## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION '85 MAR 19 P12:28

ATCMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD Before Administrative Judges:

OCKETING & SERVICE BRANCH

....

Lawrence Brenner, Chairman Dr. George A. Ferguson Dr. Peter A. Morris

## SERVED MAR 1 9 1985

In the Matter of LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1) Docket No. 50-322-OL

March 18, 1985

## ORDER SETTING PAGE LIMIT FOR PROPOSED FINDINGS

The Board hereby establishes 100 double-spaced pages as the overall limit for proposed findings on the issues remaining in controversy for which findings have not been filed previously, <u>i.e.</u>: additional crankshaft findings, cylinder block findings and qualified load findings. This limitation, as applied to LILCO, includes both initial and reply findings.

The Board considers the County's request for a limit of 140 pages to be greatly in excess of the pages required. The Board insists that the proposed findings filed by all parties be a synthesis consisting of tight, logical arguments, with 'seferences to the supporting record, demonstrating the reasoning by which the Board should accept the proponent's arguments and reject those of opposing parties. The Board

8503200467 850318 PDR ADOCK 05000322

140

does not want, as has occurred in the past in this case, either the extreme of verbose repetition of much of the testimony or the different extreme of a relatively brief, but unreasoned, summary of the written direct testimony of those witnesses supporting the proponent's position; as if there had been almost no material oral evidence or other witnesses. The Board believes that the 80 page limit proposed by LILCO and the NRC Staff would have probably been adequate, but we are not sufficiently sure to order it. Accordingly, the Board has set the limit at 100 pages with assurance in our minds that it can be met without sacrificing any necessary substance in the findings. Indeed, it is the Board's strong view that, consistent with the guidance given above, the required adherence to this limit will improve the quality and usefulness to the Board of the findings.

As previously established, the schedule for receipt of the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law is as follows:

April 4, 1985: LILCO's findings
April 15, 1985: Joint Suffolk County's and New York
State's findings
April 25, 1985: NRC Staff's findings
May 2, 1985: LILCO's reply findings

- 2 -

As always in this case, the parties are required to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law on issues in controversy. <u>See</u> 10 C.F.R. § 2.754(b).

IT IS SG ORDERED.

FOR THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

awana nerner

Lawrence Brenner, Chairman ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Bethesda, Maryland March 18, 1985