

cise controllers and/or observers . . . including all completed drill and/or exercise evaluation forms . . . and/or exercises that have been conducted."

On June 1, 1984, the Board ordered LILCO to produce such documents. Tr. 9,670 (Laurenson). In ordering that the documents be produced, the Board agreed with the County that the LILCO training testimony specifically relied upon evaluations and critiques of LERO trainees' performance during drills and exercises to support the LILCO witnesses' assertion that the LILCO training program teaches trainees their emergency response roles, including how to perform their emergency jobs. See Tr. 9,672-73. Thus, the Board ruled that the completed evaluation and critique forms were relevant to the LILCO testimony and the training contentions in issue and ordered LILCO to produce such documents. Tr. 9,673 (Laurenson).

Following receipt of the completed evaluation and critique forms on June 1, the County conducted cross examination of the LILCO training witnesses during the week of June 11. The County attempted to establish, through its cross examination, that there had been numerous and serious deficiencies in the training drills and exercises conducted under the LILCO training program, and that these deficiencies had prevailed throughout the course of the training provided to LERO trainees. For a number of reasons, however, including lack of time to review and analyze adequately

the documents provided by LILCO (the documents having been provided in the middle of a three-week trial period), the restrictions imposed by the Board on how such documents could be used in questioning the LILCO witnesses (see, e.g., Tr. 11,558-61), and the fact that the LILCO witness panel was comprised of hostile witnesses, through whom it was not possible to establish the extent of the training deficiencies revealed by the documents produced by LILCO, it remains necessary and appropriate for the County to submit supplemental testimony with respect to the extent and magnitude of such training deficiencies. Further, discussion of the deficiencies and how they impact LILCO's overall training program is necessary. This is accomplished by the attached supplemental testimony.

Clearly, under the circumstances, good cause exists for admitting the attached supplemental testimony. The testimony is relevant, material and probative to the issues raised in the training contentions and could not have been filed earlier since the documents upon which the testimony is based were themselves not produced until June 1 -- some two months after the County's prefiled direct testimony was submitted. Further, the parties will not be prejudiced if this testimony is admitted, because they will have the opportunity to cross-examine the County's witnesses about the supplemental testimony, and because the

testimony is limited in scope to a discussion of the evaluation and critique forms completed by observers/controllers of LILCO drills and/or exercises.

This Board has previously noted that, for an adequate showing of "good cause," proffered testimony must be shown to be relevant, not cumulative, and incapable of being filed in a more timely fashion. See Board Order dated February 28, 1984, at 7. Here, the proffered testimony meets the requisite showing of good cause. It is relevant to the issues raised in the training testimony submitted by Suffolk County and LILCO, since it is based directly on information gleaned from the training evaluations and critiques which this Board has previously found to be relevant. See, e.g., Tr. 9,673 (Laurenson). Further, the testimony proffered is not cumulative, since the County was barred from presenting the data discussed in the testimony during its cross examination of the LILCO witnesses. In this regard, the County notes that the summary reports admitted into evidence by the Board (see SC EP 63 and 64) do not adequately substitute for the data now offered because, unlike the summary reports, the data discussed in the supplemental testimony present particular comments which form the underlying bases for the summary reports. In addition, a number of the comments discussed in the proffered testimony are not reflected in any way in the summary reports that have been received into evidence. Thus, at this time, information contained and discussed in the supplemental testimony

does not appear as evidence anywhere in the record. Finally, it is clear that this supplemental testimony could not have been filed in a more timely fashion, since the information upon which the testimony is based was only recently produced by LILCO, and only since the end of trial in mid-June has there been adequate time for the County's expert training witnesses to review and analyze the data contained in the documents which form the bases for the testimony now offered.

For the reasons stated above, Suffolk County requests that the Board admit the supplemental training testimony attached to this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Bradley Ashare
Suffolk County Department of Law
Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York 11788

KIRKPATRICK, LOCKHART, HILL,
CHRISTOPHER & PHILLIPS

Michael S. Miller

Lawrence Coe Lanpher
Karla J. Letsche
Michael S. Miller
Christopher M. McMurray
1900 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Attorneys for Suffolk County

Date: July 6, 1984

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

_____)
In the Matter of)

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY)

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station,)
Unit 1))
_____)

Docket No. 50-322-OL-3
(Emergency Planning)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of Suffolk County's Motion to Admit Supplemental Testimony Of Deputy Inspector Peter F. Cosgrove and Lieutenant John L. Fakler on Behalf of Suffolk County Regarding Contentions 39, 40, 41, 44, 98, 99 and 100 -- Training of Offsite Emergency Response Workers have been served to the following this 6th day of July, 1984 by U.S. mail, first class, except as otherwise noted.

*James A. Laurenson, Chairman
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

James B. Dougherty, Esq.
3045 Porter Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

*Dr. Jerry R. Kline
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Marc W. Goldsmith
Energy Research Group, Inc.
400-1 Totten Pond Road
Waltham, Massachusetts 02154

*Mr. Frederick J. Shon
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

**W. Taylor Reveley, III, Esq.
Hunton & Williams
P.O. Box 1535
707 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23212

Edward M. Barrett, Esq.
General Counsel
Long Island Lighting Company
250 Old Country Road
Mineola, New York 11501

Mr. Jay Dunkleberger
New York State Energy Office
Agency Building 2
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Mr. Brian McCaffrey
Long Island Lighting Company
Shoreham Nuclear Power Station
P.O. Box 618
North Country Road
Wading River, New York 11792

Joel Blau, Esq.
New York Public Service Commission
The Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller
Building
Empire State Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Martin Bradley Ashare, Esq.
Suffolk County Attorney
H. Lee Dennison Building
Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York 11788

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

Docketing and Service Section
Office of the Secretary
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20555

*Bernard M. Bordenick, Esq.
Edwin J. Reis, Esq.
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Stewart M. Glass, Esq.
Regional Counsel
Federal Emergency Management
Agency
26 Federal Plaza, Room 1349
New York, New York 10278

*Eleanor L. Frucci, Esq.
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

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

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

Hon. Peter F. Cohalan
Suffolk County Executive
H. Lee Dennison Building
Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York 11788

Stuart Diamond
Business/Financial
New York Times
229 W. 43rd Street
New York, New York 10036

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

Jonathan D. Feinberg, Esq.
Staff Counsel
New York State Public
Service Commission
3 Rockefeller Plaza
Albany, New York 12223

Nora Eredes
Executive Director
Shoreham Opponents Coalition
195 East Main Street
Smithtown, New York 11787

Spence Perry, Esq.
Associate General Counsel
Federal Emergency Management
Agency
Washington, D.C. 20472

*Fabian Palomino, Esq.
Special Counsel to the Governor
Executive Chamber
State Capitol
Room 229
Albany, New York 12224

Michael S. Miller

Michael S. Miller
KIRKPATRICK, LOCKHART, HILL,
CHRISTOPHER & PHILLIPS
1900 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dated: July 6, 1984

* By Hand

** By Federal Express