

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

LICENSEE: MOLYCORP, INC. License No. SMB-1393 Docket Nos. 040-08794 and 040-08778 *99 AUG -2 P3:18

ADJUDIC A

MOLYCORP, INC.'S RESPONSE TO THE REQUEST FOR HEARING OF THE CITY OF WASHINGTON

Molycorp, Inc. ("Molycorp") submits the following Response to the Request for Hearing submitted by the City of Washington ("Washington"). Washington's Request for Hearing should be denied because Washington does not have standing to seek a hearing under Subpart L of 10 C.F.R. Part 2. In support hereof, Molycorp states as follows:

- 1. Washington has submitted its Request for Hearing ("Request") pursuant to a Notice of Receipt of an Amendment Request for the Temporary Storage of Decommissioning Waste from the Molycorp York, Pennsylvania Facility, which was published in the Federal Register on June 9, 1999.
- 2. Washington's Request fails to satisfy the prerequisites necessary to obtain a hearing under Subpart L of 10 C.F.R. Part 2.
- 3. Washington's Request fails to even remotely allege an interest within the zone of protection of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as Amended ("AEA"). In this regard, Washington fails to specifically assert any potential for injury due to radiation from licensed materials, which specific allegations are necessary to bring the request within the ambit of the AEA. Rather, the only interests alleged by Washington are vague and conclusory assertions of governmental and economic interests which do not fall within the zone of protection of the AEA.

- 4. For example, Washington alleges a vague governmental duty to protect the welfare of its citizens. However, Washington fails to allege any specific radiation hazard and, indeed, no such hazard exists.
- 5. Although Washington has raised an issue with respect to a 16-inch water line which runs through Molycorp's property, Washington has no property or financial interest in this water line which, in any case, is not physically near enough to the storage site to be impacted by any activity at the site.

WHEREFORE, the City of Washington is not entitled to a hearing under Subpart L of 10 C.F.R. Part 2 and, accordingly, Washington's Request for Hearing should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Randolph T. Struk Pa. I.D. No 42165 Stacey L. Jarrell Pa. I.D. No. 68385

THORP REED & ARMSTRONG, LLP Firm I.D. No. 282 One Riverfront Center Pittsburgh, PA 15222 412/394-7794



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

*99 AUG -2 P3:18

I, Randolph T. Struk, counsel for Molycorp, Inc., hereby certify that the a copy of Molycorp, Inc.'s Response To The Request For Hearing Of Canton Township was served on the 30th day of July, 1999, as follows:

Original via Federal Express:

Rulemakings and Adjudication Staff Secretary of Nuclear Regulatory Commission One White Flint North 11555 Rockville Pike Rockville, MD 20852

Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001 Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudication Staff

Executive Director for Operations U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Administrative Judge Peter B. Bloch Presiding Officer Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Mail Stop T-3 F23 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Copies Via Regular Mail:

John T. Olshock, Esquire Solicitor for Canton Township 96 N. Main Street Washington, PA 15301

Samuel P. Kamin, Esquire Goldberg, Kamin & Garvin 1806 Frick Building 437 Grant Street Pittsburgh, PA 15219-6101

Jeffrey A. Watson, Esquire Smider & Watson, P.C. 138 North Franklin Street Washington, PA 15301