



CHRIS CHRISTIE
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO
Lt. 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

PAULA T. DOW
Attorney General

ROBERT M. HANNA
Director

March 15, 2011

Clerk of the Court
United States Court of Appeals
for the District of Columbia Circuit
E. Barrett Prettyman United States Courthouse
333 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
5th Floor, Room 5523
Washington, D.C. 5523

Re: State of New York et. al. v. United States Nuclear
Regulatory Commission, et al.
Docket No. 11-1045 (consolidated with Docket Nos. 11-
1051, 11-1056, and 11-1057)

Dear Clerk:

Enclosed please find three copies of proposed-Intervenor State
of New Jersey's Motion for Leave to Intervene and accompanying
documents: (1) Declaration of Patrick Mulligan; (2) Certificate of
Parties; and (3) Certificate of Service.

These documents were electronically filed today.

Sincerely yours,

PAULA T. DOW
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW JERSEY

By: 
Ruth E. Musetto
Deputy Attorney General



UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

THE STATE OF NEW YORK,)	
THE STATE OF VERMONT, and)	
THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,)	
)	
Petitioners,)	
)	
against)	
)	
UNITED STATES NUCLEAR)	Docket No. 11-1045
REGULATORY COMMISSION, and)	(consolidated with Nos. 11-1051,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	11-1056, and 11-1057)
)	
)	
Respondents.)	
)	

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P.15(d) and D.C. Circuit Rule 15(b), the State of New Jersey (“New Jersey”) hereby moves for leave to intervene as party petitioner in the petition for judicial review filed by the States of New York, Vermont, and Connecticut (“Petitioners”) on February 14, 2011 concerning the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission’s (“NRC”) Consideration of Environmental Impacts of Temporary Storage of Spent Fuel After Cessation of Reactor Operation rule (“Temporary Storage Rule”) and affiliated Waste Confidence Decision Update (Waste Confidence Rule”). See 75 Fed. Reg. 81,032 and 81,037 (December 23, 2010). New Jersey has a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of this rule challenge. In addition, the Petitioners may not adequately represent the interests of New Jersey. Finally, New Jersey’s motion is timely filed pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 15(d).

Background

In 1990, the NRC promulgated its initial Waste Confidence rule, finding that spent fuel

from nuclear power plants could be stored safely and without significant environmental impacts for at least 30 years beyond the licensed life for operation. See 55 Fed. Reg. 38,474 (September 18, 1990). Spent nuclear fuel is defined at 42 U.S.C. § 10101 as “fuel that has been withdrawn from a nuclear reactor following irradiation, the constituent elements of which have not been separated by reprocessing.” The NRC confirmed its 1990 findings in 1999, see 64 Fed. Reg. 68,005, and issued the proposed Waste Confidence Rule on October 9, 2008 at 73 Fed. Reg. 59,551. NRC’s Temporary Storage Rule, codified at 10 C.F.R. § 51.23(a), revises the 1990 rulemaking and concludes that spent nuclear fuel from a nuclear reactor can be stored safely and without significant environmental impacts for at least 60 years beyond the expiration of an operating license in a spent fuel storage basin either onsite or offsite.

On February 14, 2011, the States of New York, Vermont, and Connecticut filed a petition for review of the Temporary Storage Rule and the Waste Confidence Rule under the above captioned Docket Number. Environmental groups--the Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Inc., Riverkeeper, Inc., and Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, Inc.--also filed petitions for review of the Temporary Storage Rule and the Waste Confidence Rule. Prairie Island Community is also a petitioner. The above captioned matter has been consolidated with Docket Nos. 11-1051, 11-1056, and 11-1057.

Standard for Intervention Under Fed. R. App. P. 15(d)

In ruling upon intervention applications, Appellate Courts have looked to the standard for intervention applicable in District Courts pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). See Sierra Club v. EPA, 358 F.3d 516, 517-18 (7th Cir. 2004); see also Automobile Workers v. Scofield, 382 U.S. 205, 209-10 n. 10 (1965). Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2) provides that intervention is proper for anyone

who "claims an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the subject of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant's ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest"(emphasis added). See also Building and Construction Trades Dept., AFL-CIO v. Reich, 40 F.3d 1275, 1282 (D.C. Cir. 1994).

For the following reasons, New Jersey respectfully requests the Court to allow for intervention:

New Jersey Has a Direct and Substantial Interest In This Rule Challenge

Courts have granted intervention to parties that have demonstrated a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of the action. See, e.g., Yakima Valley Cablevision, Inc. v. FCC, 794 F.2d 737, 744-45 (D.C. Cir. 1986)(granting intervention because movants were "directly affected by application" of agency policy); New Mexico Dep't of Human Services v. HCFA, 4 F.3d 882, 884, n. 2 (10th Cir. 1993)(allowing medicaid beneficiaries to intervene since "*their* benefits hang in the balance")(emphasis in original); Bales v. NLRB, 914 F.2d 92, 94 (6th Cir. 1990) (intervention granted to a party with a "substantial interest in the outcome of the petition").

New Jersey has a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of the Temporary Storage Rule and Waste Confidence Rule challenge. New Jersey has four operating nuclear power reactors that are affected by the NRC's rules: Oyster Creek in Forked River, New Jersey, Hope Creek (Unit One) in Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey, and Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Units 1 and 2), also in Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey. See Declaration of Patrick Mulligan, attached hereto. The 60 year time period applies once a license has expired or is terminated.

According to NRC's "High-Value Datasets" set forth in the Temporary Storage Rule, there are 14 reactor operating licenses that will expire between 2012 and 2020 and an additional 36 licenses that will expire between 2021 and 2030. 75 Fed. Reg. 81,036. Of the New Jersey power plants, at least Oyster Creek will be subject to termination of its license or will cease operations during this time frame (thereby triggering the 60 year time period it would be allowed to store spent fuel). A recent settlement agreement requires Oyster Creek to cease generation prior to January 1, 2020. See Declaration of Patrick Mulligan, attached hereto.

As the state sovereign, New Jersey is concerned with the health of its citizens and the environment and has responsibilities to protect the public health. See, e.g., Department of Health v. Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp., 100 N.J. Super. 366, 381 (App. Div. 1968) (“The safeguarding of the public health has long been considered an essential government function of the police power of the State”)(citing Borough of West Caldwell v. Borough of Caldwell, 138 A.2d 402, 413 (1958)). Here, although it doubled the acceptable storage time, the NRC failed to conduct a complete Environmental Impact Statement pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”), 42 U.S.C. § 4332(1)(C), and instead performed an environmental assessment that found no significant impact from its rules. Based on the lack of a detailed Environmental Impact Statement as required by NEPA, there are no assurances that the citizens and environment of New Jersey will not be harmed by leaks from the long-term storage of spent fuel at a nuclear power plant in New Jersey. Accordingly, the outcome of this rule challenge directly and substantially affects New Jersey’s interests.

New Jersey’s Interests May Not Be Adequately Represented by the Petitioners

This Court has held that an intervenor “need only show that the representation of

his interest 'may be' inadequate, not that representation will in fact be inadequate.” Dimond v. District of Columbia, 792 F.2d 179, 192 (D.C. Cir. 1986)(quoting Trbovich v. United Mine Workers, 404 U.S. 528, 538 n.10 (1972)(“The requirement of the Rule is satisfied if the applicant shows that representation of his interest ‘may be’ inadequate; and the burden of making that showing should be treated as minimal”).

New Jersey is home to four nuclear power plants. Each nuclear power plant in the nation presents unique public health and safety concerns based on varying sizes of the reactors, the integrity of the storage basins, and the locations of the power plants. In addition, the permit life varies among the power plants and thus, too, the potential storage time of spent fuel. As a state sovereign, New Jersey can only address interests of the State. New Jersey’s challenge will therefore be specifically tailored to address the protection of the health and safety of its citizens and its environment. Accordingly, its interests may not be adequately represented by the Petitioners.

Conclusion

New Jersey has a direct and substantial interest in the outcome of the challenge to the Temporary Storage Rule and the Waste Confidence Rule. In addition, the Petitioners in this action may not adequately represent New Jersey’s interests. New Jersey’s motion is also timely filed. Accordingly, pursuant to Fed .R. App. P. 15(d) and D.C. Circuit Rule 15(b), proposed intervenor New Jersey respectfully requests that its motion for leave to intervene in this action be granted.

Dated: March 15, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

PAULA T. DOW
Attorney General
State of New Jersey

By:

/s/ Kevin P. Auerbacher
Kevin P. Auerbacher
Assistant Attorney General
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street, P.O. Box 093
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 292-6945
kevin.auerbacher@dol.lps.state.nj.us

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

THE STATE OF NEW YORK,)	
THE STATE OF VERMONT, and)	
THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,)	
)	
Petitioners,)	
)	
against)	
)	Docket No. 11-1045
UNITED STATES NUCLEAR)	
REGULATORY COMMISSION, and)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
)	
Respondents.)	
)	

DECLARATION OF PATRICK MULLIGAN

I, Patrick Mulligan, make this declaration upon personal knowledge:


1. I submit this declaration in support of the Motion to Intervene of the State of New Jersey in the above referenced matter.
2. I am a Manager in the Bureau of Nuclear Engineering ("BNE") in the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection ("NJDEP"). The BNE is responsible for the continuous collection of radiological data from nuclear power plants in New Jersey to evaluate the impact of operation on the environment. The BNE is also responsible for the NJDEP's implementation of a comprehensive radiological emergency response in the event of an accident. As a manager in BNE, my responsibilities include ensuring staff engineers work closely with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission ("NRC") on site inspections at nuclear power plants to assure the overall safe operations of the power plant. I review and evaluate regulatory guidance, including proposed guidance, for nuclear power plant operation

issued by the NRC and the Department of Energy and Department of Homeland Security, and provide comments as necessary.

3. New Jersey has four operating nuclear power reactors: Oyster Creek Generating Station ("Oyster Creek") in Forked River, New Jersey, Hope Creek (Unit One) in Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey, and Salem Nuclear Generating Station (Units 1 and 2), also in Hancocks Bridge, New Jersey. A December 2010 Administrative Consent Order between NJDEP and Exelon Generation Company, LLC, owner and operator of Oyster Creek, requires Oyster Creek to cease generation prior to January 1, 2020.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, and under penalty of perjury, I declare that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed on March 8, 2011.


Patrick Mulligan

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

THE STATE OF NEW YORK,)	
THE STATE OF VERMONT, and)	
THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,)	
)	
Petitioners,)	
)	
against)	
)	Docket No. 11-1045
UNITED STATES NUCLEAR)	(Consolidated with Nos.
REGULATORY COMMISSION, and)	11-1051, 11-1056 and 11-1057)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
)	
Respondents.)	
)	

CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES

As required by Circuit Rule 27(a)(4) and pursuant to Circuit Rule 28(a)(1)(A), the following Certificate as to Parties and Amici is made on behalf of the State of New York, the State of Vermont and the State of Connecticut.:

Parties and Amici.

This case involves consolidated petitions for review of rulemaking actions undertaken by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, entitled “Consideration of Environmental Impacts of Temporary Storage of Spent Fuel After Cessation of Reactor Operation” (“Temporary Storage Rule”) found at 75 Fed. Reg. 81,032, and “Waste Confidence Decision Update” (Waste Confidence Rule”) found at 75 Fed. Reg. 81,037 (December 23, 2010). There was no action in the district court, and so there were no parties in the district court.

The parties in this Court in these consolidated petitions for review are:

Petitioners:

State of New York (Case No. 11-1045)

State of Vermont (Case No. 11-1045)

State of Connecticut (Case No. 11-1045)

Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc. (Case No.11-1051)

Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League (Case No. 11-1056)

Riverkeeper, Inc. (Case No. 11-1056)

Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, Inc. Case No. 11-1056)

Prairie Island Indian Community (Case No. 11-1057)

Respondents:

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

United States of America

Intervenors:

Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc. (Case No. 11-1045) for Respondents (Motion to for
Leave to Intervene pending)

Respectfully submitted,

Paula T. Dow
Attorney General of the State of New Jersey

By: /s/ Kevin P. Auerbacher
Assistant Attorney General
Ruth E. Musetto
Deputy Attorney General
New Jersey Division of Law
Environmental Enforcement & Homeland
Security Section
25 Market Street, P.O. Box 093
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0093
(609) 292-6945
Kevin.Auerbacher@dol.lps.state.nj.us
Ruth.Musetto@dol.lps.state.nj.us

Dated: March 15, 2011

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

THE STATE OF NEW YORK,)	
THE STATE OF VERMONT, and)	
THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT,)	
)	
Petitioners,)	
)	
against)	
)	Docket No. 11-1045
UNITED STATES NUCLEAR)	(consolidated with Nos.
REGULATORY COMMISSION, and)	11-1051, 11-1056 and 11-1057)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
)	
Respondents.)	
)	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Assistant Attorney General Kevin P. Auerbacher, do hereby certify that on the 15th day of March, 2011, the foregoing Motion for Leave to Intervene on Behalf of Petitioners and accompanying papers were served upon the following, by mailing a copy thereof, first class, postage prepaid, and by Electronic Case Filing, on the following parties:

Monica Blong Wagner
For Petitioner State of New York
Office of Attorney General, State of New York
Division of Appeals & Opinions
120 Broadway, 25th Floor
New York, New York 10271

Robert D. Snook, AAG
For Petitioner State of Connecticut
Office of Attorney General
State of Connecticut
55 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Thea J. Schwartz, Esq.
For Petitioner State of Vermont
Office of Attorney General, State of Vermont
109 State Street
Montpelier, Vermont 05609-1001

Joseph Fredericks Halloran, Esq.
JACOBSON, BUFFALO, MAGNUSON,
ANDERSON & HOGEN, P.C.
For Petitioner Prairie Island Indian Cmty.
335 Atrium Office Building
1295 Bandana Boulevard
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Geoffrey H. Fettus, Esq.
For Petitioner Natural Resources Defense Council
1200 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20005

John Ermad Arbab
For Respondent United States of America
U.S. Department of Justice
Environment & Natural Resources Division
P.O. Box 23795, L'Enfant Plaza Station
Washington, D.C. 20026-3795

David A. Repka, Esq.
WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP
For Pending Intervenor Nuclear Energy Inst.
1700 K. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Diane Curran, Esq.
HARMON, CURRAN, SPIELBERG &
EISENBERG, LLP
For Petitioners Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Inc., Riverkeeper, Inc. and Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, Inc.
1726 M Street, N.W. Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036

John F. Cordes, Jr., Esq., Solicitor
Robert Michael Rader, Senior Attorney
For Respondent Nuclear Reg. Commission
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Room 14 H3
11555 Rockville Pike
One White Flint North
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Ellen C. Ginsberg, Esq.
Michael A. Bauser, Esq.
Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc.
For Pending Intervenor Nuclear Energy Inst.
1776 I Street, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20006-3708

Respectfully submitted,

Paula T. Dow
Attorney General of the State of New Jersey

By: /s/ Kevin P. Auerbacher
Assistant Attorney General
Ruth E. Musetto
Deputy Attorney General
New Jersey Division of Law
Environmental Enforcement & Homeland
Security Section
25 Market Street, P.O. Box 093
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0093
(609) 292-6945
Kevin.Auerbacher@dol.lps.state.nj.us
Ruth.Musetto@dol.lps.state.nj.us

Dated: March 15, 2011