

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKETED
USNRC
'84 APR -2 P12:16

Before The Atomic Safety And Licensing Board

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

In the Matter of)

LONG ISLAND LIGHTING COMPANY)

(Shoreham Nuclear Power Station,
Unit 1))

Docket No. 50-322-OL-3

(Emergency Planning)

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ROBERT W. PETRILAK
ON BEHALF OF SUFFOLK COUNTY REGARDING
CONTENTION 15.C

Q. Please state your name and position.

A. My name is Robert W. Petrilak. I am the Vice
President of the Mt. Sinai Board of Education.

Q. Are you familiar with Contention 15.C?

A. Yes. Contention 15 as a whole asserts that because
the public does not perceive LILCO to be a credible source of
information, the public would not believe LILCO's statements or
follow LILCO's advice in the event of an emergency at Shoreham.
In particular, Contention 15.C asserts that it is unlikely that
LILCO's protective action recommendations for schools would be

8404030394 840330
PDR ADDCK 05000322
T PDR

implemented, because LILCO depends on school personnel to implement those recommendations, and because the administrators and staffs of schools and school districts are likely not to trust LILCO.

Q. Do you agree with Contention 15.C?

A. The assertion in Contention 15.C is correct. The Mt. Sinai School District would not implement protective actions solely based upon the recommendations of LILCO in the event of an emergency at Shoreham. LILCO does not have the authority to direct the actions that would be expected of school districts. Any decision to attempt to implement proposed protective actions recommended by LILCO would have to be made upon recommendations from the County and the State, not from LILCO which is a private corporation, or only after detailed verification of data which underlie LILCO's recommendations.

The administration of the Mt. Sinai School District does not regard LILCO as a reliable source of information. Recent actions taken by LILCO such as the problems with its backup diesel generators, its attempt to secure a low power license despite the opposition of the State of New York, Suffolk County and the Mt. Sinai Board of Education, LILCO's refusal to allow Suffolk County to perform an independent inspection and design

review of the Shoreham plant, and LILCO's apparent refusal to confront the extreme difficulties which would affect any emergency response to a Shoreham accident, all demonstrate to us that LILCO places its own financial interests above the safety of our school children, staff and residents. Consequently, the administration of the Mt. Sinai School District would not trust information or advice provided by LILCO, and it is unlikely that we would attempt to implement LILCO's protective action recommendations. Further, given our view that LILCO's credibility is very low, even if the District were convinced that an accident had occurred at Shoreham and that some sort of protective actions were required, it is unlikely that we would rely on a LILCO recommendation regarding the action(s) to be taken but rather would determine for ourselves what action(s) would be feasible and in the best interests of our children.

Q. Does you that conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.