# LILCO, July 19, 1984

'84 JUL 19 A11:50

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

#### Before the Commission

In the Matter of

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

Docket No. 50-322-OL-4 (Low Power)

Pour

2503

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1)

### LILCO'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THE COMMISSION'S JULY 18 MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

On July 18, 1984, the Commission issued a Memorandum and Order concerning Suffolk County's "Motion for Directed Certification of June 20 ASLB Order Granting LILCO's Motion in Limine." The Commission's order neither granted nor denied the County's motion but rather provided guidance on security matters to the Board and parties. The Commission, however, expressed no views on whether, under the facts in <u>Shoreham</u>, any security issues should be litigated. For the reasons stated below, we ask the Commission to reconsider its Memorandum and Order.

8407230031 840719 PDR ADDCK 05000322 9 PDR On July 16, LILCO filed a response to SC's Motion for Certification by placing it in first class mail in accordance with applicable Commission regulations. Long Island Lighting Company's Response to Motion for Directed Certification on Security Issues (July 16, 1984). LILCO had not been informed that the Commission intended to consider this matter on an expedited basis. As in the past, of course, the Company would have responded in an expedited fashion if the Commission had so desired.

On the morning of July 17, the Office of General Counsel (OGC) inquired as to whether LILCO intended to respond to the County's Motion for Certification because the Commission was considering the issue that morning. LILCO indicated that it had filed a timely response by first class mail. As a result of the phone call, LILCO immediately made efforts to get a copy o. the pleading to the General Counsel on an expedited basis. Although a copy of LILCO's pleading was provided to the General Counsel by approximately 11:00 am on the 17th, a complete version of the response, including its voluminous attachments, was not requested by OGC until approximately midday; it was delivered to OGC from Richmond later that afternoon. LILCO was informed at approximately 9:30 the next morning, July 18, that the Commission had already issued an order on the County's motion. From this sequence of events, it seems likely that the Commission was not able to consider fully LILCO's response to

-2-

the County's motion. Significantly, the order did not acknowledge LILCO's response nor did it address LILCO's arguments. Thus, LILCO believes the Commission acted prematurely in issuing its Memorandum and Order on the 18th and should reconsider it in light of LILCO's response in order to provide more definitive guidance for the conduct of these proceedings.

In particular, the Commission did not address the effect of the comprehensive security settlement agreement on security issues in the low power licensing proceeding. The order states that it was the Commission's understanding that the Licensing Board prevented the County from raising new security issues "because no contentions on security were currently before the Licensing Board in the operating license proceeding." Order at 1. But this was not the only ground for the denial relied upon in the Licensing Board's order. Order Granting LILCO's Motion in Limine at 2-3 (June 20, 1984). As LILCO arqued in its response, the Final Security Settlement Agreement between LILCO and Suffolk County provided a separate and independent basis for excluding security issues. LILCO Response at 23-26. This agreement resolved all pending security matters and established a framework for resolving security disputes in the future. 1/ Since the Commission's order makes no mention of

-3-

<sup>1/</sup> LILCO's response recognized that the settlement agreement does not prevent the NRC Staff from engaging security matters as part of its continuing review responsibility. By signing the agreement, however, the County waived the right to raise security issues in the future except as provided by the agreement. LILCO Response at 19.

the agreement, presumably it was not considered. We believe that if the Commission had fully considered LILCO's papers, it would have concluded that the settlement agreement was dispositive. Consequently, LILCO requests that the Commission reconsider its July 18 Memorandum and Order in light of LILCO's submittal of July 16.

> Respectfully submitted, LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

79/240 ann Donald P. Arwin

Anthony Fr Earley, Jr. Lee B. Zeugin

HUNTON & WILLIAMS 707 East Main Street Richmond, Virginia 23219

DATED: July 19, 1984

### LILCO, July 19, 1984

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

-PUCKETER USARG

In the Matter of '84 JUL 19 All :50 LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY (Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1) Docket No. 50-322-0L-4 (Low Power)

I hereby certify that copies of LILCO'S MOTION FOR RECON-SIDERATION OF THE COMMISSION'S JULY 18 MEMORANDUM AND ORDER dated July 19, 1984 were served this date upon the following by U.S. mail, first-class, postage prepaid, and in addition by hand (as indicated by one asterisk) or by telecopier (as indicated by two asterisks).

Chairman Nunzio J. Palladino\* U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 1717 H Street Washington, D.C. 20555

Commissioner James K. Asselstine\* U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 1717 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20555

Commissioner Lando W. Zech, Jr.\* U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 1717 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20555

Commissioner Frederick M. Bernthal\* U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 1717 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20555

Commissioner Thomas M. Roberts\* U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 1717 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20555 Judge Marshall E. Miller\* Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Fourth Floor East West Towers (West Tower) 4350 East-West Highway Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Judge Glenn O. Bright\* Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Fourth Floor East West Towers (West Tower) 4350 East-West Highway Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Judge Elizabeth B. Johnson\*\* Oak Ridge National Laboratory P.O. Box X, Building 3500 Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Eleanor L. Frucci, Esq.\* Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Fourth Floor East West Towers (West Tower) 4350 East-West Highway Bethesda, Maryland 20814 Honorable Peter Cohalan Suffolk County Executive County Executive/

Legislative Building Veterans Memorial Highway Hauppauge, New York 11788

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

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

Mr. Martin Suubert c/o Congressman William Carney 113 Longworth House Office Bldg. Washington, D.C. 20515

James Dougherty, Esq. 3045 Porter Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20008 Jay Dunkleberger, Esq. New York State Energy Office Agency Building 2 Empire State Plaza Albany, New York, 12223

Edwin J. Reis, Esq.\* Office of the Executive Legal Director U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Maryland National Bank Building 7735 Old Georgetown Road Bethesda, Maryland 20814 Attn: NRC 1st Floor Mail Room

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

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

Docketing and Service Branch Office of the Secretary U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Anthony F. Earley, Jrg MAC

Hunton & Williams 707 East Main Street Post Office Box 1535 Richmond, Virginia 23212

DATED: July 19, 1984