DOCKETED USARC 1988

'88 FEB -8 P4:03

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)

SUFFOLK COUNTY'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES
AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
TO LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

Suffolk County, by its counsel, propounds the following interrogatories to Long Island Lighting Company ("LILCO") pursuant to \$\$ 2.740, 2.740b and 2.741 of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Rules of Practice.

DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

The "Definitions" and "Instructions" for this second set of interrogatories and requests for production of documents are the same ones set out in Suffolk County's First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to Long Island Lighting Company, dated January 4, 1988. However, for purposes of these interrogatories and document requests, LILCO's "auxiliary bus driver arrangement" refers to the proposal for evacua-

8802100015 880205 PDR ADOCK 05000322 PDR ADOCK 05000322

D613

ting school children from the Shoreham 10-mile EPZ during a radiological emergency at Shoreham, by using LILCO employees to serve as auxiliary, or backup, and primary school bus drivers, all as more fully described by LILCO in its "Motion for Summary Disposition of Contention 25.C ('Role Conflict' of School Bus Drivers)," dated October 22, 1987.

The following interrogatories and requests for production of documents are numbered beginning where the first set, dated January 4, 1988, left off.

INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

- 33. Please identify each and every bus company that has entered into contracts with LILCO to provide buses in the event of a Shoreham emergency. For each bus company, specify whether such company provides buses and/or drivers for schools and/or school districts. For each such company which provides buses and/or drivers for schools and/or school districts, identify the particular schools and/or school districts with which the company contracts, and specify whether such schools and/or school districts are in or outside the EPZ. Provide a copy of all correspondence and documents relating to each and every bus company that has entered into a contract with LILCO.
- 34. With respect to each bus company identified in response to Interrogatory 33, please specify the number of buses that are

contracted to LILCO and further specify whether such buses are to be used by LILCO for the evacuation of the transit-dependent general population, the evacuation of the handicapped and special facilities, the evacuation of parochial and nursery schools, the evacuation of public schools, or some other purpose. If for some other purpose, specify that purpose.

- 35. In LILCO's February 4, 1988 "Response to Suffolk County's First Set of Requests for Admissions Regarding the Remand Issue of 'Role Conflict' of School Bus Drivers," Suffolk County's Request for Admission No. 5 was denied. Please provide the basis for LILCO's denial of that Request.
- 36. Please identify each and every school district, having schools located in the EPZ, which has consented to any LILCO proposal to have LILCO employees drive buses to evacuate school children during a Shoreham emergency.
- 37. In LILCO's February 4, 1988 "Response + Suffolk County's First Set of Requests for Admissions Regarding the Remand Issue of 'Role Conflict' of School Bus Drivers," Suffolk County's Request for Admission No. 6 was denied. Please provide the basis for LILCO's denial of that Request.
- 38. Please identify each and every school district, having schools located in the EPZ, which has consented to have LILCO em-

ployees drive school buses containing children during an evacuation from a Shoreham emergency.

- 39. Please provide a list of LILCO "auxiliary" bus drivers and, if such drivers have been or will be assigned as drivers of buses transporting school children from a particular school district or school within the EPZ, specify the LILCO drivers for each school or school district.
- 40. Please specify whether any LILCO "auxiliary" bus drivers have been approved by any school or school district and, if so, identify the school(s) and/or school district(s) which have approved such drivers as drivers of buses transporting school children.
- 41. In LILCO's February 4, 1988 "Response to Suffolk County's First Set of Requests for Admissions Regarding the Remand Issue of 'Role Conflict' of School Bus Drivers," Suffolk County's Request for Admission No. 15 was denied. Please provide the basis for LILCO's denial of that Request.
- 42. Please identify each and every bus company, under contract with schools and/or school districts in the EPZ, which has agreed to allow LILCO or its employees to perform school bus driving duties covered by such contracts.

- 43. Please identify each and every school and/or school district in the EPZ, if any, which has agreed or has indicated that it will or may agree (specifying for each school and/or school district whether agreement has actually been obtained or may be obtained) to have its school bus drivers trained by LILCO. Provide any correspondence or documents relating to this interrogatory.
- 44. Please identify each and every school and/or school district in the EPZ, if any, which has agreed to meet with LILCO to discuss LILCO's "auxiliary bus driver arrangement" or which has indicated in any way that it is or is not willing to do so. In answering this interrogatory, please specify for each school and/or school district whether a meeting has been or has not been agreed to by each school and/or school district identified.
- 45. Please identify each and every school district and/or school in the EPZ, if any, which has instructed its school bus drivers to accept training by LILCO or which has indicated that it will or will not so instruct its drivers. In answering this interrogatory, please specify for each school and/or school district whether an instruction to accept LILCO's training has or has not been given.
- 46. In LILCO's February 4, 1988 "Response to Suffolk County's First Set of Requests for Admissions Regarding the Remand Issue of 'Role Conflict' of School Bus Drivers," Suffolk

County's Request for Admission No. 20 was denied. Please provide the basis for LILCO's denial of that Request.

- 47. Please identify each and every school district and/or school in the EPZ, if any, which has agreed to have its school children evacuated during a Shoreham emergency to any reception center identified, or to be identified, by LILCO. Have any school districts and/or schools refused to have their school children evacuated to any such reception centers. If so, please identify.
- 48. In LILCO's February 4, 1988 "Response to Suffolk County's First Set of Requests for Admissions Regarding the Remand Issue of 'Role Conflict' of School Bus Drivers," Suffolk County's Request for Admission No. 21 was denied. Please provide the basis for LILCO's denial of that Request.
- 49. Please identify each and every school district and/or school in the EPZ, if any, which has adopted or approved a plan for the implementation of a single-wave evacuation of school children in the EPZ during a Shoreham emergency.
- 50. Please identify each and every assumption underlying LILCO's evacuation time estimates concerning the evacuation of school children under LILCO's "auxiliary bus driver arrangement," or some part thereof.

- 51. In LILCO's February 4, 1988 "Response to Suffolk County's First Set of Requests for Admissions Regarding the Remand Issue of 'Role Conflict' of School Bus Drivers," Suffolk County's Request for Admission No. 23 was denied. Please provide the basis for LILCO's denial of that Request.
- 52. Is it assumed by LILCO that no LILCO employees serving as "auxiliary," backup or primary bus drivers under LILCO's "auxiliary bus driver arrangement" will experience role conflict during a Shoreham emergency? Is it assumed by LILCO that no such LILCO employees would abandon their LERO jobs or fail to report for duty due to role conflict during a Shoreham emergency? For each of the above, please specify each and every basis of the assumptions made by LILCO, and produce any documents related to such assumptions.
- 53. Please identify each and every contact or communication in which any person or group has attempted to persuade school districts and/or schools (or representatives or employees of school districts and/or schools) to participate in LILCO's "auxiliary bus driver arrangement" or otherwise to cooperate with LILCO with regard to the evacuation of schools during a Shoreham emergency. Please specify for each such contact and/or communication, the school district or school contacted and the person(s) talked with, the date of each contact or communication, and the substance of each communication or contact. Please produce any documents related to any such contacts or communications.

- 54. Please identify each and every bus company which has been contacted by LELCO with regard to LILCO's "auxiliary bus driver arrangement" concerning the evacuation of schools during a Shoreham emergency. Please specify which such bus companies have declined to participate in LILCO's "auxiliary bus driver arrangement" or have declined to contract with LILCO for the provision of buses. Specify the reasons that each such bus company has declined to participate, and produce any documents related to this interrogatory.
- 55. To the extent there have been any changes since you have responded to Suffolk County's first set of interrogatories and requests for production of documents, please again respond to Requests 1 through 32 of Suffolk County's First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to Long Island Lighting Company, dated January 4, 1988.
- 56. Please identify and provide a copy of any document not already identified in response to the above interrogatories and/or Suffolk County's First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to Long Island Lighting Company, dated January 4, 1988, on which LILCO intends to rely in support

of its position on the issue of whether there will be a sufficient number of school bus drivers to evacuate schools during a Shoreham emergency.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael S. Miller J. Lynn Taylor

Attorneys for Suffolk County

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART 1800 M Street, N.W. South Lobby - 9th Floor Washington, D.C. 20036

February 5, 1988

DOCKETED USNRC February 5, 1988

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA '88 FEB -8 P4:09 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before the Atomic Safety and Licens The Board FAVICE

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 SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY have been served on the following this 5th day of February, 1988 by J.S. mail, first class, except as noted:

James P. Gleason, Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

James P. Gleason, Chairman 513 Gilmoure Drive Silver Spring, Maryland 20901

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

Fabian G. Palomino, Esq.
Richard J. Zahnleuter, Esq.
Special Counsel to the Governor
Executive Chamber, Rm. 229
State Capitol
Albany, New York 12224

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

William R. Cumming, Esq.
Spence W. Perry, Esq.
Office of General Counsel
Federal Emergency Management Agency
500 C Street, S.W., Room 840
Washington, D.C. 20472

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

Joel Blau, Esq.
Director, Utility Intervention
N.Y. Consumer Protection Board Suite 1020 Albany, New York 12210

E. Thomas Boyle, Esq. E. Thomas Boyle, Esq.
Suffolk County Attorney
Bldg. 158 North County Complex Veterans Memorial Highway Hauppauge, New York 11788

Mr. L. F. Britt Long Island Lighting Company Shoreham Nuclear Power Station North Country Road Wading River, New York 11792

New York State Department of Law Suffolk County Executive 120 Broadway, 3rd Floor 120 Broadway, 3rd Floor

Room 3-116

H. Lee Dennison Building
Veterans Memorial Highway New York, New York 10271

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

Albany, New York 12223

David A. Brownlee, Esq. Mr. Stuart Diamond Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Business/Financial 1500 Oliver Building NEW YORK TIMES Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222 229 W. 43rd Street New York

Anthony F. Earley, Jr., Esq. General Counsel Long Island Lighting Company 175 East Old Country Road Hicksville, New York 11801

Ms. Elisabeth Taibbi, Clerk Suffolk County Legislature Suffolk County Legislature Office Building Veterans Memorial Highway Hauppauge, New York 11788

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

Ms. Nora Bredes

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

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

Hauppauge, New York 11788

Dr. Monroe Schneider North Shore Committee P.O. Box 231 Wading River, New York 11792

Mr. Jay Dunkleburger

New York State Energy Office

Agency Building 2

Empire State Plaza

George E. Johnson, Esq.

Edwin J. Reis, Esq.

Office of the General Counsel

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm. Washington, D.C. 20555

New York, New York 10036

Douglas J. Hynes, Councilman Town Board of Oyster Bay Town Hall Oyster Bay, New York 11771

Michael S. Miller KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART

1800 M Street, N.W. South Lobby - 9th Floor Washington, D.C. 20036-5891

By Telecopy