January 26, 2004

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION BEFORE THE COMMISSION

DOCKETED USNRC

January 27, 2004 (7:30AM)

In the Matter of

Docket No. 52-008

OFFICE OF SECRETARY RULEMAKINGS AND ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC

(Early Site Permit for North Anna ESP Site)

## PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO DOMINION NUCLEAR'S APPLICATION FOR NEW ADJUDICATORY PROCESS

Petitioners, Blue Ridge Environmental Defense League, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, and Public Citizen hereby respond to Applicant's Motion to Apply New Adjudicatory Process (January 16, 2004) (hereinafter "Applicant's Motion").

Applicant, Dominion Nuclear North Anna, LLC (hereinafter "Dominion"), seeks the Commission's approval to apply the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's ("NRC's" or "Commission's") newly promulgated Part 2 regulations to this proceeding. Final Rule, Changes to Adjudicatory Process, 69 Fed. Reg. 2,182 (January 14, 2004).

Under the rule, the new Part 2 provisions are not scheduled to go into effect until mid-February. As noted by Dominion, the Commission was not required to delay the effectiveness of the rule. Petitioners believe that due to the breadth and austerity of the new rules, it was fair for the Commission to provide a 30-day period before the rule went into effect. Applicants have given no particular reason to impose the new schedule, other than they believe the rule is an improvement over the former rule. Clearly, the Commission believed the same thing when it provided the 30-day grace period.

Petitioners believe that the Commission should honor the schedule for making the rule effective that it set in the Federal Register notice.

Moreover, Petitioners do not believe that following the new rule will make the North Anna Early Site Permit proceeding more effective and efficient. Petitioners are unaware of any other Early Site Permit cases that have been litigated previously. Given the novelty of the proceeding and the potential complexity of the issues that have been raised by Petitioners regarding the relationship between reactor design and the site, alternatives to the proposal, cumulative impacts between the existing facility and prospective facilities, and site redress, Petitioners believe that a formal hearing will be a more effective and efficient means of resolving the parties' disputes.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Curran

Harmon, Curran, Spielberg, & Eisenberg, L.L.P.

1726 M Street N.W., Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20036

202/328-3500

e-mail: dcurran@harmoncurran.com

January 26, 2004

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on January 26, 2003, copies of the foregoing PETITIONERS' OPPOSITION TO DOMINION NUCLEAR'S APPLICATION FOR NEW HEARING PROCEDURES were served on the following by Federal Express:

Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff	Robert M. Weisman, Esq.
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Laura C. Zaccari, Esq.
11555 Rockville Pike	Office of General Counsel
Rockville, MD 20852-2738	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
hearingdocket@nrc.gov	11555 Rockville Pike
secy@nrc.gov	Rockville, MD 20852-2738
	rm2@nrc.gov, lcz@nrc.gov
David R. Lewis, Esq.	Lillian M. Cuoco, Esq.
Shaw Pittman	Senior Counsel
2300 N Street N.W.	Dominion Resources Services, Inc.
Washington, D.C. 20037	Ropes Ferry Road
david.lewis@shawpittman.com	Waterford, CT 06385
	cuocolm@nu.com
Nils J. Diaz, Chairman	Edward McGaffigan, Commissioner
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555	Washington, D.C. 20555
cmrdiaz@nrc.gov	cmrmcgaffigan@nrc.gov
Jeffrey S. Merrifield, Commissioner	
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission	
Washington, D.C. 20555	
cmrmerrifield@nrc.gov	

Diane Curran