RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

LILCO, August 7, 1984

DOCKETED

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Bard 50 -9 All :15 In the Matter of

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1)

## LILCO'S MOTION TO COMPEL THE IDENTIFICATION OF WITNESSES OFFERING SPECIFIC ELEMENTS OF TESTIMONY REGARDING SUFFOLK COUNTY'S EMERGENCY DIESEL GENERATOR CONTENTIONS

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. §§ 2.743(a) and (c), the Long Island Lighting Company ("LILCO") moves the Board for an Order compelling Suffolk County to specify the identity of the witness (or witnesses) sponsoring each response included in the testimony it filed on July 31, 1984. Unless such specifications are provided, LILCO will be unable to challenge effectively the qualifications of witnesses to offer a particular item of testimony and will be hindered in its cross-examination of witnesses concerning specific evidentiary points.

Almost nowhere in 184 pages of its testimony concerning the Shoreham emergency diesel generators does Suffolk County specify the identity of the witness or witnesses offering a particular response. LILCO cannot determine the source (or sources) of any element of the wide-ranging testimony the

8408090411 84080 PDR ADOCK 05000322 PDR

County has offered. Consequently, LILCO is unable to evaluate the qualifications of the proponent of any response to testify as an expert to the matters alleged.<sup>1</sup>/ LILCO thus has been precluded from advancing all the grounds for striking Suffolk County's testimony that may be available. This result is contrary to the spirit of the Commission's rules on the admission of evidence in licensing proceedings<sup>2</sup>/ and is, moreover, inconsistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure governing the use of expert testimony in civil actions.<sup>3</sup>/

The County's failure to provide the identity of the proponent of each element of the Joint Testimony will also unduly complicate LILCO's task in cross-examining the County's witnesses. Without knowing the identity of the proponent of testimony it wishes to challenge, LILCO will be required to

1/ Indeed, LILCO has been able to raise such challenges only where it is clear that <u>none</u> of the County's witnesses possess the necessary qualifications.

2/ Cf. 10 C.F.R. § 2.743(c) (only relevant, material and reliable evidence which is not unduly repetitious will be admitted) (emphasis added).

3/ Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(4)(A)(i) (a party may require any other party to identify each expert witness to be called, to state the subject matter on which the expert will testify and to state the substance of the facts and opinions to which the expert will testify). See Clark v. General Motors Corp., 20 Fed. R. Serv. 2d (Callaghan) 679, 683-84 (D. Mass. 1975) (ordering responses to interrogatories asking for the identity and qualifications of experts), citing United States v. Meyer, 398 F.2d 66, 72 (9th Cir. 1968).

-2-

consume substantial time in attempting to test a particular assertion, opinion or conclusion. As a result, the progress of the hearing will be substantially slowed. Indeed, the confusion resulting from the County's failure to associate individual witnesses with specific testimony could effectively deprive LILCO of its right to "conduct such cross-examination as may be required for full and true disclosure of the facts." 10 C.F.R. § 2.743(a). <u>Cf</u>. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(4)(A)(i).

In these circumstances, the Board should direct Suffolk County to identify the witness (or witnesses) responsible for each element of the testimony it filed on July 31, 1984. <u>Cf</u>., <u>e.q.</u>, <u>Rupp v. Vock & Weiderhold, Inc.</u>, 52 F.R.D. 111, 113-14 (E.D. Ohio 1971) (directing plaintiffs to identify expert witnesses and to state more precisely the subject matter upon which each is to testify). In order to afford LILCO adequate time to plan its cross-examination, the Board should direct Suffolk County to serve the requested identification of witnesses by August 24, 1984 (four days prior to the date on which cross-examination plans are due). $\frac{4}{2}$ 

-3-

<sup>4/</sup> Upon receiving the County's specification of witnesses, LILCO may seek leave to supplement its motion to strike portions of the County's direct testimony to include additional challenges to the competence of witnesses to offer specific testimony.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Board should direct Suffolk County to specify by August 24, 1984 the identity of the witness or witnesses sponsoring each response contained in the testimony it filed on July 31, 1984.

> Respectfully Submitted, LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

Joley. TH / 945

Hunton & Williams 2000 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W. P.O. Box 19230 Washington, D.C. 20036

W. Taylor Reveley, III Robert Rolfe Anthony Earley Darla Tarletz Hunton & Williams 707 East Main Street P.O.Box 1535 Richmond, Virginia 23212

Odes L. Stroupe, Jr. David Dreifus Hunton & Williams 333 Fayetteville Street P.O. Box 109 Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

DATED: August 7, 1984

\*84 AGO -9 A11:15

ECALED CORRESPONDENCE

## 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 JOINT DIRECT TESTIMONY OF DR. ROBERT N. ANDERSON, PROFESSOR STANLEY G. CHRISTENSEN, G. DENNIS ELEY, ANEESH BAKSHI, DALE G. BRIDENAUGH AND RICHARD B. HUBBARD AND LILCO'S MOTION TO COMPEL THE IDENTIFICATION OF WITNESSES KOFFERING SPECIFIC ELEMENTS OF TESTIMONY REGARDING SUFFOLK CCUNTY'S EMERGENCY DIESEL GENERATOR CONTENTIONS were served this date upon the following by first-class mail, postage prepaid, or (as indicated by one asterisk) by hand, or (as indicated by two asterisk) by Federal Express.

Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

Dr. Peter A. Morris\* Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555

Dr. George A. Ferguson\* Administrative Judge Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel School of Engineering Howard University 2300 6th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20059

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

Martin Bradley Ashare, Esq.\*\* Attn: Patricia A. Dempsey, Esq. County Attorney Suffolk County Department of Law Veterans Memorial Highway Hauppauge, New York 11787

Edwin J. Reis, Esq.\* Bernard M. Bordenick, Esq. Office of the Executive Legal Director U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

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

Mr. Marc W. Goldsmith Energy Research Group 4001 Totten Pond Road Waltham, Masschusetts 02154

4

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

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

James B. Dougherty, Esq. 3045 Porter Street Washington, D.C. 20008 Fabian G. Palomino, Esq.\*\* Special Counsel to the Governor Executive Chamber, Room 229 State Capitol Albany, New York 12224

Jonathan D. Feinberg, Esq.\*\* New York State Department of Public Service Three Empire State Plaza Albany, New York 12223

Robert E. Smith, Esq.\*\* Guggenheimer & Untermyer 80 Pine Street New York, New York 10005 (diesels only)

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

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

19403 E. Milton Farley

Hunton & Williams 707 East Main Street Richmond, Virginia 23219

DATED: August 7, 1984