



JON S. CORZINE
Governor

State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY
DIVISION OF LAW
25 MARKET STREET
PO Box 093
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0093

STUART RABNER
Attorney General

ROBERT J. GILSON
Director

February 23, 2007

Marcia M. Waldron, Clerk
United States Court of Appeals, Third Circuit
21400 United States Courthouse
601 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1790

Re: Petition for Review
State of New Jersey v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission and United States of America

Dear Ms. Waldron:


Enclosed for filing are original and 3 copies of petition for review of final guidance issued by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Also enclosed with this letter are a service list of respondents and parties and a certification of service of petition on the respondents and parties; a Representation Statement pursuant to F.R.A.P. 12(B); and a check for filing fee in the amount of \$450.00. Please be advised that this petition for review is identical to that filed on December 22, 2006, now docketed as 06-5140. As discussed in more detail in the enclosed petition, the December 22, 2006 filing may have been premature and the petition is now being refiled to meet jurisdictional requirements.

Kindly stamp a copy of the petition for review "FILED" and return it in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

STUART RABNER
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY

By: 
Kenneth W. Elwell
Senior Deputy Attorney General

Enclosures
c: All parties w/enclosures



UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,)
)
 Petitioner,)
)
 v.)
)
 UNITED STATES NUCLEAR)
 REGULATORY COMMISSION)
 and UNITED STATES OF)
 AMERICA,)
)
 Respondents.)

PETITION FOR REVIEW

The Nature of the Proceedings for Which Review is Sought

Pursuant to Rule 15 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, §2239(b) of the Atomic Energy Act, 42 U.S.C. 2239(b), and the Hobbs Act, 28 U.S.C. 2342 et seq., the State of New Jersey (State) hereby petitions the Court to review the determination of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to finalize revisions of NUREG-1757 guidance published by the NRC on its website on October 27, 2006 (<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/nuregs/staff/esr1757/>). The NRC's finalization of these revisions to NUREG-1757 was again announced in 71 Fed. Reg. 78284 on December 28, 2006.

The State, in response to the October 27, 2006 publication of the finalized NUREG-1757 on the NRC website, petitioned this Court for review on December 22, 2006. That petition for review was filed in order to comply with the 60 day time limit set forth in 42 U.S.C. §2344 and has been docketed by

this Court as No. 06-5140. The State has argued in its submission to the Court in No. 06-5140 that it was jurisdictionally appropriate for the State to have filed a petition for review in response to the October 27, 2006 NRC website publication. The NRC, in its own submission in No. 06-5140 has stated that "...due to the special circumstances present in this case, the NRC does not object to this Court finding that 'entry' of the NUREG for purposes of the Hobbs Act was the publication of the document on the agency's website" (footnote omitted). Nevertheless, since this Court may determine that the time for appeal was triggered by the December 28, 2006 Federal Register notice, the State is again filing this petition for review, which is identical to the petition in No. 06-5140.

The Facts on Which Venue is Based

28 U.S.C. 2343 establishes venue in the judicial circuit in which the petitioner resides. Petitioner State of New Jersey is in the Third Judicial Circuit. The NRC's NUREG 1757 guidance applies throughout the United States.

The Grounds on Which Relief is Sought

Petitioner State of New Jersey requests that this Court hold unlawful and set aside the NUREG-1757 guidance as arbitrary and capricious and otherwise contrary to law.

The NRC on November 17, 2006 determined to accept for technical and environmental review a decommissioning plan filed by

Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation, Inc., located in Newfield, New Jersey. 71 Fed. Reg. 66986. That decommissioning plan was drafted in accordance with and will be reviewed by the NRC in accordance with the NUREG-1757 guidance. The decommissioning plan proposes to permanently dispose of radioactive waste at the Shieldalloy facility located in a residential area of Newfield, New Jersey, creating a risk to public health, safety and the environment. Since the Shieldalloy wastes are long-lived nuclides, this risk will persist for billions of years.

The State participated as a party in the proceeding before the NRC by submitting timely comments dated December 28, 2005 on Draft NUREG-1757 Supplement 1. By publishing final revisions to NUREG-1757, the NRC has acted in a manner reviewable by this Court. 42 U.S.C. §2239, 28 U.S.C. §2342. Nevertheless, the NRC has to date not yet responded to the comments submitted.

The NUREG-1757 guidance conflicts with statutory and regulatory requirements, is arbitrary and capricious and lacks a reasoned basis in numerous respects, including but not limited to those described below. 5 U.S.C. 706; Citizen's Awareness Network v. NRC, 59 F.3d 284 (1st Cir. 1995). Petitioner State of New Jersey reserves the right to also raise issues raised by all the parties who commented on the guidance.

The NUREG-1757 guidance violates the Atomic Energy Act because that statute requires the NRC to utilize rules or

regulations when establishing a new license, when setting the terms and conditions of a new license and when setting forth the information an applicant for a license is required to submit. 42 U.S.C. §2232(a), 2233. Yet the NUREG-1757 guidance establishes a new NRC license, a long-term control license, which allows permanent restricted use disposal of radioactive wastes. NUREG-1757 Vol. 1 page 17-65; 71 Fed. Reg. 66986. Furthermore, NUREG-1757 conflicts with existing NRC decommissioning regulations which contemplate that once a site is decommissioned the NRC license is terminated. 10 C.F.R. §20.1003. NUREG-1757 envisions a long-term license which continues in perpetuity. The NRC admits that this was not contemplated under the license termination rule decommissioning regulations:

NRC licensing oversight for some sites could be permanent because the current sites are sites with uranium and thorium contamination. Although this NRC role was not envisioned under the LTR....SECY-03-0069 page 27 (Section 4.2.2).

NUREG-1757's requirement to provide dose assessments for only 1,000 years is based on decommissioning regulations at 10 C.F.R. §20.1401 NUREG-1757 Vol 1 page 17-88. 10 C.F.R. §20.1401 is only intended to apply to short-lived nuclides. 62 Fed. Reg. 39058, 39069, 39083 (July 21, 1997). Furthermore, the NRC is mandated to protect public health by the Atomic Energy Act, 42 U.S.C. §§2012(d), 2013(d), 2022(f)(3), 2099, 2111(b)(1)(A), 2113(b)(1)(A), 2114(a)(1), 2201(b). NUREG-1757 guidance fails to

achieve that statutory requirement by not requiring adequate controls, particularly for long-lived nuclides.

NUREG-1757 conflicts with the ALARA analysis for decommissioning a site. For sites that are being decommissioned, the regulations require residual radioactivity to be reduced to levels that are as low as reasonably achievable ("ALARA"). 10 C.F.R. §§20.1402, 20.1403(A), 20.1404(A)(3). ALARA is defined as

making every reasonable effort to maintain exposures to radiation as far below the dose limits in this part as is practical consistent with the purpose for which the licensed activity is undertaken, taking into account the state of technology, the economics of improvements in relation to benefits to the public health and safety, and other societal and socioeconomic considerations, and in relation to utilization of nuclear energy and licensed materials in the public interest. 10 C.F.R. §20.1003.

NUREG-1757 circumvents the ALARA analysis required by 10 C.F.R. §§20.1402, 20.1402(a) and 20.1404(a)(3). Specifically, NUREG-1757 states:

the Commission recognized that requiring absolute proof that institutional controls would endure over long periods of time would be difficult, and the commission did not intend to require this of licensees. Rather, the Statement of Considerations explained that institutional controls should be established with the objective of lasting 1000 years.
NUREG-1757 Vol. 1 page 23

NUREG-1757's mandate that modeling the durability of institutional controls beyond 1000 years is not required because the difficulty

involved is in direct conflict with the analysis required by the NRC's ALARA regulations.

NUREG-1757 underestimates the amount of financial assurance required by a licensee, thereby making permanent onsite disposal upon decommissioning under NUREG-1757 more attractive to licensees. NUREG-1757 claims that the licensee must provide sufficient financial assurance so that the licensee funds the long-term control of the site with no additional costs being passed on to a future site owner/licensee, even where a site contained long-lived nuclides. NUREG-1757 Vol. 1 pages 15-2 and 17-82. However, this reliance on financial assurance ignores the NRC conclusions that the amount of additional financial assurance required may likely be underestimated "because of uncertainties associates with the burial performance and potential releases of contamination, transport of contamination in the subsurface environment, cleanup costs of subsurface contamination, and future disposal costs." SECY-03-0069 page 3.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires federal agencies to conduct an environmental impact statement (EIS) for any "major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 42 U.S.C. §4332(2)(C). Specifically, NUREG-1757 establishes a new license called the long term control license, which allows decommissioning facilities to permanently dispose of their radioactive waste at the decommissioned facility.

NUREG-1757 Vol 1 page 17-65. NUREG-1757 provides various terms and conditions that a long term control license would provide, including required institutional and engineering controls. NUREG-1757 Vol 1 pages 17-65, 17-79 to 17-80. NUREG-1757 will increase the number of permanent radioactive waste disposal sites throughout the United States and multiply the risks such sites pose to health and the environment. NEPA requires that the environmental consequences of this agency policy be considered. The NRC's finalization of this guidance without having conducted an EIS is contrary to NEPA.


Relief Sought

Petitioner State of New Jersey requests that this Court set aside the NUREG-1757 guidance as arbitrary and capricious and otherwise contrary to law.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

STUART RABNER
Attorney General of New Jersey

By: 

Kenneth W. Elwell
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Andrew D. Reese
Deputy Attorney General
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street
P.O. Box 093
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 292-1401

Dated: February 23, 2007

SERVICE LIST

STATE OF NEW JERSEY V. U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY
COMMISSION AND UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Arden Scroggs, Supervisor Radioactive
Materials Section
WA Dept. of Health
P. O. Box 47827
Olympia, WA 98504-7827

Felix Gottdiener, CEC Env. Associate
Citizens' Environmental Coalition
543 Franklin St., Suite 2
Buffalo, NY 14202

Diane D'Arrigo, Nuclear Waste Project
Director
Nuclear Info and Resource Service
6930 Carroll Avenue, Suite 340,
Takoma Park, MD 20912

Steve Tarlton, Unit Leader
CO Department of Health & Radiation
Management Unit
4300 Cherry Creek Dr. S.
Denver CO 80246-1530

Oscar Paulson, Facility Supervisor
Kennecott Uranium Company
P.O. Box 1500
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301-1500

Jill Lipoti, Director
NJ Div. of Environmental Health & Safety
P.O. Box 424
Trenton, NJ 08625-0424

Jeff Deckler, Chair
ASTSWMO Radiation Focus Group
444 N. Capitol St. N.W., Suite 315
Washington, DC 20001

Richard Hill
Save the Valley, Inc.
P.O. Box 813
Madison, IN 47250

Gerard P. van Noordennen, Regulatory
Affairs Manager
CT Yankee Atomic Power Company
352 Injun Hollow Road
East Hampton, CT 06424-3099

Raymond C. Vaughan
Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Wastes
135 East Main Street
Hamburg, NY 14075

Barbara Younberg, Chief Radiation Section
NY Dept. of Environmental Conservation
Div. of Solid and Hazardous Materials
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-7255

James Lieberman, Regulatory and Nuclear
Safety Consultant
11804 Rosalinda Drive
Potomac, MD 20854

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

John Cordes, Solicitor
Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

Honorable Alberto Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Kathryn E. Kovacs
U.S. Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
Appellate Section
950 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W., Room 2143
P.O. Box 23795
Washington, DC 20026

Charles E. Mullins
Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

Oscar Paulson, Facility Supervisor
Kennecott Uranium Company
P.O. Box 1500
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301-1500

Jill Lipoti, Director
NJ Div. of Environmental Health & Safety
P.O. Box 424
Trenton, NJ 08625-0424

Jeff Deckler, Chair
ASTSWMO Radiation Focus Group
444 N. Capitol St. N.W., Suite 315
Washington, DC 20001

Richard Hill
Save the Valley, Inc.
P.O. Box 813
Madison, IN 47250

Gerard P. van Noordennen, Regulatory
Affairs Manager
CT Yankee Atomic Power Company
352 Injun Hollow Road
East Hampton, CT 06424-3099

Raymond C. Vaughan
Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Wastes
135 East Main Street
Hamburg, NY 14075

Barbara Younberg, Chief Radiation Section
NY Dept. of Environmental Conservation
Div. of Solid and Hazardous Materials
625 Broadway
Albany, NY 12233-7255

James Lieberman, Regulatory and Nuclear
Safety Consultant
11804 Rosalinda Drive
Potomac, MD 20854

Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001


John Cordes, Solicitor
Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
One White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852

Honorable Alberto Gonzales
Attorney General of the United States
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Kathryn E. Kovacs
U.S. Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
Appellate Section
P.O. Box 23795
Washington, DC 20026

Charles E. Mullins
Office of the General Counsel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

I certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are wilfully false, I am subject to punishment.


DIANNE DAVIS

Dated: February 23, 2007