UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

In the Matter of)	
) Docket No.	50-322-OL
LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY) (Emergency	Planning -
(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1)) Phase I)	

LILCO'S MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF FRED C. FINLAYSON

Testimony of Fred C. Finlayson on behalf of Suffolk County
Regarding Contention EP 14, Accident Assessment and Dose
Assessment Models. LILCO moves to strike lines 19-24 of page
8, pages 9-20, lines 12-24 on page 22, lines 1-9 and the first
three words of line 10 on page 23, pages 24-26, the first five
lines of page 27, and line 10 on page 27 through line 13 on
page 28 (the PRA testimony) because they are outside the scope
of contention EP 14. LILCO moves to strike lines 11-24 of page
5, pages 6-7, lines 1-18 of page 8, and lines 6-9 of page 27
(the Gaussian plume testimony) because they deal with a subject
outside the witness's expertise.

PRA Testimony

Much of Dr. Finlayson's testimony is outside the scope of EP 14. Under the NRC rules of practice, testimony must be

relevant to the issues in the contention. 10 C.F.R. § 2.743(c).1/ And irrelevant testimony is the proper subject of a motion to strike. See 10 C.F.R. Part 2, Appendix A, V(d)(7). The Board has the power to implement these provisions, both through its general power to regulate the conduct of a hearing, 10 C.F.R. § 2.718, and through the specific authority under 10 C.F.R. § 2.757(b) to strike argumentative, repetitious, cumulative or irrelevant evidence. Accordingly, LILCO moves to strike the parts of Dr. Finlayson's testimony specified above.

The basis for this motion to strike is the Board's Prehearing Conference Order (Phase I -- Emergency Planning) dated July 27, 1982, at 18-21, where the Board ruled in part as follows:

We therefore do not see the need to litigate LILCO's PRA in these circumstances, unless LILCO attempts to rely upon its PRA in either its direct or rebuttal testimony on this contention.

. . . Therefore, if LILCO can make its case using only evidence of "other means" used to ensure the accuracy of its assessment models, we see no reason to litigate LILCO's PRA in this context, unless LILCO intends to rely on it.

Only relevant, material, and reliable evidence which is not unduly repetitious will be admitted. Immaterial or irrelevant parts of an admissible document will be segregated and excluded so far as is practicable.

^{1/} Title 10 C.F.R. § 2.743(c) says this:

LILCO has not attempted to rely on its PRA in its testimony, and therefore evidence on the PRA is outside the scope of this contention.

Accordingly, the County's testimony on EP 14 attempts to do precisely what the Board ruled in its July 27 order should not be done, that is, to litigate a PRA on which LILCO does not rely in its emergency planning. For this reason, the portions of Dr. Finlayson's testimony cited above should be stricken.

Gaussian Plume Testimony

The other cited portions of Dr. Finlayson's testimony should be stricken because they deal with the adequacy of "straight-line trajectory, Gaussian dispersion methods" for predicting cloud motions. As far as we can tell, Dr. Finlayson's resume (Attachment 1 to his testimony) does not reveal that he is qualified to assess different types of plume models, and therefore the "Gaussian plume" portions of his testimony should be stricken.

Respectfully submitted,
LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

James N. Christman

Hunton & Williams P.O. Box 1535 707 East Main Street Richmond, VA 23212

DATED: November 9, 1982

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

In the Matter of
LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY
(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1)
Docket No. 50-322 (OL)

I hereby certify that copies of LILCO's Motion to Strike Portions of the Direct Testimony of Fred C. Finlayson were served upon the following by first-class mail, postage prepaid, by Federal Express (as indicated by an asterisk), or by hand (as indicated by two asterisks), on November 9, 1982:

Lawrence Brenner, Esq.**
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Peter A. Morris**
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. James H. Carpenter**
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Secretary of the Commission U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Daniel F. Brown, Esq.
Attorney
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Bernard M. Bordenick, Esq.**
David A. Repka, Esq.
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Herbert H. Brown, Esq.**
Lawrence Coe Lanpher, Esq.
Karla J. Letsche, Esq.
Kirkpatrick, Lockhart, Hill,
Christopher & Phillips
8th Floor
1900 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Mark W. Goldsmith Energy Research Group 4001 Totten Pond Road Waltham, Massachusetts 02154

MHB Technical Associates 1723 Hamilton Avenue Suite K San Jose, California 95125

Mr. Jay Dunkleberger New York State Energy Office Agency Building 2 Empire State Plaza Albany, New York 12223 David J. Gilmartin, Esq.
Attn: Patricia A. Dempsey, Esq.
County Attorney
Suffolk County Department of Law
Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York 11787

Stephen B. Latham, Esq.* Twomey, Latham & Shea 33 West Second Street P. O. Box 398 Riverhead, New York 11901

Ralph Shapiro, Esq.* Cammer and Shapiro, P.C. 9 East 40th Street New York, New York 10016

Howard L. Blau, Esq. 217 Newbridge Road Hicksville, New York 11801

Matthew J. Kelly, Esq. State of New York Department of Public Service Three Empire State Plaza Albany, New York 12223

Hunton & Williams 707 East Main Street P.O. Box 1535 Richmond, Virginia 23212

DATED: November 9, 1982