

# Goldberg, Kamin & Garvin

Attorneys at Law

1806 Frick Building

437 Grant Street

Pittsburgh, PA 15219-6101

(412) 281-5227

(412) 281-1119

Fax (412) 281-1121

Edward I. Goldberg  
Samuel P. Kamin  
Robert J. Garvin  
Samuel R. Grego  
David A. Wolf  
Jonathan M. Kamin

Counsel To The Firm  
Stuart E. Savage

Of Counsel  
Robert W. Mandell  
Frank J. Pistella

November 8, 1999

Mr. Robert A. Nelson  
Chief  
Special Projects Section  
Division of Waste Management  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop T-7 F27  
Washington, D.C. 20555

In Re: **Licensee: Molycorp, Inc. - Washington, PA Site**  
**Site Decommissioning Plan**  
**License No. SMB-1393**  
**Docket Nos. 040-08794 and 040-08778**

Dear Mr. Nelson:

As you will recall, this law firm is special counsel to Canton Township, Pennsylvania, in which the above-referenced Licensee's site is located. You recently advised me that no transcript has been prepared of the public hearing which was held on April 15, 1999 in Canton Township relating to the Licensee's current proposals. Nevertheless, it is my understanding that you welcomed certain follow-up written questions concerning issues which were raised at the April 15 hearing and such written questions were forwarded to you soon after the April 15 hearing. I do not believe written responses have yet been provided to such questions and an additional copy of such questions is enclosed herewith for your response.

Written responses to these questions can be forwarded to my office. Thank you for your timely attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,



SAMUEL R. GREGO

SRG:smm

cc: Chad Smith (w/enc.)  
John T. Olshock (w/enc.)  
Jeffrey A. Watson, Esquire (w/enc.)

NL10

PDR ADDOC 04008794

STORAGE FACILITY QUESTIONS NRC HEARING APRIL 15, 1999  
CANTON TOWNSHIP

1. Has a LICENSE BEEN ISSUED TO THIS SITE? DOCKET No. 0408778, License SMB-1393? If there is an existing License please provide the license and all existing files associated to the license.
2. Has Pennsylvania disqualified the Molycorp site concerning siting the Compact (Delaware, West Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania) Low Level Radiation Waste Facility, and if so why?
3. Could please tell me the benefits to me and these other people in this room of placing this storage site here and shipping these 200 roll off boxes from York , Pa to Washington, Pa.?
4. What is the agency definition of injury.. Are you and the applicant liable to cover all of the costs to everyone affected by your actions
5. Define the difference between storage facility and a disposal facility?
6. Why are more stringent requirements being applied to the proposed York Material than to the higher level material in the existing 192 roll off boxes out in the open on the plant site. PAGE 3 section 3.2?
7. What guarantees do we have that a permanent disposal plan will be put into place and outside of Pennsylvania . Since the Assumption on Page 5 Section 4.5 has lost its relevancy?
8. What are the flood plane requirements concerning this storage site?
9. What does Molycorp intend to do with the current 192-194 roll off boxes since page 5 section 4.2 states that they soils currently at the plant and those to be shipped in from York are to be kept separate?
10. What is the financial position of Molycorp, Can they prove financial worthiness, can you provide proof?
11. I request that the Agency select Alternative 3 Section 4.3 of the Draft Environmental Assessment and ship all York, Pa material to Envirocare

of Utah as well as the on site 192-194 roll off boxes and all other on site waste in land owned by Molycorp in Canton Township Pennsylvania. Since Alternative 2 is more expensive than alternative 3, therefore the cost to ship to Utah is the best answer.

12. What is the evidence submittal time frame for this hearing?
13. What is the level of compliance to NRC public and occupational dose limits? Will devices capture all environmental output of the site?
14. What guarantees does anyone have that the plant site at 300 Caldwell avenue will ever be cleaned up plus the adjacent site that was used for settlement and evaporation ponds in the years circa 1958-59, 1960-1971, when thousands of gallons of water and waste settlement were dumped on the site?
15. How do we know if the water line in front of the plant has not been compromised by leaching?
16. Prove that this temporary storage facility will no impact on people or the environment?
17. What is the long term monitoring procedure and what is its measured success rate?
18. Please explain the long term health impacts of thorium on humans, are there any verifiable long term studies?
19. Please explain the long term health impacts of gamma rays on humans and explain the impacts of gamma radiation on the deterioration of the human cell structure?
20. Request a complete transcript of this hearing in a timely manner from the NRC under all applicable federal laws, regulations and executive orders.

21. Page 7 Section 7.2.1.1, are not the worker doses higher than the standard estimates, those stated are 11, 6, and 8 mrem, apparently the standard is 5 mrem?
22. Please Explain the appellate procedure relative to this hearing?
23. Has an economic Impact Analysis been performed by the agency? If not why?
24. How does the agency explain section 61.7 (2) CFR 10, of year 1997, that appears to grant the ability to bring in classes B and C waste if a permanent disposal license were to be granted ?
25. How does the agency explain the number of private license (disposal and interim) sites that are becoming super fund sites and coming under the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency. Are you not creating future liabilities for the United States by granting increased numbers of private licenses. Especially with classes of waste that have very long half lives in the millions and billions of years.
26. In NRC 30 Thorium becomes Thallium a radioactive isotope which emits gamma radiation that penetrates the body, in the decay process are there any other reactions that take place that would increase gamma radiation output and is there any change of other atomic particle reactions?
27. Has the agency completely verified all of the information submitted by the applicant Docket No. 0408778, License no. SMB 1393, for an interim license? Can that documentation be released? Copies are requested.
28. Is the agency aware of dumping on the site with effluent evaporation ponds and that possible leaching of ground water occurred?
29. I request that the Agency select Alternative 3 Section 4.3 of the Draft Environmental Assessment and ship all York, Pa material to Envirocare of Utah as well as the on site 192-194 roll off boxes and all other on site waste in or on land owned by Molycorp in Canton Township Pennsylvania and any other properties in the vicinity that may have been contaminated.

30. Are there any regulations that would see the NRC to officially notify property owners in vicinity of the site of the impact, economic and otherwise concerning the site.
31. Is the proposed structure for this interim license flood proof?
32. Will the proposed interim facility withstand an auto crash or tractor trailer crash for I -70?
33. Does Chartiers Creek really enter the Ohio river at Carnegie?