

Janda, Donna

FSM/E

From: Taylor, Torre
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2009 5:14 PM
To: Janda, Donna
Subject: voice message
Attachments: RE: SECY paper and staff analysis of public comments

got your message; thanks. if you go to ADAMs ML091940200, it has Duncan's concurrence and his concurrence for Terry as of today. He's been reading some of the changes along the way and I pointed out the more substantial paragraph changes.

With that, attached is an edit review from Aaron - I had waiting for me. I have not looked through it in detail (and boy that track changes is hard to read). I'll be reading it in the morning. (b)(5)
(b)(5) you should probably look through it quickly too. Some of it is "boiler plate" that was in Monica's and I think in the procedure - I checked some things I didn't particularly like.

EX-5

See if anything affects you. Joan has a copy of it too. I sent it to her so she'll have a nice present in the morning.

Torre
torre.taylor@nrc.gov
301-415-7900

9/27

Received: from TWMS01.nrc.gov (148.184.200.145) by R1MS01.nrc.gov
(148.184.99.10) with Microsoft SMTP Server (TLS) id 8.1.358.0; Wed, 29 Jul
2009 17:14:14 -0400
Received: from HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov ([148.184.44.77]) by TWMS01.nrc.gov
([148.184.200.145]) with mapi; Wed, 29 Jul 2009 17:14:14 -0400
Content-Type: application/ms-tnef; name="winmail.dat"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary
From: "Taylor, Torre" <Torre.Taylor@nrc.gov>
To: "Janda, Donna" <Donna.Janda@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, 29 Jul 2009 17:14:12 -0400
Subject: voice message
Thread-Topic: voice message
Thread-Index: AcoQkYT1XNj/fqmETaq02wwnJkqMfA==
Message-ID:
<C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E71FBC778AC1@HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov>
Accept-Language: en-US
Content-Language: en-US
X-MS-Has-Attach: yes
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL: -1
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
<C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E71FBC778AC1@HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Return-Path: Torre.Taylor@nrc.gov

Janda, Donna

From: McCraw, Aaron
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2009 2:10 PM
To: Taylor, Torre; Sollenberger, Dennis
Cc: White, Duncan
Subject: RE: SECY paper and staff analysis of public comments
Attachments: rev 2 July 28 2009 enclosure public comment analysis NJ agreement.doc

Torre and Dennis,

Attached is my input on the comment resolution document. I may have even touched a little on content (you know, there were certain things I couldn't help but notice when I was looking at everything else). Hope it meets all your expectations. Let me know if you have any questions. I'll jump into the staff assessment now.

-Aaron

From: Taylor, Torre
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2009 1:31 PM
To: Olmstead, Joan; Janda, Donna
Cc: Sollenberger, Dennis; McCraw, Aaron
Subject: SECY paper and staff analysis of public comments
Importance: High

Attached are the revisions to the SECY paper and the public comment analysis. I copied them out of ADAMs, made it a clean version, and then did a new "track changes" version based on conversations and decisions from this morning. Again, I have not read it clean myself yet - there may still be some edits. We're having Aaron review it too which will help out.

Aaron, you just need to read the document, "rev 2 July 28 2009 enclosure public comment...." The SECY will go through Cathy Poland/Patty Tressler. We are looking for extra spaces, not enough spaces, inconsistency in terms/abbreviations, and such.

Joan and I discovered that if you all make changes and send it back to me, I am not seeing the different color if you used one. Unless one of you can tell me how to fix that, could you please some how mark where the changes are - maybe just insert a comment so I can see a change was made.

I will take another look after our branch meeting. then I will start working on the NRC Staff Assessment.

Thanks -
Torre
torre.taylor@nrc.gov
301-415-7900

ENCLOSURE 2

STAFF ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

**STAFF ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC COMMENTS
ON THE PROPOSED NEW JERSEY AGREEMENT**

Commenter	Affiliation	ADAMs Accession Number
Julia Schmitt, Chair	Organization of Agreement States	ML091680374
Anonymous	No known affiliation	ML091680375
Hoy E. Frakes, Jr	President, Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation	ML091700382 and ML091680491
Loretta Williams	No known affiliation	ML091680387
James Lieberman	Regulatory and Nuclear Consultant	ML091810997
Gregory R. Reinhard, MBA, DVM	Merck & Co., Inc.	ML091900370

INTRODUCTION

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff received six comment letters in response to a public notice that the Governor of New Jersey has requested to enter into an Agreement with the Commission under Section 274b₂ of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. NRC received comments from the Organization of Agreement States (OAS), two members of the public, a regulatory and nuclear consultant, and two NRC licensees from the State of New Jersey. Two commenters supported the Agreement, two commenters opposed the Agreement, and one commenter did not state their opinion. The remaining commenter supported the rationale whereby States can assume regulatory authority; however, was not supportive of the difference in administrative fees for radioactive materials licenses between New Jersey and NRC. A summary of the comments received and NRC's response is provided below.

The agency published the notice in the *Federal Register* (FR) on May 27, 2009; June 3, 2009; June 10, 2009; and June 17, 2009. The notice contained a copy of the proposed Agreement and a summary of NRC staff's draft assessment of the proposed New Jersey Agreement State Program. The *Federal Register* Notice requested comments in four categories: (1) the proposed Agreement, (2) the NRC Staff Assessment of the New Jersey Agreement State Program, (3) the adequacy of the New Jersey Agreement State Program, and (4) the adequacy of the New Jersey Agreement State Program staff.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AGREEMENT

Comments Supporting the Agreement

Summary of Comments

1. The Organization of Agreement States (OAS) strongly supports the Agreement between NRC and the State of New Jersey. The OAS letter stated that the OAS is committed to the improvement of radiation regulation nationwide, and to fostering a cooperative and productive partnership among Agreement States with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and with other Federal, State and Local agencies involved in the regulation of radioactive materials.
2. A member of the public, Loretta Williams, expressed her support for the Agreement between NRC and the State of New Jersey. Ms. Williams indicated that she has been involved as a member of the public related to the decommissioning of an NRC-licensed facility in her community. She believes that the State's regulatory program will protect the health and welfare of the residents of the community by enforcing a complete cleanup of the radioactive waste by requiring the waste to be shipped off-site to a licensed waste facility.

NRC Staff Response

The comments support NRC staff's plan to complete the NRC Staff Assessment documenting that the Commission's criteria for entering into an Agreement are satisfied, and then to request the Commission's approval of the proposed Agreement with the State of New Jersey.

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on these comments.

Formatted: Underline
Deleted: :
Formatted: Left
Deleted: The
Deleted: 6
Deleted: proposed
Deleted: The
Deleted: ;
Deleted: ;
Deleted: ;
Deleted: located within
Deleted: either way
Deleted: s
Deleted: ,
Deleted: the
Deleted: p
Deleted: p
Deleted: p
Deleted: p

Comment [A1]: Unless it's a direct quote I would avoid using this term. It makes it appear as though we are making an interpretation and speaking on behalf of OAS.
Deleted: the
Comment [A2]: This looks more like an OAS mission statement than a quote supporting the NJ Agreement State Program.
Deleted: ,
Deleted: , at
Deleted: :
Deleted: the
Deleted: ,
Deleted: that
Deleted: to
Deleted: e
Deleted: State
Comment [A3]: Not sure what the intent of this sentence is. It doesn't say anything that hasn't already been said or implied. Suggest deletion.
Deleted: These comments are consistent with the Commission's process for approval of an Agreement.

Comments Opposing the Agreement

Summary of Comments

1. A member of the public did not approve of the Federal government giving regulatory authority of this Agency to the State of New Jersey for this radioactive material. This individual preferred that the Federal government keep regulatory authority, commenting that while the Federal government is corrupt, New Jersey government is more corrupt.

NRC Staff Response

This individual did not provide any specific reasons regarding his/her belief that New Jersey government is corrupt. The individual did not provide any information that caused the staff to reassess the original assessment of the proposed New Jersey Agreement State Program.

Deleted: regulatory program

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

2. Shieldalloy Metallurgical Corporation (SMC) submitted comments opposing the proposed Agreement with the State of New Jersey. SMC generally commented that NRC should not approve New Jersey's application to become an Agreement State because New Jersey's regulatory program fails to meet the NRC's Compatibility Criteria or implementation standards described in the Commission's Statement of Policy, "Discontinuance of NRC Authority and Assumption Thereof by States through Agreement," (46 FR 7540, January 21, 1981; 48 FR 33376, July 21, 1983) (the Statement of Policy). SMC further commented that, if New Jersey became an Agreement State, NRC should retain authority over SMC's facility in Newfield, New Jersey. NRC addresses SMC's specific comments below.

Deleted: (NJ)

Deleted: deny

Deleted: c

Deleted: c

A. General Comment

SMC commented that the New Jersey Program fails to meet NRC's Compatibility Criteria. SMC stated it sent NRC their public comments submitted to New Jersey on July 18, 2008, during the public comment period on the State's proposed regulations. SMC criticized NRC for not referencing or addressing SMC's comments. In these comments, SMC said they pointed out the inconsistency between New Jersey's regulatory framework and those of NRC. SMC states that the NRC staff's assessment of the New Jersey program application is incomplete and, in part, erroneous and must be substantially revised to recognize the incompatibility of the New Jersey Program with NRC's program.

Deleted: The New Jersey Program Fails to Meet the NRC's Compatibility Criteria

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Deleted: :

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Deleted: the

Deleted: 's

NRC Staff Response

In reviewing a State's proposed regulations, the NRC does not evaluate public comments that a State receives during its public comment period on its proposed regulations. NRC reviews the State's final regulations when it assesses the Agreement State application.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

Deleted: :

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

During the application process, NRC reviews a State's radiological program to ensure that it is compatible with the NRC's regulatory program and adequate to protect public health and safety from radiation hazards. NRC staff reviews the State's application in

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

accordance with: (1) the Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs (FSME) Procedure SA-700, "Processing an Agreement," and (2) the Statement of Policy. The Statement of Policy describes the criteria that a State must meet in order to enter into an Agreement with NRC.

NRC reviewed New Jersey's final regulations and found that the State's proposed regulatory program is adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's regulatory program.

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

B. Specific Comments

j. SMC stated that New Jersey's regulations for the control of radioactive materials are invalid because they were not adopted in accordance with the procedural requirements of New Jersey's Administrative Procedures Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 et seq. SMC's bases for asserting the regulations are invalid were: (1) New Jersey failed to conduct a proper Federal Standards Analysis, as required by State law; (2) New Jersey failed to analyze and minimize the adverse economic impacts of its proposal to become an Agreement State, as required by New Jersey's Regulatory Flexibility Act; and (3) New Jersey's modification of the final rule to apply to "all persons" was a substantial change requiring notice and comment under the State's Administrative Procedures Act.

NRC Staff Response

SMC's comments express their concern that New Jersey failed to comply with State laws when enacting its regulations. NRC does not have the authority to evaluate whether a State complied with its State laws when enacting its regulations. NRC does review the State's statutory authority and administrative procedures for promulgating regulations to ensure there is public participation in the rulemaking process. Questions regarding whether a State complied with State law when promulgating their regulations should be addressed through the State's administrative process.

NRC reviewed New Jersey's statutory provisions and determined that the State had adequate authority to establish a radiation regulatory program and enter into an Agreement. In particular, State Statute N.J.S.A. 26:2D-7 provides the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection authority for the promulgation of codes, rules, or regulations, stating that "the commission shall have the power to formulate, adopt, promulgate, amend and repeal codes, rules and regulations as may be necessary to prohibit and prevent unnecessary radiation in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act." NRC further reviewed the State's Administrative Procedures Act and found that New Jersey has extensive requirements in N.J.S.A. 52:14B-2, B-3, B-4, and B-22, including a public comment process and opportunity for hearing.

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

ji. SMC commented that the New Jersey regulations differ from the radiological criteria for license termination in 10 CFR Part 20 in many significant respects, which

- Deleted: - SA-700
- Deleted: "Discontinuance of NRC Authority and Assumption Thereof by States through Agreement," (46 FR 7540, January 21, 1981; 48 FR 33376, July 21, 1983)
- Deleted: is
- Deleted: (SMC specific comments also refer to the criteria described in this Statement of Policy). ¶
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"
- Deleted: the
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"
- Deleted: <#>The Regulations issued by NJDEP are Invalid¶
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"
- Deleted: the
- Deleted: .
- Deleted: . (APA)
- Deleted: examples
- Deleted: s ..
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
- Deleted: s
- Deleted: (NJDEP)
- Deleted: [T]
- Deleted: "
- Deleted: (APA)
- Deleted: under the APA
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", Hanging: 0.06"
- Deleted: <#>The NJ Program Fails to Satisfy Compatibility Criterion 9 in that it sets Release Criteria that Differ from Those in 10 CFR Part 20 ¶
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"
- Deleted: in violation of

opposes Compatibility Criterion 9. SMC gave several examples where they believe that New Jersey regulations differ from NRC regulations, such as:

(1) the maximum allowable total dose to a member of the public of 15 mrem/year versus 25 mrem/year in NRC's regulations, (2) failure to include implementation of the "as low as reasonably achievable" (ALARA) principle, (3) failure to include provisions for restricted release, (4) allowing calculation of peak dose over 1,000 years, (5) failure to allow for more than 100 mrem total effective dose equivalent under any circumstances, and (6) requiring that the radioactivity releases to ground and surface waters be limited to the levels set by the New Jersey Ground Water And Surface Water Standards.

Deleted: ;
Deleted: ;
Deleted: ;
Deleted: ;
Deleted: ;
Deleted: s

NRC Staff Response

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

NRC reviews State regulatory requirements to ensure they are compatible with the NRC program and will provide for adequate to protect public health and safety. NRC establishes the compatibility level for each NRC regulation and program element according to FSME Procedure SA-200, "Compatibility Categories and Health and Safety Identification for NRC Regulations and Other Program Elements," and reviews Agreement State programs according to the Handbook for NRC Management Directive 5.9, "Adequacy and Compatibility of Agreement State Programs." A regulation's compatibility designation determines how much flexibility a State has in adopting a specific regulation while maintaining compatibility with NRC's program.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
Deleted: regulatory

Deleted: the Office of Federal and State Materials and Environmental Management Programs (

Deleted:)

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Deleted: - SA-200

Deleted: Handbook

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Deleted:

"Statement of Principles and Policy for the Agreement State Program: Policy Statement on Adequacy and Compatibility of Agreement State Programs, Final Policy Statement" (62 FR 46517, 46524-46525, September 3, 1997) (the Policy Statement) explains that Agreement States have "flexibility in program implementation to accommodate individual State preferences, State legislative direction, and local needs and conditions. ... [T]hat is, a State would have the flexibility to design its own program, including incorporating more stringent, or similar, requirements provided that the requirements for adequacy are still met and compatibility is maintained, and the more stringent requirements do not preclude or effectively preclude a practice in the national interest without an adequate public health and safety or environmental basis related to radiation protection."

Deleted: and still being found compatible

Deleted: regulatory

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: The

Deleted:

Deleted: Policy Statement, at 46520, column 2.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

The Policy Statement goes on to state that an Agreement State radiation control program is compatible with NRC's regulatory program when its "program does not create conflicts, duplications, gaps, or other conditions that would jeopardize an orderly pattern in the regulation of agreement material on a nationwide basis." NRC developed Compatibility Categories to designate how much flexibility a State would have when adopting a specific regulatory provision. NRC assigns a Compatibility Category to each NRC regulation. The Compatibility Categories vary from requiring the State standards to be essentially identical to NRC standards to program elements not required, or even prohibited, for State adoption. In particular, Compatibility Category "C" regulations do not require that the State be essentially identical to the NRC standards. Compatibility Category "C" regulations allow more flexibility but require the Agreement State program elements to embody the essential objective(s) of the corresponding NRC program elements.

Deleted: A

Deleted: the

Deleted: "

Deleted: Policy Statement at 46524.

Deleted: c

Deleted: ; Agreement State

Deleted: should

(b)(5)

EX-5

SMC commented that the New Jersey program fails to satisfy Compatibility Criterion 9. While Compatibility Criterion 9 applies to disposal of low-level waste, SMC examples are regulations in the "License Termination Rule," in Subpart E of 10 CFR Part 20: The final License Termination Rule was noticed in the *Federal Register* on July 21, 1997 (62 FR 39058). The compatibility designation of this rule is addressed in the Statements of Consideration for the final rule, in Section F.1, "State and NRC Compatibility," in the comment resolution. NRC originally designated the License Termination Rule as a Division 2 Rule. Subsequently, NRC developed the Policy Statement and reclassified the License Termination Rule as Compatibility Category "C." As previously discussed, the Policy Statement explained that Compatibility Category "C" designates program elements "that are important for an Agreement State to have in order to avoid conflicts, duplications, gaps, or other conditions that would jeopardize an orderly pattern in the regulation of agreement material on a nation wide basis. Such Agreement State program elements should embody the essential objective of the corresponding Commission program elements."

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
 Deleted:
 Deleted: (LTR)
 Deleted: (SOC)
 Deleted: The rule was assigned a compatibility level that is essentially equivalent to the current designation of Compatibility C.

NRC assigned the License Termination Rule as Compatibility Category "C" because the rule addresses basic principles of radiation safety and regulatory functions that allow a State to establish regulations and dose limits for license termination and decommissioning that provide a sufficient and ample margin of safety and to ensure compliance with the public dose limits of 10 CFR Part 20. The Statements of Consideration for the License Termination Rule also stated that "[T]he States would be required to adopt the regulation but would have significant flexibility in language, and would be allowed to adopt more stringent requirements."

Deleted: NRC originally designated the LTR as a Division 2 rule. Subsequently, NRC developed the Policy Statement and reclassified the LTR as Compatibility Category "C."
 Deleted: The
 Deleted: was assigned
 Deleted: designation
 Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
 Deleted: Radiological Criteria for License Termination, Final Rule 62 FR 39058, 39080 (July 21, 1997).
 Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Some of New Jersey's license termination regulations are more stringent than NRC regulatory requirements. Using the above criteria, NRC's assessment of New Jersey's regulations found the State's license termination and decommissioning regulations compatible since they meet the essential objectives of the NRC program elements and provide a level of protection of public health and safety that is at least equivalent to that afforded by NRC's requirements.

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

iii. SMC commented that New Jersey's regulations fail to meet Compatibility Criterion 12 because the regulations do not provide the State the ability to grant necessary exceptions to the regulatory standards that do not jeopardize health and safety in individual cases. SMC provided four examples in which it states that New Jersey's regulations fail to comply with Criterion 12: (1) no consideration of alternate remediation standards that would increase the allowed incremental dose criterion of 15 mrem/yr, (2) no consideration of alternate remediation standards if they would result in doses exceeding 100 mrem/yr for an "all controls fail" scenario, (3) New Jersey's regulations require that the calculations of doses from radiological decommissioning use only tables of parameters based on specific exposure scenarios, and (4) New Jersey's regulations allow no credit for any engineering controls when determining if the 100 mrem annual dose is exceeded. SMC stated that New Jersey's regulations provide no justification for requiring stricter remediation standards than those provided by NRC, or for not allowing licensees to apply the Federal standards when appropriate. For these reasons, SMC believes that New Jersey's regulations are incompatible with the NRC regulatory framework.

Deleted: <#>The NJ Program fails to Satisfy Compatibility Criterion 12 ¶
 Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"
 Deleted:
 Deleted: the

NRC Staff Response

State Regulation N.J.A.C. 7:28-2.8 allows the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, upon application and a showing of hardship or compelling need, with the approval of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Commission, to grant an exemption from any requirement of the rules should it determine that such exemption will not result in any exposure to radiation in excess of the limits permitted by N.J.A.C. 7:28-6, "Standards for protection against radiation." This regulation satisfies Compatibility Criterion 12.

- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
- Deleted: The
- Deleted: r
- Deleted: ,
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: fulfills

SMC's examples are based on the State's regulations that are compatible with NRC's License Termination Rule. As discussed in the previous response, these regulations are Compatibility Category "C." States have flexibility in meeting the essential objectives of these NRC program elements. NRC's assessment of New Jersey's regulations found the State's license termination and decommissioning regulations compatible by meeting the essential objectives of the NRC program elements. New Jersey's regulations also provide a level of protection of public health and safety that is at least equivalent to that afforded by NRC requirements.

- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
- Deleted: "

SMC also commented that New Jersey's regulations are in conflict with NRC guidance. NRC guidance is not a regulatory requirement and is not legally binding. NRC develops guidance documents to assist licensees in meeting regulatory requirements. NRC does not require State regulations to be consistent with NRC guidance documents.

- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

iv. SMC commented that the New Jersey Program fails to meet Compatibility Criterion 17, which requires licensees to provide access to inspectors. SMC states that the State Statute N.J.S.A. 26:2D-1 et seq, does not authorize inspections without either consent of the licensee or an order. SMC concludes that the New Jersey regulation purporting to authorize warrantless inspections, in 7:28-4.14, lacks an adequate legal basis in New Jersey law.

- Deleted: <#>The NJ Program Fails to Satisfy Compatibility Criterion 17 ¶
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"
- Deleted: Radiological
- Deleted: NRC's

NRC Staff Response

Compatibility Criterion 17 requires that a State have authority such that licensees shall be under obligation by law to provide access to inspectors. NRC reviewed New Jersey's regulations and legislative authority to ensure this authority was in place. New Jersey's inspectors general authority to "enter and inspect a building or place for the purpose of investigating an actual or suspected source of pollution of the environment and ascertaining compliance and non-compliance with any codes, rules, or regulations of the Department," under N.J.S.A. 13:1D-9(d). In addition, the Radiation Protection Act has a similar provision to allow New Jersey's inspectors to, "[e]nter and inspect any building or place for the purpose of investigating an actual or suspected source of radiation and ascertaining compliance with this act or any rule, regulation or order promulgated or issued pursuant thereto and inspect radiation sources, their shielding and immediate surroundings, and records concerning their operation for the determination of any possible radiation hazard."

- Deleted: NJ statute, in the Radiation Protection Act,
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: and
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
- Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
- Deleted: NJDEP has
- Deleted: ,
- Deleted: the NJDEP
- Deleted: :
- Deleted: E
- Deleted: N.J.S.A. 26-2D-9(j).

Based on these legislative provisions, NRC concluded that New Jersey has adequate legislative authority and can implement regulations to satisfy Compatibility Criterion 17.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
Deleted: meet

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

v. SMC commented that many of New Jersey's regulations are aimed specifically and uniquely at SMC's Newfield site, and provided several examples to support their comment. SMC stated that New Jersey acknowledged in its response to SMC comments on the State's proposed regulations that the stand-alone limits on radioactive releases to the surface waters affect only one facility in the State. SMC believes that this acknowledgment, coupled with the more stringent license termination provisions, demonstrates that New Jersey's regulations qualify as "special legislation" because it appears to apply only to the Newfield site. SMC claims the regulations are to prevent SMC from disposing of the licensed materials on site for license termination and decommissioning. SMC comments that the State violated the New Jersey State Constitution, art. IV § 7, ¶ 7, which provides that "[n]o general law shall embrace any provision of a private, special or local character," See also, Phillips v. Curiale, 128 N.J. 608, 627 (1992). For these reasons, SMC concludes the New Jersey Program fails to meet Compatibility Criterion 23 for fair and impartial administration of regulatory law and particularly does not formulate "rules of general applicability" but its decommissioning rules are, instead, single-purpose legislation aimed exclusively at SMC.

Deleted: <#>The NJ Program Fails to Satisfy Compatibility Criterion 23 ¶
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"
Deleted: the
Deleted: the
Deleted: The stand-alone limits on radioactive releases to the surface waters affect only "one facility in the State," as NJ acknowledged in their response to SMC public comments on the State's proposed regulations.
Deleted: response
Deleted: SMC facility
Deleted: p

NRC Staff Response

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Compatibility Criterion 23 is related to State practices for assuring the fair and impartial administration of regulatory law, including the provision for public participation where appropriate. The specific requirements under Compatibility Criterion 23 are that the State incorporates procedures for:

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

(1) formulation of rules of general applicability, (2) approving or denying applications for licenses or authorization to possess and use radioactive materials, and (3) taking disciplinary actions against licensees.

Deleted: incorporate
Deleted: ;
Deleted: ;

SMC's comments express their concern that New Jersey failed to comply with State laws when enacting its regulations. As stated in the response to SMC Specific Comment B.i., NRC does not have the authority to evaluate whether a State complied with its State laws when enacting its regulations. NRC does review the State's statutory authority and administrative procedures for promulgating regulations to ensure there is public participation in the rulemaking process. NRC found New Jersey's statutory authority and regulations provided adequate procedures for the formulation of rules of general applicability. Questions regarding whether a State complied with State law when promulgating their regulations should be addressed through the State's administrative process.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
Deleted: 1

To meet NRC's obligation under the Act, NRC reviews and determines that the State's program is adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's program. Agreement States must have a regulatory program in place that will cover all types of uses of the radioactive material or activities that a State assumes regulatory authority over in their Agreement. NRC requires the States to have this

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
Deleted: regulatory
Deleted: the
Deleted: regulatory

regulatory program in place even if there is only one licensee in the State currently licensed for a specific radioactive material or activity.

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

vi. SMC commented that the New Jersey Program fails to satisfy Compatibility Criterion 25 in that New Jersey has not sought to make "appropriate arrangements" with the NRC to ensure there will be no interference with the processing of license applications by reason of the transfer. SMC stated that they filed a proposed decommissioning plan, which is currently under review by NRC, and claims that instead of ensuring the smooth processing of the decommissioning plan, New Jersey has opposed it at every opportunity. SMC examples of New Jersey's interference include: (1) the State's requesting a hearing, and raising numerous contentions against approval of the SMC decommissioning plan at the Newfield site; and (2) New Jersey's challenging in court NRC's decommissioning guidance in NUREG-1757, "Consolidated Decommissioning Guidance," and filing a petition for rulemaking with NRC to rescind the NRC guidance document.

NRC Staff Response

Compatibility Criterion 25 addresses the transition between NRC and the State to ensure that there will be no interference with or interruption of licensed activities or the processing of license applications by reason of the transfer. The intent of this Compatibility Criterion is to ensure that licensees can continue to operate without interference with or interruption of licensed activities after the effective date of the Agreement.

NRC's review confirmed that State Statute N.J.S.A. 26:2D-9(k) contains a provision that provides for recognition of existing NRC and Agreement State licenses. NJDEP BER Procedure 3.08, "License Transition from NRC to New Jersey," addresses the transfer of NRC licenses to the State. Upon completion of the Agreement, all active NRC licenses issued to facilities in New Jersey will be recognized as New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection licenses. This will ensure a smooth transition in authority from NRC to New Jersey so that licensees can continue to operate without interference with or interruption of licensed activities. New Jersey will continue any licensing actions that are in progress at the time of the Agreement and make the final decision on all pending licensing actions. Furthermore, since NRC would relinquish its regulatory authority over the radioactive materials covered by the proposed Agreement, NRC would not have jurisdiction to continue licensing actions that were in progress at the time the Agreement would go into effect.

NRC recognizes that New Jersey has taken several actions to challenge SMC's proposed decommissioning plan and NRC's decommissioning guidance document. NRC regulations at 10 CFR Part 2 provide for the opportunity for hearings on licensing actions and allows petitions for rulemaking. As such, New Jersey is entitled to take these actions.

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

vii. SMC commented that the New Jersey Program will not be found to be "satisfactory" in subsequent periodic reviews of the State program. SMC commented that NRC

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: <#>The NJ Program Fails to Satisfy Criterion 25 ¶

Deleted: p

Deleted: NRC

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"

Deleted:

Deleted: the

Deleted: , facility

Deleted: .

Deleted: also

Deleted: ed

Deleted: the

Deleted: [NUERG-1757,

Deleted:]

Deleted: ed

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75", Hanging: 0.53"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: c

Deleted: The

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Comment [A5]: Spell out

Deleted: will

Deleted: be

Deleted: ing

Deleted: NJ

Deleted: with NJ goes

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: s

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: <#>The New Jersey Radiation Protection Program is not Satisfactory Under the NRC Implementation Standards ¶

Deleted: p

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"

Deleted: NRC

Deleted: Under the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP), NRC verifies that Agreement State programs continue to be adequate to protect public health and safety and compatit ... [1]

would not find the New Jersey program "satisfactory" under the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) evaluation criteria because: (1) the numerous existing inconsistencies between New Jersey's regulations and NRC's regulation; (2) New Jersey's regulations being applicable to "all persons" would create duplication with NRC regulations because it would cover persons remaining licensed by the NRC; (3) New Jersey's regulations would supersede NRC's decommissioning dose limits for NRC reactor licensees; and (4) New Jersey lacks statutory authority for all elements of its source material program, giving the example of a difference between "radioactive materials," as defined in NRC's regulations, and "sources of radiation" that the New Jersey statute authorizes the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection to regulate. SMC believes NRC's definition includes additional safety aspects related to source material that are not covered under the New Jersey statute.

Deleted: NRC
Deleted: R
Deleted: the
Deleted: the
Deleted: The

SMC also commented that while considering a State program against the IMPEP standards prior to entering an Agreement is a "discretionary adjunct to the evaluation process, there should be no obvious issues at the time the Agreement is implemented that would be found to lead to program unacceptability when the NRC performs its first inspection. Such obvious issues are well in evidence in the New Jersey program."

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
Deleted: a

NRC Staff Response

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

SMC refers to NRC's Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) evaluation criteria in Management Directive 5.6, "Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program." Under IMPEP, NRC verifies that Agreement State programs continue to be adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's program. SMC's comment is that New Jersey's existing regulations are not compatible with the NRC regulatory framework. Compatibility of regulations and the specific compatibility of New Jersey's regulations were discussed in detail in the response to SMC Specific Comment B.ii., above. Again, NRC has determined that New Jersey's regulations will provide adequate protection of public health and safety and are compatible with NRC's program.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
Comment [A6]: Inspections of Agreement State programs?!? Shame on whoever wrote this!

Deleted: for inspections of Agreement State programs
Deleted: The IMPEP procedures are detailed in Management Directive 5.6, "Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program." Under the IMPEP program, NRC evaluates many areas of an Agreement State program, with the compatibility of regulations being a part of that evaluation.

SMC commented the New Jersey's regulations applying to "all persons" will be duplicative because it will include NRC licensees. Agreements under Section 274b of the Atomic Energy Act do not give States regulatory authority over NRC licensees. States can only assume regulatory authority over radioactive materials or activities specified in their Agreement. For example, under the Agreement, New Jersey will not have regulatory authority over nuclear reactors. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, requires that nuclear power reactors be regulated by NRC. State Statute N.J.S.A. 26:2D-91 provides authority for Agreements with Federal government and assumption of regulatory authority by the State to regulate sources of radiation. State Statute N.J.A.C. 7:28-6.1(b), specifically states that "The Department does not regulate nuclear reactors... Insofar as the incorporated rules refer to those facilities and/or materials previously referenced, those references are not incorporated nor does any cross references include those facilities and/or materials."

Deleted: comment A.2, above
Deleted: are
Deleted: to
Deleted: regulatory
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"
Deleted: to
Deleted: ,
Deleted: NJ regulations, in
Deleted: ,

As to the differences in definitions that SMC references, States can regulate non-AEA radioactive material. Examples of these radiation/radioactive materials include

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

x-ray machines and diffuse naturally-occurring radioactive material. A State's definitions for radioactive material covered under the State program may be different than NRC's definitions as a result of this broader regulatory authority. NRC reviewed New Jersey's definitions and determined that New Jersey has definitions that are adequate and compatible for the radioactive materials for which it will have regulatory authority under the Agreement.

Deleted: regulatory

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

viii. SMC commented that, should NRC decide to enter into the proposed Agreement with New Jersey, NRC has the power to exclude the Newfield site from the transfer of authority to the State. SMC stated that "This is explicitly contemplated by the policy embodied in Compatibility Criterion 25, which directs that appropriate arrangements will be made by NRC and the State to ensure that there will be no interference with or interruption of licensed activities or the processing of license applications by reason of the transfer." SMC also indicated that exclusion of the Newfield site from the transfer of authority to New Jersey is consistent with notions of fundamental fairness and efficiency. SMC commented that this is consistent with an NRC Appeal Board decision regarding Kerr-McGee's West Chicago site in Illinois.¹

Deleted: <#>Even if New Jersey becomes an Agreement State, the NRC Can and Should Retain Jurisdiction Over the Newfield Site and its Decommissioning¶

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", Hanging: 0.25"

Deleted: also

Deleted:

Deleted: 's

Deleted: ,

Deleted: Kerr-McGee Chemical Corporation (West Chicago Rare Earths Facility), ALAB-944, 33 N.R.C. 81, 101-02 (1991), vacated as moot, CLI-96-2, 43 NRC 13 (1996).

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: S

Comment [A7]: Discussed with Joan Stet

Deleted: cannot

NRC Response

Upon the effective date of a State Agreement authorized under Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the NRC relinquishes regulatory authority and the Agreement State assumes regulatory authority over the radioactive materials and activities specified in the Agreement. The legislative history for this statutory provision specifically states that Congress did not intend to allow concurrent regulatory authority over licensees for public health and safety. If the proposed New Jersey Agreement is approved by the Commission, upon the effective date of the Agreement, all NRC licensees within the categories of materials for which the State requested regulatory authority will transfer to the State. NRC does not retain individual licensees within categories of materials.

As NRC would be relinquishing its regulatory authority, NRC will not have jurisdiction to continue licensing actions that were in progress at the time the proposed Agreement with New Jersey would go into effect. There is authority in Section 274m of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, for NRC to retain authority based on common defense and security; NRC has used this authority to implement regulatory requirements imposing additional security measures for certain categories of radioactive material licensees and retain regulatory authority over conversion facilities in Agreement States. The SMC site in Newfield, New Jersey, does not raise these common defense and security concerns.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: will

Deleted: goes

Comment [A8]: Add in controls. This is the specific example by which NRC implemented this provision.

Deleted: increased controls

Deleted: However, t

The Kerr-McGee case SMC cited does involve a complex decommissioning site that was affected by the transition of a NRC license to a new Agreement State; however, the case does not have precedence in this matter. The Commission terminated the Kerr-McGee proceeding as moot and vacated the previous Licensing and Appeals Boards' decisions after the parties reached a settlement to dispose of the mill tailings

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Deleted: .

Deleted: H

¹ Kerr-McGee Chemical Corporation (West Chicago Rare Earths Facility), ALAB-944, 33 N.R.C. 81, 101-02 (1991), vacated as moot, CLI-96-2, 43 NRC 13 (1996).

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial

material off site. In vacating the decisions, the Commission eliminated as precedent all three underlying decisions in the proceedings and specifically stated that:

Deleted: -

"In these circumstances, and because these unreviewed Board decisions involve complex questions and vigorously disputed interpretations of agency provisions for disposal of byproduct material, the Commission as a policy matter chooses to vacate and thereby eliminate as precedent all three underlying decisions in this proceeding. This will permit any similar questions that may come up to be considered anew, without the binding influence of an apparently controversial Appeal Board decision that the Commission has not had the occasion to review.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

By vacating the decisions, the Commission does not intimate any opinion on their soundness. Without engaging in a full inquiry into the merits—which no party any longer requests, and the Commission sees no compelling reason to undertake on its own—the Commission cannot properly evaluate the analyses of the Licensing and Appeal Boards."²

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1"

See also the response to SMC Specific Comment B.vi, above, for a discussion of Compatibility Criterion 25.

Deleted: In the Matter of Kerr-McGee Chemical Corporation, CLI-96-2, 43 NRC 13 (1996)

Deleted: Please s

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

Deleted: comment A.6

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.75"

Miscellaneous Comments

Summary of Comments

1. A regulatory and nuclear consultant, Jim Lieberman, submitted a comment as to whether the State of New Jersey, upon approval of the Agreement, will honor past NRC license terminations at the 25 mrem per year standard without requiring terminated NRC licensees to conduct further remediation to meet the lower standards under New Jersey regulations. Mr. Lieberman suggested that NRC condition the Agreement giving full credit to past NRC license terminations unless there was a significant threat to public health and safety.

Deleted: whether the

NRC Staff Response

State Regulation, N.J.A.C. 7:28-12.4(d) does not allow the imposition of new standards on already approved decommissioning/remediation plans due to a revision to established remediation standards unless the difference between the two standards differs by an order of magnitude. Given that the remediation standard in New Jersey regulations (15 mrem per year) and NRC regulations (25 mrem per year) do not differ by an order of magnitude, this regulation does (b)(5) a basis to revisit prior NRC license terminations under this regulation. New Jersey does have the authority to take appropriate regulatory action if the State determines there is a significant threat to public health and safety at a decommissioned site.

Deleted: The New Jersey

Deleted: r

Deleted: s,

Deleted: ,

Comment (A9): This is the language in NJ regulations - so change other than to delete the "s"

Deleted: s

Deleted: the

(b)(5)

Deleted: However,

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment or Agreement based on this comment.

² In the Matter of Kerr-McGee Chemical Corporation, CLI-96-2, 43 NRC 13 (1996)

EX-5

EX-5

2. Gregory R. Reinhard, MBA, DVM, Merck & Co., Inc., commented that the State fees that will be charged to New Jersey licensees are exorbitant at "additional use sites." Merck supports the rationale whereby States can assume regulatory authority from NRC but feels that the significant increase in fees for "additional use sites" are not justified.

Deleted: s
Deleted: the

NRC Staff Response

In reviewing a State's request to enter into an Agreement, NRC evaluates the proposed program to ensure that the State has the funding and staffing levels to manage an Agreement State program. The State's radioactive materials licensing fees are not a matter of adequacy and compatibility. The State establishes its own method(s) of funding, and decides the dollar amount of fees charged to licensees.

Deleted: However, t
Deleted: uses
Deleted: ;

No changes were made to the NRC Staff Assessment based on this comment.

Under the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP), NRC verifies that Agreement State programs continue to be adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's regulatory program.