority Officials (Aug. 22, 1997) (on file with author).


95. See id. Those counties include Atlantic, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Gloucester, Hudson, Passaic, Salem, and Union.

96. See Court Backs County Fees to Help Pay Trash Debts, N.Y. TIMES, May 14, 1999, at B6; see Fitzgerald, supra note 30.

97. See Dena Aubin, Moody's Says Plan Could Be Subject to Lawsuits, CAPITAL MARKETS REPORT, Apr. 5, 1999.


municipal solid waste incinerator based on plans that had been initiated by Passaic County in 1986, a year before the PCUA was created. To carry out the project, PCUA acquired 13.5 acres of property in Passaic County for siting the incinerator, developed site plans, initiated the permitting process, and began excavation of the incinerator site.

To fund its solid waste planning activities, which focused initially on incineration, the PCUA issued revenue bonds. The PCUA issued a $57,998,886 bond series during 1987, which Passaic County guaranteed. In 1992, PCUA refunded $29,595,000 of the 1987 bonds using the proceeds of a bond issue of $30,930,000. PCUA issued additional bonds to refund the remainder of the 1987 bonds in 1996. In 1991, the PCUA issued an additional $36,495,000 bond series that was not guaranteed by Passaic County.

The incinerator project was undertaken at a time when the NJDEP was actively promoting the construction of resource recovery facilities. Subsequently, public sentiment against the siting of incinerators caused the state to impose a virtual moratorium on this technology, which prevented PCUA from obtaining a permit. Ultimately, the plan to construct an incinerator was abandoned, but the county incurred substantial debt associated with the development costs of the incinerator and the acquisition of alternative means of solid waste disposal.

In response to the failure of the incinerator project, PCUA altered its long-term disposal method of choice. PCUA elected

103. See id.
104. See In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d at 326.
105. See id.
106. See id.
107. See id.
109. See id.
110. See In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d at 326.
not to own or operate its own solid waste treatment and disposal facility. Instead, PCUA contracted with two private hauling companies, Grinnell Solid Waste Haulers, Inc. and Spectrasen, Inc., to bring waste to one of three private transfer stations owned and operated by Pen Pac Inc., which was under contract with PCUA to process solid waste generated in the county and ultimately dispose of it out-of-state. While flow control was still in effect, the PCUA assessed tipping fees of $103 per ton for use of the transfer stations. The rate included fees assessed by the haulers and owner of the transfer station plus PCUA's administrative costs and debt service. The debt service component of the charge included the costs incurred during the planning phases of the incinerator project. With the demise of "flow control," the PCUA could no longer guarantee a flow of waste into the designated county facilities, placing the PCUA in financial jeopardy due to the significant stranded debt. None of the municipalities in Passaic County use the PCUA system because the debt service incurred when flow control was in effect prevents the PCUA from

112. See id.

Stranded debt is outstanding public debt issued to fund activities which, due to the invalidation of a regulatory scheme, prevents the use of the facility or activity funded by the debt. The cessation or diminution of revenue from the facility or activity renders the debt underfunded or unfunded or "stranded." Stranded debt bears some similarity to "stranded costs." The concept of stranded costs had been encountered in the deregulation of utilities, primarily electric, gas and telecommunications. Under former regulatory schemes in which basic utility services were provided through a single provider whose level of service and rate schedule were approved by a central rate-making board, regulated utilities incurred certain costs. Some of these costs were incurred to build infrastructure required to deliver the service or to assure universal access to the service. The advent of competition in the industry impedes and in certain circumstances prevents the recovery of these costs. Thus, these unrecoverable costs are termed "stranded."

Id.
offering a competitive price. Substantial public debt and inability to compete with private markets puts the PCUA in danger of defaulting on its bonds.

2. PCUA's Debt Repayment Plan

The PCUA and Passaic County jointly developed a plan to repay the debt service incurred while flow control was in effect. On March 3, 1995, PCUA filed a petition with the Local Finance Board (LFB) of the State Department of Community Affairs asserting that the PCUA was in financial trouble. The petition alleged that since the solid waste management system of flow control, on which the PCUA depended, was likely to be invalidated, the LFB should approve a financial plan. This petition was held in abeyance pending the outcome of the Atlantic Coast trial.

After a decision was handed down in the Atlantic Coast case, the PCUA filed an application with the LFB on November 19, 1997, for approval of a plan to refinance its debt. The LFB held hearings on December 10 and 16, 1997. The plan submitted to the LFB called for refinancing PCUA's outstanding debt through the issuance of refunding bonds not to exceed $50,000,000 to repay $21,400,000 of the $27,000,000 balance of the 1991 bond series.

118. See id. at 328.
121. Under N.J. STAT. ANN. § 40A:5A-18 and 19, the Local Finance Board has the authority to order the imposition of fees or charges necessary for local government entities in financial difficulty to assure satisfaction of outstanding obligations. EIC proposals must be reviewed by the NJDEP to assure that they are consistent with the local government entity's obligation to assess just and reasonable charges. They must also be reviewed by the Local Finance Board to ensure that the EIC is sufficient for the local government entity to meet its financial obligations. See GUIDANCE DOCUMENT, supra note 26, at 12.
123. See id.
124. See id.
125. See In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d at 328.
127. See In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d at 328.
PCUA proposed to repay the bonds through the assessment of an EIC on all municipal, commercial, and industrial users that utilized the PCUA system prior to the demise of "flow control," based on historical tonnage figures. The EIC is not dependent on any entity's use of PCUA's waste treatment and disposal services.

On November 19, 1997, the same day that PCUA filed its refinancing proposal to the LFB, PCUA asked the board to approve a Deficiency Agreement between PCUA and Passaic County. Under the terms of the agreement, Passaic County agreed to cover any shortfall in the EIC assessments. The Deficiency Agreement states that PCUA will provide solid waste services to Passaic County, which in return "will pay to the PCUA an amount equal to any shortfall in revenue which the PCUA may experience." Passaic County approved an amendment to the Deficiency Agreement on December 17, 1997, whereby the county agreed to "secure the balance of the 1991 bonds that are not refunded with the proceeds of the refunding bonds." In essence, the Deficiency Agreement provides the security for the PCUA's additional debt.

The LFB approved the PCUA's financing plan by a resolution issued on December 16, 1997. The LFB determined that the PCUA was experiencing and would continue to experience financial difficulties "which jeopardize the payment of debt service on issued obligations and that these difficulties will likely impair the credit of the PCUA and the County of Passaic." The LFB approved an EIC of $29.64 per ton. This EIC is an "allocation of
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the PCUA's total debt (including $28 million dollars in unsecured
debt) which, along with an administration fee, is imposed on a per-
ton basis on all municipalities in the County of Passaic based on
their 1996 municipal waste generation, and on all commercial and
industrial generators based upon their average flows from 1993
through 1996."\textsuperscript{138} The charge is "to be paid quarterly over a ten-
year period, independent of and unrelated to any solid waste ser-
vices being provided by PCUA"\textsuperscript{139} to the entities being assessed.

3. The City of Paterson's Lawsuit

The City of Paterson received its first EIC bill from the PCUA
on January 21, 1998 for a total assessment of $2,500,122 to be
paid in quarterly installments of $625,031 each.\textsuperscript{140} The PCUA
also issued notice to the city that Paterson's total EIC over a ten-
year period will be $20,704,613.\textsuperscript{141} The charge was assessed de-
spite the fact that since November 10, 1997, the City of Paterson
has procured its own solid waste disposal services at a lower rate
than if the city used the designated PCUA facility.\textsuperscript{142}

On January 6, 1998, the City of Paterson and its mayor, Mar-
tin G. Barnes, filed an action seeking injunctive relief restraining
Passaic County from guaranteeing the payment of previously is-
issued bonds in accordance with the Deficiency Agreement.\textsuperscript{143} The
plaintiffs also sought a declaration that the Deficiency Agreement
was unconstitutional.\textsuperscript{144} The plaintiffs' action against Passaic
County and the PCUA challenged the county's decision to enter
into the Deficiency Agreement with the PCUA in 1997, "and to
thereby assume an obligation for payment of $27,905,000 in out-

\textsuperscript{138} In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d at 328.

\textsuperscript{139} See Brief of Plaintiffs/Appellants, City of Paterson and Martin G. Barnes at
20, City of Paterson v. Passaic County Bd. of Chosen Freeholders (N.J. Super. Ct.

\textsuperscript{140} See id.

\textsuperscript{141} See id.

\textsuperscript{142} See id. at 17-18.

\textsuperscript{143} See In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d at 329.

\textsuperscript{144} See id.
standing debt” on the PCUA revenue bonds issued in 1991. This action challenged the validity of the EIC, in addition to the Deficiency Agreement. On January 7, 1998, the plaintiffs also filed an appeal of the LFB’s decision to impose the EIC, contesting that the LFB lacked the power to order the implementation of an EIC. On January 16, 1998, the City of Paterson filed an action against the Passaic County Board of Chosen Freeholders and the PCUA, challenging a pending amendment of the county’s Solid Waste Management Plan proposing the assessment of an EIC. Ten additional municipalities intervened, and these cases were subsequently consolidated and transferred to the Appellate Division.

The City of Paterson’s primary challenge to the EIC assessment was based on the contention that the charge is ultra vires and is an unauthorized county tax, unenforceable as a matter of law. The plaintiffs contended that the PCUA lacks the statutory authority to impose an EIC. According to the plaintiffs, since PCUA was created pursuant to the MCUAL, its powers are limited to those expressly stated in the enabling legislation. Since this law only allows the assessment of service charges, and not general taxes, the assessment of this EIC, which is not based on any present service being provided by the PCUA, is illegal.

Plaintiffs also contended that the Deficiency Agreement entered into by the PCUA and Passaic County is unconstitutional, representing an arbitrary, and therefore illegal, guarantee of

146. See id at 5.
148. See id.
149. See id. The ten interveners are: Township of Wayne, Borough of Totowa, Borough of West Paterson, City of Clifton, Borough of Wanaque, Borough of Bloomingdale, Borough of Hawthorne, Borough of Ringwood, Borough of Pompton Lakes, and Township of West Milford. See id.
PCUA's debt. The plaintiffs claim that the agreement by which Passaic County secures the PCUA's debt is barred by Section 33 of the MCUAL.

The additional assertions made by the plaintiffs regard the LFB's approval of the PCUA refinancing plan. Specifically, plaintiffs asserted that the LFB's resolution is unenforceable, insofar as it purports to authorize the PCUA to assess an EIC. They also claimed that the LFB's approval of the Deficiency Agreement has no legal force and effect.

On May 13, 1999, the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division, handed down a decision in favor of the defendants, PCUA and the Passaic County Board of Chosen Freeholders. The Appellate Division held that the EIC was not an illegal tax but constituted an allowable service charge. In addition, the court concluded that the Deficiency Agreement was legal, and remained in full force and effect.

4. Is an EIC an Illegal Tax?

a. Enabling Legislation

The parties to the litigation agree that the powers of the municipal utilities authorities are limited by the enabling legislation under which they were formed. The MCUAL controls and limits the activities of agencies in New Jersey that are engaged in pollution control activities, including the collection, treatment, and disposal of solid waste. The determination of the legality of an EIC depends on the proper interpretation of the MCUAL.

The MCUAL is intended, in part, to "foster and promote by all reasonable means . . . the collection, disposal and recycling of solid waste . . . in an environmentally sound manner." In general terms, the law provides for the collection of fees associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of pollution control facilities, including solid waste treatment and disposal facili-
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ties. The MCUAL authorizes "service charges to occupants or owners of property for direct or indirect connection with the use, products or services of [solid waste facilities] and providing for the establishment, collection and enforcement of such charges." The statute further limits the nature of the charges that may be assessed by a municipal utilities authority for solid waste services to rents, rates, fees or other charges . . . for the use or services of the solid waste system. Such solid waste service charges may be charged to and collected from the . . . owner or occupant . . . of any real property from or on which originates or has originated any solid waste to be treated by the solid waste system of the authority.

b. City of Paterson's Argument

Plaintiffs argued that the language in the MCUAL limits the power of the PCUA to collect fees only from generators that are using the PCUA solid waste system and only for fees related to that use. According to plaintiffs, PCUA's assessment of EIC charges violates the statute because the City of Paterson is not currently using the PCUA system for the disposal of solid waste. Since the city has not used the PCUA facilities since the demise of flow control, the PCUA is not authorized to assess an EIC from the city.

Plaintiffs relied on a comparison of Sections 40:14B-22 and 40:14B-22.1 of the MCUAL, which pertain to sewerage service charges and solid waste charges respectively, to support

163. See id.
164. Id. at § 40:14B-22.
165. "Solid waste system" is defined as the physical property of an authority by which it provides collection, recycling or disposal services. Id. at § 40:14B-3(30).
166. Id. at § 40:14B-22.1.
168. See id.
169. See id.
their position. The section, authorizing the collection of sewerage service fees, specifically allows the collection of a connection charge, which may include a component for the recovery of debt service on the capital used to construct the facilities. Plaintiffs contend that the specific language of Section 40:14B-22 that allows a municipal utilities authority to assess charges unrelated to the use of the sewerage system, such as debt service, does not appear in Section 40:14B-22.1, and should not be read into it. They argued that "if the legislature had intended to authorize the imposition of service charges for the past use of solid waste serv-

\[\text{Id.}\]

171. See id. at § 40:14B-22.1.

Every municipal authority is hereby authorized to charge and collect rents, rates, fees, or other charges (in this act sometimes referred to as "solid waste service charges") for the use or services of the solid waste system. Such solid waste service charges may be charged to and collected from any municipality or any person contracting for such use or services or from the owner or occupant, or both of them, of any real property from or on which originates or has originated any solid waste to be treated by the solid waste system of the authority, and the owner of any such real property shall be liable for and shall pay such solid waste service charges to the municipal authority at the time when and place where such solid waste service charges are due and payable. Such rents, rates, fees and charges, being in the nature of use or service charges, shall as nearly as the authority shall deem practicable and equitable be uniform throughout the county for the same type, class and amount of use or service of the solid waste system . . . .

\[\text{Id.}\]


ices or permit the PCUA to recover debt service costs, the language of 40:14B-22.1 would have explicitly reflected that purpose." 175

In addition, the plaintiffs cited Section 40:14B-33 to support their position that the EIC unfairly forced the City of Paterson to assume a debt incurred by the PCUA. 176 This section provides that

bonds or other obligations issued by a municipal authority . . . shall not be in any way a debt or liability of the State or of any such local unit . . . and shall not create or constitute any indebtedness, liability or obligation of the State or of any local unit . . . either legal, moral or otherwise. 177

The plaintiffs interpret the PCUA’s attempt to raise the revenues for its bonds through the assessment of an EIC as a violation of this statute. 178

Plaintiffs construed New Jersey decisional law to support their position that PCUA lacks the authority to assess fees and charges that are unrelated to the current use of any PCUA service. 179 Citing Airwick Industries, Inc. v. Carlstadt Sewerage Authority, 180 the plaintiffs contended that non-users of a pollution control facility should not be required to bear the cost of construction of that system unless the existence of the system increases the value of land by making its development desirable. 181 In

175. Id. at 14 (emphasis omitted).
Airwick, property owners challenged the imposition of sewer connection fees that escalated depending on the date on which the user connected to the system.\textsuperscript{182} The court held that the escalating connection fee was valid because the existence of the sewerage system conferred a benefit to the property that enhanced its value, regardless of whether the property owner connected or not.\textsuperscript{183} The existence of PCUA's solid waste management system provides no such enhancement to property, according to the plaintiffs, because in the absence of the services provided by PCUA, a thriving private solid waste collection and disposal industry could provide the same services at lower cost.\textsuperscript{184}

Plaintiffs drew additional support from Ivan v. Marlboro Township Municipal Utilities Authority.\textsuperscript{185} In Ivan, the court held that those entities that do not use a utility system are in no way obligated to pay for operations, maintenance, or debt service, regardless of the benefits to their property resulting from the construction of the municipal system.\textsuperscript{186} Plaintiffs argue that Ivan supports their position that, as a non-user, the city is not required to pay an EIC for the purpose of recovering debt.\textsuperscript{187}

c. PCUA's Response

While the City of Paterson contended that the statutory language of the MCUAL confines the PCUA's power to collect solid waste fees only to the users of the service,\textsuperscript{188} the PCUA countered with the claim that the municipal utilities authorities have broad powers to assess fees under the MCUAL and that limitations on their powers should be construed liberally.\textsuperscript{189} Rather than requir-

\textsuperscript{182} See Airwick Indus., 57 N.J. at 122 (1970).
\textsuperscript{183} See id. at 121.
\textsuperscript{186} See id. at 469.
\textsuperscript{188} See id. at 29.
ing charges to be assessed only from present users, the statute contemplates assessing fees based on past use, according to PCUA’s interpretation.\textsuperscript{190} PCUA asserted that the language in the statute allowing assessments on owners or occupants of property “from or on which originates or has originated any solid waste”\textsuperscript{191} contemplates assessment of fees based on historical use.\textsuperscript{192} Since Paterson used the PCUA solid waste disposal system during the period that flow control was in effect, the PCUA claimed that it is empowered, by the clear and unambiguous language of the statute, to assess an EIC against the city based on historical use.\textsuperscript{193}

PCUA relied on recent case law to support its position that stranded utility costs can lawfully be allocated among constituents of a deregulated utility system.\textsuperscript{194} PCUA cited \textit{Wanaque Borough Sewerage Authority v. Township of West Milford},\textsuperscript{195} where the court held that planning costs of a failed regional sewerage authority could be allocated among the municipalities within the service area, despite the fact that certain municipalities never entered into a service contract with the authority.\textsuperscript{196} PCUA attempted to convince the court that the legal standards governing judicial review of utility rates are sufficiently flexible to ensure that practical sense and reason prevail. Practical sense and reason dictate that, in a post-\textit{Atlantic Coast} world, stranded debt costs be equitably allocated among the constituent municipalities of a solid waste district, irrespective of whether a municipality exercises its continued

\textsuperscript{190.} See \textit{id.} at 28.


\textsuperscript{193.} See \textit{id.}

\textsuperscript{194.} See \textit{id.} at 25. PCUA relies on \textit{Wanaque Borough Sewerage Auth. v. Tp. of W. Milford}, 144 N.J. 564 (1996) (holding that stranded costs of a failed regional authority were required to be equitably shared by the constituents.)
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\textsuperscript{196.} See \textit{id.} at 578.
right to use a county authority's solid waste system to dispose of its waste. 197

PCUA also relied on the publication of NJDEP's Guidance Document in Response to the May 1, 1997 Court Decision on Solid Waste Flow Control 198 as an indication of NJDEP's interpretation of the MCUAL. 199 PCUA urged the court to acknowledge the "presumptive correctness of an agency decision," especially when the subject matter is highly technical and specialized. 200 Furthermore, PCUA claimed that the fact that the EIC system has been proposed in a number of districts facing similar problems to the PCUA's is evidence of its reasonableness and effectiveness. 201

d. The Appellate Division's Decision

Unimpressed with the City of Paterson's argument that the EIC is an unauthorized tax, the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division held that the EIC satisfies the three criteria required by Section 22.1 of the MCUAL 202 for a charge to be considered a solid waste service charge, and not a tax. 203 The court identified the three criteria as follows: 1) The entity imposing the charge must be a municipal authority, as defined by the MCUAL; 2) the charge must be for authorized expenses; and 3) the charge must be "for use or service of a solid waste system." 204 None of the parties to the lawsuit contested that PCUA is a municipal authority. 205 The court analyzed Section 22.1 of the MCUAL and concluded that authorized expenses include both current operation and maintenance expenses, and debt service. 206 With respect to the third criterion, which authorizes service charges only for use of the system, the court held that the language of Section 22.1, that permits an authority to charge fees to any municipality from


200. Id.

201. See id.


203. See In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d at 332.

204. Id. at 331.
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which "originates or has originated any solid waste," contemplates charges for past use. In addition, the court held that the plaintiffs' interpretation of Section 33 of the MCUAL was incorrect, in that the statute only "establishes that a municipal authority and the public entity which established it are separate entities. It does not preclude a municipal authority from making adequate provision for payment of debt service." 

The Appellate Division also disregarded the City of Paterson's interpretation of related case law. The court held that the Airwick decision recognized two sources of revenue to pay for pollution control services: the current users of the system, and those properties where service is available but the potential user has not elected to utilize the service. The court construed Airwick in favor of the PCUA's position, stating that Airwick:

\[
\text{[P]rovides more support for the PCUA's position than plaintiffs' position because the decision is infused with the Court's recognition that the ordinary expenses of a utility authority are composed of current operating costs and the cost of the debt incurred to construct the facility as well as the recognition that a utility has the authority to equitably distribute the debt among actual users and potential users of the facility.} \]

According to the Appellate Division, Airwick allows an authority to distribute debt service over current and future users, and recognizes the need for an authority to cover debt that arises from cessation of pollution control activities. The court disposed of Ivan with little ceremony, stating that the case only addressed the illegality of forcing a non-user of a system to pay current operating expenses. Since debt service was not an issue, the holding was therefore distinguishable from the case at bar. The court, however, considered Wanaque directly on point, stating that the Wanaque court "recognized the need to fashion a remedy to equitably allocate the incurred ex-
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penses [of a failed regional sewer authority] to assure that the entire financial burden would not fall upon a small sector of the community." 216

5. Is the Deficiency Agreement Illegal?

Plaintiffs contended that the Deficiency Agreement entered into between the PCUA and Passaic County is unconstitutional and an illegal guarantee of the PCUA's debt. 217 According to the Deficiency Agreement, Passaic County will be required to contribute to debt service payments in the event the PCUA cannot raise sufficient revenues through the assessment of EICs. 218 The plaintiffs argued that the language of Section 33 of the MCUAL, which prevents the debt of a municipal authority from becoming the debt of the state or of a local unit, bars Passaic County from securing PCUA's debt in this manner. 219 The court disposed of this argument by construing Section 33 as "no more than a statutory recognition that the various entities authorized to issue debt are separate entities and that none of the other entities can be considered responsible for that debt." 220

Plaintiffs also contended that the Deficiency Agreement conferred a gift on holders of the $28 million dollars in bonds that were not guaranteed by Passaic County. 221 By providing security for these bonds, Passaic County removed the risk that the bondholders incurring when the bonds were originally purchased. 222 Since the bondholders provided no consideration for this benefit, which is provided by the taxpayers of Passaic County, the Deficiency Agreement violates the donation clause of the New Jersey Constitution. 223 The Appellate Division rejected this argument,

216. Id.


218. See In re Passaic County Utils. Auth. Petition, 728 A.2d at 335.
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223. See N.J. CONST. art. VIII, § 3, ¶¶ 2-3. These sections provide that:

2. No county, city, borough, town, township or village shall hereafter give any money or property, or loan its money or credit, to or in aid of any individual, association or corporation, or become security for, or be
based on the fact that Passaic County's bond rating will be damaged in the event that the PCUA defaults on its bonds. The court conceded that the ramifications of the PCUA's default on the bonds is merely speculative. However, the court questioned whether Passaic County "must experience a default and its ramifications before [taking] measures to avoid such an occurrence," noting that "[e]ven a temporary reluctance of private investors to purchase obligations of a Passaic County public entity may mean extra cost to taxpayers." Since the New Jersey Constitution does not prohibit a private benefit that is merely incidental, the court held that the Deficiency Agreement does not offend the New Jersey Constitution.

C. The Township of Galloway Challenge

This case arose under similar circumstances as the PCUA case. In 1992, the Atlantic County Utilities Authority (ACUA) sold approximately $87 million dollars in revenue bonds to finance the county solid waste system, resulting in annual debt service costs of $8.1 million dollars. The county trash disposal system includes a landfill for the disposal of bulky wastes, a solid waste transfer station, and a recycling center. Under New Jersey's flow control system, the ACUA anticipated sufficient revenue to cover its operating expenses and recoup the debt service on the solid waste facilities. As a result of the deregulation of the solid waste industry, the ACUA lost its monopoly over solid waste in Atlantic County and was forced to lower its tipping fee to remain competitive in the market. The tipping fee was dropped from $120.47 per ton to $52.50 per ton, which can no longer cover the

---

3. No donation of land or appropriation of money shall be made by the State or any county or municipal corporation to or for the use of any society, association or corporation whatever.
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facility's debt service. To make up the difference, the ACUA has imposed an EIC, which is assessed and billed to municipalities, homeowners, and business throughout Atlantic County.

On January 7, 1998, the ACUA applied to the LFB for approval of an EIC to be imposed on all property owners in Atlantic County. The application was approved on January 14, 1998. Thereafter, "[o]n March 10, 1998, the Atlantic County Board of Chosen Freeholders adopted an ordinance . . . to amend Atlantic County's solid waste management plan to allow the ACUA to impose an EIC." The method used to collect the EIC for residential waste depends on the type of garbage collection utilized by the municipalities within Atlantic County.

232. See id.
233. See id.
235. See id.
236. Id. at 10.
237. The method for assessing the EIC is described as follows:

The ACUA has assessed an EIC on property owners it determined to be generating non-residential waste in Atlantic County. These non-residential waste generators, as identified by the ACUA, received bills directly from the ACUA for an EIC based on an estimate by the ACUA of the amount of waste generated by the property owner. . . . The ACUA has also assessed an EIC allegedly based on the generation of residential waste in Atlantic County. The method used to collect the EIC for residential waste depends on the type of garbage collection in the municipalities in Atlantic County. Twenty of the twenty-three municipalities in Atlantic County provide for the collection of the residential waste generated by its residents. The ACUA sent bills for the 1998 EIC directly to each of these twenty municipalities. The amount of each municipality's EIC bill was based on the amount of residential waste generated within that municipality in 1995. The ACUA apparently maintained records that provided this data . . . pursuant to the waste flow regulations . . . . The remaining three municipalities in Atlantic County, Galloway, Mullica and Port Republic, do not provide garbage collection services to their residents. The residents in these municipalities must contract directly with the waste haulers for the collection of their waste. The ACUA sent bills directly to each of the residential property owners it identified in these three municipalities. Unlike the amount of waste generated in the twenty municipalities that provide garbage collection services to their residents, the ACUA does not know the amount of waste generated by each residential property. In calculating the EIC for residential property owners in the three municipalities in Atlantic County that do not provide municipal garbage collection services to its residents, the ACUA estimated the amount of waste generated by each property owner.

Id. at 10 - 11 (citations omitted).
The Township of Galloway filed suit to enjoin the ACUA from imposing the EIC charge.238 Pointing to the MCUAL,239 the plaintiffs claim that the ACUA lacks the authority to impose the EIC because the utilities authorities can only charge fees to users of their services.240 The Township of Galloway characterized the EIC as an unauthorized tax, and with respect to both users and non-users of the ACUA system, claims that it is illegal on its face.241

The Township of Galloway's action was originally filed in the Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division.242 After a preliminary ruling that the Superior Court had jurisdiction over the matter,243 the defendants moved to have the case transferred to the Appellate Division. On September 4, 1998, the court ruled that the Appellate Division had proper jurisdiction over the matter and the case was transferred.244 A determination on the merits is pending in the Appellate Division. It is certain that the Passaic County decision will control the final disposition of this challenge.

IV. Analysis

The powers of the municipal utilities authorities are limited by the enabling legislation under which they were formed.245 Arguments that the assessment of an EIC by a municipal utilities authority exceeds the power granted by statute are convincing despite the Appellate Division's disregard of this position. It is clear, according to the plain language of Section 40:14B-22.1 of the MCUAL, that agencies such as the PCUA and the ACUA can charge fees for the processing of solid waste delivered to their fa-
Assessment of an EIC, however, which is not based on any current use of a solid waste system, exceeds the power of a municipal utilities authority, absent a specific grant of authority by the New Jersey State Legislature. It is useful to compare the sections of the MCUAL respecting sewer service fees (40:14B-22) to the section regarding solid waste service fees (40:14B-22.1). While the two sections are similar, they are not identical and the difference is material to the issue of whether a municipal utility authority may assess an EIC. Under Section 40:14B-22.1, a municipal utility providing solid waste services may "charge and collect rents, rates, fees or other charges . . . for the use or services of the solid waste system. Such solid waste service charges may be charged to and collected from any municipality or any person contracting for such use or services." It is apparent from the language that fees are the only charges that can be assessed for the use or services of the solid waste system.

Alternatively, the New Jersey Legislature has granted the utilities authorities providing sewer services the authority to collect separate charges to assist the agency with the recovery of debt service costs. The statute allows the collection of a connection charge, which may reflect an amount representing debt service on the capital required to build the sewerage facilities. By specific grant of power, the Legislature has allowed a sewerage authority to assess charges for a purpose unrelated to the use of the sewer system. This language does not appear in the statute in connection with solid waste services. By including separate language in the part of the statute addressing sewer charges, the Legislature acknowledged that a specific grant of authority is necessary to collect a particular type of revenue.

Prior to the Appellate Division's decision in the City of Paterson case, there were no reported decisions construing a municipal utilities authority's powers under Section 40:14B-22.1 of the MCUAL respecting solid waste services. The Appellate Division analyzed several decisions related to the power of municipal utili-
ties authorities to charge fees for water and sewer services. However, in some cases, the court failed to fully consider the difference between sewer utilities and solid waste utilities. For example, in *Airwick Industries, Inc. v. Carlstadt Sewerage Authority*, the court held that, with respect to operation and maintenance costs of a sewer system, only the current users should be charged. On the other hand, all properties, where sewer service was available, were required to absorb the debt cost of constructing the facilities. The court held that even if the property was not actually connected to the system, the property could receive the benefit of enhanced property value due to the availability of sewer service. However, the court made clear that even with respect to debt costs, the statute does not authorize an immediate charge against a non-user of the system. The statute requires the application of the debt charge as a connection fee to be assessed when the property is actually connected to the sewer system.

Application of the *Airwick* rationale to solid waste is problematic because the availability of county solid waste disposal services to municipalities is not analogous to the availability of a sewerage system. Most notably, the absence of county solid waste treatment and disposal services does not result in the unavailability of those services to generators. There is a thriving and competitive private solid waste industry in New Jersey that does not exist in the wastewater arena. Therefore, the fact that solid waste disposal is available through the county does not increase the value of property in the county to any extent because those services could easily be provided by private entities. Since the EIC is a charge specifically to recover debt service, under *Airwick* these charges could only be assessed when there has been some corresponding enhancement to the value of property in the county. However, even if the *Airwick* rationale implicitly permits the imposition of solid waste service charges to recover debt, there is no precedent for the imposition of a debt service charge on non-users of an authority's disposal system. *Airwick* made clear that a municipal utility authority had no power to impose a charge until a person connected to the sewerage system.
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Similarly, in *Ivan v. Marlboro Township Municipal Utilities Authority*, the court held that those entities that do not use a utility system are in no way obligated to pay for operations, maintenance, or debt service, regardless of the benefits to their property resulting from the construction of the municipal system. In *Ivan*, the plaintiff used private wells on his property for potable water, but was billed by the municipal authority for a connection charge and an annual minimum water use charge. When plaintiff sued to restrain the utility from imposing the charge, the utility argued that the MCUAL permitted the charge because plaintiff's property benefited from the existence of the water utility. The court found that even though plaintiff's property benefited from the availability of the water system, only actual users were required to pay the utility fees. The court noted that users who come into the system late may be required to pay an increased tie-in charge to offset charges imposed on the first users of the system who paid for operating and maintenance costs as well as debt service, but not until they actually become users of the system.

In a contrary decision, *Wanaque Borough Sewerage Authority v. West Milford*, the court held the town of West Milford partially responsible for the payment of debt service charges incurred during the planning phases of a regional sewerage authority. However, the case can be distinguished from the situation faced by municipalities that are being assessed EICs because West Milford had utilized the information obtained during the planning phase of the regional sewerage authority to develop its own treatment system. If the municipalities that are being assessed EICs used the planning information of the municipal utilities authorities to develop their own solid waste treatment and disposal facilities, then they should pay part of the debt incurred to develop the information. Since a thriving private solid waste collection and disposal industry exists in New Jersey, it is unlikely that municipalities will construct their own facilities. Instead, most are likely to contract with private haulers who will transport solid waste.
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waste to their own transfer stations and landfills for final disposal.

The argument was raised that the NJDEP Guidance Document In Response to the May 1, 1997 Court Decision on Solid Waste Flow Control,266 which presumes the legality of assessing EICs267 somehow offers legal support for EICs.268 The NJDEP's authority with respect to economic issues under the SWMA is limited to ensuring that district plans for financing solid waste management are consistent with the goals of the Act.269 Section 13:1E-2(b)(6) states that district plans must include "a method or methods of financing solid waste management in the solid waste management district."270 The NJDEP cannot expand its role in economic issues beyond that which was expressly granted by the statute. Recognizing that its guidance document is not the final word on post-waste flow issues, the NJDEP states:

It must be stressed that solid waste management policy will continue to evolve over the weeks and months ahead as we collectively develop revised county plans into a comprehensive statewide mosaic. At this stage, it is not possible to predict the final outcome of each issue. Therefore, not all questions raised by the affected community and reflected in this document have complete answers at this time . . . .271

This statement begs for a legislative solution to the economic crisis facing New Jersey's solid waste authorities. Solid waste

---

266. Id. at 11-12. The language regarding EICs is as follows:
Question: What is the legal authority to impose an EIC? Answer: The legal authority to impose an EIC derives from each authority's enabling statutes. See N.J.S.A. 40:14B-1 et seq. (Mun. and County Util. Auth. Law); N.J.S.A. 40:37A-1 et seq. (County Improvement Auth. Law). In addition, the Local Finance Board has broad authority to order the imposition of fees and/or charges necessary for local government entities in financial difficulty to assure satisfaction of outstanding obligations (N.J.S.A. 40A:5A-18 & 19); and the DEP has broad authority over solid waste utility rates to ensure adequate and proper service, N.J.S.A. 48:13A-1 et seq.
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management has long been regarded by the Legislature as an environmental problem that warrants state-wide planning.\textsuperscript{272} It would be consistent with the state-wide solid waste planning approach for the Legislature to develop means by which the municipal utilities authorities could solve their debt crises in a manner that is equitable and generally applicable across the state.

Critics of EICs argue that they are unfair, because the tax burden is not distributed evenly throughout the tax base.\textsuperscript{273} Wealthier towns that can afford tax increases are spared under the EIC system because they produced less trash historically than more densely populated and poorer cities.\textsuperscript{274} The State should make funds available to help municipal utilities authorities and counties pay for their outstanding bond debt.\textsuperscript{275}

It is possible that the Legislature will choose not to pass legislation authorizing EICs. In 1998, legislation was introduced that would instead impose a tax on solid waste transporters and use the funds to reduce the debt on solid waste treatment and disposal facilities.\textsuperscript{276} This and similar proposals were rejected by the Legislature,\textsuperscript{277} but innovative solutions beyond EICs are possible.

There is also reason to expect that market forces may provide the answer for at least some of the New Jersey solid waste utilities authorities. New York City is required to close the Fresh Kills landfill on Staten Island by the end of 2001.\textsuperscript{278} One proposal to find an alternative site for New York solid waste involves transporting garbage from Queens and Manhattan to the solid waste transfer station operated by Bergen County Utilities Authority (BCUA).\textsuperscript{279} The transfer station has a daily capacity of 5,000 tons, but currently processes only 1,400 to 1,500 tons per day.\textsuperscript{280} BCUA has proposed assessing an EIC of $25.58 per ton to pay off its outstanding debt of $109 million dollars,\textsuperscript{281} but accepting New York
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City garbage could offset this amount considerably, providing the transfer station could be operated at closer to its full capacity. The Governor of New Jersey has reacted to this proposal negatively, citing traffic and other environmental concerns. Instead of finding reasons not to accept New York City garbage, the State should take the lead in directing New York City trash into underutilized New Jersey facilities, thereby reducing the debt that will need to be paid for by EICs or other means.

The City of Paterson filed a challenge to the ruling of the Appellate Division on May 19, 1999. The Supreme Court of New Jersey will have an opportunity to review the lower court's decision and provide a different interpretation of applicable statutory and decisional law. Despite the dire warnings of the debt-ridden authorities, the court should not succumb to the urge to provide a quick-fix in the form of an EIC.

V. Conclusion

The New Jersey Legislature is clearly aware of the situation faced by the utilities authorities, but has elected not to pass legislation authorizing the assessment of EICs, such as Assembly Bill No. 50. Rather than waiting for legislative authorization to assess an EIC, many authorities, including the PCUA and the ACUA, implemented EICs immediately. Regardless of the method chosen by the Legislature to resolve the current crisis, the ubiquity of the problem throughout the state requires a state-wide solution. While the Legislature is crafting this long-term solution, the counties are grasping at EICs to manage their debt crises. Despite the urgency of the situation and the desire of the counties to solve their immediate financial problems, an illegal and unfair solution such as EICs should not be tolerated.
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