2047

December 22, 1986 ETEL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

'86 DEC 30 P12:14

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

OFFICE OF SECRETARY DOCKETING A SERVICE BRANCH

In the Matter of

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station,
 Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-322-OL-5 (EP Exercise)

OPPOSITION OF SUFFOLK COUNTY, STATE OF NEW YORK AND TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON TO FEMA'S REQUEST FOR STAY

On December 19, 1986, the Federal Emergency Management
Agency ("FEMA") filed its "Request for Stay of Issuance of
Subpoenas and Modification of Procedure with Respect to
Depositions" ("Request for Stay"). FEMA argues that "the Board
should stay its Order of the 17th with respect to issuance of
subpoenas, so that FEMA can determine whether or not appeal of
the Board's approach to discovery against FEMA with respect to
both witnesses and document production is appropriate." Request
for Stay at 2.

FEMA's Request for Stay is both procedurally defective and premature, and should therefore be denied. The proper procedure for opposing issuance of a subpoena is by motion to quash or modify. 10 CFR § 2.720(f). To the extent that FEMA's Request

for Stay addresses matters in the Board's December 17 Order 1/other than the issuance of subpoenas, it is defective for failing to address the criteria set forth in 10 CFR 5 2.788(e). That section provides as follows:

- (e) In determining whether to grant or deny an application for a stay, the Commission, Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board, or presiding officer will consider.
- (1) Whether the moving party has made a strong showing that it is likely to prevail on the merits;
- (2) Whether the party will be irreparably injured unless a stay is granted;
- (3) Whether the granting of a stay would harm other parties; and
 - (4) Where the public interest lies.

Any party who seeks a stay of a Board order must, inter alia, give "[a] concise statement of the grounds for stay, with reference to the factors specified in paragraph (e) of this Section." See, 10 CFR § 2.788(b)(2). This FEMA has failed to do and, for that reason alone, the Request for Stay should be denied.

If the Board should decide to consider FEMA's Request for Stay on the merits, despite its procedural defects, the Request should be denied. The only grounds FEMA gives for its Request are: 1) that FEMA "assumes" the Governments will wish to

Memorandum and Order (Ruling in Part on Intervenors' Motions to Compel FEMA to Produce Witnesses for Deposition, to Permit Witnesses to answer Deposition Questions, and to Produce Documents), December 17, 1986.

question the subpoenaed evaluators on Revisions 7 and 8 and, since the review of Revisions 7 and 8 will not be available until December 31, 1986, any testimony prior to that date will only lead to wrangling and delay; and 2) that the procedure for asserting the deliberative process privilege outlined in the Board's Order of Decmber 17, 1986 will be almost impossible for Counsel for FEMA to implement "[a]ssuming that the Intervenors [sic] questions are both numerous and lengthy. . . " Request for Stay at 2-3.

As to FEMA's first stated ground, given the present realities in this litigation, it is highly unlikely that any of the subpoenaed witnesses will be called to testify prior to December 31. See letter to Board from Michael S. Miller dated December 22, 1986. Furthermore, while the Governments may indeed inquire into Revisions 7 and 8, it is expected that the majority of the Governments' questioning of these witnesses will concern their roles at the February 13 Exercise.

FEMA's second ground for requesting a stay is premature.

Again, FEMA is basing its Request on an "assumption" -- that the Governments will engage in lengthy inquiry into privileged areas.

FEMA's request that the Board further delay the testimony of four evaluators who were at the Exercise solely because FEMA's counsel may find it burdensome to object to questions he "assumes" will be asked is absurd on its face and makes a mockery of both due process and the law of the deliberative process privilege.

None of the grounds asserted by FEMA for its Request meets the requisite showing under 10 CFR § 2.788(e). FEMA has made no showing that it is likely to prevail on the merits, nor has it shown that a failure to grant the stay will cause any, let alone irreparable, injury to FEMA.

For the foregoing reasons, the Governments respectfully ask that the Board deny FEMA's Request for Stay as both procedurally defective and premature.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Bradley Ashare Suffolk County Attorney Building 158 North County Complex Veterans Memorial Highway Hauppauge, New York 11788

Michael S. Miller Christopher M. McMurray
Susan Casey
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART
South Lobby - 9th Floor
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5891

Attorneys for Suffolk County

Fabian G. Palomino Sme

Special Counsel to the Governor

of the State of New York Executive Chamber, Room 229

Capitol Building

Albany, New York 12224

Attorney for Mario M. Cuomo, Governor of the State of New York Stephen B. Latham / 8mc Stephen B. Latham Twomey, Latham & Shea P.O. Box 398 33 West Second Street Riverhead, New York 11901 Attorney for the Town of Southampton Dated: December 22, 1986 - 5 -

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

'86 DEC 30 P12:14

Before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board

OFFICE OF SEARCHARY BRANCH

In the Matter of

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station,
Unit 1)

Docket No. 50-322-OL-5 (EP Exercise)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of OPPOSITION OF SUFFOLK COUNTY, STATE OF NEW YORK AND TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON TO FEMA'S REQUEST FOR STAY have been served this 19th day of December 1986 by U.S. mail, first class, except as otherwise noted.

John H. Frye, III, Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Oscar H. Paris
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

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

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

Mr. William Rogers
Clerk
Suffolk County Legislature
Suffolk County Legislature
Office Building
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

Ms. Nora Bredes
Executive Director
Shoreham Opponents Coalition
195 East Main Street
Smithtown, New York 11787

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

Martin Bradley Ashare, Esq. Suffolk County Attorney Bldg, 158 North County Complex Veterans Memorial Highway Hauppauge, New York 11788

David A. Brownlee Kirkpatrick & Lockhart 1500 Oliver Building Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222 Anthony F. Earley, Jr., Esq. General Counsel Long Island Lighting Company 175 East Old Country Road Hicksville, New York 11801

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

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

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

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

Richard J. Zahnleuter
Deputy Special Counsel to
the Governor
Capitol, Room 229
Albany, New York 12274

Mr. Phillip McIntire
Federal Emergency Management
Agency
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10278

Susan M Casey
Susan M. Casey
KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART
South Lobby - 9th Floor
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5891

^{*} By Federal Express