

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

COMMITTEE TO BRIDGE THE GAP, No. 01CS01445 Dept. 11
CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF
SCIENTISTS, PHYSICIANS FOR RULING ON SUBMITTED MATTER
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, LOS
ANGELES CHAPTER,

Petitioners, Plaintiffs,

vs.

DIANA M. BONTA, Director, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES; STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Respondents, Defendants.

This matter came on for hearing on March 29, 2002. The matter was argued and taken under submission. The Court, having considered the evidence and the arguments of the parties, now makes its ruling as follows:

(1) The respondents' claim that the adoption of the subject regulation, section 30253 of Title 17, California Code of Regulations, is categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to section 15308 of the CEQA Guidelines is without merit. Petitioners have shown that there is a reasonable

possibility that the adoption of the subject regulation will have a significant adverse environmental effect. The argument that the subject regulation imposes a more stringent standard than what presently exists is not persuasive. There is no standard in effect at present for decommissioning of a licensed radioactive site. The 100 millirem standard is for sites in operation and not decommissioned sites. Moreover, in practice, decommissioned sites have been required to meet a more stringent standard than 100 millirems and a more stringent standard than the 25 millirems in the subject regulation. Nor does the "ALARA" language in the subject regulation transform the subject regulation to a more stringent standard than what has been applied in the past.

(2) Respondents' reliance on the federal EIS, even if proper notice had been given, is misplaced. See section 15220 of the CEQA Guidelines which provides:

"This article applies to projects that are subject to both CEQA and NEPA. NEPA applies to projects which are carried out, financed, or approved in whole or in part by federal agencies. Accordingly, this article applies to projects which involve one or more state or local agencies and one or more federal agencies."

The Court concludes that this project, the approval by the California Department of Health Services of an amendment of California regulations, is not one which is subject to NEPA. Therefore, section 15225 of the Guidelines is not applicable.

(ram01cs01,45.doc)

California Administrative Procedures Act in adopting this regulation. The Court finds that the Initial Statement of Reasons for the regulation contained a sufficient statement of purposes. But respondents acknowledge that they could have chosen a standard more stringent than the federal standard. Yet the statement of reasons for adopting the subject regulation relies on the conclusion that the respondent was limited to following the federal standard. By failing to discuss and consider alternatives, respondents have violated the California Administrative Procedures Act.

The respondents' objection to the Declaration of Daniel Hirsch is sustained on the grounds of hearsay and lack of relevance.

The petition for writ of mandamus is GRANTED, and the complaint for declaratory relief is GRANTED. Judgment shall be entered directing the issuance of a writ of mandate commanding respondent BONTA to set aside her approval of the regulation amendment, as it was without compliance with the california Environmental Quality Act. The judgment also shall declare that respondent BONTA's approval of the regulation amendment was invalid as it was in violation of the California Administrative Procedures Act.

Counsel for petitioners shall prepare, serve and submit $_{\mbox{\scriptsize a}}$ written form of judgment granting the petition and

complaint in accordance with the above and a writ of mandate for issuance by the clerk of the court.

DATED: APR 10 2002

GAIL D. OHANESIAN
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

(xxm01cs0145.doc)