UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Mater of

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station,)
Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-322

STATUS REPORT

Coincident with its submission of Interrogatories.

to SOC on May 21, 1981, Applicant filed with all parties
and the Board a "Status Report" setting forth its views
on developments in the proceedings in Docket No. 50-322.

In order that the Board may have the views of other
parties on the status of this proceeding, SOC has set
forth below a brief response to some of the more
critical issues stated or implied in Applicant's May 21,
1981 "Status Report". SOC will file additional
responses where deemed appropriate by the Board or in
response to "Status Reports" be filed by other parties.

1. Issuance of SER and Prehearing Schedule contained in Board Order dated March 8, 1978.

As noted by Applicant on page 1 of its "Status Report", the SER was issued on April 17, 1981 (46 Fed. Reg. 23575; April 27, 1981). Applicant neglects to observe that the document issued by NRC Staff is not a final SER, but is instead a significantly incomplete and partial Staff review of the Shoreham plant containing more than 60 "open items". At least two SER-supplements are contemplated by Staff (see letter from Tedesco to Pollack dated May 7, 1981), the last of which is scheduled for issuance on August 28, 1981. Among the "open items" are all the post-TMI additional safety measures that are required. These TMI safety issues constitute the principal foundation upon which SOC's intervention was based.

Although not clearly stated, Applicant's "Status Report" suggests that the document issued by Staff on April 17, 1981 may have triggered the prehearing schedule set by the Board on March 8, 1978. If that is in fact Applicant's position, SOC believes it to be in error for the following reasons:

- a) A review of the October 11, 1977 pre-hearing conference during which the pre-hearing schedule was set indicates that no discussion was held concerning the contingency of a partial SER issuance. SOC believes that the parties and the Board at that time contemplated a single SER or that the pre-hearing schedule would begin after the completion of the SER. It is thus SOC's view that to the extent this Board considers the March 8, 1978 Order still valid, the pre-hearing schedule will begin after the issuance of the final SSER and the receipt of the appropriate ACRS letters;
- b) In view of the fact that SOC's intervention was predicated on the TMI-2 accident and NRC responses thereto, and further assuming that a pre-hearing schedule can be deemed to be in effect as against one party and not others, it is clearly appropriate with regard to SOC that the pre-hearing schedule would run after the issuance of the TMI SSER and the appropriate ACRS letter(s);
- c) To the extent the Applicant has deemed certain of SOC's contentions virtually ready for hearings (Applicant's Status Report, at p. 2), SOC disagrees.

 Some of the reasons for SOC's disagreement are evident in the various interrogatory responses submitted by SOC which note Applicant's and Staff's failure to respond to numerous informal discovery requests. Since Applicant has now unilaterally elected to terminate the informal discovery process, SOC will endeavor to promptly file the appropriate formal discovery requests;

d) Applicant laments the fact that this proceeding has now been underway for more than five years as opposed to only two years when the March 8, 1978 Order was issued. This concern has little, if any, bearing on the selection of a pre-hearing schedule particularly when the cause of delay is beyond the control of the Board and the parties (i.e., TMI) or is self-inflicted (i.e., the Company's inability to manage Shoreham's construction towards a prompt completion). SOC further notes that a review by the New York State Public Service Commission in Cases 27774/27563 of Shoreham's remaining construction schedule and the Company's own internal monthly status reports suggest further delay in Shoreham's completion beyond the scheduled January 1983 in-service date, perhaps by a year or more.

"Status Report" provides the Board with little guidance towards the establishment of an appropriate pre-hearing schedule in this proceeding. Should the Board's views on the pre-hearing schedule and in particular, its applicability to SOC, differ from the views set forth by SOC herein, SOC asks the Board to formally request the views of all parties on these issues to be followed by a pre-hearing conference at the Board's earliest convenience to set an appropriate schedule.

2. Relevance of Proposed TMI Rule to Shoreham Operating Licensing Proceeding.

In a footnote on page 2 of its "Status Rejort", Applicant suggests that in SOC's particularization of Contention 7a(ii) (re: TMI), SOC will have to take into account the NRC's proposed rulemaking on TMI (Sec. 46 Fed. Reg. 26491 (May 13, 1981)). SOC has reviewed that document and has noted nothing that revokes the effectiveness of the Commission's "Policy Statement on TMI" (December 16, 1980) or the requirements for operating licenses contained therein. It is clear that the Policy Statement remains in effect, and SOC is particularizing contention 7a(ii) with that understanding.

Respectfully Submitted, SHOREHAM OPPONENTS COALITION

Stephen B. Latham TWOMEY, LATHAM & SCHMITT

P.O. Box 398

Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Dated: June 9, 1981